Appendix

Address by Hon. Edward Martin of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I intended to deliver before the American Legion of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia this morning.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is always a pleasure and an inspiration to meet with my comrades of the American Legion.

Let me assure you again, as I have in the past, that I deeply appreciate the high honor of addressing this convention of the department of Pennsylvania.

I am happy to be here today because the American Legion represents the spirit and the will to build a better America, to defend freedom in peace as in war, and to sustain the sacred ideals of our national faith.

The American Legion keeps alive the heroic tradition of American fighting men whose courage and sacrifice preserved our liberty and independence.

In all recorded history there is no more inspiring story than that which relates the toil, sacrifice, and heroism that built America.

It is a glorious story of victory produced by a people whose hearts and minds were aflame with the spirit of liberty and independence.

It is the story of those courageous patriots who met here in Philadelphia, 180 years ago, and pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, to establish a new nation. For the first time in all the world government recognized the divine origin of man's inalienable rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The story of America is the story of George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln.

It is the story of Lexington, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, Yorktown, Gettysburg, Chateau Thierry, the Argonne, the Normandy beaches, Iwo Jima, and the frozen hills of Korea.

It should be told and retold, over and over again, in our schools and colleges, in meetings of fraternal and patriotic organizations, in labor meetings, political rallies and every other place where Americans assemble to discuss the welfare of our country.

It is therefore most appropriate, in a meeting such as this, to consider the situation confronting the United States today.

The course of history has placed upon the American people the responsibility for peace and progress in the world.

The United States stands as the one strong barrier against the Communist conspiracy to dominate and enslave the entire world.

We must not allow ourselves to be lulled into a false sense of security by the mask of friendliness now worn by the masters of the Kremlin.

We must not lower our guard just because the Soviet propaganda has taken a new turn.

We must not deceive ourselves into thinking that the Communists have abandoned their unholy ambition to destroy all human freedom.

Since the end of World War II we have learned by tragic experience that the Red dictators look upon compacts and agreements as mere scraps of paper.

Not once since diplomatic recognition was extended to them by the United States have they honored the terms of any agreement.

The Communists talk peace but the record denies their words. They have sabotaged every effort for peace and they will continue to do so.

Wherever there is tension in any part of the world, wherever there is unrest or strife, we find Communist agents stirring up hatreds, fanning the flames of disruption and subversion. We find them conspiring in the political and economic spheres to destroy the hopes and aspirations of those who believe in peace, justice and freedom.

No, my fellow Americans, the fundamental objectives of communism have not changed. The denunciation of Stalin has not restored them to international respectability. The bloody hands of the Soviet gangsters still reach out for more innocent victims to be crushed under cruel tyranny and dictatorship.

I place no confidence whatever in the so-called doctrine of peaceful coexistence. So long as communism conspires behind the Iron Curtain for the destruction of all human liberty we are not free from danger.

For my own part I would demand more substantial proof of their honorable intentions—not in words but in deeds.

Has one nation, conquered by the mass murders of Stalin, been restored to its rightful place of freedom?

Have the people of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other countries held in Communist captivity been granted the right of free elections to decide their form of government?

The United States recognizes the Baltic States as independent republics, but their courageous people are still ground down under Communist terrorism.

A united Germany could make a great contribution to world progress but Soviet policy bars the way.

It is plain that the Communists have no intention of backing up their gestures of world friendship with any act of decent regard for the principles of civilized intercourse between nations.

I have discussed one phase of the international situation, but it is just as important to be constantly alert against the dangers of Communist influence here at home.

The American Legion battles against communism and does a good job. It believes that loyal Americans should fight disloyalty with every legal weapon at our command.

You are all familiar with the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court which held that the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction in the field of sedition and subversion.

This decision struck down laws enacted in 42 States and Territories under which those guilty of subversion could be prosecuted and punished by the State.

We may not agree with the findings of the Supreme Court but its decision must be accepted as coming within the framework of the Constitution.

I have the highest regard for the Court, but I believe that each State should have the right to combat sedition within its borders. I believe each should have the right to punish not only those who seek forcible overthrow of the State, but also those who would overthrow the Nation by force.

Because that is my belief I was glad to join in sponsoring a bill in the Senate that would restore to the States the right to prosecute those who conspire to destroy the Government of the United States or the State. It would plug up the hole made by the Supreme Court decision in the dike protecting our internal security. It will provide us with a powerful and effective weapon against those who would undermine the structure of American freedom.

Every loyal American knows that the United States is the one power on earth that can rally free men in resistance to tyranny and the preservation of human liberty.

Therefore, I say we must never be diverted from our most sacred responsibility. We must never deviate from our plainly marked path of patriotic duty and that is to keep America sound, strong, prosperous, and at peace.

To meet the desperate challenge of the atomic age we must build up every element of our national strength. Not military strength alone, but the strength and power of a strong, stable, expanding economy, supported by the highest moral and spiritual standards.

I would like to direct your attention to some of the dangers that threaten America.

First. Big government and government doing things that we should do for ourselves.

The vast expansion in the size and cost of government at all levels is leading us away from the ideals of the Founding Fathers. The people are constantly demanding more and more services. Under that pressure Government has become involved in too many functions in which it does not properly belong. The result has always been excessive taxation and the steady flow of power from the hands of the people into centralized government control.

Second. Too much private and public debt. Never before in the history of the world have any people owed so much as we owe today. It should be a matter of deep concern to every one of us that the American people now owe a total of more than $658 billion, an increase of $51 billion in a single year. During 1955 the increase in the Federal debt was only one-half of 1 percent, but State and local debt rose 15 percent, and private debt increased 13 percent.

It is time to give heed to the warning that more nations have been destroyed by debt and taxes than by invading armies.

Third. Moral decay among the people. Great armies and great navies will not maintain a Nation's strength where the moral courage and patriotic fervor of its people are permitted to decay. Every student of history knows that great nations of the past have gone down to destruction when the moral fiber of the people was undermined by greed and corruption.

Fourth. Too little interest in government. Unfortunately there are too many misguided Americans who do not understand and do not appreciate the real meaning of America.

They do not seem to realize that our system of free government places upon each citizen an equal share of responsibility for our security and our progress.

Good citizenship is the basis of patriotism. That is why I am constantly urging every individual to take a more active, intelligent, patriotic part in government.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

I bring these dangers to the attention of this great organization of veterans because your patriotic service entitles you to leadership in civic responsibility.

I am fully aware of the many activities in which the Legion works for better Americanism. I am proud that the Legion is a powerful influence for the kind of patriotism that builds the strength of our country. I congratulate the Legion on its loyal, vigorous, and determined dedication to our country and our flag.

We pray that America may never turn away from its historic mission—to defend liberty, to oppose oppression, to stand against injustice and to support the aspiration of all men of good will for a world of peace.

We hope and pray for the day when all nations will lay down their arms and live in brotherhood under God.

But until that happy day dawns we must be prepared to defend the God-given freedom that we hold sacred.

Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

Eisenhower Circus Takes Off

SPEECH

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who were distressed to recently learn that the Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey bigtop had come down for the last time, and that several other major circuses had been taken off the road, can take some consolation from reports that the Republican campaign circus is leaving its rehearsal quarters and is about to go on the road.

An article written by Mr. Alistair Cooke and printed in the Manchester Guardian Weekly discusses the significant event. The article, in part, follows:

[From the Manchester Guardian Weekly of July 19, 1956]

EISENHOWER CIRCUS TAKES OFF

(By Alistair Cooke)

NEW YORK.—Until President Eisenhower announced that he would run again, we had to pretend, as a matter of historical accuracy, that the supreme commanders on both sides were unkown, and that the battle plans were hardly sketched out. Last week's news from Gettysburg exploded this hypocrisy.

The following day the National Citizens for Eisenhower put on in Madison Square Garden a "rehearsal" of their campaign circus which was about as impromptu as the planning of D-day. A 30-ton tractor caravan called Eisenhower's Bandwagon led a cavalcade of ranch wagons, teams of balloon technicians. "Ike-jeeps," and fleets of cars. Over the invasion fleet floated an Army surplus barrage baloon bearing the single word "Ike." It is only 1 of 16 that will hover in the autumn skies. They are inflated with helium, which has claim to be called a strategic gas and can be pre-empted by the Air Force's national-defense needs. Ike's jubilant citizens confided that since November they had been stealthily hoarding all the surplus helium they could get their hands on.

A week ago, Mr. Leonard Hall, the Republican national chairman, spent almost an hour telling the press about the party's campaign plans which, if they had been dreamed up since the Tuesday before, would be a staggering tribute to the Republicans' ability to improvise a blitz. Mr. NIXON is "absolutely" to be the dictated running mate. The campaign will cost $7 million. It will start about September 15 and will run for 6 weeks. The President will make 5 or 6 television speeches for which he will fly to different regions of the country. Representative CHARLES HALLECK, of Indiana, an old favorite of the President, will be the man to make the speech, at the San Francisco convention, putting Ike's name in nomination.

The interesting possibility that a State or two might be allowed, for form's sake, to nominate a favorite son or otherwise to support the illusion that the convention will be an open parliament with the right of free decisions, was crisply disposed of by the announcement that the President had agreed to fly to San Francisco to accept the renomination. Notice is hereby given that the Republican Convention is to be a Pompey's triumph, a colorful formality that will not require the delegates even to take a vote. The hero will be "chosen" by acclamation.

This is good news to everyone except the San Francisco hotel managers and shopkeepers, who had been promised about $2 million in revenue from the carousing delegates and their wives, who bend themselves at such times to a shopping spree. Indeed, the only snag in the Republican arrangements is the grouse of the San Franciscans that the convention may be all over in 3 days. The Republican National Committee, however, has already given its confidential promise that the ceremonies will be tricked out with tenors, drum majorettes, fashion shows, and all the other beguilements that have mercifully vanished since 1948 in deference to the impatience of television viewers.

In short, it seems that the humble workers in the Republican ranks have been on the parade ground with their battle dress under their arms all the time. They knew, if we didn't, that the battle would commence, but like Sam Small they wanted to have the word from the Duke of Wellington himself.

Dangers Involved in Adoption of Proposed General Staff Idea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Ramparts of the Nation's Defense—Part IV," which was published in the Deseret News and Telegram of Salt Lake City, Utah, pointing out the dangers involved in the adoption of the proposed General Staff idea.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City Deseret News and Telegram of June 9, 1956]

RAMPARTS OF THE NATION'S DEFENSE—PART IV

The spectacular feud between the three branches of the United States armed services indicates to some critics that there are cracks of disorganization and disunity in the surface of our national defenses. This is of grave concern to every citizen of America and the free world, for only by remaining sufficiently strong to discourage any potential aggressor can we hope to preserve peace in the world.

Actually, the open airing of the differences in high-level thinking on the subject of defense policy is a wholesome thing. It would be much more dangerous to have far-reaching decisions made without the knowledge of the Congress and the American public.

The major arguments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps have been presented on this page the past three Saturdays. Now it is time to take a look at the overall picture.

Two major factors have made the present discussions inevitable. They are:

1. The great technological advances made since the era of World War II.

The atomic and hydrogen bombs, the guided missile (with the probability of early development of the intercontinental ballistics missile), the atomic submarine and warship, the supersonic airplane—these and other new weapons have brought major changes in the military picture.

2. The startling rapid advances made by the Communists in the past few years.

From a definitely backward country, Russia has come rushing to the fore as an engineering and producing nation and is challenging our traditional superiority in many fields. If it is true that the Soviets have actually surpassed us in the production of intercontinental strategic bombers, guided missiles, and other fields, it is long past time for a sober look at our organization, production procedures, and top-level strategy. Some big changes may be indicated.

In examining the real issues behind the interservice quarrel and analyzing the status of our national defense, the question that inevitably comes up first is:

If war should come, what would be its nature?

This is a vital question, but one to which there is not—and cannot be at this time—a definite answer. We know that incredible strides have been made since the end of World War II and that both we and our enemies have new and more powerful weapons than have ever been used in war. But we don't know exactly how the war of the future will be fought, and we won't know until and unless war actually comes.

It would be foolhardy and dangerous to allow ourselves to lag behind in research and in the development and perfection of the most modern atomic-age weapons. This cannot be questioned.

But it would be dangerous, too, to leap too fast into the atomic future and neglect the less spectucular, traditional weapons which we could desperately need. The lesson of Korea still stands before us, and it is quite possible that Communist strategy will be to try to wear us down with a series of small "brush fire" wars around the globe. To meet such challenges, our hydrogen and atomic arms of "massive retaliation" might be largely or completely useless.

Even in the case of all all-out war with a major enemy, putting too much—just as putting too little—reliance on untried arms such as the long-range ballistics missile, could be utterly disastrous. As some wit has said, some people want "to rush into a pushbutton war when all we have is the pushbutton."

The inter-service wrangling over missions and areas of control poses the question of whether the definition of the basic missions of the three services, formulated in 1948 as a part of the services' integration," should be reexamined and redefined.

Many people definitely think so.

The bitter argument between the Army and the Air Force over who has the responsibility of antiaircraft defense of our major cities makes the suggestion appear reasonable.

It is highly appropriate, then, for the public to pause and take a look at the National Security Act of 1947 (amended in 1950) and think through the question of what changes would be made and what effect they would have.

In the National Security Act of 1947, Congress very wisely defined the basic missions of the three branches of the armed services in the broadest terms. Any attempt to change this and spell out into law the exact responsibilities of each branch of the service would be a serious mistake. It would destroy the flexibility that is so vital to our Military Establishment if we are to meet the challenge of the fast-changing atomic age.

The more detailed definition of responsibilities that came out of the Key West Conference in 1948, after unification had become law, may well be studied and reevaluated, however. Some change may or may not be indicated, but the full airing of the current disputes should help administration officials in reaching a correct decision. It is significant to note that the points now in dispute could be decided in any one of the several ways within the terms of the National Security Act.

All the argument over who has cognizance—as military documents usually say—of the guided missile and other new weapons is spectacular, but presents no real issue. Or at least, it should not present an issue.

The question of whether the Army, the Navy or the Air Force has primary responsibility for the medium or long-range missile should be decided administratively. What is important is that all weapons be used in the most effective way—and that they be used by all the branches of the service.

Weapons, including those of the atomic-hydrogen age, are the tools of the Armed Forces, and they should be used as they can best serve. To reserve any weapon to a particular branch of the service would be military folly of the highest order.

History is filled with examples of this type of folly. It was not too long ago that the Navy for a time halted the development of contending that a plane that could fly contending that a plane that coudld fly more than 300 miles over the ocean would be infringing on the Navy's area of responsibility. Army artillerymen tried hard to restrict the budding Air Corps to a mission of reconnaissance. And so on back through history.

In the field of research and development of new weapons, the interservice rivalry perhaps comes into its most acute area of conflict, and it is here that the most delicate decisions will have to be made.

The debate over the two antiaircraft guided missiles, the Army Nike and the Navy-Air Force Talos, is the immediate bone of contention, but the real issue is far broader. The Army claims responsibility for antiaircraft defense of major American cities, and for that purpose has ready its Nike 1, with a 25-mile range.

The Air Force argues that supersonic speed jet planes make such a short range missile obsolete and says it should take over the antiaircraft responsibility with the 60-mile-range Talos. The Army counters with talk of the Nike II, designed for 60-mile range and the Air Force comes back with the argument that an improved version of the Talos, now being developed, will have double that range.

The entire argument is missing the real point. Whether the Army or the Air Force defends our cities is incidental. The important thing is that they be well defended. The best possible antiaircraft missile must be developed, and used by whichever service is in the best position to handle the assignment—or both. That is a matter of administrative decision.

In the matter of research and development, the interservice rivalry is undoubtedly costly—in the age of guided missiles, tremendously costly. Yet before it is suppressed in the name of economy, some thought should be given to the stimulative value of competition and to the fact that the real value of any weapon is never fully known until it is actually battle tested.

Certainly the idea of setting up a single armed services research and development center should be carefully studied. But let those making the study be mindful of history. As a case in point, the May 10, 1941, issue of the Saturday Evening Post carried an article by C. B. Allen entitled "A Feud Between Engines," outlining the then hot argument over the relative merits of the air-cooled and water-cooled engines for military aircraft. At that time, it appeared the water-cooled engine was winning.

Fortunately, the rivalry continued and both types were developed—or the World War II cost to us might have been incalculable. Approximately 87 percent of our effective combat aircraft in World War II were powered by air-cooled engines.

Sometimes there is value in continuing more than one line of research, despite the cost. At the same time, unnecessary duplication should be avoided, and there must be a completely free interchange of information between the services. Interservice rivalry, though valuable to a point, must never be allowed to get out of hand and hinder our bigger rivalry with the potential enemy.

The biggest issue of all is tht of the basic form of our Defense Establishment. The squabble between our three service branches has brought on talk of junking our traditional Joint Chief of Staff organization for a single supreme commander and a national general staff. Even such influential publications as Time and Newsweeks have come out for this radical step.

It could be a serious, and possibly, a disastrous mistake.

History speaks clearly against the supreme command concept. Every major nation that has adopted it has found it led to eventual defeat.

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Johnson (retired), board member of the Johnson & Johnson pharmaceutical firm and a wartime assistant to Donald Nelson, testified before a congressional committee:

"It is no accident that nations with national general staffs may win the first battles—but lose the wars."

The first Hoover Commission's Task Force on National Security turned in a majority report vigorously opposing the national command and general staff concept, noting that it had proved a failure on strictly military as well as political grounds. A minority report by a group headed by Dean Acheson did support the general staff theory, and many Washington observers believe this group is behind the present move to revive the issue.

The present controversy itself should be the clearest proof of the danger of the general staff concept. Top professional military men, trained in the three different branches of the service, differ radically in their opinions. Obviously, if any one of them were placed in supreme command, his decisions would be colored by his background and training. Neglect of one of the other branches of the service could be ruinous in time of war.

There is a tremendous difference between the organization needed for battlefield action and for long-range strategic planning. On the battlefield, it is imperative that one man be in absolute command. It has been said that, on the battlefield, "a prompt wrong decision is better than a delayed right one," for speed is of primary importance.

But in the realm of long-term strategic planning, th situation is reversed. There is ample time for full consideration—and a mistake is almost always irretrievable.

The joint-command concept is not only in the American military tradition, it is in the tradition of the American way. America's successful businessmen operate on the same principle—they call in expert engineers, salesmen, production experts, and other specialists for technical advice, and then make a decision that is not colored by being too close to one phase of the problem.

On the battlefield level, it may be advisable to reexamine our alinement of Army, Navy, and Air Force. Perhaps something on the order of an expanded World War II task-force concept is in order, utilizing units of all three services in forces designed for missions of defense, tactical attack, and longer-range strategic operations against the enemy.

But at the top, let us preserve the system that has brought us victory—and not abandon it for the system that has carried our enemies to defeat.

In the final analysis, the Armed Forces squabble should be a wholesome thing for the Nation. It should help us probe and correct weaknesses in our defense program while there is still time. And it guarantees us against the top-level, closed-door type of decision that can and has led uninformed peoples to their doom.

We can take comfort in the fact that, through our history, the Congress that represents the people has been basically sounder in its military judgment than even our professional military men. It is imperative that military discussions be kept in the open so the people may know.

Tilt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial from the New Era, published in Reading, Pa.:

TILT

It is now obvious that the big business Republican machine will stop at nothing to achieve an election victory this year.

That's the only conclusion one can draw from the circus-like invasion of Reading and Berks County by Federal agents, ostensibly for the purpose of collecting $250 licenses for pinball machines.

Even though pinball machines were operating in every luncheonette, taproom, gas station, corner grocery store, and club during 4 years of Republican city and county administration, the Internal Revenue men waited until last week for their theatrically-staged foray against Democrats.

But this wasn't the only giveaway of political motives. A spokesman for the organized clergy let the cat out of the bag when he said that the ministers had decided to let the pinball games exist "over the summer" but would use FBI agents to conduct an "educational" campaign in the fall.

This is another way of saying that there was little point in making noise right now because the fall is much closer to the election. If the clergy felt pinballs were immoral, then why didn't they raise their voices during 4 long years of Republicanism?

Now we hold no brief for the pinball games if they are, in fact, gambling devices. Our only point is that these machines obviously don't change their stripes according to which political regime is in power. If they are gambling machines now they also were gambling machines under Mr. Republican, ex-Mayor Bamford. And that means that the

Internal Revenue men were sorely negligent in performing their duty. Or were they?

And, while we're on the subject, why don't the Republican-controlled revenue agents crack down on all of the counties in the 48 States of our very big United States? Which Republican was powerful enough to pull strings all the way into Washington to smear Reading and Berks County?

Is Uncle Sam now at the point where he makes one law for Berks County and another for the rest of the United States?

We hope this country never arrives at the point of fascism where the Justice Department and tax sleuths are only glorified Gestapo agents, using their powers for political revenge.

Those who remember the O'Conor probe of a few years ago recall that the pattern that year is the same as the Republican plan for this year. First, the probe provided newspaper headlines—no arrests, just headlines. Then the ministers issued statements. Then FBI agents came to town to make spectacular allegations that could be translated into Republican headlines.

This year the target of the Republican big business interests is organized labor. They want to get at labor by fighting Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES. RHODES consistently has supported liberal legislation to help the ordinary fellow. Naturally, that doesn't go down well with the tycoons of industry.

Therefore, a handful of reactionaries now controlling the Republican Party have worked out a long-range campaign that started with the pinball episode and is already leading into the ministerial and propaganda phases of the preelection effort.

Even though law-enforcement offices are not involved in the present campaign, the GOP hopes some of the propaganda will brush off.

Workers resent this maneuver which in the long run can mean a loss of benefits and hard-won gains. The RHODES legislative record is a good one for the vast majority of our citizens. It's the kind of record the people will support at the polls, regardless of Republican smears in the months ahead.

Death of Tom Underwood a Distinct Loss to Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to come here with the late Tom Underwood as Congressman representing adjoining districts. As I became better acquainted with him a personal friendship developed that will always remain one of my fondest memories.

His interest in the needs of the public and his efforts for a more effective Government remain among my most valuable guides in my efforts to do a good job. When he moved over into the Senate in 1951, this close personal relationship continued during his term in the Senate and the 1952 campaign. Tom Underwood, and what he meant to others, is best described by ex-Gov. Keen Johnson, a long time associate, who is now editor of the Richmond (Ky.) Register:

DEATH OF TOM UNDERWOOD A DISTINCT LOSS TO KENTUCKY

(By Keen Johnson)

The Commonwealth has lost a great Kentuckian, central Kentucky has lost a zealous champion, and I have lost one of my most esteemed friends as result of the passing of Tom Underwood, editor of the Lexington Herald: His unexpected death came as a saddening shock to the wide group of friends who had enjoyed his friendship and felt the glow of his warm personality.

No tribute that I may write can adequately express my exalted esteem and effectionate regard for this gifted newspaperman, statesman, and civic-minded citizen. I was en route by airplane from New York to Lexington when the distressing news of his death came to me. The plane was on the ground for a stop in Washington. I telephoned my sister at the Capitol. The conversation opened with her conveying to me the unhappy news that Tom's rich, fruitful life had come to an end.

When I reboarded the plane I found abroad another old friend and contemporary, Joe Lovett, to whom I imparted the news that was responsible for the mist in my eyes. And we reminisced. In 1921, the gifted, youthful Underwood was managing editor of the Lexington Herald, under the supervision of the brilliant Desha Breckinridge. I was a reporter on the staff, covering the courthouse and city hall. Joe Lovett was sports editor. Eliza Piggott, later to become Tom's wife, was State editor.

Out of that association there grew a friendship which I have cherished through the years. The news stories have related in detail the noteworthy achievements of Tom Underwood, so the chronology of his successive steps in a variety of exceptional accomplishments may properly be excluded from this comment. He was widely recognized as a newspaper editor of exceptional attainments, a competent member of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate, an editorial advocate of good government through the Democratic Party, a champion of all that contained possibility of advancing the welfare of Kentucky in general and central Kentucky in particular.

But I shall remember him, as will thousands of other friends, as a warm, generous personality, who was always a charming companion, with an alert intellect and a keen interest in a multitude of activities which affected the public welfare. I shall remember his original, tangy wit and his gift in adapting an appropriate story to the occasion.

Sympathy is extended to his lovely mother, wife, and attractive sons. I shall always revere his memory.

The Late Honorable Thomas E. Watson, United States Senator and Father of Rural Free Delivery Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a short article from the June 1956 issue of the Georgia Department of Commerce Newsletter giving the story of how the late Senator Thomas E. Watson conceived the idea of rural free delivery service. This is in connection with a marker which the Georgia Historical Commission is erecting in honor of Senator Watson.

The article follows:

Here is the story of how Georgia's Tom Watson conceived the idea of rural free delivery service:

"In 1868, at Norwood, six men along a 5-mile rural route hired Jerry Parson, a Negro who could not read, to deliver and collect mail at their homes each day except Sunday and holidays for his food and clothing. The postmaster at Norwood each morning arranged the mail in correct order and 'Uncle Jerry' began his 10-mile walk covering, in all, 3,110 miles. Senator Thomas E. Watson, then a boy clerking for Hon. T. E. Massengale, observed this perfect plan for rural free delivery. In February 1893, Senator Watson, then in Congress, sponsored the bill creating rural free delivery, copying 'Uncle Jerry's' R. F. D. in Norwood."

Hospitalization and Care of the Mentally Ill of Alaska

SPEECH
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I may not use the 10 minutes, but I want to inform the House that the conference report on the Alaska mental health bill that is now before us is quite different from the bill we passed in the House. There has been a great deal of nonsense pro and con on this mental health bill that has kept Members of the House greatly agitated. Much of the propaganda does not have an ounce of truth in its fabric.

In the past I have had some objections to the bill; I had some in the House, although I think the bill we passed in the House was a much better bill than we have here in this conference report. I did not sign the conference report.

The conferees took out the section on commitment procedures. I am sure my colleagues understand that the mentally ill for many years have been taken care of at an institution in Portland, Oreg. The cost of their care is about $6 a day at the present time. It used to be $4.

For several years Alaska has sent their mentally ill to the hospital in Portland. The commitment has been lax—patients have not been treated very well. Mentally ill patients are held in jail until a plane load can be gathered for the trip to Portland, Oreg. The House Committee on Territories worked hard and earnestly to develop some good commitment procedures. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] made a magnificent statement when the bill was before the House calling attention to the need of commitment procedures. We adopted them. They were needed and it was the one strong compelling force that gave the bill merit.

In the Senate they took out all commitment procedures. There is no com-

mitment procedure in this bill at all except we say to the Alaska legislators that they may adopt some commitment procedures, but what they are we do not know. They need not adopt any. The Alaska legislature can take the $12.5 million and thumb their nose at Congress.

The other reason I objected to the bill is because it carries $6½ million for the next 10 years to help the mentally ill; we are paying for it now. That is not too bad, but there is an additional $6 million to build a mental hospital in Alaska to care for the mentally ill. In the first place, the $6 million is not being matched at all by Alaska. It seems to me we should not proceed with them any differently than with other areas under the Hill-Burton Act where the States or other groups put up funds themselves. But the people of Alaska are not paying 1 thin dime towards the building of this institution.

They now have about 350 inmates at the institution in Portland and they are being cared for at a cost of about $6 a day. I have visited this institution. While it is not the best in the world the patients do get pretty good treatment; and Portland, Oreg., of course, has an ideal climate for the mentally ill.

As I say, there are two things in this bill to which I object: No commitment procedures. They must continue with the same old archaic and worn-out procedures they have had in the past, and I foresee no change in it at all except that the legislators may adopt some commitment procedures.

Second. They do not match any of the money we make available to them. The $6 million will not build a very large hospital in Alaska. The experts who appeared before us said that that would build a hospital for approximately 250 people and the requirement is for a hospital for 400 patients. This $6 million will not be enough to complete the needed hospital requirements.

I am sure the people of Alaska will not than us for passing a bill that will cause them to pay $30 or $35 a day to take care of their mentally ill in Alaska with all the new trappings they have to have. They are getting care now for $6 a day in Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I think that the gentleman will remember my questions at the time when this legislation was originally before the House. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me if the provision that a million acres of land be given, has been removed from the present bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; the million acres of land is still in the bill, and I see no particular objection to that. We have heard cries from all over the country to the effect that we were building a little Siberia up in Alaska to send people there who do not think as we do. I do not give very much credence to those statements. The Congress in the past has given many millions of acres of land to the States for school purposes, for hospital purposes, and for various reasons. The million acres of land will be used by the Territory of Alaska. Out of some 375 million acres there are only involved about a million acres and this is in order to take care of their mentally ill when they do get a hospital, although I doubt very much that this will be sufficient to give them very much revenue for the care of the mentally ill.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] being a member of the committee and familiar with the original bill as well as the conference report. Does the gentleman from Nebraska agree with me this is of such a controversial nature, and due to the fact the House was not fully aware of its contents when it was before us in the first instance, that at this time there should be a rollcall to determine whether or not it should be approved?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have had 6 or 8 Members ask for a rollcall. I presume that Members who want to stay here for the next 30 minutes will have a chance to vote on the conference report.

Mr. DIES. It was announced that there would be no rollcalls this afternoon.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Not this evening. Tomorrow.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Will the gentleman explain whether this is a million acres of land in total? Is it a maximum which the Territory could obtain, or just what does it amount to?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not sure that it is spelled out in the bill. It does seem to me that we ought to have commitment procedure and (2) we should not give the Territory of Alaska or any State outright money where they do not put up one single dime. That thing is wrong in principle and, of course, I am not objecting to that. We ought to send this back to the committee and let it rest for another year. No harm will be done and we will save some money and we will have a chance to look at this matter again when the heat, the controversy, and the wave of emotions have passed over. We can then think a little more clearly.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. What are the rules for commitment at the present time?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the bill passed by the House they are very high and they are very complicated rules. We spent several days in going over them. They were adopted by the American Psychiatric Association.

Mr. FENTON. In Alaska?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They have no particular rules in Alaska and would not have under this bill. I doubt very much whether the legislature would adopt any.

Mr. FENTON. How are they committed now?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They are committed by the court, and under rather crude proceedings, the sheriff takes them down to Portland. The need for commitment procedure was the reason for the bill in the first place. No one advanced any other reason that we must have a hospital in Alaska except that we must have commitment procedure. This bill does not contain any commitment procedure.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Much has been made in letters which I have received from people who are opposed to this bill that, if enacted, the governor of any of the 48 States could upon his own order commit a citizen of that State to this mental institution in Alaska without any further trial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is a distorted idea of the facts and there is no basis for it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it true that citizens of the various States, the 48 States, could be committed to this institution, and, if so, under what procedure?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Just as they do in the States now. For instance, a citizen of Nebraska or Iowa might be in Alaska and become mentally ill and he could be sent back here.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Could they be transferred from Iowa or Nebraska up there now?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If they are citizens of Alaska, yes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska if quite an important change was not made in section 302 of the bill? It states that within 210 days the Secretary of the Interior, with the concurrence of the Governor of Alaska, may either, first, assign all rights and duties under contract No. 1404–01–81, entered into on June 18, 1953, between the Secretary of the Interior, and so on. Why was "shall" changed to "may"?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not know. That was done in the other body, and it was not in the House bill. This bill is an entirely different bill than the one we passed.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that was an important change in the bill, and that therefore this bill ought to go back for further consideration to the Interior Committee and come back to the House next year?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is my considered judgment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not true that since 1912 Alaska has been forbidden by law from establishing commitment procedures?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the legislature could automatically delegate that power, and apparently in this act they may enact some commitment procedure. This Congress should keep the

responsibility of adopting good commitment procedures and not "pass the buck" to Alaska.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is it not a fact that this bill, if passed, will life that restriction in order to enable the Alaska Legislature to establish some modern, reasonable commitment procedures?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think it is clear in the bill at all, sir. I am a doctor, and I have studied it very carefully and sat in on all of the hearings, and I have read the conference report, and I do not think that is so. Alaska may or may not adopt commitment procedures.

Big Tom Project Dedication Plans Are Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, from the Greeley Tribune of July 12 I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD plans for a program on August 11 marking the completion of the irrigation features of the Colorado-Big Thompson project.

A great deal of interest is expected in the meeting as the program will celebrate the end of the irrigation construction of the project and will turn over the entire operation of the water distribution to the Colorado Conservancy District.

The article follows:

BIG TOM PROJECT DEDICATION PLANS ARE COMPLETED

LOVELAND.—Plans for the program August 11 marking the completion of the irrigation features of the Colorado-Big Thompson project were discussed by representatives of Greeley, Loveland, Berthoud, and the Bureau of Reclamation at a meeting at the chamber of commerce office here Monday night.

The program also will include the dedication of a monument at the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy District office, west of Loveland, to the founders of the vast transmountain water-diversion project and the Charles Hansen Canals.

Members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, meeting in Grand Lake August 9 and 10, will come over the divide to the eastern slope and Loveland August 11 for the program at the water-conservancy district office at 4:30 p. m.

Following the program at the office, a chuck wagon steak dinner, open to the public, will be held at the Loveland waterworks in the Big Thompson canyon. Tickets for the dinner and social hour are available at the Greely Chamber of Commerce office at $4 a plate.

Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, will give the principal address at the ceremony at the office and will be among the many dignitaries in attendance.

Gov. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, who is 1 of 10 governors on the Inter-Agency committee, will introduce the other governors and also the representatives of Federal agencies who make up the committee along with the governors.

GORDON ALLOTT, United States Senator from Colorado, WILLIAM S. HILL, Congressman from the second congressional district, and possibly other Members of Colorado's congressional delegation will be present. Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, will attend.

Ed Garrett, former mayor of Loveland and now president of the Colorado Chamber of Commerce, will serve as master of ceremonies for the program, commemorating 18 years of canal, tunnel, and reservoir construction to bring a supplementary supply of irrigation water to the eastern slope from the Colorado River.

The monument will be dedicated to the many men whose vision and efforts made the project possible and whose work already has paid off by saving millions of dollars worth of crops in the Northern Colorado Water Conservancy district during recent drought years.

Among the men was Charles Hansen, late publisher of the Tribune and prime organizer of the project and first president of the district. Official action has been completed to name the Horsetooth feeder canal as the Charles Hansen feeder canal and the Poudre supply canal as the Charles Hansen canal during the ceremony.

The feeder canal runs a distance of 13 miles from Flatiron powerplant to Horsetooth Reservoir and the supply canal a distance of 5 miles from Horsetooth Reservoir to the Cache la Poudre River.

Members of the present board of directors for the district will be among those who will be introduced during the program.

On the morning of August 11, the interagency group will drive over Trail Ridge to Hidden Valley, where it will stop for coffee. Enroute to Loveland, the group will stop at various places to examine features of the diversion project.

The members will have lunch at Estes Park.

Greeley was represented at Monday night's planning meeting by Clint Meyer, manager of the chamber of commerce.

Surplus Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of Friday, July 20, 1956:

SURPLUS SPENDING
(By Marshall McNeil)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This final of two articles tells how the Federal Government spends, lends, or gives away surplus farm commodities and how it spends the foreign currency it gets for them.)

So we're building air bases in Spain.

We need housing for the men who'll run them.

Spain needs cotton, wheat, fats and oils.

So Yankee Trader Uncle Sam, his shelves bulging with immense surplus farm goods acquired to boost incomes here at home, sells Spain what she needs.

He gets paid in Spanish pesetas.

He spends those pesetas to build our soldiers homes at air bases in Spain.

That's one of the simpler deals under the United States program to get rid of market-depressing farm surpluses piled up in bins, vaults and even ships and caves.

The President has just reported to Congress on how the scheme has worked.

Not all the deals are simple as the Spanish one above. Others involve 2 or 3 or even more countries—with the foreign currency we got, say, surplus Kansas wheat caroming around the world money markets like a billiard ball.

Japan has bought from us, and borrowed back the yen they paid us to start $51 million worth of electric power facilities. Israel did likewise, for $6,500,000 worth. Other deals:

Spain, reforestation and watershed control.
Chile, roads.
Peru, irrigation.
Colombia, milk consumer survey.
Japan, better diet study.
France, sales campaign for cottons.
Brazil, strategic "rare earths."
Austria, aluminum powder deal.
Argentina, a deal for tungsten.

Such funds can also be used to finance the international exchange of students.

And we take part in, and partially finance, trade affairs, like Japan's last April, where we gave away ice cream cones, sweet rolls and cake made from United States flour, and Kentucky tobacco cigarettes.

Here's a three-way deal: Italy bought surplus wheat, cotton, fats, oils, eac. Then we negotiated with Italy and Israel so that Israel could use $5 million worth of the Italian lire we were paid, to buy Italian industrial products. Half of that we gave to Israel.

Meanwhile, our International Cooperation Administration had agreed to make grants to Israel. So ICA dollars were used to buy $2,500,000 of those lire. Israel got the other $2,500,000 as an interest-bearing loan.

Sounds complicated? It is.

The United States also has donated for foreign and domestic relief through nonprofit channels commodities that cost the CCC (taxpayers) $681 million.

Finally, the President's report said: "A small portion of these (foreign) currencies has been made available for congressional travel expenses * * *." But it doesn't say how much.

The situation today: We're getting rid of sizable surpluses, causing some smiles and some frowns here and abroad.

But we still have a lot of stuff stored. CCC is acquiring more right along.

It appears that Uncle Sam for good or ill, will be in business for some time.

This Editorial Speaks for Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Martins Ferry (Ohio) Times Leader, one of the largest newspapers in eastern Ohio and a Republican paper, speaks for itself:

Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS, who for a time was toying with the idea of running for governor, or maybe even the senate, has decided to seek reelection to Congress. We are glad of that, and at the risk of some embarrassment on account of not knowing who his opponent might be, we would like to give him our endorsement.

HAYS has been around Washington for a long time, and his seniority in the Congress places him in a position of being able to do the most good for his district. He is respected by members of both parties in Congress, his office is extremely efficient and he at least gives the old college try to meet requests for assistance from people of his district regardless of whether they voted for him or not.

He has a keen insight into the intricacies of our international relationships and we are pleased that he chooses to keep on the job at a time when he is in a position to be of greatest service to the Nation.

Needless to say I am extremely proud of this editorial and at the same time I am aware of the necessity for trying to do an even better job so that I can merit such an editorial as this.

The 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Act Are an Adaptation of the Philosophy of the Townsend Plan as Enunciated Over the Years by Dr. Francis E. Townsend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, last year we passed here in the House a social security bill by a vote of a little better than 10 to 1. The Committee on Ways and Means, or at least the majority on that committee, held that public hearings were not necessary in the course of their preparation of that bill. Since our action in passing that bill, H. R. 7225, the Senate Committee on Finance has held extensive public hearings on it.

The Senate debated and amended the Finance Committee's version of the bill and approved it. The legislation after being referred to the conference committee composed of Senate and House Members has been returned to the Senate and House for final action. The debate in the Senate—a privilege we have not been accorded in the House on social-security amendments—proved to be, I think, by far the most exhaustive and effective consideration of social security we have yet had in the Congress. I feel that every Member of the House should read the entire proceedings of the Senate on H. R. 7225 with great care.

The recent debate on the social-security amendments in the Senate shows that whenever the problem of social security is granted the opportunity for reasonable debate in Congress, it proves itself to be an unchallengeable cause and liberalism toward it prevails. This truth about social security must henceforth be recognized. We have not yet anywhere near completed the work that must be done by Congress on social security.

Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to point out a few truths that should be recognized squarely and fully. In their general import, the amendments we passed here in the House last year and those just passed in the Senate—after extensive debate—amount to clear recognition and acceptance of principles first embodied and fully defined in the Townsend plan. Time and experience are making it unanswerably clear that progress toward perfecting our national social-security system requires adoption—however slowly, however reluctantly, however piecemeal, as the case may be—of the principles of the Townsend plan.

Dr. Townsend envisaged the general abolition of poverty in this country with economic freedom and independence as the final reward in life for the American citizen. We have far to go, yet, before realizing that happy and sound goal; but, right now, here in Congress, we are breaking through the wall of obstruction to great progress in that direction. The studies and debates of recent date clearly show that in no other direction can we move if we are ever going to create the kind of fully just and adequate social-security system the American people want and deserve to have.

Personally, I am proud today, that over 17 years ago, in 1939, as a Member of this House, I stood up to be counted, along with some 100 other Members, as then voting for the Townsend plan. I prize my membership in this group designated by Dr. Francis E. Townsend as "The 101 Immortals of the 76th Congress." I feel firmly that the status of social-security development today emphatically stamps as entirely sound the views of this problem which I had then adopted and espoused. Today, many indeed, from all quarters and walks of life, as represented here in Congress, are lining up to support those principles. Honest and candid recognition of this truth could well serve to hasten greatly the day when economic freedom and independence will be the final reward in life for Americans through a fully adequate and just national social-security system. And, there is no other road of any kind toward that goal.

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity, as this Congress draws to its close, to vote in favor of the conference report on H. R. 7225 as it reaffirms my vote in the House last year for these pending amendments to our social-security system. I only wish they were more liberal than they are. I pray that the future holds opportunities for me to support and vote for the needed further changes necessary to change the present poverty and despair, with which most of our aged, disabled, and bereaved live, into the freedom, security, and independence that should be their just lot.

Home Research Foundation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to report to the House that in early August 1956 ground will be broken at Lake Progress, just outside of Grand Rapids, Mich., for a unique and advanced facility for displaying the best that the home-building and home-furnishings industries have to offer the American people. Owned and operated by Home Research Foundation, Inc., this Homestyle Center will present for the first time in the world, display homes designed to present total environmental living. This was a subject which was presented with great interest to those women attending the recent Women's Housing Congress.

Home Research Foundation, Inc., is an independent nonprofit organization, incorporated under the laws of Michigan. The foundation was established to provide facilities for research and study of all living requirements within the American home and to encourage continuing improvements in the standards thereof.

Homestyle Center, a project of Home Research Foundation, is a display center for 50 homes to be built on an 80-acre site, on the outskirts of Grand Rapids, Mich. It is a permanent, comprehensive, self-generating facility for the display of better solutions to home living needs, and includes a program of integration of technical and research groups with the professions, manufacturers, associations, and all interests concerned with the evolution of the home and its environment. Home Research Foundation and Homestyle Center were conceived to fulfill a need in the constant striving for improvement of the American standard of living. The technical transition that has occurred within the home field in recent years has introduced an entirely new area of constructural design, building materials, construction techniques, and consideration of tastes and standards in furnishing and equipping the home.

The objectives of Homestyle Center are to, first, gather all available research, technology, information and talent for the study of how to better solve home-living needs; second, combine the talents of outstanding architects, interior designers, landscape architects, engineers, industrial designers and builders in the development of better homes to be constructed at the center; third, select, utilize and display only the better ideas, materials, products, equipment, furniture, furnishings, and appliances presently available or in experimental development; fourth, serve as an information, reference and display center where all those interested in the home field may study and compare the most comprehensive display of homes ever built; fifth, serve as a continuing and permanent research, evaluation and information facility for the consistent advancement of home-living standards.

The program of Homestyle Center has been formulated after 3 years' study and preparation. It is planned to be opened for public view and display in the spring of 1957, at which time 25 of the homes will have been completed, out of the total of 50 homes which are to be eventually displayed. The remaining 25 homes will be built, in approximately equal portions, during the following 3-year period.

After the first 50 homes have been constructed, 5 to 10 homes will be removed each year and replaced; by new

designs. In this manner, Homestyle Center will be permanently self-perpetuating its program to raise home living standards.

Each home will be furnished under the auspices of outstanding interior decorators, with better furnishings and appliances selected from those available from the Nation's industry or especially designed for the project. The furniture and furnishings will be as diverse and comprehensive as are the home designs. All homes will be redecorated and refurnished annually and appliances and furnishings will be replaced as better and newer models are designed and marketed. In addition to the presentation of presently marketed products, use will be made of experimental categories as research and study prototypes.

Professional membership of the Builder and Home Furnishing Industries have long recognized the need for a focal point, an integration center for the efforts of the two fields. It has been through the encouragement of these national professional groups and the technical assistance and counsel of such organizations as the National Association of Home Builders that the Home Research Foundation, Inc., and its initial project, Homestyle Center, are a reality.

I am extremely proud, as the Representative of the community which is pioneering in this endeavor, to bring the Homestyle Center to the attention of the Congress and the American people.

Five Hundred and Ninety-two Thousand, Five Hundred and Three Acres Colorado Land in Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the soil-bank program is getting into full swing in Colorado. The administrative officer of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation program gives his report which I have taken from the Greeley Tribune of July 17, 1956.

FIVE HUNDRED AND NINETY-TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND THREE ACRES COLORADO LAND IN SOIL BANK

DENVER.—A total of 2,696 agreements have been approved for Colorado farmers participating in the Government's new soil-bank program since it went into effect 3 weeks ago, officials said Tuesday.

They said the agreements represent 592,503 acres of farmland retired from wheat planting at a total compensation to farmers of $1,874,682. They come from 42 of the possible 52 wheat counties in the State.

Warren Myers, agricultural program specialist, said many of the agreements are centered in the ravaged wheat areas of southeastern Colorado, heavily hit by drought.

Andrew J. Mair, administrative officer of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, said the full effect of the program cannot be determined until the wheat-planting program begins in 1957.

It is estimated that 1,400,000 of Colorado's 2,766,000 acres can be accepted in the program.

Passage of the So-Called Tanker Bill, H. R. 11122, Will Cost the American Taxpayers Millions of Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House are familiar with the parliamentary situation that prevailed following the passage of the so-called tanker bill, H. R. 11122, which was to be considered under a rule but instead was called up unexpectedly on the Consent Calendar and approved.

The manner in which this legislation was handled in the House has aroused the ire of those of us who were opposed to the legislation and who had secured assurance that the bill would be brought to the floor under a rule which we were told had been requested.

H. R. 11122 authorizes the Government to pay $1,600,000 to a private shipping firm for tankers the Government sold 9 years ago for $950,000 each.

The following article by Roger Stuart, staff writer, appeared in the Washington Daily News, July 20, 1956. It tells the story in a nutshell of how the American taxpayer will be taken for a ride if H. R. 11122 is enacted.

The article follows:

READ ABOUT THIS ONE, TAXPAYERS—A SHIP BILL THAT SMELLS LIKE $25 MILLION

(By Roger Stuart)

This is the odd story of a bill telling the Government to pay $1,600,000 each for tankers which it sold as surplus nearly 10 years ago for $950,000 each.

The bill is lined up for passage by Congress right now.

It would cost the taxpayer some $20 million to $25 million, according to Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York.

ONE-MAN WAR

Up to now, he's been fighting the battle against the tanker deal almost singlehandedly.

(NOTE.—Representative Zelenko is the freshman legislator who first called Congress' attention to a loophole in the 1954 tax law, paving the way for its repeal in time to save the Government billions of dollars in tax forgiveness to corporations.)

Up to now, Representative ZELENKO has been taking a licking, but today he insisted that he's finally lined up a lot of support, and he hopes to block the bill even though it has already passed the House and has been acted on favorably by a Senate committee.

"You see," Representative ZELENKO said, "at first, this bill was not widely understood. Then it was slipped through the House at an unexpected moment. But now we have got a number of Members of both Houses alerted.

REPRESENTATIVE BONNER: SPONSOR

Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, put the bill in the hopper last May.

Its nobly stated purpose is to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade and to encourage the construction of new vessels, and Mr. ZELENKO says those avowed purposes are "all right."

But one of its clauses, he points out, calls for the Government to buy from a private shipping firm approximately 35 old wartime tankers, sold by the Government 9 years ago at about $950,000 each.

"If you took a 5-percent annual depreciation on them," he said, "they ought to be worth, say, roughly a half-million dollars apiece. But skip all that * * *.

"Suppose there's been no depreciation. Suppose they're still worth what the private company paid the Government for them. Would that make them worth $1,600,000 apiece today? Not on your life.

"Yet that is what the Government would pay for them under this bill."

IT ALL CAME OUT

During House debate it was disclosed that the ships include those now owned by the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp., headed by M. P. McLean.

McLean interests bought out the Waterman Steamship Line in March 1955. The Waterman concern had bought the ships from the Government in 1947 for around $950,000 apiece.

Under suspension of the rules, the bill was voted on July 2. Result: 101 ayes and 90 nays.

Since a two-thirds majority is necessary under suspension of the rules, this indicated the measure was beaten.

But Chairman BONNER objected to the vote. He asserted a quorum wasn't present. He asked for and got unanimous consent to have further action put off until July 6.

On that day, Chairman BONNER again had action postponed, explaining that he'd bring the bill up next under terms of a rule which he hoped to get from the Rules Committee.

The committee considered the measure on July 9 and 10. It did not vote the rule which Chairman BONNER had requested.

Representative ZELENKO said he had supposed this meant the measure was dead.

But the bill was brought up on the unanimous-consent calendar on July 16, without benefit of a rule, a few minutes after the House convened, and adopted by unanimous consent before many Members, including Mr. ZELENKO could reach the floor.

Later that day, Representative ZELENKO asked unanimous consent to have the bill brought back for reconsideration.

ONE-MAN MOTION

His request was killed on the one-man motion of Chairman BONNER. (Unanimous-consent motions can be killed by action of a single dissenting Member.)

Meanwhile, the Senate Commerce Committee, which had voted down an identical bill, convened on Tuesday (day after the House had adopted the Bonner bill) and voted favorably on that measure.

That's where matters now stand.

Representative ZELENKO declined to reveal the nature of his next move.

But he insisted that the fight isn't over.

Spending Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of Thursday, July 19, 1956:

SPENDING CORN

(By Marshall McNeil)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—How world-wide commodity sales operations of surplus farm products acquired in its agricultural price-support

programs gets Uncle Sam foreign money, and how he spends it abroad will be told in two articles, of which this is the first.)

Surplus corn from Iowa, wheat from Kansas, cotton from Texas are the currencies used by Uncle Sam, in a vast and fabulous business.

For these surpluses he gets foreigners' "funney money," to pay for goods and services. With it he is buying:

Strategic defense materials.

Housing for our troops abroad.

Ice cream cones for visitors to a Japanese fair.

School lunches for Japanese children.

Surveys to boost foreign consumption of American goods—and part of it is being set aside to help pay the cost of congressional junkets.

Uncle sells his surpluses where he can. He barters. He gives them away to help the needy. Sometimes all this casts him in the dominant role in world commodity markets, but he is making at least a small dent in the Government's hoard of surplus farm products.

This new function of the Government is a far cry from the simple purposes the founders must have had in mind. It is a kind of socialism (if that's what government in business is) born of the depression.

Then, the Government started to raise citizens' buying power by putting price props under basic foods, fibers, and smoking tobacco. It offered loans on produce the farmers could sell in the open market only at lower prices. It still does. Thus, it acquired immense quantities of the produce.

It stored so much, sometimes at fancy fees and in strange places, that Congress concluded ways must be found to get rid of it all abroad.

Commodity Credit Corporation, Uncle Sam's greatest merchant, grocer, and farmers' loan agency, got the job. Basic condition was to be that sales of surpluses for foreign currencies should not displace usual United States marketings abroad or unduly disrupt world prices.

President Eisenhower has just reported to Congress that to June of this year, we have arranged to dispose of surplus produce which cost about $2,900,000,000. We will realize much less.

Some of the money invested comes back immediately; some, with interest years hence under loan agreements. For some products we get nothing.

Example: We have agreed to sell for $1 billion in foreign currencies surpluses that represent a CCC, or taxpayer's, investment of $1,400,000,000. This includes, for instance, 69,900,000 bushels of wheat that cost the taxpayers $234 million for which we will get $116 million; and 8,000,000 hundredweight of rice that the taxpayers bought for $102 million, for $52 million.

Tomorrow: Funny money—what Uncle does with it.

Chicago Newspapers Deserve Credit for Exposing Scandals Involving Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of July 19, 1956:

THE PRESS IN THE HODGE CASE

Lloyd Morey, the newly appointed interim State auditor, has the commendable distinction of having once foiled a power grab by his disgraced predecessor, Orville E. Hodge.

It was Morey, former president and for many years comptroller of the University of Illinois, who successfully blocked Hodge's attempt to take over supervision of University of Illinois spending. Morey feared that such a procedure would give the auditor a dangerous degree of control over the university.

In the light of the gigantic Hodge swindle that has rocked the foundations of our State government, Morey was eminently justified in his fears. Hodges might have walked off with the university's goal posts without the benefit of a football game.

Governor Stratton's appointment of the impreccably honest Morey, who is a widely recognized authority on public accounting, is a good one. The only cause for regret is that Morey had to take on the unenviable task of clamping a lock on the barn door after the horse had been stolen. There is little money left in the auditor's office for anyone to embezzle, but it is a satisfaction to know that these leftovers are in Morey's capable care.

So long as Morey is in charge, public confidence in the conduct of the auditor's office undoubtedly will be restored. But the people will have no similar confidance in a governmental system that was able neither to detect nor safeguard itself against the daylight robbery of nearly $1 million by un unarmed and maskless Hodge.

For the truth is that if Chicago newspapers had not dug up the bulk of the evidence there is no reason to believe that the politicians and the subordinate law enforcement authorities would ever have caught up with Hodge's con game. We tip our journalistic hat to the Daily News for breaking the story, which was later developed in full by all of the Chicago papers.

The Illinois Budgetary Commission, a State legislature branch which includes Governor Stratton as an ex officio member, is charged by law to "make a thorough study and investigation of all State expenditures and income from any source." But it was not until after the newspapers had produced damning evidence against Hodge that the commission leaped into the act.

(This is the same commission which time and again, and with Stratton's full concurrence, has barred the press from its deliberations on State finances.)

Even the Chicago Police Department would not have got to first base in investigating William D. Lydon, the policeman pal of Hodge, if it hadn't been for the groundwork laid by the Chicago daily press.

At it was, Police Commissioner O'Connor and his minions were able to discover nothing about Lydon that had not already appeared in the newspapers before O'Connor belatedly stirred his stumps to do something about the situation. In fact, the police hierarchy discovered that the press knew more about Lydon personally and officially than the department did. Irwin N. Cohen, commissioner of the new Chicago Department of Investigation, should make it his first order of business to find out why the police department was so derelict about every aspect of the Lydon case.

The average citizen is sometimes skeptical when newspapers discuss freedom of the press. But on the basis of the Hodge exposure, many people in Illinois may now agree with Thomas Jefferson's observation that he would rather have a free press without a government than a government without a free press.

Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert an article of mine which appeared in the weekly newspapers in my District on the subject of civil rights.

The article follows:

Commenting on the President's civil-rights bill last week, a Valley newspaper (the Staunton News-Leader) said: "It is unbelievable that the Eisenhower administration is behind this iniquitous measures, but it is."

The measure was first proposed in the President's state of the Union message in January. It was sent to the Congress by the Attorney General in April. Several weeks, ago, the language of the bill was approved by the President in a message to the NAACP. The new alliance of New Deal Democrats and Republicans in support of it was brought into focus in the House Committee on Rules. Representative LEO ALLEN of Illinois, Republican leader of the committee praised the bill, after which Representative RAY MADDEN, a New Deal Democrat from the highly industrialized racial melting pot of Gary, Ind., said: "I have voiced the sentiments that my friend, LEO ALLEN, has stated. In fact, it is getting so I do not know whether I am following LEO, or LEO is following me any more."

The President's personal endorsement was pointed up last week at Gettysburg. He was quoted as saying he had asked Congress for "very little" in the way of civil-rights legislation, but this little he expected to obtain.

The "very little" includes authorization of $12-a-day expense money for volunteer informers on alleged civil-rights violations; invasion of long-settled State authority over voting laws, and by-passing of State courts at the whim of the Attorney General of the United States. The most preposterous provision would give free legal service to help an agitator, malcontent, or screwball hail into a Federal court, without right of jury trial, any citizen accused by the complainant of having engaged in, or—in the incredible language of the proposed statute—being "about to engage in" a violation of a claimed civil right.

Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on Rules, questioned Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, a New Deal Democrat from Brooklyn, N. Y.:

"Mr. SMITH. I don't find anything in this bill that requires the individual who is trampled on to make this complaint, and the Attorney General just hops out himself at the instance of some civil organization and brings these suits against people.

"Mr. CELLER. I think you are correct in that. * * * There is nothing to prevent the Attorney General to bring action of his own accord whether he consults with the individual or not * * *.

"Mr. SMITH. Now, NAACP observes something they don't like and say that John Doe has had his civil rights violated. NAACP can go to the Attorney General under this bill and ask the Attorney General to institute a suit?

"Mr. CELLER. I think that is possible under this bill."

Congressman E. L. FORRESTER, of Georgia, pointed out that complaints of economic

pressures would be investigated only "if it is because of race, color, religion, or national origin. If you are so unfortunate that your forefathers fought in the Revolution, and helped win this country and helped write our Constitution, none of this is for you. You are to be pursued, instead of being protected."

I might add that if economic discrimination bears on you because you are a woman, or because you are over 40, there will be no free lawsuits brought in your behalf.

Neither the Congress, nor the President, nor the Republican Party, nor the Democratic Party, appears to be much concerned by recent Supreme Court decisions that a State may not discharge a Red schoolteacher, or prosecute one who plots the overthrow of its government; nor may the Government of the United States dismiss a disloyal employee. In other words, if you are a Red, the law will coddle you, but it may move against you with fearful vengeance if you are a citizen of one of the States of the late Confederacy and subscribe to the laws and customs of your State.

Rex Davis, KMOX Commentator, Discusses Successful Waltham, Mass., Houing Project for Elderly Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have been supporting legislation for special housing aids for the elderly have in mind particularly the stimulation of housing design and construction which takes into account the special needs of persons up in years. It is not just a case of building apartment units and setting them aside for occupancy priority for the aged, but rather actually taking into account the kind of housing such persons require for happier and safer living conditions.

In this connection, I am grateful to Rex Davis, director of news and public affairs of radio station KMOX in St. Louis for a Story Behind the Headline broadcast he made recently describing a housing project recently built in Waltham, Mass., under a $15 million Massachusetts program of providing housing for the elderly. It is, according to this broadcast, 1 of 37 projects "in the works" in the Bay State designed for residents 65 and over, including not only married couples but single persons—just as we would do under the elderly person feature of the housing bill which we approved in the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. Davis tells in this excellent broadcast about the unusual design features in the Waltham project—the convenient location close to stores, library, and churches; the increased use of glass to provide more light for those with failing eyesight; the more gradual stairways so that the steps are not steep; the built-in seats and grab-bars in the bathtubs; the luminous light switches, triple-lighting, and "trouble bells." Each bedroom and living room is equipped with such a device so that if a tenant is suddenly stricken he merely pushes the "trouble button" to summon help.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent of the House of Representatives, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of the Members, this excellent report by Rex Davis, of station KMOX, St. Louis, on the Waltham, Mass., housing project for elderly persons, based on Associated Press dispatches from Waltham. I know that the Members will find this report of great interest. It helps to explain what we are driving for in connection with the proposed Federal program for special housing aids for the elderly, through private investment and nonprofit groups, as well as through public housing. The Rex Davis report was as follows:

The status of housing legislation remains very much in doubt these days. The Senate has passed a housing bill, but in the House the measure has been bottled up in committee and the leadership may have to resort to a seldom-used parliamentary maneuver to get it out.

Some of our listeners are very much interested in the public-housing feature of that bill; particularly housing which would be provided for older persons. In this connection, it's interesting to note that the State of Massachusetts already has a $15 million housing program for its elderly citizens.

Thirty-seven projects designed for residents over 65 years of age are in the works, and 1 of them, at Waltham, Mass., has been in use since this past January. It's a 2-story brick building in a settled neighborhood about 2 blocks from the main thoroughfare. The eldest tenant is 87, the youngest 65. The average age of the 5 married couples, 18 widows, and 1 widower who live in this building is 74. Some of these who talked with reporters say that moving into this new envornment was "like a spring tonic." As one of them put it, "I'm 81, but for the last 5 months I haven't felt a day over 30."

The Massachusetts State Housing Board studied plans for older age housing in all parts of the world before designing its buildings, and here are some of the features they have incorporated. For one thing, the location is convenient to neighborhood stores, the library, and places of worship. The maximum rent is $41.50 a month and that includes heat and water. Glass has been used abundantly with king-size picture widows providing three times the normal daylight for living and bedrooms. For older people whose sight is failing this is invaluable.

A fire escape leads from the bedroom of each of the second-floor apartments. The steps to the second floor are much lower than normal, feet do not have to be lifted as much. The bathtubs have builtin seats and grab-bars. Kitchens have sink, stove, and refrigerator arranged side by side within a 5-foot area. Under the sink is a handy disposal and to the right of the refrigerator is a roomy pantry closet with low shelves.

Because older people have difficulty detecting odors, all appliances are electric. Other safeguards include luminous light switches, triple lighting, and trouble bells. These are located in each bedroom and living room. If a tenant is suddenly stricken or some other trouble occurs, he can summon outside help merely by pressing the trouble-bell button.

It's always pleasant to hear about a State which refuses to wait for the Federal Government to come in to initiate projects like these. The executive director of the Waltham (Mass.) Housing Board says, "Massachusetts has no intention of neglecting its senior citizens. Our golden-age citizens have always given us their best; this is a small way but the right way for us to say 'Thanks.'"

The Situation in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues the following letter which appeared in the New York Times of July 21, 1956.

If, in the days of the American Revolution, freedom-loving people all over the world had not come to the aid of our Founding Fathers, this country would not today be the world's greatest bastion of liberty.

The letter points up the necessity for having a program and a policy at all times ready to step in and help any freedom-loving people when they seek to throw off the shackles of tyranny and dictatorship. We missed the boat on several occasions recently, the most recent of them in Poland, by not being ready to and by failing to come to the aid of liberty-loving people who are ready to die rather than continue to be enslaved.

The letter follows:

SITUATION IN POLAND—COUNTRY IS SAID TO BE BASICALLY DEMOCRATIC IN FEELING

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your editorials Protests of Polands, June 30, or Eyes on Poland (July 6) and your correspondents' dispatches from Poland and Germany force me to point out to you and your readers a few basic facts which might help you to understand better what is happening in Poland.

Poland's great devotion to and understanding of democracy was proved when she proclaimed, as the third country in the modern world, a democratic constitution, along with France and the United States of America.

Even though Poland lost her independence and has struggled for over a hundred years to regain it, she never forgot to help other oppressed peoples, and her contribution in the last World War, when she was overrun by the Nazi and Soviet invasion, cannot be dismissed. The Polish Air Force shot down 14 percent of Nazi airplanes in the Battle of Britain alone, and on land and sea Poland's help to bring victory was much greater than that of many other allies.

The tragic errors of the Western World in helping to create the Iron and Bamboo Curtains have been known ever since their beginning. Even now, when it is so obvious what disastrous effects they have produced, there are few people of prominence who would be ready to admit the error of the Western Powers because of dominating fear of thereby precipitating another world war.

The struggle of Poland over many centuries against imperialisms, dictatorships, and other forms of invasions is far too deeply ingrained in the Poles and in their tradition to expect that some crude and clumsy indoctrination would change the people. Only the savage slaughter of some 6 million Polish citizens during the last war and the overwhelming power of the present rulers keep Poland from rising, but when the proper time shall come there is no doubt on which side Poles will line up.

Over 1 million Poles who exist outside the Iron Curtain as displaced persons or refugees, and some 10 million citizens of Polish

descent in the United States, Canada, France, Britain, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, and other countries, are always ready to help Poland to be free. Only the lack of clear and definite policy on the part of Western Powers with respect to the whole Central-Eastern Europe prevents a wider and wiser use of these representatives of some 140 millions of freedom-loving Europeans at present under the Kremlin yoke.

STEFAN W. DASZYNSKI.

GUATEMALA, JULY 14, 1956.

Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to say a few words in commendation of Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr., who for the past 2 years has served as Assistant Capitol Physician.

Dr. Gifford came to this position while serving on active duty with the United States Navy where he holds the rank of lieutenant commander, and with the completion of his active-duty assignment within the next few days he will return to his former position as consultant in medicine at the Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minn.

It was my privilege to become acquainted with Dr. Gifford soon after he came on duty here. Because he and his good wife are natives of Ohio, although not from the district I have the honor to represent, I have given special attention to the outstanding service he has rendered as Assistant Capitol Physician.

During the several years I have been in Congress, I have had some opportunity to observe the medical service rendered by the Capitol Physicians' Office. In all that time I have never known such thorough conscientious, painstaking, and efficient medical care as has been given by Dr. Gifford. I believe it is significant that during 1 of his 2 years on duty here no Member of either the House or the Senate passed away. This was widely noted in the press at the time because normally there are several deaths each year in the Congress.

I know that all Members who have had occasion to consult with Dr. Gifford will sorely miss him. Always patient, considerate, and understanding, a keen diagnostician, he embodies all those characteristics we think of when we speak of a person being "a good doctor."

Many Members of Congress have expressed their regret that he is leaving us. Only a few weeks ago a Member told me he would be dead had it not been for the medical diagnosis and treatment prescribed by Dr. Gifford.

The Mayo Clinic is to be congratulated upon having the services of this fine, outstanding physician.

For Dr. Gifford, his fine wife and two lovely daughters, I am sure all Members of Congress wish the best of health, happiness, and success as they return to their home in Rochester, Minn.

This Kind of Living Stinks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of July 20, 1956:

SAYS BRIG. GEN. CHARLES A. HEIM: "THIS KIND OF LIVING STINKS"—REPORTER SAYS SOLDIERS AT AFRICA BASE "LIVE LIKE FORGOTTEN MEN"

(By Ernest Barcella)

NOUASSEUR, FRENCH MOROCCO—The commanding general made a sweeping gesture toward a jungletown of dismal little white huts and delivered himself of a pent-up judgment: "This kind of living stinks!"

Brig. Gen. Charles A. Heim made no effort to conceal the bitterness he feels about the way his men must live on this sprawling United States Air Force supply base—the lifeline for United States planes guarding freedom's frontiers.

In this desolate strip of the world:

They live like forgotten men.

They live like steerage-class citizens of the richest Nation in the world.

They live in cheap plywood huts that make some sharecropper shacks back home seem, by comparison, like the Statler or the Shoreham.

They live in surroundings that make you feel a sense of shock and shame.

Live?

IN 20 YEARS: THE WORST

A service-hardened master sergeant put it this way:

"I have been in the service for more than 20 years but I've never seen living conditions as bad as they are on this base. The guys here don't live. They merely exist.

"We give millions away to anybody that comes along. Why don't we do something for our own—like giving us at least halfway decent living quarters here?

"Take a look at these lousy things we have to call home for 18 long, long months."

You take a long look, inside and out. You see row on row on huts pitched on the stony, grayish brown soil that kicks up acrid dust when the wind blows in the present dry season and becomes a sea of slime and ankle-deep mud in the long rainy season from November until April.

They call these Dallas huts. They were jerry-built 5 years ago at an estimated cost of $1,100 apiece. The American taxpayer paid for these hovels. But they didn't pay anything like the price several thousand American airmen here are paying—they have to live in them.

FOUR TO EIGHT IN A SINGLE HUT

There are some 600 of these huts. The singles are 16 by 16. The "duplex" types are 32 feet long and 16 feet wide. The bottom half is built of flimsy plywood. The upper half is screened. Beneath the pyramidal roofs are accommodations for 4 to 8 men.

It's a tight squeeze, with bunks, footlockers, standing lockers, and pot-bellied oil stove with a vent pipe which pokes through the roof in a way that guarantees leaks in the rainy season.

Inside, the GI's try to make their hut as livable as possible. That takes a major effort.

Outside, the weeds grow high and wild. The dust blows and the tropical sun beats down.

FOR TRANSIT TROOPS AND SINGLE MEN

The GI's who live in the huts are somewhat luckier than transient troops. The transients are put up in tent huts—skeletonized frame shacks with heavy, dirty tarpaulin drapping down, umbrella-like, from the roof to keep out the weather.

In these Dallas huts live the single men, married men who have elected to leave their dependents back in the States and sweat it out alone; and some junior officers.

Here you do not get room with bath. The latrines are as much as 100 yards from an airman's hut, and their condition is not good, to put it mildly. Frequently, many of the facilities are fouled up.

HERE'S THE WAY MARRIED MEN LIVE

In an area across the paved highway that leads to Casablanca is trailer-town, or "project caravan."

Here live the married airmen. They made the hard choice of bringing their dependents here to live. Some quickly come to regret the choice. This is hardly the ideal place to raise a family. They live in Belgian- and Italian-built $6,500 trailers packed together in a tight community where one looks in vain for a little patch of grass.

Some officers live in a just-finished motel-type cluster of one-story permanent buildings made of cinder blocks. Others, among them General Heim, live in little wooden cottages.

But even these are a far cry from the comparatively plush housing available to officers, airmen, and civilian workers at, for instance, United States Air Force headquarters on the outskirts of Wiesbaden, Germany. There, in the Hainerberg housing area, one finds apartments that compare favorably with many in United States apartment developments.

LACK OF HOUSING IS AFFECTING MORALE

The lack of decent housing, 800 units short on family type alone, is a major morale problem on this vitally important African base. No one realizes this more than General Heim who came up from the ranks to win his single star.

General Heim, a short, dynamic man whose men consider him a nice guy, has gone to bat repeatedly to get his men decent housing. So far, he has struck out with the Pentagon.

He believes he can provide decent housing, 1-story barracks of concrete slabs, at a cost of about $2,400,000.

"We don't need reinforced concrete for the job," he said. "All we need is some decent place for these men to live. Durosol concrete slabs are easily available here. You can build fast with them. They are good for this kind of climate and look nice. And we could also install central heating."

BARRACKS PROJECT: SCRATCHED AGAIN

But the planners in the Defense Department have yet to see it that way. The latest word here is that the barracks project has been scratched again.

Veteran airmen here are puzzled and irked by Washington's attitude.

"They vote billions of dollars, but none of it seems to trickle down to us," a 14-year man said. "Maybe if some Congressman came over here and saw how we lived we might get some action.

TWO THEATERS BUT—NO PLACE TO LIVE

"Look, we got a new 1,000-man air-conditioned theater ready to open. Right next door we got that fine-looking outdoor theater. We need that one like Custer needed four more Indians. We can get along with one theater.

"But why the hell don't they do something in Washington about giving us something decent to live in?

"I'm not one of those guys squawking about the duty here. I don't mind it too much here. I might even reenlist, if they

did something about this lousy housing situation."

Housing isn't the only morale problem.

Loneliness and boredom from lack of something to do are big ones. There are precious few diversions in this lonely outpost.

"We promote everything we can and spend every buck we can to make life a little better for the kids," General Heim said.

There are eight bowling alleys, a hobby shop, a little quonset hut library, a nearly completed swimming pool and the service club—the main haven for airmen, especially on Sundays when most are off duty.

They arrive early at the service club, sit in lounge chairs and mostly stare into space.

Free coffee and doughnuts are available. And the boys can buy magazines that are 2 months old and metropolitan United States papers at least 2 weeks old.

NOBODY EVER TURNS UP

"Those big-name American entertainers don't seem to be able to find this place," one airman said dejectedly. "In the last 19 months we've only had one show up here—Billy Eckstine. It sure would help a lot if some of the others came here once in a while."

Some of the airmen go to Casablanca, 20 miles to the south, to spend an evening. But recently there has been a series of muggings and rollings. As a result, there's a midnight curfew for airmen walking the streets of the city.

There are now 1 full-time Catholic and 2 Protestant chaplains and 1 part-time Jewish chaplain on duty here to minister to the religious needs of the men. Religious services are held in a chapel in the center of the base.

General Heim summoned up the situation this way:

"We're fighting every day to give the kids something better so they'll stay in the service—even if they go back home to reenlist. Housing is the biggest problem we've got. We've got to beat it."

What Part of Indiana Do You Come From?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, throughout the years Indiana has made a great contribution to American literature and American humor. Not the least of these contributions has been made by my good friend, Herb Shriner, who recently appeared at a meeting of the Indiana Society of Washington. At that time Herb sang, "What Part of Indiana Do You Come From?" the words of which Herb wrote himself, and which were set to music by Perry Botkin.

The song is so typically Hoosier that I asked the permission of Herb and Mr. Botkin to place the song in the Appendix of the RECORD, and they have now granted this permission. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the lyrics of the song be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the song was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Verse)

Folks from Indiana are proverbially inquisitive,
That's nosey in a nice sort of way.
Be it Keokuk or Nome, when we are far from home,
A Hoosier spots a Hoosier miles away.

(Chorus)

I

When I spy a pretty girl, I always want to ask her
What part of Indiana do you come from?
Do you call a stream a crick, call a country boy a hick?
What part of Indiana do you come from?
Remember spellin' bees, squeezin' cider—spoonin' 'neath a Hoosier moon?
Hide and seek in a hay mow—sulphur and molasses on a spoon?
Hey, you Hoosiers, gather round;
Come on, let's ask each other,
Name your town and who's your brother
What part of Indiana do you come from?

II

When I hear a fellow sing or come out with something funny,
What part of Indiana do you come from?
If I hear folks laugh out loud, there's a Hoosier in the crowd.
What part of Indiana do you come from?
Remember settin' down to Sunday dinners, ev'ry kind of vittles passin' by—
Berry jam, powder biscuits—have another piece of pumpkin pie.
Hey, you Hoosiers, gather round;
Come on, let's ask each other,
Name your town and who's your brother
What part of Indiana do you come from?

California State Tax Exemption for Nonprofit Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared on June 15, 1956 in the Tidings, weekly newspaper for the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles:

VOTERS' DECISION UPHELD BY COURT RULING ON "3"

Tax exemption of private, nonprofit schools promotes the general welfare, the California State Supreme Court declared last week in its historic decision in the proposition 3 case.

The high court, in a 4 to 3 decision, reversed a ruling of the Alameda County Superior Court, which held such exemptions were unconstitutional.

It had been charged that the 1951 California statute granting the exemptions violates both Federal and State constitutions.

It was alleged the exemptions contravene that part of the first amendment to the United States Constitution which says "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion."

WELFARE PROMOTED

In their ruling on this charge, the court majority held first that the exemption measure was enacted "to promote the general welfare through encouraging the education of the young" and that it was not intended to favor any religion, since it applies also to nonreligious groups.

"Under any circumstances," the majority decision continued, "any benefit received by religious denominations is merely incidental to the achievement of a public purpose."

In the second part of its ruling, the Court that "even if we regard the exemption as benefiting religious organizations, it does not follow that it violates the first amendment."

EXEMPTION VALID

Pointing out that "the practice of granting tax exemptions benefiting religious sects began in the colonial period," the Court said that today at least some form of tax exemption is authorized for religious groups by Federal law and in every State and the District of Columbia.

"The principle of separation of church and state is not impaired by granting tax exemptions to religious groups generally, and it seems clear that the first amendment was not intended to prohibit such exemptions.

"Accordingly, an exemption of property used for education purposes may validly be applied to school property owned and operated by religious organizations," the Court said.

The California Taxpayers' Alliance fought the measure in the courts on the grounds that the State constitution prohibited exemption of private schools. The alliance contended that when the writers of the State constitution exempted religious, hospital, or charitable property they did not specifically mention educational institutions and therefore intended to exclude them.

The key question in the case was whether private elementary and high schools could be included under the "charitable purposes" provision of the State constitution.

The State supreme court majority held that such schools are "charitable purposes" because the "ultimate recipients" are the community as a whole or an indefinite portion of the community.

The court further said that "the presumption is in favor of the constitutionality" of the law, stating that "we cannot adopt our own interpretation of a provision of the constitution without regard to the legislative construction, and, where more than one reasonable meaning exists, it is our duty to accept that chosen by the legislature."

APPEAL THREATENED

The dissenting opinion disagreed with the majority's view that the constitutional provision encompassed educational purposes. The dissent contended such an interpretation does violence to the plain meaning of the language of the provision. It maintained that, in other instances where the people chose to exempt educational institutions from taxation, specific provision was made in the Constitution.

Henry C. Clausen, chief attorney for the California Taxpayers' Alliance, announced the group would carry the case to the United States Supreme Court "as soon as possible." He said there was a Federal question "relating to the United States Constitution."

Arguing before the court in favor of the exemption were the State attorney general's office and the Roman Catholic Welfare Corp. Andrew F. Burke, representing the Catholic group, said the exemption of all nonprofit private schools affected would cost the State $1,124,000 a year in taxes.

He said that Catholic schools alone save the State more than $118 million a year in educational expenses.

College level institutions were previously exempted in California and private schools are tax exempt in every other State, Mr. Burke remnided.

PASSED IN 1951

Events that led to the Supreme Court's ruling began with th passage in 1944 of a Welfare Exemption Act to extend relief to religious and charitable organizations. Op-

ponents argued that this did not mean schools.

Then in 1951 the California Legislature passed a measure which gave schools exemption under the meaning of the 1944 act. The assembly passed the measure 75 to 0 and the senate approved it 33 to 3. Then Gov. Earl Warren, now Chief Justice of the United States, signed the measure, expressing his wholehearted approval.

But opponents managed to round up enough support to initiate a referendum on the action in the 1952 general elections. This prevented the measure from becoming law until after ratification by the voters.

Called Proposition 3 on the ballot, the measure was passed in the November voting.

DECISION REVERSED

However, Alfred J. Lundberg, leader of the California Taxpayers Alliance, challenged the constitutionality of the measure. He was upheld by the Alameda court.

Alameda County District Attorney J. F. Coakley was one of the defendants in the suit. His appeal brought the case to the State supreme court.

The supreme court's majority decision was written by Chief Justice Philip S. Gibson, and concurred in by Justices Roger J. Traynor, Homer R. Spence and Marshall F. McComb.

A dissenting opinion was written by Justice B. Rey Schauer and concurred in by Justices Jesse W. Carter and John W. Shenk.

When Bob Bennett Lost $64,000 He Won Hearts With Rare Dignity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article entitled "When Bob Bennett Lost $64,000 He Won Hearts With Rare Dignity." This article which was written by Ernest Rogers appeared in the Atlanta Journal on March 28, 1956, and reprinted in the Southeast Georgian, Kingsland, Ga., on March 29, 1956.

The article follows:

WHEN BOB BENNETT LOST $64,000 HE WON HEARTS WITH RARE DIGNITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following article was written by Ernest Rogers of the Atlanta Journal and printed in the March 28 issue of that paper. Because of its human interest and praise of Bob Bennett we are reprinting for our readers who may have missed it.)

Although he lost the big money on last week's $64,000 Question show Mr. Robert Edward Bennett, a $75-a-week clerk in a Kingsland, Ga., store, won the respect and admiration of millions of TV viewers, and I suspect that his fellow townsmen are as proud of him as if he had returned home with the $64,000 (before taxes).

When Mr. Bennett made his first appearance before the TV cameras he wore a grim and foreboding look. The corners of his mouth turned down and his face was a mask of determined resolution.

But when he began conversing with the master of ceremonies his manner changed, an attractive smile lit up his countenance, and he revealed himself as a man of good humor and unexpected poise. To the surprise of most onlookers he chose the "Lincoln" category and breezed through the questions until he encountered the $64,000 "stumper."

HAS DIGNITY

Then, in the moment of loss, he revealed the finest ingredient of his personality: dignity.

Before taking the big plunge—which he did without hesitation—Mr. Bennett revealed that the $32,000 he had already won represented approximately the amount of income he would receive from 10 years on his job in the Kingsland store. But, he had pointed out, his needs were simple and his tastes were not extravagant and that he made out very well on his present salary.

Then, when tragedy struck in the form of a miss on the first part of an involved and difficult question, his dignity came to the front. I was unable to detect even the slightest trace of disappointment in his voice or manner. He spoke warmly of the pleasure he had derived from meeting the people connected with the program and others far from his Kingsland home. He also thanked the many people who had written to him during his tenure on the program.

PROVES METTLE

In those intense moments of disappointment he proved his mettle as a gentleman. He previously had proved his caliber as a scholar.

Georgians, particularly, were proud of the showing Bob Bennett made. He had conducted himself with dignity and had reflected credit on his home State. As a good-will ambassador he had scored 100 percent.

A group of us were discussing Mr. Bennett's experience the other evening.

"When he missed that question," one lady reported, "I wept."

Others in the group said they had experienced a similar reaction.

Had Mr. Bennett been "flip" or "smart alecky" no one would have cared particularly. Had he been coy, as some of the contestants are, there would have been little, if any, regret.

But the dignity of this scholarly man from a small Georgia town was such a magnificent thing to see that all joined in the general wave of disappointment.

Yet I think Mr. Bennett has learned from his experience that winning friends is more important than winning money. After all, there are no tax take-outs on friendship.

A Critical Evaluation of Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a large portion of an article entitled "A Critical Evaluation of Flouridation," by the celebrated Dr. Charles A. Brusch, B. S., M. D., and his able collaborator, George B. Ceresia, Ph. D.

Dr. Brusch is not only an outstanding doctor, who is the head of the very successful Brusch Medical Center, Cambridge, Mass., but he is also known for humanitarian interests and contributions.

The excerpts follow:

A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF FLUORIDATION

(By Charles A. Brusch, B. S., M. D., director of the Brusch Medical Center, Cambridge, Mass.; and George B. Ceresia, Ph. D., assistant professor of chemistry, Albany College of Pharmacy, Union University, Albany, N. Y.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is the editor's opinion that a good case has been made in support of the fluoridation of municipal water supplies, but it is the policy of this journal to print both sides of any controversy when the proponents are responsible and capable workers. The arguments against fluoridation are well summarized in this paper.)

The recent hearings on the Weir bill to prevent fluoridation by cities on a national scale has aired some of the pros and cons of this controversy. While there exists a multiplicity of data showing that addition of fluorine to drinking water is largely beneficial in delaying tooth decay, there has been a great deal of contradictory evidence and sworn testimony by experts concerning its adverse effects on the physiological system. At the risk of being included in the group which "presents arguments against adding one part per million of sodium fluoride to drinking water resembling those raised 50 years ago against chlorination of water, against pasteurization, and against vaccination," this article is designed to critically review and present the liabilities of fluoridation as revealed by recent scientific investigation.

The relationship between the fluoride ion and dental health starts with an inquisitive dentist, F. S. McKay in Colorado Springs. He observed characteristic brown stains on the teeth of so many patients that he became curious. He consulted with a dental pathologist by the name of G. V. Black and, in 1915, they both published a paper describing "mottled enamel" in teeth. Dr. Black died soon after, but Dr. McKay continued searching and approximately 15 years later found his answer, fluorine content of the drinking water.

In 1931 the chief chemist for Alcoa studied the water of Bauxite, Ariz., and found the drinking water contained 14 parts per million of fluoride which he ascribed as the cause of the brown stain on the inhabitants' teeth. Simultaneously, an independent investigation by Margaret C. and H. V. Smith, University of Arizona chemists, found by animal experimentation and chemical analysis of the water of St. David, Ariz., that fluoride concentration had a toxic effect on the teeth, called "mottling."

Facts such as this led H. T. Dean, now director of the National Institute of Dental Research, and his associates into carrying out a study of the effect of fluoridated and nonfluoridated waters on the teeth. Examining the mouths of 7,000 children ranging from 12 to 14 years of age and recording carefully each case of mottled enamel, decayed or missing teeth, they postulated that 1 to 1.5 parts of fluorine per million parts of water produced no brown stains of "mottling" and reduced decay by two-thirds.

Although water had been previously fluoridated, it wasn't until 1945 that results of fluoridation of Grand Rapids, Mich., as a test site with Muskegon, Mich., as a control, were published. The fluoride concentration of Muskegon which along with Grand Rapids draws its water from Lake Michigan, was to be kept on one-tenth part per million. Aurora, Ill., whose water contains 1.2 parts of fluorine per million was to be the second control. Again results showed a reduction in tooth decay, particularly in children 4 to 7 years old.

In 1945 a similar test was started in Newburgh and Kingston, N. Y., both of which

get their water from the same source. Newburgh fluoridated and after 8 years reports a very significant decrease in dental caries when compared with its control, Kingston. As a result, on February 1, 1953, more than 10 million persons in 600 different cities and towns of the United States were drinking fluoridated water. Since then there has been a reappraisal.

* * * * *

The majority of the reports in the literature state that the addition of 1 to 1.2 parts per million of fluorine to drinking water, as advocated by the United States Public Health Service, aids in the delay of dental caries. However, there is some disagreement about just how this is accomplished. For a time it was felt that fluorine prevented decay by lowering the count of Lactobacillus acidophilus, the organism in the saliva thought to be responsible for decay. Counts of zero to less than 100 are found in 38 percent of the children as compared with 18 percent in the fluoride areas. Consequently, there seems to be no relationship between fluoride content in saliva and incidence in caries. Later, electron and X-ray diffraction experiments showed that the treatment of powdered dental enamel surfaces results in a direct transformation from an apatite to a calcium fluoride crystalline structure; a more resistant form. The rate of the transformation was influenced by the acidity and concentration of fluorine in the solution, for human beings this would be the saliva. At present the mode of action is taken as a combination of both of the preceding theories.

During this time chemists, dentists, and physicians were asking themselves what were the physiological effects of fluoridation. How does this chemical, fluorine, affect the sick and healthy, alike? Was there no effect, was there a beneficial or was there a detrimental effect on the body functions—especially, on the organs such as the liver, heart, kidneys, thyroid, etc., which were already weakened by disease? How would the people fare in a community which was abruptly and completely subjected to fluoridated water? Investigations are slow and costly. Results were and still are dribbling in because the animal organism known as man has a relatively long life span and the abnormalities which are brought about by factors in the environment are very slow but certain in development.

An article written on March 21, 1953, in Business Week has this to say:

"Quite a few doctors and scientists want to know just what fluorine does to the bones, to elderly people with chronic diseases, and—on a long-range basis—to teeth. Of a given amount of fluorine absorbed by the body, a much larger percentage goes into the bones than into the teeth. Doctors are wondering whether the larger amounts will not damage bone marrow.

"It has been found in statistics that deaths from certain causes, notably heart attacks, have increased sharply in cities where the water is fluoridated. Scientists think that these figures indicate a danger area that should be explored.

"The early research on fluorine showed that it was one of the causes of mottled, or darkened teeth. This was caused by too high a concentration of the chemical. It is thought that no matter how weak the concentration, continued use of the treated water would permit the body to store up dangerous quantities. * * * The antifluoridators claim that however fine the effects may be on the teeth of children, they may be overbalanced by troubles when childhood is passed."

Since then the United States Public Health Service has issued a publication with some statistical evidence showing fluoridation does not affect the heart. Close analytical evaluation of this evidence shows it not to be conclusive.

J. Rorty in a 1953 issue of Harper's describes the work and findings of a research dentist:

"Dr. Reuben Feltman, research dentist, conducted a study of children and pregnant women to whom fluoride tablets had been administered (equivalent of one part per million water fluoridation). Many of his subjects had such bad reactions in the form of urticaria, vomiting, etc., that this dosage had to be discontinued. His question is, 'What will happen to such individuals when water is fluoridated if it may cause unusual reactions to a few?'

"Dr. Feltman again asks: 'Where are we going? Are we going hastily to fluoridate all water supplies, reduce the incidence of dental caries, and then be stigmatized as a profession because of dental fluorosia which appears after 12 to 14 years of use and possible other effects which may prove to be serious medical problems after 20 to 30 years of ingestion?'"

Dr. V. O. Hurme, director of clinical research; Dr. A. Taylor, research scientist; Dr. R. S. Harris, director of the nutritional biochemistry laboratories; and Dr. G. W. Rapp, of the school of dentistry, Loyola University, are some of the scientists, among others, who believe fluoridation harmful. As recently as June 1954, V. A. Kleinfeld, Washington lawyer representing the Citizens Committee on Fluoridation at hearings on the Weir bill in Washington, D. C., charged that not enough is yet known about possible physiological effects of fluoridated water to justify its use by any Federal, State, or municipal agency.

Fluorine and its compounds have long been known to be poisons. Fluorine as an element is the most active of the halogen family, whose stable other members are chlorine, bromine, and iodine. Sodium fluoride is used as a rat poison and a poisoning agent in many of the preparations on the market today. Calcium fluoride has been used as a roach poison and, hydrogen fluoride, a highly corrosive acid, may be compared with hydrogen cyanide as a lethal agent, especially in the gaseous state. All three of these compounds together with sodium fluorosilicate have been or are being used as an artificial source of fluoride ion in drinking water; sodium fluoride being the principal compound used. The range of acute toxicity of sodium fluoride is from 0.046 to 0.50 milligram per kilogram of body weight when injected subcutaneously in dogs, rabbits, guinea pigs, or rats. The acute toxicity range in man is not definite and has yet to be accurately determined although it is suspected that these concentrations are harmful if not toxic.

Analysis has shown fluorine to be present in the body in small amounts and there is some speculation among scientists whether it is a necessary element or is present because it is in our daily food and is deposited along with the calcium and phosphorus of the body. The normal bone contains from 0.01 to 0.03 percent of fluorine and the dental enamel contains from 0.01 to 0.02 percent. As has been stated, since no diet has so far been devised which is free of fluorine, it is difficult to determine whether the element has a functional importance, and, if so, what the function is.

An article which dramatically points out the lethal possibilities of fluorides, is entitled "Pass the Arsenic but Be Sure To Try the Fluorine as Well." In one of its statements the article points out the fact that an overdose of fluoride, familiar as an ant poisoner, kills one quite as dead as arsenic.

Many communities have drinking water whose fluoride content is greater than the artificially introduced 1.2 parts per million; especially those States in the South and Southwestern part of the United States. In these localities the problem is one of defluorination using activated superphosphate, slaked lime, etc. There is an acknoweldged problem in "mottling" of teeth and in preparation of water for industrial use. The breweries are greatly concerned, as are the bakeries, because it has been demonstrated rather thoroughly that the yeast organism is very susceptible to fluorine. Not much has been pulished correlating the vital statistics with that of other areas having little or no fluorine in their drinking water but one fact has been presented. The ratio of premature births in Texas and New Mexico is 35.1 percent and 55.9 percent respectively, as compared with the ratio of 26.7 percent throughout other sections of the country.

In the naturally fluoridated waters calcium fluoride (solubility is 0.17 percent at 26° C.) and sodium silicofluoride (solubility very low) are the principal fluorine compounds. The chief artificially introduced fluoride, sodium fluoride, has a solubility of 4.0 percent at 25° C.; although recent experiments have proven stannous fluoride a better fluoridating agent for the delay of dental caries. Thus the fluorine available as hydrogen fluoride from calcium fluoride at a concentration of 1 part per million is 0.00425 milligrams and from sodium fluoride at the same concentration, 0.25 milligrams to a glass of water. It can be clearly seen that it is possible for a naturally fluoridated water with a higher percent of fluorine to give less available or usable fluorine ion than an artificially fluoridated water.

In addition to the water supply as a source, we get fluorine from many of the common foods in the American diet. From butter, cheese, liver, chicken, oysters, bread, and honey we get 1.5, 1.6, 1.5, 1.4, 1.5, 1 and 1 parts per million of fluoride, respectively. Dry tea is especially rich in fluoride with a content of 30 to 60 parts per million of fluoride. Thus, it is easily seen that the amount of fluorine necessary for delay of dental caries and the amount necessary for body function, if necessary at all, is amply supplied in the daily diet.

* * * * *

Therefore, in conclusion, we have evidence that in the delay of dental caries in children, fluoride treatment is helpful, but even here there is contradictory evidence from dental researchers and, there is the defect that when the critical level of fluoride is overstepped, unsightly mottling results. However, since no contagious disease is involved this is not a public health problem but a personal matter. Such fluoridation would impose upon the entire population the consumption of highly toxic protoplasmic poison in small doses from the time before we are born until the time we die. This drug, against which there is no antidote, would be forced on everyone, regardless of his environment, his physical condition and his moral attitude—whether or not he wishes to take this drug. At the same time, there might be created a false sense of security, a false impression that we do not need to consider the predisposing causes, the bacterial, nutritional, or the hygienic procedures under medical and dental care which are essential for good teeth.

However, what is to be greatly feared is the long-term results of fluoridation on the physiological system. We know that fluoride effect is a matter of activity, that is, how much is available as fluoride ion and not as some insoluble complex as calcium fluoride, which is the main constituent of natural fluoridated waters. We know that the oft-repeated statement, "other people live in areas in which the natural fluorine content of the water is much higher than one part per million and they suffer no ill effects," is not true. Investigations of the vital statistics of those areas have been in progress and some of the reports trickling in, show some startling correlations with harmful physical dysfunction and abnormalities. This is particularly true for heart disease, premature births, osseous growth and cancer. Scientific proof or disproof of these facts will

take time and cannot be dismissed with a refutation like that published recently by the United States Public Health Service regarding heart disease.

Experiments performed and studies already made on animals, and, in some cases man, definitely indicate that fluoridation is harmful. We do not have enough data to date to know exactly what does happen. Enough has been done, however, to strongly indicate that even at a concentration of one part per million fluorine has a cumulative toxicity, much in the same manner as arsenic, on people with defective excretory organs.

Principally, for these reasons there are now militant organizations of citizens in almost every community who oppose fluoridation. * * * One such committee which represents Florida has petitioned Congress to pass the antifluoridation Wier bill because—

"It is unethical and illegal for city councils and waterworks departments, who are unlicensed, to prescribe medical treatment or to dispense treatment to anyone individually or en masse.

"We insist upon exercise of our right to be secure in our own homes and persons, to choose our own physician, our own medicine, and manner of taking it."

For those who wish to provide enough fluorine to insure getting the amount prescribed by the Public Health Service they have the choice of selecting certain foods for the diet or they may apply any of the several brands of toothpaste or dental powder containing fluoride which is on the market. Let them not gamble with the lives of their children and loved ones by allowing the ingestion of fluoride to become mandatory. It would be wise to heed the words of the Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas J. Riley who said in his newspaper column:

"As long as, in the judgment of competent authorities, there is solid reason for fearing that fluoridation may have serious, harmful, and widely prevalent long-term effects, it would be wrong to impose it on the general population."

Chairman Jere Cooper of the Committee on Ways and Means Announces Conference Agreement on H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JERE COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

The Honorable JERE COOPER, Democrat, Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, announces the agreement of the House and Senate conferees on H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956. A summary of the principal provisions of the conference agreement follows:

I. COVERAGE

(a) *Self-employed professional groups*

The conferees agreed to the Senate version which excluded from coverage physicians and osteopaths. This provision is effective for taxable years after 1955. Both the House and Senate bills extended coverage to other professional groups.

(b) *Farm operators and share farmers*

Two-thirds of farm operators gross income where it is $1,800 or less would be considered as net income for social security purposes.

Where farm operators gross income is over $1,800 they may report either their actual net income, or, if their net income is less than $1,200, they may report $1,200 as their net income. The optional method of reporting would be made available to farmers who are on an accrual basis of accounting.

This provision would be effective for taxable years after 1956.

Rentals would be credited as self-employment income where the owner or tenant of the land participates materially with the individual working the land in the production or the management of the production of an agricultural or horticultural commodity. Share farmers would be covered as self-employed persons.

(c) *Ministers*

Ministers outside the United States would be covered if they serve a congregation predominantly made up of United States citizens even though their employer may not be a United States employer.

(d) *Agricultural workers*

Agricultural workers would be covered if (1) they are paid $150 more or in cash wages in a calendar year by one employer, or (2) they perform agricultural labor for an employer on 20 days or more during the calendar year for cash wages computed on a time basis.

Such laborers who are recruited and paid by a crew leader would be deemed to be employees of the crew leader if the crew leader is not by written agreement designated to be an employee of the owner or tenant and if such crew leader is customarily engaged in recruiting and supplying individuals to perform agricultural labor. Under the above circumstances, the crew leader will be deemed to be self-employed.

Agricultural workers from any foreign country who are admitted to the United States on a temporary basis would be excluded from coverage.

Persons producing or harvesting gum resin products would be excluded from coverage.

(e) *State and local employees*

Florida, Georgia, New York, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Hawaii would be authorized at their option to cover those persons now members of a State retirement system who wish to be covered, provided that the new employees are covered compulsorily. The same treatment would be authorized for political subdivision retirement systems of the States.

Florida, Georgia, Minnesota, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, Washington, and Hawaii at their option would be authorized to cover employees who are paid wholly or partly from Federal funds under the unemployment compensation provisions of the Social Security Act either by themselves or with other employees of the Department of State in which they are employed. In such situations, the referendum provisions must be complied with.

Florida, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, and Hawaii would be authorized at their options up until July 1, 1957, to include employees of public school districts who are under teachers' retirement systems but who are not required to have teachers' or school administrators' certificates (for example, school custodians) in the States OASI agreement without a referendum and without including the certificated employees who are under teachers' retirement system.

Florida, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and South Dakota would be allowed to give coverage to policemen and firemen subject to the same conditions that apply to coverage of other employees who are under State and local retirement systems, except that where the policemen and firemen are in a retirement system with other classes of employees, the policemen and firemen may at the option of the State hold a separate referendum and be covered as a separate group.

(f) *Employees of nonprofit organizations*

Such employees would be allowed coverage by being listed on supplemental lists and where they did not concur in the initial coverage certificate of a nonprofit organization provided such lists are filed by January 1, 1959.

Where a nonprofit organization employs an individual after 1950 and before the enactment of H. R. 7225 and the organization failed to file a valid waiver certificate although it believed that it had done so, such individual will be permitted to receive credit for his employment by filing a request with the Internal Revenue Service if at least part of the OASI taxes were paid and not refunded prior to the enactment of H. R. 7225.

Where a nonprofit organization filed a valid waiver but an employee's name was not on the list of names of those which are submitted and who are listed for coverage, such an employee can get credit for employment on which taxes were paid and not refunded prior to the date of enactment of H. R. 7225 upon request to the Internal Revenue Service.

(g) *Federal employees*

TVA employees would be given social security coverage upon their submitting to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for approval an integrated plan (which integrates their present system with social security) and upon the approval of such plan by the Secretary. Coverage was also extended to employees of Federal Home Loan Banks. This coverage at the discretion of these groups could be effective as of January 1, 1956. There are approximately 11,000 TVA employees and 200 Federal Home Loan Bank employees.

(h) *Citizens of the United States employed by foreign subsidiaries of American corporations*

Such persons would be covered where a domestic corporation owns not less than 20 percent of the voting stock of the foreign subsidiary (at present a domestic corporation must own 50 percent of such stock).

(i) *Insured status*

Persons covered in 1956 would be deemed fully insured if all but 4 (but not less than 6) of the quarters after 1954 and prior to the later of (1) July 1, 1957, or (2) the quarter of death or attainment of retirement age (whichever first occurs) are quarters of coverage. Five years may be dropped out in computing average monthly wages in all cases regardless of the number of quarters of coverage. This provision would be effective after enactment of H. R. 7225.

A provision would be added primarily for persons who are first covered in 1956. Such individuals who become entitled to benefits or who die in 1957 and who have at least six quarters of coverage after 1955 would be permitted to have a starting date of December 31, 1955, and a closing date of July 1, 1957, in those cases where these dates would yield a higher benefit.

II. BENEFITS FOR PERMANENTLY AND TOTALLY DISABLED PERSONS

The conferees for the most part accepted the Senate version of this provision.

A separate trust fund and a separate tax would be provided for these payments.

Members of the Christian Science Church or other churches which rely on spiritual healing and who refuse rehabilitation services would be deemed to have done so with good cause.

The conferees deleted the provision of the Senate bill whereby individuals who refuse to undergo surgical or medical services in

connection with rehabilitation would have been deemed to have done so with good cause.

Dependent disabled children would be given benefits if such children are permanently and totally disabled and have been so disabled since before they reached age 18.

Disability benefit payments will begin in July 1957.

III. RETIREMENT AGE FOR WOMEN

The conferees accepted the Senate version with an amendment making the change effective in November 1956. Widows and surviving dependent mothers would be given full benefits at age 62. Working women and wives would be given reduced benefits if they begin to draw them between age 62 and 65. Working women would receive 80 percent of their full benefit should they retire at age 62. If they delay retirement they would be given five-ninths of 1 percent for each month's delay up to age 65. Wives would be given 75 percent of their full benefits should they begin to receive benefits at 62. For each month's delay up to age 65 they would receive twenty-five thirty-sixths of 1 percent. Should a woman accept a reduced benefit, this benefit would continue to be payable and it would not be increased upon their reaching age 65.

IV. SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS WHO LIVE IN THE UNITED STATES

The Senate version, whereby payments to persons not a citizen or national of the United States would have their benefit payments suspended if they leave the United States, was accepted with amendments. The amendments would make the provision inapplicable if such a person has been a resident of the United States for 10 years or has paid contributions for 10 years or where there is a reciprocal treaty under which the country to which such person goes pays benefits to United States citizens under their program. The Senate version was also amended so as to provide that a person would have to be outside the United States for 6 months (instead of 3) before his payments would be suspended.

V. FORFEITURE OF BENEFITS FOR PERSONS CONVICTED OF CERTAIN CRIMES

The Senate version would have terminated an individual's benefits if he is or has been convicted of treason, sedition, sabotage, espionage, or certain other crimes under the Internal Security Act. The conferees amended this provision so as to provide that benefits could be terminated by a court in such cases. This provision applies only to the person involved and is not applicable to dependents or survivors.

VI. EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF PERSONS LISTED BY THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Employees of organization listed by the SACB would be excluded from old-age and survivors insurance coverage.

VII. FINANCING

A separate trust fund would be established for the disability benefits program. Social-security taxes would be increased effective January 1, 1957, by one-fourth of 1 percent for each the employee and employer, making the rate 2¼ percent on each. The self-employment tax would be increased from 3 to 3⅜ percent, effective January 1, 1957. These increases would also be made in each of the scheduled increases now contained in the law. The interest rate on United States obligations in which a trust fund is invested would be determined by using the average rate of interest paid on interest-bearing obligations of the United States which are not due or callable until after the expiration of 5 years from the date of original issue.

VIII. PUBLIC ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS

(a) Matching formula

The matching formula for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children at the present time for the first 3 of these programs is four-fifths of the first $25 of a State's average monthly payment and one-half of the next $30, up to a maximum of $55. The maximum amount matchable for these 3 programs would be increased from $55 to $60 and the formula would be changed so as to provide matching of four-fifths of the first $30 and one-half of the next $30 up to a maximum of $60. The aid to dependent children formula is presently four-fifths of the first $15 of a State's average monthly payment plus one-half of the next $15 up to a maximum of $30 for an eligible adult and for the first child. Each additional child is subject to a maximum of $21. The amount matchable would be increased by $2.

The increase in cost over present law for the first year amounts to $98 million for aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and old-age assistance and $48 million for the first year for aid to dependent children. The conferees deleted the "pass-along" provision from the Senate bill.

(b) Medical care

A new program would be added whereby the Federal Government would match on a 50–50 basis State expenditures on vendor payments in behalf of public-assistance recipients needing medical care up to a maximum determined by multiplying $6 per month times the number of adults and $3 per month times the number of children. This program will cost $65 million in the first year.

The conferees deleted the Senate provision providing that the Federal Government would share in the amount by which the maximum possible Federal matching of cash payments exceed the amount actually matched by the Federal Government.

(c) Administrative costs

Under present law there is separate dollar-for-dollar matching in costs for the administration of the public-assistance programs. The conferees accepted the Senate amendment which makes explicit that the restoration of receipients of public assistance to self-support or self-care is a program objective and that the strengthening of family life is an objective in the program of aid to dependent children.

(d) Requirements for approval of State plans

A requirement would be added to the effect that a State plan for public assistance to be approved must contain a description of services, if any, which a State provides for self-support or self-care. The Senate provision to the effect that in determining need a State could disregard up to $50 in earned income was deleted. The conferees also deleted the Senate provision requiring that there be no discrimination based on sex in determining need.

(e) Research and demonstration projects

Five million dollars would be authorized for fiscal year 1957 for grants to States, public and nonprofit organizations for paying part of the cost of research and demonstration projects on prevention and reduction of dependency.

(f) Training grants for public assistance personnel

Five million dollars would be authorized for fiscal year 1957 for allotment to States on a variable basis to pay to institutions of higher learning for the training of public welfare personnel, etc. The Federal share would be 80 percent.

(g) Definition of a needy child

Provisions relating to aid to dependent children would be amended so as to delete the requirement of school attendance for children between the ages of 16 and 18. The persons eligible for payments under the ADC program would be broadened to include first cousins, nephews, and nieces. Parents and other relatives would be made eligible for payments in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

(h) Ceilings on grants to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands

The ceiling on Federal matching for the Virgin Islands would be raised from $160,000 to $200,000, and on Puerto Rico from $4,250,000 to $5,312,500.

(i) Child welfare programs

The authorization for child welfare programs would be increased from $10 to $12 million a year.

(j) Commission on Aging

The Senate provision establishing this Commission was deleted.

Dulles Makes an Enemy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1956, is interesting reading.

It is further proof of our floundering, confusing, wandering foreign policy that never knows where it is going or what it wants, or when it should ask for it. Every opportunity to amicably work out a peaceful solution to the Middle East problem has been allowed to slip through the fingers our our traveling Secretary of State. The following column points up another such instance:

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

DULLES MAKES AN ENEMY

WASHINGTON.—The handling of the matter of the Aswan Dam in Egypt has been one of the strangest exercises in diplomacy since Secretary of State John Foster Dulles took office, which is saying a good deal.

Dulles, in a brief, unhappy conversation with Egyptian Ambassador Achmed Hussein, has flatly informed the Egyption Government of Col. Abdel Gamel Nasser that the American offer to help build the dam has been withdrawn. The dam project, designed to avert future famine in Egypt by irrigating a vast area of desert, has become an immensely important political symbol not only in Egypt but throughout the Middle East.

Nasser is scheduled to go to Moscow in August. Twice already, once last year and again last month, Soviet Foreign Minister Dmitri Shepilov has offered Nasser help in building the dam, on ostensibly generous terms. There is every reason to believe that the offer will now be repeated. And as the able American Ambassador to Egypt, Henry Byroade, has consistently warned Dulles, there is also every reason to believe that Nasser will accept the Russian offer, if he cannot find the necessary help in the West.

Nasser himself, who is no fool whatever else he may be, is not eager to accept the Russian offer, simply because he knows that it would mean total economic domination of his country by the Soviet bloc. But, according to Byroade and other observers, the political pressures built up in Egypt are such that Nasser is almost certain to feel that he has no alternative.

With Egypt dominated by the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union will certainly become the dominant power in the strategically vital Middle East, where Western interests are al-

ready directly threatened. In short, Dulles has decided to take a downright breath-taking risk, which may have genuinely catastrophic consequences. Moreover, the risk is one which could almost certainly have been avoided.

Last December, when an Egyptian delegation visited this country, an agreement in principle was reached for an International Bank loan of $200 million for the dam project, plus initial grants of $56 million from this country and $14 million from Britain. In January, Eugene Black, capable president of the International Bank, went to Cairo to tidy up the loose ends.

He found Nasser reasonable enough, and the deal seemed well under way. The necessary $56 million was set aside for the dam project from available foreign-aid funds. Thereafter, the Egyptians sent a message to the State Department, raising some irritating but essentially minor points about the terms of the American grant. Meanwhile, Nasser had acted in a manner nicely calculated, in a whole series of ways, to infuriate the American Government.

Instead of continuing serious negotiations, therefore, an attitude of studied indifference was adopted by Dulles and the State Department, over the strong protests of Byroade (who has an unwelcome habit of reporting home truths to Washington, and who has since been removed for his pains).

At the same time, an alliance of Democrats from the cotton States and right-wing Republicans in the Senate opposed the dam project. When Dulles testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee last month, he pleased the antidam Senators, but he all but burned his bridges behind him.

He stated flatly that there was "no likelihood" of using "any United States funds" for the dam. And he remarked that the Russians might well build the dam instead, as though this were a matter of hardly more than passing interest.

If Dulles had now attempted to reverse himself, he would have found himself in an unholy row with the senatorial antidam alliance, which would no doubt have been led by Republican minority leader WILLIAM KNOWLAND. Dulles' spokesmen claim that this fact never even entered his head when he decided to kick Nasser in the teeth, and that Dulles is, rather, taking a calculated risk in the national interest.

Maybe so. But it should at least be recognized that the Dulles decision will, at the most, mean Russian domination of the whole Middle East, and, at the least, the open hostility of the most powerful figure in the Middle East. In these circumstances, the least the State Department can do is to use the still considerable power of the United States—notably in Saudi-Arabia, where American oil money finances many of Nasser's pet foreign projects—to cut the Egyptian President down to size. For if you are going to make an enemy, you must treat him as an enemy.

A Southern Viewpoint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an exchange of letters between a young German lawyer and W. A. Price, chairman of the international contacts committee of the Inverness (Miss.) Rotary Club:

CELLE, *March 4, 1956.*

DEAR MR. PRICE: As my father gave me your kind letter to the Rotary Club of Stade and asked me to translate it for him and also to translate his and the club's answer, I think I ought to apologize for the mistakes I have most certainly made. Although I was lucky enough to spend 1 year of studies at the University of Chicago in 1952–53, it is yet quite a task to write an English letter properly.

When I was in the United States I had the opportunity to travel a bit and so to see many things, which interested me very much and made me like your wonderful country. And I do feel very lucky that I could find many friends among the fellow students in Chicago, with some of whom I am still in contact.

Unfortunately I had not the chance to see the Southern States of the United States and did not travel farther south than West Virginia. I regret that the more, as there are obviously many problems in the American South, which I have no idea about. Please, don't regard me as impolite, for I am asking not out of mere curiosity, but because I believe it important to know more about the southern population's view for instance of the Negro problem, etc. Whenever the question comes up whether the Negroes should have the right to vote, to go to universities, etc., most of the European papers quote the United States Supreme Court's decisions, the articles of the New York and perhaps Chicago papers, but rarely refer to the southern people's opinion. But as long as one doesn't know that, I believe it to be difficult if not unjustified to talk about what is done or not done in the respective States of the Union. Of course it is not easy to understand many things which are commented upon in the radio or the papers. Last year, for example, there was much excitement about a case in which a jury in Mississippi allegedly acquitted an accused, although he was found guilty of having slain a Negro boy. Now I am sure that there must have been other reasons than only that the killed boy whistled, when he saw a white lady in the street.

Since I would like so much to understand completely the problems you have to solve in the Southern States, I take the freedom to ask you for giving me any information that might help me to understand the racial problem of the South of the United States.

I suppose that you won't be able to write to me personally, as your work will take most of your precious time. But perhaps you or another member of your club might have a son who would be willing to help me. I am 28 years old and working as a referendar, i. e., a junior lawyer. Here in Germany we have a legal system, which is quite different from yours and results also in a different legal education. For after we have studied law in a university for 4 years, we have to pass a first state examination. Then we got to work in different judicial fields for 3½ years as a kind of legal apprentice, and then have to take a second state examination. That is what I am doing right now in Celle at the Oberlandesgericht, which is in some ways comparable to your courts of appeal.

I would like to ask you once more not to misunderstand my wish for further information, because I believe that it is important to know more about other nations generally, and the United States especially.

Although I am not a Rotarian myself, please do accept my best wishes for you and for your club.

I am most sincerely yours,

DIETRICH W. ACKEMANN.

INVERNESS, MISS., *April 6, 1956.*

Mr. DIETRICH W. ACKEMANN,
Celle, Germany.

DEAR MR. ACKEMANN: First, please accept my sincere thanks for translating my letter to the State Rotary Club, and your father's answer. I have received several letters from other clubs in Germany but they were all written in German and I had to have them translated for me. Fortunately there is a fine lady, a former resident of Germany living here that is very kind and does the translating for me. Incidentally, your father's letter was most cordial and informative.

Second, I do not regard you as impolite in asking about the South's opinion concerning the Negro problem. On the contrary I appreciate your interest and feel honored in having the opportunity to answer your inquiries.

After the War Between the States, the South was not only faced with the great task of reconstructing a war-torn country but the matter of adjusting the customs and way of life of the people was further complicated by the fact that the Federal Army of Occupation together with the fortune hunters from the North completely demoralized the country for a number of years. In spite of all that though the southern white people and the Negroes began adjusting themselves to the new way of life and by the turn of the century conditions were much better. The more industrious type of Negro began to improve his living conditions and was successful in doing so, however, the less industrious, which was and is the majority became solely and voluntarily dependent on the white man for everything.

The white people provided him employment, living necessities, educational facilities, in fact did everything they could to encourage him to try to raise the standards of his own living. In making all these adjustments and provisions the two races naturally lived by their own standards and in their segregated societies. This mode of living was not forced upon anyone by anyone, but just came as a natural action.

This way of life has continued until the present time and each race has progressed and advanced in every respect. The two races have lived and worked together harmoniously and have been happy and contented in doing so. And during all this time in most of the Southern States, especially the 5 or 6 in the Deep South which includes Mississippi, the Negro has outnumbered the white by great numbers, in some instances 3 to 1.

The Negro has advanced very rapidly since 1865 in spite of the fact that he had so far to come. And I dare say that he has advanced more in the South than he has in any other part of the country.

The situation in the North is entirely different, for in some States the whites outnumber the Negro 3 to 1, and there are some areas where a Negro is almost an oddity. The North brought some of the Negroes to their States after the war and their system of integration just came into being naturally. Due to the few in number, there was no undue confusion.

Regarding the Supreme Court decision, which you mention, we in the South feel that it is not in keeping with the Constitution of the United States because it violates the sovereign powers delegated to the States in the Constitution. We further believe that the Court based their decision on phychological and sociological theories rather than on constitutional law. Politics, of course plays it's part for the northern Negro vote is being sought after very much by the politicians there.

We in the South think the Negro should have every educational advantage that any other citizen has, but on a segregated basis.

We further feel that if our way of life is broken down there will follow the breaking down of social barriers, which will lead to complete intermingling of the races and finally to intermarriage and mongrelization. This is the basic reason for our way of thinking. We, in the South cannot afford to give the right of vote completely over to the Negro for we are outnumbered, and he is not advanced and educated to the point of being capable of handling that responsibility.

I regret to say that the New York and Chicago and other northern and eastern newspapers, which you mention do not convey the true impression of the situation. They do not reflect the state of affairs as they really exist. There are reasons for that, and one is the fact that a lot of the industries from the North and East are moving South because they find more favorable conditions here in a number of ways. The North does not want to lose this business, nor do they want the South to become too strong economically.

In regard to the Negro boy mentioned that was killed in Mississippi and the jury acquitted the accused. I am sure the papers you read did not give a true picture of that incident. The northern papers and the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) took advantage of the incident and used it to spread propaganda and adverse publicity. The NAACP is a Communist inspired organization.

Frankly, I believe the north is beginning to see that the Supreme Court made a terrible mistake in rendering the decision concerning segregation in the schools, for since that time they have been confronted with a number of tragic incidents that we are able to handle much better here. And tension and feeling between the races exist more there than here, although their papers give very little account of it.

We feel that we are a true friend to the Negro, and will do anything and everything we can to help him advance to any level his ability will permit, but we insist that we must live according to the segregated society that has existed in the South for nearly a hundred years. And we believe in States rights. If the Northern, Eastern, or any other States want to integrate schools, or other public institutions they should have the privilege of doing so. By the same token we feel that we should have the right to maintain and operate our form of living and society without interference from outside sources. And in insisting on our rights as individual States, we, of course, have no intention of violating any of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Again let me say that I am glad to have the opportunity to discuss this matter with you. I want to congratulate you on your progress in the legal profession, and wish for you a brilliant career. I am quite a bit older than 28 but I am sure I was not as advanced and as good a thinker as you when I was your age.

I showed your letter to a friend that is a former State senator and is presently a county official. He was very much interested and promised me that he would send you some literature regarding the matters you inquire about. I hope it will be helpful.

Please remember that we would be most happy to have you as our guest, in the event you should return to the United States, and I would look forward to your coming if you should let me know in advance.

With best wishes to you and your father, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

WILL A. PRICE,
Chairman, International Contacts Committee, Inverness Rotary Club.

Stockpiling Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter by Willard F. Rockwell, a former Special Assistant to Secretary of Defense Wilson, appeared in the New York Times of July 20, 1956.

While everything he says is true, he does not go quite far enough. He fails to comment upon the fact that big business, through its WOC's—Federal employees without compensation, on loan from big business, drawing their compensation from big business—sits in on all the high policy discussions and has all the information that is classified so as not to reach the small-business man. So big business knows exactly when to pile up its inventory and when to unload it.

When the story is fully told, it will prove to be the biggest scandal of the century.

The letter follows:

STOCKPILING OPPOSED—GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS SAID TO CAUSE SEVERE LOSS TO SMALL BUSINESS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The writer of the following letter was formally a special assistant to Secretary of Defense Wilson.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Both political parties have expressed great concern over the welfare of small business, but good intentions cannot take the place of proper planning. The strange planning of Government stockpiling (and the disregard of expert advice) is causing heavy losses to small business, which is helpless unless Congress takes prompt action.

Scientists have said that a war involving nuclear weapons could not last more than 30 days, or at most 90 days, without destroying civilization. Our own military men say that the larger manpower of the Communist nations requires the use of nuclear weapons if we are attacked by them.

Prime Minister Anthony Eden announces a multimillion-dollar cut in defense spending in line with the British belief that conventional weapons are outmoded.

If these assumptions are correct, our Government's stockpiling of a 5-year supply of critical and strategic materials and a vast supply of conventional weapons in western Europe is utterly unnecessary, and is only promoting inflation, which many people think is a greater threat to the western world than a Communist attack.

EFFECT ON PRICES

Government stockpiling is causing terrific losses to small business. For example, natural rubber reached a price of 52 cents last December, and dropped 40 percent when the end of Government stockpiling was announced. Just 2 weeks after the announcement that aluminum stockpiling had ended the price of secondary aluminum dropped 20 percent.

Small business enterprises have to buy their requirements at current prices, while big business is able to protect itself with long-term contracts. Government stockpiling has been the primary cause of the inflationary price rises, and with each announcement that stockpiling has ended there has been a terrific drop in prices. Small business enterprises are hit by both price movements.

Because the Government has withheld all information about stockpile targets and made it illegal to express opinions on the quantities involved or the approach of completion of any 5-year stockpiling, the small-business enterprises have suffered severely, and some small businesses have been wiped out.

Investigations by Congress have shown that there has been a black market in nickel, which made it necessary to buy in the gray market, where prices increased 300 percent in 12 months. Although the Government exposed these operations last November, neither Congress nor the public was aware of the situation until May 30. Following the exposure before the Senate Small Business Committee, the gray market price of nickel has dropped 50 percent, but even so, many small-business enterprises have had to stop all their operations and do not dare to accept contracts for future deliveries of products containing nickel.

EXPERTS ADVICE

Experts on the nickel situation have advised the Government to stop nickel stockpiling, claiming that it will not reduce the available supply for defense purposes and will eliminate the gray market for nondefense users. The Government has also been advised that the only way to provide enough nickel for defense purposes (in view of the inability of the military officers to forecast their requirements) is to build standby facilities for refining nickel.

Experts state that it takes at least 2 years to build nickel refineries, and that nickel ore is available when it is needed, but, at the present time, there is no available capacity in the few refineries now in full operation.

If the facts were presented fairly and squarely to Congress there would be hope of immediate action before the end of the present congressional session, but if no action is taken in the near future more small-business enterprises will be wiped out.

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL.

PITTSBURGH, PA., July 16, 1956.

Klamath Indian Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, Mark Talney, executive director of the Oregon Council of Churches, is one of the best informed and most reliable authorities on the affairs of the Klamath Indians. His judgment should and does carry great weight. In the July 25 issue of the Christian Century, which has consistently spoken with the voice of wisdom and conscience on Indian affairs, Dr. Talney has written an excellent analysis of the grave problems developing under the Klamath termination law, Public Law 587. Because the Congress will, clearly, have to make extensive revision in this greatly defective law early in the next session of Congress, I hope Members will find the opportunity to read this authoritative discussion; and, under

unanimous consent, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

QUESTION VALIDITY OF KLAMATH PLAN—INSTITUTE REPORT INDICATES ENDING OF FEDERAL CONTROL OVER TRIBE IN OREGON IS UNDESIRABLE

(By Mark A. Talney)

PORTLAND, OREG., July 2.—A Stanford Research Institute report dealing with the termination in 1958 of Federal control over the Klamath Indian Tribe has substantiated the growing opinion among informed people in Oregon that the termination act as now constituted is ill-conceived and cannot be enforced without doing harm to the Indians and creating a serious social and economic problem in the Klamath area.

A large number of the Indians queried in the institute's careful survey stated they did not know why they were selected for early termination of Federal guardianship. Only 14 out of 100 interviewed believed that the tribe had requested termination. Only 6 believed they were more advanced than other tribes and for that reason were selected for termination. And 42 were unable to think of any reason at all for the move.

UNPREPARED FOR TERMINATION

The report bears out the opinion of management specialists, engaged by the secretary of the Interior to carry out the termination procedures set forth in the act, that the Klamath Tribe is less well prepared for termination than was believed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which conducted hearings on the subject prior to enactment of the termination bill. Two of the specialists, T. B. Watters and E. G. Favell, recently visited the Indian Bureau in Washington to plead for essential amendments and changes in the act if a great hardship is not to be inflicted upon the tribe and the Klamath area.

Attitudes of the on-reservation Indians toward termination are divided. Younger members are generally in favor, primarily because of the freedom and the financial benefits it seems to offer. Many but not all of the older members believe that the tribe is not ready for termination and that the Government is doing them an injustice. They wish to feel protected and cared for; at the same time, they feel hostile and resentful towards supervisory organization. They want to have their per capita payments, amounting to $800 per person and giving some families an income of as much as $4,000 a year; they would like to have all their hunting and fishing privileges preserved and all of the agency services retained; and they desire a measure of freedom not now possible. Even those who favor termination grow nostalgic when contemplating the loss of their hunting and fishing rights—which incidentally would bring a further decrease in the overall income.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL LOW

There is considerable confusion among tribe members concerning the implications of termination, since many do not realize that to obtain their share of tribal assets they must withdraw permanently from the tribe. Nor are they fully aware of the economic consequences of termination; namely, being forced to compete with non-Indian neighbors for a livelihood.

The educational level of tribe members is very low. Although public schools have been available to them since 1927, until last year the State could not enforce attendance. Over 25 years the educational conditions have shown small, if any, improvement. In the school year 1953–54, 324 Klamath children were attending the public schools from grades 1 to 12, but only 225 were promoted to higher grades. In 1954 only 12 were attending schools of higher education. Of 100 adults interviewed, 39 had grammar school training or less, 11 had had a brief period in high school, 11 had from 2 to 3 years in high school.

FUTURE LOOKS BLEAK

Lack of education is reflected in the scarcity of skilled workmen and the total absence of professional people in the Klamath tribe. If education is one yardstick by which to measure the ability of people to make their way in a complex society, the future of these Indians is very bleak as they seek to compete with their educated and well-trained white neighbors. Even with the stepped-up educational program authorized under the act, it would be several years before many of the Klamaths would be qualified to handle the resources which would suddenly be made available to them when their property is turned over to the tribe and portioned off to those who withdraw.

The State department of education readily admits that the educational program to date has failed badly. This department and the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs have agreed to add to the original educational program provided by the act facilities to teach the provisions of the act to the Indians, to educate them on State laws and the application of these laws as the transition from the Bureau to the State takes place, and to assist them in making individual decisions that go with their new position as citizens of Oregon.

WHAT ABOUT TIMBERLANDS?

Meanwhile, one of the most vexing problems is the after-termination disposition of the vast timber holdings of the Klamath Tribe. The research report indicates that fully 70 percent of the members may choose to leave the tribe and take a money settlement for their holdings. The 647,000 acres of commercial timberland on the Klamath Indian reservation bear one of the finest stands of ponderosa pine in the world, including 500,000 acres of cutover land bearing nearly 2.9 billion board feet of merchantable timber, and 92,000 acres of virgin forest bearing about 1.2 billion board feet for merchantable timber. Under present management practices, provision is made for a "sustained yield" cut over many years. Timber men and the forestry service believe that this practice is the only way to maintain a sane and steady balance in the lumber market and make possible the best use of the tribe's timberlands.

Under the present law, the time allowed for the cruising, setting up for sale and final disposition of the lands to the sold seems too limited to achieve a reasonably satisfactory sales price. By August 1958, the tribe members who withdraw will have to receive the money coming to them, with a consequently depressing effect on the realizable values. This will also make much more difficult the management of the remaining assets in such a way as to assure a reasonable per capita payment for members who remain in the tribe. Planning for the best interests of all would suggest that the reservation timberlands continue to be operated on a sustained yield basis. However, this is made impossible if a large number of members withdraw from the tribe, requiring the immediate sale of large portions of the timberland. Management specialists, along with timber experts of the State, are eager to seek some amendment to the act that would make a sustained yield policy of operation possible.

EFFECT ON NEARBY TOWNS

The plans of the Indians who choose to take a cash settlement after termination are of particular concern to the cities contiguous to the reservation, since approximately 75 percent of those who intend to withdraw from the tribe say they intend to remain near the reservation. Of those who desire cash settlement, most are able to indicate what they will do with their money. However, when asked to guess what their fellow tribesmen would with their money, many said that their neighbors would "go on a binge," "drink it up," "gamble it away," etc.

Some form of management for remaining assets of the tribe, after settlement with withdrawing members, must be made before the period of termination. If a large number of persons remain in the tribe, a corporation is proposed; if a small number remain, a corporation under tribal management would have little chance of success, leaving only a trusteeship program as the desirable solution. But either plan would require much more time to set up than is allowed under the present act.

A committee of the Oregon Council of Churches has carefully studied the implications of the termination bill. As a result, it is calling a conference for September 27, in cooperation with the department of sociology of Willamette University, at Salem, to discuss the problems raised by the termination and seek solutions. The conference will bring together representatives of all organizations and agencies that are concerned—the Indian Bureau, the State department of education, law-enforcement agencies, the judiciary, timber interests, churches, and others.

Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, has proposed an amendment designed to give Congress another look at Public Law 587. A major change she proposes would provide a 9-month review period before the Secretary of the Inter ior could act on the basis of the appraisal and recommendations being formulated by management specialists. This waiting period would give Congress time to take any legislative action it may find necessary to improve the present act.

A Brief Report to the People of the Sixth District of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, Congress has acted upon many major bills during the session which is now rapidly approaching adjournment. All of them merit comment, but I would like to report on only a few of them for the benefit of my constituents.

NATIONAL DEBT

Inasmuch as money is eventually involved in most of these bills it is perhaps fitting that mention first be made of our present fiscal situation. As all members know, our national debt amounts to almost $274 billion. At the end of the fiscal year, ending July 1, administration economies made possible a surplus of revenues over expenditures to the extent of about $2 billion, which has been applied toward a reduction of that debt.

APPROPRIATIONS

With the exception of supplemental appropriations we have now acted upon all appropriation bills for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1956. These bills add up to a total of approximately $66 billion. I believe my people will be interested in knowing where this money is to be spent during the next 12 months.

The greatest expenditures will be made by the Department of Defense. The appropriations for this Department total almost $35 billion, with the Air Force getting $16.5 billion of it. The Air Force got about $800 million more than Secretary Wilson said he could spend, but Congress insisted that he use it to speed up airplane construction.

An expenditure related to defense spending is the interest payment on our national debt which is largely the result of wartime spending. The annual interest payment on the debt amounts to $7 billion, or slightly over 10 percent of our entire annual appropriations.

Another such related expenditure is that for veterans' payments, hospitalization, pensions, and so forth. This comes to over $5 billion per year. If pensions for World War I veterans are approved, this figure will increase.

Foreign aid programs will account for about $3.5 billion. Agriculture programs will receive $2 billion. The operation of all other departments of Government account for the balance of the funds appropriated.

In other words, preparing for defense and spending for past wars costs the United States taxpayer about $50 billion annually, whereas the ordinary business of Government costs about $16 billion.

REVISED FARM PROGRAM

The newly passed farm legislation merits some mention in this report. For the first time, Congress approved the so-called soil bank proposal. After one Presidential veto of a farm bill, Congress passed a revised measure which received the approval of the White House. Amongst other things, it sets up an acreage reserve program by authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate farmers for reducing their 1956 to 1959 acreage of basic commodities, feed grains, and so forth, at the Secretary's discretion; land thus retired from production could be put to no other use. The objective of the bill was to cut down overproduction and to assist in the reduction of our multibillion dollar surplus agriculture stocks which were depressing farm prices and farm income.

HIGHWAY LEGISLATION

On June 26, Congress completed action on the biggest road-building program in United States history. The highway measure as accepted by the President (who had requested it) will result in the expenditure of about $33 billion for highway construction during the next 13 years. It will be financed through increased taxes upon highway users. Federal taxes on gasoline, diesel, and other motor fuels will be increased from 2 cents up to 3 cents per gallon. Taxes on tires will go from 5 cents up to 8 cents a pound. Manufacturers' taxes on trucks, buses, and truck trailers are increased from 8 percent to 10 percent. Together with other tax increases it is anticipated that revenues will be increased by about $15 billion over the life of the act.

The State of Washington will receive over $400 million under the bill. Whereas the State has received under previous highway legislation about $13 million a year, it will hereafter receive about $40 million per year. The increased funds will do much to expand and improve the State's highway system.

Federal funds allocated for State primary and secondary highways, together with urban extensions thereof, must be matched equally with State funds. The Government is authorized to pay 90 percent of the cost of construction and improvement of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

On June 27, Congress sent to the White House an appropriation bill which contained a few dollars less than $2 billion for health, education, and welfare programs. Included in the health funds were $184 million for the National Institutes of Health research programs, concerning cancer, heart ailments, multiple sclerosis, mental disorders, polio, and other diseases. This was the highest figure ever appropriated for these purposes. The House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly for the appropriation despite the strenuous opposition of Representative CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. In support of the health programs it was pointed out that great strides had been made in the direction of finding treatments and cures for many diseases. The report of progress made through research work justifies the funds expended. Few votes gave Members as much satisfaction as votes in favor of this appropriation. Who knows but that earlier research programs may have helped him survive his heart attack.

An additional $90 million has been appropriated for research programs in hospitals and universities.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

The House of Representatives on July 5 rejected a bill to give Federal aid to States for school construction. An amendment by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, to bar aid to States which did not comply with the Supreme Court's antisegregation decree was one reason for the rejection. Another reason was the opposition of many Members to the general principle of Federal aid to education.

The President had urged, and it was pointed out during debate on the measure, that the bill before the House did not provide general Federal aid to education but only provided temporary school construction assistance to meet the urgent school classroom shortage throughout the Nation.

The proposed measure provided for Federal aid to the States at a rate of $400 million per year for 4 years. It was anticipated that this aid would help the States regain the ground they had lost during the war years in meeting classroom requirements. The House rejection doomed this legislation for this Congress.

SPECIAL SCHOOL AID

On July 7 the House passed a bill to extend to June 30, 1958, two laws providing Federal aid to certain school districts overburdened by Federal activities. The bill provided an estimated $378 million in Federal assistance to so-called federally impacted areas. The funds can be used for both construction and operation purposes. They are to be distinguished from the funds sought to be authorized in the school construction bill which the House had rejected 2 days earlier. At a later date I shall give a more detailed report on Federal funds for schools in federally impacted areas.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As of this date, both Houses of Congress have approved bills which amend the Social Security Act. They do not yet have White House approval. The amendments mark an historic expansion of protection and retirement benefits for American families. Although in slightly different form, the bills permit qualified women to start drawing retirement payments at age 62 instead of 65. This marks the first time that the age 65 retirement deadline has been broken since social security started in 1935.

Another milestone was reached when both Houses agreed that totally disabled persons covered by social security could receive benefits starting at age 50. Almost from the outset of the act, backers have tried to get disability payments written into the law. Under the disability plan, an estimated 250,000 persons would start drawing payments averaging $75 a month in the first year.

Both bills extend coverage to an additional 200,000 persons, mostly professional. Included would be 110,000 lawyers and 65,000 dentists. Doctors and osteopaths at their own request are not included. Fifty-five million persons are now covered by social security.

The new bills call for increased tax payments by both employer and employee up to one-half of 1 percent.

Politics in Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Rural New Yorker of October 1, 1955, has just been called to my attention. It makes interesting reading:

A BAD MIXTURE—POLITICS AND MILK: LAWYER-FARMER URGES MORELAND ACT INVESTIGATION INTO MILK BUSINESS

I want to congratulate you on your Oneonta milk meeting issue. Barthly Beach and William Berghold—and all those associated with you—are to be commended for what you are doing. As a dairy farmer, I thank you, and, as a lawyer, I approve of your resolutions, endorse them, and ask all farmers to adopt them as a Milk Magna Carta. They should have been printed in red ink—to symbolize the farmers' losses and "blood, sweat, and tears" that went to make up the milk dealers' swollen profits.

But I would like to add a note of warning. I don't trust politicians and I think it's a mistake to play with them, regardless of party. This is not a political question. It is one of justice, business, and economics and it has been made a political football by both political parties. Personally I am dead-set against the New York Democrats on the milk issue and I don't trust them because

of personal experience with them. They are smooth talkers when they want your votes and quick forgetters when it's time for action. I don't intend to wait until the next Presidential election for more promises.

My objections are based on their respective individual refusals to do anything on the milk question. I personally asked, in writing, for a continuation of the Murtagh investigation, and what did I get? The brushoff. The honorable deputy mayor of New York City, Mr. Henry Epstein, dismissed my views as coming from a "gentleman farmer." Well, I didn't like that, even though I don't claim to be a gentleman and I am certainly not a real dirt farmer; but I do own, and have for many years, 290 acres and 60 head of Guernseys. And I had 90 before Mr. Benson started hacking away at my milk price.

Nor did I like being summarily dismissed by a man who knows the milk business as well as anyone in this State. Mr. Epstein, the deputy mayor, comes from the law firm which has for years represented, and still does, the Milk Dealers' Association of Metropolitan New York, Inc.

When Robert F. Wagner was hanging on the ropes and not sure he could win the nomination for mayor 2 years ago, through an intermediary I got him to discuss milk in his campaign speeches. This is what Candidate Wagner said on August 28, 1953, when he was running for mayor, and I quote from the New York Times:

"Mr. Wagner, in a statement issued during the day, said that if elected he would order an inquiry into milk prices by the city department of investigation. He recalled that a similar investigation made before Mayor Impellitteri took office had resulted in reducing the price of milk to housewives by 4 cents a quart. He noted that milk prices paid to farmers had dropped 3 cents a quart since last December but that the retail price had fallen only 1½ cents."

And on August 30, 1953, he said even more, and again I quote from the New York Times:

"Mr. Wagner enlarged on an earlier theme regarding milk conditions here. The Manhattan Borough president charged that 'Governor Dewey and Mayor Impellitteri deliberately closed their eyes to the unconscionable and predatory activities of the milk monopoly in the city.' Mr. Wagner accused the Governor of wasting $700,000 of taxpayer's funds in studying the problem and declared that Mr. Impellitteri had taken no action to combat the 'sordid price fixing, unlawful rebates, and other monopolistic practices uncovered by John M. Murtagh when he was commissioner of investigation in the O'Dwyer regime.'

"Mr. Wagner pledged that he would take vigorous action to put an end to the milk monopoly so as to drive down the cost of milk and 'protect our people from a $50 million annual milk steal.'"

Not bad, sweet talking when you want something. But what has he done since? Exactly nothing.

On April 22, 1954, I sent the mayor's office a copy of the Murtagh report, with a long letter telling them of the farmers' plight, and saying that milk was a big problem and a national issue and that, if the Democrats were smart, they would take hold of it and do a real job. No action. By that time, through the same intermediary, I had the matter called to the attention of Mr. Carmine De Sapio who couldn't recognize a real issue when it was brought to him.

On the morning of the day Mr. Harriman was nominated, I was in the same room with the not-yet Governor. He was working, I guessed, on his acceptance speech of the nomination that night, standing over a man who was pounding away on a typewriter. Although not a gentleman, this dumb farmer decided it wouldn't be fair to interrupt him, so I left him alone. I went into another room. The campaign headquarters were just being opened. There was no equipment, not even a chair to sit down on. I got a chance to talk to George Backer, still one of the Governor's closest advisers. Very quickly, I tried to give Mr. Backer an earful on the milk problem. I tried to explain to him that dairy farmers had been deprived of millions of dollars by the shift in parity, that it was an injustice, and that dairy farmers were in a bad way and needed help. I showed Mr. Backer a copy of my letter to Henry Epstein. I didn't get the reaction I wanted. In fact, it was distinctly negative. Mr. Backer invited me to return in a few days, emphasizing that he couldn't promise that my views would be accepted. I never returned.

Mr. Harriman has been in office now over 9 months. What has he done except talk? Exactly nothing. Now he wants to study the subject. It's too late for study, Governor Harriman. We farmers want immediate action by people who are qualified and know this subject. We don't want any more campaign speeches in October 1956.

On July 10, 1954 (mark the date), in Syracuse, Richard H. Balch, then chairman of the Democratic State Committee, said:

"Calling the outlook for farmers 'just as gloomy,' he declared that the spread between what the dairyman received and the consumer paid for milk was at 'an all-time high.' 'In my opinion,' he added, 'it should be the duty of the Governor to investigate this terrific spread in the interests of the producers and consumers. Governor Dewey has done nothing, but we Democrats are going to do something about it.'"

Now the Governor says that the Case committee recommendations should be considered at the coming hearings. That's the biggest joke of all. Doesn't Mr. Harriman know that the Case committee was appointed in May 1953, filed its report in January 1954, and at that time recommended immediate interim price increases in class I–C and class III milk while the whole subject was being studied?

Every day close to 4 million quarts of milk come into the New York milkshed. Farmers take a licking every day and the dealers continue to pocket a corresponding unconscionable additional profit every day. And farmers have had 3 successive years of drought to add to their hardships.

The problem is serious and acute. It demands action, not conversation. The stock market is booming and everybody is working and drawing high pay. But the real producers of this entire country, the hard-working farmers, are not participating. It's a national disgrace. It's too late for study and hearings.

If you are really interested in solving this problem, Mr. Governor, appoint a Moreland Commissioner and conduct a real investigation. Let the consuming public know what's going on. Let them understand why they are paying so much for milk and exactly who is getting it. Publicity is what this subject needs to educate the public generally about what's going on. The consumer is paying too much for milk and the farmer isn't getting enough for it.

The city of New York, according to Mr. Wagner, "spends approximately $2 million on the purchase of milk." Is it paying a fair price? Does Mr. Wagner know?

What about the State of New York? How much milk do you buy and how much for hospitals and other institutions and what price do you pay, Mr. Governor?

In February 1955 when farmers were trying to get some help with a price increase, the mayor of New York had his views read at the hearing. He made the headlines which was all he wanted. He said "vast economies" can be effected in the cost of processing and distributing milk; in other words, that the price of milk could be cut and consumption increased.

What has he done to force those "vast economies" or to ventilate this subject for the public benefit? Nothing.

I could say much more but I realize your limitations of space. You will hear from me further in a more positive manner. Again thanks for your efforts—yours and Barthly Beach's. You have started something that could excite the attention of this entire Nation and determine next year's election.

But keep away from the professional politicians—in both parties. All they will give you is double-talk and promises.

Get the consumers and the farmers together. Their interests are the same. They are not opposed as some would have us believe. Both are victims of a predatory, inefficient, monopolistic and antiquated system that has to be scrapped.

GEORGE C. LEVIN.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*.
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*.—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*.—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*.
Albert, Carl, *Okla*.
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*.
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*.
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*.
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*.—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*.—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*.—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*.
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*.—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*.
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*.
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*.—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*.

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*.
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*.
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*.
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*.—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*.
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*.
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*.
Bates, William H., *Mass*.
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*.
Beamer, John V., *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*.
Belcher, Page, *Okla*.
Bell, John J., *Tex*.
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*.—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*.—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*.—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*.
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*.
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*.
Boggs, Hale, *La*.
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*.
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*.—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*.—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*.—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*.
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*.
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*.—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*.
Bray, William G., *Ind*.
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*.
Brooks, Overton, *La*.—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*.—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*.—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*.
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*.
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*.
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*.
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*.
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*.—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*.
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.
Byrne, James A., *Pa*.
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*.—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*.
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*.
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*.—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*.
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*.
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*.
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*.—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*.
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*.
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*.
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*.—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*.
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*.—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*.—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*.—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*.—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*.
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*.—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*.
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*.—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*.
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*.
Cramer, William C., *Fla*.—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*.
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*.
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*.—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*.

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*.
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*.
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*.—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*.—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*.
Dawson, William A., *Utah*.
Dawson, William L., *Ill*.
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*.
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*.
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*.—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*.
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*.
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*.
Dies, Martin, *Tex*.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*.—2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*.
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*.
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*.
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*.—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*.—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*.
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*.
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*.
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*.
Dowdy, John, *Tex*.
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*.—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*.—The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*.—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*.
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*.
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*.—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*.—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*.

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*.
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*.
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*.—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*.—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*.
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*.—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*.
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*.—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*.
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*.—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*.—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*.—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*.
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*.—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*.—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*.—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*.
Fulton, James G., *Pa*.

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*.
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*.
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*.
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*.—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*.
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*.
George, Myron V., *Kans*.—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*.
Grant, George M., *Ala*.—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*.
Green, Edith, *Oreg*.
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*.
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*.—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*.
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*.
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*.
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*.

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*.
Hale, Robert, *Maine*.—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*.
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*.—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*.
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*.—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*.
Harris, Oren, *Ark*.—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*.—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*.
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*.—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*.—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*.—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*.
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*.
Heselton, John W., *Mass*.
Hess, William E., *Ohio*.
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*.
Hill, William S., *Colo*.—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*.
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*.
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*.—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*.—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*.
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*.
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*.
Holt, Joe, *Calif*.
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*.
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*.—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*.
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*.
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*.
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*.

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*.

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*.
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*.—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*.
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*.—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*.
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*.—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*.
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*.—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*.—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*.
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*.—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*.
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*.
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*.—3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*.
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*.—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*.
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*.—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*.
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*.
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*.
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*.—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*.—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*.—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*.
King, Karl C., *Pa*.
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*.
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*.
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*.
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*.
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*.
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*.—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address of Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, Over Station WGN, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last night it was my pleasure to deliver by transcription an address over Station WGN, Chicago.

In this address, I commented upon what I regard as the accomplishments and the shortcomings of this 84th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my prepared address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY LISTS MAJOR UNDONE TASKS IN 84TH CONGRESS—SAYS FAILURE TO REFORM ELECTION LAWS IS SHOCKING

(Radio address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, prepared for delivery over Station WGN, Chicago, Ill., July 22, 1956)

Answer: "The 84th Congress is drawing to a close. I would like to list for you what I regard as some of the principal accomplishments—and yes; some of the principal failures of this Congress—your Congress.

"After all, you, the people, are the employers of your public servants in Washington. You have a right to know whether they have fulfilled their responsibilities to you."

Question: "Senator WILEY, how much time is there left in the 84th Congress?"

Answer: "The answer is, probably just a few days of next week. Of course, one never can tell; perhaps the Senate or House may get caught in some last-minute delay which could carry the session beyond.

"Congress faces, however, a final August 13 deadline; that's the date of the start of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago."

CONGRESS SHOULD STAY ON JOB

Question: "How do you feel, Senator, concerning adjournment of the Congress?"

Answer: "Well, my own feeling is that Congress should stay on the job as long as is necessary. I don't want it to go home without fulfilling the needs of you, the people. And so far as I am concerned, there are definitely a tremendous number of unfulfilled needs.

"I am not, of course, reflecting upon the hard work put in by my colleagues. Actually they have, indeed, worked long and hard.

"For several days we have been meeting at 9:30 a. m. and working straight on through until midnight.

"During all those long hours we have had committee meetings; we have worked in our offices; we have met constituents. Some legislators, such as myself, have even flown back and forth to our States on Sundays. So you can see that we have been pretty busy."

LIST OF MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Question: "Well, now, Senator, just how does the "busyness" reflect itself; what would you regard as the achievements of the 84th Congress? Are there many achievements?"

Answer: "I am delighted to say that there are. Congress has written a good record in many respects. Let me list our major achievements:

"PROGRESS TOWARD BETTER OLD AGE SECURITY

"In the first place, we are putting the finishing touches now on a wonderful new improvement in our social security laws.

"At last, we are providing a fair break for our old folks—for those 'whose hair has turned to silver.' We have, fortunately, lowered the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62.

"So far as I am concerned, however, we could just as well have lowered it to age 60 for women, since very few elderly women can get jobs these days at the age of 60 or even 55 or 50.

"In other words, my friends, the present old age pension laws, even with this improvement, will be far from perfect. People on pensions will still eke out an existence in many instances.

"People over the age of 72 and receiving pensions will still be limited in what they can earn—on the outside—limited to only $1,200 of extra income per year.

"But at least we have made some progress in providing a square deal for old people.

"We have brought in hundreds of thousands of new people under the social security system, and we have provided aid to the permanently and totally disabled people, crippled and unable to work for a whole lifetime."

VITAL HIGHWAY LAW

Question: "What are other accomplishments of this Congress?"

Answer: "Well, we have written the greatest public-works project in history—and that is of course, the $33 billion Federal highway program.

"It will establish a 40,000-mile Interstate Highway System, connecting most of the State capitals. Actually, even this vast new system won't prove big or modern enough for America's 65 million vehicles, our autos and trucks, and for the millions of additional vehicles that will be jamming the Nation's highways in the years up ahead."

Question: "Well, that road bill is at least a step in the right direction. Now how about other accomplishments?"

CONNECTING CHANNELS BILL

Answer: "So far as we of the Middle West are concerned, another great achievement was the passage of the Great Lakes connecting channels bill which I, for one, had long fought for.

"This channel law will complete the 2,300-mile, 27-foot Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. The overall seaway is, of course, now being built under the Wiley seaway law—a law which I am proud to say bears my own name."

Question: "And it is certainly an historic law. Well, there have been other achievements as well, Senator Wiley. What do these additional achievements include?"

FARM SEGMENT NEEDS MORE ATTENTION

Answer: "Here is one. We wrote an important extension of the Nation's farm parity law, and we have established a new soil bank for conservation purposes.

"But here, while I am on this subject, let me mention one of the shortcomings of the Congress. The fact is that Congress has not taken all the comprehensive steps needed to bolster America's great farm segment, particularly, the dairy farmer, whose income is far too low. To be sure, Congress did extend the vital school milk program. I am glad to say we also extended the program for combating the dread disease which affects dairy cattle, brucellosis—Bang's disease.

"But the fact is that the Midwest dairy farmer's and other farmers' income is still lagging far behind the rest of our population. So this, then, is one of the real shortcomings of the 84th Congress—lack of sufficient action on the farm front, despite the important farm parity law and soil bank law which we did write."

LIST OF TASKS UNDONE

Question: "Now, Senator Wiley, you have listed some of the major achievements and have touched upon one of the shortcomings on the farm front. What are some of the principal failures of the 84th Congress—some of the shortcomings—some of the things which it hasn't done, which it should have done?"

LACK OF ACTION ON SCHOOL BILL

Answer: "Quite a few, unfortunately.

"Now, of course, in the few remaining days of the session, there is always a chance that we may be able to finish up on some of the unfinished bills that I am going to mention now. But the fact of the matter is that the outlook on them is rather grim.

"Here are, however, the major undone tasks: In the first place, we failed the Nation's schoolchildren. President Eisenhower's vital proposed legislation for Federal school construction was, unfortunately, killed in the House.

"The result is that the Nation's obsolete classrooms will remain crowded. Many of our children will continue to meet in dingy, dark, often firetrap facilities.

"And the further result is that, in the years up ahead, we won't get the engineers, the technicians, and all the other specialists that we, as a Nation, need in order to combat Russian progress in mass education, particularly in military engineering."

Question: "Well, that is certainly a serious deficiency, Senator, failure to improve our Nation's schools. What else is a shortcoming?"

NO CIVIL-RIGHTS BILL

Answer: "A second failure is on the issue of America's minorities. Despite the pledges of both political parties, Congress has not written even—I mean a bill to protect America's minorities; to protect the right of all America's citizens to vote, for example, regardless of their race, creed, or color, to vote without being coerced or intimidated."

Question: "Any other failures?"

Answer: "Yes; unfortunately."

LACK OF ACTION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

"I am thinking now of the problem of America's 22 million veterans. The Congress fortunately has enacted an important bill to liberalize death benefits for the survivors of our servicemen.

"But the fact is that the Congress has not—it has not—enacted the omnibus pension bill. The House of Representatives ap-

proved it, but it is still stalled in the Senate Finance Committee. This pension legislation is important. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other fine groups have pleaded for action on it, but there it still sits, unfortunately, in the Finance Committee."

Question: "Are there any other bills which are still stalled?"

Answer. "Yes, indeed. Regrettably, there is a major housing bill which is still tied up in the House Rules Committee. It is a bill which provides for necessary housing for the aged, for our servicemen, for liberalized home credit repair. This bill should be passed. The Senate passed it, but not the House. The bill should not die in the Rules Committee."

Question: "Well, those are four shortcomings, Senator WILEY, lack of action on schools, on rights, veterans' pensions, and housing. Any other serious failures?"

Answer: "Yes, unfortunately."

NO SMALL BUSINESS AID BILL

Question: "Consider Congress' failure to enact important antimonopoly legislation. You know, we Americans believe in competition, not monopoly, not a stifling of the little fellow. There is now a very important bill known as the equality of opportunity bill. It is favored by hundreds of thousands of small-business men throughout the Nation—by the druggist in your town; by your retail grocer; by the retail gasoline dealer; by your local bakery shop and many other specialties. This bill—equality of opportunity—means equality between big business and small business. The bill has passed the House, but it is stalled in the Senate Judiciary Committee, unfortunately. Despite my own and others' efforts, we can't get it out of committee thus far. Yet, both political parties are committed to combat monopoly, to combat trusts, and to help small-business men."

SENATOR WILEY URGES HOOVER-TYPE TAX COMMISSION

Question: "Turning to another issue, both parties have pledged tax reform, too, Senator WILEY. Is there any progress on that front?"

Answer: "No; unfortunately not. And here you have a very big issue, indeed. Why? Because taxes directly hit all 55 million taxpayers and they hit all 167 million Americans indirectly.

"But our present tax system is a mess. It is a hodgepodge, a mixed-up conglomeration of amendments and revisions. Our tax system has grown 'like Topsy', in all directions—excise taxes, gift taxes, estate taxes, income taxes, corporation taxes, and thousands upon thousands of hidden taxes."

Question: 'Well, what is the answer, Senator?"

Answer: "The answer is not simply to revise our tax system piecemeal and thereby made it a worse hodgepodge. The answer, I feel, is to set up a Hoover-type commission which would take a broad new look at all taxes. Such a commission could then come up with comprehensive recommendations for real tax reforms."

Question: "Reforms for whom, Senator WILEY?"

Answer: "Reform for every deserving group, for folks in the low-income brackets, reform particularly for small business. These days the little fellows are socked by taxes so high that small retailers can't save up enough so as to expand and so as to meet big-business competition.

"In other words, let's set up a Hoover-type tax commission to help start a long-overdue overhaul of the tax system."

Question: "Well, the lack of tax reform then is still another shortcoming of the current Congress, Senator WILEY?

"Any others you want to mention now?"

SERIOUS FAILURE TO CLEAN UP ELECTIONS

Answer: "Yes; here is another big one. I am referring to the apparent killing of the honest-election bill—the bill to reform election practices.

"This much-needed bill would have gone a great way in helping to clean up American elections. It would have established more realistic ceilings on campaign expenditures.

"It would have granted a helpful $100 in income-tax credit to civic-minded Americans who contribute to political parties. Such a tax credit would have encouraged more little people, more people of modest income, to help cover campaign costs. And that would, in turn, have lessened the influence of a handful of big contributors who today exercise far too much influence.

"This honest-election bill was sponsored by 85 Senators, including myself. Despite this fact, it looks as if this bill is going to die unless a last-minute effort is made to revive it."

A BLACK EYE ON CONGRESS

Question: "How do you feel about the bill's death?"

Answer: "I say the death of this honest-election bill is a black eye on the 84th Congress. It is a mark of shame.

"I am not criticizing any individual, because actually a lot of Senators have worked hard to revive the bill through some form of last-minute compromise, which would avoid a long-drawn-out tussle.

"But the fact is that Congress has impaired its own reputation by its failure to act on the Johnson-Knowland bill and on the earlier Hennings bill (which wisely included primaries, as well).

"Congress is thus contributing to a higher wave of cynicism among many Americans, an attitude of 'You can never believe those guys in Congress—85 Senators say they want the bill, yet the bill dies.'

"The honest-election bill was and is a must. I say, mysterious campaign contributions—unreported, unchecked, unpublicized—constitute a poison in the political life of America.

"They can result in a dark shadow on people's faith and the independence of our legislative branch.

"Everybody knows that modern campaigns cost money, big money, especially on TV. But where is the money coming from? From whom, to whom, and how? We don't know, because the present election law has more holes than Wisconsin Swiss cheese. In my own State, I can't even get the facts thus far on a mysterious reported $150,000 campaign pledge.

"Why not? Why the secrecy? Why the mystery? Why the fear of full reporting?"

Question: "Those are certainly important questions, Senator WILEY.

"Well, despite the failure to enact the honest elections bill; and despite the failure thus far to get real tax reform, would you say that the results of the current Congress are by and large seriously bad?"

Answer: "Actually not. Remember our many achievements. Remember the fact that we have improved American health during this Congress.

"We have provided appropriations to strengthen America, to strengthen our defenses. The Senate has passed an important bill to speed atomic development.

"So, while there are a lot of tasks undone, still, we can take a certain amount of satisfaction for what was accomplished.

"Take the natural-gas rate bill. Fortunately, that bill—a very bad bill—which would have jumped rates and cost Midwest and other consumers a fortune—that unfair bill was vetoed by the President."

SUMMARY

Question: "Senator WILEY, I know that if time permitted you would comment on many other phases in this connection—tasks, done and undone—worthy of our people's attention.

"But I know, too, that your comments on the subjects which you have been able to cover within this brief time have been of interest to our listeners. They have welcomed your report on the need for an honest election bill and for a Hoover-type commission on tax reform—the need for veterans' pension legislation, for more housing, for school aid, and for still further improvements in the old-age pension system."

YOUR VIEWS WELCOME

Answer: "It has been a real pleasure to address you through the courtesy of Station WGN. If my listeners have any reactions to my comments about old-age pensions, or taxes, or honest elections, or any other front, please just drop a penny postal card or a letter to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

"Thanks very much for your kind attention, and good night to you all."

Fulbright Scholars Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from a distinguished professor at Rutgers University. This is an example of the many communications which reach my desk. These letter are evidence of the value of the scholarship program and should reassure anyone who has any doubts about the value of the undertaking, and should reassure all Senators about the program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
New Brunswick, N. J., July 16, 1956.

Senator JAMES W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: As I wrote you in a note last December, my wife and I were "Fulbrights" in Belgium for the year 1955–56. Mrs. Kirk was a research scholar in fine arts and I was Fulbright professor of American literature and civilization at the University of Liège. I want now to tell you and your New Jersey colleagues, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE and Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH of the very happy experience which we had at Liège.

In the first place, the Belgian organization is extremely well run, and, therefore, my wife and I were never at a loss over what to do and what to expect next. We were introduced to the people in Belgium in just the right ways and had no social difficulties. In the second place, we found the members of the faculty and the students at the University of Liège cordial in their responses. At the University of Ghent, where my wife and I were invited to lecture, and in Brussels and Antwerp, where we also gave lectures, we were treated delightfully. In April we were invited to lecture for 4 weeks to the third annual seminar on American literature which was held in Rome. The Italian students were just as attractive and eager to learn about the thoughts and ways of the United States as the young people in Belgium. Before all of these foreign groups we were of course, directly or indirectly, trying to explain our American democratic thought.

All in all, I believe that the Fulbright program is of tremendous value to the United

States in establishing friendly relations, in clearing up misconceptions, and, I hope, in strengthening our democratic way of life.

Very sincerely yours,

RUDOLF KIRK,
Professor of English.

Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 627) to provide means for further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am about to engage in an attempt to discuss some phases of this legislation. Of course, in the brief time that I have, I cannot discuss the details of this legislation any more than other Members have been able to do for the past hour or so. But, I do want to say this, and I call this to the attention of the House that when it comes to the question of colored and white relationships I should be able to qualify as a real authority.

Four Members of the House of Representatives appeared before the Committee on Rules in favor of this legislation. Eight members on the Committee on Rules voted to report this legislation. The men who appeared before that committee favoring this bill were Messrs. CELLER, KEATING, SCOTT, and BOYLE. My district has more Negroes—214,000—than the combined totals—now listen to this—of the districts represented by all 4 of those gentlemen; plus the 8 members of the Committee on Rules who voted to report this bill—Messrs. ALLEN, of Illinois; BROWN, of Ohio; MADDEN, of Indiana; DELANEY, of New York; BOLLING, of Missouri; O'NEILL, of Massachusetts; ELLSWORTH, of Oregon; and LATHAM, of New York; plus the combined totals of the Negro populations of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, and Minnesota, and I still have a couple of thousand left over for good measure.

In my district, we have always had a very friendly relationship between white and colored; that is, we did until a pseudosociological United States Supreme Court decided that it was their duty to disrupt that harmonious racial relationship that prevailed in the South. I can say, categorically, with all deference to the charges that have been made against the South—and my State in particular—by previous speakers, that the white and colored people get along better in my State than they do in any State north of the Mason-Dixon line.

There has not been a race riot in Mississippi during the 37 years of my life. Can the same be said for Detroit? Can the same be said for Asbury Park, N. J.? Can the same be said for Cleveland or Chicago or Buffalo? The so-called integrated areas appear to have a monopoly on racial friction.

There is not a town in the State of Mississippi where a Negro is not welcome; in fact, there is one town in the State of Mississippi of several thousand people where a white person cannot spend the night—Mound Bayou. But all of the representatives from Michigan, for instance, who have spoken in favor of this bill have kept quiet about the fact that there is a city of 97,000 people in their State—headed by their liberal governor, Soapy Williams—who advocates this kind of stuff—where they will not permit a Negro to spend the night. I take as authority for that statement the mayor, a Mr. Hubbard, the mayor of Dearborn, Mich. If you do not believe me, write Mr. Hubbard. He will tell you that there is an unwritten law against Negroes living in his city. Are these Michigan representatives equally concerned over civil rights in Dearborn, Mich.?

Of course, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor said so ably on the floor a few minutes ago, this legislation transcends temporary considerations; it strikes at the very heart of our dual sovereignty form of government.

You wonder why we in the South talk so much about States rights? It is because we are political disciples of men like Thomas Jefferson, who believed that the least government is the best government; that the true barriers of our liberty in this country are our State governments.

Mr. Chairman, in our lifetime we have seen the results of the overcentralization of government, in Germany, in Italy, in Russia. All of the initial steps toward centralization in those countries were accomplished by deceiving the people into believing that a worthy end justified any evil means toward that end. Bills such as the one before us now are but subtle and devious vehicles by which our liberties are being sapped away.

As a southerner, but first and foremost as an American who believes in the preservation of human rights and freedom, I can not subscribe to the assault being made on our Constitution by the iniquitous and monstrous legislation now before us.

Remarks of Governor Harriman, of New York, on the Occasion of an Award to Miss Linda Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on March 13, 1956, occurred an outstanding event in New York State. This was the occasion at which Miss Linda Clark, a native of New York State and a student at the College of St. Rose, Albany, N. Y., was honored as the "Outstanding Catholic Youth of the Year 1955." She won this distinction in competition with several million Catholic youth of our country.

Present at the occasion in Albany, N. Y., were the Governor of New York State; Most Rev. Leo Binz, archbishop of Dubuque, Iowa, episcopal chairman of the youth department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Most Rev. William A. Scully, bishop of the diocese of Albany, N. Y.; Most Rev. Leo R. Smith, episcopal moderator and auxiliary bishop of Buffalo, N. Y.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, director of the youth department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; and other distinguished citizens not only of New York State, but of the country as a whole.

In these days, when there is so much tragic commentary about juvenile delinquency, the achievement of one outstanding young person, such as Miss Clark, is inspiring to all of us. I only wish that the accomplishments and successes of all young people were accorded the same amount of publicity which unhappily and occasionally is accorded to those young folk who get into difficulties. Constant and conspicuous recognition of attainment by youth might have the effect of curbing to some extent juvenile delinquency which, as I see it, is the most serious internal problem now confronting our country.

I extend to Miss Clark hearty congratulations and best wishes for future outstanding accomplishments. At the same time, I pay tribute to the reverend Fathers and reverend Sisters who have contributed to her success and who have made so laudable a competition possible.

In this connection and at this point in my remarks, I ask to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the remarks of the Governor of New York, which were made on the occasion at which Miss Clark received the award of the first "Outstanding Catholic Youth of the Year."

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN AT THE CONVOCATION OF THE COLLEGE OF ST. ROSE AWARDING THE FIRST "OUTSTANDING CATHOLIC YOUTH OF THE YEAR" AWARD TO MISS LINDA CLARK, AT CHANCELLORS HALL, MARCH 13, 1956

Archbishop Binz, Bishop Smith, Bishop Scully, Monsignor Schieder, Reverend Fathers, Reverend Sisters, and Linda Clark, this is a proud moment for the State of New York and the capital city of Albany. As Governor of the State and a resident of the city it is a particularly proud moment for me. I recall that the last time I was here in Chancellors Hall it was at the opening of a State Conference on Youth and Delinquency. Even as I spoke to the distinguished and dedicated men and women who had come together to consider the problems of those of our young people who go wrong, I stressed that there is a real danger of our putting too much emphasis on them, and not enough on the many, many more who live lives of purity and achievement. Hence, I am particularly happy to have this opportunity to redress the balance and join with you in paying honor to Linda Clark, who, in serving God, has served her fellow man as well, and in-

spired us with a new confidence in the ideals and aims of our American youth.

In measure that we are indebted to Linda Clark for what she had done and what she has inspired others to do, we are indebted as well to the devoted priests and nuns who instructed her in the ways of virtue, equally as of wisdom, and who worked with her in the many activities in which she has so distinguished herself. Tonight then, as little as they might realize it and although it would never occur to them to expect it, we are here to honor Sister Catherine Francis and the Sisters of St. Joseph who taught her at the College of St. Rose and, if Linda herself were speaking, I know she would not forget Sister Mary Edmond and the Sisters of Mercy who run the Vincentian Institute with such stern looks and warm hearts.

But surely we are above all indebted to her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Clark. This must be for them one of the proudest moments of a full, happy and, as the father of two daughters myself I can assure you, a very busy life. I do not think there would be many who would argue with me that had we more parents such as these, we would have more daughters such as Linda Clark.

Finally, I know this must be a moving moment for Bishop Scully and Father Delaney, the Albany diocesan youth director with whom Linda Clark has worked in the Catholic Youth Council. I understand that owing in large part to her efforts a diocesan youth council will be established here in Albany in the very near future. The 7 million and more members of Catholic Youth organizations are one of the most positive and effective forces in American life today, and we all hope their numbers continue to grow among the Catholic youth in Albany. The churches in New York have done more than any other group in the State to give inspiration to our youth to live fuller and better lives, and it is of the greatest importance that we all support their splendid work.

In light of her own distinguished academic career and her work with the National Federation of Catholic College Students and the National Council of Catholic Youth, I think it is particularly appropriate that Miss Clark along with 77 of her classmates at St. Rose, should be preparing for a teaching career. I suppose there are never enough teachers—certainly never enough good ones—but I doubt that there has ever been a time when we were more in need of them than today.

Thus I find myself for the moment torn between the desire to wish Linda many years of success in her chosen profession and a personal good wish that she may soon meet the young man of her choice. But of course these are hardly incompatible goals and I have not the slightest doubt that so lovely and accomplished a young woman will find a way to achieve them both. We are all very happy for her and proud of her. May God continue to bless her in the years to come.

Proposed Federal Regulation of Pleasure Boating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Mr. James R. Lewis, executive secretary of the National Outboard Boating Association, commenting on the current study by the House of Representatives Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of possible Federal regulation of pleasure boating.

I feel that this statement will be of interest not only to Members of the Senate, but also to boatowners everywhere.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is the Senator referring to the bill which requires ship-to-shore communications?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had some objection to the House bill, because it required regulation if only one passenger or more were carried. I thought that was too drastic. I suggested that the number be six or more.

In the meantime, I have been given to understand that the bill would seriously handicap the Great Lakes operators and traffic on the inland waterways. The bill was not intended to have that effect. If the bill comes up, we hope to have an amendment to offer, to provide for regulation only upon navigable streams and waters offshore. I think that would take care of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Congress is to be congratulated in undertaking this study at a time when the problems of pleasure boating regulation can still be dealt with logically, after intelligent study, rather than waiting until the inevitable crowding of our waterways might make controls appear mandatory without the time and means for proper airing of the problems involved.

As the economy expands and automation and present social forces increase leisure time, it is realistic to forecast 10 million pleasure boats or 50 million persons using the waterways within the next 10 years. Any legislative action taken now should be done with this future expansion in mind.

We have followed the hearings closely and with a great deal of interest. There have been, however, no testimony from witnesses representing only outboard users, who comprise over 80 percent of the United States pleasure boaters, and yet we find ourselves in general agreement with the majority of recommendations proposed. We agree that common sense cannot be legislated.

We believe that it can be developed through education and strongly urge expansion of the activities of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in this field. An increase in the funds made available to this volunteer organization is in our opinion the most prudent single Federal expenditure that could be made to reduce boating accidents.

NOBA also is in accord with establishment of basic equipment requirements for outboard craft, especially life preservers, running lights for night operation, and fire extinguishers when boat construction so warrants. We favor standardization of the Rules of the Road (Pilot Rules) to afford uniform practices throughout the Nation. We envision these ends being accomplished by enactment of a model code to serve as a guide for all the States.

There are similarities in pleasure boat regulation comparable to motor vehicle regulation in the various States. The joint committee approach used by the Public Roads Administration in standardizing traffic control devices is a fine example of the effectiveness of this method. The confusion experienced by a pleasure car operator when attempting to obey traffic signs in various States has been reduced to a minimum by this cooperative approach. We feel that pleasure boating regulations can be effectively standardized in this same manner.

We have only one major point of divergence from recommendations already made. NOBA is not in agreement with the proposals to have Federal licensing and/or registration of small boats and operators. First of all, we question the good to be gained by such a tremendous and expensive undertaking. Admiral Richmond has already pointed out that the net results of licensing would be questionable. The presence of an authorized patrol is, in the end, the answer to enforcing boating regulations. We believe a license and/or registration will do little to reduce the number of violators.

A major oil company has given us the following approximate breakdown of the geographical location of outboards in the United States:

	Outboards
North Central States	2,000,000
East Coast States	1,000,000
West Coast States	500,000
Lower Mississippi Valley and Florida	1,000,000
Total	4,500,000

The oil company's records also indicate that 70 percent of the fuel sold to outboard users was at automobile gas stations with only 30 percent sold at dock facilities.

Because of the large numbers of outboards present in inland States it seems entirely possible to us that up to 50 percent of outboards in use may not come under Federal jurisdiction and, therefore, Federal licensing and registration may not be the desired means of control and identification.

NOBA recognizes that in congested areas small boat registration is desirable but strongly subscribes to the already established system of State registration. According to a Coast Guard tabulation submitted to this Committee last January, 13 States already have registration programs. It appears to us to be an encroachment on States prerogatives and customs as well as needless expansion of Federal activities and expenses to establish a Federal registration system for small craft.

We believe that the projected increase in number of boats in use necessitates State and local enforcement. As an example, Lake Minnetonka in Minnesota, a typical inland boating center, is presently effectively patrolled by 20 deputy sheriffs at a nominal cost to taxpayers. For the Coast Guard to duplicate this patrol at an estimated cost of $5,000 per man would amount to the sum of $100,000 for personnel alone. Multiplied on a national basis, cost of adequate Coast Guard policing appears prohibitive.

We picture the future role of the Federal Government and the Coast Guard relative to small pleasure craft in most geographical areas as being that of an advisory and mediation body for authorized State and local enforcement agencies. We believe the Coast Guard's physical operations should be limited eventually to educational and rescue work insofar as these craft are concerned. In order to facilitate and finance local enforcement, the various States should have the right to register small craft under their jurisdiction. We urge the development of a model code as a means of standardizing registration requirements among the various States.

We are aware that the Congress is severely hampered by the lack of reliable small craft accident statistics upon which to base corrective legislative action. We would like to suggest the delegation to a specific Federal agency the responsibility of developing detailed data in this area as a means of assuring factual material in the years ahead.

American Influences Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "American Tide Not All Froth," written by Malvina Lindsay and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN TIDE NOT ALL FROTH
(By Malvina Lindsay)

In many parts of the world there seems to be new fear of being engulfed in the tide of Americanization.

European highbrows are worrying over some new American imports—snack bars, television sets, quiz programs, motels. The Soviet Union is concerned over its zoot suiters, particularly their taste for American jazz, cocktails, dances, fashions. In both Europe and Asia keepers of culture fear that youth's interest in the superficial phases of American life will lead to deeper involvement with western attitudes and ideas. Yugoslavia is reestablishing its work brigades to recapture the minds of its youth from western influence.

Two groups of Americans swarming the globe—tourists and members of the Armed Forces—are constant and often irritating reminders of the sweep of American products and customs.

To many native peoples the American is typified by a brash boy in uniform, or a woman in slacks, or an uninhibited sightseer in a restaurant, or a snobbish wife of an official. But to some others at least the American stands for something much different—and it is of these concepts that little is heard.

The recent departure of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, former Navy doctor, and a team of assistants on a voluntary medical mission to Laos is a dramatic reminder that "Americanization" is taking healing, education, nutrition, many other good things to peoples of the world.

For 8 months Dr. Dooley and his team will treat the painful and crippling diseases of mountain tribesmen working through the Laos Ministry of Health. They will leave behind a skeletal-type medical setup.

In order to carry out his project, Dr. Dooley resigned from the Navy and recruited his men, supplies, and transportation. He is giving to its support the proceeds from the sale of his book, Deliver Us From Evil, which is an account of his experiences treating Vietnam refugees after the fall of Dien Bien Phu.

In remote areas of the world, such as this team will penetrate, many inhabitants have never seen an American. Yet some who have been reached by Communist propaganda fear Americanization—not in its hot-dog aspects—but because they believe Americans to be killers and monsters.

The way to answer this, Dr. Dooley believes, is not merely to deny it, but to "get there and do something about it," to "show that America believes in help."

Other dedicated Americans working in technical-assistance programs or for humanitarian organizations are also helping to build abroad a new image of the American. Many of these are carrying on heroically in lonely, difficult jobs and finding great spiritual satisfaction in doing so. The imprint of their "Americanization" will long remain.

Among others who have contributed to a better foreign concept of American values are those exchange teachers, scholars, students who have seriously carried on their work abroad, and who with great patience and maturity have met and answered foreign criticism.

There are also many conscientious officials and officers stationed abroad who, together with members of their families, have studied foreign languages and cultures and done their utmost to be good examples of their country's culture. In many a community they will be long remembered.

There are the many impersonal good things that Americanization has contributed—techniques for increasing food supplies, for healing disease, for lightening labor. There is the modern household equipment that European women are so eagerly seeking, and that holds hope—distant as yet—to the rural women of Japan and other Asian countries of bringing them a day in which at long last they will have some time of their own.

There is the spread from America of that great class leveler, mass-produced clothing, of an interest in social studies, of the abolition of school fees, of flexibility in school programs, and a closer relationship between teachers and pupils.

Other American influences in Europe have been the popularization of libraries, the increase of child care and social services, the growth of parent associations and the development—rudimentary as yet—of that institution that so greatly impresses foreign visitors to this country, that has contributed so much to the vitality of American democracy, and of which Dr. Dooley in Laos is so apt an example—volunteer activity to get needed things done.

The Value of Water Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative letter I have received from Dr. George A. Denison, the health officer of Jefferson County, Birmingham, Ala., regarding the value of water fluoridation as a means of improving the health of our people.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
Birmingham, Ala., July 18, 1956.

Hon. LISTER A. HILL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: It has come to my attention that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has recently carried comments from a group of incorrectly informed individuals who have not been convinced of the value of water fluoridation as a means of improving the dental health of our citizens. This concerns me because the unscientific statements propounded by these persons may serve to influence others against a perfectly safe and beneficial health measure.

For the above reason I am hoping that you will be willing to file these remarks of mine for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know of no other public health measure which has been subjected to such thorough study by scientists from many fields before being advocated by dental, medical and public health authorities throughout the world. In our own country there are now 1,232 communities providing fluoridated water for 25,563,927 people. Among these are Newburgh, N. Y., Grand Rapids, Mich., Sheboygan, Wis., and Marshall, Tex., all of which have been fluoridating their water supplies for the past 10 years. Children in these four American cities have approximately 60 percent fewer decayed teeth than did children in those towns 10 years ago. No harmful effects of any kind have been observed or are expected.

Also fluoridating are five communities in Alabama. I wish there were many more for as a budget-conscious health officer I am particularly impressed with the economy of being able to reduce the incidence of dental decay by 60 percent for a cost of only 10 cents per person per year.

You have kept yourself so well informed on matters pertaining to health that I feel certain you are already well aware of the advantages of fluoridation. It is for the benefit of the uninformed that I am directing this letter to you in the hope that by its publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD it may help to counteract some of the misinformation about fluoridation which has already appeared in the RECORD.

Sincerely,
GEORGE A. DENISON, M. D.,
Health Officer.

Withdrawal of Offer of American Help for the Aswan Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking editorial which was published yesterday in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OVER THE DAM

No one can take any real satisfaction in the decision to withdraw the offer of American help to Egypt on the Aswan Dam. It is a decision forced by events—by the hostile attitudes and actions of the Nasser government in an arc ranging from Algeria to Jordan, and more pointedly by the extent to which Colonel Nasser has mortgaged his country's resources for Communist arms. There is real doubt whether in present circumstances Egypt would be able to proceed with the $1.3 billion project without far greater help—which would virtually require the underwriting of the whole Egyptian economy.

The denial, which coincided with and perhaps was stimulated by a like decision in Britain, unquestionably is attended by certain risks. One of these is that Egypt will now turn to Russia, and that Russia will find a way to start the dam and will hope to absorb Egypt in the process. Although

Egypt is not now friendly toward the West, at least it is not behind the Iron Curtain. Nasser, evidently had decided, having hocked his future cotton production for Communist arms, that it would be prudent to hedge his liabilities. He may now feel compelled to cast his lot more and more with the Russians.

Against this danger, however, there is considerable opinion that the Russians will never build the dam; that they are overstrained economically, and that when the matter is before them they will denounce the mercenary West but not actually undertake the project. There is the further consideration that for this country to conciliate Nasser now, following months of virulent propaganda against the United States, would be to acquiesce in his game of playing off Washington against Moscow. It would be yielding to a sort of blackmail against which George Kennan warned with his suggested short reply to countries that threaten to go Communist: "Go." Finally, there had been no indication of any proposed quid pro quo from Egypt, in a cessation of incitement in north Africa, or in a serious attempt to make peace with Israel, or in an end to the illegal blockade of the Suez Canal.

In different circumstances construction of the Aswan Dam might be a highly worthwhile international undertaking, provided that difficulties with the Sudan over Nile waters could be adjusted and a concurrent effort made to curb Egypt's fantastically high birthrate. The alleviation of poverty ought always to be a concern of humanity. A different Nasser, one who subordinated external adventuring and dreams of Arab domination to the practical programs he promised, to raise the standards of his own people and repair the erosion of colonialism, might present new opportunities. But these will have to await a happier day. In any event, the ideal format for a project of the magnitude of the Aswan Dam would be some sort of United Nations economic development program that would tie East and West together in joint responsibility.

Multiple-Purpose Use of Forest Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our national forests serve many functions besides acting as a reservoir of timber. The task of developing plans for the maximum multiple-purpose use of the forest reserves is constantly under review by the staff workers of the United States Forest Service. Mr. Charles A. Sprague, a distinguished editor in the State of Oregon, and a long-time advocate of sound forestry conservation, recently told of his experiences in what he described as a refresher course in the Oregon forests.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column by Mr. Sprague, which appeared in the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg., on July 19, 1956.

There being no objection, the news column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME
(By Charles A. Sprague)

For 2 days I took a refresher course in the Oregon forests, along with a good comrade of many trails, W. M. Hamilton. We were guests of Robert Aufderheide, supervisor of the Willamette National Forest, which extends from the Umpqua River drainage ridge to the Breitenbush just north of Mount Jefferson, a strip 100 miles long and some 20 to 30 miles wide. It embraces the Cascade headwaters of the Willamette and Santiam River Systems and thousands of acres of forests, a large part of the remaining stand of virgin Douglas fir in the State.

Our tour touched first in the Fall Creek district, which creek empties into the Middle Fork of the Willamette below Lookout Dam and the Dexter reregulating dam on the Middle Fork. The next stop was in the McKenzie River district, spending Monday night at Belknap Forest Camp. We had to swing over McKenzie Pass and back over the Santiam Highway from Sisters to reach Fish Lake for our Tuesday night stop at the forest quarters there. Then down the Santiam Highway (U. S. 20) Wednesday morning.

What we got was a fresh insight in the heavy load of work falling on the Forest Service. Years ago its job was largely custodial—keeping out fires or suppressing them, maintaining trails, checking the relatively few fishermen and campers who wanted to penetrate the wilderness. Now multiple use has hit the forests with a bang. Over 70 percent of the stand of old growth timber is now under Federal administration, chiefly in the national forests. With the reduction in privately owned timber the demand for timber from Federal forests increases. This calls for selling plans and conditions, for notices of sale and contracts and checking on contractor performance. Access roads are a necessity since today's log transportation from the woods is by motor truck. Appropriated funds are not sufficient so sales contracts are arranged in which the successful bidder constructs the roads. These are built to good specifications—18 inches of crushed rock on a grade laid with adequate drainage. The Willamette district has 1,000 miles of roads and about 100 more are added each year.

The road system is the key to successful forest management. Not only does the timber crop come out over the roads, but after that they provide access for replanting, for fire suppression and, of course, for extensions for additional cuttings. Road system planning is therefore of prime importance, both for economy of the timber haul and for future management uses.

Another use whose dimensions are growing is recreation. At all the camp spots we saw campers and picnickers, sometimes in considerable numbers. On weekends and holidays people swarm to these forest recesses by stream or lakeshore to get away from it all. In this, conflicts over resource use arise, the latest being the one over diversion of waters of the upper McKenzie for power generation by the Eugene Water and Electric Board. We stopped again at Clear Lake and at the falls in the McKenzie just below—Sahalie and Koosah—and rejoiced that the people of Eugene had voted down the bond issue for the power project. One has only to visit Sahalie Falls to join in the prayer that they will never be molested. Here the considerable flow of the upper McKenzie seems to leap over the rock rim to fall in a tumult of spray and noise into the pool below.

A proposed redrawing of the line of the Three Sisters Wilderness area has also provoked controversy. A hearing on this has been held and the decision rests with the Department of Agriculture.

Supervisor Aufderheide has set up a special project for a study of land use. Mapping now is being done in the section from Fish Lake past Clear Lake and down to the turn in the river at Belknap Springs. The Bureau of Public Roads is building a new highway between the Santiam Highway and the McKenzie right along this route, so planning for the increased use by recreationists is timely. In general, the plans call for leaving forest corridors as screens along the highways, to open up scenic vistas and to establish a sufficient number of picnic and camping spots for public convenience. The big handicap here is lack of funds, for they come only through congressional appropriations. Numerous bills have been offered to provide more money. Senator NEUBERGER has one to authorize a study of the subject. The Forest Service itself plans to make such a study following somewhat the pattern of the National Parks Service which came up with its "mission 66" program.

One thing I want to report and that is, the awareness of the Forest Service to the importance of reforestation. We saw many cutover tracts where the new growth is evident in ample volume. The great problem is how to renew the stands on south slopes. Experimentation indicates that soil temperature is an important determining factor. When temperatures get to 120 and above, the mortality among seedlings is heavy. We saw some experimental plats in the H. J. Andrews experimental forest in the McKenzie district where temperatures and soil cover types are under study—the cooler the cover the better chance the seedlings have for survival. Incidentally foresters over western Oregon are happy this year because there is a fine crop of cones on the conifers. This will permit a big harvest of seeds for future plantings.

In this same experimental forest studies are being made on stream runoff both as to quantity and siltation where forest cuttings are made. The harvest pattern in the national forest now is by staggered settings or patches. This system has many advantages, helping to confine fires and giving some benefit from natural reforestation, also helping to conserve moisture for slower runoff. All snags are felled under the cutting contracts and slashings are burned to reduce fire damage. Reseeding or replanting is done then.

Pressures will increase on these forests both for timber for hungry saws and for spots sacred for recreation. Both purposes are laudable. One must not shut out the other, and under responsible management need not. The forest administration needs public support in its effort to balance these pressures and to serve to the maximum degree all the legitimate demands to be made on our forest-land-water resources under its care.

Health Amendments Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is the purpose of the 5 titles of this bill to improve the health of the American people by providing 5 programs designed to increase the supply of health personnel and health facilities, and to improve the methods by which certain health services

are furnished. The specific purposes of the 5 titles are as follows:

Title I: Increase the supply of public health specialists by establishing a 3-year Federal program providing graduate traineeships for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel;

Title II: Increase the supply of professional nurses who are qualified to teach in the various fields of nurse training—including practical-nurse training—or to serve in an administrative or supervisory capacity by establishing a 3-year Federal program providing advanced training to professional nurses;

Title III: Increase the supply of trained practical nurses by establishing a 5-year program of Federal matching grants to States for expanding and improving vocational educational training programs for practical nurses;

Title IV: Supply additional needed hospital and related health facilities by extending for 2 additional years the Hospital Survey and Construction Act which otherwise would expire on June 30, 1957; and

Title V: Support investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health—with particular emphasis on projects designed to improve the operation and administration of State institutions for the care or treatment of the mentally ill—by authorizing the Surgeon General to make special project grants for such purposes.

With reference to title I: Traineeships for professional public-health personnel.

The purpose of title I of the bill is to secure an increased supply of adequately trained public-health specialists. Such specialists are urgently needed by public-health agencies—Federal as well as State and local.

The present shortages of public-health personnel have resulted partly from the growth in population and partly from research discoveries which offer new methods of providing public-health protection and thereby increases the need for additional personnel.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the cost of the traineeship program during the first year will be approximately $1 million. The financial needs of the program during the second and third years would increase.

With reference to title II: Advanced training of professional nurses.

At the present time there is a great demand for additional nurses qualified to teach the increasing number of young people graduating from high schools who are willing to enter the nursing profession. One of the principal bottlenecks which stands in the way of expanding the enrollment of professional nursing schools is the shortage of qualified nurse-teachers. This shortage will increase as our population increases and the demand for nurses will remain unmet because potential nurses cannot find nursing schools sufficiently staffed to be able to accept them as students.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that the cost of the traineeship program for graduate nurses during the first year would be approximately $2 million. The Department further indicated that the cost of this program during the second and third years is expected to increase. The amount of the needed increase has not as yet been determined.

Wish reference to title III: Practical nurse training.

Increasing the supply of trained practical nurses is one of the most effective means of supplementing the services of professional nurses. Practical nurses are needed not only in the general hospitals but also in our 9,000 nursing homes. The recent large increase in the number of nursing homes has added greatly to the demand for the services of trained practical nurses. Even more important perhaps is the need for trained practical nurses in our chronic disease hospitals and in institutions for the mentally ill. Although the number of trained practical nurses has increased steadily in the last few years it has not nearly kept pace with the demand.

Title III contains a specific appropriation ceiling. Appropriations could not exceed $5 million annually, and the program is authorized for 5 years.

With reference to title IV: Extension of Hospital Survey and Construction Act, as amended.

The amendments to title VI of the Public Health Service Act which would be effected by title IV of this bill would extend for 2 additional years the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction program, which would otherwise expire on June 30, 1957.

I am convinced that this highly successful program—which has done so much to stimulate the construction of hospitals, public health centers, and related medical facilities—should be continued; for the unmet needs for such facilities is still great in all parts of the Nation.

The Hospital Survey and Construction Act authorizes an annual appropriation of $150 million for the construction of public and other nonprivate hospitals. The 1953 amendments to the act authorize an additional total annual appropriation of $60 million for the construction of diagnostic or treatment centers—$20 million; chronic-disease hospitals—$20 million; rehabilitation facilities—$10 million; and nursing homes—$10 million.

With reference to title V: Mental health.

The principal purpose of title V of the bill is to extend the present authority of the Public Health Service so as to provide an additional means of stimulating improvements in the important field of mental health. In addition to his present authority to award research and training grants, the Surgeon General would be authorized, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to make "special project grants" for the support of investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health, with particular emphasis on projects designed to improve the operation and administration of State institutions for the care or treatment of the mentally ill. These special project grants would enable State institutions to conduct experimental programs and to adapt to their own particular needs and circumstances the new advances in the care and treatment of the mentally ill which are being developed through more basic research studies.

In the President's budget document for fiscal 1957, provision is made for the later submission of a budget request of $1,500,000 for special mental health project needs.

This bill is entitled to have the full support of Congress.

Health Amendments Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 3958.

If we agree that more nurses are needed then there must be an increase of teachers, administrators, supervisors, to teach more students. This bill proposes subsidies for such graduate training.

S. 3958 is very definitely an emergency measure which seeks to meet this need in schools of nursing and related hospitals; and on that basis I strongly support it.

Everyone is agreed that the United States needs 50,000 more nurses right now, and will need still more tomorrow. The shortage of nurses is not decreasing and as more hospitals are built the relative shortage will increase. Unless something very fundamental is done, the situation will continue to grow worse.

To my regret, I can find nothing in S. 3958 which will accomplish anything fundamental or basic to meet this ever increasing problem.

Providing enough Federal money to subsidize certain segments of nursing education will not give the answers to two fundamental questions, namely: Why do not more girls choose nursing as a career; and why do so many girls who have chosen nursing leave it to go into other occupations?

Today the numbers entering the profession are only barely sufficient to fill the vacancies caused by those forsaking it.

As you know, for many years I have been seeking the answers to these questions; and it was in the hope of getting these answers, and developing constructive courses of action that would really solve and not merely ameliorate the nursing shortage, that I introduced my bill House Joint Resolution 485, for the establishment of a National Commission on Nursing Services.

On June 13, 14, and 15, the Subcommittee on Health and Science of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings upon H. R. 11549 introduced by Mr. PRIEST, providing for Federal aid to nursing education, and my own bill House Joint Resolution 485, providing for a Presidential Commission to study nursing services.

May I take this opportunity to commend the subcommittee upon its careful consideration of the testimony presented at these hearings; and in particular, I wish to express to the subcommittee my appreciation of the attention that was devoted to consideration of the testimony on behalf of House Joint Resolution 485.

The subcommittee reported favorably upon H. R. 11549 and, as you know, its provisions have been incorporated in S. 3958.

The committee acted unfavorably upon my bill, and there is no mention of it in the report before you. I am not too unhappy about that, however, because the testimony on House Joint Resolution 485 occupied nearly one-half of the time of the hearings, and the impact of this testimony must have made a deep impression upon the committee. For the committee's report states, and I quote:

> The committee feels that basic and comprehensive changes are needed in the programs designed to increase the supply of health personnel and health facilities and to improve the method by which health services are rendered, if services of high quality are to be "available more generally to our people at a cost which they can afford to pay. The committee, through its Subcommittee on Health and Science, expects to conduct, at the earliest opportunity, an investigation and study of what changes are needed, and hopes to begin such study before the convening of the 85th Congress.

I sincerely hope that the committee, as its report suggests, will go forward with such a study before the convening of the 85th Congress.

I can interpret the above-quoted paragraph from the committee's report only as indicating that the committee has realized that far broader measures are required than those contained in S. 3958; that a searching inquiry is necessary, in order to determine what such measures should be; that they lie in the main outside of and beyond the realm of Federal aid; and that the subject can best be approached from the standpoint of nursing care, which because of its ramifications will of necessity bring within the focus of study all aspects of patient care.

Now let me get back to S. 3958.

Of course the enactment of this bill is imperative.

We need more professional public health personnal.

We need traineeships for the advanced training of professional nurses.

And of course we need more practical nurses. No one realizes more thoroughly than I the splendid work done by the practical nurses, and their basic contribution to the health of the Nation. But if we increase the number of practical nurses, we certainly must increase the number of trained registered nurses in proportion, because the practical nurse must work under the supervision of a professional nurse. Such supervision is a protection not only to the patient but to the doctor on the case as well.

The fact is that what we need most of all are thousands upon thousands of well trained bedside nurses, right now. I am talking about the rank and file registered nurse, who is the backbone of the nursing profession.

Do Federal grants as set up in S. 3958, as essential as they may be, represent any actual solution to this or to other aspects of the nursing dilemma?

There is a basic question as to the most constructive form of Federal aid.

All too often, in recent years, it has been assumed that a difficulty could be solved by the expenditure of taxpayers' money; whereas the causes that led to the difficulty were deeply imbedded in practices and methods.

Under such circumstances it seems to me that the most constructive form of Federal aid would lie not in the form of subsidies, but in utilizing the facilities of the Federal Government to effect a meeting of the best brains in the Nation, on behalf of a solution of the difficulty. That is what led me to the concept of a National Commission on Nursing Services.

What are the basic causes of the shortage of nurses? Why are not more girls going into the profession? Why are so many girls who have gone into the profession leaving it? One hospital administrator said that the nurses graduated from its nursing school remained an average of only 9 months. Should we go on indefinitely spending Federal money to teach nurses, only to have them go into some other occupation?

What about nurses' compensation? If low pay by comparison to other occupations is what is causing so many nurses to leave the profession, where is the money coming from which will permit their pay to be raised to a level which will make nursing attractive to them?

What about better utilization of existing nursing skills? One witness at the hearing testified that so much of the time of qualified nurses is spent in record-keeping, care of utensils, care of apparatus, and housekeeping, that the nurse had little time left in which actually to nurse the patient.

I do not think you can find a factory in the United States today in which part of the time of a skilled machinist is used to sweep the floor, or to keep inventories in the stockroom. But although hospital methods of utilization of nursing skills are improving, there are still to be found throughout the country many hospitals in which skilled nurses are expected to spend a large portion of their time taking care of linen, supervising the upkeep of utensils, keeping apparatus in repair, writing records, and doing various things which have no direct relation to the bedside care of patients.

The problems of nursing compensation and utilization of nursing skills are problems of hospital administration. Most hospitals operate under a deficit financing system. They exist in the main through the use of taxpayers' money, or through contributions of philanthropic individuals.

Their system of administration therefore bears little relationship to that of the normal business enterprise. Hospital administrators deserve due sympathy for the dilemma in which they are placed. But what happens to the nurses as a result of this situation? And what is the answer with respect to nursing and patient care?

Does it lie in subsidies? Or does it lie in developing, in hospital administration, a type of efficient operation and utilization of personnel similar to that long since developed in industry?

What about the relationship between the doctor and the nurse? Nurses are being called upon to do more and more things in the medical field, in some cases actually illegally.

These are just a few of the questions involved in securing adequate care of the sick. Important as it is at this moment to implement the training of additional teachers, supervisors and administrators, through Federal grants, as proposed in S. 3958, this can in no way be expected to solve the broad problem.

The nursing picture is very complex. It is a composite having to do with compensation, education, hospital administration, attitudes of the medical and other health professions, methods of hospital financing, and many other factors.

The three major related professions, nursing, medicine and hospital administration, realize this and recognize that something should be done about it. But there is absolutely no agreement, within or among them, as to what course of action should be taken to remedy the situation.

It was for that reason, after long study, that I introduced House Joint Resolution 485 proposing the establishment of a Presidential Commission to study this entire picture on behalf of the public interest—that is, on behalf of the person who gets sick and needs a nurse.

The Commission I recommend would, and I quote from the bill, "gather by scientific methods authoritative data related to problems of the patient and the public in securing adequate nursing care and make recommendations to the President with respect to ways and means of solving such problems."

In short, I am trying to get down to basic causes. The difficulty is one which has arisen over the years through methods, procedures and practices, within the nursing, hospital administration and medical professions, which modern conditions are rendering obsolete.

We cannot cure the nursing dilemma simply by the expenditure of taxpayers' money. It can be solved only by constructive measures arrived at by agreement among the nursing, hospital administration, and medical professions in association with representatives of the public who view the problem from the standpoint of the potential patient.

In view of past experience, I do not believe that any such agreement can be reached unless these professions are brought together under the sponsorship of an agency dedicated to the care of the patient and the public, which can act as a catalytic agent and reduce areas of disagreement to areas of agreement. I suggested a Presidential Commission for this purpose because I think the Office of the President would give the findings of a commission national prestige, nationwide attention, and carry enough weight

to lead to remedial action of a really constructive nature.

May I review briefly the attitude of the three major professions concerned—namely, the medical, hospital administration, and nursing professions—toward my bill, House Joint Resolution 485, in the hearings before the Science and Health Subcommittee.

The American Medical Association filed a statement in support of House Joint Resolution 485.

The American Hospital Association presented testimony in opposition to House Joint Resolution 485. Their stand was that they favored a commission for the study of nursing services, but instead of a Presidential commission they wanted what they termed a so-called free commission, set up along lines established by the Mental Health Act of 1955.

In short, the AHA said they wanted the Congress of the United States to turn over some of the taxpayers' money to a group set up among and by the hospital, nursing, and medical professions, who would establish a Commission, with minority representation for the public and/or the patient, to study distribution of nursing personnel, the financing of nursing education, and the requisites of nursing education.

It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that such a free Commission would study nursing problems chiefly from the standpoint of the professions concerned, rather than from the standpoint of the patient who is sick and in need of nursing care. There have been many such professional studies made in recent years, but little, if any, action toward remedying the nursing shortage has resulted.

However, if all of the studies which have been made, and those which are now under way, were correlated and analyzed by a group whose primary consideration was the welfare of the patient, I am convinced that constructive action would automatically follow.

The American Nurses Association officially opposed any form of Commission to study nursing services, and has voiced particular objection to a Presidential commission such as I proposed in House Joint Resolution 485. However, at its national convention in Chicago in May, the house of delegates, after the facts with respect to my bill and its purposes had been presented on the floor, passed a resolution recommending to the Board of Directors of the ANA:

> That the ANA should take the initiative in seeking the assistance of the related professions and the public in the development of a comprehensive study on a scale commensurate with the problems of the patient or the public in securing adequate health care.

By passing this resolution the ANA has agreed to the need of a study such as I have proposed, and to the principle of a Commission.

Now just a few words as to titles IV and V of S. 3958.

Yes, we need more hospitals. But I have in my files examples, from all over the country, of hospitals which have had to close some of their wards because they could not get enough nurses. What good will it do to build more hospitals, if there are not enough nurses to staff them?

Yes, we need more intensive study of mental health. But above all, we need more skilled nurses to care for the mentally ill. At present the number of patients per nurse is appalling.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to emphasize once more the serious attention given to this whole question by the Health and Science Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. It is truly in line with tradition.

At the hearings the members of this subcommittee questioned the witnesses at great length, and gave evidence of the fact that they were deeply concerned about the problem of the nursing shortage.

I am therefore hopeful that this subcommittee, as suggested by the report of the committee as a whole, will indeed make an exhaustive study of those matters affecting adequate care of our sick. This is a tremendous undertaking, but one that should bring almost immeasurable results.

But whether or not the committee actually makes the study suggested in the report, I can assure you that the problem will present itself over and over again until the causes of these personnel shortages are brought into the light, thoroughly understood and done away with. It was to this end that House Joint Resolution 485 was conceived. Something of this nature must be done if solutions are to be found and acted upon.

Cumulative Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the following article which appeared in the New York Times of July 22, 1956, on the very important subject of cumulative voting of stock in national banks, which right is sought to be taken away from stockholders by S. 256:

CUMULATIVE VOTE FACES CURB BY UNITED STATES—BILL BEFORE HOUSE WOULD HALT PRACTICE USED IN ELECTING DIRECTORS OF BANKS

(By Leif H. Olsen)

The House of Representatives may vote this week to end cumulative voting for directors in the Nation's 4,700 national banks.

Under the present law, stockholders have as many votes per share as there are directors to be elected. They may vote all for one candidate or distribute the votes as they see fit.

On Friday the House Committee on Banking and Currency approved an amendment passed by the Senate last year. However, its chances of coming up for a vote on the floor are cut by the time factor. Congress is hurrying to adjourn and the schedule of bills is crowded.

The proposed legislation would eliminate the requirement for cumulative voting, but would permit stockholders to reinstate it.

BANKING HOUSE DIVIDED

The proposal has raised considerable controversy. Last week, at a hearing held by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, bankers and bank directors presented their views. There was no lack of differences of opinion. In two instances representatives from the same bank took opposite sides.

Opinions are largely split three ways. There are those who favor continuation of mandatory cumulative voting, those who want to see it ended and those who neither favor nor oppose it, but dislike the form of the present bill.

Supporters of cumulative voting see it as a means whereby minority groups of stockholders can obtain representation on the board.

Opponents say it enables undesirable persons to force themselves on the board, creating dissension.

The third group objects to the present bill because it would first eliminate cumulative voting and then make it permissive. They point out that the chances would be very slim for shareholders to recover cumulative voting once Congress had eliminated it.

This group would prefer legislation that would provide for the elimination of cumulative voting only where stockholders voted to remove it.

Typical of those who favor cumulative voting is Fred Walker, a director of the First National Bank of Arlington, Va. Mr. Walker, who runs a retail radio and television shop in Arlington, testified at the House hearing last week.

"Minority representation," said Mr. Walker, "acts as a check and balance and does not permit complete one-man dictatorship of a board of directors."

A minority director, he said, "is no more likely to improperly disclose confidential information that might tend to be imprudent or detrimental * * * to the bank than would a majority-elected director."

Mr. Walker added that the proposed legislation would "cause more discord in the form of widespread, all-out proxy fights for complete control, because * * * a 49 percent minority would have no voice whatsoever in management * * * without an all-out proxy fight."

CONTROLLER IS FOR IT

The most powerful voice in support of the bill came from Roy M. Gidney, Controller of the Currency, who is charged with the regulation of federally chartered banks.

"Confidence is not engendered by having a minority group force itself on the directorate of a bank by the use of the cumulative voting provision," Mr. Gidney said. "In cases where such an end has been accomplished it has been the usual experience that the party or parties thus added to the boards have pursued a course of troublemaking, thereby lessening the mutual confidence of the directorate and the confidence of the staff in the directorate, and in some cases the confidence of the community in the bank."

Mr. Gidney said that, because of the protection afforded stockholders by the supervision exercised by his office, he did not believe that "cumulative voting is in any sense necessary in national banks."

While Mr. Gidney, representing the Treasury, favors the elimination of cumulative voting, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, favors its continuation.

In a letter to a Senate subcommittee last year, Mr. Martin wrote: "Cumulative voting for directors of corporations, which is provided for in the constitutions of a number of States and by statute in other States, is based upon the principle that minority representa-

tion, or proportional representation, on the boards of directors is desirable. It is the [Federal Reserve] Board's opinion that the principle * * * is a sound one."

ABA DIFFERS

Among those who disagree with Mr. Martin and agree with Mr. Gidney is the American Bankers Association. It too had representatives at the hearings last week in support of the bill.

Representatives of those who simply opposed the form of the present bill, was Morris A. Schapiro, New York bank analyst.

In a carefully worded telegram to Representative BRENT SPENCE, Democrat, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Banking Committee, Mr. Schapiro politely suggested that the bill be changed to continue cumulative voting unless stockholders voted to eliminate it. The law as it now reads make cumulative voting mandatory. If Mr. Schapiro's suggestion were followed it would become optional.

"Thus Congress would be spared the onus of depriving shareholders of an existing voting right," Mr. Schapiro said. He added that he was neither for nor against cumulative voting.

"This change would provide a fair way of insuring the opportunity of expression for shareholders of national banks, who do not now enjoy the protection of the proxy rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission," he said. "Lacking this protection the Senate version [present bill] would severely handicap shareholders in any effort to recover the cumulative voting right."

Cumulative voting was made mandatory in 1933 in an amendment to the National Banking Act. In addition, 16 States require cumulative voting and 17 make it permissive. Fifteen States either prohibit cumulative voting or make no provision for it.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I did not participate in the debate on H. R. 627, the so-called civil rights bill, because the task assigned to me by my colleagues opposing this absurd legislation was that of working out parliamentary procedure to prevent hasty action upon the bill, and to assure that time for ample discussion and consideration would be available.

Before the vote is taken upon this legislation, however, I want to express my views regarding it.

I opposed this legislation first, because it is unconstitutional. Second, it is absurd and ridiculous, and third, it is unnecessary.

I think the Congress understands, and I think the country understands, that this legislation was introduced for political purposes, and that it is brought up at this particular time for the political effect it is supposed to have upon the coming election.

It is an effort of the part of northern and eastern politicians to point a finger at the South and charge that the Negro is oppressed there while at the same time there is no oppression, no discrimination, and no racial antagonism whatever in the North and East.

Such is not the case. We have our share, of course, of racial antagonism in the South. Through the experience of many generations we have learned how to handle racial antagonism with the least possible friction. We were handling racial problems in the South with little antagonism or hostility until in recent years busybodies and outsiders from other sections began to agitate the situation and stir up animosities and hostilities.

Today racial problems are not confined to any one section of our country. Pride of race exists in every section of the United States. Whatever problems exist anywhere with reference to racial differences, exist in the North, East, and the West, as well as in the South.

Racial agitators in all sections of the country are succeeding in stirring up hostility and animosity between the races. Racial violence between southern white people and southern Negroes is rare indeed, and I would point out to the "holier than thou" sponsors of this piece of political legislation that segregation is just as much a fact in your own cities as it is in my section; that what you refer to as "discrimination" is practiced in your own cities, and that racial animosity and racial violence is greater in your section than it is in mine, and this is borne out by the testimony of your own people.

You need only to read the newspapers to see that racial friction is more violent in Illinois than it is in Georgia; that the determination to keep the races segregated is as strong in Michigan and Illinois as it is in Georgia or Mississippi and that in the final analysis segregation in New York City is as much a fact as it is in New Orleans, La.

Let me point out to some of the would-be reformers from New York what one of their own leading public officials said about civil rights in that State. Less than 2 months ago Senator LEHMAN—a former governor—speaking in New York City, in his and your own territory, said that Harlem is a ghetto, and is "a rebuke to us of the North." He pointed out that "Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schools." He also said that the city's housing projects have been located so as to force a "pattern of segregation." I insert here a United Press news story of his speech which appeared in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution of June 4, 1956:

LEHMAN IN CIVIL RIGHTS PLEA CALLS HARLEM A GHETTO, REBUKE TO NORTH

NEW YORK, June 3.—Senator LEHMAN, Democrat, New York, said today civil rights is not exclusively a Southern problem and cited Harlem as "a glaring manifestation of the issue in the North."

LEHMAN said conditions in Harlem, a big Negro and Puerto Rican community in New York City, are "a rebuke to us of the North."

He urged Northerners "to clean up our backyard even as we press forward with our efforts to bring justice and equality to the Negroes and other oppressed minorities in the South."

"Harlem is a ghetto," LEHMAN told the Urban League of Greater New York. "Harlem is an area of poverty, congestion, substandard housing and substandard schools."

He said New York needs "residential integration." The city's housing projects, he said, have been located so as to force a "pattern of segregation."

"Residential segregation is the other side of the coin of school segregation," LEHMAN said.

LEHMAN said he would continue to fight in Congress for civil rights legislation and to urge the administration to exercise leadership in this field.

But he said if civil rights proponents are "frustrated" in Congress, they will "carry the fight" to the Democratic convention in August and to the people in the November election.

"I pledge you that I will not spare my own efforts, or withhold any influence which I can exert toward these ends," LEHMAN said.

The New York Senator said the problem of civil rights has "sharpened into a national crisis" that dominates the Nation's political life.

He said too many nonsoutherners, in Washington and elsewhere, say, "We must sympathize with the problems of the South."

What they mean, LEHMAN said, is that we must sympathize with "problems of the southern whites and particularly the problems of those southern whites who have a stake, political or economic, in the maintenance of segregation and the doctrine of white supremacy."

LEHMAN said he does sympathize with southerners who are trying to end segregation in an orderly way.

"But most of all," he said, "I have sympathy for those long-suffering individuals—Americans like you and me—who for all their lives have endured the whiplash of discrimination and segregation."

Mr. Speaker, if the Negroes of New York ever begin to ask you why you do not give them some help at home to end poverty, congestion, substandard schools, and housing, instead of fighting a sham battle against segregation in the South, you are going to have a good deal of explaining to do.

In case any of you feel that you cannot accept Senator LEHMAN'S analysis of the situation, I call your attention to an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on June 12, 1956, pointing out in considerable detail the treatment which Negroes get from you New York people. I insert the article at this point:

BARRIERS CONFRONT NEGRO SEEKING HOUSING IN NORTH

(By Mary Hornaday)

At the heart of the American Negro's troubles north of the Mason and Dixon's line today is poor and restricted housing.

Says the National Urban League which has worked for nearly 44 years to improve the economic and social well-being of the Nation's Negro population, "Housing is the only commodity in America, the acquisition of which is limited by race."

Alan S. Paton wrote during a survey of the "Negro in the North" for Collier's magazine, "The cry of the Negro is no longer: 'Let my people go.' It is: 'Let my people in'."

FREE CHOICE DENIED

Here in New York City, where Negroes make up about 20 percent of the Manhattan population, they are stil almost completely excluded from a free choice to buy or rent homes in the open competitive market. The Protestant Council of the City of New York recently found that 22 of the city's 27 major real estate operators turn down Negro applicants for apartments, though accepting

white applicants of the same economic status.

Into New York's Harlem today are crowded more than a quarter of a million Negroes from the Southern States, West Indies, and Africa. Negroes began to move into Harlem in 1901 as a result of a deflated boom in real estate. Hundreds of families deserted tenements on the West Side to move into apartments built by speculative real-estate promoters. Today Harlem contains Sugar Hill where affluent Negroes live in dignity and comparative splendor but it also contains some of the most notorious rat-ridden slums in New York.

The problem of Negro "ghettos," which are also located in the East Bronx, Brooklyn, Jamaica, and Queens, becomes increasingly difficult with the recent more rapid increase in the city's nonwhite population and the trebling of Negro income. Also, as a result of the South's recent upsurge of racial difficulties, additional pressure is being put on the white conscience to act.

RULING CIRCUMVENTED

With more wealth and a smaller proportion of Negroes, it is argued, the northern whites have an obligation to give a lead to the South by being generous and by implementing their religious and democratic principles.

It has been 8 years since the United States Supreme Court banned devices have been in principle, yet numerous devices have been employed to get around that decision. The National Urban League lists among these: withholding of credit financing from nonwhite buyers, trustee devices of holding title to blocks of individually-owned properties, private "gentleman's agreements," intimidation of brokers, protests, threats, and actual acts of violence.

For many years, the Federal Goverment itself, through its various housing agencies, was an active party to Negro discrimination but gradually it has reformed their policies at least.

Since 1950, both the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration have ruled that mortgages they insure must establish that no restrictive covenant has been recorded subsequent to February 15, 1950. The recipient must also sign an agreement that no restriction on ownership or occupancy based on race, color, or creed will be imposed until the mortgage has been paid off.

FHA policy was recently set forth at a National Urban League meeting: "It is our sincere desire that FHA operations be color-blind, that no deviations or differentials are made which under any circumstances can be related to the racial identity of the prospective home purchaser."

MORTGAGE BARRIERS

New York State recently has taken even more stringent steps to open up new private housing to Negroes with the passage of the Metacl-Baker law putting within the scope of the State Commission Against Discrimination, discrimination in housing insured by the FHA or the Veterans' Administration.

The big challenge now is to enforce this law. The Urban League is advocating a provision in the certificate of incorporation of building firms which would enable the FHA to step in as a preferred stockholder and correct any default in compliance with the law. At least, the law will have a big educational effect.

Mortgage money from private sources for improving the housing condition of nonwhites is still highly limited in New York, despite the formation of some all-Negro mortgage companies in Harlem.

The whites here, as in other places, say they don't want to keep Negroes out just because they are black but because they have low educational and moral standards and no respect for other people's property. Negro organizations argue back that their people do not automatically make bad neighbors, but only when they are exploited by real-estate people who charge high rents that induce overcrowding.

UNIONS BUILD

Today there is no discrimination on racial grounds in any public housing project in New York City and several unions, notably the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union have built cooperative housing development with union funds to run on interracial lines in a special effort to break patterns of segregated housing. But there is still a great shortage of low-cost housing of both these types.

New York citizen leaders have expressed confidence that this metropolis eventually will absorb its Negro citizens as democratically and fairly as it has its other waves of immigration. There are still big obstacles standing in the way of such assimilation, but when they look out across the miles at Chicago where 93 policemen are assigned around-the-clock to guard the Trumbull Park public housing project where integration is under way and at Montgomery's and Tallahassee's bus boycotts down South, they feel they have come a long way toward this goal.

I insert here also a newspaper article from the Atlanta Journal-Constitution of June 12, 1956, reporting a speech made in Atlanta by the retiring executive vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., who has lived the last 5 years in New York City. He states:

They make a great effort to condemn segregation in the South, but New York is the most painfully racial and religious clique-minded town in existence.

I insert this newspaper article herewith:

SEGREGATION JUST AS STRONG IN NORTH, DUMAS DECLARES

Except for public transportation segregation is just as strong in New York City as any place in the South, said Hal Dumas, former president of Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co. here.

Mr. Dumas was telling the Atlanta Rotary Club of his last 5 years of living in New York. He left Atlanta in 1951 to become the executive vice president of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

He will retire at the end of June and, following a trip to Europe, plans to return to live in Atlanta.

"They make a great effort to condemn segregation in the South," he said, "but it (New York) is the most painfully racial and religious clique-minded town in existence.

"I have never seen Negroes in many of the churches that talk down segregation; nor Negro society pictures in papers that support integration," he said.

Mr. Dumas praised Atlanta as being the finest, freest city I know anything about. He said that no other city in the Nation equals it for civic leadership and urged the group to keep it a shining light to the rest of the country.

In his description of New York, he said that it suffered from "giganticism." He said there were a lot of wonderful people, but for the most part "discourtesy is a cult and there is widespread dishonesty."

His lasting opinion of New York, he said, is "a filthy, dirty town in a continual traffic jam."

He said he felt the present mayor Robert Wagner, would do a great deal to help the world's largest city.

Mr. Dumas said that he thinks that the greatest need in New York is to develop civic support from the businessmen of th city. "As a civic entity, New York has lost its soul and is a menace to itself and the rest of the country," he said.

Mr. Dumas is a graduate of Alabama Polytechnic Institute at Auburn, Ala. He began working for the Southern Bell Telephone and Telegraph Co. in 1911 and was made president of the organization in 1943.

Prior to his departure from Atlanta, he was active in the Capital City Club, the Atlanta Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, Red Cross, Community Fund, Community Chest Drive, Boy and Girl Scout work, YMCA and YWCA, Salvation Army, National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and many other civic organizations.

To those from Illinois whose hearts have been bleeding the last few days because of the treatment that Negroes receive in the South, let me recommend that you read a news item by James K. Sparkman appearing in the Christian Science Monitor on July 16, 1956. He quotes a Negro director of the Urban League as saying that Chicago "is the most segregated city in the North," and that Negroes in Chicago "are situated in the middle of the Nation's largest racial ghetto."

He quotes the same Negro spokesman as saying that Negroes pay 30 to 50 percent more than a white man would pay for the same housing and that:

Negroes are not only denied freedom of movement, but they are ruthlessly exploited, overcharged, overcrowded, and disproportionately forced into slum living.

I insert the article herewith:

CHICAGO NEGROES FIND OLD MANSIONS DISAPPOINTMENT

(By James K. Sparkman)

"Many of our people thought that mansions were palaces. They have found them monstrosities."

This is how Roi Ottley, noted Negro author and Chicago radio commetator, brings home the point that for Chicago Negroes, achieving size in homes has not proved an answer to their longings.

Mr. Ottley, along with Negro newsmen, welfare, and political leaders, is quick to say that if jobs are the incoming Negro's primary gain here, housing is his area of least progress.

Indeed, despite the visible evidence of changing home and apartment ownership, including that of many old South Side lakeshore mansions, little has been accomplished when compared with the growing problem, they argue.

Less than a month ago, Edwin C. Berry, new executive director of the reorganized Urban League, concluded from the weight of the league's study data that Chicago "is the most segregated city in the North" even though there has been progress in Negro housing.

"You and I," Mr. Berry told delegates here to a red cap union convention, "are situated in the middle of the Nation's largest racial ghetto."

It is, he said in describing the area lying parallel to Lake Michigan south of the Loop which takes in the site of the ill-reputed Mecca flats and a hefty fraction of Chicago's 23 square miles of densely populated slums, "8 miles long by 2½ miles wide and contains more people than the entire population of Columbus, Ohio."

RESTRICTIVE DEVICE

By its nature, if not always by design, housing restrictions are "a landlord's device for controlling rents," one Negro spokesman observed here to this correspondent recently. The victimized tenant, if given poor return for his money, has little chance to flee. Said the Urban League on this subject:

"This residential segregation forced by Chicago custom means that Negroes are not only denied freedom of movement, but they are ruthlessly exploited, overcharged, overcrowded, and disproportionately forced into slum living." Although no study of Negro rents in Chicago has yet been made, Mr. Berry estimates that Negroes pay 30 to 50 percent more than would a white man for similar quarters.

Why has there been no answer to this problem—especially in an era of record home and apartment building? The causative forces are to be found deep in the nature of the steady stream of 1,000 to 2,500 Negroes which are believed settling monthly in Chicago.

(Some Negro spokesmen believe this figure should be smaller; southbound trains are daily full of Negroes, they note, who have decided they have stayed long enough in the Windy City.)

OFFICIAL ANSWER

New arrivals by and large, are least able to move into jobs with higher-than-minimum pay, and by custom in the rural South, are probably least ready to assume the full burden of close city living. It is for them that landowners divide already small apartments in rundown, share-the-bath tenements. For if horrifying drab, dark and dirty to the second generation Negro Chicagoan or middle income white citizen, a one room and kitchenette flat—with hot water available three nights a week, and heated all winter—may look good to a sharecropper family.

In answer to the silent accusation of these conditions, official Chicago gives a strong answer: The Mecca is gone, as are many blocks that were far worse than it. Abandoned autos by the tens of thousands have been hauled from vacant lots. Rubble by the scores of tons has been swept from alleys.

More important, with the excuse of wartime emergency removed, the city has condemned and wrecked the grimmest sodden wood and blackened brick eyesores. Even the harshest critic must concede that today's worst is many shades better than that of a decade ago.

If Chicago has turned its back on pilot projects which have heartened travelers to Baltimore or Philadelphia, some weight must be given the city's claim that it has indeed leavened the lump with somewhat higher standards of cleanliness.

While this series has been in preparation, the city has passed a new housing code which officials believe will have immediate and drastic effects in preventing further slum condition generating conversions of existing dwellings, and the upgrading of large segments of the city now either stagnant or in decline.

Meanwhile, Chicago can cite 14,205 public housing units now in operation as evidence that concern is given to the low-income arrival; he is not wholly at the mercy of the slum landlord.

Proof that public housing does provide a temporary refuge for the Negro is shown by two statistics: 75 percent of the public housing residents are Negroes. The average term of residence is only 2½ years.

EXPANDING THE GHETTO

By that time, the tenant has found a spot that suits him better or has boosted his income above the maximum permitted.

If the city's estimate that 200–300 units of private housing are reaching Negroes per week, an analyst may hope that an equilibrium may be reached in the visible future.

But to this Negro leaders reply hotly that adequate housing for Negroes, desirable as that is, is not the solution. "We are not eliminating the ghetto now. We are expanding it, under pressure from within," interprets Mr. Berry.

True, Chicago does have integrated housing, and it has won wide attention in the city and beyond. "You find," Mr. Ottley cautions the observer enthusiastically "that we don't have true integration yet. When Negroes move in, two groups stay: The young idealists, and the older folk whose children have married and moved away. The middle group still has not faced up to the problem."

And the same forces that prompt rent-gouging of new arrivals from the South are to be found at the edge of the expanding Black Belt, Mr. Berry adds. "Exploiters—black and white—will come to a white family and tell them how they will lose money if they stay when Negroes move in nearby. They want the homeowner to sell too low, so that they can sell to the Negro too high."

Negro leaders are distressed at the economic loss suffered by white sellers, as at the unfair price to the Negro buyer. But within the framework of their view that all the community should insist that all Chicagoans of whatever color live up to the statutes concerning housekeeping, they express little sympathy for white families deeply troubled by advancing Negro areas.

FRICTION DECREASES

When Government actions have led to movement of Negro families into new areas (into new housing projects like Trumbull Park, for example), the results are not yet inspiring. Chicago police are still on the alert, months after initial unrest was stamped out.

Two signs, by contrast, are seen by Negro leaders as hopeful. In high income areas of several cities, Negroes well up in their professions have been accepted without great friction, and Negro spokesmen here see this as a favorable step since moneyed families they argue, set the style.

Where South Side slums have been cleared and replaced with topflight housing (as in the monumental Lake Meadows project), there is evidence that the appeal of lakeside, close-to-the-Loop living is enough to lure white families back to spots their parents fled a quarter- or half-century ago, and back to integrated living.

With all the lakeside from the Loop to Illinois Institute of Technology now slated for ultimate replacement, this could prove a powerful magnet to pull together the wedged-wide segments of the community, Negroes and white Chicagoans agree.

In such a movement, community leaders can see an end to two aspects of the present situation deplored by members of both races: discrimination on the basis of color (rather than the more understandable discrimination of home owners against poor-housekeeping newcomers), and monetary losses frequently suffered by homeowners caught in the path of a changing community. Continued success of Chicago interracial experiments, they feel, cannot fail to benefit all city residents, whether black or white.

Illinois, which today is represented in Congress by so many knights in shining armor had a race riot in 1951, in which an International News Service story said that an anti-Negro mob of 10,000 milled about an apartment building in Cicero, Ill., a west Chicago suburb.

These 10,000 Illinois people were stirred to a mob violence pitch because a Negro war veteran undertook to move his family into an apartment building. This news item stated that Illinois National Guard men were lined up four deep holding back the crowd with guns and fixed bayonets, and that at least six persons were bayoneted by the guardsmen. The mob which began on Wednesday with 3,000 people, grew to 10,000 by Thursday. The news story on this occurrence is as follows, from the Atlanta Constitution of July 12, 1951.

SIX WOUNDED AS 10,000 BATTLE IN RACE RIOT

CHICAGO, July 12—At least six persons were bayoneted Thursday night while steel-helmeted troops and police fought to rout an anti-Negro mob of 10,000 milling about an apartment building in Cicero, west Chicago suburb.

The most seriously wounded was identified as Vincent Kaduk, 20, of Cicero, who was jabbed in the left side with a bayonet.

The others were reported to have suffered minor cuts.

Illinois National Guard men were lined up four deep holding fixed bayonets in a cordon about the building, trying to push the screaming crowd back.

Although most of the crowd had edged back to 200 feet from the building, some of the mob kept breaking through to as close as 50 feet from the troop perimeter, tossing bricks, rocks and firecrackers at the building.

Several windows that had remained intact through two pillagings Wednesday night and Thursday were broken.

Although the guardsmen were outfitted with guns, no shots were fired.

The menacing crowd, kept a block away from the building since sundown, broke through police lines as the steel-helmeted troops arrived aboard guard trucks and chartered buses.

Earlier, police routed 25 persons who broke through their lines by firing pistols into the air.

The violence stemmed from efforts of a Negro war veteran and his family to move into the apartment building. They would have been the suburb's first Negro residents.

Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson ordered 500 troops to the apartment building Thursday after vandals rampaged through the building for the second time.

An estimated 3,000 screaming jostling Cicero residents gathered outside the building Wednesday night when teen-agers and hoodlums raced into the dwelling, ransacked four apartments, and made a bonfire of the furniture.

Not a single family remained in the 12-flat structure.

Mr. Speaker, Chicago people have not become more "tolerant" since the Cicero occurrence. In 1953, 2 years later, a mob of such size as to require approximately 2,000 policemen per day staged riots at the Trumbull Park's housing project in Chicago. This resulted, as in Cicero, Ill., from efforts to forcibly integrate a Negro family into a white housing project. Eighteen months later, Police Commissioner Timothy O'Conner said that 313 policemen were assigned to the project daily, and that police details at the project have ranged to more than 1,800 men in a 24-hour period.

Michigan has pointed the finger at the South from time to time. In the 1952 Democratic National Convention, Michigan's Governor was brazen enough to say that delegates from the South should actually not be seated in the Convention of the Democratic Party.

Yet Dearborn, Mich., is far more prosegregationist than Atlanta, Ga. Dearborn's mayor boasts in newspaper interviews that not a single Negro lives in the city limits of Dearborn.

One might judge from the breast-beating of the Michigan Governor that Detroit would be a model brotherhood city, to which Negroes might come as a place of refuge from the segregated South, and be welcomed with open arms. However, the Associated Press on April

5, 1956, reported a news story to the effect that a mob of nearly 500 people in Detroit threw rocks through the windows of the home of a 70-year-old retired private policeman who had just moved in. Although this man said he and his family were white people, the word got around among the neighbors that he was a Negro, and the same sentiment manifested itself in Detroit as in Cicero and Chicago, Ill. The news item about the Detroit incident is as follows:

DETROIT MOB FORCES OUT FAMILY RUMORED NEGRO

(By Bem Price)

DETROIT, April 5.—Aged John W. Rouse bowed today to his neighbors' belief that he and his family are Negroes.

Rouse said he had decided to sell and move after a near race riot by nearly 500 people last night on quiet, tree-lined Robson Avenue in northwest Detroit. Two windows in the modest brick home were broken by rocks before police broke up the growing demonstration.

PRIVATE POLICEMAN

Rouse, a retired private policeman, insists that he and all of his family, wife, daughter, and two grandchildren, are white. The 70-year-old former watchman sold the house to the Belmont Subdivision Association for $18,500, a $2,000 profit.

Under the terms of the sale Rouse has 2 months in which to move. In the meantime he has free rent. When the sale was completed a 6-foot red-lettered sign appeared on the front lawn, reading, "Settled." It was taken down an hour later by the association. Police blocked both ends of the street, cutting off the steady stream of curiosity seekers who had been driving past.

"People think that (sign) means they're going to stay here," one member of the association said.

Mrs. Rouse, also 70, cried, "How do they know we are Negro? They haven't even seen us. We didn't even get out here until after dark Tuesday. I think there is something very wrong. I could expect something like this in a foreign country."

YOUNGSTERS PLAY

While Mrs. Rouse talked, her 2 grandchildren, a boy 7 and a girl 10, were playing with a baseball in the backyard under police protection.

"You know how children are," she said. "They don't know about things like this and I couldn't keep them in the house all day.

"I did not want them in the front yard where the other kids could make hasty remarks."

GIRLS GIGGLE

Off and on all day little girls in Bermuda shorts and long hose passed in front of the Rouse house giggling and occasionally yelling, "There's a Negro in the crowd."

Large numbers of teen-agers gathered in knots across the street from time to time while housewives sat on porches in the warm sun gossiping about the neighborhood affair.

Oddly, a reporter ranging the street could find no one who admitted having seen or known the Rouse family, but all insisted they knew they were Negro.

RACIAL UNIT

Sgt. Thomas Nickerson and Detective Ed Boggs, members of the Special Investigation Bureau which deals with racial problems, tried all day to trace the source of the rumor which set off the demonstration.

"As near as we can determine," said Boggs, "it started with the movers. One of the workmen moving furniture into the house told a boy, 'You ought to tell your folks there is a Negro moving in.' It apparently started from there."

The gray-haired Mrs. Rouse said, "I guess you know how all this started. I wish they had broken my dishes instead."

TRACE RUMOR

Boggs and the sergeant, in tracing the rumor, found it passed by word of mouth mostly from one agitated neighbor to another.

The two officers said that their investigation showed that both grandchildren were registered at birth as white. Rouse said he is part Cherokee Indian and that his wife is Scotch-Irish and French Canadian.

In Ohio a little more than a month ago, a judge in Cleveland sent a Negro woman and her children back to Alabama, although she tearfully objected. The same news story stated that a Cleveland welfare representative told the judge that if this woman and her children were allowed to remain in Cleveland, word would get back to the South and they would be flooded with similar families. The news story by Associated Press regarding this occurrence is as follows:

OHIO FEARS MIGRANT FLOOD, REJECTS MOTHER WITH EIGHT

CLEVELAND, June 8.—Because they are not eligible for relief funds in Ohio, a jobless Negro mother and her eight dependents were under a court order today to return to Livingston, Ala.

The mother, Mrs. Martha Winston, 40, objected tearfully to the ruling by Juvenile Court Judge Albert A. Woldman yesterday.

"I brought the children here because I didn't want them to grow up in the South," she said. "I won't go back South."

"Do you want your children to starve?" asked the judge as he issued the order to return to Alabama. "Do you want that little baby to die?"

"I'll do the best I can, and if that's not enough, then it's up to the Lord," the woman replied.

But today the court ordered deputies to go to the family's home in an east side slum section and put it on a bus or train for Alabama.

The dependents are 7 children—the oldest is a 17-year-old girl—and an 11-day-old infant born to the girl out of wedlock.

Between them and relief aid in Ohio is a law that only persons who have lived in Ohio a year can qualify.

Mrs. Winston and her husband separated 5 years ago. She said she came to Cleveland 4 years ago.

A local welfare representative told Judge Woldman that the Sumter County, Ala., relief organization had acknowledged the children to be legal residents of Alabama and entitled to relief there.

"If these people are allowed to remain here, your honor, word will get back to the South and we will be flooded with similar families," the welfare representative told the court.

The judge issued the exile order, but observed:

"This is a broad human problem that concerns the whole United States."

Segregationist sentiment exists in Cincinnati, Ohio, just as it does in New Orleans or Mobile. The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which is stirring up racial antagonism in all sections of the country, brought a suit in Cincinnati to force the Coney Island Amusement Park near Cincinnati to admit Negroes. The Ohio Supreme Court has refused to enjoin the amusement park in the case. The United Press news story regarding this incident is as follows:

TOP OHIO COURT RULES PARK CAN SEGREGATE

COLUMBUS, OHIO, April 18.—The Ohio Supreme Court Wednesday refused to issue an injunction forcing the Coney Island Amusement Park near Cincinnati to admit Negroes.

The court order had been asked by Mrs. Ethel Fletcher, a member of the National Association for Advancement of Colored People.

The case, which had been in the courts for almost 3 years, stemmed from a refusal by the amusement park to admit Mrs. Fletcher on two occasions in July 1953.

The 5-to-2 decision said that "a proprietor of a private place of amusement or entertainment has a right to admit or exclude whomsoever he chooses, until such right is changed by statute."

The northern and eastern newspapers play up every racial incident which occurs in the South. They play down and minimize the numerous racial incidents which occur in their own sections.

Even this hypocritical attitude cannot conceal the fact that there is far more racial tension and far more racial violence out of the South than there is in the South. In this good year of 1956, in spite of all the provocation on the part of the NAACP and other radicals and agitators, about the only two instances of racial violence which have occurred in the South were the Autherine Lucy incident in Tuscaloosa, Ala., and the Nat King Cole incident in Birmingham, notwithstanding all the boycotting carried on by the Negroes in Montgomery, Ala., and Tallahassee, Fla.

In the Tuscaloosa incident, the Negress Autherine Lucy who was merely a pawn of the NAACP had a few eggs and tomatoes thrown at her. There was no property damage or personal injury received. Yet this incident received about as much publicity in the Northern press as the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima. Not only did the press squeeze the last particle of publicity from the incident; the television and radio networks outdid themselves in publicizing even the most insignificant details connected with it.

The same all-out zealous efforts were made to publicize the Nat King Cole incident, another occurrence in which neither property damage or personal injury were sustained. Another great difference in this occurrence and most of those happening in the North is that in the Birmingham incident those responsible for the law violation were properly apprehended, tried and punished by the duly constituted authorities. In contrast with the lack of racial violence in the South, there have been dozens and dozens of instances of racial violence in areas out of the South, this year, where brotherhood, fellowship, integration, and miscegenation, are supposed to reign supremely.

In New York City, where the panderers to the NAACP have even discontinued using the words "white" and "colored" on applications for driver's licenses, registration, and so forth, racial fights and racial violence are almost daily occurrences. I have in my file on this subject dozens of clippings of news items regarding racial fights and riots, nearly all of them clipped from the Atlanta, Ga., papers. There is not time or space to place more than a few sam-

ples of these news stories of racial violence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. However, to illustrate the prevalence of racial antagonism and racial violence, I insert at this point half a dozen news stories of such events occurring in New York, Missouri, Indiana, New Jersey, and even as far away as Hawaii, any one of which if it had happened in Atlanta would have kept northern city editors, reporters, and television and radio commentators up all night getting out bulletins and special stories of the eruption of racial antagonism and violence in the benighted South which "hates Negroes and deprives them of their rights." Here are the news stories and they are only a few of dozens of similar stories:

[From the Atlanta Journal of March 6, 1956]

BOY GANG HELD IN STABBING

NEW YORK, March 6.—Police rounded up six members of a teen-age Negro gang early Tuesday and charged them with the wanton stabbing of a 17-year-old white youth "for no reason at all."

Two female members of the gang also were arrested for the simultaneous and apparently unprovoked beating of two 14-year-old girls who were returning home from a church.

The stabbing victim, who was in very critical condition with four stab wounds in his stomach, was identified as Joseph Connelly.

[From the Atlanta Journal of April 25, 1956]

RACIAL FIGHTS BREAK OUT AT KANSAS CITY GAME

KANSAS CITY, April 25.—A flurry of fist fights between white and Negro boys broke out Tuesday at Municipal Stadium as the crowd was leaving after Detroit beat Kansas City 7–4.

Police headquarters said it was not called so had no report on the disturbance.

Officers directing traffic on nearby streets moved onto the playing field but by that time things had simmered down.

There was nothing to indicate what started the trouble. This is the first year white and Negro pupils have been integrated in Kansas City's public high schools and occasional fights after school hours have been reported.

It was high-school day at the stadium and the crowd of 13,963 included 8,447 youngsters dismissed from classes to see the game on special 50-cent tickets.

One spectator estimated 35 to 40 fights were going on at once but from the press box it appeared a dozen was the maximum, with about 300 participating in the general melee.

One boy had blood on his face but no serious injuries were reported. One groundskeeper was hit on the head with a rake handle.

Adults complained mass movements of youngsters through the aisles kept them from enjoying the game.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1956]

FBI LAUNCHES PROBE OF HOLIDAY SHIP RIOTS

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 1.—Federal authorities today were conducting a "full and complete investigation" of a Memorial Day riots aboard an excursion steamer that climaxed a day of clashes between whites and Negroes at the Crystal Beach (Ont.) amusement park.

At least 50 persons were injured in the rioting at the Canadian resort, about 15 miles across Lake Erie from here, and aboard the steamship *Canadiana*.

Nine youths, both white and Negro, were arrested by Canadian authorities and two Negroes were named in assault complaints filed with a United States commissioner in Buffalo. Ages ranged from 15 to 20.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation opened its inquiry yesterday at the request of United States Attorney John O. Henderson.

GOVERNOR IS CONCERNED

State, municipal and community groups also took action.

A spokesman for Governor Harriman said he had expressed "grave concern" over the demonstrations and had ordered his office to watch developments closely.

Mayor Steven Pankow of Buffalo called a meeting of community leaders for today to discuss ways to prevent similar outbreaks in the city.

Victor Einach, Buffalo field representative for the State Commission Against Discrimination, declared that "tensions have been brewing for some time" and that a conflict was "almost inevitable." His office would conduct an investigation, he said.

Mr. Einach said it was his opinion that the disorders were the result of a complex pattern of sociological problems.

He said they included the large migration of southern Negroes into Buffalo in recent years, overcrowding and shortage of decent housing for them, increased unemployment and what he called the present wave of hoodlumism.

"Probably most significant, however," he said, "is the fact that some of the minority group have a strong chip-on-the-shoulder attitude and that some of the majority refuse to face up to the fact that racial problems exist."

NAACP SEEKS CAUSE

The Reverend Kenneth A. Bowen, president of the Buffalo branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, called on all agencies to aid in determining "what motivated this thing that we might stop it." He said his group deplored "this kind of conflagration, especially since it seems to be between racial groups."

A park official said that the trouble at Crystal Beach started in a picnic grove when 3 white youths and 3 Negro youths started fighting. He said two more Negroes and another white joined the fight.

When the 9 brawlers were placed in the guardhouse at the beach, this official said, about 300 Negroes converged on the guardhouse and threatened to free the prisoners. He said the mob dispersed when police reinforcement arrived.

After a day of disorders at the park, rioting broke out on the Canadiana.

[From the Atlanta Journal of June 10, 1956]

ONE DEAD, THREE HURT IN WHITE, NEGRO SAILORS' BRAWL

PEARL HARBOR, T. H., June 9.—One sailor was stabbed to death and three others injured when friction between Negro and white crewmen of the carrier U. S. S. *Lexington* erupted into a riotous brawl, the Navy disclosed Saturday.

Seaman Apprentice Johnny Green, a Negro of 2717 Drummond Street, Vicksburg, Miss., was held in the Navy Yard brig, suspected of slaying a white sailor Friday night during a cursing, slugging brawl between more than a score of white and Negro seamen.

The identity of the dead man was withheld pending notification of next of kin, the Navy said.

Three white sailors—all Texans—were treated for injuries. They were Airman G. O. Medley, 19, Fort Davis; Aviation Machinist Mate 3/c W. L. Short, 21, Austin; and N. O. Vela, 18, a seaman apprentice from Alice.

Medley and Short suffered stab wounds but were not in critical condition, the Navy said. Vela suffered a head laceration when struck by a flying beer can.

A Navy spokesman said the riot broke out Friday night outside the recreation hall on Ford Island, the naval air station in the middle of Pearl Harbor. Details of the brawl were not disclosed but the Navy said the melee apparently broke out after a series of uncomplimentary remarks passed between Negro and white *Lexington* crewmen earlier in the evening.

[From the Atlanta Journal of June 12, 1956]

THREATS FLY IN MUNCIE RACIAL TROUBLE

MUNCIE, IND., June 12.—Between 200 and 300 persons milled about this city early Tuesday shouting threats at each other in what police termed a "racial disturbance."

Nineteen were arrested, including 10 juveniles 14 to 17 years old. Nine persons, including 5 Negroes and 4 white youths, were charged with disorderly conduct and released on bond when they pleaded innocent.

Authorities said groups of youths toured sections of the city in automobiles from about 10 p. m., Monday, to 1 a. m., Tuesday. There was no report of violence, officers said. But many threats of fighting were shouted and groups congregated around Ball State Teachers College student center, the Muncie fieldhouse, and Tuhey swimming pool. The pool was closed indefinitely Saturday when tensions arose because a group of Negroes went swimming.

The demonstration came a few hours after city officials met to discuss a solution to the problem which arose when four Negroes entered the pool which in years past was used only by whites.

[From the Atlanta Constitution of July 2, 1956]

WHITE, NEGRO YOUTHS BATTLE AT NEW JERSEY DANCE

ASBURY PARK, N. J., July 1.—A series of teen-age fights which police said were between Negroes and whites ended early today with some 28 persons injured and 25 taken into custody.

Sgt. James Leone of the Asbury Park police termed the fighting which began at a dance late last night "a near riot" and said "It was between Negroes and whites." However, he declined to describe as a race riot the battles involving about 200 persons.

The fight began at Convention Hall where about 2,700 persons, mostly teen-agers, were dancing. It spilled out into Ocean Avenue, which runs along the sea at this resort community.

The fighting raged until police from 12 Monmouth County communities, State and military police joined officers here to disperse the gathering crowd of about 75,000, most of whom were bystanders.

Joseph Redicker, one of the operators of the hall, said he could not determine the cause of the fights. He said, "They just seemed to break out."

Police themselves were unable to give the cause of the fighting.

A very good summary of the situation was given in a recent editorial from the Macon Telegraph, Macon, Ga., which was reprinted in the Atlanta Constitution on April 13, 1956. This editorial is as follows:

SOUTH ISN'T THE ONLY REGION EXPERIENCING RACIAL TENSION

The problem of harmonious relations between the races and the question of segregation versus integration are quite rapidly becoming matters for serious concern in communities outside the South.

Two recent incidents bear out this fact.

First was the report of Chicago Welfare Commissioner Alvin Rose that more than 75 percent of the 48,000 persons on that city's relief roles are Negroes and that an estimated 2,500 Negroes are migrating into Chicago each month.

This influx from the South has brought with it problems of its own because the older

Chicago Negro residents do not welcome the newcomers.

These racial tensions in Chicago, now being intensified, already had exploded on various occasions in the recent past, particularly in the Trumbull Park housing project, where the first Negro family moved in August 1953. At the height of the disorders which followed 1,100 policemen, or one-seventh of the Chicago force, were assigned to the 462-family project.

The other incident was last week's mob which demonstrated in one of Detroit's white neighborhoods in protest to what it thought was a Negro couple which had bought a house and moved in. Actually the husband said he was a 70-year-old Cherokee Indian and his wife of Scotch-Irish descent. But the crowd thought they were Negroes.

The question which promptly arises is, if such protests are aroused in Detroit, a city just recently rated as the Nation's best in the field of Negro integration, how can anyone outside the South fail to understand similar protests in this region?

The important point is, of course, that expressions of opposition be kept within the bounds of established law and order. Mob action is not within those bounds.

Disorders in one region by no means justify disorders in another. Rather, they emphasize that it is the entire Nation, not solely the South or any other single region, which is confronted with the necessity for mutually amicable relations between the races.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed regrettable that the floor of the House of Representatives must every so often serve as the forum for bowing and scraping in election years to such radical organizations as the NAACP, the ADA, and their associates. The spectacle which was presented here last week is simply a repetition of what we have had in the past, and of what no doubt, we will continue to have in the future, until the long-suffering public becomes surfeited with these political plays to appease organized minorities, and in turn do some organizing themselves, to put these radical organizations and their political sponsors out of the American picture.

This proposed legislation is absurd and ridiculous on its face. It is not only absurd and ridiculous; it is patently unconstitutional, and if it should be adopted—which it will not—it would be a blow at local self-government and the rights of the States to conduct their own local affairs.

University Settlement Celebrates its 70th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the University Settlement of New York City is celebrating the 70th anniversary of its founding this year. This is a significant occasion for all settlement and neighborhood houses in the United States, for the founding of the University Settlement in 1886, marked the beginning of the settlement movement in America.

On the occasion of this 70th anniversary, it is well for us to consider the significance of this movement in relation to the social welfare of our American communities. Today there are over 800 settlements and neighborhood houses in most of the States of the Union, the District of Columbia and the Territory of Hawaii. Settlements and neighborhood centers are agencies which offer a great variety of services. They exist to serve the social needs of persons in given geographical neighborhoods. The neighborhood, itself, is actually the client of the settlement.

City planners and housing officials, as well as real estate operators and industrialists, know how important "the neighborhood" is to living conditions and to property values. It is, however, the importance of neighborhood environment in the growth and development of our children and our youth, that is the neighborhood's greatest significance. Every effort to rebuild neighborhoods and to regenerate neighborly relations among people is, therefore, close to the hearts of all Americans.

While the need for social reform may seem less dramatic than it was when Stanton Coit founded the University Settlement, improvement of living conditions is still one of the main objectives of settlements. This the settlement attempts to accomplish in cooperation with its neighbors.

The settlement seeks to strengthen family life; create a feeling of neighborliness by helping individuals and groups relate to each other; seeks to develop indigenous leadership and integrate a local neighborhood with its city, State, and the Nation. In its attempt to carry out these objectives the settlement works with a cross section of all cultural, racial, religious, and age groups in its neighborhood. These common purposes are the cord which binds all settlements together. Beyond these common purposes, settlements are apt to be more different from one another than they are alike. This is due primarily to the differences in neighborhoods in which settlements are located. The program and the specific objectives of a settlement are the result of neighborhood needs.

Settlements are commonly thought of as serving economically depressed areas. However, since the settlement approach of working with all persons in a neighborhood and all members of a family is effective, the demand for settlement services is increasing in many kinds of neighborhoods. Branches of existing settlements, or new neighborhood centers are spreading to suburban areas and communities.

It is my privilege to serve on the board of directors of the University Settlement, America's first and oldest settlement. I know well how it continues to pioneer in social welfare services, as do the other settlements in my district. We owe much to the settlements for their pioneering efforts. Many of our present social welfare laws had their initial inspiration and actual basis in the neighborhood work and studies made by our settlement houses. They have done much to weld our many peoples into one. They have been the birthplace of our energetic and growing profession of social work, and they have been the harbingers of our Nation's social conscience.

Settlements are the grass roots of our democracy; a place where neighbors strive not only to raise their standards of living, but of equal importance, where neighbors seek to raise the standard of living together.

I wish to extend my greetings and best wishes on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University Settlement and the founding of the settlement movement in America.

Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follows a letter addressed to me by Mr. Karl G. Page, of Idaho Falls, Idaho. It is a most excellent letter and merits the attention of every Member of the Congress:

THE OUTDOORSMAN,
Idaho Falls, Idaho, July 7, 1956.

The Honorable HAMER H. BUDGE,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUDGE: I have had the opportunity of making a study of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I find them most impressive.

As a small-business man and an American father, I find economy a most vital part of my daily considerations. In the management of my business and my home life, I find there are many things that I would like, which we cannot afford. As a result, we put first things first and eliminate many expenditures for things which we feel we can live without. I feel very strongly that the management of the United States Government is merely a many times magnified operation of my own small setup. With inflation and high taxes taking so much from our standard of living, I feel that it is pitiful to have unnecessary Government waste making even deeper gouges.

Won't you please exert every effort and lend all of your good offices toward adoption of these Hoover Commission recommendations which could make such wonderful savings for our Government, for our country, and for me, a small American businessman?

Sincerely yours,

KARL G. PAGE.

PRICE OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The Public Printer is authorized to furnish to subscribers the daily RECORD at $1.50 per month, payable in advance.

Remit by money order payable to Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed 137 measures on calendar call and numerous other sundry bills, by unanimous vote of 86 yeas adopted resolution in opposition to Red China admission to U. N.

House passed civil-rights bill, adopted conference report on supplemental appropriations and passed sundry bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 12664–12670

Bills Introduced: 9 bills and 2 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4268–S. 4276; S. J. Res. 201; and S. Res. 322. Pages 12665–12666

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows: The following bills were reported July 21 during recess of Senate under prior authorization:

H. R. 1739 and S. 1783, private bills (S. Repts. 2748 and 2749);

(S. Rept. 2750 was reported July 21 under "Bills Reported" in DIGEST of Saturday, July 21);

S. 4211, to assist the States in establishing State committees on education beyond high school, with amendments (S. Rept. 2751);

H. R. 9547, amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to simplify procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under such act (S. Rept. 2752);

H. R. 11695, to extend to June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities, with amendments (S. Rept. 2753);

H. R. 11122, to promote the development and rehabilitation of the coastwise trade and to encourage the construction of new vessels, with amendments (S. Rept. 2754);

S. 1494, conveyance of certain lands at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., with amendments (S. Rept. 2755);

H. R. 4127, to amend the Korean GI bill of rights concerning courses of instruction which have been in operation for less than 2 years (S. Rept. 2756);

S. 3438, 2647, 3230, H. R. 8008, S. 1355, 2599, H. R. 4899, 1952, private bills (S. Repts. 2757–2764, respectively);

S. 4267, providing assistance to State and local juvenile delinquency programs (S. Rept. 2765); and

S. Res. 320, authorizing additional expenditures by Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (no written report), referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

The following bills were reported today:

S. 728, providing assistance to States in programs for control of juvenile delinquency, with amendments (S. Rept. 2766);

S. J. Res. 180, providing for reappointment of Arthur H. Compton as Citizen Regent of Board of Regents of Smithsonian Institution (S. Rept. 2767);

S. Res. 320, authorizing additional expenditures by Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments (S. Rept. 2768);

Report of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on television inquiry with respect to allocation phase, with independent views (S. Rept. 2769);

S. Res. 312, increasing limit of expenditures for hearings by Committee on Armed Services ($10,000) (no written report);

S. Res. 315, authorizing increase in expenditures for Committee on Foreign Relations ($10,000) (no written report);

S. Res. 318, authorizing printing of additional copies of S. Doc. 83 entitled "Critical Materials" for use of Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 254, authorizing printing of additional copies of House Reports No. 2240–2244 (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 261, authorizing printing of additional copies of hearings on civil defense for national survival by House Committee on Government Operations (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 262, authorizing printing of 40,000 additional copies of hearings by Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Progress Report on Research in Medicine,

Appendix

A Tribute to a Great American Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written of late about missiles, air power, atomic warfare, and modern war. I would like to speak briefly about the oldest of all of our services in the defense family, the United States Army. I could say many things about the Army, its role in the atomic era and the senior officers now directing its destiny. Today I intend to confine my remarks to one of these leaders, although similar remarks could easily be applied to numerous others. This officer is an outstanding expert in the field of modern war. He is not an old man in years. Quite to the contrary, he is still in the rich vigor of middle age. But he is old in experience in war. I am speaking, sir, of that gallant son of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, who is claimed by that great State as her ambassador, Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, of the United States Army.

This outstanding officer, this intrepid combat leader, this brilliant thinker and strategist, has lived and fought and risen in his chosen profession in the truest American tradition. The orphan son of Irish immigrants, James Maurice Gavin enlisted in the United States Army at the age of 17. Within a year, he had reached the first stage of his cherished goal, an appointment to the United States Military Academy. He was graduated from the Academy and commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry on June 13, 1929. Instead of listing each detail of General Gavin's early career I want to quote to you an extract from the introduction of a book written by him shortly after the close of World War II. This introduction was written by his close friend, Maj. Gen. William C. Lee. Here is what he had to say:

It was a hot sultry day in August when Captain James M. Gavin, thirty-four years of age, reported for duty with the Provisional Parachute Group at Fort Benning, Georgia. As a former enlisted man in the Regular Army and as a graduate of the United States Military Academy of the class of 1929, his service had been varied and broadening. His friends spoke exceedingly well of him, and he impressed his associates with his quiet dignified bearing, his appearance of lean physical toughness, and his keen and penetrating mind. His work as a battalion officer marked him for greater responsibilities and promotion to major, and then to lieutenant colonel.

The rapid expansion of our airborne forces, immediately after the attack at Pearl Harbor, created many strange and complex problems and a vast amount of work. The activiation of new units, the development of new types of weapons and equipment, new tactics and new methods of training were only a few of the arduous difficulties that confronted the builders of new forces. Mistakes were made and many of them, but the building seems to have been fundamentally sound. No one man or no small group of men can be credited with this achievement. Many men and many elements made the project successful. But in the last anslysis the burden of building this great new force fell on the shoulders of the staffs of the Airborne Command of the Ground Forces and the Troop Carrier Command of the Air Forces, and on those staff officers in Washington who directed the planning on the higher levels. These were the architects and not the least of them was Gavin.

In the building of this force Gavin was a dynamo of intelligent energy. As the head of the Plans and Training Section of the Parachute Group, and later the Airborne Command, he wrote many of our basic training doctrines and our first textbooks on airborne training and tactics. By late 1942 he had received his colonelcy and the command of his own regiment. In January 1943, his regiment was assigned to the 82d Airborne Division, and on the night of July 9 of that year he commanded the airborne combat team which spearheaded the American assault of Sicily. This book is Gavin's story of that assault as well as all the airborne combat that followed until the end of the war, and it is his interpretation of those events as applied to future war.

From Sicily to Italy to England, Jim Gavin continued to pioneer, and to win his battles. In rising from colonel to brigadier general, he continued to learn warfare. As airborne adviser to the Supreme Allied Commander in London, he was determined that costly mistakes made in Sicily must not be repeated in Normandy. Upon his arrival in England from Italy, he was immediately enmeshed in the intricate details of operational plans of the Allied airborne forces, working closely with the British and American airborne commanders. The success of those forces on D-day is all the evidence needed of the brilliancy of his work. As assistant division commander of the 82d Airborne Division he led the assault parachute echelon of that division into Normandy. And later, on the elevation of Maj. Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, the division commander, to the command of the airborne corps, Gavin was made division commander and a major general at the age of 37. He commanded the division throughout the rest of the war in its brilliantly successful operations in Holland, Belgium, and Germany. As a young and dynamic commander he represents, to my mind, the type of American leadership produced in our greatest war.

In his book, entitled, "Airborne Warfare," General Gavin wrote the lessons of airborne troops of World War II and he wrote of things to come. He wrote of modern war as he conceived it. He recognized then the importance of air forces; however, he went on to assert that "despite the opinions of advocates of victory solely through airpower such as Douhet and De Seversky, I believe that any bombing or guided missile attack will need a human follow-up force to exploit the disorganization and chaos that future bomb and missile attacks will cause." Today, General Gavin's thinking goes far beyond these earlier thoughts. And since those days as commander of the famous 82d Airborne Division, General Gavin has served in a variety of important posts, each of which has helped to prepare him particularly well for his present assignment as the Chief of Research and Development of the United States Army.

Upon his departure from the 82d Division in 1948, he was appointed Chief of Staff of the Fifth Army until 1949, when he came to Washington to serve as Army member of the Weapons Systems Evaluation Group in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. This service accomplished three things for the general: First, it widened his contact with many forward-looking senior officers from the sister services; second, it provided an exceptional opportunity to study the viewpoint of many outstanding civilian scientists; and third, it gave him an opportunity to observe and influence the development of future weapons, thus better equipping him for his present assignment. One of his most important contributions during this period was the preparation of a staff study, which resulted in a decision to manufacture the 280 millimeter atomic cannon.

In June 1951 General Gavin again went overseas where he served initially as Chief of Staff of the Allied Forces in Southern Europe. In December of 1952 he assumed command of the United States VII Corps in Germany. This important command position gave the general an opportunity to explore some of the many theories of modern war which he had developed as a result of constant study. In the international maneuvers held under the direction of the Supreme Allied Commander, General Gavin introduced into his scheme of maneuver the first planned control of forces operating under conditions of atomic warfare. In this maneuver, General Gavin attempted to reduce the number of simulated casualties by using highly dispersed formations operating over extended distances with improved communications techniques. This means of control was utilized not only in cross-country movements and in open warfare, but also in the assault of cities, river crossings and other types of combat action. In these operations, General Gavin was limited somewhat by the existing tables of organization and by the equipment available for his use.

That he found these limitations onerous cannot be doubted for, as he was concluding this assignment as corps commander, he wrote his widely read, frequently quoted article for Harper's magazine, "Cavalry, and I Don't Mean Horses," in which he lamented the lack of true mobility in the army of today. During the years after the war, he wrote extensively concerning his beliefs, and his writings have been widely read by officers anxious to develop new methods of applying the principles of war. None can doubt that his writings have had a deep influence on his many readers.

When he left Germany in 1954, he was assigned back to Washington where he has served ever since. The first assignment given General Gavin upon his return from Europe was in the office of the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–3, of the Department of the Army. While in this position, the major contributions of General Gavin to the improvement of the Army and thus the advancement of national security were as follows:

First. His insistence throughout his tenure of office that the Army be "forward thinking" and establish the goals in mobility, fire power, and communications toward which it should be striving for the next 15 years.

Second. His insistence that the Army be organized for the prosecution of either a general war or a localized, "brush fire" war.

Third. His efforts to expose the fallacy that ground forces are no longer required to win a war.

As a result, General Gavin exerted an Army-wide influence on organization, mobility, fire power, and communications. The organization of the new Infantry and Armored Divisions which were recently tested, was influenced by his thinking. In addition, he, along with other senior officers of the Army emphasized the role of Army Aviation and helped lift it to its present position of importance stressing that in order to achieve true mobility the Army must utilize aircraft characterized by the ability to employ either vertical or short take-off and landing techniques in the accomplishment of Army missions.

In March 1955 General Gavin was designated Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Research of the Department of the Army and promoted to the grade of Lieutenant General. Here he continued to look for new concepts. He strove to convince his fellow officers that the Army must get away from the idea of a fixed line of battle. General Gavin preached what he had written years before in his book Airborne Warfare, that "dispersion must govern all operations of the future." He emphasized, as he had for years that dispersion and mobility must be the basis for successful combat operations in the atomic era. "Only thus," said he, "can tactical units survive in the battle area."

On October 10, 1955, General Gavin was appointed Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the Army with status as a Deputy Chief of Staff. Here, in this post, newly created as a result of a reorganization of the Army Staff, the general found himself at the very fountainhead as far as new weapons and equipment are concerned. Just as his thinking had helped influence the evolution of tactical organizations, his fertile mind now was free to study Army requirements for new materiel. As on of the Army's leading proponents for streamlined and modernized ground forces, his selection has been fully justified. General Gavin has used a number of important guidelines in his present work, guidelines which reflect the Army point of view and help channel his efforts in the research and development field. The most important of these are as follows:

First. The United States must develop visible strength-in-being adequate to convince any enemy that aggression will fail. This strength must be real and tangible—and must be tridimensional—on the ground, in the air, and on the sea. This means a ready, mobile, hard-hitting modern United States Army capable of moving by land, sea, or air, anywhere in the world to deal with any threat the United States Government may decide to meet.

Second. Present military programs which generally make adequate provisions for the strength and capabilities necessary to deter general or total war involving the unrestricted use of nuclear weapons must also provide adequate means to deter aggression short of general war, and to deter general or total war in which the use of nuclear weapons is outlawed or restricted.

Third. With its inherent versatility, the Army is capable of applying force with discrimination, accurately, in the right amount, at the right time, in all types of weather and terrain.

Fourth. Variety of armament gives the Army its most outstanding and valuable characteristic: flexibility and selectivity in application of military power.

Fifth. While there are obvious practical and psychological difficulties in employing atomic weapons, the Army must seek ways and means of restricting their killing power to the battlefield, and to military targets.

Sixth. The Army will be able to cope with any military problem that may confront it in the atomic age, given adequate manpower, firepower, mobility, and logistic support.

In translating these concepts into tangible programs, he has sought the development of small-yield atomic weapons, recognizing the dangers inherent in attempting to wage war through the use of thermonuclear devices. He has moved the Army along its way in the missile field, pointing out that such systems were after all only an evolution of conventional artillery. He is aware of the vital importance of protecting the continental United States with such weapons as the Nike family. He has helped make clear that the Army's know-how in the missiles field fitted it for development of an intermediate range ballistic missile, an act which resulted in the establishment of the Jupiter project, a joint undertaking of the Army and the Navy. In addition, he has directed the undertaking of one of the most challenging and difficult tasks which confront the Nation today, the development of an antimissile missile.

In connection with the development of an intermediate-range ballistic missile, the joint Army and Navy effort, called Jupiter, is using the fruits of 6 years of Army experience with the Redstone missile, and it is also making use of some of the world's most eminent scientists in the missile field. The advantages which Redstone experience offers to the Army include the fact that many of the components to be used in the Jupiter program are already proven components as a result of flight testing of the Redstone.

The Army is carrying forward its responsibilities for the development of the missile system for Jupiter under methods of maximum urgency, and is confident that it will achieve the first 1,500-mile ballistic missile capability in the Western World.

As for the antimissile missile, in 1953, the Army foresaw the forthcoming threat of the ballistic missile and the Army initiated studies at that time with the objective of developing weapons systems capable of successfully attacking these missiles.

While the Army appreciates the magnitude and complexity of the problem of developing a successful antimissile missile, General Gavin and his staff are convinced that they can develop systems to counter the ballistic missile.

While the difficulties and complexities of these problems seem almost insoluble, I assure you that I have the utmost confidence in the Army and the members of its staff to whom these matters are entrusted. And in closing I say also that, should this Nation again come under the scourge of war, Gen. James M. Gavin and his colleagues in the Army will be among the principal architects to bring victory to American arms.

A Cable Car Ride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a reprint of an article which appeared in the Little City News, of San Francisco, Calif. With so many of my colleagues planning to visit the city I represent, I would like to be sure that they do not miss one of the most colorful experiences available. The following article vividly portrays the panorama to be seen from one of our fabulous cable cars:

Thrills and excitement: Yes, there's no doubt about it, you can roam the world over and never find more excitement and thrills than a ride on the Powell and Mason Street cable car offers—a visit to metropolitan San Francisco, sophisticated Nob Hill, mysterious and exotic Chinatown, picturesque Little Italy, and colorful Fisherman's Wharf. All this on a quaint, yet jaunty, cable car—a ride that truly is the eighth wonder of the world.

Cable car melody: To begin our journey, we board our cable car at the Powell and

Market turntable. Our conductor clangs the bell twice, the signal for the motorman to begin our ride. Our cable car slowly makes its way up Powell—a street bedecked with small shops, hotels, picturesque outdoor flower stands, and street corner news vendors shouting the latest headline. We come to Union Square, a beautiful block-long park, where people sit on benches happily feeding the pigeons. Our cable car rapidly starts to climb the steep Powell Street hill. We have left behind the hustle and bustle of downtown San Francisco, and now have reached statuesque and sedate Nob Hill. Here are two world-famous landmarks: The Mark Hopkins Hotel with its renowned Top of the Mark, where tourists and natives alike can relax while looking down at the magnificent view of the city by the Golden Gate, and the Fairmont Hotel, where famous personalities of the political and entertainment world stroll through the plush lobby daily.

A little of the Orient: As our cable car proceeds north on Powell Street and within a few blocks of Nob Hill, we find ourselves entering upon a completely new and unusual world—the world of Chinatown. Just a short walk from our cable car ride is the heart of this community—the largest Chinese settlement in the United States. It is an area with many small gift shops offering the public everything from real Chinese silk to the latest model chopsticks. Chinese restaurants offer not only the chop suey variety but also serve authetic Chinese food. And in these small crowded streets, one often sees Chinese women walking in their long oriental style silk dresses. Even though you are in America, you can walk around this area all day and hardly hear a word of English spoken.

Little Italy: Our cable car swings up Jackson Street and after one short block suddenly turns right on Mason Street. Within a matter of seconds, we leave colorful Chinatown and enter North Beach, commonly referred to as "Little Italy." Our cable car travels down the steep Mason Street hills. While descending, we can look straight out into San Francisco Bay and at a small island called Alcatraz, the Nation's maximum Federal security prison. Proceding down these hills we find ourselves in the residential heart of North Beach. Within a few blocks of our cable car ride are North Beach's world-famous Italian restaurants with their strictly old world flavor. These restaurants, at times described as more Italian than their counterparts in Italy, range from the six course $1.50 Italian dinner featuring minestrone, spaghetti, and ravioli, to the exclusive Italian restaurants offering the thickest of steaks along with the best of Italian food and desserts. If you would care to roam around North Beach, say in the Columbus Avenue and Green Street section, you will soon notice that there's also more Italian spoken there than English. And if you are still in the roving mood, you would notice more than a dozen Italian pastry shops, featuring creamy Italian delicacies along with sweet Italian imported fancy candies. This, too, is a district where you can also buy real Italian-made olive oil, numerous varieties of tangy cheese and real Italian salami that will make your mouth water for more.

Entertainment galore: In the evening North Beach is a mecca for tourists the world over. Keeping with the Italian flavor, North Beach boasts of night clubs featuring operatic music along with niteries presenting the biggest names in show business. It's also a district crowded with struggling artists and writers, all patiently marking time until their names become a household word.

Fisherman's wharf: Coming back to our cable-car ride down Mason Street in North Beach, our car suddenly swings from Mason Street to Taylor Street and in 5 short minutes we're at the end of the line, Taylor and Bay Streets, just a few blocks from world-famous Fisherman's Wharf. Here, enterprising restaurateurs have built colorful restaurants alongside the wharf overlooking the brightly painted fishing boats. One can dine at these restaurants, choosing from a variety of over 100 authentic fish dishes, while looking out into the water with the bobbing fishing boats. After dinner, you walk around Fisherman's Wharf, watch the fishermen mending their nets, swab their boats, and get ready for the night's expedition. Around the wharf, the majority of fishermen and restaurant owners are Italian, still clinging to much of the European atmosphere. There are many fisherman's wharfs throughout the country, but in the hearts and minds of many people, there is only one Fisherman's Wharf and that's in San Francisco.

A never-forgotten ride: As we said in the beginning, you can travel the entire world over, see many sights, visit many European cities, but you will never match the sheer excitement and thrills that a ride on the Powell and Mason cable car can offer—a ride loaded with the true atmosphere of San Francisco.

Educational Danger Signals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert a timely and excellent address by Dr. Andersen Arbury at Alma College, in my State of Michigan, entitled: "Educational Danger Signals." It is a discussion of certain trends dangerous not only to education but to the security of the Nation in a day when that security is dependent upon a sound educational base.

Dr. Arbury is one of the leading orthodontists of Michigan who, as a citizen and as a member of the county school board of Midland County for a number of years, has interested himself in public education. His address reflects the devotion of private citizens of this high type to the preservation of sound educational standards.

The address follows:

It is an honor to appear on this fine program as a representative of the fathers and mothers of students in Alma College. I am proud to be one of the parents whose sons and daughters are privileged to live and work and learn here.

And what a privilege that is in our troubled world! More than 800 million people are today living in intellectual darkness behind Iron or Bamboo Curtains. They have buildings called universities, gangsters called professors, and tragic students brain-washed to deny God and to believe in scientific violence, treachery, and crime as educational resources for subjugating the globe to communism. By contrast, an American institution of learning like Alma College is a beacon light of hope on a dark and stormy sea.

Here at Alma are the really precious years of life—the years when young men and women, who must soon shoulder the burdens of adult existence, gather the value they will need to cope with the future. Here is inexhaustible deposit is knowledge—civilization's greatest treasure and inheritance of the past. Here is one place in life where the goals are clean, honorable, and unalloyed—a place where standards should be steady as rocks and clearly recognizable. The years our children spend here, and the moral and intellectual foundation they build within these walls, can guide them and give them balance when the pattern of life grows more intricate and the paths forward seem uncertain.

But I would be less than honest if I did not tell you that all is not well with American education today. Even as late as my father's day, the Nation's public school system was the pride of every community. Centers of higher learning were universally respected. The whole American educational system, from the first day of the grade school through baccalaureate day, functioned to cultivate in future citizens sound judgment based upon disciplined thinking and thorough knowledge. It is through such thinking that the human race has progressed from caves, and the nurture of such thinking is the great objective of sound education.

But today many parents are worried about the educational process. Numbers do not even know what is happening. Yet danger signals are flying in every direction. Look at our public schools. The three R's used to be considered indispensable. Now certain influential school administrators say that they are not really important, and in many public schools much less attention is being given to them. The result is that the public schools are turning out in increasing numbers young people who are practically illiterate and who are unable to do the simplest problems in arithmetic. Typical of those inducing this incompetency in your child and mine is the educator who not so long ago, in a bulletin of the powerful National Association of Secondary-School Principals, openly ridiculed the idea that every student should know the multiplication tables before graduation.

The time-honored discipline of history is also in peril. A distinguished American philosopher has said that "those who cannot remember the past are doomed to repeat it". It is history which illuminates the mistakes of the past to guide our charting of the future. But there is a definite tendency to minimize the importance of history in the curriculum—to set students adrift in a world where past experience is regarded as of little value. Could it be that the playing down of historical knowledge has a darker purpose behind it—that the principle of statism can be better imprinted on young and unsuspecting minds if its long failure in world history can be kept hidden from them? There are scholars who say this is so.

Geometry, physics, and chemistry were once highly valued for training the observational and analytical powers of the mind and for interesting students in scientific work as a career—work which today is vital to our national security. But these disciplines, too, are losing out in the public schools. A recent survey shows that nearly one-half the high schools of the nation no longer have formal courses in geometry, physics, and chemistry. The survey comments that if "public school pupils are given such a little encouragement to study basic science courses, they are not likely to go on to advanced ones". And right now our great scientific societies are expressing "a deep concern about a national shortage of physicists and scientists in general." You may be sure that the Kremlin appreciates educational policies of the free world which restrict the supply of scientists. In Russia the search is ceaseless for youthful scientific talent to multiply the potential of its vast war machine.

But what is curtailing or pushing out the old disciplines in the public schools? The answer is: Numerous courses under a general caption called education in life adjustment. We find fifth graders discussing "human rights," and teen-agers the merits of Supreme Court decisions or the causes

and cure of unemployment, without any solid background of knowledge to guide their thinking on these difficult problems. In other courses trivia are heaped on trivia. The purpose seems clear: to pry the secondary school curriculum loose from the established disciplines of science and scholarship—to wrench education from its sane, traditional orbit.

And the result today? Dr. Arthur Bestor, professor of history at the University of Illinois, points out that across the public schools "stretches an iron curtain that professional educators have fashioned. Behind it, in virtual slave-labor camps, are classroom teachers, whose only hope of rescue is from without. On the hither side lies the free world of science and learning, menaced but not yet conquered." And Dr. Bestor puts his finger on the cause of this misdirection of American intellectual life. He says it is possible because the first 12 grades "of formal schooling (from the elementary grades through the high school) are likely to have fallen under the policymaking control of professional educators who have no real place in—who do not respect, and whose learning is not respected by—the world of science, of scholarship, and of the learned professions."

Ironically, our educational revolutionists are never weary of speaking about "education for the atomic age." Yet they actually propose to train citizens to decide intricate public questions posed by science, to solve complex industrial problems, and to deal with global upheavals, by turning out pupils deficient in the three R's, with only a smattering of history and science, and with minds incapable of disciplined thinking. It would all be ridiculous if it were not so dangerous.

But now, how does all this affect our colleges? First, radical educators entrenched in the public schools want to do away with college entrance requirements. Why? So that they may be free to eliminate or drastically reduce intellectual training in the secondary schools. They want colleges to adopt admission standards which do not specify the courses students are to take in high school. Why? So that institutions of higher learning may become accessories to the crime of the stunted mind. To our new educational medicine men, systematic knowledge is a waste of time—just as "bacteriology is so much learned nonsense to the happy faith healer."

Second, over and above all I have said, there is the further and separate problem of the slanted social science textbook. This is the textbook that boosts socialism while misrepresenting to immature minds the basic tenets of Americanism—tenets which made America the greatest free society with the highest standards of living the world has ever known. I am told that it is very difficult to find an unslanted social science textbook in the secondary schools, and that this difficulty is spreading to the colleges.

Perhaps there are some here who read a letter recently printed in the Wall Street Journal from a young college student in Iowa who rose in rebellion against an economics textbook. This book was prepared by a group of American teachers and is in use in over 200 universities and colleges. It advocates a great deal more Government control in business and denounces the private enterprise system as sheer, stark selfishness, even though through that system the common man has achieved more prosperity in two centuries than in the thousands of years that went before. The book praises the logic of Karl Marx's teachings as irrefutable, although Marx's economic logic has long been exploded by scholars and despite the fact that, in all of history, no society whose economic life was dominated by government has ever been either productive or free. Debt and borrowing and more borrowing are praised as good things, and students are instructed that people owe it to themselves to spend more than they earn. Think of it.

It is time for me to stop. There is much I could not tell you, but I think I have told you enough to warn you that a determined effort is underway to destroy sound values in education. Some sectors of American education have already succumbed. Others are weakening. But there are still the unconquered, and there are encouraging signs that parents and teachers and trustees and whole communities are waking up and that the battle is not yet lost.

In closing, may I express to you, President Harker, my confidence that Alma College, under your able leadership, will uphold high standards of learning and will successfully resist those who would subvert education to undermine our great heritage of freedom.

Ukrainian Political Prisoners in Soviet Concentration Camps Write Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editors of the National Review, a weekly journal of opinion, under date of August 1, 1956, in a special supplement included letters from two groups of Ukrainian political prisoners who are confined in Soviet concentration camps. As part of my remarks, I am including a statement by the editor and thereafter an open letter from one group of prisoners and following that, a letter from women political prisoners addressed to all Ukrainians in the free world.

The matter follows:

THEY SPEAK FOR THE SILENT—STATEMENT OF THE EDITOR

In order that they may become part of the historical record of our time National Review here makes public two documents as remarkable in their origin as in their content. They were written by two groups of Ukrainian political prisoners at the Soviet concentration camp complex located in Mordovia, about 400 miles southeast of Moscow.

The original Ukrainian texts, dated September and October 1955, are painstakingly written, in a purple that rather looks like the old-fashioned indelible pencil marking, on pieces of linen cloth that may have been torn from the lining of a coat or dress. Such writing on cloth, which lends itself to concealment, is a classic underground device.

So concealed, the pieces of linen made their slow, hazardous journey westward. By stages that cannot, of course, be revealed, the documents finally reached a representative in Western Europe of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council (UHVR), the governing committee of the Ukrainian underground. From Europe the documents were brought to Mr. Mikola Lebed, Secretary General for Foreign Affairs of the UHVR. Mr. Lebed is well known to us. We have inspected the original texts and have gone over with him and his associates the history of their transmission.

The first of the documents is addressed to the United Nations and Mr. Lebed is now endeavoring to bring it formally and forcefully to U. N. attention. The second, less formal, is intended primarily for Ukrainian refugees and emigres in countries outside the Soviet Empire.

We call particular attention to the continuity here revealed in the internal measure of the Stalin and the post-Stalin regimes. The concentration camp system continues as a basic institution in the Soviet structure The proclaimed amnesty of 1953 applied only to prisoners with sentences under 10 years. Most of these were not allowed to return home, but were forced to remain as compulsory settlers in the penal regions.

These documents are the first to disclose that revolts in the camps began before Stalin's death. In the autumn of 1952 they were started in the Karaganda camp system by former soldiers of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army, the force that fought first against the Reichswehr and then against the Bolsheviks, and which still fights from the underground. The 1953 strike in the Vorkuta complex, hitherto thought to be the first, was led by 300 of the insurgents who had been transferred from Karaganda. Further strikes followed in Noril'sk, Vorkuta again, the Kingir camps (in Kazakhstan) the camps of Verkhnoye-Imbatskoye and Mirnoye, from 1953 on into the present. The Kingir strikes lasted for 2½ months in 1954, and (according to the direct testimony of the Hungarian Dr. Fedor Varkonyi, here confirmed) were suppressed finally when MVD used tanks to crush hundreds of the prisoners.

The first document asks: "Does the civilized world know that, over the mass burial sites of the prison camps, new camps and cities are built, canals are dug, and stadiums are erected, in order to obliterate the traces of these crimes?" This is presumably a thoughtful precaution of the Khrushchev-Bulganin regime as part of its preparation for receiving tourists and visitors from the West. We may recall that toward the end of World War II when it became probable that the Nazis were going to be defeated, the Gestapo carried through a similar construction program in the attempt to conceal the mass slaughters in their death camps.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS, DIVISION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, AND TO THE ENTIRE CIVILIZED WORLD, FROM THE PRISONERS IN CAMPS IN THE U. S. S. R.

We, the prisoners in the Mordovian special camps, wish to bring the following statement to the attention of the entire civilized world.

We, Ukranians, are in favor of any movement whose aims are freedom and truth; we advocate cultural progress in all walks of life, and we stand behind self-determination for all nations, including the United Ukranian state.

We have no desire to exaggerate the facts of the situation that has long existed in Ukraine. We do not ask for mercy or pardon. We demand our right to live under laws that should be recognized by the entire civilized world—the world of 20th-century civilization. This civilization has been spearheaded by a number of humanitarian elements, from small groups on up through national leaders. They include the great world-wide organization, the United Nations.

Our Ukrainian Nation, like a number of other nations, has come under the conquering heel of Red Russia. We have been deprived of the basic rights of existence. We have been driven into camps, with severe sentences of from 10 to 25 years—not for criminal acts, as the Bolsheviks maintain before the rest of the world; not for arson, treason, or murder; but because we, like every freedom-loving people, demand our lawful rights in our own land.

The question therefore arises: Does the civilized world know about the conditions prevailing not only among us prisoners, but throughout our country? Does the civilized world know that, when we have served our sentences, we are exiled to the so-called vir-

gin lands of Kazakhstan, Krasnoyarsk, and the Far North—while they proclaim that it is volunteers and members of the Komsomol who go out to those areas?

Can the civilized world conceive of Ukrainian sovereignty without a Ukrainian government, without a Ukrainian army, and without the Ukrainian people? If Ukraine is sovereign—and she should be—why is there no army composed exclusively of Ukrainians? Why do Ukrainians serve their terms in the army beyond the borders of their country? Why are military units composed of Russians and other nationalities to whom the interests of the Ukrainian people are alien, if not directly hostile, stationed in our country? If we are traitors and if our punishment is just, why were we tried by "peoples" or "military" courts, whose composition is certainly not Ukrainian? Why do we not serve our terms on Ukrainian territory, which was ravaged by the last war and is in need of reconstruction? Why do we have to work at the cultivation of wild, remote lands and forests, when there is such a need for our forces at home?

ON HUMAN BONES

Does the civilized world know that, over the mass burial sites of the prison camps, new camps and cities are built, canals are dug, and stadiums are erected, in order to obliterate the traces of these crimes? In Abez' (Komi ASSR), camps 1, 4, and 5 stand on former cemeteries. At Zavod 5 in Leplya (Mordovskaya ASSR), the first and second polishing shops, the technical laboratory, and the forge were erected on human bones. Does the world know about the mass executions of prisoners who only demanded their rights as political internees? (At mine 29 in Vorkuta, Attorney General Rudenko was in charge of the firing squads.) Is it known that, in Kingir (post-office box 392, colonies 1 and 3, Kazakhstan), men and women demanding their lawful rights were charged by four tanks and crushed by them?

Does the civilized world know that Ukraine has suffered starvation for 38 years, in addition to the artificial famine of 1933; that western Ukraine has been inundated by floods, and that the people have been condemned to death by starvation, with no hope of aid from humanitarian, peace-loving Communist Russia? This at a time when millions of tons of grain are exported abroad for propaganda purposes, when all sorts of foreign delegations visit model collective farms (special display models) and factories in the U. S. S. R.

In the postwar period (1945–55), Russia has raised the level of light and heavy industry beyond the prewar level. This was accomplished by a toll of millions of prisoners. Those prisoners raised the issue of improved living conditions—an improvement essential for any creature that breathes air (after between 9 and 11 hours of work in the mines, the prisoners were shut up like cattle in close, stinking barracks furnished with the well-known slop buckets). Some of these prisoners were shot, others were crushed by tanks. Many of them received additional sentences of from 10 to 25 years and were put in jail, where they are to this day.

This is addressed to the civilized world of the 20th century—a century of education and progress. We feel certain that anyone who reads these lines will experience revulsion and contempt for the "just and humanitarian" Communist Party of Russia and the crimes committed against the nations it has enslaved.

We are not discouraged, because we know that our will for freedom is founded on natural law, and we believe that the entire civilized world will uphold us in our course.

RESOLUTIONS

Bearing in mind the foregoing points, we, the prisoners in the Mordovian special camps, have adopted the following resolutions:

"I

"(a) A commission should be appointed for precise verification of the facts as we have stated them: that Attorney General Rudenko and Deputy Minister of the MVD Maslennikov were distinguished by the cruelty of their conduct in Vorkuta and Noril'sk in 1953, and in Karaganda in 1954.

"(b) The fact that camps 1, 4, and 5 in Abez' (Komi A. S. S. R.) and Zavod 5 (Mordovskaya A. S. S. R.) were built on cemetery grounds should be verified. Similar cases are not hard to find—there are 44 such camps in this area.

"(c) We demand that the cemeteries be put in order, that the buildings and plants on them be razed, and that memorials be erected to the dead, as a symbol of perpetual shame to the Red slaveholders. Since members of all nationalities of the world are numbered among the dead, a special international organization should be established for the purpose of erecting these memorials.

"(d) We demand comprehensive social security for the orphans, widows, and parents (if they are not fit for work) of these victims of cruel injustice; also for those persons and their families who have suffered complete physical disability in camps and are unable to provide for themselves and their families.

"(e) Since an entire family is held responsible for an offense committed by one member (they are all subject to exile, deportation, confiscation of property) and a man's grandson as well as his son may suffer because of an act he himself committed, there have appeared castes of "reliables and unreliables." The "unreliables" live under constant oppression, persecution and misery. We therefore demand that these people be given back their rights as human beings, that they receive social security, and that they be permitted to return to their countries.

"(f) We demand that all persons who have served out their sentences be permitted to return to their native lands. We protest the passing of sentences up to 25 years on a mass basis, because such a sentence is a sentence for life.

"(g) All persons who underwent a second trial and were then transferred from camp to jail because of their participation in camp strikes or in any other form of mass or individual protest against the violation of their rights as political prisoners should be released from jail and their sentences annulled.

"(h) All desert lands, pits, mines, and forests that became part of the U. S. S. R. after their discovery or cultivation should belong to the nations whose sons and daughters worked on them and strewed them with their bones.

"II

"(a) We demand the establishment of an international control commission charged with the fair distribution of aid earmarked for underdeveloped countries and for disaster areas (including the U. S. S. R.).

"(b) We are wholeheartedly in favor of extending aid to all those who need it—regardless of their nationality, religion, race or political convictions. But we cannot agree that bread should be torn from the mouths of the starving and sent abroad as aid, when it is really for purposes of propaganda. This is done in the Soviet Union, at a time when millions of people are starving.

"III

"(a) Whereas every criminal act against the enslaved nations is perpetrated with the knowledge of the Politburo and of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union be brought before international justice.

"(b) Yezhov, Beria, Abakumov and others, whose execution was ordered by the security organs in order to deceive people at home and abroad, cannot be held responsible for everything, because crimes against the enslaved nations continue to be perpetrated.

"IV

"We, Ukrainians, make the following demands on purely nationalist grounds:

"(a) All Russian nationals shall be required to leave Ukrainian territory. They shall not be permitted to return until such time as Russia abandons her dream of denationalizing, assimilating and eventually devouring Ukraine—until she ceases to regard herself as Big Brother. It is a distortion of reality and of historical fact to speak of 'the union of Ukraine with Russia.' Ukraine has always been cruly enslaved by Russia.

"(b) We concede the right of other nationals—unless they have been sent by the Russian Government for aggressive purposes—to live on Ukrainian territory, enjoying equal rights with the Ukrainian people. Russians may live there only when they begin to be governed by general standards of morality.

"(c) As long as there are armed forces in the world, the only units stationed in Ukraine are to be composed exclusively of Ukrainians and under the command of Ukrainians; all soldiers and commanders not of Ukrainian extraction are to be withdrawn beyond the borders of our country. This also applies to the administrative and security organs of the MVD.

"(d) Anyone who violates the laws of Ukraine is to be tried before a Ukrainian people's or military court; if convicted, his sentence will be served within the national borders."

NOTE.—We request that the citizens of the world be informed of this letter by the United Nations, Division on Human Rights.

"We have signed with initials and pseudonyms, so as to forestall any possible consequences.

"(Signed by initials and pseudonyms of 5 deputies from the women's column and 8 deputies from the men's column of prisoners.)"

FROM WOMEN POLITICAL PRISONERS TO UKRAINIANS IN THE FREE WORLD

DEAR FRIENDS: We want to take advantage of this opportunity to tell you in brief what the Bolsheviks say about you—our political emigres of the last decade—in their so-called lectures and in recent articles in the press. We would also like to give the Ukrainians abroad who are not indifferent to our fate some idea of the conditions prevailing among political prisoners in special Soviet camps since the war.

Lectures on Ukrainian affairs are delivered by important officials in the Mordovian Party, and not by members of the administration of local special camps. The main point in what they have been saying about you is roughly as follows: Although the number of Ukrainian political emigres in the last decade has been small, the group is torn by dissension and split into many parties. They are politically shortsighted, and they no longer enjoy popularity among their people, whose support they have lost. They are not fighting for anything real—just for the capital letter "U." The Bolsheviks cite the names of our most prominent political leaders abroad, calling them "The most despicable betrayers of the Ukrainian people."

Lectures on Ukrainian affairs were recently discontinued. The reason may lie in the prisoners' dignified reaction to the Bolsheviks' tendentious distortion of historical fact. These lectures, held at unexpected times, caused us spiritual anguish. But at the same time, they were a welcome event, because they allowed us to think (correctly we hope) that our position in international politics had improved and that the Bolsheviks were therefore intensifying their propaganda efforts in the pertinent direction. Political prisoners of other nationalities in the Soviet

Union envy us without rancor, and they hope that we did not rejoice in vain.

Among recent printed works attacking us, first place is occupied in the libraries of the Mordovian special camps by the brochures of Halan (Selected Works, 1954), of Belyayev and of M. Rudnitskiy (Under Alien Banners). They are permeated with monstrous, unparalleled venom, bigotry, and hatred for everything Ukrainian and non-Communist.

Entire chapters in these libelous sheets are devoted to you, our political emigres of today. Emphasis is placed on internal disorder, dissensions, the struggle for power, the lust for gain, and political immaturity. Our attitude toward all forms of Bolshevik propaganda is the same. We are convinced that the written and the spoken word in the Soviet "prisons of nations" is hopelessly slanted. We firmly believe that, with the benefit of past experience, you will do your duty with honor—a moral duty imposed by the nation upon its political emigres; that your years in exile will not prove to be time lost; that you are using this time to good advantage and that you will return to Ukraine with your forces undiminished and with an awareness of all important theories successfully practiced in Europe and the rest of the world, so that our Nation may benefit from them. We believe that your long sojourn abroad will not diminish your longing for your country and that it will not make you want to live abroad for the rest of your lives.

COLD, FAMINE, OVERWORK

And now a few words about living conditions among political prisoners in Soviet special camps during the postwar years. The basic features of the Bolshevik prison camp system have not changed. Almost all of the special camps are located in areas where the climate is severe (Kolyma, Taymyr, Siberia, Komi, Kazakhstan). Sentences for political crimes very in length from 5 years (for a single attempt, as they say in jest, at "suspect" thought) to 25 years in so-called corrective labor camps, and from 15 to 20 years of penal servitude. In the immediate postwar period, famine, unendurably hard labor, and appalling sanitary conditions took a toll of thousands of political prisoners.

Again in 1948 a so-called strict regime was introduced in the special camps. The iron-barred barracks were locked at night. Correspondence was restricted to two letters per year. No one was permitted to keep cash. There were penal barracks. Prisoners were not allowed to wear their own clothing but had to wear prison uniforms with numbers on the back; they were not allowed to take notes from books, to engage in handicrafts, to assemble in large groups, and so forth. All this was coupled with 12 hours at hard labor and a deliberate increase in the work norms.

The unbearable living conditions brought about uprisings in certain camp centers—Vorkuta in 1953, Noril'sk in the spring and summer of 1953, and Kengir (Kazakhstan) in 1954. Over 40,000 prisoners of different nationalities took part in the uprisings. In suppressing them, the enemy used all kinds of weapons, including tanks. At the cost of several thousand comrades killed or wounded, we brought about the abolition of the stricter regime and the introduction of an 8-hour day.

In the last few years the Bolsheviks have paraded their humanitarianism before the world. They issued decres that also pertained to political prisoners, but most of them were not put into effect on a comprehensive scale (the decree releasing invalids from special camps, the "probationary" release of political prisoners who had served two-thirds of their terms). Following their release from special camps, prisoners can usually expect to be exiled to Siberia for an indefinite period.

In September of this year, an amnesty was declared for political prisoners who had collaborated with the Germans during the war. The official Bolshevik term for our nationalist prisoners is "Banderivtsi" or "Ukraino-German Nationalists," and the amnesty does not apply to us—another proof of the perfidy of the Bolshevik system.

For the sake of the truth, we want to say in conclusion that we hold the name, Ukranian political prisoners, in deep respect and that we have, generally speaking, feigned favor and recognition from political prisoners of other nationalities.

God bless you, dear friends, do not forget us, and keep in mind your return to Ukraine.

UKRAINIAN WOMEN, POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE MORDOVIAN SPECIAL CAMPS.

MORDOVIA, *October 5, 1955.*

FROM THE U. N. UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

ART. 3. Everyone has the right to life, liberty, and security of person.

ART. 4. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude.

ART. 5. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

ART. 6. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

ART. 15. (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

ART. 18. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

ART. 19. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression.

ART. 20. (3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government.

Nebraska Farmers Need Electrical Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, presently pending on the House Calendar is House Joint Resolution 672, which I introduced to reauthorize, in effect, the Secretary of the Interior to construct a 230,000-volt transmission line from the Fort Randall Dam on the Missouri River to Grand Island, Nebr. The Interior Department takes the position, and quite soundly I am sure, that further legislation is not necessary to authorize construction of this project, inasmuch as the Flood Control Act of 1944 provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall construct such transmission lines as are needed to bring power generated at the Missouri River plants to the load centers in the basin.

I offered an amendment to include $5.5 million for this public power project in the public works appropriation bill when it was considered by the House this year, but the amendment was rejected when a point of order interposed thereto was sustained. For that reason I introduced House Joint Resolution 672 which is, in effect, reauthorizing legislation.

I appreciate the consideration my colleagues have given to this resolution, because the project is badly needed in Nebraska. At the present time, there are in my State approximately 15,000 irrigation wells and there is every prospect that 2,000 to 3,000 more wells will be drilled and put into operation during the coming year. Nebraska agriculture has suffered severely from drought, and the only way our agriculture can stabilize itself is through irrigation from one source or another.

We are steadily going ahead with reservoirs and ditch irrigation systems, but in large areas in Nebraska this method of development is infeasible. However, where this situation exists there is, fortunately, a tremendous reserve of underground water. These irrigation wells are tapping that underground source and they need a constantly growing amount of electrical energy for their operation. The primary purpose of the Grand Island transmission line is to provide a source of relatively cheap power, to be marketed by the REA's and public power agencies of the State, for the future development and stabilization of Nebraska agriculture. The cost will be repaid with interest.

This sound and feasible project has been approved by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget, and President Eisenhower, this year, made a special request to Congress for an appropriation of $5.5 million to bring about construction of the line.

I hope my colleagues will vote favorably on House Joint Resolution 672.

Review of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the sands of time are fast running out in the life and history of this 84th Congress. And I would not want adjournment to take place without an expression from me acknowledging the privilege and enjoyment of working with the membership of this, the greatest legislative body in the world. I say most gratefully, too, that the courtesy and unfailing assistance of committee chairmen and all colleagues are much appreciated, and in extending this simple word of thanks, I would repeat also, as I did at the conclusion of the 83d Congress, that only with the help of my many friends and fellow legislators has it been possible to properly and effectively serve my constituents.

Since I was first elected in 1952 I have been fortunate in being a member of two major committees of this House, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and, for the past 2 years, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. This latter committee assignment is one of special value to the people of my district and the State of Washington. Obviously, Seattle, as a great port, and Kitsap County bordering on Puget Sound, have basic economic ties with the maritime industry. Seattle is the gate-

way and closest shipping center to Alaska and, likewise, the Orient and Far East. Also Puget Sound and Alaskan waters furnish one of the major fishing areas of our Nation.

So the jurisdiction and activities of my committee have a direct bearing on the welfare of thousands of my constituents, and I am proud to state legislation arising from our committee studies and recommendations this session will have stimulated ship construction, increased the active American merchant marine, and promoted fishing and water-front activities. New-ship contracts alone should triple shipyard employment throughout the Nation when present negotiations between various steamship operators and the Maritime Administration are finished.

And speaking of ship construction, the largest peacetime contract in Washington State's history, $34 million, was awarded earlier this year to a private yard in Seattle by the Navy Department, which was gratifying to me, to put it mildly, because I had been urging that consideration be given to the successful Puget Sound Shipyard.

I have been interested in public as well as private shipyard employment, as the Members of the House know, Mr. Speaker. The Navy has been replacing or modernizing our combat vessels, and in this connection I have followed closely the workload available to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton and know something of the effort of the Bureau of Ships to maintain employment in peacetime so as to be ready in the event of war.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose at the moment to take issue with those Senators and Representatives who seem to feel that the intercontinental ballastic guided missile and the Air Force will make a Navy unnecessary. However, the value of the aircraft carrier, as I have said to the House before, must be increasingly apparent as the friendship of our allies abroad grows cooler and it becomes a question if we can continue to control the full number of strategic air-command bases that encircle the Soviet Union.

These aircraft carriers are mobile bases for defense or offense any place in the world, and according to President Eisenhower represent our balance of power with the Soviets. So, with justifiable pride, I mention that I have in my district the outstanding carrier shipyard of the Nation. Fortunately, the record of performance of the Bremerton yard has been recognized and has justified an allocation of work by the Navy designed to give it a full stable workload under peacetime conditions. This is fortunate since this naval shipyard is in a one-industry community and owes its existence and value in event of a future war on a continued allocation of work

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I return to my district grateful that the administration has recognized the national interest of a strong modern Navy and, likewise, the importance of Bremerton in job allocations authorized and funds appropriated. As Members know, I have never failed in congressional debate to point up the role of the Navy and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard.

The duties of a Congressman, as Members well know, under present conditions are varied and exacting. My activities for the people of my legislative district have been legion, but, frankly they are such as to give me both pleasure and satisfaction. It is a great privilege, of course, to work for the development and welfare of the Nation as a whole, and equally a privilege, at the same time, to serve individuals and my people at home. In this latter respect, I have in mind deserving citizens and organizations dedicated to improving the lot of the often-forgotten Federal employee and, likewise, retired people, veterans, low-income families, the aged, and the sick and disabled. As I have said before, the President's dynamic program, while in great measure ignored and neglected out of partisanship and politics this election year, offers great hope and challenge for a better and happier life for less privileged and less fortunate people.

I have stood squarely for such a program, and hundreds of letters in my files acknowledging my efforts and objectives are rewarding testimonials to a rich experience of public service.

Several specific projects in my area point up the success of the individual and joint efforts of members of my State of Washington's delegation and indicate too the recognition of congressional committees of the merit of the Federal improvements requested.

In all frankness, much of the President's legislative program has not been enacted by this Congress out of partisanship looking to the coming election. I am pleased, however, that we did pass highway construction legislation. But, unfortunately, little that was not motivated by its effect on next November's election got much attention, and on this score the voters will decide who was responsible and what should be done about it. In overall results accomplished, history must judge this 84th Congress; but as to my personal effort and effectiveness, I am well satisfied to allow the record to speak for itself.

In my district, the Boeing Airplane Co. is busy, employment and payrolls, thanks to the Eisenhower fiscal policies, are high, and prosperity with peace means something.

One of my pet projects since coming to Washington in 1952 has been the construction of the Shilshoe Breakwater outside the Ballard Locks to provide protected moorage for small craft and commercial fishing vessels. For well over 20 years, constituents in my district tried to obtain congressional action on this project. In the 83d Congress, I was fortunate in being able to obtain the necessary authorization for this breakwater and this year Congress has seen fit to appropriate funds to get the construction underway. Incidentally, the Bureau of the Budget, under the impression that the primary purpose of this project was for the use of pleasure craft only, deleted the Corps of Engineers' request for these funds. However, I am glad to say I was able to present the true facts to the White House pointing up the fact that 1,200 commercial vessels stand to benefit from this facility and, at my request, the White House asked for a supplemental appropriation to begin construction of the breakwater this year.

So, as Congress concludes its labors, with a considerable bit of optimism I will return to report to my friends, neighbors, and all those I have tried to fairly represent. With income taxes reduced, with the Federal Government finances having shown a $1.75 billion surplus, with employment and wages up, the Eisenhower administration can take pride in its accomplishments.

Meanwhile, farewell colleagues and friends. I hope it is appropriate to say "until we meet again!"

Bill Groves Warns of Declining Water Table

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 12, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the problem of our declining water table, in Wisconsin and elsewhere, grows more serious each year. The need for conservation of our underground water supply is well pointed up in the following article by William F. Groves, commentator for the Wisconsin Agriculturist and Farmer:

Some of my readers may remember an old song entitled "You Never Miss the Water 'Til the Well Runs Dry." This song, in a way, is a modern parable. It suggests a major problem facing our State and Nation.

The American people, today, are water-conscious. A rapidly growing population and an expanding industry has brought the problem of water to the forefront. Everyone knows that America's water supply is diminishing; that her underground water table is steadily sinking.

WATER TABLE IS DRAINING

Even in Wisconsin, where the water supply is sufficient for all reasonable needs, increased usage has lowered the water table and drained subterranean pools at a rate much faster than nature can replenish them.

Who owns the interlocking network of subterranean rivers and rivulets which flow beneath the earth's surface? Is that water the property of the landowner who holds title to the soil above?

Or does this priceless heritage of underground water belong to society at large? Is it the function of the State to control this water to "promote the general welfare?"

These are pertinent questions. The legal rights to water are of paramount importance to all of us and should be definitely defined.

It may seem strange, but Wisconsin has very few laws, if any, which govern or regulate the use of underground water. Property owners have been allowed to sink wells and utilize underground water pretty much as they please.

Quite recently a case has been brought before the Wisconsin Supreme Court which brings the problem of underground water to the forefront. The story of the case very briefly is this:

CITIES USE MORE WATER

The city of Fond du Lac needs additional water. The city's population is increasing rapidly; its industry expanding. The city proposes to augment its water supply approximately 3 million gallons by sinking wells in the nearby rural area.

This action by the city of Fond du Lac will adversely affect some 530 outlying dairy farms. The wholesale use of underground water will lower the water table of the entire surrounding country. As a result, natural springs will dry up; creeks will become mere ditches.

Many farmers will be forced to drill new wells or to modify and lower existing ones. The proposed action by the city of Fond du Lac will damage the nearby farmers to the extent of many thousands of dollars.

Consequently the farmers have restrained the city from drilling these wells until the city guarantees proper damages to each and every farmer adversely affected.

The city of Fond du Lac denies that any damages are forthcoming. It contends that the city owns the land on which the wells are to be sunk. The city, therefore, has the right to use the water beneath in any way it sees fit.

The contending parties have carried their quarrel to the State supreme court. I have no idea of what the decision of the court in this case will be. Experience has taught me never to try to anticipate the thought pattern or logic which this august body employs. Very often their decisions are too deep for my humble mind to fathom.

TIME FOR ACTION

Irrespective of the court's action I am positive that the time has arrived for our State legislature to take action. This body should enact a comprehensive code of laws governing the use of underground water similar in scope and character to the statute now regulating surface water.

The Bible says: "All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again."

In the past our courts and legislatures have paid scant attention to this ancient Biblical observation. They have failed to take into consideration the natural phenomenon known as the "water cycle."

Wisconsin's average 31 inches of rainfall is the source of the State's abundant water supply. About 50 percent of this precipitation runs off the earth's surface into watercourses; 30 percent is evaporated, and the remaining 20 percent is absorbed by the ground. Unless that State's annual rainfall increases, its water resources can never be augmented.

Conservation, therefore, is the State's only alternative in its efforts to meet an ever-increasing demand for water. Each and every citizen of Wisconsin should bear this fact in mind.

Wide Recognition Brought to Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Record of Friday, July 20, 1956, which discusses and comments on the wide publicity which Wilkes-Barre has received through its sponsorship of sports-car racing which was held during a 3-day period last week:

ALL-TIME RECORDS

Golden Jubilee Giants' Despair Hill climb and Brynfan Tyddyn road races, scheduled today and tomorrow, have broken a number of significant records, quite in addition to speed on the hill or at Brynfan Tyddyn.

These are records of importance to the valley's growth and development as an important American community.

T. Newell Wood, hill climb association president, reported last night that this year's entry list for both events is surpassing, with 194 cars entered for competition. As of the last report, entries were still coming in by wire.

The hill climb official pointed out that a wave of unparalleled enthusiasm for the local events has swept sports-car drivers throughout the country.

In addition, national attention to Wilkes-Barre's sports-car classic has reached new heights, with direct coverage by main-line metropolitan newspapers, network television, and radio shows, newsreels, magazines like the Saturday Evening Post, and wire reports.

All this indicates a community asset of the first importance. Favorable publicity of this kind is impossible to buy. It can only be earned. The attention thus brought to Wilkes-Barre is certainly welcome.

Tax on Admissions

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to voice my approval of the bill H. R. 9875, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only with respect to that portion of the amount paid for any admission which is in excess of $1. I am glad that the great Ways and Means Committee of the House has taken cognizance of the predicament of the theater industry and has afforded it a measure of relief through this legislation.

I know from my correspondence and from talks with motion theater people in my district and State that the industry is greatly in need of this consideration. We owe much to the theater industry in the way of entertainment and relaxation, for long before television and even before radio was perfected, the movies provided a fine entertainment and recreation channel. In recent years, especially, the movies have provided some very excellent educational and documentary films. The industry made a fine contribution to the war effort and to our national defense in the war and postwar years. Our young men in the service found wholesome and educational entertainment in the movie houses throughout the country in their leave periods.

The small-business people who operate the theaters in our cities and towns are having a struggle to survive, and I believe the elimination of this tax will enable many of them to keep in business. The relief which we formerly gave in the Excise Reduction Act of 1954, when the tax was lifted from admissions of 50 cents or less, has been inadequate for the survival and successful operation of our movie theaters, and I sincerely hope that we can take this remedial action in the House today in behalf of the industry.

Welcoming Address of Mrs. James C. Casserly, President, New Orleans Memorial Day Association Exercises, May 30, 1956, Audubon Park Bandstand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Memorial Day in New Orleans this year was a most impressive affair.

For the first time in the history of our Memorial Day celebration a distinguished lady, Mrs. James C. Casserly, of New Orleans, served as president.

Mrs. Casserly has been most active in patriotic affairs in our community. It was very fitting indeed that she should have been so honored because her late husband, James C. Casserly, a leader in patriotic affairs, served as president in the year 1943.

I am very pleased to include herewith the following copy of her address delivered on May 30 in Audubon Park in the city of New Orleans:

Mr. Chairman; Lt. Col. Thomas Bonner; past presidents of the New Orleans Memorial Day Association; distinguished members of the consular corps; distinguished and ranking officers and members of the military forces; members of the New Orleans Memorial Day Association; director and members of the American Legion, Crescent City Post No. 125 band; director and members of the New Orleans Public Service Chorallers; members of Battery B, 935th Field Artillery Battalion, Washington Artillery; members of the Boy Scouts; Hon. A. Brown Moore, councilman of the city of New Orleans; and most especially our honored Gold Star mothers and my distinguished officers and chairman of this year and friends, to each of you I bring greetings as the personal representative of the patriotic and civic organizations that are the composite part of this New Orleans Memorial Day Association. I wish to welcome you to this memorial program.

It is a well-known trait of human character that all of us want to be remembered. However, primitive or advanced may be the man and of whatever race or color, we all have the same universal longing to be remembered. So today, we remember yesterday and remember their glory forever—all war heroes who have up to this time made contributions to keep this country free. So that we may repeat the immemorable words of the immortal Daniel Webster "Thank God I am an American citizen." Inspired by their example of sacrifice and patriotism, we pray in words and deeds God save America. God bless America, that has been made safe for us by the heroes since the beginning of glorious America. Let us rededicate ourselves anew to keep faith with our comrades who have gone before, and pledge ourselves wholeheartedly to keep

America strong, four-square with the winds that blow, and faithful to all, while we do our best to make it better. Will you join in honoring all great heroes? May the memories that rise before us in this solemn hour banish indifference and lethargy from our souls, and let us go forth in the spirit of our comrades to finish the task they have left for us to do.

The New Orleans Memorial Day Association with the presentation of this program will mark 25 consecutive years of bringing about the duty left to us to disseminate peace on earth and good will to men. I welcome each of you. Thank you.

Ninth Anniversary of Independence of Pakistan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Because Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to send greetings to the people of Pakistan, President Iskander Mirza, and His Excellency Mohammed Ali, Ambassador of Pakistan on the occasion of the celebration of the ninth anniversary of independence of Pakistan, August 14, 1956.

Pakistan came into existence as the result of a struggle of a people to win a homeland for themselves in which they would be free to live their own way of life, develop their own culture, and safeguard their political and economic interests. Pakistan was founded by the indomitable will of a people determined not to be relegated forever to the unalterable position of a colony. In the words of His Excellency Liaquat Ali Khan, Prime Minister of Pakistan:

> The idea was the idea of liberty which has had its ardent followers in all climates and all countries. When our time came, its call summoned us too, and we could not hold back. * * * But this, we realize, is only the beginning of a new life. The achievement of freedom is not an instantaneous event; it is a process. The seed is planted, but before the tree can take root and grow and spread it has to be nurtured untiringly by innumerable hands.

The Prime Minister set forth the aims of Pakistan in his address to the United States Senate in 1950—truths which hold today:

> We have * * * guaranteed fundamental human rights, equality of status and opportunity, and before law, social, economic and political justice, freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship and association. * * *
>
> We have pledged that our minorities shall enjoy full rights of citizenship and shall freely profess and practice their religions and develop their cultures and that their legitimate interests shall be adequately safeguarded. * * *
>
> We have kept steadily before us the principles of democracy, freedom, equality, tolerance and social justice. * * * These are articles of faith with us and by them we are irrevocably bound. They are our way of life; and no threat or persuasion, no material peril or ideological allurement can deflect us from the path we have chosen.

The aspirations that were at the back of the demand for the creation of Pakistan were, and remain, the strongest urge of the Pakistanis. May these tenets of faith and democracy continue to guide Pakistan so that her people may prosper and attain their full contribution toward international peace and progress and happiness of mankind.

Vigorous Program Recommended To Aid Chronic Unemployment Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, July 22, 1956, stating that the National Planning Association recommends that the Federal Government assume responsibility for a vigorous program to remove such conditions as chronic local unemployment:

(By the Associated Press)

Asserting "chronic local unemployment" is a national problem, a National Planning Association committee yesterday recommended that the Federal Government assume responsibility for a "vigorous program" to remove such conditions.

It said the Government, in collaboration with local and private programs, should seek to end what it called this threat to internal development and external security by undertaking:

1. New and expanded activities providing for technical assistance.
2. Certain kinds of financing.
3. Specific types of tax exemptions.

Such a program, said a committee on depressed areas of the private, nonprofit organization, would be designed to stimulate expansion of business enterprises or encourage new businesses suitable for labor surplus areas.

"A Federal program," said the committee, "should not supersede local programs directed to relieving local unemployment. On the contrary, it should supplement them and should stimulate even more local effort than is now being directed toward this problem."

Elaborating on its proposals, the committee said it is possible that the Federal Government might enter the field of new plant financing in depressed areas either through primary loans, supplementary loans, or guaranteeing of private loans.

It suggested a form of tax relief to any industries making new investments in affected areas.

The committee said migration of people from afflicted areas to regions with a lively demand for labor may often be a necessary palliative, but cannot be accepted as a solution to the problem.

Several members of the committee dissented from parts of the report or elaborated on other sections.

Better Days for the Green River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Green River Valley in Kentucky is noted for its scenic beauty, its glorious climate, fertile soil, natural resources, vast coal seams, and its abundant resources of native people.

Green River travels some 375 miles through this beautiful valley before it reaches the Ohio, and it has a number of navigable tributaries.

The Green River watershed contains 9,273 square miles. There is little timberland left in this section to slow down the flow of water during and following rains. This water reaches the streams in quantities which quickly causes them to overflow, thereby resulting in flood damage, and loss of lives. From 1943 up to the present time we have had seven floods in this section of Kentucky. Beginning in the year 1913 and extending to the year 1943 we have suffered from 5 major floods in the Green River Valley. The more serious floods occurred in the years 1913, 1937 and 1950. It is estimated that our total loss of topsoil during each year in the Green River Valley is in excess of 5 million tons.

Not only the Green River Valley will benefit from navigation and flood control projects but great benefit will also be received by the lower Ohio and lower Mississippi Valleys. According to study made by the Corps of Engineers the entire State of Kentucky with the exception of eight counties in the lower southwestern section is in the flood danger area and Kentucky has more of its entire boundary within the flood danger area than any other State in the United States.

As the direct result of our inability to utilize our vast coal resources and our lack of flood control in the valley our population decreased over 100,000 from 1940 to 1950. With all of our natural resources, transportation, navigable streams, and abundance of manpower we were losing more people per year than almost any section of our country.

We have some 13,970,000,000 tons of recoverable low cost steam coal in the Green River Valley, and this coal is located on a navigable stream. We have large steam powerplants at Madison, Ind.; Paducah, Ky.; Johnsonville, Tenn., and Colbert, Ala.—all close to this vast deposit of coal on the Green River. The Atomic Energy Commission Plant at Portsmouth, Ohio, is operated with power from the Madison, Ind., steam plant which has a capacity of 1,200,000 kilo-

watts. Coal required to operate this plant per annum amounts to 4,000,000 tons.

Suffering from loss of population, flood damage and with several sections of the Valley declared to be in an area of chronic labor surplus it was imperative that the necessary steps be taken to correct this situation. Larger and deeper locks were necessary for the Green River. Such locks would accomodate modern barges of the size used on the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers, and our coal could move out to market. Flood control projects must be secured in order to eliminate our annual flood damage.

Beginning in the year 1954 we secured necessary appropriations to contruct two modern locks and dam at Spottsville and Rumsey on the Green River and in the Second Congressional District of Kentucky. We also established and secured a canalization project for Green River beginning at at the Ohio River and extending 103 miles to Rochester, Ky. Flood control projects on Rough River and Nolin River are underway and better days are ahead for the Green River Valley.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the July 17, 1956, issue of the Courier-Journal, of Louisville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

BETTER DAYS FOR THE GREEN RIVER

A lot of people had a good time down at Calhoun last Saturday, dedicating the two new locks that will open up the Lower Green River to heavy barge traffic. It was a day filled with speeches, ribbon-cutting, beauty queens, music and political handshaking, and no one seemed to mind that there were more beauty queens—31 of them, one for each county in the Green River Valley—than politicians.

There was good reason for rejoicing. For the past 20 years the valley has been in the midst of a semidepression, losing population and job opportunities while surrounding areas prospered. Along the banks of the Green River lie some of the world's largest deposits of high-grade coal, and there is plenty of water in the stream to encourage industrial use, but poor transportation has been too much of an obstacle. The old locks on the river, two of which have now been replaced with modern structures, could not accommodate Ohio River barges, and rail shipping costs put local coal operators at a disadvantage with nearby coal producers who had access to lower-cost river transport. The new locks, built to handle Ohio barge traffic, will change all this. Already, contracts have been signed for 3,000,000 tons of Green River coal each year, and more are doubtless on the way.

There was plenty of barbecue, oratory, and calliope music in Calhoun Saturday. And there was enough credit to go around, too. Certainly the Green River Valley Citizens League had reason for pride. From the day C. A. Reis first started agitating for improvement of the river, this group has never quit trying, and Saturday's celebration was largely the product of the stubborn, undiscouraged efforts of its members. Credit is due, too, to Congressman WILLIAM NATCHER and Senator EARLE CLEMENTS, both of whom fought for river-improvement appropriations in Washington, and whose efforts finally resulted in construction of the two now-completed locks.

Work on the Green is not finished, though. Other upstream locks and dams are needed. Flood control on the river will never be effected until the flood-control reservoirs on the Routh, Nolin, and Barren Rivers are finished. There is dredging and channel-straightening work to be done before the whole river is cleared for big-barge traffic. But if the people of the valley and our Representatives in Congress continue the good work, there's a better day coming for the counties along the Green River Valley.

The Moravian Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this coming year, in March 1957, the Moravian Church, one of the world's great religious institutions, will celebrate its 500th anniversary. It is an event of far-reaching significance, not only to the members of that church but to all cherish the principles of religious freedom.

The influence of the Moravians extends far beyond the Pennsylvania communities where they established themselves. It is to them that we owe the beginnings of the passion for religious freedom that led the Pilgrims and the Puritans to New England to lay the cornerstone of America's heritage of liberty.

It was in 1457 that a group of followers of John Hus, the Bohemian reformer, banded together in the little village of Kumbald to form the Unitas Fratrum—the Unity of Brethren. From this emerged the Moravian Church as we know it today. The group was animated by the teaching of John Wycliffe—the "morning star" of the Reformation—which had passed on through Hus. Each of them believed that it was his imperative duty to bring the word of Christ in the common tongue to all people. And each man, like Wycliffe and Hus, was prepared to go to prison, or even to the stake, proclaiming, "I believe that in the end that truth will conquer."

Those were days of persecution and religious war. But through their heroic courage the small band was able to maintain its faith, to grow, and to welcome the rise of other Protestant bodies. As the young church expanded beyond its original boundaries, it came to comprise three separate branches in Bohemia, Moravia, and Poland. The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics declares of this development:

> Yet the three remained organically one, and thus the Unitas became the earliest international Protestant church.

Throughout their history the Moravians have lived up to their noble motto, "In essentials unity, in nonessentials liberty, in all things charity."

Under the protective influence of Count von Zinzendorf, groups of the brethren began to come to America. They were missionaries rather than immigrants, for they came, inspired by their religious fervor, to spread the word of God in the New World. Upon their arrival they established schools and missions for the Indians and for the settlers already in the Colonies. They translated the Bible, the Psalms, and, equally important, school texts into the various Indian tongues and into German.

In 1742 the Moravian Seminary for Girls was opened at Bethlehem, Pa. This was the first boarding school for girls in America. Today, the Moravian educational system includes the Moravian Preparatory School, the Moravian Seminary and College for Women, Linden Hall Junion College, Linden Hall School for Girls, the Salem Academy, Salem College, Moravian College and the Moravian Theological Seminary. In this connection one should mention the name of John Comenius, a far-seeing pioneer who devised educational methods still in use throughout our schools today. It was Comenius who introduced the graded system of education and was the first to use visual aids in teaching.

In addition to their passion for religion and scholarship, the early Moravian settlers brought with them a deep love of music. A early as 1750 they established a church orchestra and later organized the Bach festivals which are held each year in Bethlehem. They also established one of the world's great musical libraries at Winston-Salem, which now contains more than 7,000 manuscripts. Among them is the earliest known copy of Haydn's Symphony No. 17.

In my own district of Pennsylvania, the towns of Bethlehem and Nazareth stand as enduring testimonials to the enterprise and the good neighborliness of the Moravians. On the occasion of this forthcoming 500th anniversary, the Nation as a whole may well acknowledge the debt it owes to the fund of moral and religious strength with which the Moravians have endowed us.

Egypt Celebrates Fourth Anniversary of Independence July 23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States. Today is the fourth anniversary of the independence of Egypt and I rise to felicitate that country.

I wish to extend sincere greetings to the people of Egypt, President Gamal Abdel Nasser, and his Excellency Ahmed Hussein, Ambassador of Egypt, on the occasion of the celebration of the fourth anniversary of Egypt, July 23, 1956.

The most important event in the history of modern Egypt occurred on July 23, 1952, when a handful of youthful pa-

triots ousted the symbols of feudalism and proclaimed the Republic of Egypt some months later. By their actions, they opened a new era in Egyptian history. With precision and dispatch, the independence movement was led by President Nasser, who saw that Egypt had to be made strong, united, and free. Devoted to the liberation of the masses, Nasser gave the people what they seldom had—hope.

President Nasser is well aware of Egypt's No. 1 problem: the utter despondency of the Egyptian fellaheen. His proclaimed goal is to end the rule of the big landowners and to liberate the peasants from the hands of usurers. The Government aims to broaden the basis of the economy and make it less critically dependent on a single export crop; to raise the standard of living of the people, thereby bridging the wide gap between the rich and the poor. Ambitious plans in this direction have already been undertaken, but much remains to be done.

The various reform programs have been been executed with such vigor that many observers have remarked that in the brief 4 years since independence, Egypt has advanced more than at any other time in its history.

As Egypt goes forward into a new year of national life, I pray for the people and their leaders continued success and prosperity. And may the spirit of peace and sympathetic understanding serve as guides in the achievement of democratic goals and may Egypt continue to maintain her present prominent place among the free nations of the world.

A Double Standard on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a number of the Republican Members of this House gave the people another demonstration of the double standard on civil rights that has characterized the policies of the Republican Party for the last 3 years.

On July 5 the House of Representatives voted in favor of the Powell amendment—a civil-rights amendment to the Federal aid for education bill. I voted for that amendment; so did other Democratic Members of this House. It seemed for a while, and may continue to seem to uninformed people, that the Republican Party was supporting this civil-rights amendment. However, when the vote on the bill was taken, nearly 100 Republican Congressmen who had gotten their names on record as favoring the Powell amendment, then voted against the Federal aid bill. They turned against the civil-rights provisions of the bill they had just recently supported.

Not one Democrat joined the 96 Republicans in this maneuver.

Let us make no mistake about it. The major opposition to that bill came from those who were opposed to its civil-rights provisions, rather than to the aid for education. As a result of the switch pulled by these 96 Republican Congressmen, the civil-rights provision of the bill, which they claimed to be for, is just as dead as the education provisions which they admit to opposing.

The Kelley bill to aid the schools, which included the Powell amendment, was defeated by a relatively small number of votes. If only 16 of the Republican Congressmen who defected on the final vote had stood by their vote on the Powell amendment, the Kelley bill would have been passed.

One who does not have the full story of the Republican record on this civil-rights issue might think that my statement and my point of view are harsh. To say that there has been a double standard by the Republicans on civil rights for the last 3 years is merely to state the facts. Let me summarize the record the Republicans have built up while they have been in office:

First. For 3½ years, Eisenhower had no legislative program on civil rights, and waited until April of an election year to present a watered-down version of Democratic civil-rights proposals.

Second. The Eisenhower administration refused to support Democratic civil-rights measures introduced by Democrats—even refused to answer requests from Congress for its views on those measures.

Third. The Eisenhower administration has abandoned three key provisions of the 1952 GOP platform.

Fourth. A majority of the GOP in the United States Congress has voted against key efforts at civil-rights progress.

Fifth. In the field of so-called administrative accomplishments on civil rights, the GOP has merely picked up where the Democrats left off in pioneering the real breakthroughs on civil rights progress.

Some illustrations from the Republican record make help to make clear how the Republican Party has approached the job of making votes out of no-policy on civil rights.

For example, here is what one highly placed spokesman for the Republicans, Vice President NIXON, had to say when he addressed a northern audience in February of this year:

> President Eisenhower's great Republican administration has registered the greatest advance for the rights of racial minorities since the Emancipation Proclamation itself * * * speaking for a unanimous Supreme Court, a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the Nation's public schools. (Vice President NIXON, New York, N. Y., February 13, 1956.)

However, here is another Republican point of view entirely. This one was served up to a southern audience by another spokesman for the same Republican Party.

> Republicans will campaign next November on a States' Rights platform assuring constitutional government, Charles K. McWhorter of New York, Young Republicans' national chairman declared in Jackson (Miss.) last night. (Jackson (Miss.) State-Times, May 25, 1056.)
>
> [McWhorter] opined the Republicans' record as a conservative party, moderate on civil rights, best suits the interest of Mississippians. (Jackson (Miss.) State-Times, May 25, 1956.)

Speeches aside, the record of the Republican Party for 3 long years was one of do-nothingness. The administration, in spite of its campaign promises and pledges gave no leadership and no support to the forces working for civil-rights legislation, both in and out of Congress. Even the official requests of congressional committees, in the Senate as well as the House, for advice on bills before them, got only silence.

At least, this was true for 3 years. But now we are in the fourth year of this administration, the presidential election year. Now a record must be made. Operating on the policy that it is not what you do for people that counts, but only what you do to impress them, the Republicans now begin to build what they hope will be an impressive record on this issue which was allowed to languish for 3 years. But I am sure that it will be a record of speeches and statements that the people will be offered, as in the case of the education bill, not real substance—not legislation.

Here is an example of what the record now shows on the issue of civil rights. For 3 years the administration had no recommendation to make on legislation to protect the basic American right to vote. Nine Democrats and one Republican had joined in proposing such legislation in the Senate. But the administration had neither a proposal of its own, or a recommendation to make on this one.

Congressman CELLER introduced a bill to protect civil rights on a wide front. The Department of Justice was asked for its views on this bill; the Department made no reply. It took no notice whatsoever of the bill until after the Judiciary Committee reported the bill out.

Many other bills in both Houses of Congress, got this same cold treatment from the administration—up until this year. But now, the Republicans have discovered the date on the political calendar and the civil rights issue at the same time. The election is coming up; the Republicans are out to make the election-campaign record. Legislation has been belatedly introduced, and the press releases will now really be grinding out the claims of the party that it is the Republicans—the facts notwithstanding—who are the advocates of civil rights.

In other fields of the good fight for human rights, the Republicans have moved in to claim credit where no credit at all was due them. For example, it was President Truman who initiated the abolition of segregation in the armed services and in Army post schools. Read the Republican Party press releases, and you get a clear impression, which the informed person knows is not correct, that the Republicans were responsible.

Even Supreme Court decisions are coming out with a phony Republican label stamped on them. Everyone remembers the attempt by Vice President NIXON, which I referred to earlier, to conjure up credit for the Republican Party out of the Supreme Court decision in the school integration case. This was

not the first time this particular stunt had been pulled. Before that, when the Supreme Court outlawed segregation in District of Columbia restaurants, the GOP tried to make this look like a Republican accomplishment.

How any political party can claim credit for a Supreme Court decision, I do not understand. How the Republican Party could claim credit for these decisions, when the Government case had been presented to the court by Democratic appointees, I particularly do not understand.

I cannot believe that the people will be taken in by these attempts to grasp credit where the Republicans deserve no credit. The American people are not looking for press releases, campaign speeches, and statements glorifying an empty record. They want to see results—in the field of civil rights legislation as well as in other fields. Results mean votes—votes for the many civil rights bills already laid before this Congress. But votes alone are not the payoff. It is legislation laid by Congress on the desk of the President of the United States for his signature that count.

There is still time in this session to build the kind of record that counts, the kind of record that impresses people because it has substance and real accomplishment. This is the kind of record this Congress can build by adopting legislation, not by writing press releases.

If we can lay such a record before the American people, I, for one, will be perfectly willing to let the people judge. And I am sure that my pride and confidence in the Democratic Party will be strengthened when the record is completed and the judgment of the people has been made.

Liberia Celebrates 109th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly terms with the United States. Thursday, July 26, marks the 109th anniversary of the independence of Liberia and I rise to felicitate that country.

I wish to take this opportunity to extend greetings to the people of Liberia, President William V. S. Tubman, and His Excellency George Arthur Padmore, Ambassador of Liberia on the occasion of the celebration of the 109th anniversary of the independence of Liberia, July 26, 1956.

Liberia is politically unique. It is the one truly independent government on the old Gold Coast and one of the world's only two republics governed by the Negro race. Liberia was founded in 1822 by the American Colonization Society. She declared her independence as a free and sovereign state on July 26, 1847. Liberia has a republican form of government. Its constitution is patterned closely after that of the United States. Americans have a tender spot in their hearts for this small country which owes its existence to the initiative of some 19th century Americans who chose this spot to resettle a group of freed slaves.

In 1947 the Liberian Government developed the first concrete plan in the history of the country to map, and as far as possible, blueprint the necessary steps to expand existing services and facilities and improve the overall economy of the country in a 5-year plan.

Basic surveys were made of agricultural production, soil, and mineral resources and the country's forest lands. Detailed estimates and studies of the country's potential were made and a comprehensive program for action was drawn up. On the basis of this program, Liberia was among the first nations to submit their request for technical assistance under the United States point-four program. In 1953, in his annual message to the Legislature, President Tubman called for the extension of the 5-year program by an additional 4 years to become a 9-year development plan. The 9-year program envisions completion of the highway system; expansion of the school system; establishment of additional hospital facilities; intensified medical public buildings; development of hydroelectric power; increased agricultural extension work with emphasis on animal husbandry; greater output of agricultural, forest and mining products; and the construction of additional ports and harbors.

President Tubman has, therefore, recommended "that ways and means for the financing of the program be authorized or initiated based not on gifts or benevolence but upon the guaranty of the national resources of the country."

The Republic of Liberia—land of great contrasts between the primitive and the modern—may be the pivot on which will swing the future of Atlantic Africa. In the words of former Ambassador Simpson:

> Historically and culturally, Liberia's roots are more closely intertwined with those of the United States than any other nation in the world. The people of the United States were directly responsible for the founding of Liberia. * * * The first settlers of Liberia came from the United States.
>
> The 2 nations have helped each other in peace and in war for more than 130 years. Liberia is the only nation on the continent of Africa on which the United States has been able to rely as an ally beyond question. The United States has aided materially in the economic development of Liberia.

Liberia exercises a great interest and participation in world affairs. Very aptly stated by H. E. Henry Ford Cooper, chairman, Liberian delegation to the eighth session of the United Nations General Assembly:

> We, as Liberians, whose existence was brought into being by grinding oppression, cannot be indifferent to and uninterested in the far cry of our brethren in Africa—or in the East or West, North or South, or any portion of the universe. We owe it to our national self-respect to give all the support we can to the aspiration of those people whose only wish is to be freemen, masters of their own destinies.

Liberia has actively shouldered its responsibility in the United Nations. United Nations Day ranks in Liberia as second only to Liberian Independence Day. Liberia has not only welcomed the proposals advanced by the General Assembly with regard to specialized technical aid and assistance for many areas of the world but has participated actively in the direction of the specialized agencies of the United Nations such as UNESCO, WHO, UNICEF, FAO, and ILO.

I salute Liberia on this momentous occasion and pray for her people continued progress and prosperity.

Is Toughness Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the American Weekly magazine of Sunday, July 22, 1956, written by Mr. Curtis Mitchell who submitted a series of questions on Marine Corps training to Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Puller, retired:

IS TOUGHNESS NECESSARY?
(By Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Puller, retired, as told to Curtis Mitchell)

The remarkably indestructible Marine called "Chesty" Puller rose from private to lieutenant general to be known as the toughest Marine in the Corps. During almost 39 years of duty he won 14 medals, including five Navy Crosses, for valor in combat.

As a Marine assigned to the Haitian constabulary, he fought 40 battles with revolutionists during his first 5 years. In Nicaragua, he fought bandits for another 5 years. At Guadalcanal he won a Purple Heart, Bronze Star, and his third Navy Cross in a savage battle that saved Henderson Airfield. Surgeons dug six chunks of steel out of his tough body but, 2 weeks later, he was back in action.

In 1944 he reorganized two shot-up Marine battalions on the island of New Britain, led them through heavy fire to take a strongly fortified objective—and won another Navy Cross.

He commanded the 1st Marine Combat Team that made the impossible landing at Inchon in Korea. His troops liberated the heart of Seoul and were at the Choshin Reservoir when the Chinese Army attacked, forcing a hard-to-swallow withdrawal. He fought his way out of the Chinese trap and won his fifth Navy Cross for "driving off repeated and fanatical enemy attacks * * *."

Few living Americans have had more first-hand knowledge of warfare than this marine. His answers to these questions are important to every father and mother, and to the safety of our Nation.

Question. General Puller, the progress of science and research has given many people the idea that any war in the future will be

fought with pushbuttons, and that the foot soldier will not be needed. In short, that the kind of toughness the Marines have always demonstrated in battle will not be required. This is my question, sir: Is this toughness still necessary?

General PULLER. The idea of a pushbutton war is very attractive. It's supposed to be a war in which nobody gets hurt except the enemy. A few scientists began talking it up in 1945 and presently it became gospel to a lot of soft-thinking Americans. Then came Korea. And there it was the old, old story again: man against man.

I can still remember a cartoon that showed a little American soldier weighing about 100 pounds, loaded down with 250 pounds of pack, rifle, grenades, the works—and this little fellow with his back about to break under that mountain of gear was running around in the Korean night with a lighted candle, yelling, "Where in hell are those pushbuttons?"

Question. You were an enlisted man and a Parris Island drill instructor before you became an officer. Were you taught toughness and did you teach your men to be tough?

General PULLER. I hope I taught them to do a soldier's job. When old Von Steuben wrote the first book of military regulations for Gen. George Washington during the Revolution, he said the object of military training was "success in battle." Just three words. They were good enough to last from the Revolution through World War II. I still think that success in battle is the real object of military training.

Question. What qualities are needed for a man to become a successful soldier?

General PULLER. When I trained at Parris Island, I was told what I still believe, and so do a lot of other good soldiers: that the best fighting man is one whose love for his own outfit—the Marines, in my case—is greater than anything else in the world. He needs to feel that his is the best squad in the best platoon, in the best company, in the best regiment, in the best division, in the best army in the world. To feel that he has to know that he—and his entire outfit—is in top shape physically. In short, he's tough.

Question. Does a soldier need to be as hard physically today as in other wars?

General PULLER. He did at Guadalcanal. He did in Korea. Caesar marched his men about 20 miles a day. Napoleon demanded about the same. Despite our trucks and jeeps, our men in Korea often covered from 15 to 20 miles every day. I've said this before and it is still sound: A good soldier ought to be able to walk 20 miles, run 5 miles, and then go into battle and win. That's not really as rugged as it sounds. College football players get about the same amount of training. I know it can be done by any ordinary person because I did it myself, day in and day out for about 10 years, walking 20 miles a day for 3 weeks out of each month. That's when we were patrolling in Haiti and Nicaragua.

Question. Isn't that pretty tough on older men?

General PULLER. The idea that only younger men—men in their twenties—can stand field duty is nonsense. If you build yourself up, you can take every bit of hard field work you'll encounter. I was over 50 when I commanded the 1st Marine Combat team that took Inchon and then cleaned out the heart of Seoul. Later, I took them up to the Choshin Reservoir and back, but I covered those mountains on foot as ably as my best men.

One other thing I'd like to say that shows what can be done: In all my service, as long as one of my men had to travel on foot, I've never ridden a horse or in a motor vehicle of any sort.

If I could do it, so can others.

Question. Let's talk about your troops, say young marines at the end of their basic training. Up to their enlistment, each had been taught to think pretty much for himself. In civilian life, that's the way to get ahead. Now he's got to follow an officer's commands, even against his own reasoning. How do you "sell" this to a recruit without some sort of brainwashing?

General PULLER. What I've always told my marines—and I'm certain other officers have done the same—is that we're going to train them to solve a lot of unusual problems, unusual for them, that is, because these aren't matters that a civilian runs into. These are battle problems, tactics, maneuvers, the value of surprise and such.

Most Americans don't know much about the fighting business, but professional soldiers do. So I tell my men that their officers have studied every battle in American history and then we've gone back another 1,000 years or so and studied all the other battles.

What we've learned is the basis for what we ask them to do in training and in battle. I've never met a man who, when this was explained to him, wanted to go on thinking for himself.

Question. How long does it take to get an ordinarily healthy boy hardened enough for combat?

General PULLER. We start them off with about 6 hours per day of close-order drill. Some people have said that close-order drill is out of date. In my experience there's no better way to condition green men. It toughens legs. It teaches strangers to work together with split-second timing. It sets a standard that is high and tough but attainable. It's the beginning of the real Marine spirit. Next, we put them through conditioning hikes of about 10 miles each with a day's rest in between. Finally, they'll march up to 20 miles in a day and then go on into the field for maneuvers. Of course, they're learning to use their weapons, too. After 6 months, they're good and tough.

Question. Do you feel that the enlisted men of the corps think that the Marine system is too tough?

General PULLER. A kid stopped by my house 3 months ago. He'd just enlisted in the Marines and wanted my advice on how to succeed. I said, "You do what you're told, keep your mouth shut, and remember, no matter what you're told to do, it's only what thousands of other marines have done before you, and they made out all right." He went away to Parris Island and just last week he came back on completing his training. He'd filled out about 20 pounds and he looked mighty good in his uniform.

I asked that boy about his experiences at boot camp. Would he change anything? Too hard? Too tough? He said proudly, "Not a thing, sir. No, sir, not a thing."

That's my point. These youngsters take pride in becoming Marines.

Question. Let's look into the future for a moment. Won't the guided missile do away with the foot soldier?

General PULLER. In the first place, the intercontinental guided missile is still talk. The Marines are a force in being, ready to fight now. In the second place, my answer is that guided missiles are only another form of aerial warfare. Thus far no war has been won in the air. In Korea the target was a triangle of land about the size of New York State. Yet, when the Armistice was signed, there were more miles of railway and more locomotives and more freight cars running in that area than when the war began.

If all our air power couldn't knock out that little chunk of country, or even reduce its railway facilities, in my opinion air power alone can never do the whole job of winning a war. That takes a team, including a tough foot soldier.

Question: But air power didn't use its Sunday punch, which is the atomic or hydrogen bomb. Wouldn't that have won for us?

General PULLER. Whether it would or not is now academic. What's vital now is what will win the next war. Both sides now have super bombs. So think about this: What if both parties decide not to commit suicide but to keep their big bombs in storage, as we did with our gas supplies in World War II? Who does the fighting then? All I can see is that tough little guy carrying that mountain of gear over the hills and yelling, "Where are those push buttons?"

Seriously, no single weapon is going to win any war. No matter what weapons are used, eventually that little guy has to go in to grab and hold the real estate.

He'll be needed as far ahead as anybody can see, and he'll have to be plenty tough.

Question. How're we doing today? Are our young Americans softer than their fathers or grandfathers?

General PULLER. I've been a Marine for almost 40 years and I've seen a lot of our boys in strenuous circumstances. And I'll say this about today's youngsters: They're great. They're every bit as good as their fathers and grandfathers. What's wrong today is some of their parents. They're the ones who are looking for an easy war, one run by pushbuttons. They're the ones who won't take the time to teach their kids integrity and character. But our boys are all right.

Question. What else would you have parents teach their sons?

General PULLER. I've got a boy 10 years old that I'm trying to help become a man. Among other things, I'm telling him that some day he may have to go away to war. This is a shocker to most parents, but look at our history and you'll see that it happens. Boys ought to know it and get ready for it. Second, I'm teaching my son exactly what the Spartan mothers taught their boys over 2,000 years ago. They told their sons, "When you go into battle, come out with honor. Or come back on your own shield."

Question. Do you want your own son to become a marine?

General PULLER. I'll answer that this way: Mrs. Puller and I have 3 children, 2 of them twins. When the twins—a boy and a girl—were babies she tells how I'd visit the nursery and go to the girl's crib and make all kinds of sweet talk while I chucked her under the chin. And then, she swears, I'd march over to my son's crib, look him in the eye, and shout, "Hup, 2, 3, 4."

Yes, sir, I'd be proud for my son to become a marine.

Faith in Future of Anthracite Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Plain Speaker, Hazleton, Pa., on Friday, July 20, 1956, which discloses that the Glen Alden Corp. has taken steps to improve the economic situation in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania:

Faith in the future of the anthracite coal industry was exemplified by the decision of the Glen Alden Corp. to begin work in the near future on a new million dollar breaker at Audenried. Just as recently as 1952 when the coal business was in the throes of an

economic slump the old Audenried breaker was torn down and coal is now being trucked to Junedale where a small plant processes the fuel.

The announcement by President Case and Vice President Everett and other officials of Glen Alden who made a prolonged study of the south side situation, comes as a boon to the greater Hazleton area. It is definitely certain that a plant of such proportions will require additional labor. While the breaker itself will be highly mechanized, its requirement for top production means that more mining and stripping operations, plus trucks, shovels and bulldozers will require labor.

There have been many recent incidents in the hard coal industry to indicate that an upturn in this vast field and incidentally our major industry, had taken hold.

However, a big shot-in-the-arm for the greater Hazleton area was Glen Alden's building plan as announced yesterday. It is important and most heartening, too, to our people that this tremendous investment in our community, followed in the footsteps of the groundbreaking for the new Valmont Industrial Park just west of Hazleton. Here other new plants are expected to be built in the not far distant future.

Oldtime mining men visualize the huge investment by Glen Alden as a sound business procedure. Their claim is that few tracts have coal deposits as rich as the veins from Audenreid to Green Mountain, which is on the east crest of the Brandonville Valley.

The south side operations of this company, until the A. E. Dick Construction and Contracting Co. opened up some major stripping projects years ago, generally depended upon deep-mined coal. Now with modern equipment for removing topsoil, many large deposits of fuel can be reached. Thus, a new breaker was decided upon.

Two other factors are worthy of mention in this development. One is that a local firm, the Wilmot Engineering Co., will build the breaker. And completion of the new northeast Pennsylvania turnpike which will speed up transportation in a rapidly growing trucking business that has found new fields in recently built communities.

Alaska's Abortive Congressional Elections

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Territorial government of Alaska has adopted procedures for the election of 2 United States Senators and 1 United States Representative in this fall's elections.

I introduced a bill, today, to nullify these proposed elections to nonexistent public offices.

This statement is made for the purpose of calling to the attention of the people of Alaska and the 48 States some of the salient features of this political maneuver.

These elections are in conflict with Federal law which limits the House of Representatives to 435 Members. The Territorial laws attempting to authorize the election of 2 United States Senators and 1 Representative exceed the authority granted the Territory by Congress in its organic law.

The proponents of statehood are attempting a power-politics maneuver to coerce and stampede Congress into granting statehood. They propose to usurp the power and responsibility of Congress to determine the advisability of statehood by presenting to Congress a prejudged and accomplished state of affairs, viz: 2 de facto United States Senators and 1 de facto Representative.

The proponents of statehood, no doubt, intend to use this phantom election to whip up an emotional hysteria in favor of statehood. I trust that the electorate will keep this election within its proper perspective.

In a large measure, our laws are not enacted on the basis of valid economic, mathematical, or social principles. Laws are, generally, the product of a conglomerate compromise between a voting political majority of the House and the Senate. Due to two political evolvements, the majority voting power very often does not represent the best interests of the Nation or the will of the majority.

First. The 18th amendment, providing for direct election of Senators, has intensified the political and sectional obligations of our Senators. It has restricted their freedom to make decisions based upon the primary national welfare. States with less than 30 percent of our population are invested with a majority vote in the United States Senate.

Second. The committees of the House of Representatives are stacked with members who have a personal political self-interest in the legislation within the jurisdiction of the committees.

For example, the members of the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives from the Western States favoring irrigation, reclamation, and subsidized public power outnumber Representatives from the balance of the 48 States by a ratio of 3 to 1. Yet, the majority of votes in this committee represent States with less than 25 percent of the population. No one with any understanding of human nature or politics could expect any legislation out of this committee which did not completely satisfy the political interests of the majority votes on this committee irrespective of the national interests involved.

The imbalance of political power in the Senate and in the committees of the House accelerates our drift toward a welfare state. The principle of equality before the law is being replaced by preferential and political favoritism for minority classes over the total body of taxpayers. The welfare state is the forerunner of the police state.

Statehood for Alaska would accentuate this imbalance of power. It would, further, contribute toward sectional and minority control over the majority of the people to the deteriment of the national interest.

Next January, Congress will be confronted with ludicrous claims by Alaska that it should have statehood because it has legally elected its representatives to Congress.

Robert L. Rote—Wisconsin Loses a Great Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the State of Wisconsin mourns the death of one of its outstanding businessmen, Mr. Robert L. Rote of Monroe, Wis.

Mr. Rote contributed much to the public life of the State. He was one of the founders of the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce. In addition to being a successful businessman, he was an engineer and a student of government. At all times he was ready to fight for the principles which have made this country great, among them the right of the individual as against the right of entrenched government. He made many contributions to community life in his beloved Monroe. Green County will miss him as will the business and professional people of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial that appeared in the Monroe (Wis.) Evening Times which relates to Mr. Rote:

ROBERT L. ROTE

Our cousins overseas have a boast to the effect that the educated, intelligent, and vigorously intent Englishman represents the finest product of modern civilization, the ultimate in the evolution of man.

Robert L. Rote was such a man.

Businessman, engineer, outstanding citizen, student of government, and warm friend, Mr. Rote combined in his 68 years all of the attributes that make up the complete man, as described by the British.

Possessed of charming manners and the social graces, he also demonstrated in his long years of service an inflexible ability to strike pointedly at the heart of questions concerning his community and his country.

Mr. Rote was proud of Monroe and his widespread activities in State and National affairs enabled him to spread the good word about this little city wherever he went. He performed this missionary work effectively. It is safe to say that thousands who never knew of Monroe's existence were convinced after chatting with Mr. Rote that this city and its dairy-farming area is the wonderful place we all think it is.

Mr. Rote's affiliations, interests, and public service covered a variety of fields—more, perhaps, than ever has been experienced by any of his fellow townsmen. He was a tireless booster of Wisconsin's fine recreational facilities, its scenery, and its people. Since he found great enjoyment in studying people and in making friends, we suspect Mr. Rote had a keen realization of the unique heritage of special characteristics that Wisconsin offers all its citizens—native and adopted.

Businesswise, he was an outstanding success, because of his high ability and also because of his unusual personality which represented a perfect balance between friendliness, keen judgment, and a precise application of his talents to fit the situation at hand.

In public service, Mr. Rote concentrated his energies in a direction which offered the best opportunity for putting his skills and

his understanding to best use—Monroe's municipal water utility. As president of the city water commission, he played a major role in building that system into an efficient and sound operation for the benefit of all taxpayers.

Mr. Rote's activities at the State and National level were so numerous that his fellow citizens often wondered where he found the time to participate. The answer was simple. He was sincere in his interests, so he took the time—often at some sacrifice to his private business.

Each of his legion of friends and even those who did not know him personally will remember Robert L. Rote for a different reason, perhaps. That, because of the many facets of his life, is natural. Some will remember him as a builder, others as a gracious host. Still others throughout the State and Nation will recall his devotion to Wisconsin and the problems of better government.

The important thing, however, is that the record of Robert L. Rote's career and activities stands as a fine testimonial to his completeness as a citizen, a perpetual scholar, and a good friend. That is why he will be remembered for a long, long time.

Report of Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, July 18, 1956, the Joint Economic Committee met to consider a report by one of its subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy. This report was entitled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy, Case Study of Watch Industry and Precision Skills." A quorum was not present, but was agreed in accordance with the committee's rules to obtain concurrence by telephoning the committee members to transmit the subcommittee report for printing and publication. It was specifically understood that there was basic disagreement in the minds of some of the members of the full committee on the "conclusions and recommendations" contained in the subcommittee report and that approval for transmittal was not to be construed as an adoption by the full committee of the subcommittee's report. Furthermore, time was to be permitted members who wished to file supplemental or dissenting views to be incorporated in the printed report. Through a misunderstanding the report was printed without some of the additional views. It was agreed however not to send out the subcommittee report until the supplemental views were printed and that both the report and these views would be sent out together.

Regrettably the press has reported the subcommittee report as being the report of the full committee. This is not true.

I am now inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD, the views of Senator GOLDWATER, Representative WOLCOTT, and myself, members of the full committee on this report. These views are to be printed and distributed with the subcommittee report. Above all, it should be cleared up beyond any doubt that the subcommittee report was neither considered nor adopted by the full committee.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, ARIZONA, AND REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS B. CURTIS, MISSOURI, ON REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE ENTITLED "DEFENSE ESSENTIALITY AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY—CASE STUDY OF WATCH INDUSTRY AND PRECISION SKILLS"

Certain of the conclusions and recommendations in the report are subject to the following criticism: 1. They go beyond the study of the subcommittee. 2. They are contrary to the arguments and observations contained in the body of the report. 3. They are inconsistent with each other. On other conclusions and recommendations, though within the scope of the study and having a basis set forth in the report, in our judgment, the better logic points to different conclusions.

With this preamble the following observations are made:

1. Comment: It is agreed that "a community of economically healthy nations devoted to living in harmony and tied by mutually beneficial trade is not the least factor of our national security." But in light of the subject matter of the report, it should be affirmatively stated, and it is not, that the greatest factor of national security depends upon the economic health of the United States.

2. Comment: It is axiomatic that mobilization thinking must go far beyond outmoded ideas of continental defense, but how far must mobilization thinking go beyond up-to-date ideas of continental defense?

4. Comment: The entire testimony about the possible types of future wars which the subcommittee itself found in its studies contradicts conclusion No. 4. The real conclusion is that it is not safe to make any firm assumption as to which type of war we might have to fight. Certainly, it is highly probable that we will fight a war where there will be time to convert our industry from war to peace. The time lag probably will have to be improved over the period of years, the subcommittee assumes.

5. Comment: The subcommittee made no study which justifies such a statement that "Thermonuclear war would destroy civilization and mankind everywhere." Certainly there is a school of thought which advances this idea, but there are many other schools of thought which take sharp issue with this bit of human conceit.

Comment: It is hard to understand how the conclusion is reached that "economic support of this effort implies current production and stockpiling of material needed rather than massive conversion of industry." Of course, through the use of the adjective "massive," the statement is not so easily refutable. However, the very burden of the study is the question of how much industrial conversion might be feasibly planned for the various types of potential wars. The use of the adjective "massive" in a positive statement on another matter takes away the very point at issue and under discussion.

12. Comment: This subcommittee made no study of tariffs versus other methods of trade regulation and is hardly in a position to comment upon the feasibility of one method of regulating trade over another without such a study.

13. Comment: Just what does the term "likeminded nations" refer to? Likeminded on judgments of economic-political philosophy?

WATCHES

2. Comment: This is directly contrary to what evidence the subcommittee adduced about possible wars in the future. One of the most likely of all wars is nonthermonuclear where Russia moves over the face of Western Europe with its land armies. Such a movement would amount to a war in which Switzerland is cut off from us and our factories would still be intact. The decision as to whether a peripheral war is to become thermonuclear is largely one that the United States will make. In Korea, we decided against it. In Indochina, we decided against it. In the taking over of Czechoslovakia, not only did we decide against it, we decided to do nothing. In Greece we decided against it. Now on what basis does the subcommittee make such an assumption in recommendation 2 on watches?

3. Comment: If conclusion 2 is unsupported, conclusion 3 falls also.

5. Comment: It is hard to understand the data from whence it is concluded that trade restrictions will not preserve the domestic industry. The entire reason for the position of the Swiss importers is that they want the business; the position of the domestic producer is that they want the business. The trade restriction as presently drawn gives the business to the domestic producer. It isn't a question of "preservation" as such as much as it is a question of "growth" with the growing economy.

The argument that trade restriction is a burden on other industries and consumers can be applied to any restriction on anything. The question at hand is, Is the thing restricted against sufficiently detrimental to the part that it in effect is detrimental to the whole?

7. Comment: This conception is amoral and inconsistent with the previous conclusions of the subcommittee. In conclusion 13 the subcommittee argues for the need of the United States to stay committed to a policy of intervention in world affairs. "This requires our consistent application of principles designed to encourage economic growth and progress throughout all like-minded nations of the world; a timorous and inconsistent policy with principle sacrificed to temporary expedience will weaken true national security," the subcommittee states.

The United States has antitrust laws to restrict against trusts, cartels, and many other attempts of persons to gain monopolistic control over economic powers. We do that in the firm belief that not to do so will discourage economic growth and progress. Now, either we believe this is true or we do not. Either we believe that minimum wage laws and laws against sweat shops do encourage economic growth and progress and that permitting the opposite will discourage it, or we do not. We either believe that our health regulations that we impose on our domestic producers are in the interest of the health of our consumers and of our society or we do not.

This doctrine advanced by the subcommittee in this recommendation that "we have no valid reason for dictating the form of internal business organization in a foreign country" can only come logically from a belief that these restrictions we place on our own domestic producers are just window dressing—voter appeal stuff—matters that have no relation to reality. Certainly, if the members of the subcommittee and the staff who prepared this report believed in the economic merit of antitrust laws, minimum-wage laws, health laws, and all the other restrictions we place upon our domestic manufacturers, they would see that the only way we can help spread economic growth and progress in foreign countries is through an insistence upon paying attention to these standards.

Now do we have to go as far as the subcommittee does in its recommendation No. 13 in the extent of United States intervention abroad in this matter. The subject matter at hand concerns a question of foreign coun-

tries wanting to sell their goods in the United States domestic market. We surely have the right to impose a little intervention here to say to the foreign producer, we have certain economic regulations imposed upon our domestic manufacturer which we felt are necessary to maintain this great domestic market we have built and to protect our consumers and we expect you to pay some attention to them too if you want to gain the benefits of trading in it.

In essence, the presentation of the subcommittee is the same argument that used to be used domestically in favor of sweatshops * * * the consumer gets the benefit in price. Well, we have concluded in this country that, thought the consumer may get an immediate benefit in price from sweatshop labor, in the long run neither the consumer nor any one else derives benefit from exploitation of other men's labors.

For over 10 years now we have been following the mixed up philosophy, the same that is herein advanced by the subcommittee in its recommendations and conclusions, in our foreign policy. It has not done well in stemming communism in the world either ideologically in the hearts of men or physically in the broad lands of the world. The reasons why this foreign policy has not succeeded should be obvious by now. We have not been promoting the political and economic philosophy which made this country what it is, the philosophy of high wages, good working conditions, fair-trade practices, rules against economic monopoly (including the worst kind of economic monopoly, that controlled by the political government). Those who have been charged with setting up and administering our foreign policy from their actions, seem to have no concept of what the virtues of private enterprise are. They have taken this great society in the United States for granted and then have gone abroad and condoned and indeed, encouraged the very economic practices which we had to fight against over a period of many years in this country in order to have the system that we do have.

If we are indeed to promote economic growth and progress abroad, we had better start paying attention to the things that produced the economic growth and progress in this Nation. The laws of economics and sociology are just as true abroad as they are at home.

Aid Asked for Chronic Unemployment Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Sunday, July 22, 1956, which discloses that the National Planning Association has called upon the Federal Government to take on the job of restoring prosperity in chronic unemployment areas:

UNITED STATES ACTION ASKED ON JOBLESS AREAS

The National Planning Association said yesterday the Government should take on the job of restoring prosperity in chronic unemployment areas.

The private research group said in a policy statement that depressed communities are a national problem which "threatens our internal development and our external security."

The Department of Labor has listed 23 such areas and has made them eligible for Federal help. Assistance to date, however, has been limited to placing defense contracts. Even this is not possible in some communities.

The association, composed of representatives of business, labor, agriculture and the professions, recommended a cooperative Federal-local-private program to include:

A study to determine which industries might be drawn to depressed cities and what resources and facilities are available.

Public works programs which would attract new industries or help revive existing ones.

Applying to the slack areas some of the American techniques used successfully in underdeveloped foreign countries.

Various financial inducements such as direct Government lending or guarantee of private loans. One of the policy drafters thought this would be an intrusion on private enterprise.

Tax concessions such as rapid amortization of new plants.

Unemployment insurance, direct work relief, training for new and different jobs, and improved employment services.

The association said a comprehensive approach is required "since local efforts, even when well organized, have always fallen well short of success."

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the U. S., Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I wish to include the following address delivered by me at the annual convention of the Department of New Jersey, Italian-American World War Veterans of the U. S., Inc., at the Hotel Robert Treat, Newark, N. J., July 22, 1956:

Mr. State Commander, fellow veterans, no movement within our American society is closer to my heart than the organizations of veterans of American wars of which the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States is an active and moving force. I have dedicated my life to the proposition that the hyphen can and should be a uniting, not a dividing, force in American life; and that immigrants, second generation Americans, descendants of colonial Americans, and our only natives, the American Indians, have an equal privilege and duty to provide pieces in the shining kaleidoscopic pattern of American culture. To Jewish groups and Negro groups, to Polish-American, German-American, and Irish-American patriotic associations and the rest, I give my hearty and enthusiastic support, so long as the organizations and their members, whatever their racial and ancestral character, put America in first place, supreme and unquestioned. But to your group, I give not only my enthusiasm for the general idea of bringing the old culture to make its contribution to the new, but the warm personal feeling of identification. I am myself proud to be an American of Italian ancestry, and it warms my heart to know that the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States now have a department in my own State of New Jersey.

I believe, too, most heartily, in the uniting of veterans, not only in one, but in many organizations. Each veterans' organization has its contribution to make to the country, its maintenance in peace and its defense in war; and each veterans' organization, in my experience, has its own particular flavor and character, and its own particular contribution to make to the happiness and welfare of the individual members. I find no conflict of loyalties, but a useful interaction and coordination in my own membership in such varied veterans' organizations as the Fellowship of United States-British Comrades, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans of World War II, the American Legion, and the Military Order of World Wars.

To a group of this sort, I know I need not speak, either statistically or instance by instance, of contributions Italians and Italian-Americans have made to the building of the United States, and to its defense in war. The facts summarized in Albert Q. Maisel's splendid article, The Italians Among Us, in the Reader's Digest of January 1955, and in similar articles from time to time, need not be rehearsed here. You know, and I know, that in music and painting, in sculpture and poetry, in science and religion, whether of modern times or ancient, whether of the new world or the old, no list of the great would be complete without its Italian names. But our greatness is not only in those summits, those mountain peaks of achievement that shine out before the world as Palestrina and Verdi, De Vinci and Raphael, Michelangelo and Donatello, Dante and Petrarch, Galileo and Volta, St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Ambrose, of Milan. Our greatness is in the way each one of us tackles his job, however small or obscure it may be. We are proud to count among our Italian-Americans the streetcleaners and the plumbers, the roadmenders and ditchdiggers, the operators of cranes and bulldozers, the makers of shoes, the growers and sellers of vegetables, the workers with the products of the earth, that are the solid foundation of this and every country. When I walk along a city street, I like to think that the Italian-American hosierymakers, of Paterson, may have made the socks, and the Italian-American shoemakers, of Brockton, Mass., the shoes, on which I walk, and that the labor of uncounted Italian-Americans, and other Americans, has gone into the paving, and the ditching, and the pipes and wires and conduits, under my feet. I like to remember, too, that it is by the undaunted courage and devotion of Italian-Americans and other Americans, that we have held and still hold this free soil of America, with all the gifts of God and products of the industry and ingenuity of man that make us the envy and the hope of the world.

May the blood of Italy, in the veins of American veterans, still pulse through New Jersey, and through America, in joy, in generous service, in fervent devotion to God and country.

House Joint Resolution 604—United States World Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let this occasion pass without ex-

pressing my feeling of sincere pride and happiness at the passage by both Houses of the Congress of my resolution to focus world attention on the United States World Trade Fair which will be held at the New Coliseum in New York City in April 1957. It was my fond hope when I introduced that legislation that some small contribution might be made to the cause of peace and understanding through world trade.

The bill is now to be presented to the President for his signature. There is no doubt in my mind that a great service will be rendered as a result of the passage of this measure. The States of the Union and the nations of the world will be invited to attend the fair and take part in it for the purpose of displaying under one roof the combined productive creativeness of the entire free world.

The most intriguing feature of the exposition is the possibility that it will cause new and strong economic ties between nations and States and that as a result new and strong friendships will be created, each contributing in some measure to better understanding and greater good will in the world. In addition, there is the possibility that the economic benefits to be derived from the fair will in the long run put many nations on their feet economically. There can be little doubt that a nation would much prefer to be economically self-sufficient, than economically reliant on others.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to add one personal note of thanks to Chairman Richards and the other members of the Foreign Affairs Committee for the expeditious manner in which they brought this measure to the floor of the House for consideration and to the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma for the assistance which they gave toward prompt action in the Senate. I am very grateful to all who aided in the passage of this measure.

Our Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following articles:

NAVY'S OBJECTIVES—VARIED JOBS DEPEND ON VARIED SITUATIONS

The way Adm. Arleigh Burke sees it, the Navy has all-important but different jobs in the cold war, the limited war, and the all-out nuclear war.

In the cold war, the Chief of Naval Operations has pointed out, the United States Navy keeps fleets on guard in troubled waters in a quiet, unprovoking manner. The United States Sixth Fleet now is on guard in the Mediterranean. The Seventh fleet is ready for action in the Western Pacific.

In a limited war, the Navy has responsibilities of the kind that it assumed in the Communist attack on Korea.

In the all-out nuclear war it would have still another type of role. Burke believes that the main thing there may be for the Navy to be ready to deliver the "third punch."

This is the way he explained it:

"In case of an all-out atomic surprise attack, naval forces ready for action at sea will be among the first to retaliate.

"Then perhaps after both sides have made their initial strikes, the United States ability to take further action will depend upon the mobile striking power we have dispersed at sea."

This means that the Chief of Naval Operations believes that land bases, American and overseas, may have possibly less chance to survive surprise attacks than combat ships whose movements make them hard to find and harder to hit.

The Navy expects to strike back with available units of its 984 active ships (to be increased to more than 1,000 in 1957), its 1,700 combat aircraft handled by 17 air groups, and its family of missiles.

The most important single ship is the new carrier *Forrestal*, a vessel with a 4-acre flight deck sturdy enough to handle the new Douglas A3D Skywarrior, a 70,000-pound twin-jet bomber capable of delivering a hydrogen bomb on a target more than 1,500 miles away at speeds in the 600 to 700 mile per hour range. A half-dozen operational squadrons have been supplied with this plane which has a service ceiling of 40,000 feet.

The *Forrestal* is to be joined later this year by a sister ship, the *Saratoga*, now undergoing sea trials. They are the first of a whole new line of atomic age 60,000-ton carriers, the later ones of which will have atomic engines.

One fighter plane that will protect the *Forrestal* and other task force ships from enemy aircraft is the Chance-Vought F8U–1, a new supersonic jet fighter called the Crusader.

Like the Skywarrior, the F8U–1 was given carrier tests aboard the *Forrestal*, and stirred enthusiastic approval.

At the Patuxent River (Md.) Naval Air Test Center, test pilots showed the same liking for planes.

The Crusader, with a speed of around 1,000 miles an hour, was flown first in March of 1955, and the first production model flew the following September. The F8U is powered by a single Pratt and Whitney J–57 turbojet engine with afterburner. Production orders totaling $165 million for the plane have been placed by the Navy within recent months.

In the modern naval task force, a large part of the burden of air defense will be borne by the guided missile ships. The Navy has 12 of them now.

They include the converted heavy cruisers, U. S. S. *Boston* and U. S. S. *Canberra*, which with the tactical command ship U. S. S. *Northampton* comprise the world's first guided missile cruiser division.

Both cruisers are equipped with launchers to fire the Terrier, a surface-to-air missile, from twin mounts. The Terrier, a supersonic beam rider, is designed to knock down enemy aircraft.

The Terrier, which is manufactured by the Convair Division of General Dynamics, also can be fired from launchers on the destroyer U. S. S. *Gyatt*. The Terrier is 15 feet long and weighs 2,700 pounds.

The 7-ton Regulus surface-to-surface missile can be fired from six vessels. They are the submarines *Barbero* and *Tunny*, the aircraft carrier *Hancock*, and the cruisers *Los Angeles*, *Macon*, and *Helena*.

The surface-to-air missile Talos, heavier and longer-range than the Terrier, can be fired by launchers on the light cruiser *Galveston*.

The Navy's other two missile-firing ships are the converted seaplane tender *Norton Sound* and the U. S. S. *Mississippi*, the Navy's oldest battleship. Both are used as test ships.

The Terrier's record of kills during tests have been consistently excellent. The Regulus has been in quantity production for several years, and the Navy only recently placed a new $14-million order for it with Chance Vought.

Another Navy missile in fleet use is Petrel. Launched from patrol planes, Petrel is designed to make quick kills of surface ships.

One of the smallest of the Navy missile family is the air-to-air Sparrow I, a 300-pound missile measuring 12 feet in length. Capable of reaching a speed of 1,500 miles per hour in 2 seconds, it is carried under the wings of such Navy fighter planes as the Douglas F3D Skyknight and the Chance Vought F7U Cutlass.

NAVY'S WEAPONS—SHIPS AND MISSILES FEATURE POWER, SPEED

The United States Navy already has been drastically redesigned, but its scientists say that this is only the beginning.

Navy Secretary Thomas has pointed out what is happening. All at the same time the Navy is changing from oil burners to atomic engines, from gunpowder to nuclear warheads, from ordinary TNT shells to missiles, from propeller planes to jets, and from subsonic speeds to supersonic speeds in the air.

The astonishing success of the nuclear-powered submarine *Nautilus* has set the Navy to designing even larger, more powerful nuclear submarines. The second atomic submarine, the *Sea Wolf* is ready for commissioning. Seven more are building or authorized, and the Navy is asking Congress to authorize six more after that.

To speed its nuclear power program, the Navy also has asked Congress to authorize construction of an 11,000-ton missile cruiser to be propelled by atomic engines, and to permit the Navy to build an atomic engine for an aircraft carrier.

Less well known to most Americans, but of extraordinary interest among Navy scientists, is the performance of the experimental submarine *Albacore*. The *Albacore* is powered by conventional diesel engines and electric battteries, but her tear-drop hull shape has given the boat such maneuverability and speed underwater that the Navy foresees a whole new kind of naval power evolving.

The next step, already planned by the Navy, is to wed the *Albacore* and the *Nautilus*—putting nuclear power into the Albacore's tear-drop shape.

Navy scientists feel certain that the result will be a boat such as no scientist even let himself dream of a few years ago.

The *Albacore* proved in tests to have many of the characteristics under water that an airplane has in the air. The boat dived, turned, and generally responded to controls so eagerly that crewmen started talking about her trips as flights, and seat belts were introduced into the *Albacore* to keep men from losing their balance in quick dives.

With an atomic engine, a teardrop shaped submarine could perform under water for just as long as her crew could take it—4 or 5 days—instead of only for the few hours possible now in the *Albacore* with electric batteries.

The future value of the submarine is linked to success in developing missiles, such as the Jupiter, which the Navy and Army are cooperating in developing.

The Jupiter is a 1,500-mile-range missile. Some Navy scientists envision a future American Navy which would be able to ring the continents of Europe and Asia with nuclear-powered, tear-drop shaped submarines, each equipped to fire 1,500-mile-range missiles.

Since no target on earth is more than 1,700 miles from the sea, such a force could practically cover the earth.

The more conventional view of the naval task force of the future is one consisting mainly of large aircraft carriers and multi-purpose escorts able to launch defensive guided missiles against enemy aircraft and

guided missiles. The escorts would be equipped to detect and destroy enemy submarines.

Nuclear-powered submarines would operate in the vanguard, acting as scouts, radar pickets, and missile carriers. Such a task force would be scattered over an area two-thirds the size of Illinois. The dispersal would make it difficult for an enemy to hit more than one ship, even with a hydrogen bomb, and any enemy vessel or aircraft approaching the area would have little chance of survival.

Another new weapon with great promise is the jet seaplane. The plane is the Martin P6M Seamaster, a 600-mile-per-hour multijet that Adm. Arleigh Burke, the chief of naval operations, has called the fastest low-altitude attack aircraft in existence.

Built primarily as a photo-reconnaissance and minelaying aircraft, the *Seamaster* is to be introduced into the fleet during 1958.

In the past, seaplanes have been cumbersome and slow. The *Seamaster* has great range as well as great speed, and can be refueled and armed at sea by submarine or surface ship.

Somewhere ahead in the Navy's arsenal is the atomic-powered airplane—undoubtedly, scientists believe now, destined to be a seaplane. Convair is working on it, and other companies and naval scientists are driving ahead on the idea in a speeded-up development program. The Air Force as well as the Navy has made its own start on this program.

One of the Navy's scientists predicted last month that a breakthrough is near in the greatest single problem facing designers and builders of the atomic-powered airplane. This problem is shielding the crew against atomic radiation. The trouble now is that shielding, largely of lead plates, is so heavy.

Such an aircraft, when developed, would be able to reach any target on earth. It could fly for weeks or months without refueling. The only immediate limitation on its operations would be the endurance of the crew.

NAVY'S SPENDING—BUDGET THIS YEAR: $10 BILLION

The United States Navy will get $10 billion during the next 12 months. That is its share of the $35 billion 1956–57 military budget which gives the Air Force $17 billion and the Army around $8 billion.

The Navy's part represents 2½ cents out of every dollar of the Nation's $400 billion annual income.

How does the Navy spend this money? Is there any way of judging what kind of value the Nation is getting?

The Navy spends the money in thousands of different ways, but basically it spends for ships, airplanes, maintenance, ammunition, and men.

To build a ship costs more money each year, and the current rate on ships, marking the transition to a nuclear fleet, is $1½ billion a year.

Some sample prices: the atomic submarine *Nautilus*, $5 million; carrier U. S. S. *Forrestal*, world's most powerful combat vessel, $198 million; new guided-missile cruiser with atomic engines, $100 million; system to launch the Terrier guided missile from the converted heavy cruiser *Boston*, $4 million.

Airplanes are costly items, too. Just to mention one plane—the Chance Vought F8U Crusader—the Navy has signed contracts for $165 million for Crusaders.

Is the Crusader worth it? Navy men, from maintenance men to pilots, and test-center commanders to top admirals, are certain that it is. The Crusader will fly 1,000 miles an hour and supply the Navy with the greatest carrier-based fighting force in the world.

The present Naval Establishment consists of 2,724 ships, 12,000 airplanes (including U. S. Marine Corps airplanes), and 671,000 officers and men, plus 198,000 Marines. Of the total number of ships, 984 are active, and 403 are combat craft.

Altogether, the Navy has $56½ billion worth of property of all kinds—real estate, ships, guns, missiles, uniforms, vehicles, paper clips, canned food.

As a measure of military value these things are useful, and as a measuring stick in relation to other services' expenditure they also are valuable. The Navy's accountants can point out convincingly that the Navy handles a dollar as carefully as anyone in Government.

NAVY'S MANPOWER—PROGRAM TO GET AND KEEP GOOD MEN GAINS

The United States Navy has found manpower is a problem that never is fully solved, but there is evidence that the Navy has done an expert job in getting and keeping high caliber officers and enlisted men.

During the last 12 months the Navy got 180,000 recruits to replace the men whose Korean war enlistments expired, and only 28,500 of these men were from selective service. Thirty thousand were from the Reserves, and the others from recruitment.

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., chief of naval personnel for the last 3 years, said that to meet personnel needs during the next year the Navy would continue its recruitment efforts, backed by the Navy League and the Fleet Reserve, and would take other steps.

For one thing, the Navy will increase its Officer Candidate School output from 2,600 a year now, to between 4,000 and 5,000 in 1957.

The Navy is facing a shortage of medical doctors and nurses, line aviation officers, and skilled technicians in about a dozen enlisted ratings.

Holloway expects the flight training output to increase from 2,900 in 1956 to 3,200 in 1957. This is expected to produce enough pilots.

Other measures to help the personnel situation are found in the drive by all the military services to get better pay, housing and medical care for personnel and their families.

The Navy also is making efforts to build sailors' pride in their units, and as a phase of this effort American sailors will start wearing the name of their ship on their sleeves in September.

NAVY CREED—FOR TODAY, NEW DEDICATION

In recent weeks, bulletins and wardrooms on ships and stations of the United States Navy around the world have displayed a new statement of the modern Navy's purpose and duties. Called the Navy's Creed, it reads:

"The United States Navy is responsible for maintaining control of the sea and is a ready force on watch at home and overseas, capable of strong action to preserve the peace or of instant offensive action to win in war.

"It is upon the maintenance of this control that our country's glorious future depends; the United States Navy exists to make it so.

"WE SERVE WITH HONOR

"Tradition, valor, and victory are the Navy's heritage from the past. To these may be added dedication, discipline, and vigilance as the watchwords of the present and the future.

"At home or on distant stations we serve with pride, confident in the respect of our country, our shipmates, and our families.

"Our responsibilities sober us; our adversities strengthen us.

"Service to God and Country is our special privilege. We serve with honor.

"THE FUTURE OF THE NAVY

"The Navy will always employ new weapons, new techniques, and greater power to protect and defend the United States on the sea, under the sea, and in the air.

"Now and in the future, control of the sea gives the United States her greatest advantage for the maintenace of peace and for victory in war.

"Mobility, surprise, dispersal, and offensive power are the keynotes of the new Navy. The roots of the Navy lie in a strong belief in the future, in continued dedication to our tasks, and in reflection on our heritage from the past.

"Never have our opportunities and our responsibilities been greater."

Successful Cloud Seeding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H. R. 10413 which I introduced last April with S. 2913 which has passed both Houses, been approved by the President, and upon which the Appropriations Committee has already approved a supplemental appropriation to carry on the work of this fiscal year, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an Associated Press article appearing in the Rapid City (S. Dak.) Journal under date of July 19, 1956.

The article is of interest not only because it describes the method in which South Dakota through its ex-Marine ace, Gov. Joe Foss, and its National Guard have been seeding clouds with dry ice, but it is also of technical interest to those who are interested in the program of weather modification:

South Dakota has successfully pioneered in cloud seeding experiments by jet planes, it was reported to a State weather modification conference here.

Clouds were seeded for the first time by a specially equipped jet plane and produced excellent results, Chief Howard Welle, United States Navy representative on the national advisory committee on weather control, told the conference.

The plane, carrying a converted jato tube (jet assist takeoff) with 60 pounds of dry ice on each flight, successfully seeded the clouds in the southeastern part of the State on 6 days.

Wells said arrangements for the experiments was made in Washington 2 weeks ago in conferences with Senator Francis Case, Gov. Joe Foss, and Lt. Col. D. L. (Duke) Corning. One of the Air Guard planes of the 175th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Sioux Falls was specially equipped for the experiments on July 5.

TRACKED DOWN BY RADAR

"The experiments were carried out in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau Station at Sioux Falls which tracked the seeding operations by radar," Wells disclosed.

"We made one run in a C47, but the icing level in this country is high (12,000–14,000 feet) and it took too long to reach that altitude."

Wells said M. Sgt. Bob Perkins, Air Guard mechanic, designed a trap door arrangement for a jato tube and placed screen mesh at one end. The tube, loaded with dry ice, was attached to the belly of a T33 jet trainer. The pilot tripped the trap door from his pressurized cockpit, rushing air through the tube and super-cooling it while the screen prevented chunks of ice from escaping.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILES AN HOUR

The supercooled air was spread over the tops of storm clouds at altitudes ranging from 6,500 to 39,000 feet while the jet plane was traveling about 350 miles per hour. Except for one trip over the West River and near Pickstown, all flights were flown over the East River area.

Most of them were flown near Sioux Falls to permit ground as well as air observation.

Wells said every cloud seeded produced rains, many of them minutes after the plane had made its run over the tops. The ground observers kept in radio contact with the pilot and learned that the clouds rose quickly after seeding. One pilot reported that the top a cloud he had seeded rose 2,500 feet within 3 minutes.

Flights were made July 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, and 17 and Wells gave instructions to the pilots on days when cloud formations were not right for seeding and when there were severe thunderstorms in the area.

THREE-INCH FALL

"There was a complete changeover in the formation of the clouds after seeding and rain fell from them soon after each run," Wells said. "On 1 flight, 3 clouds 20 miles apart were seeded and 1 of them dropped 3 inches of rain in the Sioux City region."

Colonel Corning, Maj. John Schilt, and Capt. Justin Berger took turns piloting the plane on the experimental flights. A chase plane went along on each flight to observe the effect of the seeding.

Colonel Corning described flying through one of the clouds after seeding and said, "Something was churning in there, and I flew out of it fast."

"There were a lot of skeptics among my boys at first," Corning added. "But they joined me in believing there's something to it now."

Wells said the dry ice disappeared at the rate of about 1 pound for every 4 miles, while normal cloud seeding with dry ice requires from 3 to 20 pounds every 4 miles.

He added, "There is an abundance of moisture in the clouds out here."

FOSS OPENS EVENT

Governor Foss opened the weather-modification conference by stating that rain-increase programs should be encouraged in an effort to provide more stable rainfall for this agricultural State. He said arrangements have been made to conduct further experiments by the State.

"We're going to try out some new ideas," Foss said. "I realize that these programs are still pretty much of a gamble. However, rain-increase research has been improving the odds."

Aid or Perish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 23, 1956:

AID OR PERISH

Foreign aid is under attack from many sources, and unless its sponsors can show greater strength than they have done to date in the Senate the program may be seriously impaired. The President's request for $2.3 billion for military aid to friendly countries barely squeezed through the Senate last week. Fortunately, the Senate also voted the full $15 million requested by the adminstration for technical assistance to be administered by the United Nations in underdeveloped countries, thus eliminating a sharp reduction imposed by the House. Several other aspects of the $4.1 billion foreign aid bill, however, appear to be in peril.

There are various reasons for this increased opposition to foreign aid. World tensions have lessened in recent months, and people are no longer as fearful as they were of large-scale war. In some instances the Administration has failed to make the best use of foreign-aid funds, and the big drive for new ideas that would help to cement the free world together has produced nothing of a striking nature in either political party. No doubt the increasingly uncooperative attitude of some of our allies, in the face of relaxed tension, has also hastened the cooling off in this country toward continued help of the type that has been given during the last decade.

It is not surprising that these and other factors have lessened the popularity of foreign aid, but it is astonishing that some responsible statesmen are willing to undercut the present ties that help to bind the free world together before anything more constructive has been put in their place. There is, of course, a substantial go-it-alone element in Congress and in the country that would be delighted to swing national policy back to what its conceives to be the good old days of isolationism. But this is a minor element. The aid program is really imperiled only when these die-hards of the pre-aviation and preatomic ages are supported by disgruntled partisans and critics of specific weakness in existing policies.

The latter group should weigh carefully what they are doing. The one overriding fact to be remembered is that the United States cannot be secure in this age of atomic bombs and aggressive ideologies without firm defense arrangements with numerous friendly powers. It is true that no nation can buy friendship with dollars or guns. But it is equally true that, in this age of close international ties, we cannot make common cause with the remainder of the free world without a sympathetic understanding of other peoples' problems and a willingness to help them gain their national aspirations.

Basically, the foreign-aid program is not a giveaway. Rather, it is an investment in free-world solidarity. If some of the money is being unwisely spent, if new techniques and new ideas are needed, the proper course is to correct the errors and to supply new techniques and ideas—not to cripple the program. It is especially important for the Senate to assert courageous leadership toward this objective to offset the negativism that has already gripped the House.

A Program for Public Use of Flood-Control Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, recently I have been looking into the need for providing public use and recreational facilities in connection with flood-control projects built by the Corps of Engineers. I have run into some facts concerning our lack of planning of such a program which are not understandable in view of the fact that the Congress appears to have repeatedly authorized it. Quite a few Members have indicated their interest in developing a modest but adequate provision for public use in connection with this construction. I hope other Members will join with us in working out this urgently needed use of our developed natural resources, and for this reason I would like to submit here a copy of a letter I have written to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers on this matter. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 11, 1956.

Lt. Gen. S. D. STURGIS, Jr.,
Chief, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, Gravelly Point, Va.

DEAR GENERAL STURGIS: I am writing to you because I am very much disturbed about the program to provide adequate recreational and public use facilities in connection with flood control dams and reservoirs, and other similar projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers. While my immediate concern over this matter arises from the lack of recreational facilities at projects in my own district, I am equally concerned about the entire program throughout the United States.

My preliminary inquiries into the existing situation disclosed that during the calendar year 1955 you had the perfectly astounding total of 62 million visitors at Army engineer projects. This is considerably in excess of the total number of visitors who went to all of our national parks combined during the same year, and is far greater than the number recorded in recreation areas of our forests. I found that you have 64,000 boats licensed for operation on the reservoirs created by Army engineer dams, and that this number is increasing at a rapid rate.

Some further inquiry disclosed that the Army engineers are responsible for projects of this nature in operation or under construction costing a total of $7,484,000,000. Of this tremendous sum, I find, you have spent approximately $4,500,000 for recreational facilities and that the greater portion of this sum, though charged to recreational facilities, has actually been expended on access roads which would have been built in connection with the construction and operation, but may have been constructed to higher standards to permit public use.

I consider that 1 percent of the construction cost of a project of this nature would be a reasonable amount to spend in order to afford recreational and public use of the natural resources enhanced by the project. If this percentage had been allocated on your construction, it would have amounted to more than $74 million, but the actual amount spent was less than one-sixteenth of 1 percent.

My first thought in connection with what I consider to be an urgently needed improved policy was the introduction into Congress of legislation to declare a policy for a modest but adequate provision for recreational and public use as a part of the construction cost of your projects. I also felt that in making your reports to Congress to provide the basis for authorizations, it would be a good idea to consider and estimate recreational and public use benefits.

My inquiries disclosed that it is the opinion of your organization that further or supplementary legislation is not needed. I understand that the flood control acts of 1954 and prior years contain the necessary authority and that what we need to do is to activate a program already authorized by the Congress. I want you to know that if you feel this is not the case, I will be most happy to sponsor and support necessary legislation, and I would welcome your suggestions along this line.

I would like to direct your attention to the fact that our national parks, forests, and

wilderness areas are suffering from serious overloading by those who are seeking recreation. In many instances it would be more economical, faster, and more desirable for the persons who are now crowding our parks and forests to go instead to recreational areas in conjunction with nearby flood-control projects, if adequate facilities were available. I am aware of the fact that responsibility for recreational development in conjunction with flood control projects has several times been studied and reported on by commissions and boards. I understand that the last such study resulted in a vague recommendation that there is Federal responsibility for such facilities when the recreational benefits are of a national character, but that facilities should be locally provided when the benefits are deemed to be of a local character. Such a proposal involves a great deal of administrative difficulty and does not appear to me to offer a satisfactory solution of our problem. The fact of the matter is that it is well established that the Federal Government, functioning through departments such as the Secretary of the Interior, has definite responsibility in connection with recreation and wildlife when the Federal Government undertakes a water conservation project. I see no reason why this rule should be differently applied because of a differing departmental jurisdiction.

It is my feeling that the pressure of public opinion and the overwhelming demand for adequate public uses of these projects will force recognition of Federal responsibility. I understand that it is presently the endeavor of the Corps of Engineers to interest States and local agencies such as cities and counties, to take over recreational and public usage responsibility in connection with your projects. With this I have no quarrel. I think it is entirely proper that the States and local agencies should participate, and if possible, completely administrate areas appropriate to their needs and financial abilities. I think this program could be improved if you set forth and widely publicize arrangements under which local administration could be accomplished. I suggest the possibility that after providing the initial adequate facilities as an integral part of the construction of a project, it would be entirely proper to seek matching funds or other financial participation by States and local agencies primarily benefited.

As an example of the problems we face, I would like to cite the situation surrounding the construction of Pine Flat Dam and Reservoir on the Kings River in California. The area now covered by the reservoir was a developed recreational area containing at least four campgrounds. I understand that on February 1, 1956, the Corps of Engineers transferred to the United States Forest Service the sum of $343,000 to pay the cost of relocating these facilities. To replace the former campgrounds, the Forest Service has established a single campground at Kirch Flat. This is the only public use facility developed by the Forest Service in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir, and it is some 30 miles above the dam. I am informed that the Corps of Engineers is presently examining the possibility of collecting other small appropriated funds for the Pine Flat project with the object of trying to help in meeting the public use demands at this location. People in the area tell me that beside developing access roads to the dam, the Corps of Engineers' contribution thus far has been the providing of 6 portable toilets.

Hundreds of thousands of people from the San Joaquin Valley and the entire Nation will seek to visit Pine Flat Reservoir this year. Millerton Reservoir on the San Joaquin River, a few miles to the north, already is overtaxed. I anticipate that the Corps of Engineers, the Forest Service, and my office will experience an overwhelming demand for immediate action to take care of the situation at Pine Flat.

As you know, I have recently introduced legislation which has been approved by committee, and which may result in the authorization for the Corps of Engineers to construct Hidden Dam on the Fresno River, and Buchanan Dam on the Chowchilla River. I recognize that these facilities will not have the attraction or the public usage that may be expected at Pine Flat, but they are capable of becoming major recreational assets for the people of Madera and Merced Counties. I strongly urge that in planning these facilities and estimating their cost, you make adequate provision for recreational use, and request in your construction budget sufficient funds to provide needed facilities.

I do not intend by this letter to urge extravagant or exorbitant expenditures for recreation. I am asking only for adequate facilities to care for the people who are attracted and who have the right to a proper use of these public facilities. I cannot conceive of any logic under which any department, administrative or legislative, would properly disagree with such a policy.

Very truly yours,

B. F. SISK,
Member of Congress.

Racketeers Make News—Clean Unionism Doesn't

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial from Labor, official publication of the railroad labor organizations:

RACKETEERS MAKE NEWS, CLEAN UNIONISM DOESN'T

Labor has frequently reported that strikes make news in the daily press, but that peaceful union-management settlements—which outnumber stoppages by approximately 50 to 1—rate little or no space in the daily newspapers.

It's the same with labor racketeering. The vast majority of American unions are clean as a hound's tooth. Who, for example, ever heard of a racketeer in the ranks of the Railroad Brotherhoods? He'd have as much chance of getting a foothold in a rail union as you would have of flying to the moon.

But the fact that most unions are honest and led by men of integrity isn't news. On the other hand, just mention labor racketeer and you get a banner headline.

Needless to say, Labor doesn't object to exposures of crooks in the labor movement. They should be exposed, kicked out, and prosecuted to the full extent of the law.

But how about placing that picture in its proper context? Labor is moved to raise that question by the ultrasensational play given in the newspapers to an ultra-sensational series of articles entitled "My War With the Mob," written by Victor Riesel, syndicated columnist.

Americans were justifiably aroused and indignant when Riesel was recently blinded by acid, thrown by an unidentified thug. Police authorities in New York appear to have made an exhaustive investigation, without coming up with any lead as to the assailant. He could have been a hired mobster; he could also have been a personal enemy of Riesel's. No one know for sure.

But the press took it for granted that racketeers in the labor movement were responsible, and Riesel did likewise. This impression was intensified by Riesel's series of flamboyant articles, which got blazing front-page headlines on papers through the land.

Labor doesn't have the space to analyze the articles in detail. They're an amalgam. They contain a history of past rackets. They include some apparently factual cases of hoodlums currently operating in some unions. But they also are interlarded with sweeping generalizations designed to create the inference that crime honeycombs the union movement from top to bottom. Throughout, too, they're injected with Riesel's widely known special brand of journalistic "hypo," which makes old style Hearst yellow journalism seem pallid by comparison.

Actually, many of the hoodlums mentioned in the series have been convicted and jailed, usually with the help of evidence supplied by honest trade unionists. Attorney General Brownell, as well as local and State authorities, have repeatedly acknowledged the help given by reputable union leaders in obtaining such indictments and convictions.

Nevertheless, the overall impression created by the articles, particularly as exploited by the press, was that the labor movement as a whole is infested with crime.

An even more distorted picture could be created of the business world by lumping together all the cases of thieves, embezzlers, and other crooked operators among businessmen. But it would be no more fair to indict all business because of the malpractices of a few than to indict all labor for the same reason.

The fact remains that the trade-union movement has been doing much to clean out racketeers and it is set to do more through the new AFL-CIO ethical practices committee. Even one racketeer in the labor field is one too much. Labor is confident that the union movement can and will do the cleanup job and it needs no Riesel to beat the drums or show the way.

Rally Protesting Soviet Tyranny in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend a great rally held in Bridgeport, Conn., yesterday, July 22, 1956, for the purpose of protesting Soviet tyranny in Poland.

Hundreds of people from the Bridgeport area were in attendance and they unanimously adopted the appended resolution.

I believe that meetings of this kind which adopt such resolutions express the attitude of the American people, and I hope that my colleagues in this House will do all that they can to see that Congress exercises its influence with respect to this vital matter.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the enslaved peoples of this world desire to throw off the yoke of oppression and slavery suffered by them under the strong hand of Communist Russia; and

Whereas the people of Poland declared their love for freedom and hatred of Communist oppression by a bloody protest in Poznan on June 28, 1956; and

Whereas Communist Russia has been declaring her desire to improve the world and the conditions of the peoples in the various countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the undersigned, as representatives of the citizens of Polish descent of the Bridgeport, Conn., area, gathered this 22d day of July 1956, at a public meeting in Bridgeport, Conn., sponsored by the Central Committee of the United Polish Societies, of Bridgeport, and Fairfield, That

1. As citizens of the United States of America, we pledge our loyalty and combined efforts to the support and furtherance of the ideals and rights defined in the great Constitution of the United States;

2. We urge our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to exert their efforts, wisdom, and skill in guiding our country in its efforts to assist the oppressed peoples of the world;

3. We ask that our Senators and Congressmen, through our Government, seek to inform Russia that she prove her sincerity by restoring freedom and full autonomy to the so-called satellite countries of Russia;

4. We earnestly hope that our Government can influence the Communist government in Poland, to exercise leniency and moderation in passing judgment upon the hundreds of persons arrested at the time of the Poznan riots, whose bodies were hungry for food, whose minds have been starved for want of fairness and justice, and whose hearts cannot live without a full measure of freedom;

5. As descendants of a freedom-loving nation, Poland, which for centuries fought for liberty and justice for all of its inhabitants, as well as for the peoples of the world, we too "dedicate ourselves to the proposition that all men are created equal and that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth."

Dated at Bridgeport, Conn., this 22d day of July A. D. 1956.

CLEMENT J. KRILEUK,
President, Central Committee of the United Polish Societies in Bridgeport.

Just Learning To Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting below a short article from the Modesto Bee, a paper published in Modesto, Calif., which I think says more in a short space than any other comment that I have read concerning the efforts of India, Pakistan, and other countries in the colonial area, who are also seeking freedom, which quotes John Sherman Cooper, former Ambassador to India. His statement is exceedingly interesting and tolerant, and the editor of the Bee has distilled the thoughts expressed by him, and in which I heartily concur.

The article follows:

JUST LEARNING TO WALK

John Sherman Cooper, American Ambassador to India, urges a better understanding by Americans of the dire problems facing the recently freed peoples of southern Asia.

He points out that "they are exhibiting the same concern for freedom and voluntary individual action that we do; and if in strengthening their free political and economic institutions, they succeed, as I believe they can, they will further the cause of freedom in the world, which is our great cause."

It is of almost as much importance to us as to them that the strenuous efforts all these pepoles are putting forth to secure the blessings of democracy for themselves and their children shall not be in vain.

They may make mistakes but after all, they have been self-governing only for a decade. And has there ever been an infant who did not stumble while learning to walk? It is hardly useful to be too critical.

Defeat of the Hells Canyon Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, the Hells Canyon bill was defeated because its opponents possessed superior political, economic and propaganda power. The distinguished columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, summed up what happened in a column written 2 days after the defeat of the bill. So the people may have the facts—I ask unanimous consent that the column be carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

DEFEAT OF THE HELLS CANYON BILL—EISENHOWER IS BLAMED AS SENATE REJECTS PUBLIC POWER PROPOSAL

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

The showdown on the Hell's Canyon bill in the Senate this week should open the eyes of the public, at least that part of the public which is interested in proper conservation of our natural resources, including our water resources.

For it fixed responsibility upon President Eisenhower himself for the administration's conservation policy which has been severely criticized—and properly—because it permits exploitation of our natural resources by privileged private interests for their profit to the detriment of the public interest.

This was exposed in the personal pressure brought by the White House upon Senators, on a scale not heretofore seen in this administration, in the effort, ultimately successful, to swing enough votes to defeat the Democratic-sponsored bill. The measure provided for a Government-constructed high dam across the Snake River gorge along the Idaho-Oregon border to develop the river for production of hydroelectric power, flood control, navigation and reclamation.

The effect of this administration maneuver goes far beyond Hells Canyon, in which the whole Pacific Northwest is interested, in its implications. It should finally awaken people all over the country to the administration's determination, as stressed here frequently, to turn over all still-undeveloped water resources to the private power monopoly to develop as it pleases, without proper consideration of the public interest, and at high rates to yield a handsome profit.

Once again the private power barons are back in the saddle in Government, from where they had been driven during the Roosevelt-Truman era. They realized the significant test inherent in what is done about development of the biggest yet undeveloped site—at Hells Canyon. Coordinating with the White House campaign of pressure upon the Senate, electric utilities conducted a high-powered drive themselves in personal contacts with Senators by telephone, wire and letter, beseeching defeat of the bill for public development of Hells Canyon.

They rallied behind the corporation known as the Idaho Power Co., though it is almost entirely eastern-owned, which already has started to work on the Snake River under a license granted by the Federal Power Commission some months ago which Democrats and conservationists were seeking to annul by the bill which the Senate defeated 51 to 41. The Idaho Power Co. plan calls ultimately for three small dams. Its plan, according to best expert evidence, will not realize the full potentials of the Snake River and will foreclose forever the proper development of the whole Columbia River system as projected by the United States Army engineers.

In the most tense and dramatic scene in the Senate this session the Senators were reminded in closing debate of the inadequacies of the Idaho Power Co.'s plan; of how the people and industries in the developing region will be deprived of the full benefit of their water resources; of how they must pay 6.29 mills per kilowatt hour for electricity generated there by the Idaho Power Co. as compared with three mills if it were developed publicly. It was pointed out also how public development would be self-liquidating as are all such water resource enterprises, and would return a nice profit to the United States Treasury.

But in vain. * * *

The administration position revealed in the Hells Canyon battle is well known to anyone who has followed the course of events here; but never before had White House responsibility been so graphically revealed to the public.

Hitherto others were blamed, chiefly former Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, who was, of course, only following White House orders. Democrats had made such a target of Secretary McKay that he finally became too heavy a political liability and was yanked by President Eisenhower and sent into the race for the Senate in Oregon. * * * It was said then that it would hamper Democrats to have their target thus pulled away on the eve of the campaign. But the removal of the administration scapegoat and shield also seems to have worked to the disadvantage of the administration by leaving the President and his White House operatives exposed and in line of fire. At least, that was the effect in the Hells Canyon fight.

Now the blame can be laid where it belonged all the time—on the President himself.

The Taxpayers Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, with the anticipation that the majority leadership may still wish to schedule action on the Hells Canyon bill, I wish to call to their attention the editorial comments of the Cleveland Plain Dealer on the defeat of this measure in the other body.

The editorial, which was published on July 20, was aptly entitled "The Taxpayers Win," and I am in full agreement

with this accurate conclusion. It follows:

THE TAXPAYERS WIN

The advocates of socialized power took a beating in the Senate yesterday when their proposal to build a high Federal power dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho was defeated, 51 to 41. The major purpose of the Democratic-sponsored legislation was to embarrass the Eisenhower administration by compelling cancellation of the authority given the Idaho Power Co. to build three smaller dams on the river. But the southern Democrats, not being as socialistically inclined as their northern colleagues, joined with the Republicans to defeat the measure.

From this distance it is not possible to assess the sentiment of the region affected, aside from this point, that it wants and needs more power to supply the industries that are already there and that are contemplating expansion or establishment in the northwest. The people involved probably don't care much who supplies the power as long as they get it.

In the Senate a band of New-Fair Dealers was determined that the Federal Government, that is, the taxpayers of the entire country, should finance the power facilities for this one area. The Federal development would have cost approximately $400 million, according to the estimates, which are generally low, and would have paid back, in lieu of taxes, approximately $100 million to local governments over a period of 50 years. The Idaho Power Co. dams, now under construction, are expected to cost about $200 million and they are scheduled to pay approximately $500 million in taxes, at current rates, over the 50-year period.

Thus it would seem that the taxpayers got a good deal when the Senate decided to allow the privately owned, taxpaying power company to proceed with the dams. It was a victory for the Eisenhower administration, too, and its philosophy that private enterprise should be allowed to proceed with power developments wherever feasible and, when not feasible, the Federal Government should participate only as a partner of local governments and private enterprise.

An Open Letter to the United Nations, Division on Human Rights, and to the Entire Civilized World, From the Prisoners in Camps in the U. S. S. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 10, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of Congress have long been concerned about the network of concentration camps maintained by the Russian Communists. Many efforts have been made by Members of this body to expose the evils of that system and to bring about their elimination.

The United Nations has been studying the problem for some years.

The International Labor Organization is presently at work to bring about an international convention outlawing slave labor and to establish an agency to enforce the guaranties of such a convention. But with all this positive effort the Communists persist in the practice of maintaining their network of concentration camps where they incarcerate and torture their political enemies. This is a matter which must concern us until it is corrected.

Recently the political prisoners of the Mordovian special camps succeeded in getting a communication out to the free world. It was laboriously compared upon light cloth and written with a dye of the indelible type. This practice made it possible for the underground to conceal it over a period of time and to bring it over a long journey to the free world. This communication has now been translated into English and was made available to me today.

It speaks the hearts of the Ukrainian political prisoners whose only crime was to love their homeland.

It tells the tragic story of what has happened to the Ukrainian patriots who dared to dissent, dared to oppose the Russian occupier. This is a story which will be of interest to all Members of Congress.

The text of the translated communication is as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS, DIVISION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, AND TO THE ENTIRE CIVILIZED WORLD FROM THE PRISONERS IN CAMPS IN THE U. S. S. R.

We, the prisoners in Mordovian special camps, wish to bring the following statement to the attention of the entire civilized world. We, Ukrainians, are in favor of any movement whose aims are freedom and truth; we advocate cultural progress in all walks of life, and we stand behind self-determination for all nations, including the United Ukrainian State.

We have no desire to exaggerate the facts of the situation that has existed in Ukraine for a long time. We do not ask for mercy or for pardon. We demand our right to live under laws that should be recognized by the entire civilized world—the world of 20th century civilization. This century has been spearheaded by a number of humanitarian organizations, from small groups on up through national leaders. They include the great worldwide organization, the United Nations. Our Ukrainian nation, like a number of other nations, has come under the conquering heel of Red Russia. We have been deprived of the basic rights of existence. We have been driven into camps, with severe sentences from 10 to 25 years—not for criminal acts, as the Bolsheviks maintain before the rest of the world; not for arson, treason, or murder; but because we, like every freedom-loving people, demand our lawful rights in our own land.

The question therefore arises: Does the civilized world know about the conditions prevailing not only among us prisoners, but throughout our country? Does the civilized world know that, when we have served our sentences, we are exiled to the so-called virgin lands of Kazakhstan, Krasnoyarsk, and the far north—while they proclaim that it is volunteers and members of the Komsomol who go out to those areas.

Can the civilized world conceive of Ukrainian sovereignty without a Ukrainian Government, without a Ukrainian Army, and without the Ukrainian people? If Ukraine is sovereign—and she should be—why is there no army composed exclusively of Ukrainians? Why do Ukrainians serve their terms in the army beyond the borders of their country? Why are military units, composed of Russians and other nationalities to whom the interests of the Ukrainian people are alien, if not directly hostile, stationed in our country? If we are traitors and if our punishment is just, why were we tried by "peoples'" or "military" courts, whose composition is certainly not Ukrainian? Why do we not serve our terms on Ukrainian territory, which was ravaged by the last war and is in need of reconstruction? Why do we have to work at the cultivation of wild, remote lands, and forests, when there is such a need for our forces at home?

Does the civilized world know that, over the mass burial sites of the prison camps, new camps and cities are built, canals are dug, and stadiums are erected, in order to obliterate the traces of these crimes? In Abez (Komi ASSR), Camps 1, 4, and 5 stand on former cemeteries. At Zavod five in Leplya (Mordovskaya ASSR), the first and second polishing shops, the technical laboratory, and the forge were erected on human bones. Does the world know about the mass executions of prisoners who only demanded their rights as political internees (at mine 29 in Vorkuta, Attorney-General Rudenko was in charge of the firing squads). Is it known that, in Kingir (Post Office Box 392, Colonies 1 and 3, Kazakhstan), men and women demanding their lawful rights were charged by four tanks and crushed by them?

Does the civilized world know that Ukraine has suffered starvation for 38 years, in addition to the artificial famine of 1933; that western Ukraine has been inundated by floods, and that the people have been condemned to death by starvation, with no hope of aid from "humanitarian, peace-loving" Communist Russia. This, at a time when millions of tons of grain are exported abroad for propaganda purposes, when all sorts of foreign delegations visit model collective farms(special display models) and factories in the U. S. S. R.

In the postwar period (1945–55), Russia has raised the level of light and heavy industry beyond the prewar level. This was accomplished by the toil of millions of prisoners. Those prisoners raised the issue of improved living conditions—an improvement essential for any creature that breathes air (after between 9 and 11 hours of work in the mines, the prisoners were shut up like cattle in close, smelly barracks furnished with the well-known slop buckets). Some of these prisoners were shot, other were crushed by tanks. Many of them received additional sentences of from 10 to 25 years and were put in jail, where they are to this day.

This is addressed to the civilized world of the 20th century; a century of education and progress. We feel certain that anyone who reads these lines will experience revolt and contempt for the "just and humanitarian" Communist Party of Russia and crimes committed against the nations she has enslaved.

We are not discouraged, because we know that our will for freedom is founded on natural law, and we believe that the entire civilized world will uphold us in our course.

Bearing in mind the foregoing points, we, the prisoners in Mordovian special camps, have adopted the following resolution:

"RESOLUTION

"I

"1. A commission is to be appointed for precise verification of the facts as we have stated them: That Attorney General Rudenko and Deputy Minister of the MVD, Maslennikov, were distinguished by the cruelty of their conduct in Vorkuta and Noril'sk in 1953, and in Karaganda in 1954.

"2. The fact that camps 1, 4, and 5 in Abez' (Komi ASSR) and Zavod 5 (Mordovskaya ASSR) were built on cemetery grounds is to be verified. Similar cases are not hard to find—there are 44 such camps in this area.

"3. We demand that the cemeteries be put in order, that the buildings and plants on them be razed, and that memorials be erected to the dead, as a symbol of perpetual shame to Red slaveholders. Since members of all nationalities of the world are num-

bered among the dead, a special international organization is to be established for the purpose of erecting these memorials.

"4. We demand comprehensive social security for the orphans, widows, and parents (if they are not fit for work) of these victims of cruel injustice; also for those persons and their families who incurred complete physical disability in camps and are unable to provide for themselves and their families.

"5. Since an entire family is held responsible for an offense committed by one member (they are all subject to exile, deportation, confiscation of property) and a man's grandson as well as his son may suffer because of an act he himself has committed, there have appeared castes of "reliables" and "unreliables." The "unreliables" live under constant oppression, persecution and misery. We therefore demand that these people be given back their rights as human beings, that they receive social security, and that they be permitted to return to their countries.

"6. We demand that all persons who have served our their sentences be permitted to return to their native lands. We protest the passing of sentences of 25 years on a mass basis, because such a sentence is a sentence for life.

"7. All persons who underwent a second trial and were then transferred from camp to jail because of their participation in camp strikes or in any other form of mass or individual protest against the violation of their rights as political prisoners are to be released from jail and to have their sentences annulled.

"8. All desert lands, pits, mines, and forests that became part of the U. S. S. R. after their discovery or cultivation are to belong to the nations whose sons and daughters worked on them and strewed them with their bones.

"II

"1. We demand the establishment of an international control commission charged with the fair distribution of aid earmarked for underdeveloped countries and for disaster areas including the U. S. S. R.

"2. We are wholeheartedly in favor of extending aid to all those who need it—regardless of their nationality, religion, race, or political convictions. But we cannot agree that bread should be torn from the mouths of the starving and sent abroad as aid, when it is really for purposes of propaganda. This is done in the Soviet Union, at a time when millions of people are starving.

"III

"1. Whereas every criminal act against the enslaved nations is perpetrated with the knowledge of the Politburo and of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we demand that the entire ruling class of the Soviet Union be brought before international justice.

"2. Yezhov, Beria, Abakumov and others, whose execution was ordered by the security organs in order to deceive people at home and abroad, cannot be made to hold full responsibility for everything, because crimes against the enslaved nations continue to be perpetrated.

"IV

"We, Ukrainians, make the following demands on purely nationalist grounds:

"1. All Russian nationals shall be required to leave Ukrainian territory. They will not be permitted to return until such time as Russia abandons her dream of denationalization, assimilation, and of eventually devouring Ukraine—until she ceases to regard herself as Big Brother. It is a distortion of reality and of historical fact to speak of "the union of Ukraine with Russia." Ukraine has always been cruelly enslaved by Russia.

"2. We concede the right of other nationals—unless they have been sent by the Russian Government for aggressive purposes—to live on Ukrainian territory, enjoying equal rights with the Ukrainian people. Russians may live there only when they begin to be governed by general standards of morality.

"3. As long as there are armed forces in the world, the only units stationed in Ukraine are to be composed exclusively of Ukrainians and under the command of Ukrainians; all soldiers and commanders not of Ukrainian extraction are to be withdrawn beyond the borders of our country. This also applies to the administrative and security organs of the MVD.

"4. Anyone who violates the laws of Ukraine is to be tried before a Ukrainian people's or military court; if convicted, his sentence will be served within the national borders."

NOTE.—We request that the citizens of the world be informed of this letter by the United Nations, Division on Human Rights.

We have signed with initials and pseudonyms, so as to forestall any possible consequences.

NOTE.—On the original, here follow signatures, by initials and pseudonyms, of 5 deputies from the women's column and 8 deputies from the men's column of prisoners.

Why I Love America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the Members of Congress to an article by Mr. Louis B. Seltzer, editor of the Cleveland Press, reprinted from Tracks Magazine, under date of July 20, 1956 entitled: "Why I Love America."

As editor of the Cleveland Press, Mr. Seltzer is constantly reminding the citizens of the Cleveland community of their privileges and of their responsibilities in a democracy. His love for America is rivaled only by his affectionate regard for his home city of Cleveland. The article as as follows:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA
(By Louis B. Seltzer)

Never before have I held so much love for the United States of America as at this very moment.

From the time I was a small boy, the United States has held magic, excitement, something different, something wonderful for me.

Today, after 40 years as a newspaperman, after a lifetime of traveling across the face of the earth, after unlimited opportunities to observe the conditions under which people elsewhere live—after these years and these experiences, I now speak with awe, reverence and profound admiration for the United States of America.

It is the greatest country man has ever put together since he has lived on this earth in his present form. The United States of America is both an old and a new story. It is the kind of story which grows greater in the retelling of it.

Has ever before in the world's history a country literally exploded from a continental wilderness within several centuries to become the undisputed destiny-builder of the world?

Has ever before a country accorded to its people so many rights, so many privileges, so many opportunities, so much latitude in which to express themselves as individual personalities?

Has ever before a country brought its standard of life to such unprecedented heights, made available to its people in such abundance so many physical comforts and conveniences, shared so liberally and equitably so much of its created and produced wealth?

Has ever before a country in mankind's history furnished so profusely for its people educational advantages, industrial opportunities, so many homes, so many recreational places, so many of science's means for entertaining, stimulating, educating us all?

Has any nation ever before brought together so vast a panorama of industrial might, such phenomenal diversity of manufacture, so infinite a variety of research activity, so forward an advance in controlling human diseases and lengthening life itself?

We are today 165,000,000 Americans. We have come to America from all places on earth. We live where we wish. We work where we will. We worship as we please. We speak freely what we think. We travel wherever and whenever the spirit moves us.

In no other country at no other time have its people had so much of everything, such unlimited freedom, such unlimited opportunity.

Sometimes we have not fully appreciated all of this. There was a time when some literary smart-alecks thought to make it fashionable to ridicule democracy and debunk our heroes. Some of us fell for such pseudo-intellectual nonsense.

We learned how misguided they were. We learned, as did Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and other American greats, that it is a rare privilege to be a citizen of the United States—a land which has woven together all of the races of man, all of the religions of man, all the cultures of man, and made of them a combined and mighty land of freedom and opportunity.

In our everyday existence, struggling, meeting problems, disagreeing with one another on politics or wages or policies, going into court on a traffic case, sued or being sued about something, we may momentarily forget these things. But we remember quickly. Something always brings it back to mind.

I have set foot on every State in America. I have set foot on most of the other countries of the earth. I have seen men and women with fear in their eyes, their voices stilled, their families starving, their huts pathetically inadequate, their futures bleak.

I have then come back to America. I have thanked the divine providence which makes me a citizen of this great and wonderful land of the free.

To be sure, we have laws. They are the laws made by our elected officials for the benefit of all of us. They are the laws which protect all of us from those things and those acts which might jeopardize our safety and our lives. These must be. We know this. We respect this—we respect it more because we know we have had a hand somewhere in the making of them.

An immigrant Italian boy can become the mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, one of the great industrial cities of America. The son of immigrant Slovenian parents can become the governor of one of the great States—Ohio, and aspire even further.

It is happening not alone, in Government. It is happening in every profession, in every business, in every aspect of life in America. We blend together the cultures of all people, the opportunities of America, the unlimited horizons of freedom—and we get America, the unique, the distinctive, the only nation of its kind in all of mankind's history.

Something unusual is happening in America today. Perhaps the threat of another war may be responsible. Perhaps the ability to

get from one place to another so easily is responsible. Perhaps something in the spirit of the modern America is responsible.

But whatever reason, more people today are visiting the historic shrines of America, visiting the birthplaces of America's great, searching out of libraries and bookstores more of the history of our country and its leaders, than at any other time. There is a great thirst, a great yearning to know more about America—to drink at its fountain of inspiration, and hope, and future.

This great resurgence of faith and belief in America has happened especially since the end of World War II—since the explosion of the first A-bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki—since the locking together in cold war combat the two diametrically opposite philosophies of government.

We now sense what we have. We have now reappraised the worth of our own freedoms. We now more highly prize our own opportunities and privileges. We now match more graphically what we possess in such singular measure against what others do not have.

All over America we are building homes. More of them than ever before are going up. That means faith in America—belief in our future. More industry is being created, more plants being built, more investment being made. That means faith in America—belief in its future. More research is being made—more laboratories created—more experts being educated and trained. That means faith in America—belief in the future—and the will to protect this Nation against the unknown and the as-yet-unforeseen contingencies of a world which is changing in character and form almost literally overnight.

We are going to church in greater numbers than ever before. We realize in America that there is an Influence far greater than any we, as mortals, can exercise over our collective and individual destinies. We have lessened, in some degree, at least, our inflated notions that as human beings we know more about the world than anybody else and can do more with it. We know now—in an age of atom and cobalt bombs, of powers known and powers imagined—that anything can happen far beyond the ability of the average mortal to control. And we, therefore, seek sanctuary in a Providence upon which we of the 20th century have not always either depended or sought out for guidance.

Thus, economically, industrially, spiritually, morally, historically, we are gaining strength in America. Our faith and belief in America has undergone a great resurgence. Our conviction that freedoms as practiced in America are more precious than anywhere else on earth has risen sharply in the last dozen years. Our faith in our Nation's future, our will to help it become greater, our determination to do what we can as individuals to make this come about has increased.

Some years ago I was troubled in my mind and heart about America. I believed that its people were too preoccupied with strictly material blessings and had subverted or forgotten the very things that made all of these possible—the freedoms, the opportunities. I have seen, more particularly since the end of World War II, a great, visible, substantial change in the attitudes of people, a reevaluation of spiritual and moral and civic values. And these, together with homes, churches, industry, communities, and facing up more courageously to the basic issues of our time, induce from me more respect for, more affection toward, and more devotion to the greatest country on the face of this earth—the United States of America.

I would not trade one small thimbleful of its free soil for any other country or any other place in the world.

The Moral Obligation of the United States To Support the Workers of Poznan in the Struggle Against Communist Tyranny

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, in 1918 there was a revolt in Poznan, Poland. It was against the German occupation, and occurred at the same time Ignace Paderewski returned from America after World War I.

This was the only victorious uprising in Polish history, and afterward the main square in Poznan was renamed Freedom Square. This symbol of liberty is cherished by the people of Poznan.

On June 28, 1956, it was no surprise that the Poznan workers marched on historic Freedom Square, now the headquarters of the Polish Communist Party and their security police, to demand bread and freedom. Their pleas were answered with bullets. The result was the loss of 38 lives and 270 wounded, many of whom were innocent women and children.

The latest barrage of propaganda from the Communists tells us that the June revolt was inspired and incited by "foreign agents" directed by our own Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles. But the facts are clear. It was hunger, unrest, subjugation, and the other plagues of Kremlin dictatorship which were the real inciters of the uprising. For this was a revolt sparked internally by the proletarian workers of Poznan whom the Communists are forever claiming they represent. It is ironic then that these were the same proletarians who took to the streets to voice their demands and whose lives were taken by these Communist butchers known otherwise as their self-styled protectors. The Polish Government's talk of outside imperialist agents as the cause of the revolt is nothing but the big-lie technique, designed to justify its brutal actions.

We, as free Americans, and others of the free world have the moral obligation to speak out in the name of decency and humanity against the terrible Poznan killings.

Besides accusing Mr. Dulles of inflamatory speeches to incite the Poznan riot, Pravda and other Soviet organs have charged that the revolt was financed by the United States with funds appropriated by Congress. We all know this not to be the case but if it were true the expense of helping those to throw off the yoke of Communist tyranny would be more than morally justified.

It is apparent that Russia is beginning to face the frightening realization she is losing her stranglehold on the captive satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain. Since the downgrading of Stalin by Bulganin and Khrushchev, Communist leaders outside the captive countries have raised doubts about the motives of the Kremlin, all of which have contributed to the Soviet sense of insecurity.

The Poznan upsurge has its distinctions in this regard. It is the first major uprising in the satellites since the debasement of Stalin. The brave and courageous citizens of Poznan have served notice on the Kremlin that they vigorously protest the denial of their rightful share of freedom, regardless of the Stalin downgrading. The Russian overtones of relaxing their systems of state police control have counted for nothing with the Polish people. A lesser degree of tyranny and subjugation makes the courageous Poles no more likely to accept their existence in the vaccuous Communist world.

The Polish nation was the first to fall under the planning of mad Hitler and plundering of the Nazi army. This Nation knows well, the results of force, brutality, and murder upon its innocents. The nightmare of Katyn Forest is burned into their memories. The Russian domination with which Poland contends now, is just as detestable and abhorent to them as the Nazi pillagers, for both stand as a cruel and cunning barrier to a people who fight and are beaten and fight again and pray for freedom and the return of their legitimate government and culture.

The Communists in their highly propagandized efforts to flaunt their kindness and amnesty to the rest of the world have actually made a mockery out of humanity. The workers of Poznan are underpaid and underfed for their forced labors in behalf of the Russian and Chinese military preparations. The former Prime Minister of Free Poland, Mr. Stanislau Mikolajczyk, has stated that out of the 100,000 political prisoners and 300,000 persons in forced labor camps, a mere 26,000 were released under the so-called recent amnesty.

The manipulation of taxes by the Communists in Poznan has kept the people barely existing. A result of the June 28 riot has caused the government to initiate a supposed "tax reform" measure to refund taxes to certain workers. It is no wonder that one of the reasons for the uprising was the fantastic prices where shoes cost one-half to one-third of a month's wages, a pound of butter one-half day's wages, a suit of utility clothes a month's wages. It has been said that workers of the Communist countries can partially free themselves when they can control the methods of collection of state revenues. By the voicing of their grievances through violence the Poznan workers have realized a "tax reform" and although such a measure is a long way from freedom itself it was the indication of a Communist concession and an admission of wrongdoing.

Rights which our workers in the United States regard as elementary are still forbidden in the Communist workers "paradise."

The Pozman workers have learned there is no new smile on the Soviet face. The "new" atmosphere in Poland for the most part is a cruel hoax. The evidence is the scores of dead and wounded

who on June 28 thought they could safely air their grievances.

Only temporarily has the unrest in Poznan been drowned in blood. Even now this tragedy is not complete. Latest bulletins indicate that 323 persons will face trial for armed insurrection the maximum penalty of which is death.

It should be obvious to the Russians and their satellite puppets by this time that revolts and uprisings behind the Iron Curtain will continue just so long as strength and the will for freedom God has bequeathed to us all exists in the hearts and the minds of the Poles and other captive peoples.

It is my strong belief that our Government has the obligation to express clear and forthright objection to the Communist tyranny in Poland.

Six Hundred and Forty-Six Risks Reemployed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the following newspaper article written by John Cramer and published in today's Washington Daily News, is highly interesting:

SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX RISKS REEMPLOYED

(By John Cramer)

The Eisenhower administration has overstated the number of Federal employees separated from the Government as security risks by up to 14 percent.

This was one of the disclosures made yesterday in a Senate Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee's long-awaited report on the security program.

On the basis of detailed statements from individual agencies, the committee disclosed:

That 646 former employees whom the administration classed as security risks in its last report to Congress have since been reemployed by their own agencies or others.

That agencies can't identify at least 750 resigned employees the administration reported as security risks—and have no records of them.

Together, these two groups would reduce the claimed totals of security risks by 1,936 employees.

In its last report to Congress, Civil Service Commission said a total of 9270 security risks had either been removed or resigned between May of 1953 and June 30, 1955.

Subtract, the 1936, however, and the total drops to 7874.

FIFTY-SEVEN PERCENT HIRED SINCE 1953

The report also disclosed that approximately 57 percent of the alleged security risks whose removal has been claimed by the Eisenhower administration were employees originally hired by the Eisenhower administration—in other words, since January 20, 1953.

Out of 243 employees who were separated from the payroll under security program procedures, 55 were hired by the present administration.

Out of 3,243 separated under regular civil-service procedures (instead of security procedures) 1,950 were hired by the administration.

And out of 5,684 resigned employees classed as risks 2,762 were hired by the administration.

Thus, out of a total of 8,356 employees on whom hiring dates were available, 4,776 were hired by the administration.

In a story early this year, this column reported that the subcommittee headed by Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, had incomplete figures indicating that 75 percent of all alleged risks had been hired by the Eisenhower administration.

Committee sources insisted, however, that up-to-date figures, if available, "easily" would justify the 75 percent figure.

They pointed out that the administration's last report on security dismissals carried only through June 30, 1955.

Since then, they insisted, the "vast majority" of all security dismissals have been Eisenhower appointees not previously screened.

Among other things, the committee report confirmed an exclusive Washington Daily News story several weeks ago by reporter Milton Berliner who reported that agencies couldn't even identify many of the resigned employees they had listed as security risks.

According to the subcommittee report:

Justice Department could identify none of the 130 resigned employees it had listed as risks.

General Services Administration was unable to locate or identify 13 of 92 carried on the Civil Service Commission lists as resigned.

Interior was unable to locate and identify 43 cases.

Army couldn't locate or identify 235 of the 747 resigned employees it had listed as risks.

Air Force couldn't locate or identify 87.

Navy couldn't locate or identify 242 out of 998.

IRONICAL

The subcommittee report described this as ironical.

It said Justice Department, for example, had been "asked to furnish a list, without names, but showing the dates of employment of each of these 139 employees who were carried as resigned under the security order, and to check with the Civil Service Commission to determine if any of the 130 had been subquently reemployed in Federal service."

Justice replied, over the signature of William F. Tompkins, in charge of the Internal Security Division, that it maintained no lists "specifically identifying such former employees."

The subcommittee report charged that the security program's "scrambling of the three categories of loyalty, security and suitability under one general classification of security risk has brought about endless confusion."

And it said that Civil Service Commission publication of the numbers of separated security risks also had caused confusion—"first because of the generally accepted assumption that all were disloyal persons, and secondly, because actually only a small percentage of those carried were actually terminated under the security program."

In the same issue of the Washington Daily News, there appeared the following editorial:

MORE NUMBERS

There's no excuse for Civil Service Commission's incredibly sloppy handling of Federal employee security-risk numbers—as disclosed in that new report by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The report reveals that United States agencies—Justice and the military agencies among others—can't locate and can't identify 750 resigned employees they listed as security risks.

They can't prove these employees ever were on the Federal payroll.

They can't prove they resigned.

They can't back up their claim that they were risks.

If they were risks, where are they now? In some other department? Nobody knows, because apparently, nobody knows who they were in the first place.

The report also discloses 646 known employees whom the administration listed as risks eventually went back to work for the Government, because it was found they weren't risks after all.

Nevertheless, the Commission still includes them in its risk totals in this new report.

A security program of some sort is vitally necessary. But is it this sort? Numbers juggling such as this only discredits the present program.

What this report does provide is more statistics for politicians to play the "numbers game" with in an election year. This is no morale booster for loyal workers in Federal service.

When will the Commission people learn?

Argument by Attorney General John Ben Sheppard Before Texas Supreme Court on Validity of Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following argument presented by Attorney General John Ben Sheppard before the Supreme Court of Texas on the subject of the validity of the right-to-work law in that State:

ARGUMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL JOHN BEN SHEPPARD BEFORE THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS IN INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS ET AL., AGAINST M. E. SANDSBERRY, JR., ET AL, ON JUNE 27, 1956

May it please the court, I am appearing here today at attorney general of Texas, to defend in all respects the validity of the Texas right-to-work law [1] wherein the inherent right of a person to work shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organ-

[1] Art. 5207a, Vernon's Civil Statutes (Texas right-to-work law), provides in part:

"SECTION 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

"SEC. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.

"SEC. 3. Any contract which requires or prescribes that employees or applicants for employment in order to work for an employer shall or shall not be or remain members of a labor union, shall be null and void and against public policy. The provisions of this section shall not apply to any contract or contracts heretofore executed but shall apply to any renewal or extension of any existing contract and to any new agreement or contract executed after the effective date of this act."

ization of whatever nature. Section 2 provides that no person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union.

The public generally regards this law as applying only to labor unions. It is not so restricted, but applies to any organization. Section 1 was used to break up a part of the nefarious and corrupt Duval County machine.

I would be just as quick to ask this court's permission to argue if either Congress or the Legislature of Texas had passed a law requiring all manufacturers to belong to a manufacturer's association, or requiring all businessmen to belong to a chamber of commerce, or forcing all farmers to belong to the Farm Bureau—and putting them out of business if they decline.

If this case were merely a contest between the Santa Fe Railroad and the Union, I would not be here. I am here because the issue before this court is the right of any Texas citizen to work in his chosen occupation without being forced to give allegiance to an organization which may be furthering political movements, economic programs, or other activities which might be antagonistic to his personal beliefs. We are dealing with people who do not wish to join a union because of conscience, or other reasons, those who would be required to join and remain as members of a union or be fired from their jobs, and still others who have lost their seniority, retirement, and other benefits and have resigned because they were being forced into a union. Too, we are dealing with those who now belong to a union voluntarily, but who do not want to be forever compelled to remain members in order to hold their jobs.

In short, may it please the court, this is not an action against voluntary unionism, but against compulsory unionism. The compulsory features of the act of Congress now before this court are, in my opinion, in direct contravention not only of the Texas right-to-work law, but of the Constitution of the United States as well. An invalid act of Congress cannot override the Texas right-to-work law.

The original petition of the plaintiffs in this cause reflects that the relief originally sought was a prohibition against the execution of a union-shop agreement requiring full union membership. In another phase of this litigation, the Supreme Court of the United States in the Hanson case [2] held that section 2, 11th, of the Railway Labor Act does not require full union membership, but only the payment of initiation fees, dues, and assessments as compensation for services for collective bargaining.[3] The issue now before this Court is not whether there is a requirement only to pay dues and assessments, or whether that financial support relates to the work of the union in collective bargaining, but whether there is a requirement to join a union.

It has always been evident in this case that the respondent unions, by their demands incorporated in their pleadings, are demanding a contract of full union membership. The record speaks for itself. The verdict of the jury establishes a demand for a full union-shop contract.

Therefore, it is submitted that the judgment of the Court of Civil Appeals which holds that no governmental action is presented which raises constitutional questions should be reversed, and the judgment of the trial court affirmed. The Supreme Court in the Hanson case stated: "The enactment of the Federal statute authorizing union-shop agreements is the governmental action on which the Constitution operates, though it takes a private agreement to invoke the Federal sanction."

Inasmuch as the question of governmental action has been definitely determined, it is to be noted in this proceeding that the requirement of compulsory union membership completely destroys the unhampered right to work, freedom of association, and other liberties guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. The Court, in the Hanson case, said such questions were not presented in the record before them, but under the record in this case they are squarely presented.

The issue presented is twofold: (1) whether a citizen can be compelled to sacrifice his personal beliefs in order to work, and (2) whether Congress has the authority to order him to do so. The effect of the destruction of the Texas right-to-work law would be to compel Texans to join specific organizations by Federal order and have their very beliefs under sanction by Congress.

Another question which was not considered by the Supreme Court in the Hanson case and which is certainly pertinent to this argument relates to the ninth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which forms a part of the original Bill of Rights. The amendment provides: "The enumeration of the constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." If other rights were not inherent in the people, the ninth amendment would, of course, be meaningless. Every part of the Constitution must be given force and effect, and the necessary conclusion is that the people retain rights other than those referred to in the Constitution and that these rights are protected by the ninth amendment from an unlawful invasion by legislative act.

Among these unenumerated rights are the right to move about freely, the right to live where we please, the right to choose our companions and associates, the right to discriminate in choice of commodities on the market, and many other common but very basic privileges.

In *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell* (330 U. S. 75 (1947)) the Supreme Court stated:

"We accept appellant's contention that the nature of political rights reserved to the people by the 9th and 10th amendments are involved. The right claimed as inviolate may be stated as the right of a citizen to act as a party official or worker to further his own political views."

The effect of the imposition of compulsory membership in a union or any other type of organization is that great numbers of the population could be arbitrarily categorized by Federal law into regimented masses whose ideologies are dictated by government-sponsored groups—commercial, religious, social or political. We could then determine a citizen's beliefs by knowing where and for whom he works, or by reading what beliefs are imposed on him by Federal law.

In addition to the question of the Ninth Amendment and compulsory unionism, the United States Supreme Court did not consider the 1951 Amendment to the Federal Railway Labor Act as an unlawful delegation of the power to repeal both Federal and State laws.

When Congress adopted the Union Shop Statute, it attempted to lift the ban on compulsory union membership by stating that notwithstanding un-named State and Federal statutes, the parties should be permitted to make a contract in violation of them. I submit it is clear that Congress did not by the enactment of the Union Shop Statute amend the prohibitions in paragraphs 4 and 5, nor did it suspend or render inoperative any other Federal or State laws proscribing the union shop; but it did evidence an intent that these repeals should occur and that these laws should be brushed aside only if and when a carrier and a union should make a union shop contract.

It is the signing of the permitted contract that purports to effect the suspension of all State laws. Under the present situation, without a union shop contract, the carrier clearly cannot require an employee to sign a contract to join a union. In other words, the prohibition against a union shop is still in effect and remains in effect, and becomes inoperative only when the union shop contract is signed. Therefore, the only construction is that the carrier and the unions have been delegated the power to amend paragraphs 4 and 5, and to suspend State and Federal laws by the signing of a contract.

The legislative power of Congress is jealously guarded by the Constitution. For example, it is violative when Congress vests legislative power in the Executive without laying down the policy and the standards by which he must be guided. (*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 383). It is more clearly violative when Congress undertakes to confer legislative power on private persons. In *Carter* v. *Carter Coal Co.* (298 U. S. 238) the Court struck down a portion of the National Industrial Recovery Act by saying:

"The power conferred upon a majority is in effect, the power to regulate the affairs of a nonwilling minority. This is legislative delegation in its most obnoxious form; for it is not even delegation to an official or an official body presumptively disinterested but to private persons whose interest may be and often are adverse to the interest of others in the same business."

And in *Schechter* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495) the Court struck down another provision of the NIRA with these words:

"Would it be seriously contended that Congress could delegate its legislative authority to trade or industrial associations or groups, so as to empower them to enact the laws they deemed to be wise and beneficial for the rehabilitation and expansion of their trade or industries? * * * the answer is obvious, such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our law and is utterly inconsistent with the constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress."

The Texas authorities, which are not different in principle from the Federal authorities, are equally clear.

These are best summed up by this court in *Ex parte Mitchell* (177 S. W. 953), which dealt with a general law of the State licensing the operation of poolhalls. A later statute

---

[2] *Railway Employees Dept.* v. *Hanson* (cause No. 451, decided May 21, 1956).

[3] The limitation on the act is clearly reflected in the language of the Court where it is said:

"It is argued that compulsory membership will be used to impair freedom of expression. But that problem is not presented by this record. Congress endeavored to safeguard against that possibility by making explicit that no conditions to membership may be imposed except as respects 'periodic dues, initiation fees, and assessments.' If other conditions are in fact imposed, or if the exaction of dues, initiation fees, or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the first amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case. For we pass narrowly on section 2, 11th, of the Railway Labor Act. We only hold that the requirement for financial support of the collective-bargaining agency by all who receive the benefits of its work is within the power of Congress under the commerce clause and does not violate either the first or fifth amendment. We express no opinion on the use of other conditions to secure or maintain membership in a labor organization operating under a union or closed-shop agreement."

provided that if qualified voters of any county should at an election favor prohibition of poolhalls, then it should thereafter be an offense to operate or maintain them. Chief Justice Phillips speaking for this court held that the act was unconstitutional because first "it amounts to a delegation by the legislature of its own legislative power imposed upon it by the Constitution which it alone must exercise and which it may not commit to any other agency", and second, because "it authorizes the suspension of a general law of the State by the voters of a county." Under these circumstances we respectfully submit that this question, which was not argued before the Supreme Court of the United States, is open for a decision by this court and that on the merits of it the union shop statute is unconstitutional as an invalid delegation of legislative power to private parties.

Another important question relating to this argument which was not passed upon in the Hanson case relates to the unlawful imposition of a tax. Congress has invalidly authorized a tax on Texas nonunion employees to be levied in favor of the unions. This is a deprivation of Texas nonunion employees' property without due process of law, in that it is an exercise of the taxing power in favor of private organizations. Our position is that Congress could not pass legislation to the effect that all nonunion members should pay so many dollars a month to the unions. Nor can it declare that the powers delegated to the unions permit them to demand whatever sum they may desire from nonunion members. Since the Hanson case has been construed as limiting the application of section 2, eleventh, Congress is in effort ordering that nonunion men must pay to the unions such amounts as may be determined by the unions themselves. Congress only has the power to tax insofar as the Federal Government is concerned, and even Congress itself cannot impose a tax for the benefit of a private organization, the amount of which is to be determined by the organization to whom the tax is paid.

Considering all of these matters in their entirety, we respectfully submit that any statute enacted pursuant to the Commerce clause of the Constitution which is in direct contravention of other constitutional provisions as has been pointed out in this argument is certainly an abuse of the Commerce power and is null and void.

In summation, why should this court affirm the judgment of the trial court? Because it is abundantly clear from the record that the Union Shop amendment of 1951 to the Railway Labor Act violates the first, fifth, ninth and tenth amendments to the Constitution. It constitutes an unlawful delegation of legislative authority to private organizations. It also imposes an unlawful tax which accrues to the benefit of private parties and is a usurpation of power reserved to the States.

It is important to bear in mind that the Supreme Court of the United States decided the Hanson case on the record in that case and made it plain that its opinion was narrowly drawn. I would like to emphasize that it is not the Hanson record but the Sandsberry record upon which this Honorable Court is to decide the case now before it. Just as the United States Supreme Court passed upon the Union Shop statute on the record presented to it, so it is this Court's task to pass upon the statute and the demands of the unions on the basis of the Sandsberry record.

The issues before the Supreme Court of the United States were small by comparison with the issues now before the Supreme Court of Texas.

Federal Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, some individuals, including T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, are advocating repeal of the Federal income tax on the ground that it is too complicated and too erratic in its application.

I think it goes without saying that our present income tax, as now administered, is a real threat to our freedom in this country. Certainly nobody understands the complexities and subtleties of the act completely. Its original intent has long been lost and in the overall picture, the picture has become so clouded that I feel a reappraisal of the entire structure is mandatory. I feel that because of the inequities of our present tax system and the resulting injurious effects upon many of our citizens we should have a thorough examination of our entire tax system. I understand this problem is being studied by the administrations' tax aids and by certain Members of Congress. I want to say at this point that while this whole tax problem is under study I feel that there is one very important change that should be made immediately in our present income-tax law.

The overwhelming majority of American taxpayers find our income tax law so bewildering, confusing and frustrating that they are compelled to engage the services of a professional tax consultant. The taxpayer, of course, depends completely on this so-called tax expert. He answers a few questions put to him by the expert and then signs his tax return on the line pointed out to him by the tax consultant, and pays the amount that the consultant has computed. The taxpayer, in the main, does so in good faith and with every honest intent. Years later the Government decides that a mistake was made. The Government thereupon charges interest and assesses penalties against the taxpayer for all the years through which Government agents dawdled before discovering the mistake. That's why thousands of American taxpayers are having difficulty keeping up with their current income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, why should an honest taxpayer be forced to pay interest on an honest mistake? Why should he be assessed penalties when the income tax law is written so ambiguously in the first place that the taxpayer must hire and depend upon professional tax assistance to make out his return, and is in the second place capable of so many interpretations and honest misunderstandings.

To correct this situation I have today introduced a bill amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in such a way that the Federal Government will be prevented from assessing penalties and charging interest on taxes where a taxpayer has made an honest mistake in his income tax return.

I am sure that my colleagues will agree with me when I say that no honest taxpayer should be compelled to pay either penalties or interest for an honest mistake that has been made under a law that confuses the best tax experts in the country. The present system is not taxation, but has almost become legalized confiscation of one's private property.

Mr. Speaker, a very good example of this inequity in our present tax law can be seen in the tax situation of Joe Louis, former heavyweight champion of the world. The internal-revenue agents now are making it impossible for Louis to make a living by seizing every last cent of his purse moneys. They are making it impossible for him to pay this year's taxes, and though they themselves make it impossible, they will charge him with further interest and further penalties when he is unable to pay his tax this year. No matter what he does the rest of his life, Joe Louis can never save any money. And at the rate that interest piles up on what he owes, he will owe more upon his death than he ever actually earned. There is no question that a loan shark would be driven out of business by public opinion if he practiced such usury, yet this is what our own Government is doing to respectable citizens such as Louis. In several of the States, laws have been passed against this sort of thing, among installment sellers., Yet under our present Federal system of taxation, Joe Louis will pay forever for being one of the great champions of our time. Many actors, authors, painters, and other artists and professional people are having similar tax troubles. It seems to me that any democracy which permits this sort of thing is courting the emergence of a new form of government.

Therefore, I hope that the Congress will find it possible to enact my bill into law in order that this needed relief may be given to thousands of honest American taxpayers. I think it would be a simple act of justice and I feel that such action is long overdue. This bill should recommend itself to every Member of Congress irrespective of political party.

The Government Printing Office Keeps Congress and the World Informed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, when I walked into the Government Printing Office at midnight recently to return some copy for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I watched the faithful workers pursuing their nightly tasks. I know

that I speak for all the Members when I say that we deeply appreciate this great service. It is unfortunate, however, that we do not always fully recognize the effort that goes into providing us with the RECORD at our morning coffee. The significance of things done for us without scrutiny is often overlooked. Now that this Congress is drawing to a close, I think it is appropriate to express our thanks for a job well done.

I have just learned that this job was not done so well some years ago. I discovered that it was not until 1860 that Congress authorized the establishment of an official printing office to produce printing and binding for the Senate and House of Representatives, the executive and judicial departments, and the Court of Claims. Prior to that time, the Congress employed the contract system of printing and much corruption and graft were involved in the contract negotiations. After several congressional investigations, the Government decided to undertake its own printing and purchased a private printing plant for $135,000 to do the job. From this small plant has developed the Government Printing Office—the largest printing plant in the world.

H. R. 12080

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to say a few words about the authorization of two much-needed projects in my congressional district.

When the House passed H. R. 12080 on Monday, it authorized the construction of rivers and harbors projects, navigation and flood-control projects, and repairs and preservation of public works.

Included in this bill were two projects which I introduced to the Congress, the Port Townsend Harbor project, a $387,000 Government investment plus local capital, and the Sammamish River flood-control project, to cost $825,000 in Government funds plus local capital.

Authorization of the long-sought Port Townsend Harbor improvement project will provide a stimulus to the development of the fisheries and other marine industries of Port Townsend, a town located on the Olympic Peninsula in the Second Congressional District. This constructive step toward a start on this project will encourage the investment of private enterprise in development of fishing supply and other terminal facilities. Completion of the project will enable Port Townsend to participate in the commercial fishing industry to a greater extent, and to capitalize on its geographical proximity to the fishing grounds of Puget Sound. Local interests have pledged full economic cooperation with this project.

The Sammamish River flood-control project will be of inestimable value to the area northeast of the city of Seattle. The expanding residential districts of this growing city are pushing ever northward. Stabilization of the river runoff will provide building sites for diversification of light industries and for residential construction. In addition, valuable truck farm acreage will be protected from periodic flooding which has destroyed crops in the past. This project has the support of several small towns in the area and full financial participation by local groups has been assured.

It is my hope that Congress can appropriate the needed funds next session so the orderly construction of these projects can proceed. The United States Army engineers, who will direct work on both of these projects, have investigated thoroughly the mechanics of construction, the feasibility and desirability of their completion. Authorization was a firm step in the right direction toward establishment of two facilities of great value to people of the Second District in the State of Washington.

GOP Circus Drives Ringling Brothers Off the Road—Eisenhower Gets Parity and Par Confused

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address of the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson before the Colorado State Convention in Boulder, Colo., on July 20, 1956:

ADDRESS OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON TO THE COLORADO STATE CONVENTION, BOULDER, COLO., JULY 20, 1956

It is always a pleasure for me to come to Colorado—partly because of the fresh, clear air and the beautiful mountains, and partly, too, because I always find so many lively and alert Democrats. This year you have even been spared the Republican invasion of recent summers.

When you took over the governorship 2 years ago, I said it was just the beginning of a Democratic renaissance in Colorado. I welcome the opportunity today to salute the man who blazed the trail—your great governor, Ed Johnson.

And this year you are going to take over the first of your two seats in the United States Senate. I find it hard to think of two better men than your leading candidates for the senatorial nomination—Charles Brannan and John Carroll. (How useful it would be if some way could be worked out for Colorado to lend-lease its surplus political talent to one of our more underdeveloped States.)

The whole country needs a strong Colorado Democrat in the Senate next year. I can't imagine what better gift you could make—to the Democratic administration in Washington next January.

I make this confident prediction in full realization of the difficulties we face this year as a political party. Of course, there are difficulties. There always are. And I want to talk with you today about some of them.

The first is complacency, the national mood of complacency which has been created so skillfully by the present administration. Instead of informing us about our grim realities and our great opportunities, we get soothing lullabies about peace, prosperity, and progress. Instead if information we get propaganda. Even the Presidency has been used to reassure rather than educate. And a sugar diet leads to fatty degeneration.

And we haven't seen anything yet. Indeed, the heaviest barrage in political history is in the making to obscure a little longer—to the election, if possible—a continuing failure of leadership in Washington that can prove disastrous. For if we continue to mark time in the face of historic change, if we remain stalled in the middle of the road, we may well wake up a generation hence to discover that the great social and political revolution of our time has passed us by; that we have lost the great struggle of the 20th century; that we have lost the cold war without firing a shot; that we are, indeed, no longer a dynamic, creative force in the world—a great nation.

This, as I see it, is the great hazard of this election year. And the Republicans have the means of obscuring the leadership vacuum. They have the money. They will have the newspaper ads, and, of course, the editorials. They will have the billboards, the leaflets, the radio and TV time, and the big advertising agencies. With the aid of highly paid professional experts, the GOP appeal to relax and be thankful is being script written like a sales campaign.

Did you read in the papers out here about the unveiling in Madison Square Garden last week of the Eisenhower 30-ton bandwagons—6 of them—and the dress rehearsal of how they will appear up and down the streets of America from September 1 to election day with barrage balloons, searchlights, horses, and girls?

It's small wonder that Ringling Bros. and all the circuses have had to fold their tents this year in the face of that kind of competition.

But bread and circuses are not enough. They couldn't save the Romans that way and they can't save the Republicans. Money talks, but the allegiance of the American people is not for sale. Besides, it has become apparent for all to see that the Republicans are hopelessly divided, and that the President they all cynically call upon to lead the country, even the world, does not even lead his own party. In the last few days we have seen his party reject his views on school aid, foreign trade and foreign aid, the keystone of his foreign policy.

The fact is that we have peace today because of our policy of strength and because President Truman and Secretary Acheson had the courage to do the unpopular thing and stand and fight in Korea. And insofar as peace is endangered today, it is because the firm, purposeful, and sensible Voice of America is confused, contradictory, and an object of indifference, ridicule, and even contempt in many parts of the non-Communist world. Witness the recent absurd contradictions between the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State about neutralism and the morality of uncommitted nations—only the last of a long, humiliating series. The coalition of non-Communists was based on consent (unlike the Soviet satellite coalition) and that consent is being withdrawn as confidence decreases. Peace is the great American aim, and the voters are asked to decide which party is best qualified to serve that aim. They are not going to decide on the basis of bandwagons and ballyhoo if they understand what's happened to America's world position in a few short years.

And if we are to restore a people's government to the people, we must also make it a lot clearer what we mean by "single-interest government," by "big-business government."

There is nothing immoral about business, even big business. In one sense the business of America is business—that is, enterprise and efficiency and creating more comforts for more people.

What we mean is that the Eisenhower administration has granted opportunities for the few to profit at the expense of the many. I don't suppose we can any longer mention the Dixon-Yates contract which Mr. Eisenhower thought so well of not long ago and his Department of Justice now says was quite illegal.

But the examples are numerous—taxation policy, the use and the misuse of our natural resources, the use and misuse of our power potentials—electric or atomic. Likewise, the reluctance of this big-business-minded Government to invest in public welfare—in homes we can afford to buy and keep; in medical services to keep us well and save us from financial disaster; in schools and teachers numerous enough and good enough; in farms we can afford to work, etc.

We can put it this way: the Eisenhower administration has wasted our opportunities for consolidating and expanding America's humanitarian and peaceful influence abroad, and for expanding the opportunities of the American people at home. Abroad the reservoir of good will, once so full, has sprung dangerous leaks. At home the reservoir of opportunity is at low water mark.

It is not only farmers who suffer from droughts; it is not only the small-business man who is withering. There is a drought in Washington—a drying up of the vision of our national capabilities.

Think of the opportunities that lie before us—for spiritual independence, for cultural growth, for freedom of thought and expression, for the use of our resources, for collaboration for peace with our other nations. Instead we mark time and drift—and with an election coming on our Republican friends tell us "All is well; there are no issues."

Well, we won't quarrel with them for converting to their own use the principles or policies which were worked out under the bold leadership of Roosevelt and Truman. After all, imitation is the sincerest form of flattery and an administration that has no ideas of its own has the right, even the duty, to adopt those of a party that does. And after nearly 4 years of stumbling and fumbling we know those policies are not only good, but nearly foolproof.

I say that the issues are whether this country is going to go to sleep or go to work to meet its dark perils and bright prospects; whether we expect leadership or showmanship from our Government; whether we want talk or action; and whether we the people are going to decide for ourselves—or leave up to a board of directors—what is good for us.

I say that there is a vacuum of Executive direction in Washington; that this administration is living on borrowed time and on borrowed policies which are wearing out; that the Republican Party is hopelessly divided on domestic policy and even more so on foreign policy; that our Government is leaderless in fact and in principle in a time of acute peril. I say that there is no substitute for a President. I say that the ship of state badly needs vision on the bridge and a hand on the rudder.

In short, I say that to arrest this deadly drift the country sorely needs new Executive management—and that means a Democratic victory in November.

Then we can resume once more the long journey to the Democratic goal of equal justice under the law in a nation in which free men should manage their own lives, each as he sees fit, free from fear of the secret police and free from fear of the lords of the money market. And it was not for ourselves that we sought this goal. It was also that this Nation may continue to stand, as it has stood for so long, as a "beacon to mankind."

It is this purpose that our opponents do not understand. Their materialism, their complacency, their blindness, have so shaken the confidence of the rest of the world in American leadership that our friends are anxious and our defenses against communism are crumbling. At home they have ignored the farmer, ignored the worker, ignored the small-business man.

Some of you, I am told, are farmers. Two weeks ago today I was in the dry areas of the Corn Belt in Iowa, Missouri, and Nebraska. Everywhere were the evidences of the new farm depression. Many a livestock man told me that with prices falling and costs inflexible or rising they were worse off than in the depresison of the 1930's. And the saddest thing of all was the spreading failure among the young farmers who started after the war and whose slender resources are now exhausted.

And President Eisenhower and Secretary Benson have watched the farm depression expand during the past few years with a philosophic calm. But now they have adopted the Democratic idea of a soil bank. I don't know whether it was the word "bank" or the coming election that softened them up. They have even left off their preaching about the moral depravity of fixed price supports. It was not long ago that Democratic proposals of 90 percent supports were denounced as demogoguery and worse. But when the President proclaimed some price supports at 86 percent of parity—in an election year—that was principle. Evidently the difference between principle and demagoguery is 4 percent in this hound's-tooth administration, and the President who was applauded as a man of firm principles and flexible prices when he started has got around to flexible principles and firm prices—in an election year.

Actually, I used to wonder if Mr. Eisenhower didn't get parity and par mixed up—86 sounds so much better than 90 as a golf score.

To summarize my views on the farm situation would tax your patience, but I must add that in the recent book on the Eisenhower administration it says that at a Cabinet meeting last October that great agricultural expert, George Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury, said that he questioned whether much could be done about the farm problem, "except," as he put it, "to let natural processes do their work."

It was such unctuous words—"let natural processes do their work"—in another Republican administration that condemned the farmers to years of bleak and grinding poverty back in the 1920's after the first war.

Well, I believe sometimes in letting natural processes do their work, too. And I believe that natural processes will soon restore to Washington those of us who believe in the farmer—and believe in helping the farmer to help himself.

The vacuum of leadership is not confined to economic matters—on which President Eisenhower has said he is "conservative." This vacuum has proved even more ominous in the area of human freedom—where the President lays verbal claim to being "liberal."

If America is about anything, it is about the liberty of the individual. How has the Eisenhower-NIXON administration handled this precious responsibility?

First the President sat passively by while Senator MCCARTHY conducted his campaign against freedom, terrorizing the Government, assailing the foreign service and the Army, and doing his general best to shoot up the town.

Then the President sat passively by while NIXON and other prominent colleagues shouted about all the Communists, fellow travelers and security risks they had cleaned out of the Government. But it turned out that there were no Communists and that they themselves had hired half the so-called security risks.

Then the President sat passively by while his Vice President tried by innuendo to cast a veil of disloyalty over the opposition party in the 1954 campaign. You in Colorado have good reason to remember Mr. NIXON'S contributions to that campaign, his vicious assaults on John Carroll and the unspeakable full-page ads that this self-righteous bunch published all over Colorado. But did I say that the President sat passively by? I am wrong; he sent the Vice President a letter of commendation at the very height of NIXON'S ill-will tour.

In the same way, the President has sat passively by while America has wrestled with the anguished problem of racial segregation and civil rights. Here, I said last February, is an area where prestige of the Presidential office could put to active positive use—to help restore communication between the reasonable people of both sides, and to further our full understanding that the current of freedom and equality sweeping across the world is inexorable and reversible, and that what is right is also law. Yet, while this great test of our moral maturity shakes the Nation, no word, no guidance has come from the White House.

Inertia is the rule across the board. But there is no Executive pressure, no party coherence, no Presidential leadership.

Indecision is passed off as wisdom, postponement as statesmanship, stagnation as progressive in this cynical attempt to conceal the vacuum of leadership behind a barrage of propaganda, deception and ballyhoo.

The Republican formula is simple—it is pablum on the Potomac.

And against the Republican cult of showmanship there stands the calm and traditional confidence of the Democratic Party that the American people can be trusted to act intelligently when they are told the truth.

This was the real secret of our 20 years' tenure of power. Against the massed power of nearly all the money in the country, nearly all the agencies of propaganda in the country, and all the disaffected and disgruntled people in the country, we won five successive elections. The string of victories was not broken until the Republican Party masked its purposes behind a great national hero in whom that party leadership did not believe and whom it had no intention of supporting.

To explain our success, the Republicans have built up one of the most curious myths in political history. Ignoring the obvious, they have evolved a theory that it was some sort of diabolical magic, all done with mirrors and sleight-of-hand. They will not, they cannot accept the truth that all the magic lay in having the courage to tell the people the plain truth. That courage, and that alone, comprised the witchcraft of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

But to have the courage to tell the people the truth you must believe in the people. You must believe that if they are given the facts, they will make an intelligent decision. The party of privilege has never believed this—from Alexander Hamilton to Charles E. Wilson, George Humphrey and the Eisenhower Cabinet—men so rich we are supposed to conclude they must be wise.

If you believe that you can manage the people better than they can manage themselves, you never can understand men like Roosevelt and Truman.

More than that, you can never understand America.

How ridiculous it all is—that our Nation, on the verge of its greatest and most exciting feature, should stand uncertain and hesitant, mired in the materialism and complacency of its leadership.

Woodrow Wilson once stated the whole program of the Democratic Party in a phrase. Its destiny, he said, was to "release the generous energies of our people."

This is our challenge. We must break the log-jam. We must end the stagnation. We must cut the bonds that tie us to the ground.

There is work to be done. There is a chance for youth and vigor and imagination to provide the leadership which America and the world so desperately need. The slogans of yesterday, whether the slogans of liberalism or the slogans of conservatism, are not adequate to the crisis of today. In the spirit of this great convention, we must strike out on new roads, moving forward together toward freedom, toward abundance and toward peace.

America was not born to stand still. It was born to move steadily ahead—to demonstrate to all the world the power of free men and the meaning of freedom.

Let us start today. We have no time to waste. And the first milestone will be a Democratic victory in November.

Address by Hon. Charles H. Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the great institutions in the city of New York is the Grand Street Boys and I am proud to record the fact that I have long been a member of this outstanding civic and charitable institution.

Recently there was a meeting of the Grand Street Boys Foundation which provides scholarships for poor and deserving young Americans. On this occasion, Mr. Charles H. Silver, a distinguished New Yorker and now president of the Board of Education of New York City, paid tribute to the man most responsible for the record of the Grand Street Boys, its president, Judge Jonah J. Goldstein. It is a remarkable tribute from one distinguished public servant to another who has given a lifetime of service to his community, State, and country.

The following is the text of what Mr. Silver said on this very moving occasion:

ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES H. SILVER, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF EDUCATION, AT PRESENTATION OF GRAND STREET BOYS' FOUNDATION SCHOLARSHIP AWARD, JUNE 25, 1956 AT THE HALL OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION

As we go through life, destiny takes us down many streets. Sometimes we are in the narrow alleys of despair; most of us are hurrying along the busy lanes of commerce; all of us hope to walk, for a little while at least, along the broad highway of mankind's highest aspiration, the wide avenue of service to our fellowmen.

That is the street on which we have met today. It is a street of helping hands and generous hearts. It is well named a "Grand" street, and I am happy to be here again among the Grand Street Boys.

One of my closest and dearest friends lives on this street, and I use the word advisedly, because, for the many years of his richly rewarding life, Judge Jonah J. Goldstein has lived the work of the Grand Street Boys, and that means living for others.

We grew up together on the streets of New York, Judge Goldstein and I, and many of you who are here today. We know this city and we love her, in all her many moods, in all her terrifying immensity. We know the overwhelming size of our city, and we know, and prove again by these ceremonies today, that big as New York is, her heart is even bigger.

In these five boroughs, you find a world in itself, a vast mingling of races and tongues, an awesome giant of progress and industry. This magic, miracle city stands like a new colossus, its feet in the factories, harbors and homes, its eyes, frequently, on the stars.

A surging pride in our city is part of the very heartbeat of Jonah Goldstein. It pulses in every splendid civic activity of the Grand Street Boys. And well it may for this city of ours is a pretty exciting place.

Where else can you find a community of 8 million souls living and working side by side in friendship and harmony? Here is a kind of united nations among municipalities, 54 different nationalities in point of origin, an amazing variety of traditions and viewpoints, blended together into one great family, shouting together for a world series victory, griping together about a subway strike or the sudden hot spell, and striving together for the triumph of the American way of life.

I salute the Grand Street Boys as guardians of our American way of life and I salute my cherished friend, Judge Jonah J. Goldstein, for his deep personal interest in aiding the boys and girls of our city through the award of these maintenance scholarships. This is only one of many avenues of assistance to the deserving citizens of New York which this organization offers to all who are worthy, without regard to race, creed, color or political affiliation.

I am happy and honored to stand beside Judge Goldstein as he makes these awards to outstanding graduates of our city's schools. This positive approach to the encouragement of good citizenship and leadership cannot help but prove that decency and responsibility enjoy a high priority above teen-age crime and delinquecy. You young people who have earned these rewards for character, citizenship and scholarship are the best answer we can give to the detractors of youth.

The parents and the teachers of the young people, whose accomplishments are being rewarded at this gathering, may well be proud. And you who have won these awards have every reason to take pride in the work you have done which has resulted in your selection from among the more than a million children in our city's schools.

You young people represent a multitude of honor graduates in every part of our vast Nation, eager to pursue their studies in schools of higher education and technical training in every branch of man's knowledge. You were never more needed than now. You will bear the brunt of the coming struggle between the free world and the slave world in which nothing will count more than education and the ability to use creative intelligence to defend democracy throughout the earth.

The stakes are high; for, if we fail, we lose our freedom. The outcome is in your hands, tomorrow is in your hands.

Face it without fear. The laurels you have won today are proof of your ability to protect and defend the rights of mankind and to assure the survival of this God-loved land of American against any enemies present or to come. If tomorrow's conflicts can be won, as I believe they can, in the classrooms of today, the victory is yours!

Young men and women, winners of these tributes to your scholastic achievement and personal integrity, on behalf of the Board of Education, I congratulate you and wish you well in all your endeavors.

Today, when we are so desperately in need of great minds and hearts, teachers, scientists, engineers, workers, planners and healers, I cannot just say to you young people, "do not let us down." The world you inherit may be faltering in many ways it may, indeed, be falling into a void of confusion and despair. That is the challenge I ask you to face. It is not enough to say do not let us down; lift us up.

I know you will. I know you will take from this notable occasion, a new resolve to be worthy of the faith in you that you have found among the Grand Street Boys today. I know that whatever streets you follow in the unpredictable pattern of your life and career, you will carry the honors you have won today as a torch before you.

Dedicate yourselves to light some day the dark streets ahead for others; to follow the shining example of the Grand Street Boys in serving your fellow men, in leading youth onward and upward as keepers of a great heritage, as defenders of the American dream that I see proudly reflected in the eyes of all of you. Keep it bright. God bless you.

Tribute to a Great Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of July 22, 1956, has just paid a great tribute to one of the outstanding programs ever enacted by Congress. We of the Democratic Party will forever take pride in the fact that this great educational undertaking, with its manifold benefits to our Nation, was written into law under a Democratic President and by a Democratic Congress.

The article follows:

GI SCHOOL LAW ENDS WEDNESDAY—7,800,000 VETERANS TRAINED IN WORLD WAR II PLAN—KOREAN BENEFITS GO ON

The world's largest educational venture comes to an end on Wednesday.

The GI bill of rights for World War II veterans will bow out on that day. It has provided educational opportunities for 7,800,000 former servicemen at a cost to the Federal Government of $14,500,000,000.

At the height of the program in 1947, the majority of students on the Nation's campuses were veterans. Some colleges found that 90 percent or more of their male students had served their country in the war.

When President Roosevelt signed the bill on June 22, 1944, many educators viewed with alarm. Some even warned that institution of higher education would become little more than hobo camps. There is little gloom today, though.

The GI program has proved successful—far more successful than even the most optimistic supporters could have predicted.

In addition to the original bill, known as Public Law 346, the 78th Congress, also adopted another program, known as Public Law 16. It made provisions for the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. Vocational training centers were created. Some 610,000 disabled veterans were helped to become self-reliant.

KOREA BILL CONTINUES

The veteran, though, will not vanish from the American campus. The Korean GI bill is just beginning its fourth year. And, this fall, some 750,000 Korean veterans will be attending school and college, or will receive on-the-job training.

Although the educational provisions end on Wednesday, some portions of World War II measure will remain for another year. Veterans will be able to get loans under the home and business provisions of the bill until July 25, 1957. However, the Senate passed a bill yesterday that would extend the home-loan provision to January 25, 1958.

The World War II veteran has left an imprint upon American education. More mature, more determined than the average college student, the former serviceman brought greater intellectual curiosity to the classroom.

"I had to throw away my yellowed notes when the veterans came," one economics professor said, somewhat ruefully. "They wanted more than pat answers. They wanted to know why."

The GI's received money for going to school or college. When first adopted, the law provided a subsistence fund of $50 a month for unmarried veterans and $75 a month for married veterans. Soon that was raised to $65 and $90. In addition, the veterans received an allowance of $500 for tuition fees, books and incidentals. This sum went directly to the colleges.

STARTED SLOWLY IN 1945

Under the Korean bill a change has taken place. A single veteran gets $110, a married one $135 and a married veteran with dependents receives $160 a month. But he must pay his own tuition fees out of this amount.

The first veterans began to trickle back to school in the fall of 1944, soon after the bill had been enacted. The colleges did not realize what was in store for them. The fighting raged in Europe and the Pacific.

With the end of the war the veterans started to return to civilian life. The educational advantages of the bill began to receive attention. In the fall of 1945 the trickle grew to a slow stream. But still few recognized that the veterans would jump at the chance to get free schooling the way they did.

Indeed, officials at the highest Government levels predicted that a total of 500,000 veterans might take advantage of the bill. It was not long, though, before they revised their estimates and guessed perhaps 1 million.

Actually, even this highest estimate, which was met with skepticism in 1945, soon proved too conservative.

Consternation set in. Plainly, the colleges had been caught with their academic blueprints down. Conferences were suddenly called by school groups to solve the crisis. The veterans filled every nook and corner of the dormitories, laboratories and classrooms.

Emergency measures were adopted. Quonset huts dotted the campuses, frow the University of Maine to the University of California. A rush call for professors came next.

REACHED PEAK IN 1947

The peak was reached in 1947, when about 1,500,000 veterans were on the campuses. In the prewar days of 1939–40, the entire college enrollment was less than that.

The colleges responded nobly. Most institutions started counseling services for veterans. The former serviceman was king on the campus. He was given every kind of break. Brown University, for example, established a special school for veterans who could not qualify as regular students.

And Brown found what most other institutions did: That the veterans came to the top. The veterans in the Brown experiment soon showed that they could compete on equal terms with the regular students.

Yale University established an Institute of Collegiate Study for former servicemen. Other institutions chartered new branches or divisions for veterans.

But the education did not end in this country. A world of educational opportunities was opened. The Veterans' Administration ruled that ex-servicemen might take their educational benefits anywhere. The sole criterion was this: do the foreign schools meet American standards?

Young Americans were soon found in Oxford and Cambridge, England. They were found at the University of Paris and the Sorbonne. They made their way to institutions in Germany and Italy, to Belgium and the Netherlands.

"We never had it so good," one of the young veterans said, as he recalled his days at Oxford. "What an ideal situation. We went to school abroad and got paid for it."

In New York the problem became so acute that Governor Dewey called together the heads of the private and public colleges at Albany. They were told that come what may room had to be found for the veterans.

The State institutions doubled their facilities in some instances.

And the State did its share. It helped create a new institution at Plattsburgh, known as Champlain College. This had been a base for the Air Force. Now thousands of veterans received a collegiate education there.

Many old traditions fell by the board. Such old-line well-established women's colleges as Vassar, Sarah Lawrence, Barnard, Finch and others admitted men to their campuses. It even got to the point where the 90 or so coeds at Vassar wanted a football team. That was going too far, said the officials, who vetoed the idea.

A public school in Philadelphia set aside no-smoking signs. In their place the principal created a smoking room. But this was reserved for veterans. It was off-limits for the teen-aged civilians.

All was not smooth and peaceful for the Veterans' Administration. It found that human nature had rather low greedy depths. Soon a number of fly-by-night schools was established to fleece the veterans of their $500 tuition allowance. Some of these "schools" pretended to make a man an architect in 7 months. All taught little in the way of trades.

Schools of ballroom dancing, bartending, and even chicken-sexing sprang up. It was estimated that close to $500 million was wasted in these nonprofitable courses before the VA clamped down. But before the officials caught up with this defect, hundreds of thousands of veterans wasted their benefits. Some 400,000 veterans entered flight-training courses.

The veterans were entitled to from 1 to 4 years of free schooling, depending upon their length of service. Some servicemen found to their dismay that they had lost their benefits on gilded promises.

But, fortunately, this was a defect that was soon corrected. In the main, the veterans did a tremendously valuable and serious job in school and college. They crowded the engineering colleges. In 1950, when the veterans flooded the campuses, the colleges graduated 50,000 engineers. Today it has dropped to less than half that number—some 23,500.

The largest number, 33 percent, went into craft, trade, and industrial courses. Business administration and managerial courses accounted for a substantial number. So did agriculture and related programs.

MANY IN PROFESSIONS

But the humanities were not overlooked. Many veterans entered upon a teaching profession; others became doctors, lawyers, scientists, artists. Hardly a field of training did not attract its quota of veterans.

The men who came out of the war damaged in body or mind got help, too. The vocational rehabilitation program served the ex-soldiers well.

New hope came to the handicapped. The disabled veterans proved that you could lead a productive, independent life if you got the chance to overcome your handicaps. And the VA gave the men and women that opportunity.

A recent followup study by the Veterans' Administration showed that 95 out of every 100 rehabilitated veterans were employed. Most of them like the work they are doing.

It was found that the salary of the trainee had been doubled since his VA schooling.

Some 35 percent of the disabled veterans trained for professional, semiprofessional, and managerial occupations. Only 23 percent of the labor force in the Nation holds such jobs. Another 38 percent trained for skilled trade and industrial occupations, 14 percent studied farming, and 11 percent sought clerical and sales positions.

"The morale of these retrained vets has never been higher," one of the VA officials declared. "It's remarkable how well they adjust."

The veterans brought much to the campuses. They did a better academic job than their civilian classmates. They became the editors, the club presidents, the athletic heroes. Even the college officials were surprised at this turn of events.

AFFECTED AMERICAN LIFE

The GI bill had a profound effect upon American life. It helped create a reservoir of trained manpower so urgently needed today.

"It helped raise the educational level of an entire generation," said Harvey V. Higley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. "It has been a living symbol that America does not forget her veterans. And in their accomplishments, veterans have more than justified the remembrance."

Many illustrations could be cited of the way veterans overcame all kinds of handicaps to land on top. A blinded Korean veteran was graduated cum laude from Boston College last month. He plans to continue for his master's degree and then enter the field of personnel work. A paralyzed veteran took a journalism course and is editing a specialty journal.

One veteran got a job as a lion tamer after completing his GI program. Another is working at Brookhaven National Laboratories. When he got home from the Army, he worked in a laundry, sold soap, became a clerk, learned to repair television sets, and finally wandered into the VA vocational counseling office. He was found to be scientific minded. With this encouragement, he enrolled at Columbia University, where he received a master of arts and doctor of philosophy in physical chemistry.

This must be balanced with the case of the GI who practiced making counterfeit money as part of his vocational training. He had completed a GI course in engraving. He got 10 years of free Government subsistence as a postgraduate course.

The average veteran was 27 years old when he entered the GI program. Ninety-eight percent of all trainees were male; two-thirds of all veterans in college had dependents. It cost Uncle Sam $1,800 to train an average veteran. If he went to college, the cost was $2,500; below college, $1,500; for farm training, $3,000, and on-the-job, $1,000.

AVERAGE TRAINED 19 MONTHS

The average veteran trained for 19 months, but he was eligible for 40. The college student attended classes for 23 months, and below college level, for 15 months.

Congress took the first steps to eliminate playtime training in VA's appropriations in 1948. It banned avocational or recreational courses, unless the veteran could show that the courses were to be used in connection with their present or contemplated business or occupations. Congress shortly thereafter cracked down on the fly-by-night schools that were set up to fleece the veterans.

Thus ends a saga of American life. The World War II veterans will no longer dominate the campuses. But a new group, the Korean serviceman, has replaced them to a smaller extent.

The Korean veterans must complete their training by January 31, 1963. Those under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act have until January 31, 1964. Other veterans must take advantage of their rights within 8 years after the date of discharge.

For the next 8 years some veterans will be found on the campuses and in the classrooms. But their number will diminish.

But the campuses will not be deserted. A crop of civilians, exceeding in number the postwar veterans, are crowding the Nation's campuses.

Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in the pressure of work and time that attends the rush to adjournment of the Congress, it is not possible always to pause and take cognizance of the reports filed by our various committees on studies that they have undertaken. For this reason, I should like to call attention to the distinguished and excellent report on Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy just issued by the Joint Economic Committee. This report was printed as a Senate document and, therefore, may escape the attention of Members of this House. Yet the subcommittee was composed of Members from both the House and the Senate and, indeed, the chairman of the subcommittee that issued the report is the young, dynamic, and very able Congressman from Missouri, RICHARD BOLLING.

This unanimous report on Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy was the product of a careful study of the broad issue of defense essentiality as the rationale for restricting imports. In addition, as a case study, the committee took a long look at our import policy with respect to Swiss watches. A major conclusion of the subcommittee is:

Protection of the watch industry by trade restrictions in the name of defense is unwarranted because first, it will not be effective in preserving the domestic industry, and second, it represents an undue burden on other industries as well as consumers. The burden on other industries and on the trade of the free world will detract from national security.

I have consistently felt that the 1954 increase of 50 percent in Swiss watch tariffs was unwarranted and prejudicial to our national interest. Now that a review of the effects of that decision is about to be completed and its findings submitted to the President, this document on Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy assumes an even greater importance. The responsible officials in the administration could do no better than to give the Bolling subcommittee report the closest study. I urge, too, that my colleagues in the Congress acquaint themselves with the conclusions of this highly significant report. There is much to be learned from it.

The Second Death of Stalin and the Future of Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include by request the following article appearing in the Albanian-American of Boston, entitled "The Second Death of Stalin and the Future of Albania":

THE SECOND DEATH OF STALIN AND THE FUTURE OF ALBANIA

(By Prof. Glenn A. McLain)

PART I

The most sensational news story of 1956 is the deflation of Stalin by the new "salesmen" of the Kremlin. Hard-boiled western political analysts and diplomatic experts could hardly believe the reports coming out of Moscow after a secret session of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party had met late in February. Nikita S. Khrushchev spoke before a Soviet party delegation of 1,355 comrades for over 3 hours.

He tearfully told the party leaders that Stalin was a murderer, a false diplomat, a treasonous leader, a paranoic with delusions of grandeur, and heresy of heresies that Stalin was not a true Communist. While foreign Communist leaders were barred from this meeting, the ghost of Stalin strode over the great Kremlin palace, and over the plains of Russia into the heartland of the Soviet Empire. From the officers of the Daily Worker in the United States to the dusty tents of Communist supporters in the Peoples Republic of Mongolia party leaders shivered in confusion. Since this fantastic news was leaked to the Western press, speculative articles, learned commentaries and outright guesswork from the West and from satellite publications have aroused the world. One of the most important results of this dethronement of the God Stalin might well be its effect on the captive nations of Europe and especially Albania.

Under the direction of Stalin the Russian and the satellite press has accused the West of colonialism and aggression toward countries like Albania. Bashkimi and Zeri I Populair have echoed this Stalinist propaganda in their newspaper columns. Meanwhile, Stalin has been pictured as the champion of the weak and underpriviledged areas of the Balkans and the world. The Yalta papers show Stalin's "love for Albania" to be a feeling based upon cynicism, not respect for Albanian integrity.

Only the most blind followers of the Russian line could accept Stalin's position toward Albania as being one of love and compassion. Stalin's stand toward Albania was shown most clearly in the Bohlen Minutes taken at the Tripartite dinner meeting, February 4, 1945, at the Livadia Palace, Yalta. The subject of the Top Three secret discussion was "the Voice of Smaller Powers in Postwar Peace Organization." Principal participants in the discussion were Stalin, Churchill, and Roosevelt.

Stalin made it quite evident during the talks that it would not serve the interests of the Soviet State "to give the small powers any rights to preserve the peace of the world." He said that "it was ridiculous to believe that Albania should have an equal voice with the three great powers who had won the war." Prime Minister Churchill replied that "there was no question of the small powers dictating to the big powers * * * but moral responsibility and leadership by the big powers should be exercised with moderation and respect for the rights of small nations." Roosevelt agreed with this view. Churchill then tried to soften Stalin's inflexible approach by saying "The eagle should permit the small birds to sing out and care not wherefore they sang." But Stalin was not interested in small nations or birds, but merely in digesting as much territory and power as his soldiers might be able to grab.

Such was the basis of Stalin's "love for Albania." As the Yalta Conference progressed, Stalin showed time and time again that the rights of all small nations were a mockery to him. Whenever he was pressed by Churchill or Roosevelt to make concessions to the small nations he blandly refused or agreed only to repudiate his agreements. Stalin showed his "love" not only for Albania but also for the millions of free peoples in his slave empire as he became the "father" of the oppressed. His open and unqualified disregard for Albania at the Yalta Conference thus prepared the world for his post-World War II treachery.

"The Second Death of Stalin" holds important implications for Albania. Anti-Stalin Communist leaders who are still among the living are being "rehabilitated" in Hungry, Poland, and Czechoslovakia. Rumanian, Bulgarian, and Albanian leaders are expected to follow in this effort of the Kremlin to show the Western World that its new policy is "enlightened." Stalinism or collective leadership means the same thing to Albania. Economic exploitation, political misery, and starvation stalk the land of the eagle. The Albanian underground should seize this opportunity to show the Albanians how Stalinism has ruined their country. As Tito will gain in this battle of Communists against Communists, all Red leaders must be painted with the same brush of truth. The time to point these facts out to the Albanian people is now. Upon the result might hinge the future of Russia's weakest outpost—the land of Albania.

The Steel Dispute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include a state-

ment by David J. McDonald, president, United Steelworkers of America, pertinent to the industrial dispute existing between the steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America.

I am certain every Member of this House will obtain valuable information from Mr. McDonald's statement which covers the entire problem very thoroughly and very factually.

The statement follows:

Since midnight of June 30 the basic steel industry has been idle because of the decision of the companies to shut down operations when labor contracts with the United Steelworkers of America terminated.

Instead of engaging in good-faith bargaining with the union prior to June 30 to work out new contracts which would meet the needs of the employees and provide them with an adequate share in the tremendous prosperity of the industry, the companies forced 650,000 of their employees and thousands in other industries into unemployment with consequent harm to the economy.

We of the United Steelworkers did not want this shutdown to happen. We did everything in our power to prevent it. We made reasonable proposals for an honorable settlement which would be fair to the employees, the stockholders, and the public. However, we were confronted by a totally inadequate "take it or leave it" proposition from the industry.

We are not indulging in wild charges, but stating our sober conviction, when we say that the leaders of the steel industry forced the shutdowns—for ulterior reasons which they must be better able to explain than anyone else. You will recall that the Steelworkers Union, just before contract talks with the industry spokesmen were broken off, made a forthright offer to extend our agreements for 15 days with customary retroactivity to provide more time for negotiations. The industry showed its true purpose of forcing a shutdown when it flatly rejected this offer.

Thus we stand at the present impasse—with time ticking away, with a needless great loss in production, in wages, in purchasing power to keep the wheels of our economic machine turning.

I realize that you, as a public-spirited citizen, would like to know more of the facts on this situation than can be found in the newspapers. Ours is a responsible union. We believe that you, and the public in general, have a right to know the facts because all of us have a stake in the outcome. It is in recognition of your right to know that the United Steelworkers of America has prepared two well-documented studies of the facts and real issues involved in our present dispute with the steel industry. For it is only through a study of the clear facts that the issues can be reasonably appraised and intelligent negotiations carried on.

Unfortunately, the spokesmen for the industry have not been willing to engage in genuine negotiations based on the irrefutable facts contained in these two studies. Rather, they have substituted press releases, press conferences, and newspaper advertisements for genuine negotiations. Because their inadequate proposals, which they well knew the union could not accept, were handed down with a take-it-or-leave-it attitude which cannot be defended, they have obscured or misrepresented the facts.

So I commend, then, for your judgment, the facts in our two studies here summarized. In the one entitled "Steel and the National Economy 1956," there is a thorough analysis of the current state of the economy and the overall effect of the steel industry on the national economy, with special emphasis on the question of inflation. In the other study entitled "Facts on Steel: Profits, Productivity, Prices, and Wages 1956," there is a detailed examination of the financial position of the industry, with significant comparisons of the relationship of profits, productivity, prices, and wages.

You recall that steel industry spokesmen have sought to justify their failure to offer a reasonable wage increase by invoking the word "inflation." They said that "no increase in employment costs at this time would be in the Nation's best interests * * *" since it would set off "another ruinous round of inflation." Now, there are very few people indeed who want inflation, but we sharply disagree with the industry's contention that inflation is caused by wage increases—for to say this is tantamount to saying that it is impossible for the living standards of the working population to improve at all. Indeed, any inflationary tendencies that may exist in our economy stem not from wage and salary increases, which are vitally needed, but from pricing policies of industry generally and particularly the steel industry. Let us see what our studies have to say on this and related subjects.

STEEL AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The volume which addresses itself to the problem of inflation and the present state of our economy contains the following facts and essential policies:

Concern is expressed by the union as to the need to safeguard and improve the health of our economy as a whole. Note is taken of the fact that there have been some serious "soft spots" in the fabric of the economy, which has been on a plateau for some 9 months. Despite precarious inventory accumulations and higher consumer debt, the full employment levels of 1952 and 1953 have not been matched. Prosperity in the last decade has been sustained by wage and salary increases and labor's rising share of the total income. (Though in steel labor's total-income share has fallen in this decade.) But labor's share in the economy, as well as in steel, has fallen in the last year and consumer purchases are lagging. Unless corrected, this could spell trouble.

With confidence in the fundamental strength of our economic system, and with faith in its potential growth, we also in this study take into account the possibilities and challenges of the years ahead. A growing labor force and rising productivity make possible a doubling of our production and our standard of living within the next 20 years. These can be achieved only if there is an active market for the goods and services we can produce.

Consumers buy 5 of every 6 dollars worth of goods and services purchased privately. Since consumer purchasing power arises largely from wages and salaries, wages and salaries must increase if economic expansion is to be resumed and a market provided for this doubled production.

Our study refutes any alleged relation between wage increases and inflation and states: "Experience has proved that wage increases have not caused inflation, that wages can be increased without prices being raised, and that rising real wages gives us stable prosperity and growth."

Wage increases, says our report, lagged behind price increases in the immediate postwar and Korean inflations and obviously could not have caused inflation. The pattern of inflation is rising prices, rising real profits, and lagging real wages. In the stable period since mid-1951, on the other hand, wage rates in manufacturing have risen 23 percent, living costs less than 4 percent and industrial prices 4 percent. Yet total profits before taxes reached record levels in 1955.

Rising real wages, stable prices, and sustained high profits, made possible by constantly increasing productivity, are thus the keys to economic stability and perpetuation of prosperity for all segments of our economy. Our study points out:

"Productivity * * * has been increasing more than 3 percent per year. In manufacturing industries, the annual rate has been exceeding 4 percent. Automation will increase the pace. * * * Real hourly earnings in manufacturing fell behind the rise in productivity at the time of the Korean war and have not caught up yet. This disparity must be corrected through rising real wages."

With steel a conspicuous exception, the union's report says, rising volume of business in industry generally has tended to be associated with lower profit margins per unit of production in periods of stability. This policy has yielded prosperity and high total profits. The spurt of industrial prices ahead of wages and the sharp rise in profit margins in 1955, after 4 years of moderate decline, spell danger and must be reversed.

Our study reveals a disturbing irresponsibility in the pricing and profit margin policies of the steel industry. Our study states:

"The contrast between the pricing policies of the steel industry and of all manufacturing industries as a whole is rather startling. Steel prices have increased proportionately with wage rates since 1947 ignoring rapidly rising productivity in its pricing policies. For all manufacturing, industrial prices increased considerably less than half as much as wage rates from 1947 to 1955.

"The steel industry does not follow the principle of higher volume and lower margins. If there is any single industry that has followed inflationary pricing practices; that has shown a disregard for the economic welfare of the country, especially relative to its key role in the economy; that has truly practiced inflation; that has the least right to hide behind the cloak of favoring a sound dollar and to contend that wage increases are inflationary; it is the steel industry."

Before the union commenced negotiations with the industry, several steel company spokesmen had issued public statements calling for higher prices for their products. They based this mainly on the plea that price increases were required to finance expansion. Our study says of this:

"Contentions by leaders of the steel industry and other industries that prices must be increased so that there will be more profits with which to finance expansion are astounding. Raising prices to secure funds for new plant and equipment in effect forces the consumer to put up the money for new plants for the benefit of existing stockholders. The consumer gets nothing for his forced 'investment.' The opportunity for American citizens to participate in the growth of American industry is denied when expansion is financed entirely through exorbitant profits rather than security flotations."

FACTS ON STEEL: PROFITS, PRODUCTIVITY, PRICES, AND WAGES

Now let me refer you to the second of our two economic studies, which deals with the financial position of the steel industry in relation to industry as a whole and in relation to profits, wages, prices, and—of special significance—productivity in relation to all of these factors.

Our study emphasizes productivity as the key to the entire question of wages, prices, profits, and the health of the overall economy.

"It is now commonly accepted that, over long periods, wage gains and rising living standards must come largely from increased productivity, i. e., rising output per man-hour," states our report. "With this concept the union has no quarrel as long as one prior condition is met—namely, that the income shares as between management and investors on the one hand and labor on the

other * * * are fair and equitable. There is no such equitable sharing in the steel industry today."

Here is what our analysis of the productivity record in steel reveals:

Taking note of the great, continuing rise in productivity for many years, we observe especially "the sharp acceleration in the productivity rate in the most recent years."

For example, productivity in the steel industry currently has been running at a rate 4.7 percent higher than in 1955. And the rate in 1955 was a phenomenal 11.2 percent above 1954. In short, steelworkers are producing more and more steel per man-hour. Increased productivity in steel has run well in excess of the increase in the economy as a whole and in manufacturing industries.

Yet what does a comparison show us? Taking the years 1939–56 (more than 16 years), we find the "real" productivity increase in the steel industry to be 68.8 percent. For the same period, the "real" straight time average hourly earnings of the steelworker rose only 47.1 percent.

It is evident that increasing productivity is the key to providing higher wages, higher standards of living, broader and more stable prosperity—and all without the need to boost prices beyond reason and without harm to the rightful profits of the industry and its investors. For if the millions of workers in industry do not receive a fair share of these benefits of increased productivity, then our free enterprise economy cannot continue to function. And it is in this area that the leaders of the steel industry have, so far, been far too backward and short-sighted.

Our study of the industry contains interesting revelations as to steel profits. Far from being in dire straits, profitwise, the steel corporations under examination have been showing a 1956 profit rate of 15.3 percent higher than last year and—believe it or not—107.4 percent higher than in 1954. These are profits before taxes, and it should be remembered that wage increases are offset from profits before, not after taxes. As to profits after taxes, you will find that these companies have been reaping—at the 1956 rate—net profits 13.1 percent higher than in 1955 and 95.6 percent higher than in 1954.

That is not all of the story, however, for any such gain in profits has to be compared to profits in other lines of manufacturing to make real sense out of the comparison. You will find in our study that such a comparison shows that the steel industry has done very well indeed.

Take a look at this, if you will, from the point of view of profits as a share of the "sales dollar," which is a favorite approach of many companies. What we discover is this:

While net profits as a share of the sales dollar in the steel industry went up from 6.2 cents in 1947 to 7.9 cents in 1956, the record shows that net profits for all manufacturing companies went down from 5.7 cents in 1947 to 4.3 cents in 1956.

And these figures, by the way, do not at all mean that companies in other manufacturing lines are in bad condition, profitwise, or are ill-managed. Rather, it means simply that with increased productivity and higher volume of business these companies are taking less profit per dollar of sales. In contrast to this, the steel industry has been siphoning off more and more profit from each and every sales dollar—instead of passing on more of the benefits of increased productivity and high-level sales to their employees and their customers.

You will find, too, a striking contrast in the rising size of dividend payments by the steel companies, whose dividends more than tripled between 1947 and 1956 while the dividends from all corporations were not quite doubled.

This study discloses, as does our other study, that the pricing policies of the steel industry have shown little concern for the welfare of the public. Traditionally the industry has sought to justify price increases as being necessitated by wage increases, increased materials costs, alleged "too low" profits margins, and more recently, the "need" to finance expansion out of profits. We have already seen from our studies that profit margins certainly are not "too low" and that the concept of financing expansion out of profits is untenable and in contradiction to the traditional system of obtaining expansion capital through flotation of securities.

The facts in our study likewise contradict the industry's assertions that increased wages and materials costs have necessitated price increases. The industry has increased prices out of all proportion to increased costs. For each $1 increase in labor since 1945, exorbitant price increases have yielded $3.19 in additional revenues. The figures on materials costs are equally startling. Materials cost since 1947 have risen about 28 percent, but steel prices in the same period have risen 78.2 percent—an excess of price increases over cost increases of nearly 3 to 1.

A central and overriding fact relative to the current dispute which emerges from our study of the steel industry is the ability of the industry to absorb a truly substantial wage increase without a price increase. This is due to the relatively small portion of total costs represented by wage costs—about one-third only—and to the great profitability of the industry.

Within the framework of its 1956 operations, the steel industry could absorb for a full year a wage "cost" increase which would meet the needs of its employees, forego a price increase, and end up with net profits comparable to the huge profits of prior years. The return on net worth would still be nearly double the fair and reasonable rate of 6 percent—and the return on sales would be well above the 4.3 cents for all manufacturing corporations in 1956.

The picture becomes even more overwhelming when we realize that the foregoing figures are based on an assumption of no increase in productivity. Clearly, even a modest productivity increase of 4 or 5 percent will facilitate the industry's ability to absorb wage increases without increasing prices and still end up with enormous profits.

What does all of this prove? Certainly not that the industry should not make good profits, nor that the stockholders should not receive good dividends. Rather, what it demonstrates is that the steel companies can well afford, beyond the shadow of a doubt, to meet the steelworkers' proposals for a substantial wage increase and the other benefits we ask for our members and that they can do so without raising prices.

The steelworkers union presented reasonable, practical and justifiable proposals to the steel industry.

We asked for a substantial wage increase which is vitally needed to permit steelworkers to improve their living standards, to share in the industry's record prosperity and productivity which they have greatly helped to fashion, and to provide them with the increased purchasing power needed for a prosperous and expanding economy.

We asked for Sunday premium pay at double time and Saturday premium pay at time and one-half in line with the predominant practice in American industry.

We asked for improvements in "fringe" benefits such as holidays, vacations, shift differentials and insurance.

These provisions of our contracts have fallen far behind practices now prevalent in American industry as indicated by the following table taken from our report:

	American industry practices	Steel industry practices
Pay for Sunday work	Double time	Single time.
Pay for Saturday work	Time and ½	Do.
Paid holidays	7	6.
Premium above holiday pay for work on holidays.	½ time or better.	None.
Vacations for—		
3 years of service	2 weeks	1 week.
10 years of service	3 weeks	2 weeks.
Over 15 years of service.	3 or 4 weeks	3 weeks.
Shift differentials:		
Evening	10 cents	6 cents.
Night	15 cents	9 cents.

We asked for a supplemental unemployment benefits plan to protect steelworkers against the ravages of unemployment which occasionally occurs in this industry.

We asked for improvements in other contract provisions which need modernization.

Our study points out that the steel industry has refused to make a wage offer or an offer on the other contract items which even begins to meet the needs here noted. Customarily, the industry and the union have signed 2-year contracts with provision for wage reopening after 1 year. Now the industry has demanded a closed-term, 5-year contract, the provisions of which are decidedly substandard. The industry has flatly refused to make any wage or contract proposals for the customary 2-year term.

The industry has advertised far and wide that the "take-it-or-leave-it package" which they have offered us, over the 5-year term, would cost 65 cents an hour.

This industry figure, as our study proves, is propaganda rather than fact. Giving the companies the benefit of any doubt, the ultimate value of the industry's offer, when they all finally go into effect in 1961, would be 45.3 cents per hour. Moreover, the average benefit over the 5-year term amounts only to 28.5 cents per hour since many of the offered benefits would not become effective for several years. This is much less than we have received on the average during the past 10 years under 1- and 2-year contracts.

The industry has alleged that any substantial meeting of the union's demands would:

1. represent a cost too great for the industry to bear,
2. force a large hike in steel prices,
3. be highly inflationary in steel and in the economy.

These allegations are, as our studies have shown, wholly unsupported by the facts. They are a deliberate attempt to mislead the public. It is plainly not true that increases in employment costs in steel would set off another round of inflation. Inflation is an increase in prices—and it is the companies' price policies which have an inflationary effect, not its wage policies. As has been shown above, the steel industry—unlike almost every other American industry—has refused to absorb wage increases in the past and has, instead, passed on to the consumer three times the cost of each wage increase. The steel industry—unlike almost every other American industry—has increased its profit on each dollar of sales, instead of lowering it, as volume increased. The steel industry—unlike almost every other American industry—has refused to recognize that wages should increase without a price increase when workers produce more steel for each hour they work.

In short, the steel industry can afford to meet the union's proposals without increasing prices, and without setting off any inflationary effect whatsoever.

Not only can they afford it, but they have a responsibility to do so—in order that the

benefits of increased productivity and profits shall be shared by their employees and thus keep purchasing power in balance with output to insure a healthy economic situation.

For you will find in our study of the industry that the steel industry's share of the sales dollar in gross profit has risen from 10.9 cents in 1947 to a rate of 16.2 cents in 1956. But in shocking contrast to this, an analysis of the 11 companies on which proper information was available reveals that wages and salaries, as a share of the sales dollar, have been reduced from 40.5 cents in 1939 to 35.5 cents in 1955. In other words, as we state in our report, "the wage earner's portion of the sales dollar has grown smaller and smaller." The facts reveal, for example, that despite the hourly wage increases (plus pension and insurance improvements) in 1954 and 1955, the actual labor cost per ton of steel produced is less in 1956 than it was in 1954.

All this is, indeed, a far cry from the impression created by steel industry propaganda, with its complaints of rising "wage costs" and "too-small" profits. And, of course, the factual record of their pricing policies do not jibe with their piously expressed concern over "inflation." The facts, as our two studies prove, are that the industry's profit position has been steadily improving while its wage and salary costs have been substantially reduced.

Obviously, if such a trend as this were prevalent throughout all industry, there would spread such a gap between the output of mass production and the buying power of the consumers as to create a serious danger to the economy. There must be a balanced sharing of the benefits derived from increased productivity to keep the economy going forward.

The steel industry leaders should face the plain economic facts which are presented in our two studies and which I have outlined to you here.

Adm. Ben Moreell, of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., speaking in behalf of the steel industry over a nationwide television network on June 28, said that agreement could be reached between men of good will. We in the Steelworkers concurred in that, and we still concur. Added to good will must, of course, be reason. And reason must operate within the framework of the economic facts.

The union has been willing throughout, and is willing now, to negotiate a fair and honorable settlement based on our proposals, which our studies prove are reasonable, practical and entirely justifiable. It is the plain duty of the industry, now that it has succeeded in forcing a steel shutdown, to begin—for the first time—the process of give-and-take negotiation which alone can end the present crisis.

Stassen-for-Herter Popper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer herewith two editorials from the Washington Daily News of today which are pertinent to an announcement by Harold Stassen of yesterday:

STASSEN, THE DISARMER

In the Eisenhower administration, Harold Stassen's specialty is world disarmament.

And while he so far has not persuaded the Russians or anyone to disarm, it was a little startling, in view of his position, to hear him say he will try to disarm Vice President NIXON at the Republican convention 4 weeks hence.

Mr. Stassen has come out for Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts for the GOP vice presidential nomination. And right when practically everybody finally had accepted the Eisenhower-Nixon ticket as a set matter, but definitely.

For a White House intimate to make this sudden lunge at what has seemed nigh inevitable, only consternation could follow. And it did, but quick! From Capitol Hill to Panama City. Ike lost no time in letting it be known that Mr. Stassen was speaking for himself, "not as a member of the official family."

Some bitter anti-Nixonites in the opposition party may try to make much of it. At least they will enjoy Mr. Stassen's attempt to riffle the deck.

All in all, however, he has stirred up a hornet's nest among the Republicans, and got himself in bad with a great many leaders of his party, if not the President.

But knowing our man Harold, we can believe him when he says it is just his own idea.

And we can believe what he says about Governor Herter, who has a wide reputation as an able and well-grounded citizen.

Our question, though, is whether, if Mr. Herter had any remote chance of snatching Mr. Nixon's nomination, sponsorship by Mr. Stassen isn't enough to undo it.

STASSEN-FOR-HERTER POPPER

(By Peter Edson)

Just when everyone was predicting a dull, rubberstamp Republican peace and love feast convention at San Francisco, up pops the unpredictable ex-Gov. Harold E. Stassen of Minnesota to head a new "Stop DICK NIXON" drive.

Mr. Stassen's proposal to nominate Republican Gov. Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts, for Vice President made one of the quietest paper bag explosions heard in a long time.

On July 5, an organization calling itself, "Young Americans for Eisenhower First, Stassen Second," was unveiled here in Washington. Fewer people could not possibly have cared less. It was an even more futile demonstration than the "KNOWLAND for President * * * If" movement launched earlier by followers of Gerald L. K. Smith in California.

The resounding apathy with which this "Stassen, Second" outfit was greeted may have been one of the reasons why Governor Stassen switched his support to Gov. Herter for Vice President.

This wasn't the reason he gave. What he said was that he was supporting Governor Herter "out of loyalty to President Eisenhower and the principles and objectives which he represents."

In one respect this does make political sense, according to observers here in Washington. They point out that if Mr. Eisenhower should have to resign the Presidency for reasons of health—after being reelected—and if Mr. NIXON should then become President, there might be some resentment.

With Governor Herter succeeding to the Presidency, this resentment might be reduced.

According to Governor Stassen's figures as of today, an Eisenhower-Herter ticket would win by 62-percent majority. An Eisenhower-Nixon ticket might win by only 56 percent. The 6-percent differential is the measure of Governor Herter's greater popularity .

This figure itself is open to some doubt, however. For Mr. NIXON as Vice President, is probably better known nationally than Governor Herter, whose fame is limited to New England.

But all this puts Governor Herter himself on something of a spot. Here in Washington not long ago, Governor Herter was asked if he thought Mr. NIXON was the best Vice Presidential candidate? Mr. Herter ducked.

"May I be pardoned," he said, "from commenting on any of my friends who are in the administration today."

Asked if there was a Knight-Herter Axis (with Gov. Goodwin J. Knight of California) to stop NIXON, Governor Herter replied: "None that I know of."

Asked point blank if he would be interested in second place on the ticket with Mr. Eisenhower, Governor Herter said, "DICK NIXON is a friend of mine. The President is entitled to the man he chooses for his running mate."

Mercy Flight Saves Life of Congo Boy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, too often we think of the air transport industry as a cold-blooded vehicle whereby a passenger travels from point A to point B. Seldom do we realize the many responsibilities that our international air carriers have thrust upon them. Sometimes we are too prone to criticize because this carrier or that carrier is compelled to be on a subsidy basis because of the necessity of their flying certain routes in the national interest.

Last week a 2-year-old boy, in far off Belgian Congo, was stricken with hemophelia, an infection which prevents blood from clotting.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that the combination of Dr. Irving F. Klein, medical superintendent of Seaview Hospital in Staten Island, the New York Daily News and Pan American World Airways has saved the life of this little boy.

It is gratifying that the facilities of our principal international world airways system is available for humanitarian purposes as well as for its principal intention—that of transporting persons and cargo to the far ends of the earth. The Daily News, Pan American Airways, and American and Belgian Congo amateur radio operators are to be congratulated for their selfless devotion to the preservation of human life.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. P. Gorecki, of Leopoldville, in the Belgian Congo, who attended this little boy has prepared a statement concerning this unusual humanitarian achievement. I join him in congratulating Dr. Klein, the New York Daily News, and Pan American World Airways and, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include Dr. Gorecki's statement and various articles from the New York Daily News in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The matters follow:

STATEMENT BY DR. P. GORECKI, JULY 23, 1956

I wish to convey my very greatest thanks to all who have helped in saving the life of our little sick boy in the capital of the Belgian Congo. To the American and the

Belgian Congo wireless amateurs, without their expert and tireless efforts the necessary connections could not have been made in time. To all on the staff of the Daily News, their decisive intervention backed by the world famous organization of their newspaper got the life saving drug in time on board of the PAA Clipper. To the PAA for their fast and hearty cooperation and last but not least to the genial, great American spirit.

[From the New York Daily News of July 16, 1956]

NEWS HELPS FLY AID TO CONGO BOY

(By Howard Wantuch and Frank Schild)

Men and organizations on two continents joined forces yesterday in an effort to save the life of a critically ill 2-year-old boy in far off Leopoldville, Belgian Congo.

The youngster, Poll Jean Luc, suffers from hemophilia, an affliction which prevents blood from clotting. Bleeding from the nose, he has been kept alive by continuous blood transfusions. Supplies are running low. Only through a drug which causes clotting and is available in the United States, but not in Africa or Europe, can he be saved.

Yesterday, the News, Pan American World Airways, and several individuals teamed up to get him the drug.

GETS MESSAGE FROM AFRICA

If the youngster, son of a factory worker, survives, he will owe a debt to two amateur radio operators who carried word of his plight 5,400 miles across the sea.

At 3 p. m., Saturday, Harry Fendt, 50, of 169 Wiman Avenue, Great Kills, Staten Island, a marine engineer and radio ham, whose call letters are W2PFL, intercepted an emergency message from a fellow ham—OQ5B1—of Leopoldville.

OQ5B1 told about the hemophiliac, said that Leopoldville's public health officer, Dr. Przemyslaw Gorecky, urgently wanted a drug called parenogen for his patient, but could not obtain it through African or European sources. Would someone in the United States help, OQ5B1 asked.

Fendt notified Robert Link, supervisor of amateur radio communications for the local civilian defense office.

PHONES DOCTOR AND THE NEWS

Link phoned Dr. Irving F. Klein, medical superintendent of Seaview Hospital, West New Brighton, S. I., for help to get the drug, and the News to get the parenogen to the Congo in the event it could be obtained. Klein and the News pledged cooperation.

The physician established that the drug was produced by the Cutter Laboratories in Teterboro, N. J. But the plant was closed for the week end. Klein got in touch with a company official who said that the Fulton Surgical Co., 169–01 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica, Queens, was a distributor.

The News picked up the ball. Pan American Airways said that its first plane for Leopoldville would leave International Airport at 1:20 p. m. yesterday. PAA would be glad to fly the drug over the 6,966 flying miles to the Belgian Congo, a spokesman said.

At 10 a. m. yesterday, Leon Brofsky, 52, left his home at 87–09 Homelawn Street, Jamaica, to open his store, Fulton Surgical, and provide the News with 10 one-gram doses of parenogen requested by Dr. Gorecky.

The News then delivered the precious drug to Edith Blatz, 21, of 1935 Madison Street, Brooklyn, stewardess of the plane which would carry it overseas. Capt Arnold T. Anderson, 40, of 102 Shinnecock Avenue, Massapequa, Long Island, a veteran of 12,000 flying hours, was at the controls.

Anderson said that Capt. Bernard N. Coley, of 44 Tangle Lane, Wantagh, Long Island, would take over the DC–6B in Lisbon today. The plane is scheduled to reach Leopoldville at 1:30 a. m. tomorrow.

[From the New York Daily News of July 17, 1956]

CLIPPER RACING DRUG TO CONGO

A huge DC–6B plunged through torrential tropical rains yesterday as it sped down the African Gold Coast with a precious supply of a blood-clotting drug desperately needed to save the life of a 2-year-old hemophilia victim in Leopoldville, in the Belgian Congo.

The mercy flight was initiated through the combined efforts of two ham radio operators, Pan American World Airways, and the News.

The *Clipper Panama* was running ahead of schedule. The last lap was in sight as it took off in midafternoon from Monrovia, Liberia for Accra, in the Gold Coast, where it was expected at about the time this edition went to press. This left only a final lap of 1,270 miles of the 6,966 from New York to Leopoldville. The plane left New York International Airport at 1:20 p. m. Sunday and is due in Leopoldville at 1:30 a. m. today.

BLEEDING TO DEATH

The flight was initiated Saturday afternoon when Harry Fendt, 50, of 169 Wiman Avenue, Great Kills, Staten Island, a marine engineer and radio ham, intercepted a call from a fellow ham—OQ5B1—of Leopoldville.

OQ5B1 was broadcasting an appeal for a supply of parenogen on behalf of Poll Jean Luc, son of a factory worker, who was bleeding to death. A victim of the rare, hereditary blood disease, hemophilia, little Jean had started to bleed from the nose and Dr. Przemyslaw Goreckly found it impossible to stanch the flow.

An urgent call to European and African sources failed to turn up any supply, so the African operator was appealing to America.

In Staten Island Fendt enlisted the help of the News. It was found, through the efforts of Dr. Irving F. Klein, superintendent of Seaview Hospital, West New Brighton, Staten Island, that the drug, manufactured by the Cutter Laboratories, was obtainable at the Fulton Surgical Co., 160–01 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica, Queens.

Hemophilia is a disease characterized by inordinate bleeding, often from small injuries. The patient's blood will not coagulate. Until recent research produced such coagulants as parenogen, innumerable blood transfusions were the only means of arresting the disease. There is no known cure.

The disease has never been found in women but is transmitted from mother to son.

Parenogea is itself a trade name of a drug known in medical circles as Fibrinogen, obtained from blood plasma.

[From the New York Daily News of July 18, 1956]

BLEEDING STOPS—MERCY DRUG SAVES CONGO CHILD

(By Eugene Spagnoli and Theo Wilson)

"The bleeding has stopped * * * the baby is in good condition * * * everybody here is very, very grateful to all of you."

The heavily accented voice, coming from Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, to a ham radio station on Staten Island yesterday, was bringing good news. It meant that a 6,966-mile mercy flight had been accomplished successfully, that a little boy's life had been saved.

SLOWLY BLEEDING TO DEATH

For weeks Jean Luc-Poll, a 2-year-old hemophiliac, has been bleeding at the Clinque Reine Elizabeth in Leopoldville.

Yesterday, thanks to the cooperation of ham radio operators here and in Leopoldville, Pan-American World Airways, the News and a Staten Island hospital superintendent, Jean was given two injections of a blood-clotting drug and almost immediately was reported "much better."

The youngster's doctor, Przemyslaw Gorecky, a Polish-born, now stateless, physician who was a prisoner of war in Russia and Germany, issued a frantic appeal for the drug—after his supply ran out and no more could be obtained in Europe and Africa.

Two hams in Leopoldville, Julian Boca and Gerard Capelle, sent out the appeal and on Saturday it was picked up on Staten Island by Harry Fendt, of 169 Wiman Avenue, Staten Island.

Dr. Irving F. Klein, superintendent of Seaview Hospital, West New Brighton, Staten Island, located the drug, the News got a supply and delivered it to PAA at International Airport on Sunday, and at 1:30 a. m. yesterday the precious medicine was in Leopoldville.

Dr. Gorecky told the News yesterday that his little patient "is feeling much better now. I think he will be all right in a few days."

PARENTS SEND GRATITUDE

Then, expressing his own gratitude to "all of you in America who helped us", he explained that the boy's parents, fatigued from a constant bedside vigil, also had sent a message: "They are most grateful to you for showing such a warm heart."

About 3 p. m. yesterday, in response to a cable from the News, Julian Boca, one of the two Leopoldville radio hams who sent the appeal, spoke to Fendt and told him the bleeding had stopped.

"The people in Leopoldville," he said, "have been very much concerned about the boy and the papers here have been carrying stories about him. Although the airplane with the drug arrived very early in the morning, there were many of us at the airport to see it arrive.

"The doctor told me there now is enough on hand to take care of the boy. So far he has given him only two injections and the bleeding has stopped."

[From the New York Daily News of July 20, 1956]

A GIFT OF LIFE FLOWN TO BOY IN CONGO

Jean Luc-Poll, 2-year-old hemophiliac, is given blood-clotting agent by Dr. Przemyslaw Gorecky as he lies on mother's lap in hospital in Leopoldville, Belgian Congo. Drug was flown from New York following urgent appeal sent by two Leopoldville ham operators and picked up here by another ham. The call for help was relayed to the News, which, with the cooperation of Dr. Irving F. Klein, of a Staten Island hospital, was able to dispatch the vital shots to Africa via Pan American World Airways. In a phone call to this paper, Dr. Gorecky said, "I want to thank you for saving the life of the boy." Meanwhile, Jean was having his first solid food in 12 days.

CONGO TOT EATS AGAIN AFTER DRUG IS FLOWN IN

For the first time in 12 days, Jean Luc-Poll, a 2-year-old hemophiliac, was able to eat solid food yesterday in the Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, hospital, where he has received three injections of a blood-clotting drug flown 6,966 miles from New York in answer to an emergency appeal sent out by two Leopoldville ham radio operators and picked up by another ham on Staten Island.

In the telephone conversation yesterday afternoon with the News—which cooperated with Pan-American World Airways and Dr. Irving F. Klein, superintendent of a Staten Island hospital, in getting the drug to Africa—the child's doctor reported that Jean is definitely out of danger.

"The bleeding has ceased completely and the child has eaten this morning for the first time in 12 days," said Dr. Przemyslaw Gorecky.

"I want to thank you very much for saving the life of the boy," the doctor added. He had asked for the drug when he learned it could not be obtained in Africa and Europe. The Leopoldville hams, Julian Boca and Gerald Capelle, sent the message for

hours until it was picked up Saturday by Harry Fendt, a veteran ham operator, of 169 Wilman Avenue, Staten Island. The drug was dispatched Sunday.

MERCY FLIGHT SAVES BOY

After 12 days liquid diet, Jean Luc-Poll, of Leopoldville, Belgian Congo, was eating solids in his hospital bed yesterday. The 2-year-old hemophiliac was feeling better after getting three shots of blood-clotting drug rushed from here by air following urgent appeal sent by two Leopoldville ham operators and received by another one here. The News and Pan American World Airways helped speed aid to the child, along with Dr. Irving F. Klein, of a Staten Island hospital.

Iowa: The 1956 Garden of Eden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article by one of the great editorial writers of the Middle West, Don Berry, publisher and editor of the Indianola Record-Herald, Indianola, Iowa.

The article follows:

IOWA: THE 1956 GARDEN OF EDEN

(By Don Berry)

The thing that makes it hard for an editorial writer in rural Iowa to keep his wires clear is that once in a while some darn farmer bobs up who is making a little money.

It is not known here whether the Drover's Journal sent a Chicago lawyer to cross-examine Gilbert Piffer or not; but, at any rate, the Journal ran a 2-column story about Gilbert in which he didn't tell how much he was making, but did admit he was not going broke fast. We hope some of these farmers who want to join the CIO won't throw a brick through Gilbert's window some night to warn him to slow down.

NOT SO EASY TO MAKE MONEY

Gilbert doesn't claim that it is easy to make money farming in these days, but he does explain that his diversified operations enable him to make a little to the good, maintain the fertility of his farm, and be ready to go into the good money when the chance comes again.

Cattle have not always made money, although mostly they have paid well for their board; and when the cattle were going slow the sheep fattening project has paid pretty well. Moreover, eggs have not done so badly, all of them going to a weekly delivery market in Des Moines. And he gets a fair price for his purebred Shorthorn bulls.

Gilbert's father, George Piffer, now retired, is very well satisfied with the way his boy is doing and modestly says he thinks there is still an opportunity for a boy in farming in Iowa. George had just told us how he, himself, had practically gone broke after World War I, and had made it back—farming in Warren County.

And while we were talking to George, who should walk up but Frank Jenner (who isn't busted nowadays) and, without knowing of what we had been talking, began to recall some days back when this scribe was working for Harry Hooper and Frank was driving a wheel scraper building the racetrack at the fairgrounds for Hooper, after Frank had gone so broke in South Dakota that he had come back to Iowa with nothing left but a team and hardly the money to buy feed for it. Frank recovered his losses farming in Warren County.

A GOOD PLACE TO LIVE

When the man from the United States Department of Agriculture went over Warren County to decide whether it should be rated as a disaster area, he was embarrassed to find oats making 30 to 40 bushels to the acre where he was supposed to find disaster conditions.

It is very true that the pastures were short and the hay crop had not been good. It would be foolish to play down the seriousness of the grasshopper infestation and the lack of moisture in the subsoil; but let us not throw up the game because we lost the ball on a fumble. Let us not sell Warren County short. It is a mighty good place to be born, to live, and to spend one's life.

Uncle Henry Wallace (Henry the Great) used to say that, after God had made all the rest of the world, had had all the experience of building Asia, Africa, Europe, South America, the islands of the sea and the rest of North America, as a crowning act he made Iowa. And, geologically, that is almost literally true.

Economic conditions may go up and go down. They always have. But there has never been a time when an Iowa quarter section would not make a living for a family. On 2 percent of the Nation's area, Iowa farmers raise 10 percent of the Nation's food. Of all the grade A land in the United States, 50 percent is within 250 miles of Iowa's capital city. The best part of every State that joins Iowa is the part that lies up against Iowa.

"From yonder Mississippi's stream to where Missouri's water's gleam,
Oh, fair thou art as poet's dream, Iowa, our Iowa."

Sing it; sing it again; and sing it again!!

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAM COON
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation to increase railroad retirement benefits. Many fine railroad workers live in the Second Congressional District of Oregon which I represent. They mostly work for the Union Pacific and the Southern Pacific. They keep the trains running which link the west coast with the east coast, and which connect the cities in the Northwest with those of the Southwest. These folks do important work. Many of them are subject to more than the usual amount of hazard on their jobs.

Railroad workers help pay for their retirement benefits, through a 6-percent deduction from the pay they receive before taxes. Employees under Social Security have but 2 percent deducted from their pay. Considering the differences in payroll deductions, I feel that railroad-retirement benefits compare unfavorably with social-security benefits. I have been concerned about this situation.

I am glad to have the opportunity to vote for legislation which will result in more generous retirement benefits for railroad workers. The 10-percent increase in benefits which more than 400,000 persons will receive, should prove most helpful.

The bill as passed does not grant the 15-percent increase which was proposed, but neither does it include the 1-percent increase in the payroll deduction which was proposed at the same time. I am sorry that the bill did not include provisions to lower the voluntary retirement age. I favor voluntary retirement at age 60 after 30 years of service, and after 35 years of respective of age.

Why Congressional Control Is Needed in Order To Prevent Defense Department Waste

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7992) to enact certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, section 27 of H. R. 7992 repeals section 638 of the act of July 13, 1955. Section 638 holds up for 90 days any proposed discontinuance by the Defense Department of a commercial-type enterprise, and allows the Appropriations Committee of either the House or Senate to veto the transfer by resolution. This House on May 10, 1956, voted out of the Defense Department appropriation bill a similar provision. In order to permit the Defense Department to conduct its operations in such a way that there will be the maximum saving of taxpayers' dollars consistent with the national security, there is no need to hold up a Defense Department decision for as long as 90 days, or to submit it to the veto of a committee, unchecked by the vote of the entire House or Senate.

If the Defense Department were following the proper criterion on whether or not to continue a business-type activity—which method of operation will contribute most to saving taxpayers' dollars consistent with the national defense?—there would be no justification for even the minimum clogs which section 27 imposes upon the Defense Department's freedom of action. These clogs are merely a 60-day wait, and the opportunity of the full House or Senate to veto. Unfortunately, there has come to my attention during the debate on section 27 conclusive evidence that the Defense Department has not espoused this vital criterion of dollar-saving. On February 8, 1955, the Defense Department issued Directive 4100.15, on the

subject of Commercial and Industrial-Type Facilities. In essence, it directs that the Defense Department give up any business-type facility except where certain criteria exist. Among these criteria are the lack of any private facilities sufficient to meet the need, the need for training personnel in a government facility, and the danger of releasing secret data if a private facility is used. Unhappily, the most important criterion of all—which method of operation, on balance, saves the most taxpayers' dollars?—is entirely omitted from the directive.

That this vital element of cost is being neglected by the Department of Defense is made clear in a newsletter by the National Association of Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington 6, D. C., for February 1955, wherein it is said:

"The Department of Defense has just issued a new directive to all branches of the armed services, eliminating cost as a factor in perpetuating competitive business operations or starting new ones."

This philosophy of the Department of Defense disregards the taxpayers' interest in having the Department utilize that method of operation, public or private, which is most efficient, consistent with the national security. As long as the Department adheres to the philosophy that cost is of no importance, there can be no assurance that the Department will not give up a highly efficient governmental operation in favor of a private operation which is much costlier to the taxpayers. The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee quite properly exercises surveillance over disposition by the Department of the Interior of oil and gas leases in the national wildlife refuges. This extraordinary congressional jurisdiction was necessitated by the Department of the Interior improvident disposition of these leases. Similarly, as long as the Department of Defense disregards the cost factor in its disposition policy for commercial-type enterprises, the extraordinary congressional jurisdiction envisaged by section 27 is needed.

Harold Stassen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, well, it looks like NIXON for Vice President. The outburst of Stassen against NIXON came at the right time and everything worked out well, except probably Herter, of Massachusetts, was hurt by the Stassen blast. Mr. Herter is in no worse position than was Queen Elizabeth, when she offered up a prayer, "God save me from my friends." The final result will be that NIXON has just about cinched the spot.

You would think that Stassen was the great Grecian oracle of American politics. But when we examine Stassen's background and take into consideration the fact that he speaks from a very subordinate position in the Republican Party, his statement will not do any convincing except to convince the people that Stassen is all washed up politically. I doubt very much whether Stassen was the real author of the move. It might be that the enemies of NIXON were looking around to find someone weak enough politically—where he could not be hurt—to send up this trial balloon and see what the reaction was. The reaction was instantaneous and indicated clearly that Republicans, generally, resented this so-called unofficial intrusion.

If the administration knew of this blast and O. K.'d it, it can now deny that this was their trial balloon and Mr. Stassen may be dismissed for speaking out of turn. If he is retained, it will be presumptive proof that the administration was not altogether innocent.

There are many figures in the administration who are not sold on NIXON. When the parity for farm prices was being scuttled by Benson, NIXON took a stand for the farmers and this nettled quite a number of the Cabinet. You will remember that the Cabinet was called together and O. K.'d the Benson plan right in the face of the recommendations being made by NIXON. I would not be a bit surprised but what this Stassen outburst was premeditated on the part of those in the Cabinet who feel they cannot rely on or handle NIXON.

I do not think the President knew anything about it for he is not very close to the administration. The President is in the same position President Lincoln was in when a man who had labored night and day in Ohio for the election of Mr. Lincoln asked for a job. This man came to Washington and had an interview with Mr. Lincoln, and in the course of the conversation said: "Mr. Lincoln, don't you think I am entitled to this appointment because of the tremendous effort I made in your behalf?" Mr. Lincoln replied: "Yes, of course you are, but the trouble is I have very little influence with my administration."

I will be greatly surprised if the administration does not make greater blunders before and after the Republican convention. Republican Members of Congress are out on a limb now in the Wheat Belt, through the activities of Secretary Benson, and this Stassen statement has added further resentment in many sections of the country. I do not know what will come next, but the administration is abundantly able to make more contributions to the Democratic cause.

Nonsense From Kansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star newspaper of Washington, D. C., on Monday, July 23, 1956, the following editorial was published. The writer of this editorial displays commonsense in pointing out the nonsense from Kansas.

NONSENSE FROM KANSAS

New York's Democratic Governor Harriman is doing what comes naturally, one supposes, in conjuring up depressing visions of life in the United States under a Republican administration. But his imagination is leading him pretty far from any discernible evidence when he predicts, as he did in Kansas the other day, that after another 4 years of an Eisenhower administration, "we won't be able to recognize the American free enterprise system as we have known it and as we believe in it." At this point, of course, the American free enterprise system is rolling along at a record high level of good health with plenty of signs that administration policies of the past 3 years have helped greatly in contributing to this condition.

In foreseeing an "economic blight," Mr. Harriman blamed most of it on a Republican do-nothing policy toward the farm depression. He did not mention, however that the farm depression had started before the latest Democratic administration left office, that his own party's solution was a return to the very conditions responsible for the economically depressing farm surpluses and that current measures for aiding the agricultural economy had been enacted belatedly because of initial Democratic resistance.

Still, it is quite likely that the farmers themselves will not be wholly taken in by a city slicker version of what has been done to and for them, or what is going on in the country.

Forty Thousand Refugees Barred From United States by Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of this body an article from the July 22 Sunday Star on the refugee relief situation. This act is due to expire on the last day of this year unless my bill or others like it are acted upon to extend the law beyond that date. My bill also calls for the pooling of unused quotas in the case of Germany and Austria to provide them for nationals of Italy and Greece whose quotas are very badly oversubscribed.

It is discouraging and frustrating to note that this Congress has done nothing to relieve these conditions or correct the inequities and shortcomings of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, Mr. Pierce J. Gerety, who has given the program a tremendous boost, has repeatedly requested Congress to provide for the redistribution of unused quotas before the expiration date. It is obviously too late at this time to expect Congress to give serious thought to the revision of our general immigration program. But it is not too late for the Senate to give consideration to the wishes of Senator WATKINS to amend the sheepherders bill to provide for the pooling of

these unused numbers. Such an amendment would carry out the basic intent of the refugee program and enable many deserving persons to immigrate to the United States where they are now unable to do so. With so many worthy refugees asking to come to our country and with numbers available to them through redistribution, it is incumbent upon Congress to act on this matter before adjournment.

The article follows:

FORTY THOUSAND REFUGEES BARRED FROM UNITED STATES BY QUOTAS

(By Mary McGrory)

Only some exceptionally lively congressional action in the next few days can open the door to about 40,000 refugees who are currently barred from coming here because they fled to the wrong countries.

The Refugee Relief Act allows for the entrance of 214,000 refugees. But it will expire on December 31 without having reached that figure unless Congress moves before adjournment to transfer the unused quotas of some countries to countries whose quotas are oversubscribed.

Under the allocation provisions of the act, 90,000 visas are assigned to Germany and Austria. But because many escapees and expellees of Iron Curtain nations have come to those countries, found conditions good and settled down, almost half of the visas have not been spoken for.

Meanwhile, in other countries, whose quotas have been exhausted, thousands of applicants who have qualified under the rigid security restrictions of the act and who have found American sponsors to insure them homes and jobs when they arrive, cannot be given visas.

M'LEOD DISPUTE RECALLED

The Refugee Act, which was passed in 1953, was the subject of bitter dispute inside the State Department last year. Its administrator, Security Chief Scott McLeod, was accused by immigration expert, Edward Corsi, of administering its admittedly strict provisions with unwonted toughness. Mr. McLeod maintained that the difficulty in finding sponsors was the reason for the mere trickle of refugees.

In any case, a Connecticut lawyer, Pierce J. Gerety, took over the program when the dust had settled, and things began to move. Visas were issued at the rate of 2,500 a month. Just last week, 850 were given out.

Now, however, the program is grinding to a halt, because applications can no longer be taken from people, no matter how worthy they are, if they happen to be in countries whose quotas have been exhausted.

Repeatedly, Mr. Gerety has gone before congressional committees to urge the redistribution of quotas. He has pointed out that our propaganda agencies repeatedly urge people to flee from Iron Curtain countries, but that when they have taken the risk and broken through, we do not offer them asylum.

BARRIER OVERCOME

The sponsorship barrier has been overcome. Once Americans began to see refugees in their midst, they realized the value of the program and stepped forward as sponsors.

Mr. Gerety has set a notable example in this regard. He has personally sponsored some 10 Asian refugees whose plight was called to his attention in letters to the Department. In Hong Kong today, he says, numerous exceptionally qualified Chinese, many of them United States educated, are squandering their lives because the Far Eastern quota has been oversubscribed.

The President has called for revision of both the Refugee Relief Act and its parent bill, the McCarran-Walter Act. It is the position of the administration that our immigration policy constitutes a vital arm of our foreign policy, in that we cannot on the one hand tell people we are friends and on the other tell them they are not welcome here.

LITTLE INTEREST SHOWN

This session of Congress has shown little interest in immigration matters. Only one bill has come out of any congressional committee, and that is a measure to permit the immigration of 350 Basque sheepherders, who are much in demand in Western grazing States.

On this frail structure, Senator WATKINS, Republican of Utah, the doughty Mormon elder, who headed the McCarthy censure committee, is attempting to build a whole system of immigration reform. He has offered 4 amendments, 1 of which will redistribute the 40,000 unused visas. Another would change the base of the whole quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act from the 1925 census figures to those of 1950.

The Senate is habitually reluctant to legislate by amendment, even for immigration liberalization, which could be a campaign issue. So Senator WATKINS' chances seem dubious at best.

PRESSES FOR BILL

Nonetheless, he is pressing the majority leader, Senator JOHNSON of Texas, to schedule the sheepherder bill, reminding him that one of the points of the Democratic program with a heart was amendment of the immigration and refugee acts.

Senator WATKINS, who voted for the controversial McCarran-Walter Act, but who has altered his views somewhat since, solicited and received a letter from President Eisenhower in which Mr. Eisenhower again urged congressional action.

Senator JOHNSON has not indicated whether or not he will call up the bill in the last crowded hours of the session. Despite the lateness of the hour it is not inconceivable that the leadership might make some move that would at least brighten the chances of some 40,000 refugees for a new life here.

Mexican Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 in Mexico, from the luxuriant tropical coastline to the snow-capped mountain peaks, church bells will peal and firecrackers illuminate the skies. Shouts of "Viva Mexico! Viva la independencia!" will ring out in city and village as the Mexican people commemorate their independence day with a mixture of solemnity and joy.

In the 18th and early 19th century, Spain had tried to suppress in its Mexican colony the revolutionary principles of the rights of man. But all the force and terror mustered by the Spanish Crown could not hold back the ideas of liberty and equality. Brave men secretly continued to circulate books by the French philosophers and news of the experiment in self-government going on north of the border in the former British colonies. On September 16, 1810, Miguel Hidalgo, the parish priest in the small town of Dolores, launched a movement for independence that was to spread throughout this whole rich Spanish possession. Padre Hidalgo, a white-haired, green-eyed, scholarly priest, called to the people to revolt against their oppressors and himself led them on their march to the capital.

Several months later, Hidalgo was captured and executed by a firing squad. But the determination to resist tyranny which he had kindled in the hearts of his fellow Mexicans burned on brightly after his death. And although 11 years passed before Mexico finally gained its independence, it is Hidalgo who bears the title of "father of independence" and September 16 the day which all Mexico sanctifies.

Today Mexico stands among the forefront of the democracies. It is one of our stanchest allies in the defense of freedom and human dignity. Each year we watch with pleasure as our sister republic grows economically more prosperous and politically more stable, and increasingly able to defend the human rights and freedoms we both cherish. It is only fitting that we in the United States join with our neighbors in Mexico in paying tribute to the brave leaders of Mexican independence. In so doing, may we rededicate our own efforts to the service of the great principles for which our heroes, north and south of the Rio Grande, gave battle.

Press Relations at the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 18 a Member of the other body raised several interesting points regarding the dissemination of news about the President's health. I believe the following article by Doris Fleeson which appeared in the July 16, 1956, issue of the Washington Evening Star is also pertinent to the question.

HAGERTY AND THE WHITE HOUSE NEWS—WRITER FINDS REPORTERS HAVE LITTLE DIRECT CONTACT WITH THE ACTUAL SOURCES

(By Doris Fleeson)

GETTYSBURG, PA., July 15.—An average day in the well-equipped White House press headquarters here leaves the visitor with several strong impressions.

Rarely in the history of United States political conflict has so much been written and said by so many reporters with so little direct, give and take, contact with the actual sources of the news.

White House news is now concentrated in the exceedingly capable hands of Press Secretary Hagerty to an unprecedented degree. He is daily speaking by and large for the sources of the news rather than arranging the means by which reporters can know and reach those sources. Their White House social contacts are limited to Hagerty, too.

An occasional visitor speaks for himself. Republican National Chairman Hall held a press conference; it turned out to be merely

confirmatory of a Hagerty smile. The Republican legislative leaders spoke up though they were noticeably franker when back in their Capitol haunts.

Vice President NIXON talked to reporters at the airport after seeing the President. But the President did not show himself and NIXON was so cagy, Hagerty was later pressed to say whether it was still an Ike-DICK ticket. Hagerty said yes; again making the hard news.

The President's isolation from the press and, so far as they can learn, from anyone but top staff or personal friends and doctors is all but complete. Reporters have not talked to him; they have glimpsed him twice, once when he left the hospital and once when he accompanied the legislative leaders to his Gettysburg college office to talk privately with them and pose for pictures.

So far as reporters have been able to learn, that hour is the only time the President has used that office.

Everything comes from Hagerty. When the end of the President's fifth week of convalescence disclosed that his surgeon, Maj. Gen. Leonard Heaton was still with the President on his farm, that the President was still not gaining weight despite a high calorie diet and that one of the assistant surgeons, Dr. Isidor Ravdin, was coming for the weekend, all the questions had to go to the press secretary.

Hagerty made it plain that the iron curtain between reporters and the President's ileitis doctors was still down, since that first-day press conference, and would remain down.

Dr. Heaton's visit, he said, was social; he was taking some leave from his post as commanding officer at Walter Reed Hospital. Dr. Ravdin's visit was social, too. Hagerty conceded Dr. Heaton examined the President with the Eisenhower personal physician, Dr. Howard Snyder, and that Dr. Ravdin would, too.

Hagerty said the doctors were not concerned by the President's failure to gain weight. Asked if that failure was due to a digestive inadequacy he said he did not know.

Hagerty's announcement that the President would still be a convalescent when he returns to the White House indicated that there would be no opportunity for the press to see him there. Reporters will, of course, accompany him—but on a different plane—when he goes to Panama next Friday.

The Second Death of Stalin and the Future of Albania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include by request the following article appearing in the Albanian-American of Boston, entitled "The Second Death of Stalin and the Future of Albania":

THE SECOND DEATH OF STALIN AND THE FUTURE OF ALBANIA

(By Prof. Glenn A. McLain)

II

One of the most important aspects of the present Kremlin policy of anti-Stalinism is the rise in prestige of Tito of Yugoslavia. None of the moves by the Post-Stalin collective leadership in international affairs has aroused the western world any more than the Soviet visit to Belgrade in 1955. The results of this Khrushchev "hat in hand" delegation highlight Tito's new position among the satellite states and pose serious questions for the future of Albania. In order to analyze this stiuation it is necessary to review briefly the history of Yugoslavia since 1945 and its present position among the world powers.

After Tito's installation as dictator in October 1944 his behavior toward Moscow was that of an obedient satellite. Gradually, Tito's own propaganda convinced him that he was the future leader of the Balkans. In various visits to sattellite capitals after 1945 he painted himself as the fountainhead of Communist wisdom in the Balkans and as the military heir to the Byzantine emperors of the late Roman Empire. Although the closest friends and advisors of Tito could see the Russian storm clouds over the horizon it took great skill and careful preparation to prepare the Yugoslavian people for the break with Stalin which took place in June 1948, when the Cominform expelled the "heretic." Yugoslavian communism quickly became "nationalistic" and "independent" of Stalin's influence. Firm condemnation of Tito's new position by Stalin; and economic pressures set in motion by the statellites only intensified Yugoslavian nationalism. These moves threw Tito into contact with the west where he has remained like a tightrope walker at the circus working without a net. When the Russian leaders came to Tito last year the mission resembled the mountain coming to Mohammed. Tito's power and prestige have even risen in Albania where he has been denounced consistently by Hoxha's government since 1948.

During the past year Tito has really spread his diplomatic wings. The normalization of relations with the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland, Rumania, and Czechoslovakia have been underlined by his official state visits to India, Britain, and France. Many prominent world figures including Secretary of State Dulles have visited him in Yugoslavia. In the eyes of Yugoslavians and the satellite leaders, Tito's stand on Stalinism has been vindicated. In the Western World and among the uncommitted nations in the cold war he has become a figure of stature. Because of these facts a new look at Titoism is in order and Albania provides a good example for evaluation of this so-called alternative to Kremlin-style communism.

Stalin never seemed to be greatly concerned about the importance of Albania as long as Yugoslavia obeyed his commands. Under the direction of Tito, the Albanian Communist Party was reformed and reactivated. Hoxha and his followers placed great stress upon their debt to Tito both for the military and political success of the Albanian State. The Yugoslavians used the Soviet method of joint stock companies to completely dominate the Albanian economy until 1948. Yugoslavian trade treaties, political pacts, and cultural exchanges filled out the picture of colonial domination of Albania by Tito. Events since 1955 have shown clearly that Tito still views the possibility of Albanian-Yugoslavian friendship with great hope.

The Albanian legation in Belgrade has been reestablished and the beginnings of trade relations once again negotiated. The Albanian frontier with Yugoslavia has been reopened and the Belgrade-Tirana radios have ceased their name calling. Frontier incidents have brought offers of compensation instead of the usual hate propaganda. The new smiling look of Yugoslavia is now being hailed on both sides as a progressive attitude.

The growth of Tito's strength among the satellites offers little hope for the improvement of Albania's relations with the West. As Tito prepares to visit Moscow he can be expected to ask the Kremlin the famous 5-point doctrine of noninterference in the affairs of friendly nations. His increasingly amiable relations with Albania in recent months could well mean the beginning of his efforts to bring independence to the entire satellite bloc. The second death of Stalin is but another series of Russian moves dictated by the new strength of the Kremlin. As the Soviets have been able to develop new atomic weapons, cut their military forces because of the change in weapons and to use the new economic psychology of foreign aid to attempt to break up the western alliance, it is probable that Khrushchev and company will agree to the continued growth of Tito's power. Albania seems to be the first country on the list for Tito to test his new-found strength. Meanwhile, the rewards of Titoism have been great. Tito has recently received over $300 million in easy credit from the Soviet bloc under Russian direction. He continues to receive large sums from the United States. Titoism pays off and more satellites can be expected to follow the lead of Tito. The West must judge with care these devolpments as nationalistic communism has not been proven to be any more acceptable than the Kremlin brand. The Albanian pattern of past Yugoslavian domination should therefore present a warning to American policymakers. Tito would like to try it again on his march to leadership in the Balkans.

The Fury of Frustration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by an outstanding Wisconsin columnist, Mr. John Wyngaard. His article appeared in the Janesville (Wis.) Gazette on July 16:

FURY OF FRUSTRATION IS UNLEASHED BY SENATOR WILEY AGAINST HIS OWN PARTY

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—Soundings around the State have made it clear that Representative GLENN R. DAVIS starts as the underdog in his campaign to wrest the Republican nomination for United States Senator from aging Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

But the beginnings of the campaign also make it clear that, whatever its outcome, it will be one of the hardest fought and perhaps the bitterest of its kind in recent times.

The senior Senator himself set the tone by his blasts at DAVIS and DAVIS' supporters after the Republican State convention chose the Congressman as its endorsed candidate. WILEY's angry denunciations of what he said was the manipulation of that convention and his bitter disparagement of the organization as a whole would have come with better grace, the voter might suppose, had he not been before that convention in the role of petitioner. He wanted that endorsement. He asked for it. He did everything possible to get it. It was only when he was denied what he wanted that the process became wrong, a threat to the people's rights, and an evil scheming of the bosses.

FRIEND TO FOE

DAVIS and WILEY have served as intimate associates in the Congress for the last decade.

The Wisconsin congressional delegation is a small one. Its members perforce know each other well. But there had not been a single hint, to the public at least, that WILEY did not hold DAVIS in at least normal regard. It was only after DAVIS turned up to threaten WILEY'S seat as Senator as the favorite of the Republican Party organization, that WILEY turned on him as an unworthy Representative.

Given WILEY'S responses since his repudiation from the convention, DAVIS' rejoinders in equally bitter vein probably had to be expected. The Congressman has shown, moreover, in the speeches during his first week on the campaign trail, that he is prepared to reply in kind, and to give more than he gets in his competition with the senior Senator.

On the issues, the Senator is likely to have some difficulty in his debate with the Congressman. DAVIS can show those who measure a candidate's eligibility by his attitude toward the Eisenhower administration's program that his credentials are at least as presentable as those of the Senator. He has shown also that he has some ammunition in WILEY'S record of omissions, as in his absences from some key rollcalls in the Senate. DAVIS last week sent to all Wisconsin editors "without comment, for your information and reference" a breakdown of the Senator's voting record. It is one that is likely to provoke some questioning of the Senator.

SYMBOL

Actually, it is not DAVIS who is the issue in the WILEY campaign. DAVIS is merely the symbol of the Republican opposition to the Senator, and the Senator would have turned on any other candidate against him with the same fury of frustration. As DAVIS has repeatedly said, the convention could have picked any one of a number of others who had been mentioned as candidates—Kohler, Byrnes, Representative Smith, Knowles, etc.—when it became clear that a majority of the delegates wouldn't endorse WILEY under any circumstances.

WILEY'S prime issue, at bottom, is with the Republican organization of the State, the only statewide working group of the partisan label with which he has been associated. Late in his life, the Senator sees that organization as baleful and undemocratic. But again, the Senator's objections would be uttered with more grace had he not accepted that very organization's backing as he started his career as an endorsed candidate for governor, as he continued it as an endorsed candidate for Senator, and as he wanted to continue it as an endorsed candidate for Senator again this year.

Gangster Slayings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. FORRESTER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Daily News of Saturday, July 21, 1956, contained on its front page the following news item:

CHICAGO FINDS THIRD GANG VICTIM

CHICAGO, July 21.—The body of a hoodlum, Thomas Kaskas, 36, bearing knife and bullet wounds, and showing signs of torture, was found on the West Side today. It was Chicago's third gang slaying in recent days.

Authorities said Kaskas apparently had been tortured for days before he was killed. The body clad only in undershorts, was found in an alley. His wrists and ankles were trussed and his mouth sealed with adhesive tape.

In two short paragraphs, the newspaper article disposes of a barbarous and diabolical murder as could be committed. It is significant that there is no demand that the FBI move in or that the military be sent to Chicago. I have patiently waited to see if any pressure organizations would become interested, on the theory that Kaskas had been denied his civil rights, but it seems that no pressure group is interested. I certainly would not contend that Kaskas was killed because of his religion, for I feel certain that his assassins know nothing whatsoever about the Christian religion. Nevertheless, the right to live is a very precious civil right. Undoubtedly his killing was the result of a conspiracy continuing over many days, over which period the man was tortured. Then too, it is highly probable that this killing and the other killings referred to as having occurred "in recent days" involved State governmental action. We all know that gangster slayings are as much a part of Chicago as the Wrigley Building or Comiskey Park, dating back beyond the days of Al Capone and his gang and successors. Anyone knows that this could not have existed over the years without the assistance of persons connected with enforcement of the law in the city of Chicago. That the gangsters have been protected by some officials in that city has been contended many times over the years, and certainly with substance. As a matter of fact, an article from Springfield, Ill., states that Orville E. Hodge, State auditor, was probably connected with southern Illinois' racketeers and gamblers in extensive business deals as well as personal relationships, and probably Hodge embezzled $800,000 to repay gangster associates.

Every now and then a murder is committed in the South while murders in Chicago are daily occurrences, and are murders utterly without provocation and the result of abandoned and malignant hearts, coolly planned and executed. It is strange that thousands have not paraded the streets in Chicago about these killings, as they did in the Till case in Mississippi. In the Till case, according to the newspapers, young Till's father was hung for rape overseas, of white women. True, that was not chargeable to young Till. Yet one must consider the atmosphere young Till was reared in. If these gangster murderers are ever apprehended and convicted, which everyone seriously doubts, it is doubtful that they will be men decorated for valor on the battlefields as were the alleged killers of young Till, and it is doubtful that these gangsters have any impulses of patriotism whatsoever. According to the newspapers and magazines, young Till forcibly embraced the wife of one of our World War II heroes, made her an indecent proposal, and added insult by saying, "I have had white women before in Chicago." Whether Till told the truth about certain white women in Chicago will be left for Chicagoans to decide. Evidently young Till was boasting over what he had been permitted to do in Chicago. If the men charged with killing young Till actually did so, there was certainly great provocation, while the gangsters cannot claim that they killed in defense of the honor of a good woman, or because they were outraged by any violation of decency.

I am not advocating sending the FBI or the military into Chicago. Illinois is a sovereign State, and I respect it as such. Murder is certainly a crime to be handled by a State instead of the Federal Government. I simply make this record in order to show that hypocrisy is so prevalent in the field of civil rights. I wonder if the people will not sometime agree to leave the Southern States alone. It is very disillusioning to have people in States who are far more guilty to be advocating even the destruction of the Constitution in order to pass punitive legislation against a certain section of this country.

Worldwide Antinarcotic Suppression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I ask permission to refer to the hearings held by a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee on "Traffic in, and Control of, Narcotics, Barbiturates and Amphetamines" from October 14, 1955, to January 30, 1956. As you are aware, these hearings attracted national and international attention and the official record of the hearings are now being circulated throughout the world as the most embracive record of narcoticism ever produced.

One of the expert witnesses testifying before the committee on the narcotic evil was Capt. Edward Page Gaston, international director of the World Antinarcotic Foundation. He has traveled in many countries investigating this evil at first hand, has been attached to the American Embassies in Germany and Mexico, and has been honored with royal decorations and other distinctions. Captain Gaston has announced that he will shortly depart on a world tour to gather additional information on the various aspects of the distribution and use of narcotics.

The statement of Captain Gaston before the subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee is as follows:

STATEMENT OF CAPT. EDWARD PAGE GASTON, NATIONAL COMMANDER, PATRIOT GUARD OF AMERICA AND INTERNATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE WORLD ANTINARCOTIC FOUNDATION

Mr. BOGGS. Our next witness is Capt. Page Gaston. Captain Gaston, will you identify yourself for the record, please?

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Chairman, I am Capt. Edward Page Gaston, Reserve, head of the Patriot Guard of America, and international director of the World Antinarcotic Foundation.

Herewith, I beg leave to submit an account of the activities of two organizations with which I am connected.

The Patriot Guard is especially charged with protection of teen-agers against he traffic in narcotics. With its related units it has operated for 46 years.

We believe that its unpaid forces could break up narcotic outlawry throughout the Nation, and could do that without additional cost to the Government.

Working silently, under cover, our secret volunteer forces, which include Army, Navy, and Air reservists, as well as many civilians, during the last 20 years especially, have accomplished a great deal.

As narcotics today involve teen-agers so deeply, we are out to enroll recruits particularly among university, college, and high-school students, and faculties. They reveal to us the inner workings and dope habits in their circles.

Arrests of traffickers are then made promptly, and the severest penalties exacted, even up to death in extreme cases. Some of the individual supporters of our federation are active in addressing thousands of schoolchildren and other students yearly in cooperation with school authorities. We work closely with the Department of Justice, magistrate, police, district attorneys, and other law-enforcement officers to assure prompt and impartial justice.

* * * * *

We operate among fraternal and patriotics such as Masons, the American Legion, service clubs such as Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Optimists, Sertomas, and their women auxiliaries. Also the Federation of Women's Clubs, DAR, and other feminine units active in social and patriotic service.

At the instance of Commander Leavitt, president of the noted Sertoma Club of Washington, the following resolution is being circulated, and numerously signed by members and auxiliaries of that club:

"Resolved, That we as members of the Sertoma Club deeply appreciate the impartial attitude shown by the House Ways and Means Committee in the antinarcotic hearings now being held, composed of Representatives BOGGS, of Louisiana, chairman; Representative KARSTEN, of Missouri; Representative MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Representative FRANK IKARD, of Texas; Representative BYRNES of Wisconsin; Representative SADLAK, of New York; and Representative BAKER, of Tennessee.

"We commend this action and express the hope that the committee will press forward the required congressional legislation looking to severe punishment for narcotic traffickers, and a tightening up of the existing regulations for better protection of teen-agers and the public generally."

It is planned that the same form of resolution shall be presented for adoption to other similar organizations.

The fiendish traffic in narcotics could be quickly stamped out by united action, according to Harry J. Anslinger of the United States Treasury Narcotics Bureau, and other authorities. "They have done it before, and they can again," says Mr. Anslinger.

"We can lick organized crime," says United States Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee.

General Grant has given me permission to quote a letter which he has written to the Honorable HALE BOGGS, chairman of this committee:

"MY DEAR MR. BOGGS: I understand that you are chairman of a subcommittee considering H. R. 565 introduced by Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, JR., to strengthen our laws for the prevention of the traffic in narcotics. Like most observant citizens, I am aware of the apparent increase in addiction to the drug habit, especially among adolescents.

"Manifestly, the spread of the illegitimate use of narcotics can only result in reducing both the physical and intellectual vigor of our Nation, an eventuality sought by our Nation's enemies, for which reason, as well as the human tragedies it produces, I am naturally in favor of any legislation that will help the enforcing authorities in their most difficult work.

"Being anything but an expert in this field, I do not presume to suggest or advise just what legislation will be most effective to the desired end, confident that your subcommittee will find the most effective measures and terminology.

"I venture to write to you on the subject merely to assure you that many of us citizens not in official positions are interested in the problem, and are convinced of the urgency of further legislation in the matter by Congress.

"With best wishes for your success in framing the most suitable and efficient solution,

"Sincerely yours,

"U. S. GRANT III,
"Major General, United States Army, Retired."

I might say that General Grant is a grandson of the great General Grant of the Civil War.

Our legislative operations of the Patriot Guard are indicated by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as shown herewith, bearing the names of nearly twoscore supporting Members of Congress. These include seven Congressmen who have filed antinarcotic bills of their own, including that of Chairman Boggs of Louisiana, chairman of your committee, which is now law.

Similar measures have been numerously sponsored by the United States Senate as also in various States. I pass these to the members of the committee.

Mr. BOGGS. We have copies of them, Captain.

Mr. GASTON. Yes, sir.

I am also international director of the World Antinarcotic Foundation of Washington, London, Istanbul, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and other capitals.

Our crusade covers all countries afflicted with dope, in which we and its related units have worked for 46 years, with a score of governments.

I have personally investigated narcotics by traveling in many countries, and was formerly attached to the American Embassies in Germany and Mexico. Also, I am a volunteer worker with the United Nations. When in England last summer, I interviewed several members of Her Majesty's Government. Heroin has been outlawed and is not now in the British pharmacopoeia. In talking with Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister, it was gratifying to note the official strong attitude taken by the present Government, as well as that of Sir Winston Churchill previously. An important blue book was issued last year entitled, "The Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs," a report to the United Nations by Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for 1954.

Preparations are in the making for my projected world tour which will embrace Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Egypt, Lebanon, India, Pakistan, Burma, Thailand, China, Russia, Japan, the Philippines, Hawaii, Canada, Central and South America, and other countries. Ad hoc sessions are projected for various capitals looking to better international action for universal narcotics suppression so far as possible. University students are being specialized in these efforts for permanent operations in their countries. The United States Bureau of Narcotics has been promised a series of reports on these operations as they develop during my tour.

Our Patriot Guard and World Antinarcotics Foundation operate from 1800 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and our telephone number is Hobart 2-9343.

Mr. BOGGS. Does that complete your statement, Captain?

Mr. GASTON. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Thank you very much.

Are there any questions?

(No response.)

Mr. BOGGS. If there are no further questions, thank you, Captain, and we take this opportunity to congratulate you upon the fine work that you are doing.

Mr. GASTON. Thank you, sir.

McCarran-Walter Immigration Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to introduce a statement by my good friend, Justice S. Samuel Di Falco, of the New York State Supreme Court. It is also more than a personal tribute to a distinguished public figure by whose friendship I am honored. Justice Di Falco's address was delivered at a recent convention of the 26th United HIAS Service held at the Hotel Commodore in New York City. More than 1,500 persons attended.

I regard it as a public service to bring to the attention of my fellow Congressmen and of the American people the striking words of Judge Di Falco on the McCarran Immigration Law. Surely if anyone is qualified to speak on this subject it is one who is himself the child of a group which was among the more recent arrivals to this country, a group which has done and is doing so much for it in every avenue of public service. He is an ardent advocate of repeal of this law, or at least the amendment thereof so as to enable many of our citizens and legally resident aliens to become reunited with their families and loved ones.

Judge Di Falco's statement follows:

I am most highly honored to have been invited to participate in the 26th annual convention of the Council of Organizations of the United Hias.

It has been my fortunate privilege throughout my entire life to have been in daily contact with people of the Jewish faith. When I say constant—I mean, not only in a business or professional capacity, but as a friend, neighbor, confidant, and associate. I have also had the pleasure of participating in the advancement of a great number of worthy Jewish causes.

I feel kinship with you men and women of Hias for no one can more fully appreciate the wonderful work of Hias than one—who, himself—came to these shores as an immigrant boy as I did. Nor can anyone decry more forcefully the folly, the inhumanity, the lack of foresight and the impudent stupidity which close our gates to the humanity which seeks entrance here, than can an immigrant boy like myself.

BLOT ON AMERICAN HISTORY

To me, an immigrant, it is a source of horrifying amazement that a McCarran-Walter bill could be enacted in a land which has grown from a tiny seed planted on the shores by immigrants, fed and nurtured from the breast of immigrants, and that has blossomed and flourished through the life-giving blood stream of the contributions of immigrants.

One of the great blots in the history of America has been the restrictive, discriminatory quota system of immigration. In 1924 a quota system has evolved which later barred our gates to those petitioning America for rescue from the butchering, slaughtering and wholesale massacre of innocent victims of Nazi persecution. Our doors were closed in their face, and instead the doors of the gas chambers were opened. Innocent people, millions of Jews. Brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers and children of our American citizenry were needlessly, wantonly and savagely destroyed because political expedience was placed above and before the basic moral and human issues involved. Any manmade law which prevents and deprives families from unity under God, and keeps them separate and apart for life in different parts of the world must be condemned as cruel, barbaric, and inhuman.

My friends, one would think that the soul and conscience of every decent minded person would be troubled by the fact that only a few dozen words on a piece of paper in an immigration law in 1924 meant the difference between life and death to 6 million innocent people.

Yet, what happened? In 1952 while efforts were still being made to identify the bodies of the people who perished in the concentration camps, a McCarran-Walter bill was brazenly and harshly foisted upon the American people, closing the doors still tighter to the few human remnants seeking admission to our country, and thereby cutting off the flow of a life-line of new fresh immigrant blood into America. The quota system of the McCarran-Walter bill is shameful and degrading and will ever remain a blemish on the history of America unless and until this discriminatory legislation is replaced or liberalized.

SAVE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

I might also add that the Refugee Relief Act expires at the end of 1956. This year we must, all of us, exert our concerted efforts in a drive to insure that it is extended for such a period of time, until every victim of suffering and torture has had an opportunity to join us to start life all over again.

To you delegates, I say, go back, go back among your people and our organizations and let them know that unless they fight, unless they rise up with righteous indignation, unless they exert pressure, they will not succeed in liberalizing or repealing the McCarran-Walter immigration law, or in extending the Refugee Relief Act. There cannot, there must not, and we shall not, permit any compromise or any pussyfooting of this issue.

For even though the crown of achievement in the entire world is studded and sparkles with Jewish names in every field or endeavor, it is here in America that the Jew has made his greatest contributions and has attained most complete fulfillment; and, contrary to many preconceived notions, the history of the Jew is not of recent vintage. The Sephardic Jews, the refugees from Brazil, Asser Levy, Aaron Lopez, Rabbi Gershom Mendes Seixas, the Gratz brothers, Hyam Solomon, Senator Judah P. Benjamin, Dr. Abraham Jacoby, are but a few of the pioneers in American history.

In all fields of human endeavor the American Jew has distinguished himself for his contributions to science, medicine, philosophy, and the arts.

HUMANITARIAN JEWS

America has provided, and, in turn, has received doublefold, the benefits which the immigrant or the sons of the immigrant have returned to our great country.

What a sad commentary it would be if our Nation had been deprived of great Jewish scientists like the late Albert Einstein, or the recent discoverer of a polio vaccine, Dr. Jonas Salk, or if we had been deprived of the wisdom of the immortal jurists as Brandeis, Cardozo or a Frankfurter, or if the world of music had lacked a Gershwin, a Peerce, a Richard Tucker, a Robert Merrill, or a Leonard Bernstein.

Or, if New York, Illinois, and Connecticut had been deprived of great governors like a Herbert Lehman, a Henry Horner, or an Abraham Ribicoff.

I, too, have been the recipient of the bounty America affords an immigrant boy. But I cannot overemphasize the intensity with which I deplore the cold, calculating manner in which the immigrant has been barred by the practice of a foreign policy which deliberately has chosen to close its eyes to international injustices.

If a small country like Israel can keep its doors open midst all the struggle and strife and suffering to any person seeking a home, then certainly the large and mighty nation of America should take heed from the example of this oasis of democracy on the Dark Continent, and should do no less.

As a matter of fact, men of conscience everywhere have been stirred by Israel's struggle for survival among the despotic intrigues of the Middle East. Israel's future was carved and cultivated from a barren desert, a desert which did not surrender too easily to the will of the Israeli people.

IMPORTANCE OF ISRAEL'S SUCCESS

Israel's success is vital to the Jewish people, yet to the rest of the world it is even more necessary. To the Jewish people it represents the realization of a homeland after 2,000 years of wandering, but to the rest of the world it represents the rebirth of an ancient, sacred, and esteemed civilization, hallowed in the dust of the ancient sages, consecrated in the blood of modern martyrs, and dedicated to the cause of freedom and democracy.

As I look back on my public career, I am most proud of the resolution which I introduced in the City Council in 1948 calling upon President Truman to reject the Bernadotte Plan for a third partition of Palestine and for a declaration of independence and the de jure recognition of the State of Israel.

To you men and women who have always recognized the need for action, I urge you to fight for the cause of Israel, to continue the support of Israel so that it can always absorb those immigrants seeking a home in the Holy Land, and to fight with every ounce of energy for the repeal of the discriminatory restrictive McCarran-Walter immigration law so that we may open our shores for other immigrants like you and me to find a haven here with us.

AMERICA LEADS THE WAY

It is no accident that America has grown to become the leading world power. Such a phenomenon could only evolve in a land whose young civilization welcomed the talents of immigrants from Poland, Austria, Russia, Hungary, Ireland, England, Latin America, Germany, and others with love and brotherhood without bias, prejudice, or bigotry; and the dark clouds of discrimination and intolerance must never be allowed to eclipse the glorious light of democracy, for the quota system under which immigration to this country is being administered actually is an underhanded attempt and subterfuge for the practice of discrimination, intolerance, and bigotry.

I salute Hias for a job well done, and I pray that your labors may be blessed with future successes made easier through the enlightenment of men who thus far have refused to see the light.

Hon. John W. McCormack and Reporters' Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, July 23, 1956, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader of the House, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, appeared as the guest on the radio program known as Reporters' Roundup.

Congressman MCCORMACK, chairman of the platform committee for the coming Democratic national convention, was questioned by well-known members of the Washington press corps, Mr. Jim Lucas, staff writer for Scripps-Howard newspapers, and Mrs. Doris Fleeson, syndicated columnist for United Features. The moderator was Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual commentator and director of Washington operations.

Under permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I am including herewith the complete transcript of this broadcast of Reporters' Roundup:

Mr. FISKE. Reporters' Roundup, where bylines make headlines. In a moment hear the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic United States Congressman of Massachusetts and House majority leader of the 84th Congress, answer questions fired at him by a panel of veteran reporters.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman, what are the accomplishments of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress?

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Democrats be able to hold the House and the Senate in the next elections?

Mrs. FLEESON. What are the Democratic chances of beating President Eisenhower for the White House?

Mr. HURLEIGH. The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress is in high gear in an effort to adjourn. Democratic leaders say they are armed with facts about a lack of Republican support in Congress for some major programs, such as foreign aid. Members of the 84th Congress realize that the record made in Congress will be a major test for both Democrats and Republicans for control of the Senate and House in the forthcoming elections. Our guest is the majority leader of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts' 12th District. The Democrats named Congressman MCCORMACK recently to head the platform committee at the Democratic national convention. Congressman MCCORMACK was born in South Boston. He was elected to represent his district in 1928; named majority leader in 1940. Congressman MCCORMACK has held the majority leader post in each Congress since, except the 80th and 83d, in which he served as Democratic whip. And now our guest is ready.

Mr. FISKE. Reporters' Roundup, which comes to you transcribed from the House Radio Gallery in the Nation's Capital, is presented by Mutual and Facts Forum as part of Facts Forum's effort to stimulate interest in current issues. Facts Forum, nationwide

adult educational organization, is devoted to encouraging a desire in all Americans to listen, read, and think more about public affairs. Facts Forum has faith that if the American people will inform themselves from sources of their own choosing they will make wise decisions. May the opinions you will now hear expressed by our guest prompt you to further thought. Our guest is the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democratic United States Congressman of Massachusetts' 12th District and House majority leader of the 84th Congress. Congressman MCCORMACK is prepared to meet the challenging questions of this panel of well-known and able reporters: Mr. Jim Lucas, staff-writer of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, and Mrs. Doris Fleeson, columnist of United Features Syndicate. Your moderator, Robert F. Hurleigh, Mutual commentator and director of Washington operations.

Mr. HURLEIGH. And now, Mr. Lucas, let's have the first question for Congressman MCCORMACK.

Mr. LUCAS. Congressman MCCORMACK, you are to be the chairman of the platform committee in Chicago. I wonder if you think you will be able to write a civil-rights plank that will satisfy both the North and the South and still say anything?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I was chairman, if you will remember, Mr. Lucas, in 1944. I was chairman of the platform committee in 1952 when the same situation existed probably in more acute form and as I project my mind into the coming platform meetings and considerations and the results and in relation to civil rights, I feel very confident that a plank will be drafted and adopted that will be satisfactory and maintain unity in the Democratic Party.

Mr. LUCAS. What specifically would that plank include?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, of course as chairman of the committee, I am not going to express myself on that prior to the committee meeting and the considerations because I want to go into the committee in the position where I can accomplish the greatest amount of results.

Mr. LUCAS. Do you feel that the situation is more acute in the past—has been more acute in the past—that it is today?

Mr. MCCORMACK. From the evidence I have, I would say, Yes.

Mrs. FLEESON. Congressman, aren't you going to have to mention that Supreme Court decision banning segregation in the platform this year?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That's one of the questions that will be considered, Mrs. Fleeson, and prior to the committee meeting I am not going to express any opinions because as chairman of the committee I feel that I would not place myself in the proper position if I were to do so.

Mrs. FLEESON. Well, I hope you wont stick with that because I would like to ask another question about a formal piece of legislation if you can express yourself. How are you going to explain in the Democratic platform that the Democratic Congress failed to pass a bill for Federal aid in the construction of badly needed school buildings?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that is very—that is easily explainable. We have a very narrow body—there is a—the democratic majority is such that if we had 15 more Democrats, progressive Democrats, why in my poinion the result would be different. But let us look at the record Mrs. Fleeson. The Republicans have responsibility also. I think you will admit that. Certainly the public will and on the roll call of the passage of the bill there were 75 Republicans voted for the bill—119 against the bill. There were 119 Democrats who voted for the bill and 105 against the bill. I wish there were less of those 105 Democrats and I wish there were less than the 119 Republicans. In other words the Republican Members of the House by a large majority voted against the bill and they have their responsibility as a party and as individual Members.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. MCCORMACK on the basis of your record in Congress, do you think the Democrats will be able to hold the House and the Senate in the next election?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am hopeful. In 1952 when President Eisenhower won by over 6½ million votes, there were 221 Republican Members elected to the House—213 Democrats and 1 Independent. In other words, the Republicans barely squeezed through so far as the House was concerned. Strange thing is that with that tremendous plurality that President Eisenhower received in 1952, the popular vote for Members of the House throughout the country was about the same, if anything the Democrats had a little more popular vote than the Republicans. And we have that unusual phenomenon where the people voted for Eisenhower in 1952, but apparently they didn't want to leave the leadership and the policies of the Democratic Party because they realized that we were for their best interest. Based upon the Eisenhower vote in 1952, if that had reflected itself against the Democratic Party as such, we would not have had more than 165 Democrats instead of 213 elected. Now we had that and in 1954 we gained the House and we made rapid gains in governorships and in local elections in the several States of the Union and I have a feeling of confidence that the people in their wisdom will reelect a Democratic House and Senate this fall.

Mr. LUCAS. Presumably General Eisenhower will be at the head of the Republican ticket again this year. Will that make——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Indications point that way now.

Mr. LUCAS. Will that make more difficult your task of retaining control of the two Houses of Congress?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, of course, the factors—there are many factors between now and November. Of course, President Eisenhower is not as strong now as he was in 1952 by any means. Furthermore, there are other factors involved. We have certain big business control of Government, you have the discrimination against small and independent business, you have the—the disregard of the farmers, the forgotten people. You have the tie-up with big special interests in connection with the public resources, we are on the defensive throughout the world on foreign affairs, there are many factors and the American people are sensitive and, of course, in the minds of every person, they realize that in voting for President, they do and are considering it—they have got to consider the national interest of our country which is paramount and they should. Because it is not a question of electing a man because of popularity to the presidency of the United States. That's the most responsible position in the world. And the very fate of our country could be involved in having a man in there where we would be assured of permanent policy and leadership during his administration.

Mrs. FLEESON. Isn't it a fact, Congressman, that the President is interested himself in improving the caliber of the candidates in the Republican Party this fal? They've had stronger candidates certainly in the Senate in many States than they've had in previous years.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, that's a question of fact, Mrs. Fleeson. I notice, of course, if you have in mind Kentucky why that would be an illustration.

Mrs. FLEESON. And the State of Washington.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That would be an illustration. I am not so sure about the other candidates because you are in the unusual position where most of the Republican candidates like Ike using that slogan for election purposes but after they are elected their record shows the great majority don't vote for the matters he recommends.

Mrs. FLEESON. Let me switch to your party. Speaking of liking Ike—do you like your colleague, Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, for the vice presidential nomination? On the Democratic ticket?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Why, of course, the vice presidential nomination—you don't run for that, you're selected. You know that as well as I do. The—whoever you nominate for President—he has the big voice in selecting the second place. You are not going to, you're not going to—if Governor Stevenson is nominated, I would assume and I hope that Senator KENNEDY would be given very serious consideration by him. So far as Senator KENNEDY and I are concerned, we have a friendly relationship. Certainly I have evidenced it to him on so many occasions that there ought to be a friendly state of mind on his part toward me and particularly I hav a friendly state of mind toward him.

Mrs. FLEESON. Congressman, it is felt that the nomination of KENNEDY for Vice President or that of Mayor Wagner, of New York, who are Catholics would strengthen the Democrats in the big cities of the United States. Do you think that they need strengthening with the Catholic vote of the big cities of the United States?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I don't; I don't recognize anything as a Catholic vote any more than a Baptist vote or a Presbyterian vote or an Episcopalian vote—I am an American. I am a communicant of the Catholic Church; I love my religion. And I want the world to know it. And I respect all other religions. I am serving here as an American citizen and in a sense I deplore the use of a Catholic vote as such, same as I would a colored vote as such. I think our fine Americans of the colored race vote as Americans.

Mr. LUCAS. Along that line, Congressman——

Mr. MCCORMACK. Same as I deplore such a characterization of a Baptist vote or a Presbyterian vote. Now, in direct answer to your question, I think the time has arrived in America when one who is outstanding, a man who has impressed himself upon the American people and who is a communicant of the Catholic Church would not be denied election because of that fact. I think the people of the South would vote for a good man, a good American, who is a Catholic, and certainly the North would. And I think this year in particular that if a good American with outstanding service who is honorable and trustworthy and commands the respect of the American people is selected—on the Democratic ticket or on the Republican ticket—but we will confine ourselves to the Democratic ticket because that is the immediate subject of discussion of your question—if one is selected, I think it would be a decided asset to the Democratic Party. But he shouldn't be selected because he is a Catholic, just the same as they might select a man who comes from an agricultural area, the party might, because they want to have the influence upon the agricultural vote. It's always an important incidental and secondary consideration and that is where it belongs and that is where it should be but as a secondary consideration this year, I am frank in stating that I think that if the Democratic Party were to select a good outstanding man who is a communicant of the Catholic Church for President he would be elected—I don't think the American people would vote against a man because of his religion. A few here and there. The 1928 fight cannot be revived in 1956 in my opinion.

Mr. LUCAS. Along that line, Mr. Congressman, a southern member of Congress the other day accused the nonsoutherners of socially segregating the three Negro members of Congress. Do you have any comment on that?

Mr. McCORMACK. What do you mean? I don't know, that's the first I ever heard of this.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. ABERNETHY of Mississippi.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am stunned——

Mrs. FLEESON. Congressman ABERNETHY made the charge, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh well, the—I imagine that was under emotional strain. I cannot undertake to interpret the mind of someone else. I can interpret my own mind.

Mrs. FLEESON. Well, can you say whether they do or do not segregate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, no—fartherest thing in the world, Mrs. Fleeson and Mr. Lucas. The accident of birth means nothing to me. God didn't consult me when I was born and why should I have anything, feelings, against any person because of the accident of birth. And God isn't going to judge me or anyone else on the color of our skin. When we die we go up and Peter judges—and go to the Gates of Heaven——

Mrs. FLEESON. Congressman, that isn't the question, sir. Congressman ABERNETHY charged specifically that the colored Members of the House were not socially received in the homes of their colleagues and that the northerners were guilty of hypocrisy in this regard.

Mr. McCORMACK. What do you mean, socially received?

Mr. LUCAS. Visit in their apartments, in their homes——

Mrs. FLEESON. Dine with them——

Mr. LUCAS. Dine with them in the House restaurant was a specific point that he made.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I have seen a Member of Congress of the colored race eating in the House restaurant——

Mrs. FLEESON. With white colleagues?

Mr. McCORMACK. A lot of people—the question of social—take Congressman DAWSON, Who is a finer American than Congressman DAWSON? He would be welcomed anywhere. He is chairman of the House Administration Committee, Government Operations Committee, the first representative, American, of the colored race ever to be chairman of a committee in the entire history of the country. And I serve on that committe, and I serve on that committee because I am proud to serve under BILL DAWSON. I didn't serve on Ways and Means Committee that I was a member of when I was first elected leader in 1940—I resigned from Ways and Means Committee. But I was a Member of the House, of the Government Operations Committee during the 80th Republican Congress and I was reelected leader in the 81st Congress, but I stayed on the committee, I not only stayed on it but I stepped aside. I was his senior—I could have been chairman of the committee, but I stepped aside so that—and he became chairman and then I served on the committee to show how proud I was not only to step aside for this great American Congressman DAWSON, but to serve under him as my chairman.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. McCORMACK, the Massachusetts delegation to Chicago, I believe is pledged to you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Well, it's a write-in vote now; that is, I got the majority of the write-in votes. Now, the extent to which they are pledged to me, that is a question of fact. I have read in the newspapers that they are going to cast their first ballot for me if I want it. I'm putting in "if I want it" in there.

Mrs. FLEESON. Do you want it?

Mr. McGORMACK. I may, because it would be a good part of my obituary.

Mrs. FLEESON. We're not looking forward to that.

Mr. LUCAS. No; not at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I think you can read my mind and see the—how serious, how much I think I will ever get the nomination—but it's a very nice compliment. I appreciate the action of the people in writing my name in. I didn't seek it. I wasn't a candidate. Friends of mine proposed it without my knowledge, and then it blossomed up in 2 or 3 days. So many good friends of mine and I couldn't publicly repudiate them, their efforts, their sincerity, and I said you go ahead and conduct it yourself. And we know what the results were—I got the write-in vote. If you want to ask any further questions on that subject, it is perfectly all right with me——

Mr. LUCAS. Well, where will it go after casting this courtesy or complimentary——

Mr. McCORMACK. I imagine the majority will probably go to Governor Stevenson and where the others go I couldn't tell you now.

Mrs. FLEESON. Who is your favorite candidate for the Democratic nomination, Congressman?

Mr. McCORMACK. I'm not for anybody yet. I am not, and certainly I never develop a state of mind where I am against anybody. I would like to see the candidate selected who will be the strongest man. And when you select a candidate you have also got to consider the candidates in the State for Governor and United States Senator, and the candidates for Congress and close districts. If we select or nominate a weak man, a man who isn't strong in close districts, we might lose 10 or 15 close districts that we otherwise would win.

Mrs. FLEESON. Are there any weak Democrats?

Mr. McCORMACK. What? Well, there are some stronger than others.

Mr. LUCAS. And who would you rate the strongest then?

Mr. McCORMACK. Why, that's, that is a difficult question. I would say that on the voter level I would say that Senator SYMINGTON would be strong. I would say that Governor Harriman would be strong. I would say that Senator KEFAUVER would be strong on the voter level. And I'd put Governor Stevenson in the next place.

Mr. LUCAS. Do you think that Senator SYMINGTON could take it in a national campaign?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I am a great admirer of STUART SYMINGTON but he is not an active candidate. I'm not talking candidates now—I am for anyone who is nominated and I will go out enthusiastically and support him and I think we've got a great opportunity for a Democratic victory this year. I am not one of those defeatists.

Mrs. FLEESON. Do you think President Eisenhower's health will be an issue in the campaign?

Mr. McCORMACK. It's bound to be in the minds of the people. The very fact that you asked the question shows that it is in your mind. And you know I have a lot of confidence in these American families, when husband and wife sit together and they chat as Mrs. McCormack and I do, we discuss things seriously. So do the other husbands and wives and their children. And it's bound to be in their minds, because the very national interest of our country is involved—the office of President is the most important in the world. It's a full-time job, particularly in an emergency like we have today where the fate of the free world and our own country might be involved. You have got to have continuous, permanent, firm leadership and the question confronting the American people is not "do I like some individual"—but "what is for the national interest of our country?"—having in mind the world condition and circumstances and the physical condition of candidates. So, the answer to your question is, and nobody argues it, it's an issue in the minds of the American people in my opinion. Because, speaking as an American, I can't escape it. Much as I wish it didn't exist and I just can't escape it and every other American is bound to have the same thoughts along that line.

Mr. LUCAS. How much do you think Vice President NIXON will strengthen the Republican ticket?

Mr. McCORMACK. Nixon? He will weaken the ticket?

Mrs. FLEESON. Why?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, Vice President NIXON—I am expressing an opinion based upon my extensive associations with people and listening to what they say, he is very unpopular.

Mrs. FLEESON. With whom, besides Democrats?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, well now. I am not confining myself to Democrats. I have met any number of Republicans who have told me for example that if he were the candidate for President, they'd vote for a Democrat. Now, that feeling reflects itself further, because I am satisfied that the great majority of the American people feel that he is not capable or qualified to fill the office of President if that situation should arise, which we all hope and pray will not, if President Eisenhower is reelected and I am not conceding his reelection.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Mr. McCORMACK, if the health of President Eisenhower will be an issue, and if many people perhaps entertain doubts about his longevity and Mr. NIXON is a weak candidate for the vice presidency, would you then suggest that the Republican ticket is weak for 1956?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, now that would not necessarily follow. The fact that Mr. NIXON will be the vice presidential candidate I think will cause the people to give additional thought to the health of the President and the results of his election.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. McCORMACK, what States which went for Eisenhower in the last election do you think are likely to go Democratic this year?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we have the solid South in line with the possibility there may be one State in the South, but I don't even think in that case.

Mrs. FLEESON. Florida?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Still I don't think in that case. I would think we have a good chance of carrying some of the farm states that we didn't carry in 1952.

Mr. LUCAS. New York?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we have a good chance of carrying Massachusetts and New York, Pennsylvania. Now, I may not mention some States and they will think that I think that they won't be carried. I don't want any listener to get that impression. But I think, I felt even before the unfortunate heart attack of the President, before his later operation, that with the issues we had and with the record of the present administration that we had, that even with Eisenhower a candidate for reelection that he didn't have much better than a 50–50 chance of winning.

Mrs. FLEESON. The Democrats say that they are dead broke. That they have no money, and that——

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, we've always been——

Mrs. FLEESON. The Republicans have a large treasury. Don't you think that will handicap your party?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, money—money is a powerful influence, but we Democrats have always been more or less broke and there is nothing new to that and all I can suggest is that we Democrats have certainly saved business, big and little, and I've once and awhile said to one of my friends who's in big business, who is a Republican, that for every $5 you contribute to the Republican Party out of an act of gratitude and appreciation, why don't you contribute $1 to the Democratic Party?

Mr. HURLEIGH. I'm sorry, Congressman, but I am going to have to cut in here. Our board of judges has selected the prize-winning questions submitted by our listeners for this broadcast. In a moment, Congressman Mc-

CORMACK is going to answer these questions. Stand by for the names of the winners.

Mr. FISKE. There's more fun in your morning when you stay tuned to Mutual. The weather is always bright and sunny when you're on the Mutual line for programs that brighten a gay day, or lighten a gray day. It's the easy way to make time fly by before you know it, while household chores become a pleasure when you enjoy yourself and listen while you work. You'll find there are several easy to listen to news digests, 5 minutes of up-to-the-minute headlines to keep you informed on what's happening in the world. Mornings on Mutual mean all the happy good times of quiz programs, with their excitement and thrills, the suspense as contestants reach for big prizes and the warm glow that comes from hearing of another's good fortune. Make your morning pleasure Mutual with programs that let you keep right on with everyday tasks, hear them all every weekday over most of these stations. Remember, Mutual is your network for news.

Mr. HURLEIGH. And now, Congressman MCCORMACK, here are those prize-winning questions from our listeners.

Mr. FISKE. From Mrs. Spiro C. Minolas, of Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman MCCORMACK, from your own State, why in your opinion has the United States lost ground during the past few years in the East-West conflict and what can the new Congress do to help regain the initiative?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That's a very pertinent question. The last few years we have lost ground because of the uncertain and confused leadership that we have in Washington from President Eisenhower down. For example, last July at the Geneva meeting, he said that—he admitted publicly, stated publicly that the Communists were sincere in their desire for peace. Of course they are—for a Communist peace, but that's not our peace. That's the worst mistake he could have made. We see the fraternization that's going on. That's bad. That affects millions of persons behind the Iron Curtain who hate their Communist oppressors. We are on the defensive throughout the entire world. We have the illustration of neutralism. The President says one thing, he clarifies it the next day which is bad. Vice President NIXON says something different. Secretary Dulles goes to the extreme and then he tries to say that the President and he agrees when everybody knows he said the opposite of the President. All of that shows uncertain leadership. The leaders of other countries are doubting our sincerity—of other countries friendly to us, so there are many things I could say on that. But we are on the defensive throughout the world and it is because of a lack of firm leadership and the Democratic Party, the Democratic leadership will bring back the policy of peace and strength. We've got to have firmness in our international relations with other countries so they will respect us and we are losing respect throughout the world.

Mr. FISKE. From Robert P. McCloghery, of San Francisco, Calif.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman MCCORMACK, should we cut our Armed Forces overseas, return them to the United States and depend on greater Air Force and guided missiles?

Mr. MCCORMACK. That's a very hard question for a layman to answer. It's a very good question. However, as one charged with responsibility I feel that we should not take any calculated risks on the side of weakness. If we are going to err, it's better to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness and before we reduce our foot soldiers, our land soldiers, our military leaders, and those responsible for the preservation of our Government had better be careful that they are right.

Mr. FISKE. From Donald E. Fortson, of North Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. HURLEIGH. Congressman MCCORMACK, what single piece of legislation passed by the 84th Congress do you regard as the most significant?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, there are several. There is the Interstate Highway System, the 41,000-mile system, which is of vital importance to our people. There is the appropriations made for defense, I think the upping of $900 million by the Democrats in both Houses of the Congress—initiated in the Senate and concurred in by the House—for the buildup of our Air Force is of vital importance. The big job for us today is to preserve our country and we have got to have the leadership that will establish policies that are for the national interest of our country and the best interest of our people—and it can't be bullying but it's got to be firm leadership. Other nations are watching us closely and when they see uncertainty on the part of our top leadership they then commence to doubt. And it can't be a day-to-day or a week-to-week foreign policy. Now when President Truman was in, the world knew he first made his own decisions and second when he made his decisions he meant them. They don't feel the same way about the present administration.

Mr. HURLEIGH. I want to thank United States Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and House majority leader, for being our guest on Reporters' Roundup, which came to you transcribed from the House Radio Gallery in your Nation's Capitol. My thanks too, to the reporters on our panel—Mr. Jim Lucas, staff writer of Scripps Howard Newspapers, and Mrs. Doris Fleeson, syndicated columnist of United Features.

Stassen's Boner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith an editorial from the Washington Star of Tuesday, July 24, 1956, entitled "Stassen's Boner," and also an article by David Lawrence of the same date with reference to an announcement by Harold Stassen of yesterday—both of which are most appropriate and reflect wide sentiment in the Republican Party.

STASSEN'S BONER

Some wag has described Harold Stassen's attempt to put the skids under Vice President Nixon as an "unteamly" thing for him to do. And that seems to be about the size of it.

When Mr. Stassen told the President last week that he planned to make the statement, Mr. Eisenhower informed him that he had every right to do so as an individual but that it was obvious he "could not make such a statement as a member of the President's official family." Mr. Stassen was among those present to greet the President at the airport when he returned this morning from his trip to Panama. But all he got, relatively speaking, was a brushoff. Mr. Eisenhower's warm attentions were reserved for the Vice President, also a member of the welcome-home delegation.

All of which leaves the question of why Mr. Stassen chose to climb so far out on this particular limb. He said that he was motivated by "loyalty to President Eisenhower," that he had the support of a group of unidentified Republican leaders, and that private polls had convinced him that the GOP ticket would be weakened by at least 6 percent with Mr. NIXON in the No. 2 spot.

These motives are understandable. But there are several things wrong with the conclusion to which Mr. Stassen was led by them. In the first place, his injection of the loyalty angle, especially in view of the President's past comments on Mr. NIXON, implies that Mr. Eisenhower did not quite know what he was doing, and that Mr. Stassen, therefore, felt impelled to light the way for him. In the second place, Mr. Stassen's comment reflects a very low grade of political judgment. Massachusetts' Governor Herter, the Stassen candidate, is a fine man and would make an excellent vice president. But at this late stage of the game his chances of getting the nomination are virtually nil. His only hope would be for the President to pull the rug from under Mr. NIXON. This is something which the President evidently does not intend to do, even though the Stassen statement suggests that he might do it.

Finally, Mr. Stassen's proposal was bound to create dissension in Republican ranks and furnish the Democrats with ammunition for campaign uses. Mr. Stassen should have known this. He would be well-advised to withdraw from his self-imposed role as kingmaker and stick to his job—if he is able to keep it—as the President's assistant in charge of disarmament negotiations.

STASSEN AND HIS BID FOR HERTER—MOVE CALLED FAUX PAS THAT MAY UPSET EISENHOWER CHANCES IF IT SPLITS GOP

(By David Lawrence)

Harold Stassen, once Governor of Minnesota and now a special assistant to President Eisenhower in charge of disarmament negotiations, has made the biggest faux pas of his political career and set in motion a movement that could result in such a serious cleavage inside the Republican Party as to destroy the chances of reelecting Eisenhower.

Merely to have announced that he favors Governor Herter instead of Vice President NIXON for the second place on the ticket would not in itself have caused a big sensation, but the grounds on which Stassen put it reveals to the Nation that there may be some serious dissension inside the Eisenhower administration and that what's been regarded as an Eisenhower-Dulles pro-American policy is really being threatened from within by proponents of a pro-European and pro-Asian policy.

The key sentence in Stassen's strange declaration is this: "The independent people at home, important portions of the population abroad, and the uncommitted nations in the world would have greater confidence in an Eisenhower-Herter ticket."

It will be a surprise to most Americans to learn that European and Asian leaders have to be satisfied before the Republican National Convention can pick a vice presidential nominee. For undoubtedly NIXON doesn't please Messrs. Nasser, Nehru, and Tito. This would give the Democrats, of course, a lively issue, as the voters in the past have shown themselves very sensitive about any suggestion that they must consider foreign influences in deciding an American election.

Governor Herter is a fine man and an able one, but now he becomes identified with all the handicaps of his sponsor—Stassen—and of the New York City group, too, which is backing this latest move to "drum NIXON."

The innuendo in the Stassen statement about "important portions of the population abroad and the uncommitted nations in the world" liking Herter so much could

split the Republican Party. For obviously many Middle West Republicans are bound to look with suspicion on any movement that is tied up with foreign economic or financial intrigue. Stassen, himself, is vulnerable on this phase of present-day policies. Only last week Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, issued a majority report bitterly criticizing Stassen for helping the Russians get materials they could use in armament preparations, MCCLELLAN wrote:

"As is clearly documented in the report (concerning the relaxation of international controls over trade with the Soviet bloc), the American people and Congress were misled about the results of this 1954 agreement (with the allies) by the statements of Mr. Harold Stassen while he was Battle Act administrator."

The report itself says:

"The Battle Act (Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951) calls for termination of aid to nations that knowingly ship items of strategic significance to the Communist nations * * *.

"Mr. Harold E. Stassen, as Battle Act administrator, in effect circumvented the Battle Act by determining that items of manifest strategic significance, and which had been so regarded prior to the 1954 revision, were not strategic for purposes of allied trade with the Communist bloc."

The report goes on to accuse Stassen of having "misrepresented facts," and as having been "an arrogant, evasive and uncandid witness" when he testified. It says that he "is to be severely criticized for his conduct in the matter."

The big question now will arise as to what group or groups were behind Stassen, both in this country and in western countries, in trying to soften the embargo on strategic commodities and whether any of the same influences now are behind his sponsoring of Governor Herter as a vice presidential candidate. For a move such as Harold Stassen made was no spur-of-the-moment decision, but the carefully conceived plan of a group of New York business and financial men who have been trying all through the present session of Congress to get vast appropriations for foreign aid without any strings.

There are unconfirmed rumors here that Paul Hoffman is one of the men back of the Herter candidacy. Hoffman was Administrator of economic aid in Europe under President Truman and last week was nominated as a Republican to be a delegate to the U. N. Although he was confirmed, 16 Republicans and 6 Democrats in the Senate voted against him.

Stassen says an Eisenhower-Herter ticket will run at least 6 percent stronger than an Eisenhower-Nixon ticket. But he has overlooked the prospect that, by dropping NIXON, there would be at least a 20 percent defection of regular Republicans who wouldn't go to the polls at all if President Eisenhower goes back on his pledge to support NIXON. For that's what his statements have been construed to mean by Republican leaders from Chairman Leonard Hall down to the rank and file. Doublecrossing doesn't sit well in politics, and the betting is 100 to 1 that Eisenhower will never be guilty of it, no matter how strong the pressure from close personal friends in New York.

Meanwhile, the Democrats in Congress have indicated by their public comments how gleeful they now are over the prospect of a split in the Republican Party. It's strange how the applecart can be upset overnight, and what looked like a sure thing for Eisenhower now becomes a big question mark until he himself clears the air.

When the Ocean Comes to Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the city of Chicago is well recognized as the largest air and rail terminal of the Nation and the world. As a proseaway crusader and vociferous exponent of Chicago's becoming the Rotterdam of the West upon the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and the Cal-Sag project, it was with great interest that I read the article by J. C. Furnas entitled "When the Ocean Comes to Chicago," published in the June 1956 issue of the Town Journal, wherein he previews Chicago's future as a world seaport.

In the article Mr. Furnas vividly portrays his journey aboard a Dutch freighter from Chicago, via the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence Canal, and the Atlantic to Antwerp, Belgium, and how the adjoining cities along the route will benefit from this world trade.

Under unanimous consent, I include the above-mentioned article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

HERE'S WHAT IT WILL BE LIKE WHEN THE OCEAN COMES TO CHICAGO

(By J. C. Furnas)

To head south from Chicago on Stony Island Avenue (routes 12–20–Alt. 30) looks like and is a good way to start for Terre Haute. It does not look like a good way to start for Antwerp, Belgium. Yet every click of the taxi meter meant I was nearer Europe, for which I was headed—by ship.

That is not a copy error. I was sailing for Belgium—from Chicago. And to do this strange thing I left from Lake Calumet in South Chicago.

The purpose was to get the hang of the much discussed but ill-understood St. Lawrance seaway—perhaps better termed the Lakes-to-the-Sea project. Anyway it is probably a far bigger deal than the Panama Canal. It directly affects 10 of the most populous States in the Union, and indirectly affects them all. It is the best investment Uncle Sam has made since he bought Alaska.

So I boarded the *Prins Casimir*, a trim little Dutch freighter loading at the ship terminal at Lake Calumet, where she was 700 miles from salt water, and about as far above sea level as the tip of the Washington Monument. The *Casimir* had struggleed up there like a spawning salmon, arduously ascending 578 feet through the shallow St. Lawrence River canals to the Lakes, then through Lakes Ontario, Erie, St. Clair, Huron, and Michigan, which adds up to the world's greatest—and most perversely obstructed—fresh-water waterway.

Now, her homeward voyage was to take the same jumps in reverse through 2,000 water-miles of lakes, artificial channels and locked canals to salt water down below Quebec city on the St. Lawrence—a miniature dress rehearsal of the navigation that seaway will offer, only much bigger, better, and faster, when it opens. That will be as soon as the ice goes out in 1959—about April. (Ships drawing more than 21 feet of water won't be able to penetrate beyond Lake Erie until 1960 or 1961; engineers expect to have finished deepening the channels all the way up to Chicago and Duluth by then.)

"What's that smell?" said the cab driver as he stopped at the *Casimir's* gangway. It assuredly wasn't roses. The source was stacks of cowhides that Chicago meatpackers had prepared, but not deodorized, for shipment to Europe via the *Casimir*. Waiting to load were tons of lard and salt pork, and empty beer kegs returning to Munich for refill.

By evening it was all under hatches. At the crack of dawn thick Dutch spattered out of the bullhorn. Up came the gangway, we cast off forward, cast off aft, the tug blatted grumpily and the *Casimir* sailed. The Calumet River has a slight fall, and when the 2,500-ton ship reached Lake Michigan and dropped her tug she had eased a foot or so downward—the first step toward regaining the sea.

The horizon ahead was empty. The first land due north was 200 miles away, where Lake Michigan leans eastward to join Lake Huron via the majestic Mackinac Strait. But we weren't going there yet. Toward evening we made a left into Milwaukee, where we had a date with more hides and pork products, some barreled salt beef and crated automobiles.

Milwaukee's fine new lakefront port smelled as strong of seaway-to-be as it did of hides. The 90-ton crane towering over all, champion dockside weight lifter of the lakes, was once called Brockel's Folly because Harry S. Brockel, Milwaukee's municipal port director and a seaway proponent, insisted in the teeth of ridicule that a crane that size would be needed. The name is now gone, for the crane now muscles away from rival Chicago such heavyweight cargo as a 75-ton steel base for a hydraulic press that recently sailed for France via Milwaukee. Such rivalry for seagoing business is already hot around the lakes. The basic reason was summed up for me by a Milwaukee industrialist. I had asked:

"Why ship stuff from Wisconsin to Europe in vessels that take some 4 weeks? Isn't it faster by rail to the East and by ship from there to Europe?"

It is, he said, a little faster, but more expensive. Other things being equal, water transport is cheaper than land transport. And in this case one of the strikingly equal things is distance. Via the Lakes-St. Lawrence route—which the seaway will open up for ships 3 and 4 times the size of the *Casimir*—many lake ports like Toledo, Detroit, or Buffalo are almost as near to Europe as New York is.

Even Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth, though hundreds of miles farther up the lakes, get much of this advantage and plan to spend millions for facilities to handle increased foreign-flag trade expected after the seaway opens.

Every year since World War II more European ships of the *Casimir's* class have used this route—a sort of pilot-plant operation. Through the Lakes the *Casimir* met a striking variety of competitors: Finns, Germans, Frenchmen, Swedes, Norwegians, Britons. Between April 1955, when ice went out, and November, when it shut off navigation as usual, almost 100 of them plied the Lakes to and from northern Europe, the Mediterranean, North Africa, and the Caribbean, taking over 500,000 tons of cargo through the small St. Lawrence canals. The fact is, this extraordinary seaway is a going concern before it gets built.

With the crated cars carefully stowed in hold No. 2, the *Casimir* headed out between the Milwaukee Harbor jetties with a sunset behind her—next stop Sarnia, Ontario. This leg—all the way up Lake Michigan and down to the southern tip of Lake Huron—was her longest uninterrupted lake run. As cargo offers, however, the salt water lakers readily call at smaller ports like Green Bay or Muskegon. Or just beyond the Mackinac

Strait the *Casimir* could have made a sharp left and asked the great locks of the Sault Ste. Marie Canals to lift her up 23 feet into Lake Superior. Foreign flaggers seldom stray that way now, though some day they may in numbers. But this Lake Superior to salt water passage is the backbone of Canadian zeal for the seaway, hence—as will be seen—the main reason why it is at last getting built.

Our Sarnia cargo was synthetic rubber from the big chemical plants on the river below town. This shallow arrangement of the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and the Detroit River, draining Lake Huron into Lake Erie, dropped us another 6 feet or so toward the sea most painlessly—except for our Canadian pilot, who coped all the way with traffic that, in seagoing terms, looked like Louisville on Derby day.

Detroit loaded the *Casimir* deeper in the water with chemicals, drugs and automobiles. At the next berth a Norwegian ship under French charter was loading baled wiping rags, baled secondhand clothes, old tires for rubber scrap. Here and there down the lakes I saw loading or listed on manifests such varied exports as electric pipe organs, juke boxes, seed corn, calculating machines, farm implements, onion seed, dental supplies, whiskey barrels. And the return flow from Glasgow, Hamburg, Cadiz, Naples—any port within 3,000 miles of the mouth of the St. Lawrence River—was bewildering:

Brandy, baby carriages, baler twine, beans, books. Clocks, cocoa, cheese, cork, carpet. Scotch, starch, saddle soap, straw hats. Poppy seed, plywood, fish, firehose. Hazelnuts, wine, toys, and tea.

Last year a Norwegian vessel got Detroit's annual award for the first salt water ship to nose into the Detroit River after the ice goes out. Her captain growled that he was running a cargo vessel, not a racing yacht—but however he took it, the award shows that Detroit is already serious about this trade. Some $6 million is being spent there privately to enlarge facilities for handling such overseas shipping.

Downbound into Lake Erie the *Casimir* happened to bypass Toledo. But there's talk there of a New York-style port authority, with $20 million worth of improvements to handle new seaway-created business. Such port-authority schemes are now before several midwestern legislatures. Lorain, Ohio, has retained as seaway consultant Dr. N. R. Danielian, the economist who, as propagandist for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, fought for the idea for 20 years. Cleveland is agitating over whether her present expansion plans are adequate or whether the town will need a salt water-style port with thirty-odd feet of water alongside.

Chicago is now digging an efficient barge connection between Lake Calumet and the Mississippi Waterways. Together with the seaway, a local expert asserts, it could make Chicago "a new Rotterdam"—meaning a great port where barges transfer cargo to seagoing ships.

After asking questions in the 7 lake ports that the *Casimir* made and getting letters from most of the others, I'd figure that at least $60 million—much of it private money—is going into readying both American and Canadian facilities for the bigger and more numerous ships due to use the seaway.

As the *Casimir* rode gentle swells at 13 knots across Lake Erie out of Cleveland, land was invisible on one beam and a mere horizon-smudge on the other. Sea gulls patrolled her wake, as they would off Nantucket Shoals.

The water edging northeastward under our keel was headed for the Niagara River. Through this tumultuous outlet the water level drops 325 feet to Lake Ontario through 2 sets of rapids sandwiching Niagara Falls—the most spectacular obstacle between Duluth and the ocean. The ship couldn't go over the falls even if her captain went mad and asked her to try—she would ground in the upper rapids. Instead she must go down as she came up—the slow way, through lock after lock of the great Welland Ship Canal, in its way as good a show as the falls.

In 1932 the Welland superseded a century-old shallow canal with 8 great locks 850 feet long, of 30-foot depth, that can lift or lower a 700-foot lake ship 40 feet at 1 step. From a downbound vessel their massive gates look like the entrance to Babylon in a DeMille movie. Exclusively Canada's achievement, the Welland is actually the upper half of the seaway project, already 20 years in business.

Its prime purpose was to accommodate the incredibly long, narrow grain ships that bring Canada's principal crops through the "Soo" and down Lakes Huron and Erie on the way to Montreal for seagoing export. Until 1932 they had to pull up at the eastern end of Lake Erie and transship to rail or to smaller vessels. The new king-size Welland allows them 300 miles farther through Lake Ontario, where the rapids of the St. Lawrence eventually bar their way. It also stimulated bulk-cargo traffic from Lake Ontario ports like Hamilton, Toronto, Oswego into the upper lakes. Even now the Welland handles better than half as much tonnage as Panama.

Its opening also pulled the plug for foreign ships small enough to squeeze into the obsolete canals by passing the St. Lawrence rapids.

These pioneers were mostly ancient Baltic Sea coasters or White Sea lumber vessels. But the growth of trade soon warranted specially designed ships, like the *Casimir*, with outsize rudders for quick turns in narrow waters, and boxy sterns and bows to get maximum cargoes through the small St. Lawrence canal locks. Summers they work the lakes. Winters they sail from ice-free Halifax or carry olive oil or oranges out of the Mediterranean to northern Europe. Their success has long borne out Canada's insistence that it would pay both her and Uncle Sam to fix it so regular-size freighters can get into and out of the lakes.

Coming out of the northernmost Welland lock, the *Casimir* was a bit more than halfway down to sea level. She crossed Lake Ontario to Toronto to load paper and farm machinery. At Kingston, Ontario, she dropped her lake pilot and picked up a special French-Canadian pilot for the exacting transit of the St. Lawrence canals to follow.

Draining the lakes northeastward toward the sea, the St. Lawrence needs only minor dredging through the Thousand Islands and on past Ogdensburg, N. Y. But some 240 feet of remaining drop to the sea must be made through 100 miles of rapids and wide, deep "lakes." The first utterly unnavigable stretch, the International Rapids, lies between New York State and the Province of Ontario. The second and third, wholly in Canada's Quebec Province, are the Soulanges and Lachine Rapids, the latter ending at Montreal.

Around 1900, Canada built canals on her side of the St. Lawrence, enabling ships drawing less than 14 feet and under 260 feet long to bypass these rapids and enter Lake Ontario. Such dimensions nowadays mean small ships, under 3,000 tons, relatively costly to operate from farther away than the Mediterranean.

Until recently some of these old gates were operated by the archaic combination of a man and a crankhandle. I never tired of watching the *Casimir* negotiate them. She had practically rattled around in the huge Welland locks. But her box-built hull fitted these as a loaf of bread fits its pan; her upper works are slightly concave so she can settle into the deeper locks without jamming. When the seaway opens, its 7 huge, roomy locks will do the job that now requires 21 of shoebox size.

So far seaway had been just a word to the homing *Casimir*. Now the project grew visible. At the lower end of the Cornwall Canal (the International Rapids bypass) we saw over on the American side of the rapids-tortured river a vast skyline of earth embankment and round caissons—the start of a great dam and hydroelectric powerhouse to exploit the 81-foot head of water that will pile up as an adjunct to the navigational project. Half in Canada, half in the States, 32 dynamos here will create a million electric horsepower for New York, a like amount for Ontario—power equal to Grand Coulee's.

And Quebec Province, with ample power so far, is assured that any time she wishes, the comparable head of water downstream in the Soulanges Rapids can be harnessed, too.

After several decades of American reluctance to go along, the navigational part of the seaway is also well started. On her side of the International Rapids, Canada is building a Welland-size dam and lock upstream at Iroquois, Ontario. The United States is building two downstream locks tying in with the powerhouse and revising a channel. Downstream at the Soulanges and Lachine Rapids, Canada will build Welland-scale locks and canals. The 1959 season will see the first 8,000- to 9,000-ton ships entering the lakes from the sea.

That was acted out for me last summer. I returned from Europe on the *Prins Willem van Oranje*, a fast, 7,000-ton cargo liner Dutch-built 2 years ago for eventual use up the lakes. Nowadays her voyage ends at Montreal. But come to seaway, she'll make herself comfortable in 800-foot locks and wide, deep canals leading up into the heart of the continent. Or put it that the seaway will permit four-fifths of the world's merchant ships to come in and out of the lakes at will, with up to 85 percent loads. And larger ships can afford longer voyages—so they will connect Detroit and Chicago directly with Cape Town, Buenos Aires, Callao; with Genoa, Casablanca, and Rouen.

Both nations have the right to duplicate the international rapids locks on their own sides of the line if traffic warrants it. This could be chicken-counting. But then some already predict that Canada will have to invest another $100 million in a second set of locks at the Welland Canal to handle the rush of seaway-born traffic. Oswego, oldest port on the lakes and most seaway-minded, even counts on a traffic jam at the Welland; that city, like Hamilton and Toronto, would be enviably located to handle cargo on the backed-up freighters.

Two years ago, when American refusal to collaborate on the seaway still sounded firm, Canada drew a long, fed-up breath and said very well, she'd build her own. (She left the door politely open for a change of heart that soon occurred.) And Canada would have profited by building it alone. For when her huge grain ships can run all the way from Lake Superior to Montreal—where seagoing vessels await their cargo—then, experts figure, Canadian wheat will cost 3 cents to 5 cents a bushel less on the world market.

So far, Canada is the senior partner, putting in roughly $200 million to our $100 million. Even though Congress has authorized another $110 million to deepen the channel beyond Lake Erie clear up to Chicago and Duluth, Uncle Sam is still getting a bargain.

The reason for American reluctance to join, for more than 20 years, is an open secret. Standing to lose considerable business by it, the great ports of the upper Atlantic seaboard and the railroads that connect them with the Midwest wanted no part of any seaway and said so emphatically in the right quarters. Railroad unions were just as hot about it as management. Canadian railroads and the ports that they feed had the same reaction.

But on both sides of the border the position was vulnerable.

The magic word was "iron ore." War has almost exhausted the high-grade Minnesota ores that steel makers now bring down the Lakes in those procession-long ore ships to Lake Erie and Lake Michigan ports. Steel men are now forced far afield for ore—to West Africa, Brazil, Venezuela—and Canada's Labrador. The first three require long-haul, open-sea transport, and Hitler's submarines taught us the hazards this involves. But—given the seaway—the immense supply of rich Labrador ore can travel submarine-free right into the same Lake Erie ports that now handle the remaining Minnesota ore. The ships too can be the same.

This contrasts sharply with the costly rail-haul required to get foreign ores from Atlantic ports to steel mills west of the Appalachians. That is one reason why United States Steel built its great Fairless plant on the Delaware above Philadelphia. Should more steel mills migrate nearer the salt water ports, it would be very bad news for the Midwest. Labrador ore brought into the Lakes cheaply by seaway would be insurance against such a calamity.

Skillfully jogged by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin, a longstanding proseawayer, Congress last year gave in to enlightened self-interest and passed the Wiley-Dondero bill committing the States to deepwater St. Lawrence canals. Canada and the States then worked out a cordial collaboration.

By 1965, according to American estimates, tonnage transited by the seaway willl be 52 million in a 7-month season. Panama does 38 million in a year. Canadian figures run somewhat smaller but are still huge, and very plausible. The small-time canals already handle over 10 million tons a year. Labrador iron ore can move inland at a rate of 10,500,000. Potential tonnage from Canadian and United States wheat is over 12 million. Cleveland expects that, when larger ships enter the lakes from farther away, bulk items other than iron ore—bauxite, chrome ore, blackstrap molasses for industrial alcohol, residual fuel oils from the Middle East—can come cheaply into the lakes via seaway, strengthening present industry and healthily founding new.

Lewis G. Castle, Duluth banker and longtime proseaway crusader, now head of the United States St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, holds that, with moderate tolls, the whole seaway investment will pay off in 35 years instead of the 50 that the law specifies.

Some details still need solution. Both Canada and the States will have a pretty problem in international law if foreign flaggers tactlessly start moving large cargoes between United States and Canadian ports, a thing so far perfectly legal. Both sides of the border, railroads are still a little wistful, and Montreal can't make up her collective mind whether the seaway will make her a ghost port or a boomtown. But big new things usually mean such hitches.

As a matter of fact, the only specific interests that can never become reconciled to the seaway are those of the barnacles on the hulls of seagoing ships entering the lakes. Biologically committed to salt water, they drop off after only a few days in the lakes. So the ships need costly dry-docking less often. The seaway is bound to be a success when even the crustaceans are cooperating, however unwillingly.

The *Casimir* is more adjustable. She has a built-in answer to approaching competition from her big sisters. She was foresightedly designed for cutting in two just forward of the bridge and the insertion of another hundred feet of so of hull. Come the seaway, she needs only a few months in a shipyard and there she is, back in business as a much larger ship.

The Migrant in Suffolk County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Long Islander, one of the better known weekly newspapers in the United States, has published a series of articles entitled "The Migrant in Suffolk County." I am sure that the problem set forth, as well as the suggested solutions, will be applicable to other areas in this country. Other Long Island weekly papers, in public-spirited and cooperative fashion, have reprinted this treatise.

I am sending this to the Department of Labor for study and comment and propose to introduce corrective legislation in the next session of Congress.

Here is an example where the weekly newspapers in a congressional district set the standard and provide the impetus for better and more effective laws.

THE MIGRANT IN SUFFOLK COUNTY

(By Ruth Schier)

1. THE MIGRANT TODAY

The southern migrant worker is America's most irresponsible, most hard-working, most improvident, most victimized, most destructive, most exploited, most unresponsive, most disenfranchised citizen, according to your point of view.

Of all the people who deal with the migrant worker, none can really figure him out. Some curse him, some like him, some exploit him, some defend him. The migrant turns the same face to them all.

This dark-skinned enigma is the end result of the South's unhappy racial policies. Ignorant, unskilled, and lacking sufficient education to acquire skills, the only work he can do is simple, sometimes back-breaking farmwork. Of necessity, his living conditions are primitive; that's all he can afford. He has no vote, no voice, and little, if any, opportunity to better himself.

He has long since become resigned and adjusted to the life he must lead. It is his way of life: it fits him well enough, and he resents your interference in it.

Labels seem to be the inevitable fate of everyone connected with the southern migrant. Farmers are either enlightened or unenlightened; officials are responsible or disinterested; communities are hostile or cooperative. In theory, it is very easy to be on the side of the migrants. In practice, it takes a great deal of patience and self-control to stay there.

As long as this farmhand stayed down South, he was the South's self-made problem and none of our concern. But as mechanization and industry invaded the South, he was forced to go farther and farther afield to find the only work he knew. His search gave him his present name—the southern migrant—and led him to one of the East's greatest agricultural counties—Suffolk. Like it or not, he's our problem now, for a third of the year.

Like it or not, we are dependent upon this migrant worker for our own prosperity. The same mechanization which drove him into the migrant stream created our need for him. Farms which employ modern agricultural methods, as ours do, require only a skeleton staff to work them until harvest time. But mechanized strawberry pickers, bean pickers, pea pickers, potato pickers, cauliflower pickers—are only beginning to be used. We still need human hands at harvest—hundreds and thousands of hands to pick our truck garden crops, in the production of which Suffolk County still leads. We're lucky to have the southern migrant worker, or our crops would rot in the fields. We have no native labor supply here that could gather our harvests.

Their personalities are not the only mysterious things about these southern migrants. Nobody knows, for instance, exactly how many come into the county each season. They, being Americans, and Suffolk being part of America, no passports are required, nor can they be forced to register. The migrant comes and goes as he pleases.

Coordinated detective work on the part of all the county, State and Federal agencies which come in contact with the migrant during his stay in Suffolk gives us only an informed guess—that between 4,000 and 6,000 migrants come into the county each summer. The Department of Health thinks that estimate too high, the other departments think it too low. At best it is only a guess.

Sometimes the southern migrant comes into Suffolk because he's been asked—that's called recruitment. Other times he comes on his own accord, just hoping and looking for work. That's called "free wheeling." If he's been recruited, it is a crew leader who has usually done it—a crew leader who has a contract to bring up a certain number of migrants for a certain farmer or group of farmers. Once in a while a farmer will do his own recruitment, but this is not often the case.

The crew leaders, who are southern Negroes themselves, do more than just recruit a crew. They transport the crew north, quite often supervise the camps at which crews stay, sometimes transport the workers back and forth from the fields, and under some contracts pay the workers after deducting their own expenses. Some of them are honest, reliable and good managers. Like the Rev. Dorsey at the Pelkowski farm, or Mr. Moore at the Muller farm in Huntington. Others of them are unscrupulous, crooked, exploit their crews viciously, and even manage to gyp the farmers with whom they have contracts.

Transportation north, even with a reliable crew leader, is not a luxury trip. Old, stake-type trucks, fitted out with board benches, are the usual type of vehicle used. There are no overnight stops. Except for short recesses for eating and toileting, it is a through trip. Single men, single women, mothers, fathers and children are all subject to the same transportation.

Free wheelers perhaps, take the trip up a little more easily, but they pay for it by having no place to stay when they get here. They must search out their own quarters, and usually end up squatting in abandoned barns or shacks, with no sanitary facilities and often no water. The health department, whenever it comes upon a group of free wheelers squatting somewhere, must make them vacate the premises, but where are they to go next? The enlightened farmer who takes pity on their plight and offers them shelter in one of his farm buildings or lets them double up in the quarters he has provided for his contracted migrants, quickly becomes an unenlightened farmer in hot water for overcrowding his camps or for harboring workers in buildings unfit for human habitation. The free wheeler, who sometimes amounts to 40 percent of the county's census of migrants (again a guesstimate) is an extremely complicating factor in an already complex picture.

Housing for recruited migrants ranges all the way from good to awful. The enlightened farmer and the large cooperative camp provide the best housing; the unenlightened farmer and the small, unsupervised camps the worst. Groups of people numbering less

than 10 do not come under the migrant camp code and are hard to bring to standard. A new bill, bringing the number down to five was signed this year, but it will take time to enforce it to the point where its effect will be felt.

Each year a certain percentage of the migrants stay on to become guests of the welfare department. The majority are free wheelers. Some stay because they've been hospitalized, at county expense, and cannot go, others because they can't raise enough money to get back, and still others because they're tired of being migrants and want to stay in one place for a change. Almost all have to be on public assistance the first year, and many the second year. If they are the right type, they ultimately find a place in Suffolk's permanent economy, if not, they become a permanent charge. Either way, they are resented by both the local white and Negro populations alike.

Contrary to all popular belief, the health problem these migrants bring with them is not a great one. They are not a source of communicable diseases. Most of their sicknesses arise from malnutrition, or are in the venereal disease category, both of which are confined to their own groups. Their hospitalization is most often due to wounds inflicted upon each other during their frequent and bloody fights.

The fights of troublemakers among the migrants are legendary, and have attracted much newspaper publicity. The favorite weapons are knives, razors and lengths of iron pipe. The results can be pretty spectacular, now and then culminating in murder. Too much liquor on pay-day night or long periods of inactivity when petty annoyances take on mountainous proportions, lie at the base of most of the battles. Hot-tempered troublemakers who appear every so often in a group of otherwise peaceful migrants, are responsible. In some instances the combatants have to be jailed, in others the police, if called in time, can break up a fight and no further action will be necessary. During the peak of the migrant season, our jails are ful and our poice are kept hopping. Some say, however, that migrant crime proportionatey is no greater than that of or regar popation, just more concentrated in certain periods of the year.

But somehow or other, our crops get harvested, the season comes to an end, the migrants leave until the following year, and everyone sighs with relief. If the crops have been good, if the weather has held, if there have been no strikes among the truckers, the migrant has had a chance to make money enough to support himself while he was here and to leave no debts behind him. If his crew leader was honest, if he hasn't fallen prey to the gamblers and procurers and illicit liquor suppliers who lie in wait for him, and if the farmers have paid him decent wages, he might even be able to take some money on to the next job which often does not start immediately due to weather, late crops or current market prices.

His wages come to about $12 a day, depending on the work he does. This means that if the weather holds for an entire week he should be able to earn $72. If there are sufficient crops, and they ripen on time, if the rain holds off, ideally the migrant should make $288 a month.

The ideal is seldom realized. Rain, slow ripening, previous frosts, or droughts all influence the picture. If he's lucky, the migrant can count on 3 working weeks a month, which brings his wages to approximately $216 a month.

That is, if he is paid directly by the farmer. Usually he isn't. The migrant's salary goes through the hands of the crew leader first.

Sometimes those hands take a small, legal percentage, if the crew leader is honest. Otherwise, they take a brutal illegal cut. Often the migrant is anesthetized with cheap wine so that he doesn't even feel the cut, and makes no fuss about it.

The sum a migrant earns after an unscrupulous crew leader gets through doling out his pay is anybody's guess. But at least the migrant pays no income tax.

That the migrant is tax free is not as unfair as it seems. He is also not eligible for social security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation. Minimum-wage laws do not protect him, and traveling around as he does his children see little schooling. Further, being a transient, the migrant has no vote and no voice in affairs, whether they concern him or not.

The migrant is America's outcast—her untouchable. We can leave it like that if we want to, and trust to luck that these people who make our prosperity possible will keep finding their way back to us to get our harvesting done for us. We can trust to luck that they won't ultimately turn against us. Or we can do something about it—and here in Suffolk we've begun to try. We have all kinds of odds against us, and it remains to be seen how much we will accomplish, but it is an exciting story.

2. MIGRANT PERSONALITIES

Migrants were considered a necessary evil by most Suffolk communities in the beginning—probably more evil than necessary. Unfortunately, that opinion is still deep-rooted. Resentful of the squalid quarters used to house most of the migrants, and upset by the constant police action necessary to keep them at peace, the local citizens wanted them out of sight while they were here and moved on as fast as possible once the harvest was over.

The weight of community hostility succeeded in many cases, in discouraging the farmers from building large central camps. It also succeeded in keeping most migrant facilities away from community centers so people could forget them, and where incidentally, they were hard for the Health Department inspectors to find.

This ostrich attitude worked for a while. What you don't see doesn't bother you. The migrants didn't complain.

It was a fool's paradise. Fire put an end to it. When you crowd people into unsuitable quarters with inadequate facilities, tragedy is bound to strike, and it did. Even the most hostile communities can no longer feel complacent when they contemplate the cindered bodies of children who have been trapped in a dwelling away from good water pressure.

Shock changes attitudes—not community attitudes, but individual attitudes. Responsible citizens here and there realized that something had to be done and set about doing it. They tried to find out a little about the migrants, and what they discovered disturbed them deeply. Housing conditions, in many cases, were deplorable. Sanitation was poor. Children were often locked in cars to keep them out of trouble while their parents worked in the fields during the long hot days. During rainy spells the migrants were like caged animals. There was nothing for them to do, and they were too isolated to go anywhere. Many of the people who bothered to look, thought the whole setup seemed more suited to animals than to humans.

The next step, obviously, was to do something about the situation. And that's where the fuming began. Communities maintained that this was a problem which concerned the farmers and packers, and saw no reason to do anything. The farmers, stung by former community hostility, refused to accept this new interest on the part of a few citizens as anything but more criticism; besides, they "knew a little something about migrants that these Johnny-come-latelys had yet to learn." They saw no reason to cooperate, either. As for the migrant, he was completely indifferent to all of it.

But the crusading spirit thrives on obstacles. In Bridgehampton the community council decided that the one place where both community and farmers might be induced to help, was in aiding the migrant children. A board was created to set up a child care center and to bring a chaplain into the Bridgehampton area to work with the migrants.

Migrant child care center

It wasn't easy. Although the State subsidizes such child care enterprises up to 70 percent of the total cost, and helps staff them, there is still the problem of a building, nursery materials, maintenance, and the other 30 percent of the cost.

The collection of three or four thousand dollars becomes colossal labor when people are indifferent or downright hostile, as most of Bridgehampton was. But somehow the committee, chairmanned by Bryan Hamlin, managed to do it. They found a suitable house they could rent, they got donations of labor to fix it up and paint it; they pitched in quite often themselves. In the end they succeeded in establishing the first community-sponsored migrant child care center in New York State, and perhaps in the country.

Only in America could you find such a committee, and only in America could it succeed. Composed of professional men, like Mr. Hamlin and Charles Niles, socially responsible women, like Mrs. Livingston Cromwell; ministers, like the Reverend Mr. Meyer; health workers and farmers, like Vincent Grubb; it has no single common denominator except an uneasy feeling that such things as the migrant problem should not be part of the American scene.

All of its members feel somewhat baffled by the migrants. Some members defend the migrants and fight for them, alibiing them endlessly while others on the same committee feel only scorn and disgust for migrants. Nor does any one on the committee pull his punches while talking with the rest of the members. Half of the committee thinks the rest of it is unenlightened, while the unenlightened part thinks the others are dreamy-eyed do-gooders who have still to face reality. Yet out of this violent divergence of views has come a concerted and successful effort to aid the migrant children in that area, and through the children in time, their parents. The Bridgehampton Child Care Committee is grassroots America at its best—a stimulating and inspiring group.

Another first scored

Bridgehampton itself is beginning to realize this. The committee has been given a permanent house for its center, and the funds are getting a bit easier to collect. Even the migrants, indifferent or suspicious at first, are starting to show a little interest. As many as 54 children a day were cared for last season. A prophet may be without honor for a while in his own home, but Bridgehampton is gaining a countrywide fame because of its community-sponsored child care center.

Shock, uneasy conscience and a feeling of responsibility caused another revolution in Suffolk County, too. In 1952, a group of the county's citizens appeared before the board of supervisors to appeal for a county-sponsored study of the migrant labor problem. The board set up a county migrant labor committee composed of representatives from the departments of welfare, health, police (the sheriff's office) the schools, as well as the agricultural agent, the New York State employment service, the churches and the State assembly.

Another first had been scored. This committee was the first of its kind in the State, and perhaps the first of its kind in the East. If it had never accomplished anything else, its opening meeting served to begin a much

needed clarification of problems to do with overlapping, responsibility, and cooperation among the various agencies dealing with the migrant. A much clearer picture of the county's migrant problem began to emerge.

That wasn't all. This committee, chairmaned by county welfare commissioner J. Milford Kirkup and county health commissioner Dr. Philip J. Rafle, was instrumental in helping to get certain much needed changes in the State laws pertaining to migrants. There is still much to do toward further State reforms, but the committee's major struggle has to be with local complex and never-ending migrant problems.

Ever-present challenge

The most frustrating part of any attempt to solve migrant problems are the migrants themselves. The Suffolk Committee, the Bridgehampton Committee, anyone who has worked with migrants will vouchsafe that. Yet the very problems which seem inherent in the migrant's personality, his attitudes, his way of life, form a challenge which few, having met it, can turn from. Migrants like the rest of us, come in all shapes, sizes, and ages. There's John, a scrawny, grizzled old fellow with a snaggle-toothed grin. He's from Georgia and he's been coming to Suffolk County about four seasons now. He likes it fine. "The work ain't hard, its nice meetin' all these different people and seein' different places." What about his quarters? "Oh, sure, sure, they're all right." John allows as how he'll "be back again, most likely next year."

And then there's Tom, a strapping young man who hails from Florida. "Coulda' had a good job down there with the railroad, but they work you too hard, and its all year round. I ain't goin' to let mahself in for that kind of stuff." Tom is up here for his second summer and he likes it fine, too. What does he do in the winter?" "I just goes home to my mammy an' rests, ma'am. No sense working all the time." "Me married?" He gives you a wide, white smile. "No siree! Who'd want all them responsibilities? Yeah, Ah guess Ah'll be back next summer. Can't never really tell, though."

Eva Lou, an attractive young woman from North Carolina, carrying an 18-months-old son on her hip, doesn't agree with the others. "No, ma'am," she says, in a surprisingly crisp voice, "I ain't never coming back! Not ever! They work you too hard around here! I never worked so hard or so long in my life" She guessed the camp she was staying in was O. K. She thought the child care center from which she had just gotten her baby was all right, too—in fact, she even liked it. But all the same, she'd never come back again. Even in Maryland they didn't work you like this.

Some find it good

Ella comes from Virginia, and it would be hard to guess her age. She is short, round and anywhere between 50 and 70. She wears an imposing straw hat trimmed with daisies and carries an enormous chip on her shoulder. Seems she went with this crew to a farm up Boston way, because the crew leader said the man had lots of work and would pay by the hour. But when they got up there, all he would give them was "piece work." What's more, he deducted for social security, but he "never asked to see my card, ma'am, and I have one, from a job of work I done once in restaurant!" As soon as Ella managed to make enough money, she bought herself a train ticket, and came to Suffolk where she'd heard there was work, and where the pay is better. Ella likes it here all right, too. Like the others, she obviously had never given her living quarters a thought before, and beyond saying they were O. K., she wasn't interested in even talking about them. Whether Ella will come back next year depends on her health. She was in an auto accident last migrant season, she and her husband, and she "don't always feel so good." The need for carrying compensation insurance is only now beginning to be impressed on crew leaders.

Mrs. Gaines is the neat-looking mother of two keen young teen-agers, of whom she is intensely proud. A Junoesque woman, she has set certain standards for herself and her family, and has lived up to them. Aware of her surroundings, whenever possible, she will try to go to the best camps or quarters. She and her family have been coming to Suffolk for several seasons, and will be here again next year. As her sons grow older, she would very much like to do what another family she's heard of have done—made their own contact with a good farmer in East Northport who was so pleased with the way the family worked that he built a nice little house just for them. When his crops are finished, this family goes around to other farmers in the county with different crops, and have arranged things so they can keep working the entire season. Mrs. Gaines and her family are pearls of rare price as is the Clements family in Huntington. Mrs. Gaines comes from Maryland.

And then there's Bill, a troublemaker. He's from Jersey (at least that's what he says) and probably has a police record. He's not likely to go back home again—he'll just stay in the migrant stream, rootless, without possessions following the seasons up and down the coast. He'll see the inside of a number of jails along the way. One would guess he had his origins in the slum area of a large city. It wouldn't be good for him if he told you anything about himself. Bill is shifty-eyed, silent, and would rather you left him alone.

That couple over there—they're living together for the summer, or anyway, this month. She's been flashing her eyes at another young man, lately, and it could lead to a fight, if she's not careful. She's not apt to be. She likes variety. So does he, but unattached girls are in the minority in migrant circles.

Those children we saw at the last camp all have the same mother, but each is the child of a different father. That's not unusual. The latest father doesn't seem to mind and treats them all alike. It's a wise child—and sometimes a wise mother—who knows all the genealogy involved.

And that is a fair sampling of the migrants who come to our county each year. The majority are unattached men, there is a scattering of unattached women, and the rest are family groups. Children make up about 10 percent of the total.

The Gaines and their friends are in the minority, the rest in the majority. But the Gaines hold out promise that perhaps some day all of them can be like that. It's decidedly worth working for. The Gaines themselves are worth working for too. But it isn't the Gaines who make the problems—its all the rest.

The majority of migrant workers are primitive—in their living standards, in their education, in their conduct. Beyond earning enough money to stay alive, their lives are aimless and without meaning. They consider possessions an encumberance, and they are not competitive. The possibility of any change for the better is so remote to them that most of them waste no time thinking about it and no effort trying for it. Anyone who tries to help them toward a change is very apt to be suspected of trying to push them around. What you don't know, you seldom like, and the migrant doesn't know very much.

3. HOUSING AND HOMELIFE

Migrants are brought up and live in 1-room shacks. The 1 room is an all-purpose room. It serves as bedroom, kitchen, dining room, and living room. The migrant bathroom is an outdoor privy or a trench. Water usually comes from a well and stoves where supplied are old-fashioned wood-burning ranges.

The migrant has learned to live fairly efficiently within his limitations. But modern sanitation, as far as he is concerned, has no meaning. Ignorance provides a certain insulation. Even the most deplorable of migrant camps are not too far removed from the kind of living conditions the migrant has been used to all his life. It doesn't occur to him that they should be better, or that he could complain about them.

Furthermore, he's only in them temporarily, they don't belong to him. He is not at all sure he wants the added burden of having to keep up nice quarters. Once his day in the fields is over, he would rather act as though he had come up here for a vacation.

All this makes it only too easy for the farmer to supply the most primitive type of lodging for his temporary migrant help—converted chickenhouses, old barns, rundown outbuildings. When a larger number of workers than usual lands in on the luckless farmer, sardine cans seem spacious compared with some of the migrant quarters, and who cares?

The Suffolk County Health Department cares. Armed with an indifferent camp code, its inspectors went about ferreting out these places and putting them in violation. Farmers began to learn that in order to house 10 or more migrants, they must apply for permits to run camps. And until the health department inspectors checked the camps, the permits were not issued.

The results were not spectacular. In the first place, the sanitary code of the State public health law pertaining to migrant labor camps was vague and generalized in its requirements. In the second place, too many farmers neglected to apply for their permits until their migrant workers had arrived. When this happened the 2 compulsory inspections a month had to be extended to 10 or 12 inspections in the same period to get the more obvious violations fixed. Some farmers never apply for a permit. Although the health department knows they are housing more than 10 migrants. The burden of proof is the health department's—a procedure which can take weeks to accomplish.

A safe water supply, a fit disposal system and adequate housing were the basic objectives.

Progress was slow. Although some farmers learned early in the game that good quarters attracted a better class of migrants, they were usually the large growers who could afford to build decent camps and pay to have them supervised. For the rest, the story was different.

Property destroyed

The epic struggles of the migrant with modern plumbing are a case in point. Some farmers, thinking to improve things, install flush toilets for their migrants. The migrant expects these newfangled devices to be at least as adequate as the old-fashioned privy, down which you can throw almost anything. He refuses to believe that this modern invention cannot manage corn cobs, bottle tops, small boxes, toothpaste tubes, bottles themselves, and all the other things the privy has always swallowed without complaint.

It usually takes an entire season's experience to educate the migrant about the ability of the flush toilet. Meanwhile, the farmer is furious and thinks the migrant is just plain malicious. It doesn't occur to the migrant that he can ask questions about these contraptions, and when the farmer tries to explain their limitations, he doesn't really listen.

It wouldn't be so bad if these were isolated episodes. But the epic of the flush toilets crops up wherever there are migrants

and modern conveniences. And the toilets are the least of the story.

Many farmers who have stretched their budgets to the last penny to build decent camps for their migrants have lived to rue the day. The migrants seem bent on wanton destruction. Walls are bashed in, furniture is chopped up for firewood, no care is taken of anything. The deterioration at the end of the season is often so bad that the farmer must invest as much again in repairs. It does not make him enthusiastic about raising the lot of the migrant.

Nor do such occurrences serve as an inspiring example for the farmer who houses fewer than 10 migrants, or for the unenlightened farmer when he hears of them. It is no good telling the farmer to be patient, or telling him to bear with it for a few years until the migrants become accustomed to better things and learn to live with them decently, because the farmer hasn't enough money to see it through.

What then is the answer?

Cooperative camp

Actually, there are several answers. A better State camp code, more large cooperative camps, more interest on the part of the farmer in his migrants, and a program of education for the migrant.

A better State camp code was achieved last year, through the combined efforts and testimony of the Suffolk County Migrant Labor Committee and the Genesee Area Migrant Committee along with that of several volunteer organizations, before the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Migrant Labor. The word "adequate" has been replaced by precise, definite minimum requirements which give the health department a real chance to force much needed basic improvements in migrant housing. But there is still nothing the department can do for camps housing less than 10 migrants.

Suffolk County already has one large cooperative migrant-labor camp in Cutchogue. This cooperative houses between 300 and 400 migrants. The migrants pay rent for these quarters, and the profits, if any, are plowed back into maintenance and improvement programs.

It takes $30,000 a year to run the Cutchogue Cooperative Camp. Two hundred and ten farmers belong to the cooperative, pay a yearly membership fee and 50 cents a day for each worker they employ from the camp. The migrant pays 35 cents a day rent per person. There are dormitories, family units, and "couple" quarters. Board may be had for $10 a week. The board includes sandwiches taken to the fields for lunch. Breakfast and dinner are served at the Dixie Belle Inn, a camp-run restaurant conducted under the same sanitary regulations as any other restaurant in the county. If the migrant does not go on the weekly board plan, he may buy individual meals or sandwiches and coffee any time he wishes, at reasonable prices. There is also a grocery store which sells canned goods, frozen food, groceries, and beer at prices equivalent to those found in local supermarkets. The family units are equipped with stoves and sinks for preparing and cooking one's own food.

Child care center

The child care center is the adjunct of which this camp is proudest. There, for 25 cents per day per child a parent may leave his children, knowing they will receive lunch and two snacks, and be in the responsible care of trained personnel from 5:30 a. m. until 7:30 p. m., or any part of that time the parent wishes. The child care center will take children from 2 months to 14 years of age. It is equipped to make formulas, sterilize equipment and do everything necessary to take care of the babies as well as the older children.

In September, when the public schools of the county open, the local Cutchogue school district sends a teacher who conducts school for the school-age children from then until the last migrants have left. The attendance runs between 15 and 25. The child care center is run on the same basis as the Bridgehampton one—the State paying 70 percent, the cooperative 30 percent, and the State supplying the trained staff.

This camp, of course, has good supervision. There is a full-time paid supervisor, and George Stelzer, president of the cooperative, spends a great deal of time there. The camp is run in strict adherence to the health department codes, and is well maintained. But even this camp is not a thing of beauty. It started as a temporary camp during World War II and as the cooperative can afford to do so, improvements are added, and it has its troubles.

The lavatory facilities which include hot showers, basins, and washtubs, are constantly being put out of commission, and not even the supervisors, who understand the migrants fairly well, can tell why; fighting breaks out periodically, and the local police must be called. (The camp needs its own police protection, and is trying to arrange with the local force to hire offduty policemen). Doctors are most reluctant to come to the camp or to accept migrants as office patients; adult recreation programs are lacking and an adult education program is needed.

But even with these lacks, the large cooperative camp does a good job—a far better job than the small farmer can hope to do by himself. The farmers realize this, but it is difficult to establish large cooperatives and the various communities where large camps might best be established are usually hostile to the idea.

Employees interest pays off

Lack of supervision in the smaller camps can sometimes be overcome by the substitution of interest on the farmer's part. As the Martin McKastys know, a real interest in one's migrant employees pays off. Formerly located in western Suffolk, but pushed by the encroachments of suburbia to a new location in Yaphank, the McKastys are building a model migrant camp on their new farm.

The McKastys have never had a supervisor in their camp—they found that a real interest in the people who work for them is better. The migrants have responded to that personal interest by becoming excellent workers and responsible citizens. The McKastys have found the whole experiment an exceedingly rewarding experience in human relations. They know their workers so well that they are willing to stand behind them in any trouble that may arise, and the workers appreciate this attitude so deeply that the McKastys have never had their faith betrayed.

Of course, this means an extra expenditure in time, work, tact, and diplomacy on the part of the farmer, but the rewards balance it out. It is hard to convince the "unenlightened" farmer that this is true. After all, there are always migrants who do not react well to any efforts on anyone's part, and if the farmer has had experience with these, he is apt to be deaf to any migrant plea.

The easiest way to protect a housing investment is to have a paid supervisor. Often his salary turns out to be less than the cost of the repairs necessary if he had not been employed.

Some crew leader contracts include camp management, and occasionally the results are good. But ordinarily crew leader supervision leaves something to be desired, and now and then can be worse than having no supervision.

There are unscrupulous farmers, too, who although they use 10 or more workers, register has having only 9, so that they may avoid health department inspection.

The small farmer could divest himself of 98 percent of his migrant housing headaches if he were to work through a cooperative migrant labor camp. The health department's inspection problems would become much simpler, and the inspection could therefore be more effective if we had several more large camps instead of the many scattered small ones. The problem of the "under-10" camps would tend to lessen. Naturally, the creation of such large camps would be of great benefit to the migrants. And our communities would profit, too, since once you have the migrants where you can reach them effectively with the programs they need, you can begin to change them from problem citizens into welcome transients.

Migrants desperately need to be taught how to live, if the housing problem is ever to reach a satisfactory solution. But how to accomplish this is a problem in education in itself.

4. EDUCATION, RECREATION, AND RELIGION

Book learning and the three "Rs" do not comprise the whole, or even the central part of an adult education program for migrants. With migrants, book learning can wait a bit while they learn how to live. Education in sanitation, nutrition, health, are necessary first, before there is even a desire to learn to read.

Some migrants, through fortunate contacts with good farmers, good crew leaders, intelligent supervisors, have already reached the point where mastery of the printed word is their next most desired achievement. But the majority, less fortunate, consider reading an enigma they would prefer to leave unsolved. They must be started with the other things first.

The Suffolk County Migrant Labor Committee early appreciated the crying need for an adult education program for migrants. In fact, until the migrant had been taught how to live decently, they saw little hope for much success with any of the other problems. During the first year of the committee's life, Walter Ormsby, district superintendent of schools, undertook, at the committee's request to start such a program in Suffolk. He suggested an adult education setup for migrants, to be run during the harvest season. To help, Mr. Ormsby obtained the services of two experts on loan from the state department of health, but no schools requested them and the program came to nothing.

The State used to sponsor visiting health clinics which worked with the migrants and did much to educate them in sanitation, nutrition, and health. These clinics have been discontinued and no amount of urging on the part of migrant labor committees, or interested citizens has so far influenced the State to reactivate them. The State does not appreciate that most migrants do not know about the local facilities, have no way of getting to them, and because of their experiences with segregation, are sure they will not be welcome. The reluctance of local doctors to treat migrants further confirms the migrants in this opinion. The visiting State clinics are badly needed, serve a very important purpose, and we should do everything in our power to get them reactivated.

Meanwhile, nothing is being done in Suffolk County about educating the migrant to live decently, except for the limited efforts of three and one-half dedicated, but already overburdened men, the migrant chaplains.

Four of the communities in the county have migrant chaplains, 3 on a full-time basis, and 1 on a part-time basis. They are, Cutchogue, Bridgehampton, Huntington, and Port Jefferson. Migrant education is only one of the myriad responsibilities of these men.

These chaplains find that by starting at the migrant's level, neither treating them like retarded children, which they resent, nor presenting them with a program that is over their heads and consequently bores them, much can be accomplished.

Like children, migrants are apt to resist and resent being taught. Tangible goals,

quick rewards, have to be part of any teaching system if it is to be successful. Incentives in the shape of awards for better housekeeping and cooking bring good response. Family groups are the quickest to respond because they have built-in goals in the shape of their children, for whom, like all of us, they want a better chance.

But three and one-half chaplains can do just so much. Although what they accomplish in migrant education is important, compared to the need it is tragically, ridiculously small. But the interest and the response the chaplains have gotten whenever they have been able to do something, proves that a large program, intelligently managed and presented could really be expected to raise the level of the emigrants' living habits.

Children can often change the living habits of their parents by bringing home ideas learned in school. Education for migrant children has always been available in Suffolk during the regular school year. But this is a long process, and with migrants, a slow one, since they are with us only 2 or at the most 3 months of our fall term. And the teaching of such children carries many problems.

Most of the migrant children have had snatches of education, but it has usually been too little and too varied to keep them abreast of their age-level. The difficulties of putting a 12-year-old with a second grade education in the sixth grade and then of trying to help him forward without penalizing the rest of the class are somewhat staggering. It is a frsutrating experience, too, because just as a good plan has been worked out and the migrant child is beginning to progress, it is time for him to move on southward for the next crop. But the schools do the best they can, and sometimes that best is very good indeed. Each school has its own methods—Bridgehampton, for instance, finds that remedial reading work for migrant children, with a special remedial instructor, helps considerably.

The best answer to the problem seems to be at the large cooperative camp in Cutchogue. There, the East Cutchogue school district sends a teacher and school equipment directly to the camp, where regular classes are held throughout the school term for as long as there are any migrant children to attend. Since the parents of these children work for farmers in several districts, a permissive bill was passed in Albany recently, allowing those districts to help defray the costs in the East Cutchogue district.

This class, which has been running now for 6 or 8 years, has proved most satisfactory. The teacher can work with each child at his own level, much as the teachers in the old-fashioned one-room schoolhouses used to do. Progress is better and sounder.

Either way it is done, the school districts have little trouble rounding up migrant students. They are usually only too willing to come. Those few whom the schools have to search out stay home only because of the lack of proper clothing. Migrant parents are desperately eager for their children to get some "learning" so that their futures will not be bound by the same ignorance which has dogged the lives of the parents.

Some of the migrant children turn out to be good students, others do not. It depends on the individual, much as it does with the local school population. But the migrant children are always working under a handicap.

Here again the migrant chaplains come into the picture. During the summer they hold classes wherever possible to help supplement the sketchy educational background these children must struggle with. But once more, there are not enough chaplains, nor do these few have sufficient time to accomplish one-tenth of what there is to do.

Special summer school

Federal aid to education could well include, in counties such as ours, the underwriting of a summer school for migrant children. It would be one good way for America to insure that the migrant in his present character of the American "untouchable" does not reproduce himself. But such programs will take a great deal of citizen pressure to bring about. Meanwhile, we might consider doing something on a local level about summer schools for migrant children. More chaplains and volunteers to help them would be one way of doing it.

Family groups are the most responsive to education programs. But they account for only about 30 percent of our migrant population. The majority of our migrant workers are unattached men. They are, on the whole, completely lacking in incentive, aimless, irresponsible and unresponsive. What's more, they are the source of most of the trouble involving the police and subsequent court proceedings. How do we reach them?

There is a way, and it works, when it is tried. It is through recreation.

Recreation and religion

The Devil gets excellent cooperation in Suffolk County finding idle migrant hands for his tasks. We have gone out of our way to make the job easy for him.

Our migrants are stuck off in the woods, away from community centers, sometimes through necessity, and sometimes because we insist upon it. Once we've got them there, they are "out of sight, out of mind." We forget that when the working week is over, or when the rains pour down, or the crops are slow to ripen, there is nothing but empty time for the migrant. He has nothing to do, nowhere to go and usually no way to get there.

Other people don't forget. Illicit liquor dealers, unscrupulous crew leaders, gamblers, procurers, seek out just this kind of situation. They are only too glad to provide the migrants with recreational outlets; it is a very profitable business.

It is costly for the migrant, but life is so aimless, any kind of fun is better than none at all. Besides taking the migrant's entire salary, this sort of recreation quite often lands him in jail; it sometimes gets him badly hurt, and at the very least leaves him with such a gigantic hangover he loses 2 or 3 days' work trying to recover. But it is something for him to do.

All of which we deplore. We resent having to spend money on jailing the migrant, on patching his wounds, on prosecuting him in our courts. We resent watching the crops rot while he recovers from his hangovers. We resent the debts he incurs and runs away from. We resent the migrant's attracting undesirable vice rings into the county to exploit him. We become even less sympathetic to the migrant than we were (if we were) before.

Our attitudes may be righteous, but they don't accomplish anything.

Our communities must be at least as enterprising as the vice rings if we want the migrants to turn to acceptable, beneficial means of recreation. The vice rings accept the migrant's isolation and seek him out. So must the community.

The migrant chaplains again can be our starting point. Intercamp softball games, horseshoe tournaments, table games, swimming, movies—all these and more the chaplain can bring to the migrants if the community will back him with help, area, and equipment.

Community aid

Where do these chaplains come from and how do they get here? The National Council of Churches trains them and supervises their work. If a community wants a chaplain, it must raise the money to pay his salary, either through a group of churches banding together and/or a group of civil organizations which are interested in the problem helping out. The chaplains can work best and accomplish the most if they are backed by an active community committee which will help with plans, equipment, and volunteer aid when it is needed.

The people involved in the Migrant Mission of the National Council of Churches are not theorists. The Reverend Austin Armistead, who heads the work in Suffolk, for instance, has lived with migrants, traveled with them, and worked beside them. These people know more about the actual character and problems of the migrant than almost anyone else. They have had sufficient disappointment and failure to know all the incorrect ways of approaching the migrant, and they have had sufficient good results and successes to know that their is great hope for these "untouchables," when approached correctly.

Religion is, of course, the first duty of the migrant chaplain, and one of his greatest aids in elevating the basic level of the workers. Wherever people worship together in groups there arises an indefinable, but nevertheless very strong pressure on the individual to conform to certain standards of decent behavior. The migrant needs that particular pressure mare than most, since, not being a member of a permanent community he has not even the usual community pressures which inspire the rest of us to keep our standards up. He is like a man at a convention—among people he will see only briefly, who don't know him or care about what he does, and who, because they are in the same situation, have relaxed their own standards as well. But unlike the man at the convention the migrant's time in such circumstances is not brief—it comprises almost his entire life.

Unfortunately, the migrant, who needs the elevating forces and pressures of religion so much, has less of it than any other group in the country. Here in Suffolk his situation is no different.

We have three and one-half chaplains for an estimated 6,000 migrants and these chaplains work only in the areas which have asked for them and support them. This leaves a great many migrants without even the services of a chaplain.

Besides his religious, educational and recreational work, the migrant chaplain gives aid and advice when the migrant falls afoul of the law, does a great deal of what might best be called social service work for the migrant, and is one of the main channels of communication between the migrant and the community.

The communities in the county which have chaplains and work with them have succeeded in accomplishing a number of favorable things. Cutchogue has contrived to give its migrants swimming privileges. In Huntington, the Kiwanis "Man of the Year" award for 1955 went to Helen Gray Smith whose leadership has both secured a chaplain for the area and opened the vacation church schools to migrant children. Between 40 and 50 migrant children attend these classes, their transportation being provided by volunteers from all the local churches. The children are taken on picnics and parties too, as part of this local program.

A scholarship to a Methodist training camp on Shelter Island given to a boy in a migrant camp so affected him that he returned to his migrant camp and changed its whole way of life to something amazingly better than it had ever known before. Last year, out of its slender funds, the Suffolk County Council of Churches sent four migrant boys and girls to summer camps for a week each.

The migrant picture is far from hopeless if the right help is given, and the migrant chaplains know how to give it. Suffolk County needs 8 or 9 of these chaplains if it is to make a real dent in its migrant problems, but to date, as we have said, it has only 3½. Most of our communities have been lax. Why?

Possibly because few, if any, of our communities realize exactly what an impact the migrant has on their economic lives. Hostility to the migrant as he is blinds them to the financial asset he could be were his way of living to be lifted. When you talk of migrants in Suffolk County, you talk in millions of dollars.

5. THE ECONOMIES AND POSSIBLE SOLUTION OF THE MIGRANT PROBLEM

Migrant workers earn approximately $3 million a season in Suffolk County during a poor year, and over $4 million in a good year. The major part of it is spent where it is earned. Even in a poor year it is not a sum to be sneered at.

Yet we have been sneering at it. We have paid so little attention to the people who earned it that the vice rings have been able to skim off a good third of it every season. Nor do the vice rings and sharp operators spend it in Suffolk. They take it out quickly. It is money lost to Suffolk and Suffolk's merchants. And a portion of what the vice rings take is usually already owed to Suffolk merchants, and migrants being what they are, is never paid.

Nor does it end there. Besides losing a million or more dollars each season, our police, court procedures, hospitalization, and welfare costs keep rising because of the results of that loss. Our hostility and indifference has actually caused us to pay money for the privilege of losing money.

The best working, best earning groups among migrants are the family groups. They are also the most impervious to the vice rings. It is to the advantage of both the farmer and the community that we attract more of them and fewer of the unattached men. Yet just the opposite is happening.

In some areas where there are no large camps, the schools report very marked drops in the number of migrant children. The family groups, discouraged by the deplorable conditions under which they are expected to live, and by the utter indifference of the farmer and the community to those conditions, are going elsewhere, to other counties, hoping to find something better.

But we have to have harvest hands. The number that we need is still on the increase, because of our ever-increasing mechanization and ever-improving agricultural methods. In certain parts of our county we are slowly but surely losing the migrants who would have responded to any efforts we made to help them become better citizens, and getting in their place people with whom it is less and less easy to work. By not facing up to our migrant problems now, we are laying up a much greater store of trouble for ourselves than we have had before, and are laying the groundwork for a much greater loss of money, too.

Most of us knew vaguely that there were migrants. But none of us suspected that there were at least 6,000 of them each season. Most of us knew vaguely that migrant labor was necessary to the farmer. But few of us realized what a dominant role in our economy our farms played, and few of us knew how potent the economic impact of the migrant was on us. None of us realized how much money was slipping through our fingers each season merely because we were ignoring our migrants.

True enough, small groups of citizens here and there throughout the county have been long aware that we had a problem and that it was a serious one, but the majority of Suffolk's communities were inclined to look upon them as alarmists or do-gooders out looking for a cause.

The truth is that the problem is far too large to be overcome by just a few, no matter how devoted they may be. Even a group of trained professional people who know the dimensions of the problem, like the Suffolk County Committee on Migrant Labor, have accomplished very little.

Like Topsy, the migrant labor problem has "just growed" to such a size that it will take the support of everyone of the county's citizens and the wholehearted efforts of every one of its communities to solve it satisfactorily. How can we do it best?

Finding the key log in a logjam is simplicity itself compared to finding the solution to the migrant problem. The migrant problem is more like a tangled skein in which any thread you start with is bound to cross, criss-cross, and loop around any number of other threads.

Any thread you begin unraveling at a local level will cross other local threads, and eventually lead into a tangle of State and Federal threads. But not much will be done with the State and Federal knots until the local threads are clear enough to convey a good pull to them.

Housing, education, and recreation for migrants are three problems which can be attacked most effectively on the local level.

Large, cooperative camps provide one of the best means for forwarding the solutions to all three categories. If and when more of these large cooperatives are built, the county could contribute a certain percentage to their expense, in order to guarantee extra facilities for the "freewheelers." Then when they are found and it is necessary to evict them from their squattings, there will be definite places to which they may be sent.

The communities which have migrant chaplains have also the beginnings of a solution to the education and recreation problems. But it is only a beginning.

On the education front, if all the school districts in any one area were to underwrite the cost of equipment and personnel for an adult migrant education program, the cost to each school district would be minute. Such programs could be initiated under the guidance of the Migrant Mission and its chaplains, who know the correct approaches, or under the guidance of the Suffolk County Committee on Migrant Labor, who can once more obtain the help of the State experts.

Recretation can best be handled on a volunteer level in those communities which have migrant chaplains. The local sports organizations, the local "Y's" all should be mobilized behind the migrant chaplain to help create good migrant recreation programs. Civic groups and church groups could help underwrite the cost of sports equipment and the rental of recreational movies. In the communities where there is no migrant chaplains, and no prospect of getting one, guidance for any migrant program should be obtained from the Suffolk County Migrant Labor Committee. No volunteer group should try to do anything without first seeking the advice of people who are skilled in such work, because working with migrants requires a great deal of know-how to be effective.

Stay-overs and shrinking farms

The migrants who stay over each year are usually not the sort of citizens we want. Both the colored and white citizens of Suffolk resent them. Yet each year more stay. In western Suffolk, diversification of crops, necessitated by shrinking farm acreage, is keeping the migrant in the area for longer and longer periods, until it becomes useless for him to return home or go back into the migrant stream for the short period of the year that is left. Lt. Wilbur Morrell, of the Huntington police force, has been engaged in a diligent effort to find these people suitable year-round dwellings, but there is little available housing for them, and no section where they are wanted. Even though some of them have year-round employment and are responsible people, until the whole migrant living level is raised, this difficulty will remain.

In other sections of the county these "stay-overs" are primarily from the "free-wheeler" category, possibly the least suited to become good citizens.

The problem of the crew leader is difficult to attack at the local level, except through bettering conditions for all migrants, so that eventually his crookedness, when he is crooked, can find little outlet, and it will pay him to behave. Meanwhile, if the county's farmers would get behind their county's migrant labor committee, much could be accomplished on the State level in the form of crew leader controls. Wherever possible, farmers should endeavor to pay their migrants directly, as this eliminates much of the crew leader's hold over his crews.

If farmers continue their indifference to migrants, they will find it exceedingly expensive. Unionization is looming on the horizon. Those farmers who insist on remaining either unenlightened or inimical toward their migrants will find themselves the victims of a movement they are not financially equipped to face. Further, they will have victimized the many enlightened farmers in the county who try to work out their migrant problems.

But even enlightened farmers cannot get very far without the active cooperation of the rest of Suffolk's citizens. Our apathy and indifference is slowly but steadily taking the heart out of even our most devoted workers.

Rousing ourselves to take action will not be hard if we remember that our apathy is endangering our greatest source of income—our agriculture; that it is causing our businessmen to lose out on literally millions of dollars in trade each season; that it is steadily increasing our taxes.

And lastly, it will not be hard, because any American worth his salt cannot stand aside from such problems as these surrounding our migrant American untouchables and let them compound themselves. We've made a beginning, here in Suffolk. Let's not waste it. Let's see it through to an excellent end.

Bad News for NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. Ludwell Denny which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Monday, July 23, 1956, in which Mr. Denny reports that a "further disastrous decline in the West's defense against increasing Soviet military power will be reported at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization" which is being held in Paris tomorrow, Wednesday, July 24:

BAD NEWS FOR NATO
(By Ludwell Denny)

PARIS, July 23.—Though it will not be admitted publicly, a further disastrous decline

of the West's defense against increasing Soviet military power will be reported at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization here Wednesday.

There is no longer even an attempt to keep national pledges to NATO, to provide adequate conscription or increase expenditures for closing the widening gap between NATO and Soviet strengths.

The trend is all the other way—fewer men on the West's line of reserve, less money, less interest, less effort. The latest alibi used by the politicians to cover up their failure is that conventional arms are outdated by the atomic age.

It's true allied military experts are struggling with the difficult problem of modernizing defense as Russia has modernized her offensive weapons and strategy. But the new weapons cost more, and require longer conscription and training.

Moreover, during the transitional period, and probably permanently, both conventional and atomic preparedness are needed—according to which kind of aggressor uses and where. So the new situation, instead of requiring less effort, calls for more.

Actual causes of the continuing disintegration of NATO are different from the technical military problem the Allied politicians use for an alibi. Chief causes are:

Voters in Allied countries want to rob defense for other things, and most politicians lack the courage to stand up against the popular trend. In Western Europe and Britain, voters prefer welfare-state benefits to protection against Soviet aggression. In Germany voters prefer that Americans and Britons be conscripted for German defense, rather than German rearmament. In the United States many prefer more luxuries to more security.

Allied governments put national policies above NATO, and the Washington administration in an election year dissipates its NATO influence by evasion. The British-Greek dispute over Cyprus has destroyed NATO in the eastern Mediterranean, as France's withdrawal of NATO troops for North Africa has left a great gap in the western defense line. Britain and France deny NATO any vote in mediating or settling these struggles which are wrecking collective security. Washington supports France against Algeria and straddles the Cyprus issue. But the United States in neither case insists on NATO's right to intervene for its own survival.

Allied politicians perpetuate the myth "peaceful coexistence." Either Soviet military might is a menace to the free world or it is not. If it is a menace than a strong NATO is a necessity, justifying as much sacrifice of European welfare-state benefits and American luxuries as democratic security is worth. If it is not a menace, than NATO is needless.

Allied politicians have tried to have it both ways. As between "peaceful coexistence" and NATO, naturally people prefer the pleasant thought that the "atomic stalemate has outlawed war," and think preparedness is a painful gyp.

So Allied politicians—having pandered to Soviet lies that destroy the democracies will to defense, end up with a weak NATO which is worse than none.

Now they are getting scared of the results. They want to save NATO. But they almost have lost control. People no longer listen to their timid warnings that preparedness is still necessary as long as Russia refuses international enforcement of disarmament.

It is up to the United States. Without American leadership there would be no NATO. Now only American leadership can save it. It may be too late. But it is worth trying.

The Dominican Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that this year larger numbers of United States citizens than ever in history will discover for themselves the charm and beauty of the Dominican Republic, that small country to the south of us which was our loyal ally in war and has proved a cooperative and undemanding friend in peace.

I would like to take this opportunity to applaud the courage and resourcefulness of our neighbors in the Dominican Republic. Few nations in the world have put the past 26 years to such phenomenal use. Today visitors may observe how Ciudad Trujillo, the capital city, combines the clean lines of modern architecture in its public edifices with the Spanish style of its beautiful old buildings, many of which have no earlier counterparts in the Western Hemisphere. But they will see no traces of the desolation which swept this small nation in the year 1930, and without some knowledge of the problems our good neighbors confronted and solved, we have no measure of the vastness of their achievements.

In 1930 a tropical hurricane laid waste to the country only 2 weeks after Gen. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo took office. In addition to the burden of a country which had neither a central sewerage system nor a satisfactory water distribution, he was faced with responsibility for a population which appeared destined to fall prey to plague, physical starvation, and even greater deprivation of the spirit—hopelessness and ignorance. At that time, for the ordinary citizen, educational opportunities were almost entirely nonexistent.

In 1956—the Dominican Republic through Government-sponsored programs has cleared land for agriculture, established huge irrigation projects, and puts a large percentage of national agricultural resources to gainful use. From a bare subsistence level Dominican enterprise now feeds its people well and exports large quantities of many foods.

Industry is organized in an attempt to use domestic materials in products for local consumption; foreign and public debt has been eliminated and the currency of the country is on a par with the dollar.

Advances in the economic life and agriculture of the Republic have been matched by similar advances in the fields of education, government and culture. Compulsory education is in effect. Modern hospitals are now staffed with professional people, many of them educated entirely in Dominican schools—such as for example the University of Santo Domingo, a university which has a rich tradition dating to the year 1538.

Housing projects flourish as does a magnificent palace of fine arts. Dominican citizens have a social security system. Of particular interest to me, as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, is the fact that in 1947 the Dominican Republic outlawed the Communist Party. Recognizing communism to be the greatest problem confronting the free world, the Dominicans share our concern over the Red menace and have maintained a policy of continuing vigilance.

The soundness of the program of reforms initiated and carried through under the tireless resourcefulness of Generalissimo Trujillo may be measured qualitatively in the soundness of his country's economy. Looking back over the history of the past 26 years in the Dominican Republic we sense a quality at work which might be called a sort of starch in the moral fiber of a nation. It is this quality which helped our forefathers turn a wilderness into the United States of America, and which has in turn helped the small Republic to our south turn from the brink of national disaster to build a new way of life.

Experience Counts in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Madison Courier of July 20, 1956:

EXPERIENCE COUNTS IN CONGRESS

As the 84th Congress nears the finish line, it is shocking to note the veterans who are voluntarily retiring to private businesses and professions.

This is not only a great loss to the constituents of their respective districts, but likewise a loss to our Nation, for these men have built up vast stores of experience and legislative know-how which can only be acquired through long years of congressional service. They have served through the most trying years of our Nation's history and have learned to be understanding, tolerant, and patient—attributes which come only with long devotion to duty.

In the Senate our Nation and the free world are losing the services of WALTER F. GEORGE; and the House is losing the services, via voluntary retirement, of DICK RICHARDS, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; CLIFF HOPE, past chairman and ranking member on Agriculture; JESSE WOLCOTT, past chairman and ranking member on Banking and Currency; GEORGE DONDERO, past chairman and ranking member on Public Works; and a dozen others whose experience adds up to more than 200 years of service.

If we compare a year of service to a rung on a ladder, it takes about 24 rungs to elevate one to a chairmanship, which makes him all powerful in the congressional legislative body. One has to begin his legislative career early in life and remain at it continuously

in order to climb that ladder toward the powerful position of chairmanship.

We of the Ninth Congressional District are fortunate in having Congressman EARL WILSON, still a comparatively young man. He became a Member of Congress at the age of 34 and now has 16 years of seniority on the powerful Committee on Appropriations.

Congressman WILSON not only has more seniority in Congress for his age than any other Member, but he has more seniority on the Committee on Appropriations for his age than any other member of that committee. In fact, those outranking Mr. WILSON on the committee are from 6 to 30 years older than he.

Perhaps someday we may have a chairman of the Committee on Appropriations from our own Ninth Congressional District of Indiana. Anyway, Congressman WILSON has hung onto his committee position and climbed the ladder of seniority and is now approaching the 17th and 18th rungs. He is well on his way toward the chairmanship of that great committee.

Over the past 2 years we in the Ohio River Valley have had many occasions to notice the importance of experience and seniority in Congress.

Why Are Airline Passengers Not Provided With Parachutes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Mr. C. J. Lowen, in which he explains the reasons why CAA does not make it mandatory for commercial airlines to provide parachutes for their passengers:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 20, 1956.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: This will acknowledge your letter dated July 6, 1956, and enclosed newspaper clipping regarding the use of parachutes in air carrier operations. In accordance with your request, the newspaper clipping is returned.

The Civil Air Regulations, which are promulgated by the Civil Aeronautics Board, do not require the use of parachutes other than during aerobatic flight. The use of parachutes has, in the past, been a matter of consideration by both the air carrier industry and government agencies. In principle, their use might seem to be highly desirable. However, there is almost a unanimous opinion that they would be impracticable. The principal factors, to prove this point, are the character of most airline accidents and the rapidly changing design of modern transport aircraft.

An analysis of past air carrier accidents discloses that, with very few exceptions, there is no advance warning in these accidents which would provide crew members with the opportunity of carrying out the evacuation and abandonment of an aircraft. If the pilot is aware of a difficulty or malfunctioning, he could conceivably have time to make the necessary operational adjustments to avoid an accident. Therefore, the crisis that might necessitate the parachuting of passengers could possibly be avoided.

In almost all airline accidents there was either no advance warning of the accident or conditions were such that they would not have permitted parachuting. This would apply in those cases where aircraft struck mountains or those which occurred at altitudes too low for parachuting such as in takeoff or landing. Even in those accidents where the aircraft was known to be at sufficient altitude, the circumstances under which descent was effected could prevent successful exit from the airplane; for example, a steep power dive or a violent, uncontrolled descent. Another obstacle to the use of parachutes in air carrier operations is the matter of passenger discipline. As you know, air carrier passengers vary from infants in arms to elderly persons. Obviously, it would be highly undesirable and dangerous to subject these people to the rigors of parachuting which in general requires highly trained specialists who meet rigid physical standards such as those required by the military services. In addition, panic could readily occur for a number of reasons, not the least of these being the inheretn fear of the human being to step off into space. Also, the rapidly increasing speeds of modern transport aircraft and the high altitudes at which they generally operate are factors to be considered. There are many dangers inherent in parachuting from an aircraft flying at high speeds. The modern transport aircraft speed of 250 to 350 miles per hour would, in itself, preclude the possibility of safe parachuting. Furthermore, high altitude egress from pressurized cabins presents complicated problems of survival. For example, the cabin would have to be depressurized and there would, of course, then be the question of survival in the rarefied atmosphere.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated. If we can be of any further assistance in this or other civil aviation matters, please advise.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. LOWEN,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

The Shortage of Scientists and Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Subcommittee on Special Investigations of the House Committee on Armed Services, of which subcommittee I have the honor to be ranking minority member, issued a report on its very thorough investigation of "Aircraft Production Costs and Profits."

In that report there is a section which discusses the shortage of scientists and engineers. In that connection I wish to call attention to the very interesting discussion which is germane to the subject in the commencement address delivered by Mr. Neil McElroy, president of the Procter & Gamble Co., at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on June 8, 1956:

DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP IN AMERICA THROUGH EDUCATION

(By Neil McElroy)

You do me great honor in inviting me to attend this commencement and to speak on this occasion.

A commencement exercise is a stimulating event at any school in America; but being here today is especially inspiring to me. Along with millions of other Americans, I have, for many years, been a warm admirer of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. I am aware of the immense prestige enjoyed by this university thorughout the world, and the contribution it and its graduates are making.

Moreover, I must mention my affection and deep respect for your distinguished president. It has been my privilege to work closely with Dr. Killian in the activities of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education. Dr. Killian, as I am sure you know, made invaluable contributions to the work of that body. The group which he headed in a study of the question "What Should Our Schools Accomplish?", returned a report that may well do more to shape the objectives of our elementary and secondary schools than any other document of our times.

In that report, Dr. Killian's Committee made these observations: "America deserves and can achieve increasingly better schools. * * * Educational programs which fully exercise and develop the abilities of especially brilliant students must be maintained. * * * Increasing stress must be placed on meeting the challenges of those students who have the capacity for the greatest intellectual growth."

These thoughts are shared by a great many educators, and by many of us who are not educators, and certainly they are reflected at this institution in the emphasis you place upon the quality of the individual intellect.

EDUCATION MUST DEVELOP FULL CAPABILITIES OF ALL OF OUR PEOPLE

The concept of developing individual capacities through education has been important throughtout our history in America. And from the standpoint of providing a basic education for all citizens, we have put this concept into practice with unrivalled success. But we face today a crucial responsibility to do much more. Today we must make certain that we are utilizing to the full the capabilities of all of our people.

It is about this need for giving our youth full opportunity to achieve their optimum intellectual growth, and for recognizing and developing those of our young people who have special talents and aptitudes that I should like to talk to you briefly this morning. I should like to suggest why this is so vitally essential, to point out the problems involved, and to consider means of their solution.

As to why so essential, let us note the great challenge confronting us as a people—the challenge of competition on a world front. Civilization has always been competitive. Competition seems to be the very nature of man and his society. Nations strive against nations—not only in wars, but in commerce, in industry, in culture, and other fields of human endeavor. And if we are realistic, we must recognize that the very survival of individual nations as strong and independent societies has depended upon the success or failure with which they have met this test.

Today this vital competition is more clearly defined, and is taking place on a far broader scale. We hear much of the race between the free world and the world of communism for supremacy in the development of colossal devices of destruction. And this, however awesome it may be, is a rivalry that commands our utmost attention.

But there are other kinds of competition which exist in the world because the world is not only competitive but it is also stirring with a great hope that the knowledge that can destroy can also bring benefits and richer lives to all mankind.

To realize these aspirations involves leadership not only in science but also of a more

general nature—leadership in the quality of thinking and vision; leadership in finding the solutions to social and political problems; leadership in inspiring the confidence of others.

Much of the world today rests in an uneasy balance, uncertain which way to cast its lot. Let us make no mistake of the fact that great decisions will turn upon the caliber of leadership we offer on the one hand, and communism offers on the other.

We must realize that, in this international competition, we do not have numbers on our side. In sheer mass of humanity, we are heavily outweighed. We have a much smaller reservoir from which to develop our intellectual sinews and leadership, and certainly we must depend upon something more than the volume of arms, legs, and backs we can throw into the myriad tasks of building our strength.

IN ORDER TO DEVELOP THE TALENTS OF ALL WE MUST LOOK TO OUR SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

This being true, nothing becomes more critical to us than our ability to take full advantage of the potentials for strength we do have on our side. These potentials, first and foremost, rest in the talents of our people. The challenge of the century, then, comes to focus upon what we can accomplish toward maximum development of the latent talents and abilities of the young men and women of America. And inevitably, this problem will devolve in major part upon our performance in the field of education. Herein lies the key source of our strength.

Our beginning must be the provision of full precollege educational opportunities for all of our children. This is no small assignment. Our school population is increasing at a record rate. Generally, it is estimated that our primary and secondary school systems will need as many as half a million additional classrooms—and the teachers for them—by 1960. Today, with the impact of our increasing population only partially felt, too many of our children are in ill-lighted, crowded, substandard classrooms. Many of our good teachers are overworked; too few of the balance are qualified to teach and guide their pupils. It is imperative, if our schools are to remain the bedrock of our strength, that we do everything possible to provide all the facilities and able teachers necessary to give all our children an adequate primary and secondary education.

NEED FOR SOUND GENERAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR THOSE STUDENTS WHO DO NOT GO BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL

Some young people will, and should, find secondary schooling to be the terminal of their educational development. With completion of their high-school studies they will be equipped to take on an important place in our economy and our civic life. Those with good vocational training will be needed in growing numbers to meet the requirements of our rapidly expanding mechanization of industry. To serve our rising population and to gain higher standards of living, we must keep our national productivity on an upward trend. This we are doing through advances in technology that amount to a virtual new industrial revolution. Keeping pace with this revolution, building its highly complex machines, and maintaining and operating them will call for workmen and technicians trained at new levels in new fields and new skills. These will be vital jobs—rewarding and satisfying jobs—to be filled by the young people coming from our vocational schools across America.

Of course, the greater number of those who terminate their formal education with high school will receive high-school educations of a general liberal arts nature. With this background they will be prepared to make important contributions in a wide variety of other occupational fields. Moreover, all the graduates of our secondary schools should have an understanding of our economy, our Government, our history, and our traditions as a people that will equip them well for better citizenship and better living. They will have reason to look ahead eagerly to their part in the progress of their community and their Nation.

At present, some 80 percent of all our secondary-school students end their formal education with their high-school diplomas. This percentage is too high. Not all of these students, by any means, should stop at this point. Many are youngsters of outstanding capability—youngsters whose contribution to our society would be greatly enhanced by extending their education past the high school.

WE MUST SEARCH OUT AND FIND MORE OF OUR GIFTED STUDENTS EARLY IN HIGH SCHOOL

We might expect to find that practically all high-school graduates who rank among the top 25 percent of their class would be going on to college. The fact is that 1 out of every 3 in this top-ranking group is failing to go further. Additionally, there are many others below this top 25 percent whose latent talents for leadership are being lost because we do not discover them and motivate them to go on to higher education.

Obviously we need to do much more toward finding our gifted young Americans and measuring their aptitudes for future leaderships while they are in the secondary schools. Here is the place to give individual preparation, guidance, and encouragement to all those having special capabilities for higher education.

This process cannot wait until they are ready for college entrance. It must take place while there is still opportunity for each student to pursue the preliminary courses and activities that will best prepare him for successful college work.

In this effort, however, a serious problem arises. There is not as yet a proven method by which high-potential students may be singled out early and their aptitudes measured with any great degree of accuracy.

When can the budding scientist first be detected, when the individual with unusual analytical powers, or judicial faculties, or administrative abilities? What, if anything, can be done to guide these talents and to motivate the individual so that he may channel them to his best advantage in later life?

The answers to these questions are not simple ones. We cannot yet put calipers against the human mind. We must nevertheless develop better ways to find and measure aptitudes before our students leave the secondary schools. We must work toward the best possible ways to find our most promising young people, appraise them, guide them, and motivate them.

One thing that institutions of higher education can do in the field of academic research is to evolve the ways to meet these needs. If these institutions need money to finance this, American business should be prepared to supply it. Certainly, from a self-interest standpoint, it is of great benefit to all business enterprises to see that these outstanding minds and talents are located, developed, and applied to the continuing progress of our national life. Recent studies carried on jointly by academic and business minds, which have attempted to forecast the key shortages that may be faced in the world several generations from now, indicate that the real bottleneck is likely to fall in the area of high-caliber individuals who can provide the leadership that will then be needed by our greatly augmented population. It seems to me that nothing can be more important for American business than to encourage long-range planning toward avoidance of this bottleneck to the continued growth of our national and world economy.

MORE OF OUR TOP YOUNG INTELLECTS MUST BE GIVEN THE ADVANTAGES OF COLLEGE EDUCATION

In the areas of student guidance and motivation, the influence of the home and the teacher loom high. Prof. Joseph E. Kahl, of Harvard, has found experimentally that a young person's aspiration to go to college is closely associated with the attitude of his family toward college attendance. In the face of the fact that each year at least 100,000 young men and women with superior qualifications for college and university education are not continuing beyond high school, it has been broadly believed that the answer could be found in improved financial aid. But that is only part of the solution. Scholarships can lower the barriers for those desiring to go to college and not having the necessary funds; they cannot reach the talented young person who simply is not motivated to want higher education. This is where the able and understanding teacher becomes invaluable.

In noting that student financial aid alone is not always the answer, I do not intend to understate the problem of financial handicaps. Certainly we have learned in America that the economic status of a young person or his family has nothing to do with his intellectual capabilities. And, just as we cannot afford to lose good minds because of lack of motivation, so we must put an end to losing many of them through lack of money. The doors to higher education must be kept open through scholarships, through grants, through loans, through every way that is feasible and right.

DOUBLE PRESENT COLLEGE FACILITIES WILL BE REQUIRED BY 1970

Now, let's assume that a variety of influences is successful in inducing a much larger share of our talented young men and women to continue their formal education beyond high school. Already colleges are full. What will colleges and universities have to do to carry their heavier educating responsibilities in the years ahead? Based on youngsters who are now born and merely looking ahead to the day when they will reach college age, it is reasonably certain that by 1970 we shall have to double the capacity of our present facilities in order to give higher education to all those who will seek it and have the capacity to benefit from it. This means that in the next 15 years we shall have to build in this country facilities for higher education equal to the total of all those built since the landing of the Pilgrims. This statement is probably correct even assuming the application of the presently indicated improved efficiency in the use of present facilities. Moreover, we will have to operate these added facilities and provide thousands more teachers for them. The question then emerges: Can our colleges and universities expand to this extent, and still give the exceptional individual the opportunity for full individual development? I think they must.

President Eisenhower has frequently indicated the Government's deep concern over this problem—which is really not a problem, but a great opportunity. In April of this year he announced plans to appoint a group of leading educators and lay citizens to a Committee on Education Beyond the High School, under the chairmanship of Devereux Josephs, to give college and university problems the same scrutiny that the elementary and secondary schools received from the White House Conference on Education. This is an important step, taking into account as it does the fact that we can reach our tremendous educational objectives only if we anticipate our problems and seek their solutions in time.

TAX-SUPPORTED UNIVERSITIES WILL ABSORB BULK OF INCREASED ENROLLMENT

In one way or another, we are going to provide facilities adequate for our university and college population. This country will not let its institutions of learning reach the point where the fundamental American right of opportunity for all is denied. As our university and college enrollment doubles over the next 15 years, our tax-supported institutions inevitably will absorb the bulk of the increased numbers. This trend already is underway. Whereas in recent years the percent of students in tax-supported schools has been about equal to those in independent institutions, the ratio today has shifted toward 60:40 in favor of the publicly supported institutions. These centers of education perform a broad and highly essential role. They have a gigantic contribution to make to the Nation's educational progress, and they have earned the warm support and appreciation of the American people in making it, including a willing provision of the needed tax dollars.

INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES MUST CONTINUE TO BE PACE SETTERS FOR WHOLE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

But this does not mean—in fact, must not mean—that we should give any less thought to the traditional role of our independent universities and colleges. These institutions historically have made invaluable contributions to the entire fabric of higher education in America. With their freedom to experiment with curricula and methods, their ability to set standards as high as they think best, their independent traditions, they serve as pace setters for the whole of our educational system. They produce a major share of our leadership in education, and, on the record, turn out more than their share of all kinds of leaders of our Nation.

But today, when they should be building and expanding to meet tomorrow's needs, our privately endowed colleges and universities are having to fight simply to hold their own. When we look at the approximately 1,000 independent colleges and universities in the United States, we find that on the average, in terms of purchasing power, they have 20 percent less to spend for each student than they had in 1940. For at least some period during the past 6 years, half of our private colleges have been operating at a deficit, according to a study by the Council for Financial Aid to Education.

Clearly, there is need for a new look at this problem. Financial support on a scale larger than we have yet envisioned must be mobilized behind these institutions. Endowment earnings have not and probably cannot be expected to keep pace with the rapidly growing needs.

Tuitions may be able to carry a larger share of the cost provided some of the better programs of installment financing of higher education are found to fit the needs of an America more and more of whose citizens each year find themselves better able to buy the things they consider important. However, it is not expected that tuition income can bridge the gap.

More money should come to the independent colleges and universities from their alumni. These men and women should know that they did not pay the full cost of their education when they were in college and hence should help provide the funds for students of later generations. Alumni should learn to budget money to be given to colleges and universities in the same way they budget other contributions of a substantial nature.

CORPORATE SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION IS GOOD BUSINESS

And, of course, corporate giving to education must also come to be looked upon as the kind of business philanthropy which is accepted as good business. There can be no doubt in the mind of any thoughtful businessman that a decline in the quality of higher education would be reflected in a reduced quality of management and other key personnel performance. It should take no extended rationalization for business and industry to realize that the maintenance of the vitality of the independent college and university is of provable importance to the future profitability of business enterprise. The size of corporate contributions as measured by standards of a decade ago, or even in terms of present performance, will have to be steadily reexamined.

BOLD, IMAGINATIVE THINKING CALLED FOR

The problems I have outlined are not small ones. They never can be met through ordinary approaches. And it is for this reason that I have dwelt on them at an MIT commencement exercise. I believe the time has come to bring to the attack on these problems the same kind of bold, aggressive, imaginative thought that characterizes the assault on the problems of science.

The layman's mind is fascinated by the daring of the scientists. The writers of science fiction have difficulty staying more than a few years ahead of the actualities of the laboratory or the testing ground. Earth satellites and space travel are now discussed in the matter-of-fact terms of a man talking about building a swimming pool—simply a matter of time and money. The incredible of today is the commonplace of tomorrow.

Not too many years ago, weird ideas having to do with something called "television," and others promising propellerless airplanes, were greeted generally with indulgent skepticism. But times have changed. Today imaginative thinking has taken hold. Tell us that in 20 years we may be taking trips to the moon, and we are ready to buy a reserved seat on the first excursion. The scientist—the chemist, the physicist, the engineer—have taught us to accept imaginative thinking, and to lay aside our instinctive reaction that "it can't be done."

We need this kind of thinking in our development of human talents. We need it badly and soon. We need the creative imagination, the boldness, the refusal to accept the obvious or to recognize the impossible. Our problems are big: they need big solutions. The objective of providing for a greatly increased youth population the type of elementary and secondary schooling which this country needs and deserves; the impelling need for finding ways to identify young people of above-average capability and motivating them to go on to post-high-school education; the necessity for providing higher education for a student population twice the present size and for making certain that in doing so we do not lessen the quality of that education—these are problems that deserve and require the best thought of all of us.

I am aware that I have not talked to you members of the graduating class about the occupational problems and opportunities you will face when you, as they say, go out into the world. I have no monumental advice to give you. You are adults. You have been schooled in a great institution with great traditions and I recognize that you are perfectly capable of making decisions, setting your own standards, and mapping your own course.

But what we have talked about today is—and will be—deeply meaningful in your personal lives. And therefore, if I may, let me just suggest that whatever else you regard as important henceforth you keep alive your appreciation of the greatness and the destiny of education in America. All over the country young men and women like you are graduating this month after having invested a part of their lives and a great deal of their energy and dreams in their colleges and universities. In the years to come, they and you will not want that investment to lose its value. Rather, the desire will be to enhance that value—to see the record and reputation of one's school maintained as an institution fully meeting the needs of the Nation and of the times.

If you and the other educated men and women of America will seek and encourage imaginative thinking toward the goal of using our Nation's talent to the full, these problems of education will be solved. No challenge in this competitive world will be too great, and we shall progress in confidence that the bright promise of America's future will be fulfilled.

Cumulative Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Rocky Mountain Journal of June 16, 1955, shows why cumulative voting must be retained and S. 256 must be defeated:

MILE HIGH OBSERVATIONS

I was talking to Irving Dilliard, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch editorial writer, on the telephone the other day, asking him to help stimulate an editorial crusade against Henry Kugeler's immortal, undemocratic and oppressive Senate bill 256—the measure that would abolish cumulative voting in the election of national bank directors.

And in the course of the conversation, Dilliard asked me what I thought about the upper Colorado River bill now pending in Congress. He also told me why the powerful Post-Dispatch, one of the most respected newspapers in the world, was against the Echo Park Dam being in the project.

I was shocked to discover that the usually well-informed Post-Dispatch is laboring under a lot of misinformation about the project, basing its opposition on grounds that simply aren't tenable.

It seems to me that the so-called Aqualantes would be beneficially employed if they got on the beam and straightened out the paper's editors on the true issues in the controversy. It hasn't dawned on some well-intentioned people in the conservationist camp that they have been sucked into a false position by the outright lying propaganda of certain forces in California.

Speaking of S. 256, this is one measure we intend to battle on right down to the finish line.

Senate bill 256 is the unfair device by which Henry Kugeler, president of the Denver National Bank, hopes to keep Maurice Brody, second largest stock and proxy holder in the bank, off the board of directors.

The Federal Reserve Board has taken an official stand against the bill, urging Congress not to pass it.

But a few self-seeking politicians in high places in the American Bankers Association are backing the bill, hoping to take the American banking system back 25 years—back to that irresponsible era when the banks of this Nation were brought to the brink of bankruptcy.

This very bad bill—denying a voice to minority stockholders in bank affairs—is in danger of passing. The bill is not easily understood and the public's very great stake in the measure is so covered over with specious protestations by bank management, that the issue hasn't had the publicity it deserves.

A combination of reactionary southern democrats—and believe me, a vote for this bill is a vote for the worst kind of special privilege—and a few northern Republicans may have the power to put the bill over.

GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, is said to be in favor of the bill. Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN is on the fence.

Against the bill are Senators Lehman, of New York, Symington, of Missouri, Magnusson, of Washington, Kilgore of West Virginia, Douglas of Illinois, Humphreys, of Minnesota and Murray, of Montana.

Persons interested in fair play who want to help kill this most unjust measure should write to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Senate Majority Leader, United States Senate Office Building., Washington, D. C. He's one person who could organize a fitting defeat for the proposal.

The fact here in Denver—and almost everybody involved admits this privately and denies it publicly—is that Maurice Brody, a highly successful market analyst and economist who has lived quietly in Denver for more than 25 years, is being kept off the board of the Denver National Bank solely because he is a Jew.

Forthcoming Retirement of George W. Combs of the Baltimore Sunpapers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared concerning the forthcoming retirement of George W. Combs, of the Baltimore Sunpapers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS ON FORTHCOMING RETIREMENT OF GEORGE W. COMBS, OF THE BALTIMORE SUNPAPERS, BY SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL, OF MARYLAND

It is with mixed emotions that I make the first public announcement of a matter which is of interest to all of us.

First there is sadness, because a good friend will soon sever his long and close connection with this body to go into well-earned retirement.

However, there is also a certain sense of satisfaction at this time—the satisfaction we all receive from seeing a job well done.

The job in this case has been the trying task of reporting accurately on the complex matters which confront our Congress.

If ever a man has deserved a sincere "well done" for having accomplished that job to perfection, it is George W. Combs—"Colonel Combs"—of the Baltimore Sunpapers.

It distressed me to learn that Colonel Combs will retire next month after 48 years of outstanding service with the Sunpapers, but instead of thinking today of what we will lose when he leaves, let us consider the more pleasant side of the situation—what we have gained as a direct result of his career.

Basically, the good that has resulted from the service of Colonel Combs has been most important in three areas.

The foremost contribution of this veteran newspaperman, of course, has been his day-by-day work.

As a result of his consistently excellent reporting, millions of newspaper readers have received factual and understandable information on the most complicated issues of our time, and his byline has become synonymous with accuracy.

Second, Colonel Combs has achieved a goal which is sought by every man who is dedicated to a specific endeavor.

He has lived with his profession and he has loved it, and he has left it a better profession because of the association.

When the principles of our treasured freedom of the press are questioned, it is men like Colonel Combs who represent the very strongest argument in supoprt of the integrity of the fourth estate.

He has followed the highest traditions of his occupation and his career should be a guide to those who would seek true success in the field.

There is also another realm in which Colonel Combs has left his mark in a special way.

Right here in the Congress, we members have a deep, although usually silent, affection for the members of the press who understand our problems and help us to understand theirs.

I need only to say that Colonel Combs has been one of our closest and truest friends.

To attempt to mention all of the highlights of Colonel Combs' career would obviously be rather ridiculous unless a man had a completely unlimited amount of time.

I would, however, like to mention a few of the events connected with the colonel's career.

Before I begin, though, it might be well to mention that the title which he bears was bestowed on him by the Governor of his native State, Kentucky.

It has since become as much of a trademark for him as his quick chuckle and bow tie.

Colonel Combs started his association with the Sunpapers on August 21, 1908, and his forthcoming retirement will become effective on the 48th anniversary of that day.

Looking back to that first day, Colonel Combs can recall that he had been hired to work in the Washington office of the Sunpapers as a clerk to take advertisements, arrange for subscriptions and sell papers over the counter for a penny apiece.

His first contact with a big news story came about 3 weeks later, when he witnessed the first airplane crash in which a member of the Armed Forces was killed.

Another staff member of the Sunpapers covered the event, however, and it was not until about 16 years later that Colonel Combs was transferred from business to newsgathering activities.

In the meantime, he had established contact with Washington's political life, and had even been appointed to jobs at two presidential inaugurations.

The first was in 1909, when President Taft took office.

Colonel Combs was supopsed to accompany the Chief Executive as a mounted aide but, according to the colonel, "There was so much slushy snow on the streets that I didn't mount and I didn't aid."

President Wilson was more fortunate in obtaining the services of Colonel Combs.

Having been appointed an active member of the Public Order Committee for the Wilson ceremonies, Colonel Combs found the inauguration-day weather to his liking and served as "a sort of one-day policeman."

Much closer contacts were formed by Colonel Combs, with other Presidents; and Mr. Coolidge, Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and Mr. Truman were all on first-name terms with him.

Mr. Roosevelt frequently asked the colonel about upcoming parties at the National Press Club, and Mr. Truman went out of his way to greet his Sunpapers friend at public events.

Another official who was a close friend of Colonel Combs and who still maintains occasional correspondence with him is James Farley.

In the crowded Washington newspaper field, Colonel Combs frequently got good stories first because of his many friendships and his untiring persistence.

It was Colonel Combs, for instance, who let the Nation know that the prohibition director was going to resign, and it was Colnel Combs who broke the story about Franklin Roosevelt's "get acquainted" invitations to his new Congress.

That latter story, incidentally, grew out of one of the colonel's trips to my office, which was in the House of Representatives at that time.

Spotting a letter from the White House on my desk, Colonel Combs began to ask questions, and as usual, got his story.

Colonel Combs, as I have indicated, has been more than just a good newspaperman.

He has dedicated himself to his profession, and his interest has shown itself in numerous ways, including his long service as an officer of the National Press Club.

For approximately 18 years he has served on the club's board of directors.

He has been elected treasurer each year for the past 14 years, and, although he will retire from the Sunpapers next month, he intends to serve out his present term of office with the Press Club.

I could speak for many hours about our friend, but I am sure that his colleagues, as well as those of us here on the floor, realize the work that lies ahead of all of us before we adjourn.

Therefore, in behalf of all of us who have known and respected Colonel Combs as a friend and as a reporter, let me say simply that we thank him for what he has done, and that we will miss him.

Twenty-First Annual Convention of the Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am delighted to take this means of informing the Congress and the American people that the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, one of our Nation's outstanding veterans' organizations, will be holding its national convention this year in Manchester, N. H. I can assure each of its members who are planning to attend a warm and sincere welcome from our Granite State.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement outlining the plans for this, their 21st annual convention, and giving a résumé of the founding and the basic objectives of this fine and dedicated association.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the course of the week of August 12 the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will celebrate their 21st annual convention at Manchester, N. H. Various sessions of the convention have been marked to be held in various parts of the city, culminating Saturday evening in a gala convention banquet and ball at the State armory building in Manchester.

The convention will see reports of progress made by this national veterans' group in the fields of Americanism, Catholic action, leadership, membership, veterans' affairs, and youth welfare. Interspersed with the serious activity of the convention will be many social activities, including a hillbilly night at Bearbrook Park Reservation on Thursday evening, a parade through Manchester with competitions for color guards, drum and bugle corps, and bands on Friday evening; and the special CWV candlelight ceremony and ritual at the convention ball on Saturday.

Other items of interest include the national golf tournament starting Wednesday morning at the Intervale Country Club; a special mass to be recited in every parish church throughout New Hampshire which has a CWV post, for the guidance of the convention deliberations and the establishment of a true world peace; the get-acquainted night scheduled for Wednesday in Pulaski Hall in Manchester, and the special communion mass and breakfast to be held at St. Joseph's Cathedral on Saturday morning, August 18.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America was founded by the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL. D., of Astoria, N. Y., back in 1935, in the words of its own constitution:

"To promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home:

"(a) For God: To promote through aggressive organized Catholic action a greater love, honor, and service to God; an understanding and application of the teachings of Christ in our everyday life; recognizing the wisdom of the church in all matters of faith and morals.

"(b) For country: Through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through active participation in the promotion of its ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, develop a more zealous citizenship; to encourage morality in government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions.

"(c) For home: To promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened patriotic American youth; to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

"(d) These objectives are encouraged without regard to race, creed, or color."

Initiated only 21 years ago, Catholic War Veterans has spread until today it is organized in 39 of the 48 States. In the course of its two decades of existence the Catholic War Veterans has been part of the fierce war of ideologies seeking to capture the minds of men. It is to the commendable credit of this organization that it has spotted and fought totalitarian and brutalitarian philosophies of both the right and left, and stood firm on the solid stand of freedom of the individual and personal independence of its citizens, under the law.

The CWV creed from the now-famous speech, Catholicism and Americanism, of the late Archbishop John Ireland, of St. Paul, Minn., states:

"My religious faith is that of the Catholic Church—Catholicism, integral and unalloyed—Catholicism, unswerving and soul-swaying, the Catholicism taught by the supreme chieftain of the Catholic Church, the Pope, the Bishop of Rome.

"My civil and political faith is that of the Republic of the United States of America—Americanism, purest and brightest, yielding in strength and loyalty to the Americanism of none other American, surpassed in spirit of obedience and sacrifice by that of none other citizen, none other soldier, sworn to uphold in peace and in war America's Star-Spangled Banner."

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America have received many commendations from agencies in Government, in business, in welfare and hospital work, in rehabilitation, in child guidance, in patriotic, fraternal, veteran, and religious spheres. (It has, the approbation of the late Pius XI and the now reigning Pontiff, Pius XII). It is recognized by the Veterans' Administration in the handling of cases before it.

It has been commended by every United States President in office since its inception and received accolades of a great many American statesmen.

Programs have included summer camps for youngsters, informative material exposing fascism, nazism, and the cancerous care of Communist propoganda, broadcasts and information bulletins on veteran benefits, support of youth groups, establishment of scholarships, fight for veterans' rights, and the spiritual comfort of our comrades, proper burial for veterans and care for their widows and dependents, exposure of intolerence, bigotry and disloyalty, promotion of activities which tend to strengthen the moral fiber of the Nation and its people, and build a "greater spirit of faith and patriotism."

The current program of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America is strictly positive. The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America are not anti anything; they are protagonists of right, truth and justice. Their whole philosophy is based on the recognition of man's dignity and rendering "to God the things that are God's." They insist on the recognition of the moral basis; underlying all political, economic, and social themes.

Their emphasis lies in action. "It is better to light one candle than to curse the darkness." They feel that no program, no matter how magnificent, can be effective unless it is acted upon.

As can be readily seen, the two decades of Catholic War Veterans' existence have proved fruitful for our freedom. And the future of America is safe, when public spirited, patriotic citizens who have fought for their nation in war, can continue to serve in peace.

The Catholic War Veterans is organized to serve the individual and the Nation. Size is not the measure of its service, its reputation, its loyalty, its faith or its spirit of fellowship.

As they celebrate that 21st anniversary milestone of their history, Catholic War Veterans take pride in their past—are confident of their future.

The Chaplain's Prayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that House Resolution 439 was adopted in the House of Representatives on July 2, 1956. It provides that the prayers offered by the Chaplain, the Reverend Bernard Braskamp, doctor of divinity, at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives of the United States from January 3, 1953, to the end of the 84th Congress be printed as a House document, and that 2,000 additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the House of Representatives, to be distributed by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to the remarks which I made in this Chamber on February 1, 1950, shortly after Dr. Bernard Braskamp was unanimously elected by the Democrats and the Republicans as the Chaplain of the House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp, since his retirement from the active pastorate in 1952, holds the distinction of being the first chaplain in the history of the United States Congress to make the chaplaincy a full-time ministry.

His so-called congressional parish numbers more than 3,000 for he seeks to make his ministry as chaplain available not only to the 435 Representatives and their families but also to the officers, secretaries, clerks, pages, and all the employees on the House side of the Capitol.

In the volume of prayers offered by Dr. Braskamp at the opening of the daily sessions of the House of Representatives from February 1, 1950, to the close of the 82d Congress, and printed as House Document No. 458, we find this introductory statement by Speaker RAYBURN:

Dr. Braskamp has been Chaplain of the House of Representatives since 1950, following 40 years of service as pastor of churches in the Washington, D. C., area. His prayers before the House have been fervent and inspiring, giving impulse to the sacredness of duty in the public service. Their devotional value is almost as great in the cold page of print as in the House itself. Dr. Braskamp enjoys in notable degree the respect and affection of the entire membership of the House, to whom he is a counsellor, friend, and brother. In publishing this volume of his prayers, we feel we are rendering a public service and commend them to good people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident all of the Members of the House concur with you in this expression of your high esteem for our Chaplain.

Defeat of S. 256 Is Essential To Retain Cumulative Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to our colleagues' attention the following excerpts from a newsletter received by me:

SENATE BILL 256—PROBABLE EFFECT ON FAR WESTERN NATIONAL BANKS

Hearings open today in Washington on a little mentioned bill of major interest to almost a quarter-million stockholders of national banks on the Pacific coast.

The measure, Senate bill No. 256, only two sentences in length, has already passed the Senate and would immediately change the voting rights of all but a handful of these stockholders if it passes Congress and becomes law.

The bill would amend the National Banking Act to make cumulative voting permissible, but not compulsory as it is now. The

hearings which begin today before the House Banking and Currency Committee under Chairman BRENT SPENCE of Kentucky open the lower House's deliberations on the proposed change. If the committee reports favorably on the bill it would be a big boost to its passage by the full House.

Under cumulative voting, each share has the same number of votes as there are directors to be elected. The shareholder can spread his votes among the candidates or concentrate his voting power on a single man. Through cumulative voting, minority stock interests are able to get representation on a board of directors.

CUMULATIVE VOTING COMPULSORY NOW

In the 23 years the Banking Act of 1933 has been in effect, cumulative voting has been compulsory for national banks, even though a bank's articles of association do not provide for it. A check of 20 national banks in major far western cities shows, according to best available information, that only 4 banks with a total of 2,550 stockholders provide for cumulative voting in their articles. If the proposed change is made in the law, the stockholders of the other 16 banks with approximately 250,000 stockholders, presumably would not be entitled to vote cumulatively unless the banks later changed their provisions.

"The matter has never been discussed by our board of directors," said the president of one San Francisco bank when asked if his bank would provide for cumulative voting in the bill passes in its present form.

Another leading western banker says he believes in cumulative voting and will recommend any changes that might be needed to continue it as far as his own institution is concerned. "I believe the little fellow ought to be heard," he adds. * * *

Asked for its opinion, the Federal Reserve Board said that the principle underlying cumulative voting is a sound one. * * *

The Investment Bankers Association, the National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., the Securities and Exchange Commission, insurance companies, mutual funds and other investor organizations did not testify before the Senate Committee, and the record does not indicate whether they received invitations to appear.

* * * * *

SENATOR LEHMAN OPPOSES CHANGE

Principal speaker against the bill was Senator LEHMAN of New York who identified himself as a former director of a number of banks.

"Today, bank boards are picked by the bank management, who select those whom the management knows will be in complete sympathy with, and under the direction of the management," he charged. "The management will not put on a bank board anyone whom it fears might differ with the philosophy or policies of the management."

If the bill becomes law, Senator LEHMAN said there would be no possibility of anyone who has less than a majority of the stock obtaining representation on the board, regardless of the qualifications of the particular individual. By giving minority stockholders recognition, the Senator pointed out, proxy fights could be prevented.

Also opposing the bill was Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. He pointed out that many States have compulsory cumulative voting laws.

Bank's cumulative voting provisions

	Number of stockholders	Do bank's articles provide for cumulative voting?	Total assets Dec. 31, 1955
Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, San Francisco	[1] 200,000	No	$9,263,276,000
Bank of California National Association, San Francisco	3,000	No	513,665,000
Bishop National Bank, Honolulu	850	No	208,462,000
Central Valley National Bank, Oakland	800	Yes [2]	38,207,000
Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank, Los Angeles	1,700	No	478,625,000
Citizens National Trust & Savings Bank, Riverside	2,100	No	175,525,000
Crocker-Anglo National Bank, San Francisco	6,800	No	1,497,463,000
Farmers & Merchants National Bank, Los Angeles	850	No	359,620,000
First National Bank of Arizona, Phoenix	600	No	183,709,000
First National Bank of Nevada, Reno	160	No	211,196,000
First National Bank of Portland, Portland, Oreg	3,200	No	903,435,000
First National Bank, San Jose	250	No	75,922,000
First National Trust & Savings Bank, San Diego	1,100	No	173,505,000
National Bank of Washington, Tacoma	500	Yes	143,904,000
Pacific National Bank, San Francisco	750	Yes [2]	93,588,000
Seattle-First National Bank, Seattle	4,000	No	861,928,000
Security-First National Bank, Los Angeles	12,600	No	2,137,854,000
United States National Bank, Portland, Oreg	5,250	No	847,711,000
United States National Bank, San Diego	500	Yes	64,860,000
Valley National Bank, Phoenix	4,900	No	397,840,000
Total	[1] 249,910		18,630,295,000

[1] Over.
[2] But controlling interest held by a voting trust.

Both Parties Should Adopt Identical Planks on Keeping Communist China Out of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of July 24, 1956:

THEY'D BLOCK RED CHINA
(By Oland D. Russell)

Growing apprehension is felt in congressional and private circles here that a "squeeze play" after the United States elections in November might seat Red China in the United Nations.

To forestall that, and make unmistakably clear America's opposition to any such diplomatic deal, a campaign is rolling to get identical planks in the platforms of both major political parties next month expressing public feelings. Thus, after the voting, the whole electorate would be on record flatly and universally against the Peiping regime.

This nonpartisan drive is being conducted by the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations. An appeal in the committee's name has gone out over the signatures of Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, Republican, of New Jersey, and Representatives WALTER H. JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, and FRANCIS E. WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania.

The plank they propose for inclusion in the Democratic and Republican platforms says this:

"We continue to oppose the seating of Communist China in the United Nations, thus upholding international morality and keeping faith with the thousands of American youths who gave their lives fighting Communist aggression in Korea. To seat a Communist China which defies, by word and deed, the principles of the United Nations Charter, would be to betray the letter, violate the spirit, and subvert the purposes of that charter. I would betray our friend and ally, the Republic of China."

At the moment the issue is a sleeper. The Communist world and its dupes among the "neutralists" are keeping quiet about it. But the full force of their undercover drive is expected to be felt immediately after the November elections.

The United Nations General Assembly meets 1 week after America goes to the polls. A strong bloc in the U. N. claims enough votes to admit the Peiping usurpers then.

The first step, observers say, might come in a complicated move to substitute India for Nationalist China on the Security Council. Such a maneuver, if successful, undoubtedly would give one more vote to the Red side, influence the uncommitted nations and grease the way for sliding Communist China into the U. N. The belief that the United States can do nothing about it meanwhile is gaining wider and wider acceptance.

But the Senate and the House and the Committee of One Million are doing their best to block any squeeze play.

Five times now since 1951 congressional resolutions have been passed unanimously stating American opposition to Red China. Only yesterday the Senate by 86 to 0 reaffirmed its stand, pointing out "previous expressions should be and are hereby reemphasized" that Peiping should be kept out of the U. N. The House last week voted the same way by 391 to 0.

The Committee of One Million, headed by Warren R. Austin, formerly our U. N. chief delegate, insists it is not a partisan issue and that its stand is backed by more than a million Americans who signed the anti-Peiping petition.

Adoption of identical planks by the GOP and Democrats, the committee believes, will put other members of the U. N. on notice that the American people will never accept the final subversion of the U. N. to appease the Communist aggressors.

Says the committee: "The eyes of the American people—and those of the hundreds of millions imprisoned behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—are on Chicago and San Francisco in August 1956."

Nuclear-Powered Merchant Ship

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it should be made clear to the Members of the House that the conferees

on H. R. 6243—the nuclear-powered merchant vessel bill—wanted to leave complete discretion to the Atomic Energy Commission as to the type of reactor which should be used in the nuclear-powered vessels authorized by this bill. You will note that the report recommends or suggests that the most advanced type of reactor be used. However, you will also note the report does not specifically state that the *Nautilus* type shall not be used. There was some thought amongst the conferees that the same kind of reactor now in the *Nautilus* should not be used in the proposed vessel. However, there was also some thought that in order to expedite the completion of this project and get the ship on the water it might be well to use some improved *Nautilus* type. The report clearly indicates that the conferees want the ship completed and afloat as expeditiously as possible.

While the vessel authorized by this bill it is not an exhibition ship as perhaps envisoned by the President's request, it is nevertheless a ship which will be capable of demonstrating our Nation's desire to utilize nuclear-power for peaceful purposes. If a combination passenger-dry cargo vessel is built it will be the object of great interest in the ports of the world, and many people will come to see it wherever it docks. Undoubtedly they will want to come aboard and examine it. The combination type merchant vessel is capable of being so constructed that there will be facilities available for the exhibition of peacetime applications of atomic energy. Pictures and exhibits could be shown on board the vessel which would point up our Nation's efforts to utilize atomic energy for peaceful pursuits. The President's objectives could, therefore, in large measure be accomplished.

Move Against S. 256 Which Seeks to Eliminate Cumulative Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following and enclosure came to me unsolicited:

GONSER REALTY CO.,
Denver, Colo., July 16, 1956.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: As a national bank stockholder I feel that our national banking system will be placed in jeopardy by S. 256, the bill to eliminate mandatory cumulative voting. I appeal to you to oppose this vicious legislation.

Enclosed is a copy of a local editorial which points out the significance of S. 256.

Yours respectfully,

EUGENE ZEITLIN.

[From the Rocky Mountain Journal of April 28, 1956]

WHO SHOULD CONTROL THE BANKS?

Lurking in committee in the United States Senate is a very bad bill sponsored by the American Bankers Association that ought never to be allowed to see the light of day.

The American Bankers Association is made up largely of men who manage banks. It is not representative of the people who own banks.

These bank managers are seeking through United States Senate bill 256 to restore themselves to the entrenched power they had over banks in the reckless twenties—an era that saw the American banking system brought almost to complete disaster.

While national banks are owned by large and small stockholders, they are of necessity run by hired hands in daily contact with the banks activities. This allows the insiders to manipulate stockholder forces in such a way as to keep the insiders in their jobs at their own discretion.

The purpose of the Banking Act of 1933 was to take control of national banks away from the inside manipulators and give it to the stockholders through the system of cumulative voting that allows minority stockholders representation on the board of directors.

In the American capitalistic system the stockholders are supreme. Does anyone, including the manipulators in the American Bankers Association, question that statement?

The 22-year-old cumulative voting provision has served American bank stockholders well and has contributed mightily to the development of sound banking policies.

Cumulative voting has forced bank managers to operate the banks in the public interest.

Cumulative voting has prevented small bands of bank insiders from entrenching themselves for life.

Cumulative voting is democratic. It violates no rights of the majority and allows the kind of control over banks that inspires confidence and serves capitalistic justice.

It would be dangerous to American banking to abolish cumulative voting. Already a subcommittee has voted 4-to-1 to eliminate the cumulative voting provision. The bill now goes to the 15-man committee on banking headed by Senator FULBRIGHT.

Under full and honest debate, this bill simply can't stand up. The bill is immoral, unjust repressive and ruthless in its intent.

Owners of bank stock will serve their own interests and protect the banks themselves by writing immediately to Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., and asking him to use his great influence to see that this vicious measure is defeated.

Resolution in Opposition to Admission of Red China Into the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the Conference on Peace and Freedom Through Liberation held its annual meeting in the House caucus room on July 2 last. This organization has for several years been working through various means to encourage the people behind the Iron Curtain of Communist tyranny, in their efforts to regain their freedom.

It was my privilege to present to the conference a resolution opposing the admission of Communist China to membership in the United Nations. The conference unanimously adopted the resolution and asked that it be made available to all Members of the Congress and that it be given wide distribution among freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the resolution:

RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO ADMISSION OF RED CHINA INTO THE UNITED NATIONS

Recognizing that the Red regime in China gained power by subversion and aggression against the government and people of the Republic of China; that it rules by force and terror; that it has carried on a program of mass murder, by which the lives of millions of peace-loving Chinese citizens have been sacrificed; that it seeks to eliminate from Chinese life those things traditionally sacred to the Chinese people, namely, spiritual values, individual liberty, and the love of family and home;

Recognizing that this Communist regime, puppet of the Soviet Union, backed the aggression which launched the Korean war in June 1950; took up arms against the people and government of the Republic of Korea and their United Nations defenders, resulting in the killing of hundreds of thousands of American, Korean, and allied personnel, with millions more casualties among the wounded and homeless, for which acts of international banditry this same Red regime in China was branded an aggressor by the United Nations;

Recognizing further that this Red regime in China still holds as prisoners in its bloody hands the people and area of North Korea, and still holds, in violation of its specific pledges and all standards of international law and decency numbers of American citizens and those of other free nations; and that this Red regime is still an aggressor before the United Nations and before the bar of public opinion of all freedom-loving peoples of the world;

And recognizing further that this same aggressor regime in Red China for years has been, and still is, seeking admission to membership in the United Nations, without having in any way so altered its behavior as to demonstrate itself qualified and eligible under the provisions of the United Nations charter:

Therefore, we who believe in liberty, justice, and international morality pledge to oppose by all political, diplomatic, economic, and other ethical means in our power the admission to membership in the United Nations of the Red regime in China. We pledge to bring to bear upon our representatives in the executive branch, the Congress, and the United Nations, our opinion that such admission of Red China would be in violation of every principle upon which the United Nations was founded and for which it should stand; would in effect greatly increase the prestige and the political capabilities of the Communist bloc in that organization and throughout the world; and would discredit that organization and greatly diminish its potentialities as an instrument of peace, justice, and international security.

Interesting History of Veterans' Security Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article

from the American Legion magazine of August 1956:

AYRES AND TEAGUE REBUKED BY HOUSE PASSAGE OF WAR VET SECURITY BILL

On June 27, after 2 days of vigorous debate, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 7886, the war veterans security bill. The vote was 365 to 51.

In effect, the overwhelming vote marked the second time, in less than 3 weeks, that Representatives had overruled OLIN TEAGUE, Texas, chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee. Earlier, on June 8, the committee—with TEAGUE dissenting—voted the bill out for debate by the House.

The American Legion's war veterans security bill as passed by the House provides that World War I veterans upon reaching age 65 shall be considered permanently and totally disabled and eligible for a pension of $90 per month subject to existing income limitations.

The bill, now in the Senate Finance Committee, further provides (1) increases for World War I and World War II and Korean war vets under 65, from $66.15 to $75 per month; (2) increases from $78.75 to $90 for those on the rolls for 10 years; (3) where a veteran is helpless or blind so as to need an attendant, an increase from $135.45 to $150; (4) a 10 percent increase on all the above rates where the veteran had overseas service for at least 30 days.

All benefits are subject to an income limitation of $1,400 for single vets and $2,700 for those with dependents.

LEGION ATTACKED

The months-long fight by the American Legion for passage of its No. 1 priority legislation reached its peak on June 8. After several delays for hearings on other matters, Chairman OLIN TEAGUE finally agreed to an executive session at which his committee could express its wishes.

The committee expressed its feelings in no uncertain terms by voting the bill out for discussion by the House over the outspoken objection of TEAGUE.

Tagged to the bill were six amendments which went beyond the scope of the Legion's war-veterans security bill. Without major exception, however, these amendments reflected policy which the Legion was mandated to follow, and National Commander J. Addington Wagner hailed the amended bill as one which the Legion heartily supports.

Overridden by his own committee, OLIN TEAGUE bitterly denounced the American Legion and accused it of pressuring committee members into voting for the bill. He rashly predicted that the House would defeat the bill and teach the American Legion a lesson.

Commenting on TEAGUE'S statements, National Commander J. Addington Wagner put his finger on the source of the outburst. "Apparently," he said, "Mr. TEAGUE is disappointed at being outvoted."

"He can criticize the Legion," said the commander, "all he likes. Of much greater concern to us is the fact that he has seen fit to add to the public misunderstanding and confusion regarding the bill. He has done this by circulating cost estimates which have no basis in fact and which can be interpreted only as a rather frantic attempt to defeat the legislation."

The numbers game—the giving out of fantastic estimates of the cost of the legislation—was the first of a series of maneuvers designed to block enactment of the bill. At first TEAGUE reported $77 billion as the cost of the bill up to the year 2000. After the amendments were added to the bill, the cost figures became astronomical, with $148 billion as the new scare number.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments were to become more important to supporters of the bill some 3 weeks later when they were used in a parliamentary move to scuttle the bill.

The amendments added by the committee provided: (1) equalization of death benefit payments between widows and children of World War I vets and those of World War II and Korea vets; (2) an increase of 20 percent in disability pension rates for those who served oversea for at least 30 days; (3) a boost to $75 per month for widows of Spanish-American War veterans; (4) increases in service-connected disability payments; (5) increases in payments to widows and children of veterans who died of service-connected causes; (6) increase burial allowance to $200.

The ensuing weeks between June 8 and June 26, when H. R. 7886 was to be debated in the House, saw violent attacks both upon the Legion and the bill. One interesting facet of the attack was that two small veterans organizations came out in violent opposition to the Legion stand. The smaller one went so far as to outdo even the Bureau of the Budget estimates. This outfit came up with $390 billion as the cost of the program.

The press contributed to the general misunderstanding of the bill's provisions. At least one columnist referred to an American Legion general pension bill. This despite the oft repeated statement by the Legion that it opposed a general pension and wanted a liberalized pension program based on need.

In still another instance, one newspaper took the already fantastic figure of $148 billion for the life of the program, and said that it would be the annual cost.

THE BIG DEBATE

When debate on H. R. 7886 opened in the House of Representatives on July 26, it was obvious that the opponents of the bill would use every possible means to kill it. They were apparently determined to do so even if it meant that there would be no veterans legislation at all.

The Representatives were treated to the seldom seen sight of a chairman of a committee attacking a bill which his own committee had approved. For OLIN TEAGUE, the Legion's bill was a challenge which he was determined to meet and destroy.

He was outdone by Representative WILLIAM H. AYRES, (Ohio) in the parliamentary maneuvering designed to scuttle the measure. The fight for the veterans was led by Representative EDWARD EDMONDSON, (Oklahoma), a World War II vet and legionnaire who ably championed the cause of the needy and disabled.

The strategy of the bill's opponents was apparent: To exaggerate the cost of the program presented by the Legion; to insist that it could not pass the Congress; and to offer instead a substitute motion that would cover service-connected disabled only.

At one point in the debate Ayres read into the record a letter written by President Eisenhower to the chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee on May 30. The President opposed legislation such as H. R. 7886 and suggested that the House wait until he submitted recommendations based on the various studies already made.

The debate raged on with AYRES and TEAGUE almost alone in their violent opposition to the bill. Congresman after Congressman rose to speak in favor of providing help for servicemen and their dependents and to defend the bill from the wild attacks which were being made upon it.

On Wednesday, June 27, the voting began. It having become obvious that the majority of Members of the House were in favor of the legislation. Representative AYRES resorted to a parliamentary maneuver which Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, later referred to as a bit of "technical righteousness."

Under the rules of the House of Representatives pension matters are considered to be "privileged legislation." As such, they go directly to the floor of the House for debate without having to go through the Rules Committee.

On this point Representative AYRES made his move. He raised a point of order. The point, he said, was that "privileged legislation" should deal only with pension matters. The various amendments—some of which provided increases in compensation for service-connected disabled—were not, by definition, pension and therefore could not be considered by the House at this time.

The point of order, highly technical and based only on the definition of the words "compensation" and "pension," was ruled on by the presiding officer, Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee. He stated that "the ruling of the Chair does not necessarily respect the views of the Chair," a definite indication that he was not in sympathy with the motion.

COOPER ruled, however, that AYRES was technically correct. Because of this point of order, all of the amendments to the bill which had been added by the Veterans' Affairs Committee were dropped from consideration by the House.

This left the Representatives with only that part of the bill to be considered which provided increases in pensions for non-service-connected disabled.

TURN ABOUT

Even this drastic cut, however, was not enough for the bill's opponents. AYRES now moved that the bill be recommitted to the Veterans' Affairs Committee for purported Teague amendments—a death blow. It was here that opponents of the bill found themselves in the uncomfortable position of having hurt most the men they claimed to champion.

Representative EDMONDSON immediately made the point of order previously made by AYRES. TEAGUE'S amendments, he pointed out, were compensation matters and therefore also not privileged legislation. By this time, Representative RAYBURN, of Texas, had returned to the chair as Speaker of the House; he ruled in favor of EDMONDSON.

The motion was now made by AYRES that the bill simply be recommitted. On a division vote the motion carried 159 to 107. At this point Representative GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, of Missouri, demanded a rollcall. The vote of 305 to 110 effectively killed the motion to recommit.

There was no further debate. The stripped-down bill was presented to the Members; it carried by a vote of 364 to 51. The House of Representatives had given the needy and disabled veterans the help which the American Legion had asked for them.

Even more, the House had shown by its vote that rather than "teach the American Legion a lesson," it endorsed the Legion's fight to provide security for men who served their country in time of war.

Ironically, however, the opponents of the bill had done a disservice to the men they said deserved first claim upon the Government. In their wild-swinging attempts to defeat the war veterans security bill, they had prevented the House from voting increases in compensation payments.

Mrs. ROGERS denounced those who had used parliamentary maneuvers to hurt the chance of the service-connected disabled to get an increase in payments. She said, "Veterans struggling to pay the increased costs of these times can gain no satisfaction out of a point of order. A point of order will not help them to buy food or pay the rent. To raise a point of order under these circumstances seems to me to border on legislative immaturity."

LEGION ACTS

The Legion moved swiftly to correct the injustice.

On June 28, H. R. 12038 to increase compensation for service-connected disabled was introduced into the House. Later the same day Representative SISK, California, introduced a bill written by the Legion to establish equalization of death pensions for widows and orphans of veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war.

In a telegram to members of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, National Commander Wagner pledged the Legion's "vigorous and enthusiastic" support to increase in compensation payments, and said the Legion is "vitally concerned" with equalizing pension benefits for widows and orphans.

Commander Wagner called passage of the bill "dramatic proof that the Nation has not forgotten or forsaken its defenders."

LEGION CHAMPION

While the Legion had marshaled its forces as never before in its history to gain a measure of security for its needy comrades, the victory was won by its friends in the House of Representatives.

To Representative ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, went most of the plaudits. It was Mr. EDMONDSON who led the fight during the debate and hectic floor action on the bill. In this he was assisted by many Members of the House.

In the Veterans' Affairs Committee the following Representatives fought for the bill: W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina; ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia; GEORGE S. LONG, of Louisiana; JAMES A. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania; FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado; LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York; GEORGE H. CHRISTOPHER, of Missouri; CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., of Michigan; B. F. SISK, of California; EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts; BERNARD W. (PAT) KEARNEY, of New York; PAUL A. FINE, of New York; PHIL WEAVER, of Nebraska; WILLIAM H. AVERY, of Kansas; JAMES A. HALEY, of Florida; and EUGENE SILER, of Kentucky.

Other Representatives who contributed much to the fight and who helped win the victory were:

Representatives JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, of Mississippi; JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania; KENNETH J. GRAY, of Illinois; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; LEROY JOHNSON, of California; THOMAS G. ABERNATHY, of Mississippi, and JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee.

Cumulative Voting Must Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article came to me in the mail. It appeared in the New York Journal-American of March 16, 1956. Its author, Leslie Gould, is a well-known and highly respected financial expert:

PROXY FIGHTS RAISE QUESTION ON CUMULATIVE VOTING

(By Leslie Gould)

The proxy fights of the last few years have raised a question as to cumulative voting and the staggered elections of directors.

The latter—electing a part of the board each year—was disposed of in the Montgomery Ward fight, when the court barred this. The arguments for this never were strong. Not so as to cumulative voting.

Cumulative voting allows a shareowner 1 vote for each director and he can accumulate his votes for 1 or more candidates. That is, where there are 10 directorships up for vote, the shareowner will have 10 votes. He can cast 1 each for each of the places, or bunch 10 votes for 1 director.

In this way a minority group can win one or more places on a board.

There are 21 States that have made this the law for companies incorporated under their statutes. The main ones are California, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Missouri, and Washington.

PERMISSIVE IN NEW YORK

There are 17 States which permit cumulative voting provided the corporations make specific charter or by-law provisions. The chief permissive States are New York, Delaware, and New Jersey.

Originally, the idea behind cumulative voting was to open the door to minorities and end secrecy over activities of management. Some of the force of this has been lost with the fuller disclosures required under the securities and exchange laws, although this isn't enforced as it should be.

The biggest criticism against it is that it gives a foot in the door to raiders and to a disruptive opposition, bringing dissension to board meetings.

Actually a raider has to win a majority to get control, whether there is cumulative voting or not. Proxy fights are expensive, particularly in the larger corporations. If a raider has to bear the expense of such fights 2 or 3 years on end, without a chance of passing these onto the company sought, he is apt to become discouraged.

A WIDE-AWAKE MANAGEMENT

While this reporter is not sold on cumulative voting, it has its points. The best insurance against raids still is a wide awake management with a major investment in the company's shares and enlightened shareowner relations. Good managements have lost out by failing to keep shareowners fully informed as to just what is going on. Their public relations have been weak, and this cannot be developed at the 11th hour.

There needs also to be full disclosure of all parties involved and their interest—financial and otherwise. The SEC is supposed to see that this is done, but it misses too often. That's where the newspapers come in.

Supping With the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the Washington Star, there appears an article written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate, which should be read by every Member of Congress and indeed by every American.

This article, which is entitled "Supping With the Devil," reads as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris)

Jibes pointing to flaws in the free world are quite the fashion. This global sport is especially indulged in by nations whose people have been fed and whose economy has been rescued from ruin by a Good Samaritan called Uncle Sam. Often, here at home, we are told that our house is made of glass, and so it is well not to throw stones, even at the totalitarian structure. The inference is that, since there are sinners on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the thing to do is to shake hands—that is, when the Communists feel like indulging in that social diversion—instead of crying out against crimes which inwardly disturb us. We are blandly told that there is nothing we can do about the awful things that are going on in the world, and so it is best to be friendly with all concerned, rather than to stand up and to speak out boldly in God's name. This advice is to "Fold the hands and acquiesce." That is the essence of the deadly plague called "neutralism," which now is weakening the defenses of a number of nations once alert to threatening danger. Siren voices are saying that, after all, the difference between social systems is just a matter of choice and of opinion. Such an attitude loses sight of the sanctities and decencies of life which can never be a matter of opinion with civilized men. In all this jellyfish neutrality there is a total, and often a willful, disregard of the reality of the heinous thing mankind is facing.

No scripture applies more literally in the present crisis than the injunction: "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." To join it, or even to regard it with complacency, means inevitably our own damnation. For what we are asked to cooperate with—and that is what the camouflaged word coexistence really means—is the most damnable thing which has ever appeared on the face of the planet. Hell has broken through the polished veneer of our modern world. Sadistic cruelties have emerged with sharpened instruments of tortue. Abominations seven times more satanic than the so-called Dark Ages ever knew have staged a comeback in this glittering 20th century. The world resounds with the wails of deported people and of hordes of slaves of their own and other nations, who are even now having their lives ground out as their waning physical strength is harnessed to the juggernaut of a godless system out to rule the world. This is the devilish thing whose representatives are now visiting capitals of nations and are being recieved as equals by those whose most sacred standards and beliefs they brazenly ridicule and deny.

Well did the Vice President of the United States, speaking to all so-called neutral nations now being exposed to the "come into my parlor said the spider to the fly" refrain, warn that "those who sup with the devil had better have a long spoon." There are moral implications of close association with those guilty of every crime on the calendar which the free world disregards to its peril. The role of true religion in this battle of Armageddon is to face the issue with the moral indignation of the Hebrew prophets and of Jesus of Nazareth. For our own souls' sakes we must do that.

Of course, we must never indulge in anger that has its roots in selfishness. The trouble is that we often become indignant over trifles. The perversity even of inanimate objects sends us into a tantrum of fury. But there is an anger which if we lose by supping with the devil will result in much of concession and compromise. Let us never forget that while Jesus could be tender He was terrible in His indignation against those who abused His brother man. When even a friend made an evil suggestion to Him, He blurted out "Get thee behind me, Satan." He would not sup with the devil. Whenever He saw cruelty perpetuated on the defenseless His indignation rose to the fury of a tempest. When he contemplated the crime of robbing children of their birthright He uttered burning words which leaped out like a devouring flame. Listen to Him: "Whoso shall cause one of these little ones to stumble, it would be better for him that a great millstone be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea."

What can we imagine the Christ would say, as, He confronted the crimes of the Soviets and of Red China? For what they are now

saying Stalin was and did is a hideous picture of what they are and are doing.

Nothing is more needed in our day than a larga capacity for moral indignation. Nothing is so deadening and damning as neutrality. This is true especially when the criminals whose lair is the Kremlin are putting on a new look, and are also offering to the world they have outraged soothing syrup which ought to be labeled "Deadly Poison." Something has happened, something terrible, to those in the free nations who can contemplate the gigantic outrages of which the Soviet system has been guilty and is still carrying on, and who can yet be as calm as a summer morning.

A willingness to sup with the devil, with a long spoon or a short one, is an indication of indifference to wrongdoing, and is always a sign of moral deterioration. And now, let us pray: From the fatal futility of becoming nothing but spineless neutrals, bowing down at the altar of a false tolerance, good Lord, deliver us.

Special Legislative Analysis of Record of Hon. Coya Knutson, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, by appropriate action, the House Committee on Agriculture was created more than 125 years ago. Many distinguished men have served on that great committee during the time that it has functioned as a vital part of the legislative machinery of our Congress. Our able and beloved colleague, Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, of Minnesota, is the first and only woman ever to be assigned to membership on the House Committee on Agriculture. Having served on that committee for more than 22 years, I have seen many members come and go. Most of the Members of the House who have been assigned to that committee have been devoted friends of agriculture, but I can truthfully say that no one with whom I have served has been more devoted to the cause of agriculture nor more dedicated to public service than the distinguished Congresswoman, Mrs. COYA KNUTSON. Nor do I know of any Member of Congress who has made more friends during the brief time that she has served as a Member of this House nor one who is held in higher esteem than this great and good public servant, Mrs. KNUTSON.

Mrs. KNUTSON has faithfully and diligently and with competence and ability performed the duties of every assignment. She has been regular in attendance and constant in attention to the many matters of importance which she has been required to consider. I am personally grateful to Mrs. KNUTSON for the splendid manner in which she has cooperated with me and other members in the work of our committee. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, more than 800 bills have been referred by you to our committee during the present term of Congress which is now ending, and not a single one of these bills has been neglected nor ignored. Mrs. KNUTSON has won the affection of all of her colleagues, and she is worthy of the faith and the confidence of the people of her district.

To the end that I might know how Mrs. KNUTSON's record in Congress might be appraised by one of the great farm organizations of the Nation, I obtained from the Farmers' Union a copy of a special legislative analysis of Mrs. KNUTSON's record as that record is analyzed and appraised by the officials of that farm organization. I take pleasure in submitting for the RECORD this special legislative analysis which also contains other comments and commendations, together with statements made on several occasions by Mrs. KNUTSON, which indicate that she is a true and devoted public servant—a Member of Congress who has a record of which she may justly be proud:

SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE ANALYSIS MEMORANDUM, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD AND REPORT ON CONGRESSWOMAN COYA KNUTSON

In furtherance of our program of keeping you informed of the voting record and legislative contributions of Members of Congress, we are including here the record of Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, Congresswoman from the Ninth District of Minnesota, which comprises the northwest tier of counties in Minnesota.

Mrs. KNUTSON's record in favor of family farmers is one of the best in the 84th Congress. Her record speaks for itself. She has done an outstanding job in not only representing the farmers of her area but all the family farmers of the Nation.

In addition to Mrs. KNUTSON's voting record on certain key bills, excerpts from some of her speeches and remarks taken from newspaper articles written about her are included in this analysis.

Mrs. KNUTSON is 42 years of age. She is a farm girl from North Dakota who migrated across the line to Minnesota at an early age. Farm wife, schoolteacher, State legislator—that's COYA as she is called by her friends. Now it's Congresswoman—Mrs. KNUTSON has voted for and initiated many bills in the 84th Congress in behalf of the family farmers of this Nation.

Voting Record—Congressional Record of Representative Coya Knutson, Democrat-Farmer-Labor, of Oklee, Minn., Ninth District of Minnesota, elected to 84th Cong., Nov. 2, 1954

	For	Against
1. To remove peanuts from list of basic crops (H. R. 12)		X
2. 90 percent farm price supports (H. R. 12)	X	
3. Social security amendments improving certain good features (H. R. 7225)	X	
4. Raise minimum wages	X	
5. Exempt natural gas companies from public utility regulation (H. R. 6645)		X
6. Public works appropriations, raising funds for Atomic Energy Commission, TVA, Interior Department, Federal power projects (H. R. 6766)	X	
7. Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126) renewing farm housing loan program	X	
8. Small Business Committee funds—to continue its investigations of monopolies (H. R. 299)	X	
9. To override President's veto of farm bill of 1956 (H. R. 12)	X	
10. Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank)	X	

ATTITUDE TOWARD FARM LEGISLATION

Here is what Drew Pearson had to say in his column in January 1955:

"Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, freshman Congresswoman from Minnesota, hardly had time to get settled in Washington when she received this note from her 15-year-old son, Terry, a student at Oklee High School: 'Hurry up and do something, Mom. Folks back here sure are relying on you.' "

The reporter said: "Mrs. KNUTSON's 275,000 constituents can relax. The lady from Minnesota began talking about the downward trend of farm prices the moment she hit town and doesn't intend to stop until she has everybody from President Eisenhower down to and including Capitol page boys alerted to the situation. 'If you knew the prices my dairy and grain farmers are getting in the present market you'd be shocked,' she says. 'I campaigned almost entirely on that issue and I'm going to continue campaigning here in Washington.' Before getting into politics, Mrs. KNUTSON farmed and taught school. During the last campaign a farm-labor leader introduced her as follows: 'Many an early morning I have seen Coya on the south forty running a tractor or climbing a barbed wire fence. What's more, she did it like a lady.' "

The following is taken from a report of the Subcommittee on Family Farms of which Mrs. KNUTSON is a member:

"The system of family farming in America rejected the feudal systems of older nations and established the free enterprise economic foundation on which this Nation has flourished. America cannot now afford to allow the substitution of a hired hand industrial type of agriculture for the independent farm family on the land. The Nation's policies must be shaped to perpetuate the family as the dominant operating unit in agriculture.

"Our agricultural policies must be such that the Nation's farmers and their families share in the blessings of free enterprise on a parity with all other elements of our national life.

"The farm program must begin with the family farm; that the program should not aid the factory in the field type of farming for, except in a few specialized operations, there are no values for the Nation in substituting a hired labor agriculture for the independent family farm; that specific emphasis must be placed upon the development of our smaller farms into adequate units with resources sufficient for economic production and that the rights of tennants as well as those of landowning farmers must be protected. Steps must be taken to protect the income of family farms at full partity returns on their production, with the benefits of such income and price protection limited to the output level of the family type farm. Therefore appropriate steps should be taken immediately toward the drafting and enactment of a family farm program for agriculture."

[From the Willmar (Minn.) Tribune]

COYA CHAMPIONING FAMILY SIZED FARM

Representative COYA KNUTSON, Democrat, (Minnesota) told the closing dinner of the Minnesota Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs Saturday night the family type farm is the country's most important agricultural unit.

"Farm products must be supported at parity," she told the group, "in order to keep the small farm solvent. If we can't maintain it as a reasonably profitable kind of life, we will start an economic and social prairie fire such as we have never had."

[From the Tyler (Minn.) Courier Times]

REPRESENTATIVE COYA KNUTSON, OF MINNESOTA CAMPAIGNS FOR HER FELLOW FARMERS

There is a determined female farmer in Congress. Fortunately, COYA KNUTSON doesn't look as grimly determined as she is about helping farmers "make a decent living." * * * "Her strength is that of five men," said one admiring Minnesota voter referring to the four men she walloped in the Democratic primary and the Republican (the incumbent with 12 years service) at the polls. * * * "From the minute the results of the election were in Mrs. KNUTSON turned to her next determination; to get assigned to the House Agriculture Committee. That's a neat political trick as every Member from a farm district is waiting in line. Her Republican predecessor never made it. She did. * * * One thing that helped Mrs. KNUTSON get the assignment was her campaign favoring full price supports for farmers. (She is the first woman to serve on this committee.)

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press]

MRS. KNUTSON TO FIGHT FOR PROPS

Representative COYA KNUTSON, Democrat, Farmer-Labor, Oklee, the first woman elected to Congress from Minnesota, said Monday her legislative work will be aimed at giving farmers high price supports and the Red River Valley improved flood control. * * * "The farmers elected me, so my chief concern will be their interests," Mrs. KNUTSON told the Pioneer Press.

[From the Kansas City Star]

FARM INCOME AN ISSUE

Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, a fledgling in politics who last year pried a Republican from his 12 years tenure as Representative from the rural Minnesota congressional district, thinks the issue on which she waged her campaign will elect a lot more Democrats in 1956. That issue is outlined as the welfare of the farming segment of the American economy.

Mrs. KNUTSON, who was in Kansas City today for a 7-State conference of Democratic women at the Hotel President was voluble on the subject she said was closest to her heart. "If the farmers don't have buying power," Mrs. KNUTSON said, "our small communities will dry up in a big hurry. Why, in my State alone, in one section, an auctioneer had 200 farms to auction lined up for this fall. Of course, they are not all foreclosures, by any means, but it is a big turnover for a section. The thing is alarming. I am an advocate," Mrs. KNUTSON continued, "of the save the family type of farm, where the farmers may have sufficient income to raise his children in the midst of his acres."

[From the Newport (Va.) News]

MINNESOTAN IS FARMER'S ADVOCATE ON CAPITOL HILL

After delivering a speech in Minnesota several months ago, former President Harry Truman was greeted by Representative COYA KNUTSON, Democrat, of Minnesota. "I am very happy that you stressed so much the subject of the farm family," she exclaimed. "COYA, you should be happy," cracked Truman, "I took most of it from your farm speech." President Truman wasn't kidding. And he isn't the only politician who recognized the astounding talents of COYA KNUTSON, a farm gal who can dazzle city and country folk alike. Among her colleagues in both parties she has come to be considered one of the outstanding spokesmen for 90 percent parity and the preservation of the family-type farm.

[From the Lutheran of October 1955]

THE CONGRESSWOMAN FROM MINNESOTA

Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, raised on a middle western farm, thinks national problems should be solved according to principles of the Christian faith.

Zion Lutheran Church at Oklee, Minn., had to give up an organist choir director, and Sunday school teacher, all in one, when Mrs. COYA KNUTSON, went to Washington as the first Congresswoman from her State.

As a farmers daughter, who represents a farm district, and the only woman ever to serve on the House Agriculture Committee, Mrs. KNUTSON is working hard for a farm program that will distribute America's surplus food to low income people in the United States and abroad.

The farm problem, she feels is one of poor distribution. It does not make sense for farmers to suffer low incomes because of bountiful supplies of crops, for which people in the rest of the world are hungering. "No piecemeal solution will work here," she said. "It is an overall, long range, planned program, that will come the nearest to preserving our rural way of life."

MR. KNUTSON'S ACTIVITY ON LEGISLATION OF INTEREST TO FARMERS UNION

Besides the very fine overall work carried on by Mrs KNUTSON to bring this Nation's attention to the problems of the family type farmers, the several issues specifically in which she has been in the forefront of the fight.

HOLLAND AMENDMENT

Passed by the House in 1954, this amendment required that a farmer, in order to qualify for price support on any one commodity he raised, would have to comply with acreage allotments and marketing quotas for all commodities raised on his farm and included in the price-support program. This was known as "cross compliance."

Mrs. KNUTSON introduced a bill, H. R. 3781, to repeal the Holland amendment and the bill was passed by Congress.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

A bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 with the same system of payments already in effect but allocating to the mainland producers a larger share of the domestic consumption increase, H. R. 5408, was introduced by Mrs. KNUTSON. This legislation, as passed, will aid the sugar beet producers of her district as well as those of other areas. Mrs. KNUTSON was selected by the House of Representatives as one of the floor managers for the conference committee on this important legislation.

FARM CREDIT

Congresswoman KNUTSON has worked very hard and very effectively in securing liberalizing amendments to present farm-credit legislation. She introduced H. R. 3874 in 1955 and H. R. 11032 in 1956. In the House-passed bill several of the features she sponsored were included, which is further evidence of the diligence Mrs. KNUTSON employs in working for the interest of the family-type farmers. Of particular importance at this time is the expanded authority provided in the new legislation for refinancing of existing indebtedness.

SCHOOL LUNCH—DAIRY

Mrs. KNUTSON introduced H. R. 7762 to amend the School-Lunch Act so as to authorize assistance to the States in furnishing two half pints of milk a day to school children. The farm in which the legislation passed the House did not provide for all the good features of her bill; however, the appropriation for this program, in which she had a leading part, was increased from $50 million to $75 million a year.

FAMILY FARM PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE

On July 16, 1956, the Subcommittee on Family Farms, of which Congresswoman KNUTSON is a member, is holding hearings on Government policy relating to family-type farming. Mrs. KNUTSON introduced H. R. 3780 which would state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve family-type farming as the basis of American agriculture.

The subcommittee held grassroots hearings around the country in the fall of 1955. The report of the subcommittee contained the following recommendations:

1. Support at full parity the production of average family farmers who agree to cooperate in the allotment and soil-conservation program. It would not be restricted to the so-called basic crops.

2. Immediate restoration of 90 percent supports on crops subject to acreage allotments in 1956.

3. Minimum production allotments to provide opportunity for all farm families to make a fair living.

4. Expanded and liberalized credit facilities under Farmers Home Administration.

5. Expanded research and marketing services.

6. Widest possible dispersal in location of industries, both Government and private, in order to provide greater opportunity for employment by part-time farmers.

7. More liberal programs for soil conservation practices on small farmers, and prompt payments.

8. A program to provide trained leadership in community organization in low farm-income areas.

This was an important advance in congressional thinking on the family-farm program.

CONSERVATION ACREAGE RESERVE

Congresswoman KNUTSON introduced H. R. 8369 in January 1956, to establish a conservation acreage reserve. This bill, if it had passed, would have provided for a sounder and more effective conservation and income program than the patchwork soil-bank program which was finally passed as the best Congress could get past the Presidential veto. Mrs. KNUTSON and many other Congressmen, were supporting this type of conservation program long before the Department of Agriculture changed its position from opposition to support.

OTHER

In other matters such as legislation dealing with education, health, Indian affairs, public power, flood control, REA, the position of Congresswoman KNUTSON has always been on the side favorable to family farmers, city workers, and small-business men. She has opposed the giveaway programs of water power sites, illegal power contracts, our forests, rangelands, and parks. She has supported appropriations to provide for adequate defense programs and foreign economic and technical assistance in the difficult times we face.

BILLS INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSWOMAN COYA KNUTSON, NINTH DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

AGRICULTURE

H. R. 3780, February 8, 1955: A bill to state explicitly the long-standing national policy to preserve and strengthen the family-farm American agriculture.

H. R. 3781, February 8, 1955: A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Act of 1938. (Repeal of Holland amendment). (Passed.)

H. R. 3782, February 8, 1955. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 (100 percent parity bill).

H. R. 3783, February 8, 1955: A bill to continue through December 31, 1957, the existing method of computing parity prices for basic agricultural commodities.

H. R. 3784, February 8, 1955: A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1937, to provide additional credit facilities for farm enlargement and development and to assist beginning farmers to become parm owners. (Beginning farmers credit.) (Passed.)

H. R. 3785, February 8, 1955: A bill to provide for a stockpiling an adequate national safety reserve of food and fiber.

H. R. 5408, March 31, 1955: A bill to amend and extend the Sugar act of 1948 as amended. (Passed.)

H. R. 6203, May 12, 1955: Passed July 2, 1956, a bill to amend section 406 of Federal Seed Act.

H. R. 7762, July 30, 1955: A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to authorize assistance to the States in furnishing two half-pints of milk a day to school children. (Passed with additional funds only.)

H. R. 8369 (same as H. R. 6052 of 1955), January 12, 1956: A bill to establish a conservation acreage reserve, to promote conservation improvement of agricultural soil and water resources in relation to watershed development, to stabilize farmers' income to adjust total agricultural production to consumer and export needs, to maintain an abundant and even flow of farm commodities in interstate commerce.

H. R. 11032, May 7, 1956: A bill to strengthen the Nation by providing auxiliary credit resources required to preserve the family-size farm, providing additional credit for farm enlargement and development, refinancing of existing indebtedness, expansion, and simplification of farm ownership and operations credit programs by amendment of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and extension and simplification of emergency and disaster farm credit by amendment of the Acts of April 6, 1949, and of August 31, 1954.

EDUCATION

H. R. 5510, April 13, 1955: A bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.

H. R. 11414, May 23, 1956: A bill to provide a program of Federal student loans to assist students to pursue programs of higher education.

INDIANS

H. R. 5478, April 4, 1955: Passed under her name. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

H. R. 8370, January 12, 1956: A bill to promote the welfare of the American Indian citizens of Minnesota and to facilitate the orderly termination of Federal supervision and control over Indians and Indian property in that State. (Same bill as H. R. 7386 for July 14, 1955, with Red Lake Tribe left out.)

H. R. 11033, May 7, 1956: A bill relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill.

H. R. 6104, May 9, 1955: A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe (White Earth Indian Reservation).

MISCELLANEOUS

H. R. 4630, March 3, 1955: Passed under her name. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.

H. R. 6265, May 16, 1955: A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union.

H. R. 10127, March 21, 1956: A bill to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to provide for an addition to the National System of Interstate Highways. (Through Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, North Dakota, Montana, and Idaho, and ending in Everett, Wash.) This would be highway No. 2 in our district.

H. R. 10128, March 21, 1956: A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

This memorandum indicates the untiring and continuing efforts of another one of our fine Representatives in Congress. Mrs. KNUTSON'S record speaks for itself just as it effectively speaks out in support of family farmers and all fair-minded citizens throughout the United States.

Proxy Contests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 6, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of July 5, 1956, makes interesting reading:

OBSERVATIONS

(By A. Wilfred May)

PROXY CONTESTS AND CONTROVERSY

The interest in this week's Fulbright committee hearings on proxy contests and proxy regulation, scheduled to begin Thursday, is enhanced by the SEC's report recently submitted (May 17) to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, setting forth the results of a factual study with respect to the corporations which would be subject to pending S. 2054 (the Fulbright bill which would bring unlisted companies within the administration of the corporate provision of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; which bill subsequently has been killed for this session. Also stimulating interest is, the SEC's amendment of its rules pertaining to contests, adopted January 17 last, and its subsequent expressions of satisfaction therewith; and by the more recent divulging by the Commission of data bearing on stockholders' proposals includable in management's proxy statements (under rule X–14A–8).

EXISTING GROSS DEFICIENCIES

The SEC reports that the study of proxy soliciting material circulated by unlisted companies has demonstrated a general failure to furnish important information which would be required by the Commission's existing proxy rules with respect to the election of directors, and significant proposals requiring stockholder approval. With respect to election of directors, such material typically consists only of a notice of meeting and a form of proxy, accompanied or preceded by an annual report. At least 23 percent of the corporations studied by the Commission did not furnish the annual report concurrent with or prior to proxy solicitation; in 73 percent of the cases, the identity of the nominees was not disclosed; and in 52 of the cases reviewed, the form of proxy gave the stockholder no opportunity to cast a ballot for or against a proposal. He must either vote for the proposal or not vote at all, unless he appears at the meeting or takes some other affirmative action to record his vote. Seventy-three percent of the corporations in soliciting proxies for the election of directors fail to inform the stockholders as to the identity of nominees; 87 percent do not indicate the principal occupation of directors and nominees; and 98 percent do not volunteer to disclose the remuneration paid to directors. In 72 percent of the cases neither a proxy statement nor equivalent information of any kind was furnished to the stockholders in management's solicitation of proxies for the election of directors. The soliciting material has likewise been found deficient in the giving of information regarding authorization or issue of new securities, in voting on modification or exchange of securities, and voting on mergers and consolidations.

A REMEDY CALLED FOR

If not via Fulbright type of legislation, no doubt some other means will be employed to remedy this inconsistent and otherwise foolish situation. Problems concerned with the constitutional possibility of enacting such uniform legislation necessary for the Federal Government's control can presumably be managed. Surely the power of the Congress to legislate is sufficient a basis for Federal regulation of the incidence of proxy contests and other proxy matters, which have a public interest. After all, if the Congress regulates the issue of securities by corporations, almost all of which have State charters, by virtue of its power to regulate interstate commerce, the power is necessarily present to go further in this area.

STOCKHOLDER PROPOSALS

The questionable status of the stockholder's privilege to have a proposal circularized to his fellow owners via management's proxy statements, which come up at this week's hearings, is highlighted by new SEC-divulged data. These show stockholder frustratiton from the fact that the number of stockholders venturing to make proposals has declined over the past 2 calendar years, as well as during the first half of 1956. During the full calendar year 1955, there were 56 proposers against 52 in 1954, and the number of stockholders whose proposals were included in proxy statements fell to 19 in 1956 from 34 during the first half of 1955 and from 28 in 1954. It is also shown that the number of proposals excluded from 1954 to 1955 rose from 54 to 62. Under the existing rules, no single one of the numerous stockholder proposals which have been opposed by management (averaging about 50 a year) has been approved.

The opportunity will be embraced at this time for exploration of the status of the public stockholder versus management in this proposal area. It must be realized that effective support for such proposals can only be solicited and secured through proxy statements; and unless they are included in the notice of meeting and proxy statement, may be ruled out of order and denied all consideration.

ANNUAL SUGGESTION BOX

Under the present rules, management is required to include in its material a statement in support of any security holder's proper proposal which it opposes. But such proposals, irrespective of their technicalities, are limited inflexibly to a maximum of 100 words. In most cases this prevents adequate education of the lay stockholder rank and file on the matter; in contrast to the complete lack of restriction on the length of management's reply. It is further pointed out that management, with the cost defrayed from corporate funds, can exert vast additional pressure in electioneering for its position; and that any elaboration by the shareholder on his own would entail his shouldering of great expense.

It is contended further that greater opportunity should be afforded for the checking of the accuracy of management's rebuttals.

Other controversial questions still open over the years which should now be resolved include the setting of minimum votes as a prerequisite for reintroduction of a proposal before waiting 4 years.

Under the rules, revision of January 1954, a nonmanagement proposal which used to require merely a 3-percent favorable vote to be eligible for reintroduction now requires 6 percent the second year and 10 percent the third year—otherwise the reintroduction is subjected to a 4-year wait.

PAYING THE WAR COSTS

Also warranting consideration is the manner of shouldering the great expense involved in the waging of proxy contests. Equitable restriction on expenditure by the corporation on behalf of the management side may be impracticable. But in the handling of the antimanagement agitation, measures would seem to be called for and practicable. The enormous outlay devolving on the challenger of management, without any reassurance of reimbursement, by itself tends to concentrate active dissent to individuals according to inappropriate criteria, as possession of the great financial wherewithal or with compensating personal motives (raiding), which are so widely decried. Perhaps the antimanagement faction could be reimbursed for contest expenses if it succeeds in winning a minimum proportion of the vote fixed at less than a 51-percent majority.

The manner of voting by fiduciaries, who are becoming ever more important, will be weighed.

Approval of the Multer bill, which would bring banks under the SEC's proxy rules, is again being urged by Lewis D. Gilbert, the volunteer "protector" of the Nation's community of public stockholders. The same quarter is continuing to urge the mandatory, and not discretionary, solicitation of proxies annually.

Also being reagitated by Mrs. Wilma Soss, president of the Federation of Women Shareholders, is an uninstructed secret ballot with a place for a writein. And she objects to riders on union contracts covering pension and retirement funds which might bindingly benefit management in advance of proxy approval. The ladies also are plumping for a legal-aid-society type of help to rescue the laywomen from their proxy-problem bewilderment.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo.*—The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*—
Bender, George H., *Ohio*—120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*—
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*—The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*—
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*—
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*—
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky.*—The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*—
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*—
Daniel, Price, *Tex.*—
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*—
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*—
Duff, James H., *Pa.*—
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*—
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*—
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt.*—
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*—
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*—
George, Walter F., *Ga.*—The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*—
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*—
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*—
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*—
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*—
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky.*—
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y.*—
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*—
Jenner, William E., *Ind.*—
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*—
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*—
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*—
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*—
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*—
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va.*—
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*—2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y.*—Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La.*—
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis.*—
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*—
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*—
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev.*—The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*—
Martin, Edward, *Pa.*—
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo.*—
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*—
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va.*—
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*—
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*—
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*—
Potter, Charles E., *Mich.*—
Purtell, William A., *Conn.*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*—
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*—
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C.*—
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*—
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J.*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*—
Sparkman, John J., *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*—
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*—
Thye, Edward J., *Minn.*—
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*—
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*—4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del.*—
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C.*—
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*—6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*—4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*
Albert, Carl, *Okla*
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*—University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*
Andrews, George W., *Ala*—3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*—4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*—113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bates, William H., *Mass*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Beamer, John V., *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*
Belcher, Page, *Okla*
Bell, John J., *Tex*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*—1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*—5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*—2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*
Boggs, Hale, *La*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*—3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*—2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*—The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*—The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*
Bray, William G., *Ind*
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*
Brooks, Overton, *La*—4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*—Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*—Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*—2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Byrne, James A., *Pa*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*—1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*—The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*—Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*—1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo.*
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*—3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*—The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*—1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*—2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*—The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*
Cramer, William C., *Fla*—Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind.*
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*—3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*—4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*—2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*
Dawson, William A., *Utah*
Dawson, William L., *Ill*
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*—2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*
Dies, Martin, *Tex*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*—2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*—3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*—The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*
Dowdy, John, *Tex*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*—3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*—The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*—3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*—3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*—5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*—3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*—200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*—Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*—The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*—3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*—4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*—514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*—The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*—Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*—3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*
Fulton, James G., *Pa*

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*—6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*
George, Myron V., *Kans*—3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*
Grant, George M., *Ala*—4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*
Green, Edith, *Oreg*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*—2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*
Hale, Robert, *Maine*—2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*—4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*—The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*
Harris, Oren, *Ark*—1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*—4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*—314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*
Healey, James C., *N. Y*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*—104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*
Heselton, John W., *Mass*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*
Hill, William S., *Colo*—110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*—100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*—Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*
Holt, Joe, *Calif*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*—3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*—200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*—2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*—630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*—3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*—3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*—3083 Ordway St

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*—2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*—Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*—1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*—The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*—The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*—3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*
King, Cecil R., *Calif*
King, Karl C., *Pa*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*—112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 7516 14th St.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Appendix

Address by Clarence Manion at the For America Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on Thursday, June 7, I had the pleasure of being one of the speakers at a gigantic patriotic rally held in the Los Angeles Shrine Civic Auditorium under the auspices of For America, a nationwide patriotic organization fighting for our national sovereignty. This great gathering was attended by nearly 6,000 thoughtful Americans who streamed into the Shrine Auditorium from points as far distant from Los Angeles as San Francisco, San Diego, Nevada, and Arizona.

One of the noteworthy addresses of the evening was delivered by Dean Clarence Manion, national cochairman of For America. Dean Manion, former head of the law school of Notre Dame University, is recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on constitutional law in our country. He is a forthright, incisive speaker; a man of deep convictions and the courage to state them.

I ask unanimous consent to have that great address by a great American be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DEAN CLARENCE MANION AT FOR AMERICA RALLY, JUNE 7, 1956, SHRINE CIVIC AUDITORIUM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Dan Smoot, Reverend Fifield, and ever so many distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans of California, it has been said that time and tide will not wait, but tonight I am sorry to say, distinguished governors and Senators and other men of distinction in America must wait a minute while I, as cochairman of what Dan Smoot has so beautifully described as the For America organization—while I, as cochairman, explain why we are so organized.

For America is brought together precisely because there is now and has been in this country for years a compact, well-financed, highly effective organization against America; and it is precisely to combat the evil effects of this effective, long-lived organization against America that For America was born.

Of course, the organization against America never advertises itself as such. This pernicious wolf has a whole wardrobe of sheep's clothing. At one time it may be disguised as a great instrument for the establishment of international peace and the brotherhood of man. And on another occasion it may masquerade itself as the champion of civil liberties. At other times it has been know to wear the garb even of anti-communism. But wherever it is and whatever it wears and whatever it does, the prime purpose of the against America organization is to destroy the sovereignty, the slovency and the Constitution of the United States of America.

Several years ago a small number of courageous men decided that this organization had had the field all to itself long enough. I remember seeing my old friend Knute Rockne demonstrate that in any tight place on the football field the best defense is always a good offensive. That tactic is effective here. To combat the organization against America, we desperately need a fighting organization for America. Here in the beautiful city of the angels there is a proper and suitable atmosphere for the forwarding of this high purpose. I am delighted, therefore, to say a word at the beginning of these proceedings.

I prepared no speech for tonight, because I have long observed that there are things in the daily press which anger me to the point where all things prepared the day before yesterday are suddenly academic. I find that this visit to Los Angeles has been no exception. I am glad that I did not waste my time preparing a long speech which the anger of the moment would forbid me to deliver because of my preoccupation with what has occurred yesterday and today.

I found that here in Los Angeles yesterday, or the day before, the Los Angeles County Council of the American Legion, with time-honored, forthright patriotism which is characteristic of that organization, renewed its resolution against this facet of the organization against America—this despicable thing called UNESCO.

I came to California prepared to congratulate the people of Los Angeles for having driven this subversive one-world organization out of the schools. I find now that they are prepared to put it back. And I hope that the resolution of this community is still steeled against the unsleeping, persistent determination of the one-worlders to infect the minds of our schoolchildren, even though they well know that, unless we do something about it, when these children grow up one world will be a fact. So I ask you to gird your loins against the resurrection of these manufacturers of un-American opinion, to guard yourselves against this insidious infiltration of American teaching. So much for that.

Here is another headline which reminds me to observe that the repercussions of this meeting throughout the country and throughout the world will undoubtedly be effectively jammed by the loud horselaugh of a character called Tito of Yugoslavia—Tito, to whom we have given $2 billion more or less, sweated out of the pay envelopes of American workers before they even saw their wages—$2 billion to Tito. This means that henceforth, as a part of the public debt of the United States, these same working people must sweat out $60 million a year in interest on what we have already given this Little Boy Blue. I also observe that this morning the President of the United States called this sort of thing "mutual security." Well, from where I stand tonight, my friends, it looks like mutual security for Khrushchev, Bulganin, and Tito, at the expense of the American taxpayer. How long will this stupid, suicidal policy go on? What will impede the prodigality of these annual appropriations of your money to these foreign, un-American purposes? One thing will stop them.

This brings me to another piece of current news: I have the great honor to call your attention to the fact that next Sunday night, over KHJ here in Los Angeles on what is called the Manion Forum, I will have the great privilege of introducing the former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Honorable T. Coleman Andrews, who will pay his respects to the income tax.

The way to keep these people from spending your money for senseless, useless purposes is to keep them from getting your money in the first place. And of course, quite by coincidence—not by any means by design, here on this For America platform we have two of the greatest champions on earth of that patriotic idea. I refer to my distinguished fellow Hoosier, the Honorable Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER. Maybe you didn't know it, but Senator JENNER has a resolution pending before the United States Senate to abolish the extortionate larceny known as the withholding tax.

Many, many years ago, Thomas Jefferson staked out the ideals for the Government over which he was to preside as President of the United States. He said his ideal was a wise and frugal Government which would restrain men from injuring one another and which would leave them otherwise free and which would not take from the mouth of labor the bread that it had earned. Well, we have made it an official, mandatory policy in this country to take from the mouth of labor the bread that it has earned, and give it to such characters as Tito, and Nehru, and Soekarno, and a lot of other people. This is precisely what the Jenner amendment would prohibit, and I am happy to announce that on the reverse side of the For America platform, which you picked up as you came in here, you will see that this organization, as a part of its purpose, endorses and calls for the passage of the Jenner resolution. From coast to coast, for his courage and candor in the demanding what no citizen nowadays is apparently able to get—in demanding a court test of the legality of the dispensation of these funds extorted from the American people by withholding taxes—here tonight we have the champion of that courageous cause, the Honorable Bracken Lee, of Utah. And so, my friends, if you came here tonight to this auditorium to hear equivocation, if you came here to bisect the unappreciable difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee, then you are going to be disappointed, because the people who follow me on this program have the courage of their convictions and the ability to express them. I sincerely hope that their great courage and patriotism and sacrifice in coming to Los Angeles—at the risk of their political lives—to tell you the truth, will pay a dividend in terms of your enthusiasm here in Los Angeles.

Now let me make one slight reference to the subject to which I was assigned: Wherever you find this pernicious organization against America and whatever garb you find it wearing at the time, you will see it avidly pursuing its purpose to destroy American independence by the establishment of world government; to destroy our economic system and our solvency by the destruction of the profit motive and the confiscation of our resources through taxation; but finally and foremost, you will see that organization against America behind its beguiling patriotic mask—you will see this organization striving to destroy the Consti-

tution of the United States. That is the target—that is its purpose; because these people know well what we have forgotten or refused to recognize—that as long as the Constitution of this country is properly construed and militantly enforced, the organization against America is helpless. The constitutional system of the United States was established to give a practical, working definition to liberty, for which we have died in every generation of American life. The one working definition of liberty is limited government. Where government is limited and where the limitations upon that government are enforced, men are free; where government is unlimited and illimitable, men are slaves. It's just as simple as that. And over a third of the world tonight, more than a third of of the people in it are enslaved by a thing we call communism, which is merely unlimited government on the loose.

My friends, we cannot defeat the menace in Moscow by establishing the same kind of despotism in Washington. In order for the organization against America to strip from our constitutional system the tight limitations that it has put around government, they have attacked the Constitution of the United States in Congress, in the executive branch of Government, and—last but not least and more importantly—in the courts. There are many, many provisions of the Constitution that are important, but the axle of the whole constitutional system—the thing upon which our Federal system turns—is the constitutional doctrine of States' rights. If the axle is broken, if the constitutional doctrine of States' rights enshrined in the 10th article of the Bill of Rights is destroyed, the whole constitutional structure of this country collapses. Many years ago a more respectable Supreme Court than we have at the present time—said, "The very genius of our constitutional system calls for an indestructible union of indestructible States." Therefore, by that constitutional commandment, you cannot destroy the States without destroying the United States. I charge tonight, that the organization against America is out to destroy the United States by destroying the sovereignty of the States of the Union. We have done it by Executive order; we have done it by congressional disregard; but we have done it particularly in the last 15 years through the devious and calculated architecture of Supreme Court decision. It's high time for the people of this country—lawyers and laymen alike—to what the steady erosion of our constitutional system through the manipulations of court judges.

Let me cite you just a few rememberable statistics: Between 1860 and 1938 the Supreme Court of the United States, mindful of the fact that the very definition of liberty is the limitation of government, and that the very purpose of the Constitution is to preserve a check upon the growing tendency of the Federal Government to seize all power, between 1860 and 1938 the Supreme Court of the United States, on 60 separate occasions, invalidated acts of the Federal Government as unconstitutional invasions of the rights of the States. Sixty times. But since 1928 the Supreme Court of the United Sttaes has faced in the other direction. In the last 18 years the Supreme Court has not once reversed a single act of Congress or other branch of the Federal Government as violative of the reserved rights of the States stipulated in the 10th article. That's a significant thing. But more. Not only has the Supreme Court refused to invalidate these encroachments of Federal power upon the domain of State governments: the Court has used every conceivable opportunity to extend the reach of congressional and executive actions far beyond the expressed intention of Congress so as to speed the day when the full deposit of despotic power presides in Washington, D. C.

For 18 years, an unbroken record of centralization, aiding and abetting and accelerating the centripetal force, threatens to destroy all liberty in this country. It's time for America to wake up. Communism is not the greatest menace to our civilization, great as the menace of communism indubitably is. The greatest menace to the continuity of our American dream, the greatest menace to the continuity of the only system in the history of the world that has provided an orderly and effective method for preserving liberty, the greatest menace to the perpetuity of that system is not communism—it is the criminal, cancerous complacency of the American people.

That is why it is heartening to come here to see and hear you—and feel your enthusiasm which I am sure you will generate. And let me tell you this before I depart. After teaching constitutional law for 25 years, I learned something about the Constitution from a notorious—and I am sure a thoroughly repentant—ex-Communist at Notre Dame. He came there fresh from the fleshpots of the Daily Worker. He hadn't been there 48 hours until he told me this: "As a teacher of constitutional law at Notre Dame," he said, "Do you know the greatest protection that we have in America against the success of the Communist conquest?" I made my guesses—as you would make yours. "No," he said, "they're all wrong. The greatest protection that the United States has against the success of the Communist conspiracy here is the constitutional doctrine of States rights." Imagine that. And of course he was right. He then spelled out and demonstrated the correctness of that statement. As long as we have the police forces of the United States locally controlled in the cities and the States of the Union—as long as we have the controls over our educational system locally controlled in the States of the Union—as long as we have the ballot boxes and voting qualifications locally controlled in the States of the Union, as long as we have property rights, business practices, and privileges locally controlled in the States of the Union—you can never have a successful Communist conspiracy in the United States of America. But as soon as the control over the police, the control over education, the control over the ballot box, the control over civil rights, the control over property is centralized in Washington, then look out; because when those controls are thoroughly and absolutely centralized in Washington in defiance of the 10th article of the Bill of Rights—when that happens, the Communist conspirators will precipitate a crisis in this country. It may be a race crisis, it may be a financial crisis, it may be a labor crisis. Any crisis will be grist for this despotic mill. When that crisis is generated, then the centralized controls in Washington will go into operation over everybody and everything in the United States. At that point a Moscow-trained Communist stooge, standing close to the right hand of the President of the United States—whoever he may be—that Moscow-trained stooge then and there will grab those centralized controls, and the Communist conspiracy will have captured the United States without firing a shot. That is why States rights is the best defense against the success of the Communist conspiracy.

Since this man told me that at Notre Dame, I have seen 16 countries, one after another, fall to the Communist conspiracy by that method. They took Czechoslovakia that way; they took Hungary; they took Bulgaria and the rest—not by marching men or dropping bombs but by the simple expedient of assembling all the controls in one place and then having their Kremlin-trained spy grab them and take over!

We still have time, my friends, to forestall that. Let me leave you with the recognition of one thing: This menace of communism is a terrific, abiding menace to us and to the world. It is a sickening and a demoralizing realization to know that 1 man out of every 3 in the world tonight is denied access to his God, to his liberty, to his property, and to the freedom of his action with his family, by this overpowering, despotic thing called communism. We should, in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, call out to these men and women all over the world, give them our moral support. Let us remind them of what we said when we found our freedom—that whenever a form of government becomes destructive of these liberty-preserving ends, it is the moral right and it is the duty of the people to overthrow such a government and to set up a government consistent with those ends.

Day after day, hour after hour, we should be exporting that dynamic principle to the oppressed people of the world. That would be a way to enrich the anti-Communist world without impoverishing ourselves. Instead of that, today's paper reveals that we are happy to accept the invitation of these godless gangsters to visit them in Moscow and that we expect to invite them back.

Ladies and gentlemen, pardon my relapse into indignation, your paper this morning said there has been no protest in Congress or by the people of the United States against this invitation, and so it's probably all right. Well, for the record, and as one small voice in this great country, I protest.

To the President, to the Congress, to the people of Russia, I say there is no room in America for the entertainment of these godless gangsters.

Let us remember that the battle against communism is not in the Middle East; it is not in Cyprus; it is not in England. The battle against the Communist conquest of the United States is here—in California and in Indiana and in New York.

Communism can attain no permanent victory anywhere on earth as long as the United States is free, nationally independent, solvent, and governed by the Constitution of this country. And so, let us fight the un-American organization. Let us fight the campaign against America by resolving that we will preserve the national independence of this country. We will fight world government. We will preserve the Constitution and the solvency of the United States. We take a pledge in other words for America.

Civilian Atomic Power Acceleration Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12061) providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, as I stated this morning, the Appropriations Committee has already approved this idea, contingent upon the passage of the legislative authorization. In the Appropriations Committee meeting I supported this legislation on the theory that private industry was going to dominate this proposal, and not the Government, and I also understood that these reactors would be dispersed. But, on reading the bill—I think it is section 3 (a) of para-

graph 242—I find that that is not in the bill. I hope the bill is amended to the extent that dispersal is made crystal clear. The Government, of course, will put up the money, because private industry cannot make a dime out of this proposition for 10 or 15 years, and you could not expect them to pay the bill. But give to industry the right to operate and call the signals.

Your second big headache in this proposition, other than financing, is manpower. The way you are going to get manpower is to disperse these things. You are not going to gain anything by putting them in the regular production plants, in your 5 big ones. It is going to cost you money to hook them up there, and the first 5 years the amount of power you are going to produce is not going to be very much, anyway. But dispersal has its advantages, and one of its big assets is going to different sections of the country from what you are operating in now, and you will get more manpower and you will train more manpower.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that any of these reactors that will be built will be built by private enterprise just as all of the reactors that we have ever built have been built by private enterprise.

Mr. THOMAS. And we gave the money.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We gave the money; the gentleman is right. Then I would say further on the dispersal problem, they will be dispersed all over this country. They will be widely dispersed, as far as Oak Ridge, Tenn., is from Hanford, and by dispersing them and placing them in those positions, you are accomplishing another thing which is very important. You are putting them at isolated places where we already have a great need for electricity and which will inure to the safety of the people in the surrounding area.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my friend from California that safety is a real factor, but the public is going to have to operate and live with these things. The public never in this world will be able to put these things on 250,000 acre tracts like we have at the 5 big production plants. You know that. Industry is going to have to learn to live with it and operate it. Let us give them a little experience; get them off this Government-owned land and in different parts of the country. It is going to inure to the benefit of people. Do not make any mistake about that. You are going to train more manpower in different locations than you will be able to train in these present locations.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. It was my recollection that the gentleman from California a few days ago was opposed to dispersal, and I cannot understand.

Mr. THOMAS. By "dispersal" he means we will put it on existing plants where we have 250,000 or 300,000 acres in one block.

I do hope that we will put first things first. Let us develop this program at home here and forget about this foreign giveaway for a while.

Construction of Hells Canyon Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement by me in connection with the vote on Senate bill 1333, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

The Hells Canyon bill has been killed and the blood is on the hands of the Republican Party and its leader, the President.

This is one time when White House lobbying and pressure was so forcefully used in a feverish attempt to defeat a bill that there is no doubt where the responsibility lies.

Two articles side by side on the front page of yesterday's New York Times show as clearly as anything just what is wrong with the present administration.

The headline of one article said, "White House Bids Senate Bar Dam at Hells Canyon—It Exerts Intensive Pressure To Reject Federal Power Bill."

The headline on the adjoining article read, "President Hears Prospects for His Program Are Slim."

Many Members on this side of the aisle have complained, and rightly, about the lack of Presidential leadership in this administration. If the prospects of the President's program are slim, responsibility must be borne by the White House itself. The kind of leadership which would get a program moving has not been exerted.

Yet in the instance of the bill providing a Federal high dam at Hells Canyon, all at once we see feverish activity on the part of the White House to defeat it. It is a remarkable thing that when what is at stake is a giveaway and a tremendously costly favor to a private power monopoly, this administration exerts every pressure known to it.

In this connection I call Senators' attention to an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post. It is a brief editorial and goes straight to the point. I quote it:

"The administration reportedly is using its influence to prevent any waivering Republican Senators from voting for the Hells Canyon bill when it comes up this week. Completely apart from the merits of this measure, why is it that the administration, which failed so dismally to prevail on the school construction bill and which has had great difficulty in getting its idea on foreign aid accepted, seems to be able to muster its strongest artillery for the essentially negative purpose of stopping legislation?"

I am glad that these newspapers are letting the people of the Nation know at last the true character of this administration.

Away All Boats—A Tribute to the Motion Picture Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in tribute to the motion picture industry and a picture concerning the United States Navy, entitled "Away All Boats," which is a saga of amphibious warfare in the South Pacific in World War II.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON—TRIBUTE TO MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY AND AWAY ALL BOATS

It is good that Americans are reminded from time to time of the great personal sacrifices which have been made by individuals throughout our country's history—sacrifices which have helped to establish and insure the freedoms we enjoy. We do not want to take for granted these contributions to our way of life.

The motion-picture industry of the United States has been notably helpful as an agency of reminder. Through the medium of the screen, in theaters over the land, film producers and exhibitors have frequently brought to our better understanding and appreciation what some of these tremendous sacrifices and patriotic efforts have been.

This type of cooperation is especially important now in view of the imperative need for more men to join the United States Navy. Pictures like Away All Boats, a saga of amphibious warfare in the South Pacific in World War II, should do much to bolster naval recruiting nationwide.

This new motion picture, currently being released, will be seen in Washington. I hope that every one of our citizens has the opportunity to see it. It is certainly one of the most realistic and spectacular film stories ever photographed. In addition, it should be an inspiration to young and old.

The picture was produced with the cooperation of the Department of Defense and the Navy, and reflects credit on our Armed Forces.

Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, Chief of Information, of the United States Navy, has this to say of the picture: "Away All Boats, one of the great stories of World War II, is not only highly entertaining, but inspirational to a degree which places it among the finest motion pictures about the services."

Carl Sandburg, who might be called "Dean" among contemporary American writers, has this to say about Away All Boats: (It) * * * "is one of the best sea stories ever done, giving wonderful personality to a ship that has rare and strange adventures, bringing into fine focus the vivid human character of the ship."

The motion-picture industry is to be commended for its magnificent accomplishments in portraying stories of heroism and courage as they are reflected in momentous epochs of our Nation's growth and development. Away All Boats is such an achievement. I want to congratulate Universal-International, the film studio which made it. I want to pay special tribute to the producer, Howard Christie; president of Universal-International, Milton Raekhil; and to the

director of the picture, Joseph Pevney; and particularly to the fine cast of players of Away All Boats, headed by Jeff Chandler, George Nader, Julie Adams, and Lex Barker.

Nor do I want to overlook the author of the best seller, from which the screen play was taken—Kenneth M. Dodson. Mr. Dodson's book has been transferred to the screen with dynamic grandeur. He should be as proud of the outcome as Americans should be thrilled to see the film version of Away All Boats.

Live Musical Programs of the National Broadcasting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the live musical programs of the National Broadcasting Co.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NEUBERGER

On Monday morning, July 30, 1956, the National Broadcasting Co. will initiate a new daily radio network program which will present the Nation's outstanding popular orchestras in 2 hours of "live" musical entertainment. This program, which will be titled the "NBC Bandstand," will be broadcast through the facilities of the National Broadcasting Co., and its affiliated stations and will reach virtually every home in the Nation.

This program deserves our attention. I think, not only because of the magnitude of its conception, but because it is "live"—that is to say, the music is transmitted directly to listeners at the very instant it is played by the musicians. Moreover, the Nation's foremost bandleaders will be in personal touch with the listeners during the show. Such a presentation, in this age or recorded sound, should serve to stimulate and heighten interest in the popular music which is so much a part of our heritage.

The National Broadcasting Co.'s inauguration of NBC Bandstand and the consequent return of the "live" band to the radio network after years of transcriptions and recordings is particularly noteworthy because of the sensational interest it has created among the leaders in the world of music. NBC Bandstand has the enthusiastic support and backing of the American Federation of Musicians, James E. Petrillo, president; the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers; Broadcast Music, Inc.; as well as leading music publishers and musicians everywhere.

This is true Americana. Popular music has been woven into the fabric of life in this country ever since the days of the American Revolution, when the fifes and the drums of the Continental Army struck up the tune of Yankee Doodle. Down through history, we have always found songs to celebrate our victories, mourn our losses and mark the stages of our growth across the continent. Songs like Tenting Tonight, Over There, Home on the Range—all these and many more call up memories of the Nation's past.

In the same way, popular music has served to strengthen and preserve our distinctive regional cultures. The chanties that were sung by our seafaring men can still be heard today, and so can the immortal melodies of Stephen Foster, the songs of the prairies and the ballads of the mountains. Only in recent years, have we begun to appreciate the value of this vast body of music and now we see our musical scholars laboring to collect and preserve such songs lest they be lost forever.

Serious students and critics of popular music seldom give it much attention until it has ceased to be popular. So it is that today we read learned critiques of the same jazz music that was at the height of its popularity 30 or 40 years ago. It has taken about the same length of time for jazz to reach beyond the United States and make itself known in other countries. Today jazz can be heard everywhere outside the Iron Curtain and it has made us millions of friends.

In recognition of the vitality of popular music as a part of our history and culture, I consider the NBC Bandstand an important new landmark in American entertainment.

Address by Gov. J. Bracken Lee at the For America Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on June 7, last, it was my privilege to address a tremendous patriotic rally, sponsored by For America, held in the Los Angeles Shrine Civic Auditorium. Nearly 6,000 loyal Americans, who continue to believe in and fight for our constitutional processes, and the maintenance of our national sovereignty, attended this stirring demonstation of love of country.

Another of the speakers at this patriotic rally was Hon. J. Bracken Lee, Governor of the State of Utah. Governor Lee, as Utahans have long known, and as the entire Nation is beginning to realize, is a man of deep convictions, sound judgment, and great courage. He attacks the things he believes are damaging the time-tested basic principles of our country, and he defends our Constitution as the real bulwark of our individual and collective liberties. His stirring and yet homespun address was acclaimed enthusiastically by the tremendous audience of patriotic Americans.

I ask leave that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. J. BRACKEN LEE, GOVERNOR OF UTAH, AT FOR AMERICA RALLY, JUNE 7, 1956, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Thank you, Dan Smoot, distinguished guests, and my fellow Americans, after listening to some very fine talks by some outstanding gentlemen and noticing the reaction of this audience, I am reminded of an incident that occurred to me soon after I was first elected to office and before I had taken office: I visited our State prison, where we had been having a considerable amount of trouble, and noticed of course that the inmates were very friendly, realizing that I would soon be on the pardons board; but at one particular cell I noticed the inmate had one of my pictures upon the wall of his cell and I asked him about it and he said, "Well, I campaigned for you; I wrote to my friends outside." And he said, "That was true of most of the inmates here." I said, why? He said, "Oh, I don't know; you seem to be more like one of us." And that's the feeling I had here this evening—I feel more like one of you.

I'm going to talk just a little bit to begin with about my version of this Constitution. I am going to take this meeting as somewhat of an illustration. I received a letter from a leading gentleman in the East who told me that he would not attend any more meetings of For America, and the reason for it was because this organization was a Catholic organization and they were trying to take over the country. And I heard when I arrived in Los Angeles that there had been quite a bit of talk that this was an anti-Jewish organization and of course anti-Republican and anti-Democratic, and the point that I want to make with that statement—and I'd like to call attention to the press that they are in this game with the rest of us—that there is only one government on the face of this earth with a Constitution like ours, that has for its purpose the protection of the rights of minorities; that includes peoples of all races, creeds, and colors, and all members of the press—those to the left and those to the right. And I would warn every minority group—and, after all, that's all any of us are—there is no such thing as a majority in any group in this country. Oh, I'll admit occasionally we'll have a majority that votes on a particular issue, but today you have a number of candidates on both tickets and if you will sum up the votes that are being cast in these various states, no man is getting a majority. That means that there is no such thing as a majority. Only when we arrive at that point where we have only two choices, then we will have a majority.

This country is not founded on the theory of majority rule; it is founded on the theory of the protection of minorities, the rights of the individual, the rights of these various groups; and just the minute we destroy this Constitution, the protection and rights of the individual and these minorities are gone. I cannot understand why the newspapers of this country do not seem to realize the importance of the protection of the rights of minorities under our Constitution and go along with this theory of so-called majority rule, because everyone of us will live to see the day that we will regret this unless we get back to this Constitution. This document—national document, the Constitution—is not something that limits the powers of the people: it limits the powers of men in public office to protect the people from abuse by those who hold public office.

The Government itself does not trust its people. In our State, in your State, in every city and every community, your Government regulates and controls peoples in ever walk of life; and it is done upon the belief that we cannot trust our people—not that our people are dishonest, but there are always some who will take advantage or always some who will exploit. If all people were honest, we would need no regulation or controls, we would need no policemen; but the Government recognizes that we are not all honest; we must be controlled on our highways, in our business; we regulate the banks on the theory that some will abuse their power if they have too much. And yet the same individuals who recognize we must control the people for this reason turn around and ask the people to remove the restrictions from them.

The only protection the people have is this Constitution, not only to protect us from the abuses of bad men but from the abuses of good men—honest men—and I'll point out to you: Anyone who is deeply religious must honestly believe that his religion is the fin-

est; if he doesn't believe that, then he does not believe his religion. And believing that his is the best, then in all honesty he certainly must believe that it would be a better world if he could get everybody to believe as he does. I notice in my departments of State government (and I have some of the finest employees that any governor in any State has) men who are honestly trying to do their duty as the see it, yet I see this human weakness that exists in me and in ever other man, to want to do a little bit better job—and if you'll just give me a little more power, how much better the job will be.

Talk to the policeman on the street, and he tells you he does not have all the power he wants; there ought to be another law to give him just a little more power. That's true and it's human nature and true of every man in public office. I cannot deny that I wouldn't like to have more power. The only thing that I cannot understand is this; that why should I, liking more power, refuse it? And the reason why I do is because everything that I do that places more power in my office as the Governor of my State will be passed on to someone else, and I do not want someone else to have that power.

Now I realize that there are arguments on every side. While I may think that I'm a hundred percent right, let me tell you that there are some arguments for these other things. The point that I want to make is this: that this country was also founded on the belief that if we were going to do the thing that was best for our country that we must get at the truth. How can we decide a problem if I tell my people in the State of Utah that I have decided this is best for you and then say no one must find fault with that. The only way you are going to arrive at what is best for the people of my State or this State or Nation is to have these questions debated. Let's find out what is best for the country.

Undoubtedly there is some merit in the things that we are doing nationally, but shouldn't we weigh these advantages with the disadvantages that go with it? And shouldn't we know what we are doing? I see nothing wrong—and I'm the one Governor of these United States that has refused to declare United Nations day [loud and long applause]—I see nothing wrong with a world organization of countries where we can sit and debate our problems and do our best to try to avoid wars; there's nothing wrong with that. But there are some things that I do see wrong. If I am not permitted and other citizens are not permitted to bring these questions before the American people, how in the world are you ever going to improve anything? I want to know when my country joins in an organization that our rights are protected, as well as other nations' rights. I want to know that if we are going to try to stop wars all over the world that other nations furnish soldiers on the same proportionate basis as we do. I want to know also that our membership in the United Nations will not destroy our own Constitution. And certainly I think I have that right.

Undoubtedly there are many things that we have done that are worthwhile with funds that have gone to foreign nations. I think if I should stand here and attempt to tell you people that it was all wrong, that it wouldn't be the truth. Certainly there has been some good. But there has been a lot of bad. I think in the first place that we are committing a wrong, and certainly I am sure that peoples all over the world in every religious group will agree with me when I say that that old golden rule, "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you," is just as good today as when it was first written. I think we are violating that rule in the dealings with other nations, the way we are handling the funds that are given to the various countries. We, as an illustration, gave Anthony Eden (or his government, I had better say) $200 million when he was running for reelection so that he could reduce the English tax by $200 million. I am sure we would resent it here in America if England or any country attempted to help either political party. We are violating the rule; we are putting strings on funds to these various countries that compel every country to resent the manner in which it's being done, another violation of the golden rule. I am not an expert—I don't pretend to be; but I have obtained a lot of my information in talking to representatives of foreign governments all over the world, who have been in my office and who are traveling at our expense, and it's customary for them to call upon the governors of the various States; and I can say without exception that I considered them highly intelligent men, fair minded, fine gentlemen, a pleasure to talk to. In almost every instance they agreed with me that this was wrong, and they would tell me other things about it that were wrong.

I ran into this the other day when I objected to the fact that we were maintaining American boys in 73 different foreign nations; that I thought it was wrong; and I stated that if your government placed your troops in Salt Lake City, it wouldn't be long till we'd tell you to go home. But his answer to that did stump me for a minute. He said you must realize that we have this great Communist menace and that if you withdrew your troops that all of these countries would then feel that Russia was going to take over. But I wonder if the answer to that isn't this: That we make these people dependent upon us; they expect us to fight all their battles, furnish all the men and all materiel. Aren't we doing them a disservice? Wouldn't it be better if we put them on their own feet, let them help themselves for a change?

You know, you mustn't talk like I do, because you're an isolationist. This name-calling rather amuses me, because when I was a little boy I found that when I ran out of arguments then I stooped to name-calling, and I don't like it; it doesn't settle anything. The fact that you call me something doesn't hurt me at all; it doesn't change the issue. Either I am right or I am wrong. Maybe I'm partially right, but certainly I think the American people are entitled to know some of the things that are going on and to debate these issues, and I defend every man in his right to stand up and question me. I have run my government openly. I have never held a closed meeting, nor will I permit any commission to hold a closed meeting. It seems to me if you're going to have a Government by the people, of the people and for the people that the Government's business is their business and it's the safest thing to do.

I find this as I have said, we're all weak, but when the press is watching us we don't do anything very wrong. The temptation is removed.

Now, I am a Republican; I'm a candidate for reelection on the Republican ticket. I have been an active Republican all my life; I have talked against the New Deal for years up until 1952, and up until 1952 I was in great demand as a Republican speaker all over the United States. I haven't changed my thinking, but I am no longer in demand.

I like people. I recognize that I am weak, and I know that other men's feet are made of clay. I don't think there is anybody in Washington that's perfect—he'll have a hard time convincing me of that—but I think the safeguard we have is the Constitution; and if we had stayed with the Constitution, it wouldn't make much difference who was sent to Washington. Do you know that? Now we have reached the stage where it makes a lot of difference who holds these particular offices.

I want to go back a minute to some of this foreign aid and I want to—I dislike appealing to people, appealing to the weakness of people. I like to appeal to the good that exists in everybody. I don't like to say—if you just do this it means something to me. But in this instance I am going to appeal to your consciousness a little bit, as so many others are influenced by tactics of that kind. But I was just figuring out the other day, in preparing the suit that I will be ready to file before very long, that if Congress appropriates the amount of money requested for foreign aid for this year, that Utah's share (remember we are only 800,000 people), Utah's share will be $22 million, just our share of foreign aid that's asked for this year. We have an income tax law in Utah (by the way, one which I would like to repeal and which I was not responsible for in the first place), but that $22 million is three times the amount of money that we take from our citizens for income tax. It equals all of the money that we've spent on our highways in a year's time this last year; and for the State of California, your share of this year's foreign aid is $330 million; and it equals all the money that you've spent on your highways this year in the State of California. Now, if you add up for the last 10 years the economic aid which the people of California have dug up for the Federal Government, it amounts to $3,300,000,000 which you've given away—$30 this year for every man, woman, and child in the United States, to be taken away mostly from taxpayers of $6,000 a year and under on their income.

Eighty-five percent of all the income tax comes from the $6,000-a-year bracket and under—which points out to me a little rule, the Golden Rule again—where whatever we do we should keep in mind that if you attempt to deprive somebody else of something that is not right, whether it's money or liberty or whatever it is—the time will come when this will all work against you. It's inevitable. If you take part today in special privilege from Government, tomorrow somebody is going to do that to you.

The American people were sold a bill of goods when this 16th amendment was passed, when we were told that it would just nick the rich man a little bit, and after all, he should pay; but it would never touch us. So we supported it—I didn't, thank goodness—but the majority of the American people or the majority of the States did, I should say; and it became a law. Now, who's getting hooked? The little fellow, isn't he, the one that was misled? That reminds me of this appealing to the people. I remember hearing—I think it was Roosevelt or Truman who said they were for the little fellow. The common man. You know, I, like a lot of people, thought they meant me, but I found out they meant themselves.

For a number of years I have been under the impression that our Constitution has been violated—without any question in my mind. I have taken it up with a number of lawyers, and I find that when I run across a constitutional lawyer—one who understands the Constitution—he agrees with me, such as Dean Manion. Apparently a new philosophy is being taught in some of our law schools today, because I had a debate with a Congressman from Washington who was a lawyer, and when I attempted to point out why the Constitution should limit men in public office he certainly disagreed with me. Why, he said, no; the minute the people elected me to office they gave me full power to do whatever I thought was right. And the freedom of the people was in their right to vote me out of office. Now there's a trained lawyer. And I think if you get this book written by ESTES KEFAUVER, you will find that he says about the same thing—that the freedom is in the open ballot. In fact he says—KEFAUVER says—it was never intended that the people would limit their

own power and after all when they elected me, I became the people. So you see there are arguments for and against everything.

When believing that our Constitution was being violated, I asked my legislature 4 years ago to direct that I bring an action against the Federal Government for taxing the American people for the support of foreign nations—which I believe to be wrong and certainly think it is wrong. There is no doubt in my mind that if you hold with the Constitution it will be stopped. I suspect that by the time we get there they're going to be doing some thinking about it, because I feel that a lot of the American people are getting to thinking about this and how wrong it is and where it's leading us. You'd be surprised how politicians respond when they feel the people don't like what they're doing. Anyway, I failed to get my legislature to support me. I had a pledge from the Members that they would, but when the administration changed nationally, then it changed locally, too. I didn't get their support. Then I took the next step.

When I met with my lawyers and told them what I wanted to do, they said no, we don't think you should do it that way. "Well," I said, "I'm going to do it. I'm going to refuse to pay my tax." They didn't think that was quite the proper way. I said, "I've got a reason for this; I want the American people to start to do a little thinking about this." After all, if you cannot awaken the American people to this problem, the cause is lost. The only means that I have to try to shock the people into doing some thinking was to say I wouldn't and why I wouldn't pay. I did, I think, awaken a lot of people. I think it has done some good. I think I accomplished my point there.

I also proved another point: that Congress had also given powers to their tax collectors that were far beyond what the Constitution granted, because they were able to come in and tie up everything I had and take it without due process of law—which I am entitled to under the Constitution. So I have proven to you that you are losing your Constitution and your rights and your freedom and your liberties.

Now I am going to bring this to a close. You people have been talked to quite a bit already, and you have an excellent speaker and a real American coming up in Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER. I have just a few closing remarks.

I know that I am like you—that I'd like somebody to tell me what to do about this. We all want to know that. Of course, Rome wasn't built in a day, and believe me you're not going to solve this thing in a hurry; but if you get the spirit of it and you begin to see how important it is, you in turn are going to do something about it. There is something that could be done at election time. You could—you know you've a Congressman—but after all let's not blame the Executive Branch for spending the money your Congressman gave to it. The human weakness to spend money—oh, it's fun—the other fellow's. It's wonderful. Let's not blame the spenders, let's blame these people who are taking our money and giving it to them to spend, and that's our Congressmen.

You could do something there, but when I see the weakness of human nature, I don't think the answer to this problem is just to keep electing somebody else. I think it has been proven that we are not going anywhere just electing somebody else. We must get back to the Constitution; we've got to force Congress to give us the right to repeal this 16th amendment, which gave them the power to take our money away from us. Thank you very much.

Transportation and Shipment of Explosives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the views of several witnesses on Senate bill 1297, dealing with the transportation of explosives, which bill the committee will not have time to act upon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUREAU OF EXPLOSIVES,
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS,
OFFICE OF CHIEF INSPECTOR,
New York, N. Y., June 19, 1956.

Mr. R. V. MOON,
Secretary, American Pyrotechnics Association, Baltimore, Md.

DEAR SIR: I have read the statement of the American Pyrotechnics Association in support of Senate bill 1297 and I believe that the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission for the safe transportation of explosives and other dangerous articles can be very readily amended and maintained in accordance with the decisions of the Federal Trade Commission with regard to the types of fireworks that would be authorized for public use.

This could be done by establishing in the Interstate Commerce Commission's regulations limitations on common fireworks and then providing that only those common fireworks could be transported for use by the public. This would not restrict the manufacture of fireworks of other types which are required for military or commercial use, such as ships' distress signals, aeroplane signals and military signals, as they could be described and transported under the existing categories in the regulations as special fireworks, etc.

I suppose a designation for fireworks authorized for use by the public could be fireworks, class B.

Yours truly,

H. A. CAMPBELL,
Chief Inspector.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN PYROTECHNIC ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF SENATE BILL 1297, TRANSPORTATION AND SHIPMENT OF FIREWORKS, PRESENTED BY ROBERT V. MOON, SECRETARY, BROCKTON, MASS.

I am appearing on behalf of the American Pyrotechnic Association which is the trade association of the fireworks industry and includes in its membership, in addition to a substantial number of jobbers and distributors of fireworks, the manufacturers and importers of approximately 90 percent of the fireworks used in the United States. Under its bylaws the association lists the following principal purposes and aims:

1. To create, maintain, and improve standards and techniques for production of safe and sane fireworks products, and to that end provide effective methods for the education of employees in the manufacture and handling of fireworks products.

2. To eliminate from manufacture those certain items of fireworks which are likely to be hazardous in their manufacture and their use by the public.

3. To promote and encourage by research the use of new and suitable products which are safe and sane in their manufacture, handling, and general use.

4. To assemble, coordinate, codify, and publish the true facts concerning the fireworks industry, its aims, efforts, and the results obtained in the promotion and use of safe and sane fireworks throughout the United States.

5. To promote and submit methods for the public governance of the fireworks industry by workable State laws and regulations to the end that the manufacture, sale, and distribution of unsafe fireworks products shall be discontinued so that the same will not reach the hands of the general public.

The products of our industry are of such a nature that they must be controlled from the standpoint of danger in their use by the public. Attempted controls from within the industry have proved ineffective since they have no legal force and because the attractiveness of dangerous items to a segment of the public provides a profitable market to the dealer who will supply them. Controls at the State level have proven unsatisfactory for reasons that will be presented below. However, under our system of Government, control must be at the State level; and our association earnestly recommends the enactment of Senate bill 1297, which will afford to the States Federal assistance without which they cannot protect their citizens from the dangerous fireworks items that are now available to them.

Before discussing Senate bill 1297 I will briefly outline the situation it is designed to correct.

Prior to the First World War no State had in any way restricted the sale and use of fireworks. Immediately following it, however, there was a tremendous expansion in both the volume and the danger of fireworks. The most vicious items were in the greatest public demand, they were freely supplied and a greatly increased accident toll was the inevitable result. Faced with this condition the States properly became concerned for the welfare of their citizens and started enacting legislation for their protection.

The States recognized that there was a wide difference in the element of danger among various fireworks items and were reluctant to interfere with the sale and use of those that were not causing accidents. They therefor enacted regulatory laws designed to prohibit the dangerous items while allowing the sale and use of those that were of an acceptable safety level.

In enacting such laws the States were faced with an extremely difficult situation:

1. They had to define the items they were regulating. There were no authentic standards to which they could conform. They, therefore, had to use trade names or technical descriptions. Trade names could easily be changed to defeat regulation so technical descriptions were generally used. But the States do not have technical laboratories or facilities to which they could go for sound definitions so the definitions were drawn by legislators, generally with the assistance of some local fireworks dealer who had a financial interest in preserving items on which he was making a profit. The result was a hodgepodge of definitions most of which were unsound and many of which were meaningless.

2. To the extent the definitions were sound they required technical determinations for their enforcement and it was not possible, for a few days in each year, to educate a body of enforcement officers to make those determinations.

3. When an arrest was made for a violation the definitions would not hold up in

court and convictions were seldom obtained.

The result has been a lucrative field for dealers who would violate the law and with very little risk of conviction. The dangerous items continued to be supplied, accidents continued to occur and the States, having been unsuccessful in their attempted regulation, started enacting laws prohibiting all fireworks.

Prohibition did not depend on technical definitions and was therefore more enforceable, but it brought with it all the abuses that are natural to prohibition. It substantially stopped the use of small, relatively safe items and thereby decreased the number of minor accidents, but it invited homemade and bootleg fireworks which increased the seriousness of the accidents that did occur.

When the States started prohibiting citizens started going to nearby States where fireworks were available and bringing them them back in their own private cars, and when sufficient States had prohibited a lucrative field was developed in so-called mail-order fireworks. Certain dealers took advantage of the reluctance of States to inferfere with interstate commerce. They sold directly to the consumer from outside the State by mail order, using common carriers to effect deliveries that were illegal from within the State.

It was this condition that the recently enacted Church law was designed to correct. That law in the words of its sponsor "puts shippers and carriers on notice that the Federal Government will not tolerate the use of interstate commerce for the purpose of circumventing State laws." It has been effective in that purpose to the extent that it has stopped the organized mail-order sale of fireworks in States where all fireworks are prohibited.

Without in any way minimizing that accomplishment it is by no means a cure of the fireworks problem. It has been of no assistance to States that have regulatory laws and cannot be so long as it depends for its enforcement on the inadequate definitions now contained in State laws. It certainly cannot be expected to have any material effect on the fireworks that are carried into States by individual purchasers in private cars. It has created a relatively new enforcement problem in its suggestion to States that provision be made for agricultural fireworks. The farmer is certainly entitled to use fireworks to the extent that they will benefit or preserve his crops but just as certainly the States cannot define agricultural fireworks or their enforcement officers identify them unless they are provided with the standards and means of identification proposed in Senate bill 1297.

Compared to the above condition of utter confusion we have the examples of England and Canada where fireworks are regulated on a national basis by technically qualified authorities. Regulation is at the source, dangerous items are not available to the public, the people have the enjoyment without the hazard and there is no fireworks problem. Our legislative problem is, of course, different from that of England or Canada in that in the United States the ultimate control of sale to and use by the public is in the province of the States. That problem was effectively solved in the case of food and drugs and a parallel solution would effect a cure in the case of fireworks.

It is a rather startling fact that, while no Federal agency at present concerns itself with public safety, Congress has given protection to transportation companies. The Interstate Commerce Commission by act of Congress (sec. 836, ch. 39 of title 18, U. S. Code) operating through its examining and enforcing agency, the Bureau of Explosives, formulates, publishes, and enforces regulations for the transportation of all dangerous articles. In these regulations articles are classified according to hazard and restrictions, including identifying markings, are prescribed for their shipment. The Bureau of Explosives, in addition to maintaining a staff of field inspectors who police compliance with the regulations, maintains a laboratory with trained technicians where all fireworks must be examined, tested, and classified before they can be offered for transportation.

Senate bill 1297 provides that the same protection now afforded to carriers be extended to the public through regulations promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission to:

1. Establish standards of safety for fireworks for public use.

2. Determine articles of fireworks that comply with those standards.

3. Prescribe identifying markings to be applied to complying articles.

It should be noted that regulations promulgated by the Federal Trade Commission for the above purpose would not be in conflct with the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Danger in public use and danger in transportation are governed by the same chemical and physical factors and generally run parallel to each other. Coordination would be entirely practical in which case duplication would be avoided, the technical experience of the Bureau of Explosives would be available to the Federal Trade Commission and enforcement of the regulations of the Federal Trade Commission would become coincident to enforcement of those of the Interstate Commerce Commission without additional personnel or expense.

With the assistance provided by Senate bill 1297 the States would no longer be involved in technical definitions. Laws would be enacted based on authentic Federal standards. Enforcement would be by means of the required identifying markings and convictions would no longer depend on the ability of a court to interpret technical definitions.

Senate bill 1297 is in no way an invasion of State rights. It merely provides standards of safety and identification under those standards which will provide the States with the means of enacting enforcible laws. It is in no way in conflict with the Church law. That law is dependent in its enforcement on the inadequate definitions now contained in State laws and to the extent that Senate bill 1297 provided the States with the means of adopting sound definitions to that extent the means of enforcing the Church law would be improved.

In summary the States are faced with a fireworks problem with which they are not able to cope. The Church law has corrected only one phase of the problem, the organized bootlegging of fireworks into States that prohibit all fireworks. Senate bill 1297 provides the States with an effective means of curing all phases of the problem and protecting their citizens from the abuses now coincident with the public use of fireworks.

The celebration of festive occasions with fireworks is traditional in the American public as it is in the people of all other nations, and no law is going to destroy the desire for that celebration. No other nation has had to prohibit celebration to protect its citizens from the exploitation of that desire. The church law has afforded Federal assistance to the States in enforcing prohibition. Senate bill 1297 recognizes the inherent right of States that want to regulate fireworks to an equal degree of Federal assistance.

IN THE MATTER OF SENATE BILL 1297, TRANSPORTATION AND SHIPMENT OF FIREWORKS—BRIEF OF M. BACKES' SONS, INC., WALLINGFORD, CONN., PRESENTED BY C. B. BACKES, WALLINGFORD, CONN., PRESIDENT OF SAID COMPANY

Our company was founded in 1876 and is operated by direct descendants of the original founder. We, therefore, speak from the cumulative experience of 80 years in the manufacture of fireworks, with the exception that during the Second World War we totally converted to the manufacture of pyrotechnics for the armed services. Our contribution to the armed services is attested by our having twice received the Army-Navy E award.

During the past 30 years, we have seen a legitimate industry reduced to a state of utter chaos, and we strongly recommend the enactment of Senate bill 1297 as the only practical method of curing that situation.

Senate bill 1297 provides that cure by the same means that effectively cured a similar chaotic situation in the case of foods and drugs. It gives to a Federal agency the duty of establishing a proper safety level for fireworks in the various categories of public use, of determining the specific items that are of an acceptable safety level in those categories, and of providing a means of identifying articles that have been approved in the various categories. It provides the States with a means of giving to the public the same degree of protection that is now given to transportation companies under the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

While we realize that it is an extremely unusual thing for an industrialist to ask that the Government impose controls on his operation, fireworks are of such a nature that controls are necessary. When a boy goes to a fireworks stand, he is going to buy the most thrilling article available, and that usually means the most dangerous. England and Canada, who have effective regulation at the national level, have proved that he will be satisfied with safe and sane items if he cannot get the dangerous ones, but he wants them just as big and as loud as the other kids have. He can only be protected by imposing controls to make the dangerous items unavailable to him.

We have often been asked why our industry does impose those controls on itself. We have tried and it doesn't work. We have had resolutions and gentlemen's agreements always inadequate in the restrictions that any group of dealers could agree to and always wholly lacking in any power of enforcement. The items the manufacturer is asked to discontinue are always his best sellers. Safe and sane will not sell where they are available. The reward for violating the agreement is an extremely lucrative business; the reward for keeping it is bankruptcy.

We attempted to accomplish the purpose of Senate bill 1297 through the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We requested the reclassification of a list of fireworks items into a new category under class C (Minimum Hazard) Explosives on the entirely supportable argument that the safety level of those items in transportation was consistant with that classification. They were given the designation "Common Fireworks" and were described as "Fireworks devices suitable for use by the public." Identification was required at the shipping case level but could not be required on inside packages or individual items where it did not effect safety in transportation but could have been of use in enforcement of State laws. And were the items suitable for public use? They were as nearly suitable as could be agreed to by a group of fireworks dealers, each one of whom was vitally concerned with his own competitive position. No representative of any State or of any organization concerned with public safety was heard and if there had been they could not have supported further restriction on the required basis of safety in transportation. We submit that similar restrictions, established under mandate of Congress for the purpose of providing public safety, would interest persons concerned with public safety and would be determined from the standpoint of public welfare rather than the welfare of fireworks dealers.

The States have tried to regulate but the definitions and descriptions necessary to regulation are highly technical and the States do not have facilities to provide them. They are always inadequate and unfortunately the nearer they approach adequacy the more difficult it becomes for enforcement officers to interpret them. Perhaps too often the sympathy of the officers is with the celebrant rather than with the regulation.

Regulations having failed, several States have prohibited all fireworks but the State borders are unprotected and bootleg and homemade fireworks both concentrating on only the most vicious items became prevalent. Organized bootlegging of so-called mail-order fireworks wherein dealers effected deliveries in violation of State laws through the use of common carriers in interstate commerce was a direct outgrowth of prohibition.

The Church law which was enacted by the last Congress has now effectively stopped the organized bootlegging of mail-order fireworks. We appeared at three hearings favoring the enactment of that law but requesting that it be amended to provide the minimum impact on legitimate commerce consistent with the accomplishment of its objectives. At the same time a bill was before Congress containing the same provisions as are contained in Senate bill 1297. We stated at that time that neither of the bills would, in itself, correct the situation but taken together they would provide the States with the means of effecting a simple cure. That statement has been borne out by experience. The Church law has had little, if any, effect on fireworks transported into prohibited areas by private automobiles. It has not been of any assistance to States that regulate rather than prohibit nor can it be because in such States its enforcement is entirely dependent on the same inadequate definitions that the States can neither interpret nor enforce.

So we have at the present time some States which have no restrictions. In these States any article that is permitted in transportation under the regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission is available to the public. We have some States with regulatory laws. In these States the laws generally cannot be enforced and the dealers who violate them are the ones that prosper. We have some States that prohibit. In these States all the abuses that are natural to prohibition are present. We think that chaos is a rather mild description.

Congress has recognized the existence of that condition to the extent of giving Federal aid to States that prohibit all fireworks. We think that the same degree of Federal aid, which would be provided by Senate bill 1297 should be given to States that want to regulate. The alternative is the continuation of the agonizing process we are now going through until all States are forced to the conclusion that they must deny legitimate celebration to their citizens to protect them from the abuses of fireworks dealers and prohibition becomes universal. We will then have the distinction of being the only Nation in the world that has had to resort to prohibition to protect their citizens from those excesses.

In conclusion, regardless of its economic importance, the fireworks industry should not be given any consideration in conflict with the welfare of the public. We believe that welfare is enhanced by preserving the right of the public to legitimate celebration. At the present time, that welfare is being violated and the States can do very little to protect its citizens against such violation. Senate bill 1297 would provide them with an effective means of providing that protection and we strongly recommend its enactment.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF S. 1297—BRIEF PRESENTED BY A. P. FABRIZI, VICE PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY FIREWORKS MANUFACTURING CO., INC., ELKTON, MD., AND VINELAND, N. J.

In a sincere effort to assist the several States in the enforcement of their fireworks laws and regulations, a bill (H. R. 116, S. 2245) was passed by the 83d Congress which prohibited transportation into any State of fireworks items prohibited by the laws of that State. The fireworks manufacturers and distributors have subsequently made every effort to assist their retail outlets and transportation agencies in the interpretation of and compliance with this law, despite the fact that, as foreseen and predicted in testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in January of 1954, the task is almost insurmountable because of the ambiguities and conflicts existing in the State laws as they now read.

Finding certain State laws impossible of interpretation, fireworks manufacturers and distributors have been reluctant to ship into these States, for fear of being found in violation of Federal law. Thus, the effect of this law has been to curtail, or eliminate entirely, shipments of legal fireworks into such States, while giving the States absolutely no assistance in the control of fireworks manufactured and offered for indiscriminate sale by bootleggers within the States themselves. Consequently, legitimate manufacturers and distributors are penalized, transportation agencies harassed, and the public is no better protected than before. Further measures are patently necessary.

These further measures are represented by Senate bill S. 1297. It would introduce into the situation several much-needed factors of a positive nature, as contrasted with the purely negative factors which have heretofore comprised the substance of regulatory efforts. These positive factors are as follows:

1. This bill would bring into existence a set of standards, established by experts and accurately defined, whereby the various types and classes of fireworks would be specifically identified.

2. By reference to this set of standards, the individual States may modify their existing laws, or introduce new laws, regulating the sale and use of fireworks within the State in accordance with their particular views and preferences.

3. With individual State laws employing the same terminology and standards, the matter of interpretation would be simplified to a point where no manufacturer, distributor, or transportation agency would have any hesitancy in shipping in accordance with the law as each interprets it.

4. The function of the law enforcement agencies would be greatly simplified by the labeling requirements of the proposed bill, and the efforts of the courts to enforce the law would be greatly facilitated by the accurately defined terms of the law.

It is very important to note that the proposed bill in no way restricts or interferes with the right of the individual States to determine what fireworks may or may not be offered for sale within their borders. Even though it prohibits the transportation in interstate commerce of fireworks which do not conform to the standards to be established by the Commission, it does not and cannot interfere with the production and sale within a State of any type of fireworks which the State may authorize, or refrain from prohibiting.

If this fact appears to be in favor of one of the factors which we fireworks manufacturers deplore, i. e., the flourishing trade of the fireworks bootlegger, one has only to reflect that by the passage of laws employing the terminology adopted by the Commission, the State can control this factor much more effectively than is now the case, since the law enforcement agencies and the courts will be better armed for the enforcement of the law.

It is apparent that the effectiveness of the proposed bill will hinge upon subsequent action by the legislatures of the several States, and this is as it should be. Its only immediate effect would be the stoppage of shipments into some States, which do not now have regulatory legislation, of items which do not meet the standards to be set up by the Commission. This would work to the advantage of the people of these States, rather than otherwise, by protecting them from dangerous types of fireworks now sold within their borders, until such time as their State saw fit to take action pursuant to the passage of this bill.

In brief, there is not a single criticism of this bill which can be legitimately advanced to offset the obvious benefits above cited. There can be no criticism on the grounds of additional expense to the Federal Government, since it proposes the employment of existing agencies, and imposes upon these agencies no more than a temporary load for such time as is needed for the establishment of the required standards.

Finally, the purpose and effect of the proposed bill is not to impose new problems upon already harassed and confused officials, administrators, jurists, and private citizens, but rather to make existing laws more susceptible of proper administration and enforcement, and to insure to our citizens the continued enjoyment, without the former dangers, of a time-honored national tradition.

Stassen and the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., of Wednesday, July 25, 1956:

STASSEN AND THE REPUBLICANS—IDEA THAT FOREIGN WISHES SHOULD AFFECT UNITED STATES CHOICE OF LEADERS ANGERS MANY

(By Constantine Brown)

There was gloom and indignation in the ranks of Republican Senators and Representatives and jubilation among the Democrats the day after Harold Stassen, a wartime naval captain, launched his political torpedo against Vice President NIXON.

Whether Stassen remains in President Eisenhower's official family or not, he has done more than take a formal stand against the present Vice President despite the fact that NIXON is regarded by all top-level Republicans as the Chief Executive's definite choice as a running mate in November. Stassen also has brought to the surface the smouldering conflict between the so-called conservative Republicans and those left of center.

It is now up to Eisenhower to decide what action to take in regard to his Secretary for Peace and Disarmament who has brought dramatically into the open the deep-seated differences within the party.

What irks the Republicans in both Houses of Congress is that they are convinced Stassen produced phony statistics to bolster his contention that Vice President NIXON would be a liability to the party and President Eisenhower. Informal continuous polls

taken particularly among precinct captains in key States indicate that NIXON is far ahead of all other hopefuls and would-be contenders.

The write-in votes in New Hampshire and Oregon have proven publicly NIXON's popularity. The estimates of professional workers in the Middle West, on the eastern seaboard, and the west coast show even a greater leaning of the Republicans, independents, and even some Democratic voters toward the Vice President.

Even the White House stalwarts in Congress say Stassen was perfectly free to make his preference known as a private individual. But the manner in which he did it is bound to hurt party unity. Instead of sending a statement of his views to the press he chose as the locale for his anti-NIXON public declaration the White House annex and also said that he had consulted Eisenhower. He thus created the impression that his utterances had the tacit blessing of the Chief Executive, himself.

Republicans in both houses also are deriding Stassen's statement that "important portions of the population abroad and the uncommitted nations in the world would have greater confidence in an Eisenhower-Herter ticket." This positive declaration, they say was the result of the former governor's consultation with his own fertile imagination.

Vice President NIXON has visited Latin America and the Far East as President Eisenhower's goodwill emissary. He was warmly received everywhere, not only because he represented the United States but also because of his personality. In fact, NIXON did a better job abroad, where he did not have to do any political acrobatics, than at home.

Moreover, the Republican legislators ask, since when do the American people have to choose their leaders in accordance with the wishes of our friends and "uncommitted nations" abroad? We have not yet reached, they say, the stage of "One World" to ask our people to vote in keeping with the preferences of our allies, friends, and neutrals. Were this the case, add the irate Republicans, we would not have President Eisenhower in the White House today. During the 1952 campaign the press and the political men, particularly in France and England, were largely for Democratic candidate Stevenson and rooted openly for his election.

Many observers believe Stassen has impulsively laid an egg which may cost him his present job. It is held improbable, however, that for political reasons Eisenhower will ask for his resignation. The speculation among politicians in Washington is that he may resign of his own accord so as not to embarras the Chief Executive while he goes all out for Governor Herter's candidacy during the weeks before the convention in San Francisco.

But Republican strategists in the Senate and House ruefully admit that the so-called Stassen egg may have seriously weakened the party unless President Eisenhower unqualifiedly disavows him. There have been rumblings about the opposition of what some call "the White House guard" to NIXON because they suspect him of being surreptitiously a right-wing Republican who gives only lip-service to Eisenhower's political philosophy of "dynamic conservatism."

There is nothing in NIXON's political activities which would support this contention. He has, however, been a strong opponent of the policy of recognition of Communist China and of co-existence which may stretch to imply world government. He took a strong stand, not only because of his own beliefs but also because he is convinced that this was Eisenhower's own thinking. In these matters he frequently has run afoul of the views of some White House advisers, in whose number is Harold Stassen.

The Helm Farm Plan—Do You Like It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, leave having been granted me, I insert in the RECORD an article by Fielding Helm of Plainview, Tex., entitled "Helm Farm Plan—Do You Like It?" which is appearing in the August issue of the Progressive Farmer, published by Eugene Butler, Dallas, Tex. I am also inserting a letter by Mr. Butler.

Over a long period of years Mr. Helm has carefully studied our agricultural problems and crusaded for improvements in the program. His ideas are stimulating and interesting and worthy of our best consideration. Some of his ideas have been accepted; some have not. But I feel the material I am placing in the RECORD will be of interest, coming as it does from a man of wisdom and experience in the agricultural field.

THE PROGRESSIVE FARMER,
Dallas, Tex., February 25, 1956.

Mr. FIELDING HELM,
Care D. L. Helm
Clifton, Tex.

DEAR MR. HELM: I appreciate your recent visit during which we discussed the farm situation and farm legislation having as its objective the improvement of the United States agriculture.

We are quite anxious that the 1,300,000 subscribers to the Progressive Farmer be kept fully informed of any new legislative proposals for the betterment of agriculture. With that in mind we shall be pleased to give our readers information regarding your three-point farm program, and ask that they let us know what they think of it.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

EUGENE BUTLER,
President and Editor.

HELM FARM PROGRAM—DO YOU LIKE IT?

Congress has settled the argument about the farm program for the time being. No more changes are likely to be made this year. But many people are not satisfied with the program we now have. The farm problem will continue to be an issue not only in the election this fall but when Congress convenes in 1957. There is still time to hear from anyone who thinks he has an answer to the very difficult and complex problems that face United States agriculture.

Such a man is Fielding Helm. Mr. Helm, who owns farmland in Bosque and Hale Counties, has been interested in farm legislation for a number of years. He has made many trips to Washington to present his ideas to Members of Congress.

Mr. Helm has a three-point farm program that provides (1) for the disposal of present surplus stocks of basic commodities; (2) a new two-price system for basic commodities; and (3) a parity price for basic commodities that will give these commodities no less purchasing power than they had from 1909 to 1914. He points out that what he proposes is not a new farm program—that they are simple amendments that can be added to the present program. Mr. Helm believes that if any farm program is to work, it must (1) let farmers farm and (2) let them sell in world trade what they produce.

The first provision of the Helm plan has to do with the surplus stocks of basic farm commodities piled up in Government warehouses.

It would direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell each year on the export market, at competitive prices, that part of the farm allotment of cotton and other basic commodities that were taken over by CCC the preceding year. For example, in setting a 1955 quota for cotton, USDA figured on 4½ million bales for export and 9.1 million bales for use in this country. Under the Helm plan, if CCC took over 4½ million bales of cotton in 1955, it would sell on the export market in 1956, at least 4½ million bales.

This provision has as one of its objectives regaining for the United States its fair historic share of the world market. But even more important, it would sell off each year as much cotton as CCC takes over, and thus prevent our Government stocks from getting any larger.

But stopping the surplus from growing any larger is not enough. If farmers are to get fair prices for basic commodities we must not only prevent the surplus from growing but also start whittling it down. To do this Mr. Helm's plan provides that surplus stocks of cotton, wheat, and other basic commodities not needed for other purposes be sold to farmers each year at muchly reduced prices. Farmers buying such commodities from the Government would be required to reduce their acreage allotments accordingly. For example here is a farmer who usually produces a half bale per acre. He buys 20 bales of cotton from the Government. His acreage allotment would be reduced 40 acres. If the price were low enough it would be to his advantage to buy part of his usual production from the Government rather than grow it. And if enough farmers did this over a period of years, Government stocks of cotton would be gradually sold off.

Mr. Helm has a new slant on a two-price system. Heretofore, all two-price systems have given farmers the full support price only on that part of their farm allotments used for domestic consumption. But under the Helm plan they would get the full support price on their entire farm allotment. In addition to their farm allotment they could grow all the cotton they thought profitable for export, or storage, without penalty. But if they sold any of their excess bales on the domestic market they would pay the penalty of 50 percent of the support price. For 1955, farm allotments of cotton were based on 9.1 million bales for domestic consumption and 4.5 million bales for export, a total of 13.6 million bales. Under the old 2-price plans, farmers would have received the full support price only on the 9.1 million bales used in this country. But under the Helm plan they would receive the full support price on the entire farm allotment of 13.6 million bales. Farmers would continue to have prices supported by Government loans in the same way they have been for a number of years under the present farm program.

As to the level of support prices for basic commodities, the Helm plan would place them at 90 percent of parity. Fixed 90 percent support would be available to any basic commodity, so long as producers of the commodity approved marketing quotas.

As to parity, the Helm plan provides that the Secretary of Agriculture use either the old parity formula or the new parity, whichever is higher.

What would happen if his plan were used? Mr. Helm believes the following things would take place:

1. The Federal Government would use the taxpayer's money to protect United States farmers' fair share of export markets. (A fair share would be the share we have had

in the past.) At present, the taxpayer's money appropriated to aid foreign agriculture is being used to destroy United States farmers' fair share of export markets.

2. In a few years, surplus stocks of basic farm commodities held by the Government would be sold at competitive prices rather than given away.

3. There would be no need for a soil bank. Therefore, there would be no need for the Government to spend $1.2 billion a year to get rid of surpluses.

4. Farm income would go up; expense of the farm program to the taxpayer would go down.

5. The Government would no longer control production of basic commodities. But it would continue to control their sale—at support prices in the United States.

6. The competitive world price of basic commodities would control the amount of these commodities farmers produce. They would produce and sell them for export at their own risk, in excess of their farm allotments.

7. Many Government restrictions on farming would be removed. Farmers would plant whatever they wish without paying excess penalties. They would plan their crop rotations and soil-building practices years ahead instead of waiting each year for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the program for the year.

The Progressive Farmer believes that there are several good features in the Helm plan. We are not willing to back all of it. However, no one seems to have all the answers to our farm problems. And we believe that anyone who has worked as long and hard as Mr. Helm to develop a sound farm program is entitled to have his plan given full consideration. We would like for Progressive Farmer readers to give this plan close study. Then write Mr. Helm in care of the Progressive Farmer, Dallas, Tex., what parts of his program you like and what features you do not believe will work. He wants your opinion.

Washington National Is Not the Busiest Airport in the Nation—It Is the Ninth Busiest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, from all the newspaper clamor about air congestion and the requirement of a new airport at Burke, you would think that Washington National was the busiest airport in this country and in the world. The fact is that it is ninth. Following is a list of the 10 busiest airports in the United States, which, of course, means the world, for the calendar year 1955 on the basis of the number of operations handled by the control tower:

Total operations
[Itinerant and local]

1.	Chicago, Ill. (Midway)	381,737
2.	Miami, Fla	276,729
3.	New York, N. Y	266,058
4.	Los Angeles, Calif	263,516
5.	Atlanta, Ga	246,709
6.	Denver, Colo	239,861
7.	Charleston, S. C	229,557
8.	Cleveland, Ohio	226,768
9.	Washington, D. C	225,914
10.	Teterboro, N. J	221,637

It will be observed that the number of landings and takeoffs from the Chicago Midway Airport is half again more operations than occurred at Washington National. As far as I know, there have been no loud demands for a new airport at Chicago. If Washington on the basis of its alleged congestion is entitled to a new $75 million airport, then what about the other eight cities in the United States where the traffic actually exceeds that at Washington National?

DOES NOT CHICAGO HAVE PRIORITY FOR NEW AIRPORT?

It would appear that these cities should be given a priority ahead of Washington, D. C., and, if we vote to build a new airport for the city of Washington at Burke, how can we legitimately on the basis of safety and congestion of air traffic deny similar treatment to other cities throughout the Nation?

FRIENDSHIP AIRPORT

There is a splendid airport at Friendship in Maryland, which is not being used very extensively. It would seem appropriate under the circumstances to seriously consider using Friendship to take the strain off of Washington National, if there is a strain, until such time as Washington National more clearly demonstrates the need for an additional new airport when compared with other airports throughout the country where a higher volume of traffic is being handled, if not easily, at least without any great complaint or clamor for the expenditure of millions of dollars to build additional airport facilities.

Tribute to Tom Underwood

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, when Tom Underwood died on June 29, 1956, the world was left a far poorer place by his absence. Yet because he lived and contributed to it in manifold ways, the world was left a rare heritage.

The wellsprings of his capacity for personal friendships ran inexhaustibly deep and those of us who were fortunate enough to know him and be his friend were bountifully blessed. Here was a man who truly never had an unkind thought or said an unkind thing about anyone. He was indeed a friend not only of those whom he knew but of those whom he did not know—he was a friend of mankind. His altruistic spirit found expression in his active participation in and guidance of countless endeavors for those stricken, needy, and less fortunate persons. His broad civic interests were manifested in his constant efforts for organizations working for the betterment of all of his fellow citizens.

His devotion to his native State was evident in his driving interest in and inexhaustible knowledge of the lore and products indigenous to it. He was an expert on the thoroughbred racehorse industry and tobacco and worked diligently and effectively for their promotion.

His salty humor and rugged and pungent philosophy gave his friends untold delight and provided him with a richly deserved reputation as one of Kentucky's and the Nation's best storytellers.

Tom was a splendid newspaperman, having been reporter, sports editor, State editor, managing editor, and general manager of the Lexington Herald before becoming its esteemed and astute editor in chief. The penetrating insight and sharpness of inquiry which mark the editor's objective approach to the issues of the day, in addition to his thorough grounding in the art and science of politics at the State level, fitted him eminently for his subsequent service in the House and in the Senate. The political acumen and sagacious judgment, which characterized his tenure of office in both Houses of the Congress, compelled him, at all times, to seek out the truth and underlying fundamentals of any question. He then directed his energies and efforts, without equivocation, in the course of action for the best interests of Kentucky and the Nation.

Tom Underwood's interests were diversified and wide; his probing intellect was deep; his human responses were warm. They made for him a life of high purpose and noble achievement and provided for his friends and his family a rich legacy of unfailing sincerity and loving association.

Public Works Projects and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Public Works Projects and the Budget," delivered by Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., on May 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS AND THE BUDGET

(Address by Robert E. Merriam, Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C.)

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I am honored to be with you at your 43d national convention to discuss with you a subject of mutual interest—public works projects and the budget. This topic, like the others on your program, is concerned with problems of major significance to the growth and development of our country.

In your President's call for this convention, he invited, among other groups, those "persons interested in the continued orderly development, conservation and use for all

beneficial purposes of the water and land resources of the United States * * *." This worthy purpose is reason enough for my being here today. But in addition, of course, the Bureau of the Budget, with which I am associated, and the President, whose office the Bureau serves, are vitally interested in this and other areas of public works.

The President places among his most important objectives the wise conservation, development, and use of the Nation's water resources. He fully recognizes that water is one of our most important natural resources and that we must have wise policies and orderly programs if we are to best utilize the full potential of our water and related land resources.

A LOOK AT THE BUDGET

People, I have discovered, have a queer image of a budget man. He is up in a cloud, they say (or perhaps located in the opposite direction), but he doesn't have a heart—and probably not a head. And yet our problems as budget makers basically are the same as every one of yours. We are interested in how we can help build a strong economy, maintain a free Nation, and prepare for a better future.

These tasks require money. They also require planning and foresight. And they demand both patience and perseverance. They are the mutual objectives of all of us. A budget is but a means of establishing priorities on a rational, sensible basis so we can reach these objectives. It is but a means to an end.

The national budget, thus, is not merely a book of figures showing the funds which the Government will receive and spend. It is the administration's recommendation for a comprehensive plan of action to meet our national objectives in a particular year. Perhaps I could throw a little light on the process of budget making by using as an example the President's 1957 budget, which the Congress of the United States now has under consideration.

The various elements of this budget provide a plan for the attainment of a just and durable peace and for fostering sound economic growth. These two objectives are closely linked to the administration's third goal—that of financial strength and stability. The budget recommendations represent a balance with respect to relative urgency in meeting our many national objectives, keeping in mind the financial side of the budget. To achieve this balance requires a searching scrutiny into the need for Government services.

It requires balancing the needs for public works against those for national defense, health, and welfare, and a host of other competing services. And even within the public-works area, it requires a determination as to whether, for example, $100 million spent on water resources development would contribute more to the Nation than the same amount spent on highways, hospitals, research facilities, or some or all of these facilities. It means that in some cases funds must be withheld for desirable programs or activities in one area in order to make available dollars needed for necessary programs or activities in other areas.

The relation between the Federal budget and the entire economy of the Nation must also be considered in drawing up the Government's blueprint for the year. The financing of the Federal programs requires us—you and me—to pay to the Federal Government almost one-fifth of our incomes—which, to my way of thinking, is a very substantial share of our individual incomes.

The size of the Government's operation staggers anyone who wrestles with it day by day.

A budget of over $60 billion.

A payroll of over $10 billion.

Civilian personnel totaling over 2 million.

Programs ranging from development of new crop seeds to the H-bomb.

Pressure for new programs beyond belief.

Our budget experts tell me that without batting an eyelash, for legitimate programs, things which someone should do, we could easily expand our present national budget by 30 to 40 percent. Where does one draw the line? And how does one decide who should perform needed services? Should it be the Federal Government? State and local governments? Or private enterprise? Or a combination of all?

PUBLIC-WORKS EXPENDITURES

But let's look at the budget in more detail, and in terms of your own particular concern at this meeting.

In recent years Federal expenditures for public works have amounted to 6 or 7 percent of the total budget. Total budget expenditures are estimated at $65.9 billion for the fiscal year 1957. About $4.5 billion will be for public works—$2.2 billion for national-security public works and $2.3 billion for civil public works. About 50 percent of the civil public-works expenditures will be for direct Federal construction and the other 50 percent will be for grants and other federally aided programs.

In the early 1900's, when the National Rivers and Harbors Congress was established, Federal expenditures for civil public works were running at $25 to $30 million a year, with expenditures on river and harbor work making up about two-thirds of the total, and public buildings most of the remainder. Public-works responsibilities of the Federal Government now encompass, in addition, such major areas as highways, hospitals, schools, and research facilities.

Summarized briefly by type of facility, we have recommended that the $2.3 billion of expenditures for Federal civil public works in 1957 be spent as follows:

Highways and roads	$894,000,000
Water resources and power projects	766,000,000
Hospitals and schools	329,000,000
Buildings and facilities	348,000,000

Some persons seem to think that the administration has been subtly trying to stifle water-resources projects. But, even with all the additional types of facilities which the Federal Government must now provide, the $766 million to be spent for water resources and related power projects make up one-third of the total civil public-works expenditures. Furthermore, the 1957 budget recommendations made provision for the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to start 83 new projects. Savings from better bids and other factors recently enabled the President to recommend 15 additional new starts without increasing the amount of appropriations requested in January.

The proposals for all new civil public works in the 1957 budget involve commitments in future years of more than $3 billion. When these new commitments are added to the amounts required to complete going work, we find that expenditures of almost $10 billion will be required in future years to complete the work programed in the 1957 budget. About three-fifths of this amount is for water resources and related power projects.

Thus, you see that budgets in succeeding years must provide for substantial amounts of expenditures if the water resorces projects now underway or scheduled for starting in the 1957 budget are to be carried to completion. And you can understand why in some years an administration can recommend for starts only those projects which are urgently needed in the national interest, in order to avoid deletion of funds for other program requirements of higher priority or impairment of the overall fiscal policy objectives of the administration.

Basically, of course, we in the Bureau of the Budget, in reviewing proposals for public works starts in any particular year must take all these factors into consideration. Naturally, in terms of individual priority, we must be guided in large part by the views of the operating agencies. In the final anaysis the President must weigh the relative needs of every facet of our life, and even problems of national existence, to determine what his budget recommendations should include.

Actually, the development of budgetary recommendations starts long before the time of budget submission. First comes the development of authorizing legislation. The Bureau of the Budget reviews agency proposals, coordinates agency views, and advises the committeees of Congress as to relationship of proposed legislation to the President's program.

Executive Order 9384 spells out in some detail the procedures for submitting public works project proposals for authorization by the Congress or for inclusion in the annual budget. Under this order agencies of the executive branch which are authorized to plan, undertake, or aid in public works and improvement projects, prepare and keep up-to-date long-range programs of such projects. These advance programs are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget annually. Before flood control, river and harbor, or irrigation projects are submitted for authorization to the Congress, a report relating to these projects must be submitted to the Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. When such report is thereafter submitted to the Congress, it will include a statement of the advice received from the Bureau.

Thus the Bureau of the Budget reviews public works projects at two stages before their construction is undertaken—first at the authorization stage, and again at the time the project is proposed for inclusion in the President's annual budget.

In its operations relating to public works, the Bureau works closely with the Public Works Planning Unit of the White House in the coordination of public works planning.

These reviews are designed for one single purpose—to provide advice and guidance to the Congress in its important considerations of the various programs. In the final analysis, of course, the Congress must make the determinations and set the direction in policy, money, and scope. This is as it always has been, and as it should be.

Our reviews must take into account priorities of need for Federal aid and action, recognizing always the common concern of everyone for an ever-expanding and improving country. We are no Solmons, but we do try to evaluate and recommend in this spirit—and in all humility.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM IN CIVIL PUBLIC WORKS

With these observations as a backgrouna, I should like to mention something about the administration's policies and programs for civil public works.

This administration believes that the Federal Government must provide in an orderly and economic manner the capital facilities required to carry out the Government's responsibilities. The rate at which these facilities are provided as well as the types of facilities provided will very, of course, from year to year in the light of relative urgency of national objectives.

In line with the objective of enhancing the economic growth and well-being of the Nation, the 1957 budget made provision for a number of new public-works programs and projects. For example, the President, in his 1957 budget message, stated his belief that construction of the Interstate Highway System should be fully authorized now as a single integrated program in order that the system may be developed over a period

of approximately 10 years with the greatest economy. The President's legislative recommendations also included a broad program for improvement of the Nation's health and educational facilities by means of Federal assistance to State and local efforts in these important areas.

With respect to the development of water resources, it has always been this administration's contention that to obtain full utilization of our water resources it will be necessary for State and local units of all kinds to share in the costs of developing these resources, wherever this is feasible and at the same time consistent with the national interet. A true partnership involves the utilization in each water resource development of the most desirable and feasible combination of interests—whether Federal, State, or local and whether public or private—to the extent that the public welfare allows. The tremendous need for water resources development can be met only through such cooperative arrangements.

There is nothing new in this partnership principle. It was first employed during President Theodore Roosevelt's tenure and has been utilized under every administration since his time. Since 1908 the Bureau of Reclamation has been making partnership arrangements with local water-users organizations or power companies for provisions of power facilities connected with its reclamation projects. The Army Engineers' approach was to look to the Federal Power Commission to license local interests to build powerplants at navigation or flood-control dams and assess charges for benefits from the falling water. By 1953 there were at least 26 time-tested examples of partnership between the Federal Government and local interests in power production, with the number about equally divided between Republican and Democratic administrations.

When President Eisenhower took office, he strongly endorse this partnership policy as a workable means of meeting the increased demands for industrial growth and improved standards of living and at the same time avoiding unnecessary increases in the Federal tax burden.

We are making progress under this partnership policy. The Federal share of the funds required for the Markham Ferry project in Oklahoma was appropriated in 1956. The remaining cost will be provided by the Grand River Dam Authority of that State. The Coosa River development, earlier planned and authorized as a Federal project, will now go farward—by agreement between the Congress and the local interests—as a local private development—an outstanding example of what can be accomplished when there is a will. Construction by non-Federal interests of the Priest Rapids project in Washington is expected to be underway in 1957. This, too, was formerly authorized as a Federal project.

But while the word "partnership" has been tossed around as a political symbol, this administration has quietly been moving ahead on a wide range of strictly Federal activities. Civil works projects of all kinds have been started in line with the philosophy that there are many areas in which the Federal Government has the prime responsibility for action. Particularly is this true in projects like the recently-authorize and long-delayed upper Colorado River development—which quite obviously because of size and complexity is beyond the means of local groups.

CONCLUSION

At the end of the current fiscal year, President Eisenhower will have been in office 3½ years. During this time almost $3 billion of Federal funds will have been invested in the construction of water resources and related power facilities. The Federal Government will continue to play a key role in the conservation and development of water resources and in the provision of other public improvements on which the general welfare and the growth of the private economy heavily depend. But its part in these essential programs will continue to be performed so as to encourage rather than displace the necessary efforts of State, local, and private groups, and to maintain a proper balance with other Federal program objectives.

As the President has said:

"The conservation and use which we make of the water resources of our Nation may in large measure determine our future progress and the standards of living of our citizens. If we are to continue to advance agriculturally and industrially we must make the best use of every drop of water which falls on our soil, or which can be extracted from the oceans. It is my desire that this administration furnish effective and resourceful leadership in establishing national policies and improving the administrative organization needed to conserve and best utilize the full potential of our water resources."

A Fishy Shipping Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FISHY SHIPPING BILL

Senators who watch the public purse ought to guard against a last-minute effort to slip through a new giveaway in the form of a shipping trade-in bill. This bill purports to encourage coastwise shipping operators to trade in old vessels to the Government at world market prices so as to promote the construction of new tankers. In the process it would confer a wholly unwarranted windfall on some operators. It would commit the Government, for example, to buy some 35 tankers from the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp. at $1,600,000 each even though the company purchased these selfsame tankers from the Government 9 years ago for approximately $950,000 apiece.

Surely it is not necessary to permit artificial enhancement of this sort in order to encourage new ship construction. This is precisely the problem that dogged the Government after World War II and led to some messy scandals. World market values can hardly be a valid criterion for ships acquired from the Government at low prices. In this instance Pan-Atlantic, after using the depreciated tankers for nearly 9 years, would end by getting back nearly twice what it paid for them. Other shipping operators, some of them enjoying operating subsidies, would benefit in similar fashion. Such brazen invitations to raids on the Treasury tend to discredit worthwhile efforts to modernize the merchant marine.

The House passed the Bonner bill on the unanimous calendar after a slippery maneuver that brought the measure up when few Members were on the floor. Courageous opposition led by Representative ZELENKO previously had prevented approval. In the upper House Senator WILLIAMS has fought the bill vigorously, and he ought to be joined by others who see the bad precedent it would set. Obviously the bill would be a wonderful bargain for the shipping companies, but for the taxpayers it would be no bargain at all.

The Niagara Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "United States Power Resources" written by the well-known columnist Stephen Debalta and published in the Leader-Post of Hamilton, Ontario, on June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEFITS OF NIAGARA PROJECT: UNITED STATES POWER RESOURCES

(By Stephen Debalta)

WASHINGTON.—In the middle ages heretics were burned at stake, in more recent times people were thrown in dungeons for committing lese majeste, and today one is stigmatized as a firebrand if he dares question the methods and practices of almighty business monopolists.

Can one imagine a more flagrant example of economic monstrosity than when one is compelled to pay twice as much for the same commodity for which his neighbor, across the river, pays only half as much? This is the case today of the American consumer living in Niagara Falls, N. Y., who is being charged twice as much as his Canadian neighbor, living across the bridge in Niagara Falls, Ontario, for electric current generated by the same waters.

Twenty years ago, as much as 96 percent of the total power supply in this country was maintained by private utilities. However, with the entrance of the Government in the business of exploiting the national water resources for the benefit of the people and the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933, the first breach was made in the monopolistic fortress of the despoilers of the country's wealth for private gain. Those still unreconciled to the self-evident truth that the blessings bestowed by nature upon a country belong to its people, look with distress at the growth of Federal hydroelectric plants, which in 1955 had the capacity of 10,762,000 kilowatts and are soon to reach the 15 million mark.

Several attempts have been made, during the present administration to arrest the Government's participation in the promotion of public owned hydroelectric projects, which have so largely contributed to national defense, agricultural improvement, industrial and community development and which was branded by the President himself as "creeping socialism." Only the explosion, last November, of the Dixon-Yates scandal, exposing the corrupt connivance of officialdom with a group of financial manipulators saved our nationally owned power resources from being gobbled up by greedy and unscrupulous moneychangers.

On May 13, a year ago, legislation authorizing United States participation in the $600 million St. Lawrence power project was at last enacted after almost half a century of legislative haggling. A new hope was born to the 16-million people of New York State and their immediate neighbors in the vast

power resources to be derived from this project. The private utilities combines, immediately alerted, threw the full weight of their financial influences behind the efforts of the bigoted champions of private ownership, in an attempt to wrest the priceless treasures of the Niagara waters from the people. Two weeks ago, on May 16, a major and, perhaps, historic victory was won in the Senate, after a long and bitter debate between the proponents of two economic philosophies, whether natural resources owned by the people should be developed and managed by a public authority, or be given away to private utilities for the profit of their stockholders. Senator HOMER CAPEHART, Republican from Indiana, better know as America's king of the juke box, told his colleagues plainly: "If we vote to make this project a public power project to the detriment of private industry then, in my opinion, we shall have broken the backbone of the private power system in this country."

His plea, however, did not convince even some members of his own party for no less than 8 stout Republicans joined 40 Democrats in approving the bill, offered and valiantly defended by New York's Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, 3-term governor of the Empire State.

The real Senate battle over the bill giving New Yorkers the same benefit enjoyed by their neighbors across the border from the development of the Niagara power project turned primarily on the specific inclusion of the so-called preference clause requiring that municipalities, farmer cooperatives, and other public bodies should be given preference over private utilities in the purchase of power created by the State. Strangely enough, this preference clause was first written into Federal law in 1906, in the days of Republical President Theodore Roosevelt, and has been a battleground for public versus private arguments for the past half century. It has been attacked only recently by a member of the Eisenhower Cabinet as socialistic and interfering with the businesslike arrangements with private utilities.

Despite the frightening effect that the mention alone of socialism never fails to produce on senatorial ears, the preference provision, assuring small communities and farmer groups of low rate electric power which they could never obtain from the utilities corporations, was left intact in the body of the bill.

Thus the great Canadian-United States Niagara power development, the biggest in the East, will finally become a reality thanks to the united effort of the Democrats against the supporters of the administration. It will cost $405 million on the American side and, at last, will bring New Yorkers a realization of a dream they have entertained ever since they envisioned the potential reservoir of power hidden in the waters of the St. Lawrence River.

Putting Another Noose Around Farmer's Neck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the present administration has on many occasions claimed that it is very much concerned about farmers and their problems. Of course, it is easy to make claims. What really counts are positive actions.

For example, a press release on July 10, 1956, by the Executive Office of the White House announced a date for hearings on a petition relative to proposed restrictions on the importation of baler and binder twine for use by the American farmer and commercial twine and rope consumers.

The petition was presented by the Cordage Institute which represents some of the industrial producers of twines and ropes in the country. Briefly, the petition attempts to establish the claim that the cordage industry is adversely affected by the importation of cordage products, and that the imports constitutes a threat to our national security.

This is an interesting claim, but I do not believe that it has merit. If the petitioners are successful in pressing their claim and imports of cordage products are restricted, then another noose will be tied around the neck of farmers. Baler and binder twine is important to thousands of farmers in the United States. Restricting imports of baler and binder twine will raise the price on both the domestic and foreign product.

I understand that the volume of rope imported into this country is only about 8 percent of domestic consumption. I am sure that the cordage industry is not worried about this small amount of imports. On the other hand imports of baler and binder twine represents about 50 percent of our domestic consumption. This is the melon that the cordage industry is really interested in, and it is the type of cordage primarily used by farmers. Thus, farmers will be the consumers most affected by restriction of cordage imports.

The domestic production of twine has never been sufficient to satisfy our needs in either peace or wartime. In the past Congress was well aware of this situation and it took appropriate action to assure farmers of an adequate supply of baler and binder twine at reasonable prices. In the 1951 session of Congress specific action was taken to remove the duty from baler and binder twine.

Before Congress took this action, extensive hearings were held by House and Senate committees.

However, now we discover that the administration is willing to undo all of the constructive action taken by Congress to assure American farmers a free and unrestricted flow of binder and baler twine. Could it be that the administration is more interested in the profits of a few cordage companies than it is the plight of hard-pressed farmers caught in a farm cost price squeeze? That is the way it looks to me.

Approximately 80 percent of the baler and binder twine is produced by two companies in the United States. The two companies are the Plymouth Cordage Co. and the International Harvester Co. It is interesting to note that the International Harvester Co. has not associated itself with the brief presented by the Cordage Institute. Therefore, the petition is presented to protect or increase the profits of one company.

I question the sincerity of presenting the claim that our national security is being threatened—particularly in view of the fact that our own production baler and binder twine has never equalled domestic demand. There is only one conclusion to draw: The stage is being set to gouge the farmer again, and the administration is willing to play handmaiden to the gouge.

I protest this action and I hope that other Members of Congress will do the same.

Heyer Products Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, each year the Federal Government spends billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money for defense. Under the terms of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, Congress has directed that the Department of Defense must purchase its supplies and services from the lowest responsible bidder in free and open competition. Congress has also made it clear that small businesses are to get a fair share of defense contracts. However, since the enactment of the Armed Services Procurement Act, there has been a disturbing tendency among procurement officials to spend the public's money without regard to the lowest obtainable price. The enormous volume of defense contracts which are let by the Government each year has made it difficult to control this situation.

In the recent case of Heyer Products Company, Inc., against the United States, the United States Court of Claims has ruled that if procurement officials ignore the lowest responsible bidder, he may recover from the Government the expense of preparing his bid. This is an important decision, which should go a long way in correcting abuses in the expenditure for defense of the taxpayer's money and for that reason I think it should be given wide circulation among the small-business men of the country.

The decision follows:

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS, No. 96–55, DECIDED MAY 1, 1956—HEYER PRODUCTS COMPANY, INC., V. THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Carl L. Shipley for plaintiff.

Mr. Herman Wolkinson, with whom was Acting Assistant Attorney General George S. Leonard, for defendant. Mr. Francis J. Robinson was on the briefs.

ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S PETITION

Whitaker, judge, delivered the opinion of the court:

This case is before the court on defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff's petition on the ground that it does not state a cause of action.

The material allegations of the petition are as follows: On March 17, 1952, the Ordnance Tank Automotive Center, Ordnance Corps, United States Army (hereafter re-

ferred to as OTAC) advertised for bids on 5,500 low-voltage circuit testers. On April 15, 1952, plaintiff submitted a bid, together with a sample unit and a letter of explanation, a photograph of the completed unit, a schematic diagram showing the circuit connections, and a specification describing the unit in detail. It alleges that its bid of $205,975 was the low bid, and that it was and is a responsible bidder; but that the Government, nevertheless, awarded the contract to a bidder whose bid was higher than the bids of six other bidders, including the plaintiff, and $190,043 higher than plaintiff's low bid of $205,975.

Plaintiff alleges that the failure of defendant to award it the contract "was the result of a deliberate artifice to retaliate against plaintiff for testifying against OTAC at a Senate hearing in 1952; that defendant deliberately and in violation of law wished to favor the successful bidder, and that defendant's action throughout the entire transaction was arbitrary, capricious, and taken in bad faith."

As a result, plaintiff says it not only lost the $7,000 which it spent in preparing its bid, but also lost its anticipated profit on the contract of $38,000, for which amounts it sues.

Defendant moves to dismiss plaintiff's petition on the ground that it does not state a cause of action.

Plaintiff's allegation of arbitrary and capricious action and of bad faith in awarding the contract was not a reckless averment. Facts are alleged that tend to support the allegation. The very fact that the bid was awarded to a bidder whose bid was higher than the bids of six other bidders, and that it was awarded at a price almost twice the low bid, put in by a responsible bidder, makes one strongly suspect discrimination and favoritism and a failure to accept that bid which was most advantageous to the Government, as OTAC was required to do under the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (62 Stat. 21). This suspicion grows stronger in the light of the further facts alleged.

Three months elapsed between the opening of the bids and the award of the contract. In the meantime, plaintiff's president had appeared before the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in connection with the rejection of a prior bid of the Heyer Products Co. for 3,000 low-voltage circuit testers, and in that hearing he had testified that that contract had been awarded to Weidenhoff Co., who was higher than six other bidders and whose bid was $116,730 higher than plaintiff's low bid of $134,100. It is further alleged that after hearing this testimony, the committee, to quote from its report (Senate Rept. 1092, 83d Cong., 2d sess.), which is incorporated in plaintiff's petition, "sought to ascertain what procurement policies and procedures in use at OTAC could possibly result in passing up the Heyer low bid to award this contract to the seventh high bidder at almost double the low bid price. This was of particular interest to your committee as the evidence revealed that Heyer had built thousands of low-voltage testers for commercial use, and some 52,000 for military use during World War II, and that Heyer had been a well-known manufacturer of automotive test equipment for 25 years, having built equipment for many of the leading companies in the automotive field, including Ford, Goodyear, Goodrich, Firestone, Willard, Exide, Atlas, Autolite."

After hearing testimony of representatives of the Ordnance Corps, the Select Committee on Small Business made a report (S. Rept. 2070, 82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 13), released April 28, 1952, quoted in the petition, in which it said:

"The representatives of Army Ordnance who appeared before your committee to explain * * * why the Heyer bids had been rejected did not give convincing explanations."

After his testimony and the report of the select committee, the petitioner alleges that, in retaliation for his appearance before the select committee, the award of the present contract in suit was again made to the same Weidenhoff Co., whose bid again was higher than the bid of six other bidders, and $190,043 higher than plaintiff's low bid of $205,975. Plaintiff alleges that this was done in brazen defiance of the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, requiring the acceptance of that bid which was most advantageous to the Government.

After the rejection of its bid on July 3, 1952, and the award of the contract to Weidenhoff Co., plaintiff alleges he again appeared before the Select Committee on Small Business, which conducted further hearings and made report No. 1092, 83d Congress, 2d session, which plaintiff sets out in its petition. In its report the committee set out the prior history of plaintiff's dealings with the Ordnance Department, as detailed above, and stated:

"This incredible coincidence (that both on November 3, 1950 and on April 16, 1952, the contract should have been awarded to the Weidenhoff Co., whose bid in both instances was higher than the bids of six other bidders and nearly double that of the lowest bidder) would seem to indicate that the officials in charge of OTAC have no wish or will to abide by the spirit and purpose of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947."

The committee goes on to report further that it called before it the commanding officer at OTAC and that this officer testified that the Heyer bid was rejected in favor of Weidenhoff because of technical evaluation; but that the Heyer Co. protested to your committee on the ground the technical reasons adduced by OTAC to justify its decision were insubstantial and were merely put forward as an ostensible excuse to deprive Heyer of a contract, to which he was rightly entitled by reason of his low bid, and that this was retaliation against him, for appearing at the first hearing on low-voltage circuit tester procurement.

To resolve this dispute the report states that Mr. Heyer and representatives of the Army "agreed to submit the disputed technical questions to the Detroit Testing Laboratory, an independent engineering laboratory, specializing for 50 years in testing devices to determine whether they comply with specifications"; that such a submission was made; and that the Detroit Testing Laboratory reported, among other things, that the specifications of the Ordnance Corps were not sufficiently clear, that additional requirements were superimposed in considering the bids, that the Army applied improper tests to the models submitted by bidders, and that, whether or not any of the bids met the specifications as drawn, Heyer's bid met them, if Weidenhoff's did.

From all of this the committee concluded: "Your committee can only conclude that for some reason unknown to it, OTAC wished to favor Weidenhoff, or to eliminate Heyer. The evidence adduced above permits no other inference, unless it be attributed to gross incompetence." And finally the committee said: "All in all, this is a shameful story."

It will thus be seen that plaintiffs' petition contains sufficient allegations to make out a case of discrimination against it, and of favoritism toward Weidenhoff Co., at a loss to the Government of several hundred thousand dollars. If the allegations are true, it would seem impossible to conclude that the bid had been accepted which was most advantageous to the Government.

Notwithstanding all this, defendant says that plaintiff has no legal capacity to sue, and that its petition should be dismissed.

It has been settled beyond controversy that most statutes governing the awarding of bids by governmental agencies are enacted for the benefit of the public who are served by these agencies, and not for the benefit of the bidders, and, therefore, that bidders have no right to sue on the ground that the provisions of such an act have been violated, in that the contract had not been let to the lowest bidder. *United States* v. *New York and Puerto Rico Steamship Co.*, (239 U. S. 88); *American Smelting and Refining Co.* v. *United States* (259 U. S. 75); *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co.* (310 U. S. 113); *Colorado Paving Co.* v. *Murphy* (78 Fed. 28), and other cases cited in *Perkins* v. *Lukens Steel Co., supra.*

It is true that one of the purposes of the act of February 19, 1948, the "Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947," was to induce the letting of a fair proportion of Government contracts to small business concerns; indeed, this was declared to be the "policy of Congress" in the beginning of the act; but the main purpose of the act was to give directions for the conduct of Government agents in making contracts, and this was for the purpose of protecting the public, and not the bidders. Clearly, section 3 (b), which plaintiff says was violated, was enacted for the benefit of the public, and not for the benefit of bidders. This section reads:

"All bids shall be publicly opened at the time and place stated in the advertisement. Award shall be made with reasonable promptness by written notice to that responsible bidder whose bid, conforming to the invitation for bids, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered: *Provided*, That all bids may be rejected when the agency head determines that it is in the public interest so to do."

So, if an award is made to a bidder whose bid was not "most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered," and the act was, therefore, violated, it is only the public who has a cause for complaint, and not an unsuccessful bidder.

The advertisement for bids was, of course, a request for offers to supply the things the Ordnance Department wanted. It could accept or reject an offer as it pleased, and no contract resulted until an offer was accepted. Hence, an unsuccessful bidder cannot recover the profit he would have made out of the contract, because he had no contract.

But this is not to say that he may not recover the expense to which he was put in preparing his bid.

It was an implied condition of the request for offers that each of them would be honestly considered, and that that offer which in the honest opinion of the contracting officer was most advantageous to the Government would be accepted. No person would have bid at all if he had known that the cards were stacked against him. No bidder would have put out $7,000 in preparing its bid, as plaintiff says it did, if it had known the Ordnance Department had already determined to give the contract to the Weidenhoff Co. It would not have put in a bid unless it thought it was to be honestly considered. It had a right to think it would be. The Ordnance Department impliedly promised plaintiff it would be. This is what induced it to spend its money to prepare its bid.

The OTAC knew it would involve considerable expense to prepare models, photographs, diagrams and specifications, and other things necessary to comply with the invitation, and so, when it invited plaintiff to incur this expense, it must necessarily be implied that it promised to give fair and impartial consideration to its bid, having in mind only the interest of the Government and not the interest of some favorite bidder.

That promise was broken, shamefully broken, if plaintiff's petition states the facts. If the facts there stated are true, the conclusion seems inescapable that the Ordnance Department knew from the beginning they were going to give Weidenhoff

the contract. The advertisement for bids was a sham, done only to appear to comply with the law, to clothe their apparently dishonest purpose with the habiliments of legality. If these allegations are true, they practiced a fraud on plaintiff and on all other innocent bidders. They induced them to spend their money to prepare their bids on the false representation that their bids would be honestly considered.

This implied contract has been broken, and plaintiff may maintain an action for damages for its breach.

The facts in *United States* v. *Purcell Envelope Co.* (249 U. S. 313), differ from the facts in this case in that in that case plaintiff's bid was accepted. But after acceptance the head of the department refused to execute the written contract. Plaintiff sued and the Government defended on the ground that discretion rested in the department head to choose with whom it would contract, and that it had chosen not to contract with plaintiff, and, hence, plaintiff had no legal capacity to sue.

The court held that a contract resulted from the offer and acceptance and that the subsequent signing of a written contract was not required.

The facts in the two cases are, therefore, different, but in the course of its opinion the Supreme Court used this language, which is applicable to the present case:

"There must be a point of time at which discretion is exhausted. The procedure for the advertising for bids for supplies * * * to the Government would else be a mockery—a procedure, we may say, that is not permissible, but required. * * * By it the Government is given the benefit of the competition of the market and each bidder is given the chance of a bargain. It is a provision, therefore, in the interest of both the Government and the bidder, necessarily giving rights to both and placing obligations on both. And it is not out of place to say that the Government should be animated by a justice as anxious to consider the rights of the bidder as to insist upon its own."

The cases we cited in the beginning of this opinion hold that acts requiring advertising and letting to the lowest responsible bidder confer no right on the bidder to secure the contract, whether or not he is the lowest responsible bidder and, hence, he may not recover his loss of anticipated profits. We do not understand the Supreme Court in the Purcell Envelope case, supra, to have intended to hold to the contrary, but it did definitely recognize that the bidder had certain rights, and that the Government was under an obligation to respect those rights.

Among these rights is the right to have his bid honestly considered. The Government is under the obligation to honestly consider it and not to wantonly disregard it. If this obligation is breached and plaintiff is put to needless expense in preparing its bid, it is entitled to recover such expenses.

It goes without saying that not every unsuccessful bidder is entitled to recover the cost of putting in his bid. Recovery can be had in only those cases where it can be shown by clear and convincing proof that there has been a fraudulent inducement for bids, with the intention, before the bids were invited or later conceived, to disregard them all except the ones from bidders to one of whom it was intended to let the contract, whether he was the lowest responsible bidder or not. In other words, it must be shown that bids were not invited in good faith, but as a pretense to conceal the purpose to let the contract to some favored bidder, or to one of a group of preferred bidders, and with the intent to willfully, capriciously, and arbitrarily disregard the obligation to let the contract to him whose bid was most advantageous to the Government.

Defendant's motion to dismiss plaintiff's petition is denied.

It is so ordered.

Littleton, judge, and Jones, chief judge, concur.

Madden, judge, dissenting in part:

I think that under the terms of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151 (b)), the plaintiff had an interest which that law was designed to protect. The principal purpose of laws relating to bidding, and of the statute here under consideration is, of course, the protection of the public treasury. But the background of this statute seems to me to show that another purpose of the statute was to give small-business men the right to get Government contracts if their bids were more advantageous to the Government than competing bids. I would treat the plaintiff's claim as one founded upon an act of Congress. If, upon trial, the plaintiff proves that the act has been violated by the agents of the Government, to his damage, I would give him a judgment for the damage.

I am not unmindful that in administering the business affairs of the Government, a wide discretion, within the stated legal limits, should be allowed to the responsible agents. But no one would claim, and the Government does not claim, that conduct such as that alleged in the plaintiff's petition is within the allowable discretion of any Government officer.

The opportunity to expose such conduct as that alleged in the petition, in a judicial proceeding, and the awarding to the victims of such conduct of compensation for their losses resulting therefrom, would be good for public morals. I would let the plaintiff prove, if it can, what it has alleged, and if it does prove it, let the normal legal consequences follow.

Laramore, judge, dissenting:

While I cannot condone the wrong done plaintiff, as alleged, I must respectfully dissent.

If the officer acting on behalf of the Government was guilty of the acts alleged in the petition, it would amount to fraud. A suit founded on fraud would sound in tort, and it is clear that this court has no original jurisdiction of tort actions. *Martilla* v. *United States* (118 C. Cls. 177).

The plaintiff, in order to recover, must show that he has a contract that he shall receive fair consideration of his bid, or that a statute by its own terms authorizes his recovery in the event his bid does not receive fair consideration. Neither the facts nor the statutes involved justify a conclusion that the Government made a contract with plaintiff to give him fair consideration. On the other hand, there is nothing in the statute which, by its own terms, would authorize the plaintiff to receive a judgment if the contracting officials had not given his bid fair consideration. Without one or the other basis, I cannot see how the court can render judgment for the plaintiff.

I would dismiss the petition.

Report on Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today, as this session of the Congress draws to a close, I would like to briefly discuss the agricultural situation as we find it.

I am happy to say that conditions are much better than they were a year ago, and I want to point out some of the efforts we have made, and some of the things we have accomplished which have helped agriculture. While the farmer has not reached the point where he can enjoy his full share of the present prosperity of this country, his lot is better; his prices are higher, and his future is brighter.

There are many of us here who had the courage to pass legislation that would help remove the cause which was depressing the farmers' market. We who helped to remove this cause, rather than resort to political expediency, have already proven that we are the real friends of agriculture, and the farmers.

Speaking for myself, and the majority of the Members of the Congress who had the courage to take the criticism, and, yet, try to remove the cause and help the patient, so to speak, we will continue to follow these sound policies until the farmer reaches full prosperity, and the opportunities to continue that prosperity will be kept open for the years ahead.

We knew the cause was the mountain of surpluses that had been piling up over the last few years which was depressing the farmers' market. We knew that one of the causes was that during the last war we had lost nearly all of our export business.

THIS IS WHAT WE DID

Mr. Speaker for the first time in our history, we passed new laws that would help us increase our exports to foreign countries. Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress was one of them. Under title I of that act, farm surpluses are being sold to friendly foreign countries for foreign currencies, and under title III, farm surpluses are being bartered, or exchanged, for strategic materials.

These two programs have given a market boost to our total agricultural exports, and it is estimated that during the current year they will constitute about 20 percent of the export total of about $3¼ billion.

Through the combined efforts of commercial trade and Government, exports have been increased during the last 3 years. In fiscal year 1954 our exports were increased 7 percent; in fiscal year 1955 they were 4 percent higher than in 1954; in fiscal year 1956 they were 9 percent higher.

As a matter of fact, on a quantity basis, if you exclude cotton, farm exports this year are expected to be the highest of any year for the past 30 years.

In the face of this fact, yet, you will hear some people say, "What has the administration done to help the lot of the farmer?" This accomplishment could not have been effected had it not been for passing this new law, and other laws, that had never been thought of by any administration in the past.

HERE ARE SOME OF THE HIGHLIGHTS

Mr. Speaker, our exports are up 20 percent from last year. Corn and other feed grain exports up 84 percent—an all-time high record.

Soybean exports up 30 percent—a new record.

Soybean and cottonseed oil exports up 52 percent—another record.

Lard exports up 31 percent—the largest in the last 4 years. This is one of several reasons hog prices have increased from a low of $11 to $18 per hundredweight.

Record exports of beans and vegetable oils have been a keen factor in the high farm prices for soybeans, with a soybean crop of 372 million bushels last year, which yielded the farmers almost $1 billion dollars. Soybeans were selling as high as $3.15, but I realize that recently soybeans have dropped from the high, largely because the acreage has been greatly increased for the 1956 crop, and that fear of a surplus, and nothing else, has lowered the price of soybeans; however, our great increase in export markets will likely remove enough of the production to maintain prices that will bring the farmers a reasonable profit.

REMOVING GOVERNMENT SURPLUSES

A truly remarkable job has been done in disposing of surplus dairy products. At the peak, in 1954, the Commodity Credit Corporation held 467 millon pounds of butter, 436 million pounds of cheese, and 566 million pounds of nonfat dry milk solids. In mid-June there was no butter in stock, cheese holdings were down to 193 million pounds, and nonfat dry milk solids down to 147 million pounds. These disposals were achieved despite higher milk production and without impairing farm income. On the contrary, from 1954 to 1955, dairy farmers' cash receipts increased by $100 million at the same time that milk production went up 1.4 billion pounds. And the improved situation continues in 1956.

During the last 3 years we have disposed of $6 billion of farm commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and owned by the Government.

What brought about this marked shift in the dairy situation? For one thing, the dairy industry itself has taken a renewed interest in educational and sales promotion efforts.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Another stimulus to consumption has come from the expanded school milk program. This school year more than 60,000 schools are taking advantage of this program and participating children will consume well over one billion half-pints of milk.

Acting on the recommendation of the President, Congress has extended the program for 2 years and increased the authorized funds to $75 million per year.

And speaking of schoolchildren, the National School Lunch Program continues to expand. This year over 10 million children in 56,000 schools are participating in the program. The schools are purchasing more than $350 million worth of food this year—in addition to the surplus foods donated to them by the United States Department of Agriculture.

SOIL BANK

The soil bank is another major step in coping with the surplus problem. It is a frontal attack on the accumulated surpluses coupled with an effort to safeguard our soil and water resources for future generations, and to improve farm income.

I need not tell you, for you already know, of the delay for months in the soil bank program in the Senate, and the monstrosity of the bill that finally came to the House of Representatives, and then, there was further delay in the House before it was sent to the President for his signature.

President Eisenhower saved the day for the farmers when he courageously vetoed the worst farm bill that has been passed in the Congress in the 14 years I have been here.

Had he not vetoed this bill, it would have shut the door to permanent recovery for the farmers of America. He not only vetoed the bill, but he demanded that the Congress give him a bill that was worthy of the farmers of America, and that would help open the door for a progressive future for the farmers of America. Grudgingly, but finally, those who tried to load the farm bill with bad amendments were defeated and worn down to where we got a soil bank bill that went a long way toward the very type of a bill that the President asked for, and a soil bank bill of which the greatest number of his provisions harmonized with the type of bill that the Farm Bureau Federation had suggested.

Had it not been for the shameful delay, the farmers could have had millions of dollars of benefit this year that has been denied them by those who tried to delay, and scuttle, the efforts of the President and those of us who wanted to bring real relief, and a better future to the farmers of America.

Mr. Speaker, now I want to pay a compliment, which I believe is deserving, to the Committee on Appropriations for Agriculture. This committee, as you know, consisting of 7 members, held hearings for about 2 months in order to give Secretary Benson, and the heads of the various departments of the Agriculture Department an opportunity to come before us and report on the progress they were making, and to explain to us how much they needed for each department for the coming year, and to what use these funds would be put. After exhaustive hearings, this committee of 7 wrote the bill which carried just for the regular activities of the Department $783,061,708. This did not take into account over a billion dollars for the Commodtiy Credit Corporation, and other services.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a great honor to have had the opportunity to serve as a member of this committee. It has been a rich experience affording me an opportunity to learn more about the basic industry, agriculture, upon which foundation the economy and power of this great Nation has been built, and upon which it rests.

Mr. Speaker, it has also given me an opportunity to be helpful to the farm segment of our economy, in which I have long been interested, which has been developed by the farmers of America to a height of production that surpasses any nation in world history. Having personally been interested in agriculture, having been a member of the Farm Bureau for 40 years, the work on this committee and the opportunity to be helpful to agriculture has been a great satisfaction to me.

FALSE CRITICISM

Mr. Speaker, since there are always those in political campaigns who seek to misrepresent, and who ciriticise Members of Congress who have really tried to do something to help agriculture, it becomes necessary at times to face such critics who deliberately misrepresent, and falsify the record of a Congressman, in order to gain a political advantage for themselves, I repeat, it becomes necessary to confront them with the truth. The truth is always powerful enough to destroy fiction, and the mispresentation of facts.

Mr. Speaker, I raise this question because there is an effort being made in my district at this time to mislead the farmers, and to misrepresent my record here, which has always been, as the Members of this Congress know, in the interest of the farmers. Efforts of that kind, I believe the Members of this Congress will bear me out, are generally made by someone who has never done anything himself for the farmers. That is the situation in the case I have in mind.

To prove the falsity of such charges, I would like to point out that our committee, the entire membership of the Appropriations Committee, of this House sought to help the farmers by increasing appropriations for Soil Conservation, for Research and Extension Service, for the extension of REA Light and Power, by liberalizing farm credit through Farmers' Home Administration, and increasing appropriations for many departments of agriculture.

Now, to confront those who would misrepresent my record, with the devastating truth, I want to quote a few paragraphs of my remarks made on May 15, 1956, which can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page 7269, when our Committee presented to the Members of the House the appropriations bill for agriculture for the coming year: This is what I said:

Mr. Chairman, our committee, in its exhaustive hearings, conscious of the fact that the farmers are not fully sharing in the prosperity of the Nation, has sought to help them where we justifiably could in certain sections of the bill.

The bill before us carries an appropriation of $783,061,708 for regular activities of the Department. It provides for loan authorizations for REA and Farmers' Home Administration of $359,300,000 both in title I of the bill.

We allowed the full budget request of $145,300,000 for REA, and in addition provided for a contingency fund of $43,700,000 which can be drawn on by cooperatives if they need more money by justifying same before the Bureau of the Budget.

For the rural telephone program we approved the budget amount, and, in addition, provided for a contingency of $50,500,000—which can also be drawn on by justifying such additional request before the Bureau of the Budget. REA is always doing a good job, and the committee wants to give it full cooperation.

SOIL CONSERVATION

In 1955 our committee increased appropriations for soil conservation from $75 million to $81 million, and for the coming year, we increased the amount

from $81 million to $97 million—an increase of $16 million over last year. In addition, we authorized for the coming year, to pay farmers for soil conservation program practices $250 million; yet, there are those who for personal political gain are spreading the false statement that "VURSELL is opposed to soil conservation."

Mr. Speaker, of course the Members of this House, with whom I have served many years, know that story is false. In addition, nearly all the farmers in my district know of my constant support of legislation in their interest. I once complained to one of my farmer friends about those unfair attempts to deceive the voters. His answer was the old axiom you have doubtless heard many times, "give a calf enough rope and he will hang himself." Well, maybe he is right.

The Great Circle Route to the Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on March 29, 1955, the California delegation, comprising 30 Members of the Congress, instructed a subcommittee to draw up its statement of position of the California delegation concerning its great interest in the Great Circle Route case. Following is the complete statement:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1955.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: No doubt you have examined the Pacific from a global viewpoint and are well aware of the fact that a great circle embraces in one hemisphere the entire Pacific Ocean and Antarctica, and in the remaining hemisphere lies most of the land mass of the world. On that great circle are Singapore, Taipei, Tokyo, Dutch Harbor, San Francisco and Los Angeles, Lima and Buenos Aires. The shortest route from Panama to Manila skirts the Bering Sea. It is to great circles that we must look for our air commerce routes, and that particular great circle connects our Pacific port cities with those of the Orient and Latin America.

That is why some days ago the Members of Congress representing the State of California met and unanimously agreed that we should present to you our considered judgment that the sound economic development of our State requires that the restrictions on Pan American World Airways' trans-Pacific route be not reimposed so that it may operate between our Pacific ports and the Orient over the great circle route.

We in California believe that with the great new long-range aircraft, we should have an opportunity to fly directly on the great circle route to the Orient and not be obliged, as we now are, to travel a needless and time-consuming extra 1,288 miles over the central Pacific. This is not only an unnecessary imposition upon people in California, but constitutes a heavy burden upon the taxpayers of the Nation when they are required to pay for the subsidy needed when passengers and mail are carried over the longer central Pacific route.

We are concerned with any further delay that would be incurred by a needless continuance of the restrictions which in their last temporary certificates, now up for review, prevented Pan American from operating a service between Tokyo, Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles, and on to Latin America. Such an operation would provide a service over the direct route from Japan to the United States, connecting in California with established American-flag service to Latin America. The Canadians are now operating a competing route from the Orient over the Great Circle to Vancouver and on to Latin America. Routes connecting the Orient with Latin America over the Great Circle are important world trade routes with all of the economic, political, and military considerations which are involved. We in California feel strongly that we should have a competitive American-flag service.

In your letter to Acting Chairman Gurney of the Civil Aeronautics Board of February 1, 1955, you said, "I desire to hold in abeyance my decision concerning the use of the Great Circle route by Pan American pending further study and later report on the economic and technical feasibility and the military and foreign policy implications of nonstop service between the west coast and the Orient."

In view of the wide interest of California in this matter and the broad national interest considerations which are involved, the California congressional delegation met and authorized the undersigned subcommittee respectfully to urge that you reach a decision which will permit Pan American to fly the entire Great Circle above described, which she has long been prepared to do. Obviously, fair play dictates that the permission extend for the same 7-year period which you recently fixed in renewing Northwest's Pacific certificate.

Respectfully yours,
CARL HINSHAW,
Chairman, the California Delegation.
CECIL KING,
JOHN SHELLEY,
WILLIAM MAILLIARD,
CHARLES TEAGUE,
Subcommittee Members.

Mr. Speaker, I am now in receipt of a telegram from Mr. A. O. Beckman, president, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, Calif., supporting the view of the California delegation, as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *July 24, 1956.*

Hon. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building:

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently actively participated in Civil Aeronautics Board Docket No. 5031, known as the reopened Transpacific Certificate Renewal case. The proceeding was reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President of the United States to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the great circle route to the Orient. Pan American inaugurated air service across the Pacific to the Orient from California Gateways in 1935 and has provided service since that time. However, Pan American was and has been denied the right to use the great circle route to the Orient even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter to Tokyo via that route. Present route restrictions require Pan American's Tokyo service from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island en route. These mandatory circuitous routings have caused many passengers who would logically be routed through California Gateways to choose other more direct routes. Carriers not serving California Gateways advertise this fact and thereby attract additional traffic away from California Gateways.

The California businessman is already at a considerable disadvantage with his competitors for the Japanese and Chinese markets because of great distances involved. Certification of Pan American to serve Tokyo via the great circle route will considerably offset these handicaps. In another docket No. 7725 presently before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Northwest Airlines, who are presently certificated to fly the great circle route to the Orient from Seattle have applied for permanent authority to serve this route. We take no position as to whether this application should be granted or denied. However, we feel that if a decision is now to be made as to the permanency of the certificate for service to Tokyo from the west coast, there is no question but that Pan American who has been serving the west coast to Orient traffic for over 21 years should be given at least equal consideration along with Northwest. Failure to grant Pan American the great circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted to any other carrier would be manifestly unjust to Pan American and the west coast Gateways it serves. The matter of subsidy is not involved in either proceeding, since both Pan American and Northwest Airlines have been free of subsidy in the Pacific operations during and since 1955. However, if present routing restrictions are not lifted and if Pan American is not permitted to fly the shorter great circle route from California Gateways via Portland and Seattle to the Orient it does not appear that they will be able to remain in a competitive position and stay off subsidy. Tokyo at present occupies the dominant position as the gateway to the Orient. Over 50 percent of the total United States-Orient traffic is generated by Japan. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through California Gateways. It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification should be given to the primary Gateways and the carrier handling the traffic, in this instance Pan American. The Civil Aeronautics Board should give favorable consideration toward the permanent certification of this much needed more expeditious air route between California Gateways and the Orient which has already been established as convenient and necessary to the public.

A. O. BECKMAN,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Airlines Battle for Share of Miami Run

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the House a column by Mr. Ray Tucker. This column appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Charleston Evening Post, on Wednesday, July 18, 1956. It has been sent to me by a number of my constituents who have watched with fascinated horror the pulling and hauling in a route case pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board. Unlike many of my colleagues, I have taken no part in this case, although my

own congressional district could be affected by the outcome of the New York-Florida proceeding. For myself, I have felt for some time now that the kind of extrajudicial activity described by Mr. Tucker in his nationally syndicated column, should be deplored by all the Members of this House. I offer this column without further comment, except the hope that Chairman James R. Durfee of the CAB, and the other distinguished members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, will read this carefully. When they do, they will ignore the pressures and perhaps censure those lobbyists who are obviously responsible for them.

My people in Charleston, S. C., want service. They deplore and view with great alarm the complete indifference with which their interests have been ignored by certain of the major airlines. It is tragic, indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the intermediate cities have to struggle for a place in the sun to get air transportation. My city wants service. Figures now show that we are unable to get all to which we are entitled. I hope that in this struggle of the Titans, the Civil Aeronautics Board will not lose sight of the great interest of the rights of all those cities between Washington and the Pot of Gold, Miami, Fla.

The article follows:

AIRLINES BATTLE FOR SHARE OF MIAMI RUN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON.—The most savage row in the history of commercial aviation has been staged before the Civil Aeronautics Board in the struggle of eight rivals to share in the New York-Miami run, now enjoyed by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker's Eastern Airlines and Ted Baker's National Airlines. With Juan Tripple's Pan American World Airways as the most aggressive contender, it is a battle of giants with no holds barred.

It will embarrass the Eisenhower administration seriously, no matter how CAB decides. From mayors, State councils, chambers of commerce, and politicians of both parties have met headon as they press the claims of their respective favorites. Cabinet members and former Cabinet members have been employed as lobbyists at Washington. Veteran aviation writers say they have never seen such offside play.

Important southern interests on and off Capitol Hill generally support the application of Delta Airlines, which has been recommended by Examiner Thomas Wrenn. Florida labor spokesmen, however, prefer the existing situation on the ground that entry of a third competitor would create unemployment among Eastern-National forces at Miami.

Some New England groups favor Northeast Airlines, owned by Howard Hughes and now serving that area, and with which Pan American would hook up. With lavish promises, pamphlets, movies, and congressional speeches, Trippe has drummed up backing in New England. He has enlisted governors and mayors there, Mayor Wagner, of New York, and similar individuals and groups all down the Atlantic coast. National has offered to buy stock control of Northeast Airlines.

Rarely has such outside pressure been brought against CAB, in complete defiance and violation of that body's Principles of Practice, which state:

"It is improper that there be any effort by any person interested in the case to sway the judgment of the Board by attempting to bring pressure or influence to bear upon the members of the Board or that such person, directly or indirectly, give statements to the press or radio, or by paid advertisements, or otherwise, designed to influence the Board's judgment in the case."

Pan American apparently believes that this provision is a dead letter, which it seems to be, in view of the Board's failure to enforce it. Juan Trippe's vast publicity organization has produced and distributed a 15-minute film entitled "Salute to New England," for showing on television or movies before civic and commercial bodies.

Pan American has important connections in currently strategic Yankeeland. Its $40,000-a-year lobbyist, Sam Pryor, Jr., was formerly Republican national committeeman for Connecticut. Commerce Secretary Sinclair Weeks, GOP boss of Massachusetts, invariably favors Pan American when he can. In fact, Connecticut Representatives have felt it necessary to explain and defend this lobbying in floor speeches.

Ironically, in official testimony before CAB, Trippe has never proposed the extensive kind of New England-South America service which he offers in his movies and brochures. Moreover, direct connection with Latin America is now available through the Pan American-National tieup at Miami, although Trippe has sought to avoid compliance with CAB's order to that effect. The Colonial-Eastern-Braniff line provides this through service now.

Trippe has corraled Maryland politicians by promising to use Baltimore's Friendship Airport for the Washington-Baltimore traffic. But Friendship is 32 miles and an hour's drive from the District of Columbia, and utterly unsuitable for this purpose. Nor has he made this offer in specific terms to CAB.

Pan American got Cuban travel agents to write lettrs in which they complained of Eastern's and National's service. But when interviewed by Eastern-National representatives, they praised these two lines, and repudiated their previous criticism.

The taxpayers, as always, have a bread-and-butter stake in this controversy. Whereas Eastern and National require no Federal subsidy, Pan American is the only great firm which still draws millions in cash from Uncle Sam's Treasury to finance its operations, although it reports rich profits and continuing heavy investments in $30-a-day luxury hotels in Cuba, Mexico, and South America.

Experts generally admit that Pan American may need even larger Federal aid, if it is given the New York-Miami flight. And, by splitting the traffic among 3 instead of 2 lines, it may throw Eastern and National back on Federal relief.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico
Fourth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to bring to the attention of the House Members that today the people of Puerto Rico are celebrating the fourth anniversary of the inauguration of their Commonwealth.

Exactly 4 years ago, that the Commonwealth came into being. Fifty-eight years ago, on this date, the Armed Forces of the United States landed in Puerto Rico. The message of freedom our troops carried to the Puerto Rican people came to full fruition on the 25th of July of 1952. Thus Puerto Ricans became a self-governing, free people, constituted by themselves into a sovereign body politic, associated with the United States in accordance with the terms of a compact which the Congress had offered them and which they freely accepted.

The relationships now existing between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States are firmly established, because they have for their foundation the basic concept of freedom—of free determination. That this was the desire of the people of Puerto Rico can well be pointed to as one of the outstanding examples of how the principles upon which our institutions are based, when properly nurtured to a people, no matter what their previous political allegiances might have been, develop and fructify in any climate.

For since the founding of Puerto Rico by Juan Ponce de Leon in 1508, to 1898, when Puerto Rico was separated from its allegiance to the Spanish Crown, they had lived under monarchical institutions. They had attained a certain development but they had developed, also, a quest for freedom, which they considered could be attained only within the democratic institutions which had become the creed of the New World. Puerto Rico felt that it belonged in the New World not only geographically but politically and spiritually.

Being a small island with very difficult problems, lacking natural resources and having a very dense population, they have not sought to navigate by themselves over the troubled waters of international life, and their association to the United States for the 54 years previous to the creation of the Commonwealth, had developed in them a profound sense of solidarity with the people of the mainland. Since 1917 they were invested with United States citizenship. Thus, they proposed to Congress a new type of political unit within our system. The Congress in turn offered them the terms under which it could be accomplished. They accepted the terms and the Commonwealth was thereby born.

We should rejoice that the Commonwealth has been a success. We should take pride in the accomplishments of the people of Puerto Rico which must be viewed as being also our own accomplishments.

National Guard in Danger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of warning members of this House that the National Guard is in profound danger.

Once again our National Guard, which has never failed our Nation in repulsing

enemies from abroad, is faced with a fight for its very existence.

This is not a struggle for survival against the forces of alien aggression. The National Guard could handle such a battle by itself. Now this mortal threat which is leveled at the guard, and all it stands for, exists, unfortunately, within our own Government.

I regret that it is necessary to inform this House that once again the Army General Staff has embarked on a power grab that, if not stopped, and stopped soon, will destroy the National Guard and every vestige of the civilian control of the military that is a keystone of our form of government.

I am aware that Congress, and particularly this House, has frequently in the past repulsed the Army General Staff's grab for power.

The Nation, and the National Guard, are deeply indebted to the Congress for the resolute manner in which it has rebuffed the plans of the Army General Staff.

Ever since the Army General Staff came into being, it has waged a vicious vendetta against what the National Guard stands for.

Why? Simply because the guard, with its decentralized control, its broad base of citizen participation, and its belief in civilian control of the military, has been an implacable obstacle to the Army General Staff plans for imposing the Prussian military system and organization over our Nation.

I need not remind this House that such a supreme general staff has been the goal of the Army General Staff. I am sure that we all believed that Congress had once and for all settled the matter in 1946 and 1949 by vigorously rejecting the Army General Staff demands for a supreme staff. This Congress did in the most pointed and unquestionable terms by rejecting the Army General Staff's Collins plan—which would have planted such a system in America. In addition, Congress also wrote into the National Security Act the most emphatic prohibitions against a supreme general staff.

We thought that by law we had defeated the proponents of this plan and in so doing we had erected a permanent protection for our National Guard.

Such prohibitions against a supreme general staff were imperative if the National Guard were to survive. The moment a supreme staff is created in this country, the National Guard will start to die. As history has proved, National Guard types of military forces cannot survive the Prussian type of highly centralized militarism under a supreme general staff.

Ever since prior to World War I the National Guard has been both an obstacle to, and a target of, the Army General Staff.

It is no secret that the Army General Staff has starved, squeezed, and impeded our National Guard. But because the guard is strong in heart and the democratic philosophy on which it is based is consonant with our form of government, the guard has persevered and survived in spite of the Army General Staff.

Is there any wonder, then, why Congress and our National Guard have both opposed every attempt to induce acceptance of the single Chief of Staff-supreme general staff system in the United States?

In a sense Congress and the National Guard are both vitally interested parties. The Prussian system would mean the end of the National Guard and it would also sound the doom of civilian control over the military.

The danger I refer to is not rumor. It is not speculation. It is not imagination.

It is real. It exists at this very moment.

The documentary evidence is conclusive. The master plan for creation of a supreme general staff has been drawn by the Army General Staff. The moment it goes into effect our democratic institutions go into decline.

The greatest citizen army in the world's history, our National Guard, at this very moment has a knife poised at its throat.

There is no secret about the Army General staff blueprint. It was published with all basic points in the New York Times of June 24, 1956.

Our Nation is indebted to the New York Times for exposing this plan to destroy civilian control of the military by erecting a Prussian-type of supreme staff.

This is what the Army General Staff's master plan would do:

First. Convert the Department of Defense into a supreme general staff.

Second. Put a super single chief of staff in command of the great supreme general staff and all the Armed Forces.

Third. Eliminate the civilian deputy and Assistant Secretaries of Defense.

Fourth. Replace them with military officers.

Fifth. Give the super chief of staff control over manpower, industrial requirements, weapons requirements, and national strategy. He would be the most powerful man in the world.

Sixth. Although the Secretary of Defense and the President would be nominally superior to the super chief of staff, as well as Congress, they would get only such information and "facts" as the chief of staff decided they could have.

Seventh. The military services would be merged into one huge armed force, in accordance with the whims of the super chief of staff.

Eighth. The inevitable result would be the elimination of the National Guard.

Ninth. The Marine Corps, too, would be eliminated. Like the National Guard, it has no mention and no place in the master plan.

Tenth. The Secretaries of the Military Departments are also eliminated.

Each of these features in themselves are loaded with disaster for our Nation. As a whole, this Army general staff plan would be the end of our form of government.

Congress and the people are entitled to know what is going on in the Pentagon.

Secretary Wilson, speaking at Quantico recently, condemned the Prussian single chief of staff system and service merger.

Yet at the very moment he was speaking the Army general staff was pushing its master plan to accomplish what Secretary Wilson publicly condemned.

Secretary of the Army Brucker has also demonstrated his awareness of this vital issue and has publicly announced his strong opposition to the integrated single service concept. Despite this, however, his general staff officers have prepared an official staff paper which is a blueprint for the very type of organization which Secretary Brucker has condemned. The very fact that the Army general staff officers would dare to write and secure the publication of such a plan vividly illustrates the stubborn persistence of the supreme general staff proponents, and the difficulty which Secretary Brucker encounters in exercising civilian control over the general staff.

This Army supreme general staff plan would destroy every iota of civilian control over the Army. It would even eliminate Secretary Brucker's job. This demonstrates the bold arrogance of the Army proponents of this plan. More than this, however, it indicates in a most compelling fashion the Army general staff's deep and shocking lack of gratitude toward Secretary Brucker who has proved to be one of the most able and loyal Secretaries the Army has ever had.

Congress must not let this Army general staff blueprint for Prussianism succeed.

It is contrary to every principle of military efficiency.

It is contrary to every sacred principle of our form of government.

It is, also, contrary to every major provision of the report of the Hoover Commission task force on national security.

It is cause for alarm and indignation on the part of every citizen.

It would be the death knell of our National Guard.

Because of the great service of the New York Times in exposing this Army general staff master plan for usurping the powers of Congress and the civilian authorities over the military, Congress and the Nation are now alerted.

In the face of an alerted nation, the Army general staff will not be able to put into effect its plan to convert our Nation into a general-staff state.

Address by Samuel M. Bemiss Before the Commissioners of Agriculture of the Southern States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent speech made by Mr. Samuel M. Bemiss, of Richmond, Va., before the Commissioners of Agriculture of the Southern States, at Williamburg, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the last few days you have probably become aware that it is dangerous to

invite a Virginian to talk, and when he does, you are justified in the suspicion that he will talk about Virginia. However, I don't feel too badly because certainly you and the Nation have roots in the Virginia soil.

Next year we are to celebrate on this peninsula the founding of this great Nation. It is a coincidence that Virginia existed for 175 years as an English colony—and exactly the same length of time as a sovereign State among the United States of America. The first 175 years are altogether intriguing. Here, Englishmen first committed themselves unreservedly to the North American Continent. Here, practical Englishmen seeking practical solutions to their most pressing problem—that of living—created and worked in one of the greatest political laboratories of all time. It is well to examine into the character and aspirations of those Englishmen who planted here the genesis of a new man and laid the foundation of a new Nation. As I have said, they were practical men. They were businessmen. They were of the great English middle class. Somewhere in their Elizabethan background, among their Elizabethan associates, was developed the concept that government rested on the consent of the governed. The military successes and the ensuing commercial prosperity of the great Queen's reign broadened their horizons and inspired their imaginations. Their courage was unlimited; their industry proverbial. They were facets in the cornerstone of their society reflecting its sheer brilliance. They would not be fenced in. They sought freedom of thought, movement, and enterprise. The sea was theirs. They claimed the new continent. Little by little and step by step, profiting by the experience and wisdom of their ancestors, they evolved principles which turned a feudal world upside down and which have become a part of our formal Constitution. In the good soil of the New World, they planted their roots.

Our story on this side of the Atlantic starts in the spring of 1607, when Capt. Christopher Newport took his little band ashore from his ships in Powhatan's great river, erected a cross, and, led by the Rev. Robert Hunt, prayed to their God to bless the seed they had brought with them.

It is well to distinguish between these Englishmen and the Spanish conquistadors to the south, who were destroying ancient civilization purely for the gold and precious stones which the process yielded, and the French to the North who were primarily interested in a crude fur trade. These practical Englishmen did not pray that their arms be blessed; they prayed for "blessings on the seed and the goodly land." Here, it seems to me, is the starting point, the genesis, the foundation of our Nation. Its greatness has ever been derived from the "goodly land."

The great plantations which they hewed out of the vast forests and founded along the river they named after one of the stupidest of English kings, still flourish and represent the oldest continuous agricultural enterprise in continental United States.

The early letters written back to England—Smith's Percy's, Strachey's, Hamor's—all describe the abundance in the forests, in the soil, and in the waters; but Smith warns that "No man hath a place in Virginia. He must make his own." This is exactly what every survivor did.

The common storehouse and communism necessarily failed. It was beneath the dignity of the privileged to work for the lowly. And the lowly, confronted with stark realism, saw no point in sharing the fruits of their labor with an idler. Many a useful artisan deserted to the Indians and lived a brief but idyllic existence in his sylvan harem. As the world knows, the stern and practical Thomas Dale arrived in the nick of time. Law and order were established. Each man got three acres of his own. He went to work. John Rolfe had crossed some seed he brought from Trinidad with the native plant and produced the "sweet scented Virginia tobacco." With Indian help or example he learned how to cure it. Everybody produced it. A money crop was discovered. The success of the colony was assured.

There were vicissitudes but the course was clear. The settlers needed peace with the Indians to establish themselves. The warring principalities of the old world furnished many a precedent—so John Rolfe married the girl. The darling daughter of Powhatan became Lady Rebecca. A practical solution for an annoying problem. Rolfe could then write to England that "every man in Virginia is sitting under his vine and fig tree enjoying the fruits of his labor insofar as he has earned them."

In the winter of 1616, Dale, Rolfe, Pocahontas, and John Martin sailed from Jamestown on the good ship *Treasurer* with a full cargo of "very fine tobac" which they sold at auction on the docks of London; the first full cargo and the first recorded auction of Virginia tobacco. These practical men who had committed themselves deliberately and unreservedly to dangerous living were now in business. In spite of a few setbacks their business grew and they prospered.

From time to time they were vigorously attacked by the natives who recognized them as businessmen and quite reasonably resented their intrusion. But they were in business to stay. Their first election of the House of Burgess in 1619 was a contested election, contested on the ground that those who possessed special immunities and privileges were not entitled to a voice among those who represented the people. On these grounds the Burgesses from Martin's Brandon were denied their seats. At the same time the rights of the delegates from Ward's plantation were questioned because Ward did not have a clear title to his land. However, these were finally seated because they were of the people, attached to the land and permanently interested in the community—an anticipation of the language and the franchise guaranteed 150 years later by the Virginia bill of rights.

These businessmen accomplished much in the first 10 years of their existence as Virginians. They established the principle that a man is entitled to the fruits of his honest labor, they produced a great money crop from their good earth, and they permanently denied governing authority to the specially privileged.

In any discussion of this period of our early existence it is difficult for me to pass over the accepted fiction of the Pocahontas stories—partly because of the testimony of Strachey in 1610 that she was married to an Indian captain named Kocoun; partly because of the testimony of Hamor that Powhatan sent her two sons as witnesses at her wedding to John Rolfe; partly because so much of Smith's history of Virginia is palpably untrue; but chiefly because of an honest resentment that the romantic historians to the royal taste ignored the transcendent heroism of the white women who nursed the sick, produced the first born in the land, buried the dead, and encouraged the living. They who were typified by one who bore the charming name Temperance Floridew. Later she became Lady Yardley, wife of his Excellency the Governor of Virginia. But the little Indian savage purchased by Samuel Argall for a copper kettle stole the show. It pleased the Stuart kings.

With the peace which was produced by Rolfe's marriage to Pocahontas, immigrants driven on by an Englishman's passion for land began to arrive in hordes,—some younger sons of the nobility, many representatives of the English gentry, yeomen, indentured servants—the rogues, the vagabonds, and the scholars.

Those who didn't work were plowed under. Those who did prospered. They waxed and multiplied. In time they developed a representative form of government which functioned, and they developed the Viginia plantation, a complete economic and social unit which in its diversity of operations and in its broader aspect was a coordinated industry which nurtured the American passion and aptitude for self-government. In order to facilitate the handling of their tobacco crops they devised an institution which we would now recognize as a bonded warehouse, and their warehouse receipts beame the prime collateral and currency of the land. Their contracts and their taxes were paid with tobacco receipts. Their chief business was done on credit and the basis of that credit was the produce of the good earth and their labor. They tried inflation and found that it didn't work. They developed a court system which did work and which brought into public life the ablest men of their communities. They built their churches and planned their schools, and partially due to the plantation system they developed a social consciousness which was imparted to our formal institutions. In short, what they accomplished was really quite marvelous. They were not common men. They were uncommon men. They shipped vast quantities of tobacco and raw materials to England. Under the pressure of this new commerce the British agent became the counterpart of our modern factor. With large credits due the Virginians on his books he quite naturally and logically became a private banker. At the direction of the Carters, the Byrds, and other successful planters he purchased English annuities, shares in the South Sea Co., and other investments. The records of the Perrys, Dawkins, and the Nortons indicate the diverse functions the agents performed; and in their activities it is reasonable to perceive the inception of the great houses of a later date which made London the banking capital of the world.

The influence of the Virginia county courts of the 17th and 18th centuries can hardly be exaggerated. They were the pulse and news centers of the counties. Here, the great planters and important men of the community functioned as umpires in a society of developing commercial interests and expanding aspirations, and as justices, administered justice among their neighbors. Their activities were embracive—executive and legislative, as well as judicial. They did, in fact govern the counties.

These courts gave stability to the new and complex society and they nurtured that civic consciousness which marked the political developments of the 18th century and which is manifest in our constitutional government. Their records indicate the indispensable role played by the freeholders, and the influence which brought into being great creative public servants.

Our romantic historians would have us believe that younger sons of the English nobility, Cavaliers, and the landed gentry constituted a majority of the immigrants to Virginia in the 17th Century. This is simply not so. Undoubtedly they provided a leaven to the loaf. The miracle of the birth of this Nation would have scarcely occurred without them. There were the Gates, the Wests, Percy, gentlemen, ladies with their maids, and many an honest yeoman.

The great names in Colonial Virginia, Carter, Page, Bird, Nelson, Washington, Lee, came from the great and virulent English middle class, all industrious, practical people. They were the men and women who built our Colonial aristocracy, founded it on the cardinal virtues of thrift, courage, and

service to the state and required its members to justify their positions. They brought to their plantations under indenture useful and industrious artisans, skilled labor, scholars as tutors for their children, and secretaries to conduct their business who in turn became landowners by virtue of their service and became members of the developing and dynamic society. They recognized the dignity of productive labor. As early as 1629, 7 members of the House of Burgesses had come to Virginia under indenture. In the first 60 years of the colony it has been estimated that 70 percent of all immigrants came in under indenture. Those who won their freedom by blood, sweat and tears cherished it. They held their proud heads erect on broad shoulders. As Jacob had done, they had sold themselves into bondage for a great reward. Those who survived became landowners and shared the flocks and married the daughters of the greater proprietors.

A thrilling example of the life and usefulness of an indentured servant may be illustrated by the little we know of Abraham Wood. He is thought to have arrived in Virginia in 1620 on the *Margaret and John* indentured to Samuel Matthews. Nothing is known of his service and early freedom, but in 1642 his name appears with military rank in the records of the House of Burgesses when he was given 600 acres of land to establish and maintain a fort on the site of the present city of Petersburg. He named it Fort Henry. Under this name it exercised its greatest influence on subsequent events. Wood was a practical businessman with an eye to profits. He developed a trade with the Indians which extended certainly to the Ohio River and possibly to the Gulf of Mexico. From Fort Henry he sent out explorers who crossed the mountains 70 years before Spottswood's famous junket and discovered the rivers flowing to the west. On this accomplishment, England and the colonies based their claim to all the land drained by the Mississippi River—a cause of the French and Indian wars a 100 years later—and which was only finally realized through the activities of George Rogers Clark during the Revolution. Wood served as a justice of the peace, in the House of Burgesses and on the council, acquired a considerable fortune and died a major general in the Virginia militia, honored and respected by his fellow men. The activities of his explorers, Fallam and Batts, and Needham and Archer, rank with the greatest adventurers and pioneer achievements in our history. Wood's daughter married Peter Jones and had numerous children. It was from this son-in-law or from a grandson that Petersburg derived its name. Wood's life was typical of other Virginians of the period. There is a very close similarity between his and that of the first William Byrd. Origin obscure—they were thrifty, courageous, inquisitive, turning their hands to anything which would yield a profit, conducting trading posts at the falls of the rivers and ever extending the boundaries of the colony to the west. American historians have neglected their greater works while they have made the French counterparts Frontenac, Joliet and La Salle household words; again, possibly because our Virginians were essentially businessmen. The London backers of Wood in his trading activities, the Lords Allington, Ashly, and Albermarle, were the same who in 1672 organized the Hudson Bay Co. which continues a profitable enterprise to this day. Had Wood had a son, doubtless he would have built a mansion on the Appomatox to rival Westover.

The Virginia land books up to 1666 indicate that 30 percent to 40 percent of the landowners in the Colony had come in under indenture. They provided the army of Nathaniel Bacon, the torchbearer of the American Revolution. The story of the indentured servant provides a proud chapter in Americana. During the life of the Virginia Company of London, it sent to Virginia honest and good artificers, surgeons, physicians, and learned divines, maids young and uncorrupted to be the wives of the planters. James and his royal descendants sent criminals from the jails, children from the almshouses, and rogues and vagabonds from the streets of London. The human mills of Virginia which ground out the durable product were inexorable. The weak in body and mind simply could not survive. During the 175 years between Jamestown and Yorktown, our Virginia peninsula served as the greatest of training schools. Here, in an atmosphere laden with certain ethical concepts of duty and service to the State, were bred and nurtured those giants of the 18th century who formulated the governing principles of this great Nation—our Bill of Rights, our Constitution, the great repositories of the collected wisdom of the past. They were the men who caught the vision of a new society and a new nation that was to be and they built its foundation on the goodly soil. In so doing, to paraphrase a statement of Edmund Burke, they did not make new laws or distort old ones. They simply ratified the Laws of God.

To understand, even a little bit, what is going on in the world today, a knowledge of the past is essential. That knowledge will increase your pride in our Nation and give you faith in our future.

Excerpts From Address on the Impact of the Changing World on Women's Organizations—Economically

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the major part of an excellent address by Mr. A. T. Spaulding, vice president and actuary of the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Co. Mr. Spaulding's speech, entitled "The Impact of the Changing World on Women's Organizations—Economically," was delivered on May 26, 1956, before the Conference of the National Council of Negro Women, Inc., in Washinfiton, D. C.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPACT OF THE CHANGING WORLD ON WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS—ECONOMICALLY

(By A. T. Spaulding)

It was because of my appreciation of the great work of your illustrious founder and others like her, and the work and worth of your organization that I agreed to come. The saga of man's upward climb is studded with such names as Anthony, Adams, Stowe, Tubman, Terrell, Wade; and the great trio of Bethune, Brown, and Burroughs. I can think of no better words to express my esteem for your organization than those of President Eisenhower when he was addressing the Republican women and said:

"I believe there is more power for moral, intellectual and political good in a great body of devoted American women than in any similar size body anywhere in the world.

"The future is very markedly in your hands, its value and its moral standing in the world and among ourselves. If you will take the power you have and use it, I have no fear of the outcome of the future."

This is the sound judgment of a great President and is mine also.

It is a far cry from the status of the American woman of only 40 years ago and what it is today. In the short span of less than twoscore years she has gained her political freedom and a large measure of her economic emancipation also. Much of this has been due to the efforts of her crusading pioneers and illustrious founders of women's organizations such as yours, along with the impact of a rapidly changing world.

American women gained their political freedom only 36 years ago come August 26, and their economic emancipation to any large extent less than 20 years ago. Among other things she has become the symbol of the husband's ability to pay. She also either spends or influences the spending of 80 to 85 percent of the spendable dollar. This is in a Nation that has the highest standard of living to be found anywhere else in the world.

In the words of Mrs. Alice Leopold, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Women's Affairs:

"By their performance in the political and community life of our Nation, by their record of accomplishments as members of the working force, women have gained acceptance—individually and collectively—as people who perform to the limits of their considerable abilities, once given the opportunity."

The features of our relatively recent history have been notably marked by the great changes in the size and character of our population; in the social customs; in the organization and expansion of business and industry; in the modes of living; in the formation of various women's organizations; in the advance in women's employment opportunities; and in a wider acceptance of an international point of view.

Two world wars have caused, aside from the many other changes, a great increase in the number of women in the labor force and in a wide variety of occupations. Today the fabric of our national life and progress depends heavily upon the work performance of women both in the home and in the labor force.

According to Women's Bureau Leaflet No. 18, of the United States Department of Labor, 1955, approximately 20 million women are in the labor force of the country; over one-third of all women of working age are in the labor force; almost one-third of all workers are women; more than one-half of all women workers are married; and more than 5 million women workers have children under 18 years of age.

Other recent reports indicate that women outdid themselves during 1955 in three ways: (1) had more babies, (2) held more jobs, and (3) pursued more education than ever before in the history of the country. The opinion has been expressed that these new records stem largely from the prosperity of the Nation—the greatest ever in peacetime, and with less inflation than ever before experienced with such high records of employment, wages, and gross national income.

According to Mrs. Alice K. Leopold, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Women's Affairs, 1953 data show that "a woman was the head of the family in nearly 4 million families throughout the Nation—or about a tenth of all family groups."

A working woman living with her family in New York City in September 1954 needed $48 a week or $2,488 a year, in order to live at a standard providing minimum adequate maintenance and protection of health. The report stated that the cost of adequate maintenance at that time was down 1.3 percent from what it was in September 1953.

The question might well be asked, "Where do Negro women fit into this picture?"

In the United States as a whole approximately 1 woman in 10 is a Negro. In some cities, however, the population of Negroes in the population has increased rapidly since 1940. Jobs created by World War II encouraged the movement of rural Negroes to the cities, thereby speeding up the shift from farms to urban areas and also in the mechanization of the farms.

At the outbreak of the Civil War about 92 percent of all Negroes lived in the South and principally in the rural areas.

It was about 1920 before there was any significant change in the location of the Negro population. By 1950 only about 68 percent of the Negro population lived in the South with about 59 percent having become city dwellers. Forty-five cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants showed an increase in their nonwhite population of 100 percent or more. They are located largely in the North Central States, the North, East, and West.

With approximately 6 million Negroes in the labor force of the United States, about 2½ million of them are Negro women who account for 13 percent of the woman labor force.

Although according to the dictionary of occupations, Negroes will be found in every one of the thousands of occupations listed, the overwhelming majority of both male and female are in the unskilled, semiskilled, and service occupations.

Three-fourths of the working Negro women are employed in three broad groups: Private household workers, service workers not in private household; and operatives in light industries. Since 1940, however, there has been a strong trend away from private household employment—a decrease from three-fifths to two-fifths of the total. The "other services" and clerical and operative groups increased. Professional and technical sales, and craftsmen groups have increased from 4.9 percent to 7.5 percent of all Negro women employed.

The importance of education as a means of improving their economic status is widely recognized by Negroes.

Half of Negro women 25 years of age and older in 1950 had more than a seventh-grade education compared with 6.4 percent years completed by Negro men. This, however, does not compare favorably with the whites as is seen from the following table:

[In percent]

	South		Other regions	
	White	Negro	White	Negro
Graduation from high school [1]	48.0	21.8	64.4	40.1
Entered college [2]	14.4	7.4	17.0	9.8
Graduated from college [3]	6.1	3.0	6.2	3.0

[1] Among 20- to 24-year age group.
[2] Among 24-year age group.
[3] Among 30- to 34-year age group.

Median school years completed in 1952 of the population 25 years and over show that nonwhite adults have completed 7.1 years of school, as compared with 10.1 years for white.

In addressing the Effective Use of Womanpower Conference in Washington, March 10, 1955, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell said:

"One of the interesting studies that we have been conducting * * * recently has been a survey of the skills of our Nation's work force, and we have been astounded at some of the results. The findings indicate that the skills of our workers have not kept pace with the technological improvements in our industrial processes."

Secretary Mitchell continued:

"It is there, I think, that women in industry, women in employment, can make the greatest contribution."

The plight of the Negro worker is even worse than that described by Secretary Mitchell, for, as Mr. Julius Thomas points out: "The Negro industrial worker is further handicapped by the fact that he has had few opportunities for the kind of training that would prepare him for factory employment. The segregated high schools in the South are rarely equipped to give Negro boys basic training for industrial work." Continues Mr. Thomas: "Few Negro colleges have adequate training facilities for technical and industrial work. To enter industrial employment, Negroes have had to fight first for any kind of job and continue to fight for on-the-job training and upgrading to better-paying jobs." In other words, until relatively recently, the Negro has been limited largely to the unskilled, low-paying Negro jobs, with correspondingly low earnings.

The median amount earned by women workers in 1952 compared with 1939 was as follows:

1952:	
Nonwhite	$814
White	1,976
1939:	
Nonwhite	246
White	676

The median income of nonwhite families in 1951 was $2,032, or about one-half of that for white families.

Largely because of the wide gap in earnings between white and nonwhite workers a greater proportion of Negro women have to enter the labor force than whites. Thirty-four percent of Negro wives versus 21 percent of white married women must remain in the labor force.

According to Julius A. Thomas, of the National Urban League, "the vast majority of Negro wage earners are victims of a system of employment discrimination which has served to depress standards of living and demoralize family life more than any other single factor." Mr. Thomas further observes that the depressed earning power of the majority of Negro wage earners constitutes one of the most serious economic problems faced by Negroes and the Nation.

Elmo Roper says: "Reluctance to hire Negroes is costing us money. It is limiting our markets, restricting our sales. It is depriving us of skills, talents, and abilities. It is hampering product improvement, stultifying new invention, handicapping advancements in manufacturing methods and throttling progress in our entire economy."

According to Hon. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor: "It is estimated that racial prejudice in all its ramifications costs the Government fifteen to thirty billion dollars a year."

This is a problem facing America's industrial leaders. It is also a problem facing you and me.

While most Negro women workers prior to 1940 were concentrated in relatively few occupations, the labor shortages during World War II and since have opened up employment opportunities in many new fields. They have found employment opportunities in steadily increasing numbers in the professional and technical group, the clerical and sales group, and the operatives group. Some have distinguished themselves in the arts and sciences as well as in the field of politics and governmental services. In the professions they are engaged as teachers, nurses, social workers, dietitians, physicians and surgeons, lawyers and judges, therapists, authors, artists, personnel workers, photographers, cosmetologists, and a variety of other specialized fields.

Quoting Mr. Julius Thomas again: "In almost every section of the Nation, the number of women now employed is increasing; * * *. We are having difficulty in almost every urban league city finding young women who can qualify for many of the * * *jobs which have opened in the last few years. Good stenographers and secretaries are almost out of the question, even in such cities as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, etc."

Some 25 major industries have recently begun to employ engineers, chemists, accountants and other professionals according to Mr. Thomas.

"The growing emphasis on the sales, research and human relations aspects of management provides for women possibilities which never existed before," according to Miss Marion L. Biggs in the June-July 1955 Challenge magazine, page 20. She also points out that the greatly expanded consumer market during the past 10 years has created the need for the "woman's point of view" since she does most of the shopping and spends the largest part of the family dollar. Then, too, women know better what other women want in services and commodities from home furnishings to financial problem solutions.

THE BIG NEGRO MARKET

The significant increase in Negro employment and employment opportunities since 1940, with over 90 percent of the civilian labor force now employed, and the husband and wife working in approximately 35 percent of the families, has resulted in a tremendous market commonly referred to as "the Negro market."

According to reports of the United States Department of Commerce:

1. Approximately 39 percent of Negro families earn from $2,000 to $5,000 annually.

2. In urban centers approximately 15 percent earn from $4,000 to $10,000 and over, annually.

The total annual income of the Negroes in the United States is now estimated at close to $16 billion with approximately 80 percent of it spent for consumer goods and services. The Negro market in this country is reported to be greater than the Canadian market, total population also. It is also estimated that of the close to 4 million dwelling units occupied by Negroes more than 35 percent are owner occupied with ownership in urban areas having increased approximately 140 percent since 1940 while the white homeownership was increasing approximately 85 percent.

Albert C. Lasher, staff reporter, writing in the Wall Street Journal of April 4, 1954, on the subject Southern Merchants Give More Attention to Negro Market, pointed out that the "tradesmen are going against old prejudices to develop big potential." He began his article: "Businessmen here (Columbia, S. C.) in the heart of the South are beginning to pay more attention to the market for their goods and services among Negroes."

Miss Sylvia F. Porter, financial writer, in the New York Post of December 3, 1954, said:

"Before the year end, one of Wall Street's biggest stock firms, with branches throughout the country, will make financial history by putting on its payroll a top Negro securities specialist.

"The assignment of this pioneer, Philip M. Jenkins, will be to organize an overall campaign to educate the Negro on investing.

"In bits and pieces, a great, new, and exciting pattern is being drawn in America—the pattern of a vast, vital, and booming Negro market with billions to spend on every type of quality product and service. And for the first time the leading businessmen of our country are awakening to the potentialities of this market and are making serious efforts to probe it, develop it, and cater to it.

"The Negro's market for securities investment alone is estimated at $1 billion a year.

"That Negroes buy brand names and durable and luxury goods far above the level of whites even in a higher income bracket is a widely accepted opinion.

"That low- and middle-income groups are large buyers of automobiles and other durable goods is shown by the following:

"In 1949, 13 percent of those in the $1,000 to $2,000 family income group bought automobiles, 14 percent other selected durable goods including television sets, and 8 percent homes. In the $2,000 to $3,000 income group, 22 percent bought automobiles, 22 percent other durable goods and 15 percent homes."

Miss Porter concludes:

"Eventually, the Negro market will fade and become just part of the regular American market. The economic advance of the Negro will help as much as any legal action to break down the barriers wherever they exist. What's beginning under our eyes assures the end."

In addition to the Negro market, Negro businesses are also contributing to the breaking down of the barriers referred to by Miss Porter. The Negro's most successful ventures in the corporate business world have been in the financial and cosmetic fields.

The 30 Negro-owned and operated savings and loan associations have combined assets of over $60 million. The 14 Negro-owned and operated banks in this country have assets of over $40 million and 66 Negro-owned and operated life-insurance companies have assets of over $200 million and insurance in force of over $1.4 billion.

The development of the resources of our country has gone hand in hand with the growth and development of the life-insurance industry. It is the key business of the modern world and no large scheme of financing can be carried through successfully without its help. A total of $90.75 billion of its assets are now serving the economy and industry of our Nation. Its 103 million policyholders carry on their lives over $373 billion of insurance.

According to the U. S. News & World Report for January 27, 1956 (p. 48), "The Deep South is living through an upheaval more profound, in many ways, than the secession. * * * It is changing the base on which the South makes its living. In the process, traditions, habits, and ways of thinking are being plowed under."

Personal income, manufacturing output, and retail sales are 4, 5, and 6 times what they were in 1939 in the 5 plantation States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina, according to this same report. Louisiana, for example, since 1947, has outgained the Nation as a whole in value of factory output. The South Carolina textile business has forged ahead of that of Massachusetts. The whole South tops the country in papermaking.

It is reported that industries are opening plants in a five State region in the South at the rate of one a day.

At the very time of these great economic advances in the South the Negro exodus continues. It has been officially estimated that a million Negroes left the Southern States between 1940 and 1950; and recent happenings in many of these States have accelerated the migration.

For the first time the South now has its own capital and can develop its own industries without having to borrow from the North. In commenting on the industrialization taking place in the South and its impact on the employment opportunities for Negroes, Mr. Julius Thomas had this to say, relative to a recent survey by the Urban League:

"I call your attention to the fact that this sample does not give any evidence that Negroes are seriously considered for the new industrial jobs in the South. We are going to work on the problem, but we realize that this is the toughest one we have ever tackled."

Although the racial progress in the South is being drowned out by the current fuss and fury, it is, nevertheless, slowly but surely taking place. The following are two examples.

Inside the H-bomb plant in South Carolina there is no segregation. Negroes use the same eating, drinking, and toilet facilities as do whites and there have been no incidents. Employment is on the basis of merit. If a Negro is better qualified to make a hydrogen bomb than a white applicant, the Negro gets the job. There are Negro laboratory technicians and assistants, some clerical workers and stenographers. Outside the plant, however, segregation lines hold firm.

In Baton Rogue, La., both whites and Negroes say race relations are generally good. The Baton Rogue boom gives work to both races.

In discussing how the Negro is to progress further to full equality, Julius Thomas says: "I see five major influences acting toward this end. These are:

"1. The enactment of fair employment legislation in 16 States and 31 cities;

"2. Direct Federal action to prevent employment discrimination by holders of defense contracts;

"3. The unionization of more than a million Negro workers;

"4. Greater participation of management and labor leadership in programs to combat racial discrimination; and

"5. The rising effectiveness of interracial organizations such as the National Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People."

For most Negroes, the problem is no longer jobs, but better jobs; it is no longer bread, but cake.

The organized planning, action, and support of women's organizations, on all levels, of the programs of the National Urban League and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and counseling services on the wise spending and investment of money, will hasten the day when the Negro will have cake and have it in more abundance.

I close by repeating the words of the President:

"The future is very markedly in your hands, its value and its moral standing in the world and among ourselves. If you will take the power you have and use it, I have no fear of the outcome of the future."

Operation of Industry International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on quite a few occasions, I have pointed out that one of the great assets of America and the free world consists of the presence in our country of some 39,000 foreign students.

In my judgment, we in this country have a priceless opportunity to make not simply 39,000 friends, but 39,000 ambassadors of good will between our own land and the peoples of the rest of the world.

These students will return to their home countries and will become the leaders of tomorrow. That is why I have always urged a comprehensive program, to make sure that the students felt as much at home in America, as possible; that they met with grass-roots Americans; that they came to know us in essence, and not just superficially.

Fortunately, American good will, American ingenuity, and American hospitality are at work in connection with these foreign students.

One of the most recent instances which I was pleased to note was the development of what has come to be known as "Industries International, Inc.," by Mr. A. Roger Hook, former secretary of the Janesville Chamber of Commerce. He and his wife, Helen, have worked up a most ingenious method of serving the economic interests of these students, of their home countries, and of the United States itself, in a most interesting free-enterprise fashion.

A number of grand folks in Rotary in Janesville have lent yeoman assistance to the development of this pioneering project. I certainly wish them well.

I send to the desk the text of an article describing this plan, which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN STUDENTS KEY IN A PARTNERSHIP IDEA—THEY CAN HELP SELVES AND THEIR COUNTRIES THROUGH VENTURE OF JANESVILLE MAN

JANESVILLE, WIS.—A nonprofit organization aimed at a three way partnership between some 39,000 foreign students now in the United States, industrial firms in their homelands, and American industry is functioning in Janesville.

Industries International, Inc., is seeking:

1. To help these foreign students find employment in their countries by serving as go-betweens for American and foreign firms.

2. To locate, through these students, industries abroad which are interested in license or royalty deals to manufacture American products.

3. To find corresponding American firms willing to export their know-how through these license and royalty arrangements.

Originator of the unique venture is A. Roger Hook, former secretary of the Janesville Chamber of Commerce and a native of Baraboo, Wis. He is executive director and treasurer. Closely associated with him is his wife, Helen, who at present is the entire office staff of Industries International.

PROBLEM FOR MANY

Industries International, incorporated last month, grew out of the Janesville Rotary clubs' foreign student weekend. Hook talked with many foreign students when groups from schools in Wisconsin visited Janesville as guests of the Rotarians.

Again and again, they told him that opportunities to put their training to use in their countries were nebulous. They wanted to find useful employment, and help the economic developments of their homelands, but didn't quite know how to begin.

Hook felt that there must be an answer to this, but it took him 6 months to find it. Starting at the University of Wisconsin school of commerce, he went to Washington for conferences with officials of the Federal, State, Commerce, and Welfare Departments and the Export-Import Bank; to New York to talk to the United Nations' industrial development commission and the Institute of International Education, and to New Orleans to check with officials of International House.

ASSISTED BY ROTARIANS

Out of these conferences came the idea and most of the organizational structure of Industries International. He put his ideas

before fellow Rotarians here, and 14 agreed to serve as officers and directors of the corporation, if Hook would direct its day-to-day operations.

Kenneth F. Bick, principal of Janesville high school, is president of the corporation; Valentine A. Weber of Val Weber Clothing Co. and Robert W. Bliss, editor and co-publisher of the Janesville Daily Gazette, are vice presidents and Kenneth R. Decker, president of Decker Manufacturing Co., is secretary.

Hook's plan to achieve the three-way partnership works like this:

Interested students will seek information through relatives and friends at home about firms which might be interested in manufacturing a United States product under a license or royalty arrangement.

The student with one or more "good leads" then fills out a detailed Industries International questionnaire covering such items as the type of product, whether new machinery or equipment is needed, sales management and territories, raw materials, labor supply, wage rates, power, transportation and governmental cooperation, plus biographical information on the student.

TRY TO FIND "MATCH"

Hook then will draw on Government source materials and his own experience in export sales to try to find a United States firm interested in licensing an existing foreign firm to make its product, or help in starting a new firm.

If Hook can "match" the foreign and domestic firms, the industry in this country will be encouraged to employ the student for 6 months or a year in a training program after his return home.

Hook has been the financial "angel" for Industries International so far, but hopes that it will become self-supporting through commissions paid by the foreign operation, the United States firm, or both, when final contracts are signed.

Information sheets on Industries International and copies of the questionnaire have been sent to some 1,600 colleges and universities throughout the United States through the Foreign Students' Advisers Association.

"That's the easy part," he said. "The hard part comes when we try to find a business in this country interested in having its products made abroad."

Robert Dinwiddie, Grandfather of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by me and others in connection with Dinwiddie Day, celebrated at Portsmouth, Va., on July 6, 1956, honoring Robert Dinwiddie, grandfather of the United States.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, OF VIRGINIA

Truly great events in history and the leaders who determined their outcome have often been blurred by subsequent occurrences. Nevertheless, with the passage of time, sometimes centuries, key figures in such events tend to emerge into their due stature.

One such leader in American history was Robert Dinwiddie, lieutenant governor and commander in chief of the colony and dominion of Virginia, from July 4, 1751 to January 12, 1758. His career is significant for the key part played by him in American colonial government and westward expansion.

It was my privilege to participate in some of the preliminary planning for the commemorative program in his honor in Portsmouth, Va., held on July 6, 1956, which was officially proclaimed by Mayor Fred A. Duke as "Dinwiddie Day."

The chairman of the committee for Dinwiddie Day arrangements was a well-known civic leader of Portsmouth and Norfolk County, Frank D. Lawrence. A notable part of the program was the renaming on July 6, 1956 of the principal hotel of Portsmouth as the Governor Dinwiddie and of its ballroom as the Washington Room, in honor of the colonial governor and his young protege, George Washington.

It is eminently fitting that the principal address was made by Counsellor Ronald William Bailey of the British Embassy in Washington as the personal representative of the Ambassador, Sir Roger Makins, and that the special guests included members of the Dinwiddie family of Virginia.

Called to order by Chairman Lawrence, who also acted as toastmaster, the program started with the British and United States national anthems, sung and played by Rev. Ernest K. Emurian. The invocation was given by Bishop William A. Brown.

Among his first comments, Toastmaster Lawrence summarized the background of the occasion. The first feature event was the unveiling of a splendid portait of Robert Dinwiddie, painted by Maurice Gompf of Portsmouth especially for this ceremony, and also a portrait of George Washintgon. The toastmaster then revealed that the original suggestion for naming the hotel as the Governor Dinwiddie was made by Capt. Miles E. DuVal, a native of Portsmouth, who spoke briefly stating that the idea had grown out of his reading the excellent biography of Robert Dinwiddie by Louis K. Koontz.

REMARKS OF REV. ERNEST K. EMURIAN, INTRODUCING RONALD WILLIAM BAILEY

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, 15 years ago, in those anxious months that preceded the fighting on the North African Coast in World War II for the control of Egypt and the Suez Canal, the British diplomatic offices in these strategic regions of the Near East were scenes of vitally important negotiations concerned with the problems of defense against pending invasions.

A young British diplomat, then on his first assignment in his country's foreign service, was stationed in these areas. Observing events from exceptional vantage points, he witnessed the unfolding of momentous historical crises—a memorable start for any young career officer.

A graduate of the University of Cambridge in England, where he was awarded the degree of master of arts, our speaker entered the British Foreign Service in 1939. After serving at Beirut in Lebanon, and Alexandria and Cairo in Egypt, he was appointed to the Foreign Office in London. Returning to Beirut in 1949 as First Secretary, he served, while on that assignment, as Her Majesty's Chargé d'Affaires in 1949 and again in 1951.

Transferred to the British Embassy in Washington in 1952, he was promoted in 1955 to be Counselor and Head of the Chancery, which position he now holds.

Thus, in our speaker we have one whose years of study, training, and observations of historical crises combine to qualify him eminently to address us on this occasion.

May I present Counselor Ronald William Bailey.

Before making his address, Counsellor Bailey read the following message from Ambassador Makins:

"On the occasion of Dinwiddie Day, I am happy to send my good wishes to the people of Portsmouth who are commemorating the life and service of one of the most outstanding of Virginia's Colonial Governors. Robert Dinwiddie labored hard for the cause of understanding in friendly commerce between Virginia and Britain and for the growth and development of this Commonwealth. I rejoice that two centuries later his ambitions in both directions have been so amply fulfilled."

ADDRESS BY RONALD WILLIAM BAILEY

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, I am happy to be here with you in Portsmouth on this auspicious day and in such distinguished company.

The English visitor to the United States always feels particularly at home in Virginia, partly because of the traditional southern hospitality which is so readily and generously extended to him, partly because of the historic links, and also because almost every city and village bears a familiar English name. I was brought up in and near Southampton, England, and from there it is but a few miles to Portsmouth and the Isle of Wight. From here in Portsmouth, Va., it is equally but a few miles to Southampton and Isle of Wight Counties.

An Englishman feels at home, too, because he finds here, perhaps more than anywhere else in this great country, a sense of the order and stability and tradition which he flatters himself is so especially characteristic of his own homeland.

In language, in government, in law, we have a common background, springing from the English settlements on these shores in the early 17th century, the continual immigration of English-speaking peoples over the years, and the unceasing intellectual and political exchanges between our two countries. The ties of Britain and Virginia are cemented, moreover, by a surprising amount of personal contact, by businessmen and sailors and tourists.

Britain is by far the largest overseas customer for Virginia tobacco, and therefore you have many business links with us. One interesting point is that in order not to harm the Virginia trade, no tobacco was allowed to be grown in England from the 17th Century until 1910. Even now, the conditions under which it may be grown are so onerous that only a very few people, and those mostly in my own county of Hampshire, actually grow it to-day.

In a naval area such as this I have no need to remind you of the sea. Many of your vessels put in regularly at British ports, and a large proportion of our Navy has at one time or another been within a few miles of where we are to-day, while merchant shipping maintains a steady exchange of commerce.

We diplomatists quickly come to learn that there is a limit to what we can do to foster international understanding and goodwill. Understanding depends so largely on national attitudes—and national attitudes depend on individual people. Personal contact can do ten times as much as anything else in making people feel kindly towards other nations; ties of business and commerce, and arrangements for the exchanges of teachers and students and clergymen and civic leaders are the best vaccine against those twin diseases, Anglophobia and anti-Americanism. The diseases are very much in the decline, and they will be eliminated, as surely as polio and other scourges.

Despite the violent rift of 1776, and the period of suspicion which followed, the good relations between the English-speaking peoples on the two sides of the Atlantic have been restored. For me it has been a great experience to be able to play my small part in working together with my American colleagues in such intimate cooperation upon the problems and challenges which beset the world today.

I am particularly honored to be asked to represent my ambassador this evening, and to be called upon to address you on the subject of a great figure who was an example of the bonds which tie Britain and Virginia together, and who was destined to play such an important part in the historical development not only of Virginia but also of the United States of America.

Let us cast our minds back a little over 200 years. On November 20, 1751, there sailed into the tidewater Robert Dinwiddie, the appointed lieutenant governor of Virginia, accompanied by his wife and two daughters, Elizabeth and Rebecca. Although in name the lieutenant-governor, the governorship properly was an honorific title. In fact, Dinwiddie was known and carried out his duties with all the authority and panoply to which the rank entitled him, including residence in the governor's palace at Williamsburg.

What manner of man was he? He was then some 58 years of age, already quite elderly by the standards of those times, having been born in Scotland in 1693. His father was a businessman engaged in the import and export trade, and he himself had begun life in the same way. At the age of 30 he had been appointed a Collector of Customs in Bermuda, and because of his vigilance and zeal in exposing a long-practiced system of fraud, he received the appointment of surveyor-general of customs of the southern ports of the continent of America in 1738. For a time then, he appears to have made his home in Virginia. In 1749, and for 2 years or so, he is said to have carried on business in London, trading with the Colonies.

A portrait of the Governor is described in the "Dinwiddie Papers" of the Virginia Historical Society (which are the main source of my information) as being "noble in its expression of earnest purpose, candor and benignity." There is no doubt that he was, as we shall see, a conscientious, shrewd and hard-working official.

What sort of country did he find? In a dispatch to the Board of Trade dated January 1755, he gives a very detailed description of the land, the system of government, the production, and the imports and exports. The principal items of production and export were tobacco, iron, beef, and pork, Indian corn and wheat, together with skins, furs, and two mysterious items called snakeroot and jenzang. A footnote to the report explained that jenzang was gingseng. But I must confess that that was not very explicative. So I consulted the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which explains that it is used in China as a medicine to encourage vitality. Apparently in price it varies from $6–400 per ounce, but although it is said to have special powers, the action of the drug appears to be entirely psychological. The Encyclopaedia Britannica is equally skeptical about the efficacy of snake-root as a cure for snake bite. But at least these were valuable exports.

The total annual value of all the exports is given as somewhat less than a million dollars. Imports to an almost equal value consisted of all the necessaries for clothing, tools and ironware, together with strong beer and "other family necessaries." The population and prosperity of the Colony was fast increasing and new towns were constantly being founded. Among these in the first year of Dinwiddie's governorship was this very Portsmouth where we are tonight.

The population of Virginia was given by Dinwiddie, using a calculation based on the number of those paying tithes, as some 295,000, or less than one-tenth of what it is now. There were then 49 counties, fewer than now, but all of them bearing present-day county names. Those to the west were evidently larger and have since been subdivided. Norfolk County is given as having a total population of some 7,500 souls. It was about this period that the West, a near West though it was, began to appear in American life. Alexander Spotswood, who was governor of Virginia from 1710 to 1722, had explored the country of the Blue Ridge with his Knights of the Golden Horseshoe and had penetrated as far as the Shenandoah Valley. That was some 30 years before, and since then there had been further movement and settlement toward the West. But the French, supported by Indian allies, having crossed Lake Erie, were pressing down the Ohio River, establishing themselves in what is now the Pittsburgh area of Pennsylvania and raiding the most westerly British settlements.

Meanwhile, in 1749, 2 years before Dinwiddie's arrival in the colony, the Ohio Company had been organized, partly to aid in securing for the English control of the valley, and partly to trade with the Indians. They had a pathway blazed joining a series of small fortified posts to connect Cumberland on the Potomac with the Monongahela River. The first general manager was the Virginian, Thomas Lee, who died in 1750. He was succeeded in that capacity by Lawrence Washington, the elder half-brother of George. Lawrence in turn died in 1752 and George Washington succeeded to the managership of the family estates at the age of 20. He was a skilled surveyor, and he excelled in all outdoor pursuits. He assumed the somewhat nominal duties also of adjutant of 1 of Virginia's 4 military districts. It is probably, therefore, no mere coincidence which led Governor Dinwiddie in the following year to select George Washington to go on a special mission into the Ohio Valley.

Britain and France being officially at peace, Governor Dinwiddie decided first to convey a warning to the French to desist from their encroachments into the Ohio Valley lands claimed by the British Crown. One messenger having failed to make contact with the French Governor, Dinwiddie decided to send George Washington. He was commissioned on October 31, 1753, his post of adjutant giving him the rank of major. He and his small party laboriously made their way, under difficult wintry conditions, to the French headquarters near Lake Erie and saw the commanding officer, who received him with courtesy, but left him in no doubt of the French intention to take possession of the Ohio Valley.

The difficulties of traveling in midwinter in these untrod areas are vividly described by George Washington in his account of the journey, and how, having tried to cross a partly frozen river by raft, he and a companion were forced to spend the night on an island and next morning were able to complete their crossing of the river on the ice, which had fortunately formed as a bridge by the time dawn broke.

In the meantime, the governor had been turning his mind to the preparation of military power to resist the penetration by these hostile forces of the far-flung parts of the State of Virginia. But it was no easy task, for there were no regular forces in the area, and the settlers, most of whom were small freeholders, were reluctant to leave their lands in the coastal plains for the discomforts and hazards of a military expedition in distant parts, leaving no one to control and run their small farms.

But Governor Dinwiddie, as his correspondence shows, was painstaking and persevering in the extreme. He tried, without much success, to enlist the support of the neighboring States. He used considerable powers of persuasion upon them, but most of them preferred to take the easy course and let things be. He had the difficulty common to all governments—and individuals for that matter—of raising enough money for their purposes so that he could provide the wherewithal for such troops as could be recruited.

In January 1754, in a letter to Lord Fairfax, Governor Dinwiddie said he proposed to despatch forthwith 200 men to protect those already sent by the Ohio Company to build one of their forts, and that he had commissioned Maj. George Washington to command 100 men to be raised in Frederick County and Augusta. Washington made for Winchester, Va., which was a meeting place with friendly Indians and one of the last outposts before the frontier country. He learned that the French had occupied a fort which they named Fort Duquesne on the present site of Pittsburgh. In a skirmish he attacked and took some prisoners who were sent to Williamsburg. But just over a month later the French brought up reinforcements, and after 9 hours' siege he was forced to capitulate. The French let him and his men go, after having disarmed them and extracted a promise that Virginia would not build another fort in the Ohio Valley for 1 year.

In February 1755, the metropolitan forces for which Governor Dinwiddie had appealed arrived in Virginia under the command of General Braddock. Governor Dinwiddie attached great hopes to the ability of these forces to assume the offensive and drive the French out of this part of the frontier. Unfortunately, although Braddock's forces consisted of 1,300 well-armed men, chiefly regular, and were attacked by only some 300 French and Indians, they were caught divided and off their guard. Braddock died of his wounds, but Washington, who was an aide-de-camp of the general's with the honorary rank of colonel, escaped unhurt, even though he had 4 bullets through his coat and 2 horses shot from under him.

This defeat was a great blow to Governor Dinwiddie, and he was highly annoyed both at the conduct of some of the men and also at the decision of Colonel Dunbar, who after Braddock's death had assumed the command, to retreat and take up winter quarters in Philadelphia.

With great energy, even though he no longer had the support of the regular troops he set about strengthening and reorganizing the Virginia Regiment. He appealed to the Burgesses urgently for funds, making them realize that as a result of this unexpected defeat the rich lands of Virginia lay wide open to invasion. The Burgesses were galvanized into support and produced adequate sums. Dinwiddie worked indefatigably, obtaining supplies, sending out recruiting officers, and helping to organize the Virginia Regiment into an efficient group. In particular, he was concerned to find a suitable leader. Dinwiddie was a man of considerable perspicacity, and he had come to appreciate those qualities which were already to be seen in Washington as a young man and for which in the judgment of history he is so renowned.

On August 14, 1755, he appointed Washington, then 23 years of age, colonel of the Virginia Regiment and commander in chief of all the forces "now raised and to be raised for the defense of this His Majesty's Colony and for repelling the unjust and hostile invasion of the French and their Indian allies." With this commission went detailed instructions on the recruitment, organization, and pay of the Virginia Regiment. Roads were built and forts constructed and, although no major engagements ensued, Washington was able, with his force of 700 men, to prevent any further French incursions during the remaining period of Din-

widdie's governorship. (Shortly after, more metropolitan forces expelled the French and Fort Duquesne was renamed Pittsburg after the British statesman.)

But Governor Dinwiddie was by now 64 years of age. He had suffered a stroke and partial paralysis, so that he asked to be relieved of his governorship and to return to England. Permission was granted, and he set sail in January 1758, maintaining his administrative correspondence to within a short time of his departure. As a token of his esteem he gave many books from his library to William and Mary College, where they unfortunately perished by fire. On his arrival in England, he made his home in Bristol, but continued to take great personal interest in the affairs of Virginia, and on a number of occasions intervened with the metropolitan government in London in support of Virginian interests. He died in 1770 at the age of 77.

I must add that Robert Dinwiddie's coat of arms bore the motto in Latin "Ubi Libertas Ibi Patria" (Where There Is Liberty There Is My Fatherland). Those are the sentiments which the English peoples have carried with them to the four corners of the world and where they have taken firm root, as in this very soil of America.

Such then was the man we are honoring this July 6, which the mayor of Portsmouth has decreed shall be known as Dinwiddie Day. This hotel has now taken his name. Dinwiddie Street passes its door and appropriately follows a course parallel to Washington Street.

George Washington is known as the Father of the United States, and because of the part which Governor Dinwiddie played in the discovery and commissioning of this young man as the commander in chief of the armed forces of Virginia, it has been suggested that he should be known as the Grandfather of the United States of America.

Certainly he is a man who merits the highest honor from Virginians, from Americans, and from Englishmen. In a time when your land was in its infancy, he came out from England and gave his strength and his health for the defense and the expansion of Virginia. A loyal Englishman, he was a loyal servant of Virginia, too. He would, I think, have been distressed had he lived another score of years and seen the rift between the two countries he had served.

But if he could return here today, I do not think that he would be saddened by what he saw. He would rejoice at the fabulous success and prosperity of Virginia and of the United States. And he would rejoice to see that the political separation of Britain and America, under the inspired leadership of his protege, George Washington, had not brought to an end the feelings of brotherhood nor the commercial ties which linked the people of the two countries in his own day. I think that if Dinwiddie were able to return here now, he would be able to see that, even if the future did not take quite the course he expected, the things that he stood for—the prosperity and the friendship of our peoples—have been achieved as abundantly as he could ever have dreamed.

RESPONSE OF JOHN MARSHALL DINWIDDIE

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests and fellow Virginians. It is a great honor for me to represent the Dinwiddie family of Virginia and it gives me much pleasure to be here with you tonight. Up in my home in Alexandria, we know a lot about George Washington, because it was his home town, and about his association with Governor Dinwiddie.

There is a street named Dinwiddie here in Portsmouth. Arlington and Richmond, Va., have one and so does Pittsburgh, Pa. And there is Dinwiddie County in our State. I dare say that the present generation knew very little of their meaning until Mr. Bailey's enlightening talk on Governor Dinwiddie here tonight.

I think it is a wonderful thing for Mr. Lawrence and his associates to rename their hotel, the Governor Dinwiddie. They are to be congratulated for they have made history here tonight in focusing attention on Governor Dinwiddie, who not only helped establish Portsmouth, but who did so much to make possible the founding of our Nation.

Thank you very much.

National Be Kind to Humans Week

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, we have a happy habit in the United States of commemorating an event, or honoring some person, or calling attention to a cause, or a national product, by having a day designated for that purpose. When we exhausted the days, we started on the weeks. I recall, for example, that we have recently celebrated National Irish Linen Week; National Kraut and Frankfurter Week; National Honey for Breakfast Week; National Hillbilly Homecoming Week, and Cat Week.

In fear of running out of weeks, we are starting to designate months, for example, "Clean Oil Month," or without such calendar limitations, "Better Bedding Time." In fact the appropriations subcommmittee on which I serve, is now putting up money for a Geophysical Year, and I look forward to an Interplanetary Decade.

Before we get completely away from the weeks, I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that May 6 to 12 was "Be Kind to Animals Week," and then to pass along to you, and the next Congress, a suggestion I received recently from two very distinguished constitutents of mine.

Both live in Riverside, the county seat of my home county. Both, as I said, are well-known citizens of the United States. I commend the suggestion to you, Mr. Speaker, and I now read the letter, in which it is made:

The Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILLIPS: At a time when the world and our Nation is involved in many tensions, a thought for the other fellow and particularly for the Golden Rule, may help in some relaxation of these tensions.

Therefore, we, the undersigned residents of Riverside County, and of the 29th District in the State of California, having noted the solicitude expressed on occasion by the Congress of the United States and by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in declaring national weeks for special events, industries and organizations, note further that possibly through oversight, no particular observation has been made in regard to the treatment of the individual who lives in the United States by the individual who lives in the United States.

Therefore, we plead that a resolution be framed and submitted to the Congress of the United States, and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which will fill the void for a greatly needed observance—a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

We, especially one of the undersigned, do not deprecate the kindness and consideration which inspired a "National Be Kind to Animals Week." This one undersigned constituent feels that he can only reciprocate by observing a "National Be Kind to Humans Week." This should be a week during which all humans and animals in our country, will be called upon to give special consideration to the human individual—a dog's best friend.

We appreciate the loving thoughts which celebrate "Mothers Day" and "Fathers Day," but there is no set period during which the entire race of mankind is reminded of the Golden Rule, and to "do unto others."

A "National Be Kind to Humans Week" could serve as a reminder to all of us that kindness toward each other can help to make this a better world, and its influence might spread throughout the other weeks in the year.

We hope that you, our representative, will join in the spirit in which this is sent, and that together, with our fellow-citizens, we can celebrate soon, a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

Respectfully yours,

LEE DUNCAN.

* * *

RIN TIN TIN.

This letter, as you will see when I hold it up, Mr. Speaker, is written from Rancho Rin Tin Tin, Riverside, Calif., and is signed by Rin Tin Tin and by his friend and coworker, Lee Duncan.

On behalf of the Congress, I know you will want me to thank them both for the suggestion. In the final confused and nerveracking days of the session, I can think of nothing more appropriate than a suggestion that we establish a "National Be Kind to Humans Week."

Senator Watkins—Major Administration Spokesman on Water Resources Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, during this session of the Congress I have watched with increasing admiration the outstanding role of the senior Senator from my State of Utah, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, in dealing with water resources legislation. Both in the Colorado River Storage Project debate and in the action on the high Hells Canyon Dam his persuasive arguments and thorough understanding enabled the legislative forces for which he spoke to achieve compelling victories. Senator WATKINS was particularly singled out for praise for his aid on Hells Canyon legislation by Idaho's senior Senator, HENRY C. DWORSHAK. The Associated Press has referred to Senator WATKINS as "a leader in two of the

Eisenhower administration's biggest Senate victories on measures proposing major water projects." Frederick Champ, prominent northern Utah banker and senior member of the national resources committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, spoke of his "admiration for Senator WATKINS, who had the courage to lead the fight against a high dam at Hells Canyon in the interests of the American taxpayer and the preservation of our free economy, as well as our reclamation program."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include newspaper articles dealing with these signal contributions by our senior Senator from Utah in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Ogden Standard-Examiner of July 20, 1956]

WATKINS LED IN TWO BIG IKE VICTORIES

WASHINGTON.—Senator WATKINS, Republican, Utah, now has been a leader in two of the Eisenhower administration's biggest Senate victories on measures proposing major water projects.

Earlier this year, WATKINS was a principal spokesman for the Upper Colorado project—an administration-backed water development and conservation plan for five Western States—which was passed by Congress and now is in preliminary stages of execution.

Yesterday and Wednesday, WATKINS was the prime spokesman for the administration's stand against the Hells Canyon bill, which went down to a 51 to 41 defeat. WATKINS made 5 of the 30 speeches delivered in the 9-hour debate.

In addition, he was on his feet frequently to question other Senators speaking for or against the proposed $485 million project in the Snake River Canyon between Oregon and Idaho.

Critics contend the administration's stands on the half-billion dollar Upper Colorado plan and Hells Canyon are contradictory. But WATKINS doesn't agree.

NOT COMPARABLE

During the Hells Canyon debate he said the projects weren't comparable—that Hells Canyon "does not begin to compare with the Colorado River storage project for its contributions as a comprehensive water resource project."

It is the view of WATKINS and other supporters of the administration that the Upper Colorado development would be primarily for water conservation with power features incidental—while Hells Canyon would be primarily a power project.

The critics say power developed in the Upper Colorado dams would cost about three times as much as that from Hells Canyon.

During the Hells Canyon debate, WATKINS was termed by one opposing Member as one of the best water lawyers in the Senate.

After the Senate vote, WATKINS issued this summing-up statement:

"Development of the water resources of the Columbia River can now continue its forward movement, as a result of the historic vote in the Senate today. The Senate voted to uphold the administration's sound policy of developing our water resources by a partnership of effort by Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise.

"I accepted an assignment to help manage the Senate floor action against this power measure, which posed as a reclamation project, because I felt that the proposal ran contrary to a policy expressed by Lincoln and applied in the Reclamation Act of 1902, to the effect that the Federal Government should not do things which the people can do for themselves.

"Furthermore, the downstream States on the Columbia River Basin have refused to ratify an interstate compact drafted in 1954 guaranteeing the water-consumption rights of the upstream States.

"Our neighboring State of Idaho is dependent almost exclusively upon the waters of the upper Snake, a tributary of the Columbia River, and I for one would be the last to risk the future availability of Idaho's water supplies in the centuries to come just to build the world's second-largest power dam—especially when the same power head will be utilized for highly efficient power production tours under an alternative private project already authorized and under way."

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of July 21, 1956]

WATKINS GETS IDAHO KUDO ON HELLS VOTE

[Tribune Washington Bureau]

WASHINGTON, July 20.—Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK (R., Idaho) paid glowing tribute Friday to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS (R., Utah) for what he described as his "vigorous leadership" in defeating the Federal Hells Canyon bill.

Idaho's senior Senator issued a statement thanking the Utahn on behalf of the Republican members of the Senate Interior Committee who had joined with Senator WATKINS in signing the minority report in opposition to the legislation.

"The water users of the Snake River valleys owe a debt of gratitude to Senator WATKINS for his fine display of cooperation to his neighboring State during not only the committee fight but also in winning the final victory on the Senate floor," said Senator DWORSHAK.

"The Utah Senator carried a heavy burden as the ranking GOP member of the reclamation subcommittee, throughout the long hearings and deliberations on the bill.

"He also drafted the minority report which stressed the safeguarding of upstream water rights and was delegated by Senate Republican Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND to supervise the floor leadership and enlist speakers against the bill."

Besides Senator WATKINS, the Hells Canyon minority report was signed by Senators DWORSHAK, BARRY GOLDWATER of Arizona, FRANK BARRETT of Wyoming and EUGENE D. MILLIKIN of Colorado.

"As a result of Thursday's vote and in order to continue the full utilization of water resources of the Columbia Basin," said Senator DWORSHAK, "I believe that Oregon and Washington should now recognize the imperative need of ratifying the Columbia Compact. Without a compact, our seven States in the Columbia Basin will continue to face many difficulties, regarding highly essential development."

Senator DWORSHAK said he would continue to work for development of the Upper Columbia watershed and expressed confidence the Senate Public Works Committee soon would recommend congressional authorization of the proposed $140 million Bruces Eddy Dam on the Clearwater River. He pointed out the Army engineers have described this damsite as one of the best still undeveloped projects in the Columbia Basin. The Senator said he understood that the Clearwater Dam would be opposed on the floor by Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER (D., Washington) because of his disappointment over the Hells Canyon defeat.

[From the Logan Herald-Journal of July 20, 1956]

COMMENTS ON BILL'S DEFEAT

"The decisive defeat yesterday in the Senate of the bill to authorize a high dam in Hells Canyon at the expense of the American taxpayer reaffirms my faith in Congress and fills me with admiration for Senator WATKINS, who had the courage to lead the fight against it in the interests of the American taxpayer and the preservation of our free economy, as well as our reclamation program," declared Frederick P. Champ, northern Utah banker and businessman and senior member of the National Resources Committee of the United States Chamber of Commerce, when asked to comment on the action taken.

"I have yet to see one single valid argument for spending the taxpayers' money on a project which private enterprise is able to build with added and more timely benefits to power users, irrigators, and navigation, and it is difficult to understand how some of my fellow Democrats in this State and in Congress can favor such a project, when it is obvious that the expenditure of $400 million by the Federal Government in Hells Canyon would limit the ability of the Federal Government to go forward with the Colorado River development and other multipurpose projects which cannot be built by private capital, unless these people assume that the Federal Treasury and the response of the American taxpayer will be unlimited."

The Political Message of Matus Cernak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1955, Dr. Matus Cernak was killed by a parcel bomb in Munich. I have here an article by Mr. Joseph Kischbaum, LL. D., Ph. D., now professor at Montreal University, which commemorates the first anniversary of Dr. Cernak's death. At the request of Dr. Joseph A. Mikkus, chairman of the foreign affairs committee of the Slovak National Council Abroad, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE POLITICAL MESSAGE OF MATUS CERNAK

(By Dr. Joseph Kirschbaum)

On July 5, 1955, Matus Cernak, a distinguished Slovak politician and diplomat, was assassinated in Munich, Germany. Forces rabid in opposing our effort to secure to establish an independent Slovakia could have hardly struck a more telling blow than was this dastardly attack, for by it they removed from active service an esteemed patriot, this Cernak of whom it may be said that of all national movers currently in exile, he most closely approxiated what, relatively speaking, we might designate as the position of a nonaccredited legate of the Slovak nation to the republic of Western Germany. And to him as such were paid final tributes and honors in death not only by the officials of that government but by the chancellor of Western Germany himself who expressed deep symapthy on the occasion of Cernak's tragic death.

In Germany Matus Cernak signalized himself beyond his office as a deserving politician and diplomat. It was due mostly to his untiring diligence and interest that two noteworthy publications continued to appear after the departure of Dr. Jozef Pauco; viz, Slobodne Slovensko (Free Slovakia, founded by Dr. Pauco) and Slowakische Korrespondenz. Concern for the social well-being of

hundreds of Slovak refugees who arrived in Germany also came to devolve upon Cernak, and his name is very closely associated with the Slovak institute in Munich.

Even this meager cut-and-dry survey of his recent major activities yields us the realization that the foul political murder, which so unexpectedly wrested Matus Cernak from our midst, is to all the Slovaks in the free world and to the struggle for a democratic independent Slovakia a much greater loss and a much more significant incident than we had appraised and accounted it in the earliest hours of our grief. After the Cernova massacre of 1907, the murder of Stefanik in 1919 and of Dr. Jozef Tiso in 1947, this attack of July 5, 1955, will be recorded in Slovak national annals as a historically vital event. The death of Matus Cernak marks not merely the passing of another exiled Slovak diplomat and patriot who dedicated all his mind and heart to the struggle to liberate Slovakia from communism and the Czech yoke. Matus Cernak's previous political background, his personal character and talents, his uncompromising doggedness, and his tireless and successful activities within the territory of one of the most decisive powers affecting the fate of Slovkia—all this contributed to make Cernak indispensable to the current state of our political efforts as well as a symbol for posterity.

WHO WAS MATUS CERNAK?

Matus Cernak was born on August 28, 1903, in the town, Vieska, where his father was a miller. After his preliminary education in Prievidza, Kezmarok, and Banska Bystrica, he undertook university studies in Prague and subsequently in Leipzig, Germany. His courses were orientated toward a professorship.

Having attained his diploma, he spent several years in teaching at Trnava, and in 1930 he became a high-school instructor in Bratislava. Until 1937 Cernak devoted himself almost exclusively to academic pursuits and to cultural interest. He was, however, one of the younger element, a member of that youthful and vitally conscious generation of Slovaks who in the 1932 demonstrations at Trencianske Teplice gave Prague incontrovertible evidence of the fact that the spiritual and political development of Slovakia will follow native inspiration and bent and will not be trammeled by constraining directives from Prague. As a youthful patriot, then, Cernak naturally found himself an active participant in various political demonstrations supporting Slovakia's interests and deserts.

It was the temper of the times that shaped his destiny. He made more and more public appearances and spirited pronouncements but after his patriotic manifesto delivered in the Slovak National Theater in 1937, Cernak was overnight not only projected into popular acclaim but was irrevocably committed to his role as an outstanding leader in the political arena. The keynote of his message on this occasion was "Ours is that portion of land beneath the Tatra and to us rightfully belongs all its yield." This cry and justification came to echo from innumerable speaker's platforms and it blazed its appeal throughout all the press houses of Slovakia. Within a year after this induction into public national life, Matus Cernak, despite his youthful 35 years, became a minister in the Prague government.

Prague, long accustomed to an accord of fawning subservience and servility on the part of those to whom she had granted political ministries and various similar offices, soon realized that this Cernak who accepted a ministerial portfolio came as a representative of a new generation. He was not a hireling. He was a public servant who bore the concerns of the Slovak nation deep in his heart, one to be touched neither by bribes nor by intimidation. He was upright as well as fearless and his attitude was undisguised. He understood that it served no purpose to temporize with the Czechs; consequently, he had hardly established himself in his new office when, mincing no words, he demanded as by a 24-hour ultimatum that Dr Benes examine the Slovak problem in the spirit of the Pittsburgh Pact; i. e., Cernak sought to activate Slovakia's autonomy as it had been guaranteed by the Czechs when Thomas G. Masaryk signed the Pittsburgh Pact in 1918 and the unreserved ratification of the Parliament convened on November 12, 1918 had made the agreement binding both legally and morally. Benes was unwilling to meet Cernak's terms. Manfully and honorably Cernak offered his resignation from ministerial duties and his decisive action hastened Slovakia's autonomy and later her complete independence.

In the autonomous state of Slovakia (October 6, 1938—March 19, 1939) Cernak became a prominent and popular personality. He was named minister of education and after the proclamation of independence, he was appointed the first Slovak envoy to Berlin.

Berlin was not only the most significant, it was also the most difficult ambassadorial post. The very existence of the Slovak Republic often hung by a hair there, and the Slovak diplomatic representative had to exercise consummate tact while at the same time he preserved an inflexible devotion to his country and defended the interests committed to him in sacred trust. Matus Cernak proved himself in this capacity. He again advanced the welfare of Slovakia with the same degree of ardor and uncompromising vigor which had characterized him formerly in Prague, and his mission was successful. So well, in fact, did he acquit himself of his duties that he won for the Slovak cause the sympathies even of that power that came after the occupation of Germany, and in its eyes, too, he was accepted as a nonaccredited envoy of the Slovak nation.

Political reprisals meted out a prison sentence for Cernak, and after serving several years in Bratislava, he left Slovakia in 1948. His country was then degraded by the communistic and Czech regimes. Cernak in exile dedicated himself to the struggle to secure a new freedom and independence for Slovakia, a sacred fight against communism, a crusade for the triumph of democracy and liberty.

For this reason, the brutal political murder of Matus Cernak, who had been favored by fate to assume in this national struggle for liberty and independence a role granted only to heroes and to persons of uncommon historic stature, has shaken every worthy Slovak and every honorable person in the world. For in that little post office in Munich there fell at the hands of a cynical murderer not merely a member of the little Slovak nation, but a wholly dedicated defender of the idea of freedom and democracy, and that at the very hour when the representatives of international communism and of Czech imperialism were sporting the mask of surface smiles and pretending sugared speeches on peace and cooperation and coexistence.

If the world's free press agencies, broadcasts, and televised reports from Bonn to Washington, from Paris to Canada, Australia, Argentina, and all the free world circulated reports and commentaries on this despicable political crime, then it was in tribute to the victim Cernak, a promoter of the ideal of freedom and democracy. Only the intervention and meddling of the forces of cowardly appeasement, of collaboration with communism, and Czech-sown hatred of the Slovaks prevented the glorification of this sacrifice of Matus Cernak as a price demanded by the true instinct of communism and of Czech chauvinism. Their malice alone precluded the hailing of Matus Cernak as a martyr to the cause of liberty and democracy, blessings cherished by the universal free world. This honor Matus Cernak fully deserves.

Slovak nation at home and all loyal Slovaks now exiled and scattered throughout the far-flung countries of the free world can appraise this holocaust of Matus Cernak in its full historic significance.

WHY WAS MATUS CERNAK SLAIN?

Matus Cernak fell because he was the foe of communism and of Czech efforts to dominate Slovakia and to usurp her rights. He was singled out as one of the most unyielding exponents of the principle of liberty and a democratic way for Slovakia. For these reasons he become marked as a sworn enemy of the dual powers of international communism and of Czech aggressive pretensions. Because he had already established a record of several years of successful service on the Slovak political front, which has been in the recent past and which will very likely in the near future again be of paramount importance in the Slovak contest for liberty and independence, not only Communistic Prague, but also the adherents of there-established Czech hegemony over Slovakia ranked him as the No. 1 man on their list of resistance leaders active in exile to thwart their nefarious designs.

He fell because of his love for Slovakia suffering under Czech domination, because of his friendly attitude toward the German nation, and because of the fruitful mission he was accomlishing in the Republic of Western Germany, where he had all the prospects of continuing an eminently flourishing career.

Whether the base assassin will be discovered as an individual or not, it is unmistakably clear to every thinking person just whose henchmen he must have been and in whose employ he accomplished his ambush bloody deed. Since 1945 so great a number of outstanding Slovak patriots has been killed, deported and deprived of liberty that doubt concerning the mastermind of this vicious crime would hardly be in place. Czechs, both of the Communist watermark and non-Communist conformers, especially those who in the wake of unsuccessful collaboration with communism escaped into the countries of Western Europe, live in abnormal fears bred by guilt, the spawn of those crimes they perpetuated against Sudeten and Carpathian Germans. Their panic mounts as they see Germany now in the ascendancy as one of the influential nations in international politics. To both classes of Czechs it is clear that the existence of the Czechoslovak Republic, the question of Czech boundaries and conditions affecting the principles of life for the Czech nation in the future will come to depend in no small measure and in no negligible way on Germany and on this decisive factor whether or not Slovakia will succeed in winning the support of influential powers which will further her endeavor for independence.

Matus Cernak with over 15 years of residence in Germany and very desirable contacts and personal acquaintances even among the highest of German dignitaries was undeniably instrumental in securing favor for the idea of Slovakia's independence. His personal integrity and his indefatigable efforts in behalf of his country, as posthumously appraised by the German press and attested to by hundreds of telegrams of condolence, won sympathetic response even in the highest levels of political power in Bonn and presaged ultimate success for the Slovak cause, it was primarily for this reason that the foes of the Slovak nation and of the Slovak effort to attain national independence decided to liquidate Cernak.

THE POLITICAL MESSAGE OF M. CERNAK

Cernak was felled in the heat of the national struggle. He died with a conviction of Slovak truth, confident in the ultimate victory of the natural right of the Slovak people to enjoy their proper national life. He consummated his own supreme sacrifice in the spirit of his motto "To liberty through sacrifice" and he signed his political credo with his own life's blood.

It is not difficult nor will it be difficult to ascertain what would have been the final political message of Cernak. He wrote it in 1938 in terms of his adamant resistance to compromise, his steadfastness and his patriotic ardor. You can find it recorded in hundreds of his articles and political manifestoes, in his lifelong political career and in his heroic martyrdom. In the ranks of Slovak political figures, personages who have gone before us in death, Cernak takes his place as the representative of a new political generation, one which has sought and which still seeks a solution of the Slovak problem on a broader European basis within the cadre of modern democratic and Christian powers.

For his political mission in exile, Matus Cernak was better prepared than were most Slovaks, and by his educational background and his professional experience as well as by his personal endowments and characteristics he satisfactorily evidenced a Slovak sense of balance and maturity and fitness for life. He also exemplified Slovakia's innate belonging to Europe and to European traditions.

The most substantial and eloquent proof of his adequacy to fill the role he chose in the fight for a democratic and independent Slovakia is his very assassination, the tragic bomb which the antagonists of a Christian and independent Slovakia sent him.

The death of Matus Cernak is a painful and very grievous loss to the Slovak forces working in exile; it is one of the severest blows which the Slovak people could suffer at this time. The manner to which their foes had to resort in order to bring about Cernak's destruction, however, is in itself an assurance to all Slovak emigres that in the eyes of Prague and of international communism it is no "quantite negligeable," that it is, in fact, so formidable a hindrance to them for the Slovaks to be allied with the democracies that they even ventured such a brutal scandal to register their reaction.

To Slovak patriots in exile, mourning the death of their most distinguished representative, Matus Cernak, this realization begets a fresh spur to redoubled activities.

Consummate triumph of the Slovak hope for independence beckons on the trail over which Matus Cernak has forged ahead in honor and in complete unflinching dedication. God grant it.

Recodification of Retailers' Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H. R. 12421 providing for a complete recodification of that portion of chapter 31 of subtitle D of the Internal Revenue Code which imposes retailers' excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage.

These retail sales taxes, duplicating those imposed by a majority of the States, were originally enacted as temporary taxes under wartime conditions. The continued encroachment by the Federal Government upon this major source of State tax revenues is tolerable only so long as the defense needs of the Government continue at their present high levels.

Until such time as reduced Government expenditures or replacement revenue sources permit the total elimination of these retail sales taxes, a complete recodification of the law is required, first, to relieve consumers of the burden of a 10 percent luxury excise tax on articles of everyday usage and necessity; and, second, to eliminate a long list of competitive inequities and compliance problems among the several hundred thousand retailers burdened with the duty of collecting these taxes.

The principal articles which would be relieved of the present 10 percent taxes under the bill are:

Silver-plated tableware.

All jewelry, clocks, watches, and related articles sold at retail for $5 or less.

All fur or fur-trimmed articles other than capes, coats, jackets, scarves, stoles, wraps, and similar garments.

Antiperspirants, deodorants, sunburn preventatives, petroleum jellies, and aromatic cachous.

Handbags, wallets, key cases, and luggage sold at retail for $5 or less.

The enactment of H. R. 12421 will not result in a significant loss of revenue to the Government. While the exemptions provided under the bill for nonluxury articles of everyday usage and necessity will mean a tax savings to consumers of as much as $50 million annually, most, if not all, of this apparent revenue loss will be recouped through improved compliance and enforcement made possible by the adoption of a more equitable and certain statute.

In introducing H. R. 12421 at this time, I am hopeful that taxpayers will exercise the opportunity to study its provisions carefully and that the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Excise Tax policy will find it convenient and desirable to schedule public hearings upon it at an early date.

People Behind the Stassen Coup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

PEOPLE BEHIND THE STASSEN COUP—LEFTWING NEW YORK COTERIE RUMORED TO HAVE FINANCED ANTI-NIXON POLLS

(By David Lawrence)

Who really is the Vice-Presidential candidate that Harold Stassen is backing? It certainly isn't Governor Herter, of Massachusetts, who, it now develops, wasn't consulted by Stassen before launching the boom for him. In fact, Governor Herter will make the speech placing NIXON in nomination at the convention.

The objective of Stassen and those who are in league with him is to bring about the removal of Vice President NIXON from the ticket. It isn't so much a pro-Herter move as an anti-NIXON maneuver. For one thing, there is some doubt as to whether the Massachusetts Governor is constitutionally eligible, since he was born abroad. It would take a Supreme Court decision to clear up the doubt, and that would only give the Democrats a campaign argument, because no such decision probably could be obtained between August and November.

But who are the people back of the Stassen coup? There are all sorts of rumors afloat, and the finger points to a leftwing coterie in New York which put up money for the polls with the avowed object of developing statistical data to force NIXON out of the race.

The so-called polls or how they were taken and what the questions were have not been revealed, but the Gallup polls in recent months actually have shown NIXON to have gained steadily in strength over the last year as compared with a year ago.

This correspondent has known NIXON for many years. He is a modest, hardworking, conscientious and straightforward individual whose principle "sin" seems to have been that he helped to expose Alger Hiss, and fought the Communists. Another "sin" is that he told the voters frankly what he thought of the Communist infiltration in Government.

This apparently is the kind of campaigning which some of the Democrats don't like, though Harry Truman never handled any issue with kid gloves, and went so far as to question the integrity and patriotism of General Eisenhower in the 1952 campaign—something NIXON never did with respect to any opponent.

The attempt to "get NIXON" will not succeed. It will boomerang. In some respects, it is better that the insidious campaign has come out into the open so that the voters can learn the whys and wherefores of the anti-Nixon smears and just who in the so-called liberal wing of the Republican Party has fallen for the anti-Nixon propaganda stirred up by the Democrats.

Certainly the Democrats have been keeping up a steady attack in the hope of creating friction for the Republicans. In fact, 95 percent of the criticism of NIXON has come from Democrats, who resent his effectiveness as a campaigner. For, singlehanded, he saved many a seat for the Republicans in Congress during the 1954 campaign.

The adroitness of the anti-Nixonites is emphasized by the way Harold Stassen referred to his conversation last Friday with the President. He gave newsmen the impression at first that Eisenhower had no objection and hence really favored Stassen's move for Herter. Now it turns out the President made it clear to Stassen that he would be acting as an individual "and not as a member of the President's official family." This was a palpable disavowal.

No sooner was the announcement made on Tuesday afternoon that Governor Herter would make the speech nominating NIXON at San Francisco than Stassen issued a comment implying it was kind of a cooked-up deal and that one had agreed to nominate the other. No such understanding, however, has been reach with NIXON.

Even more disingenuous was Stassen's statement to the press on Monday. He gave the impression that he had tactfully and politely notified NIXON as a matter of courtesy. Yet the letter sent to NIXON on Monday, a few hours before the press conference, was about as discourteous a piece of writing as has been noted between supposedly friendly members of the same administration.

It looks odd to have Stassen, special assistant to the President, writing to a member of the same Cabinet that the nomination of the Vice President would hurt the "prospects of a lasting peace" and would not satisfy the "uncommitted nations." This is taken to mean that the speeches made by NIXON about "neutral" nations recently, with the full approval of Secretary Dulles and the President, are opposed by Stassen and his group. It means some kind of declaration of war against the leadership and the President himself.

Stassen assumes that Eisenhower will sit back and let a factional fight develop on a "let the better man win" basis just a few weeks before the national convention. Eisenhower may be unfamiliar with the ways of party politics, but he isn't as naive as the Stassen clique thinks he is. To date many of the friends of the late Senator Taft, whom Stassen antagonized in the bitter 1952 primary campaign in Ohio, and the Members of Congress of every shade of Republicanism have rallied to NIXON's side. It could gain further momentum when the President himself, speaks out for NIXON, as he is certainly expected to do before long.

Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, today is the fourth anniversary of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement concerning this achievement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JACKSON
COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

My responsibilities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Insular Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, must of necessity keep my attention focused on the development of the off-shore areas within the political jurisdiction of the United States, whatever their present political status.

Today, I am happy to call attention to one of those areas whose present political status represents clear proof that our constitutional system will always offer the right solution to whatever problems of a political nature may arise under our flag. This is illustrated in the case of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Fifty-eight years ago, to this day, the military forces of the United States landed in Puerto Rico as an incident in the Spanish-American War. The Spanish-American War was a war of liberation: Three years after the Treaty of Paris was signed, Cuba became an independent republic. In 1946, the Philippines became an independent republic. In 1952, Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth, voluntarily associated to the United States. The Congress in each instance has done for the peoples of these islands or groups of islands, exactly what their people wished, and had struggled for within the framework of the Spanish monarchy from which they were separated under the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1899.

Before the Commonwealth, Puerto Rico was termed a possession of the United States. The people, gradually, under successive acts of Congress, assumed more and more responsibility in the conduct of their own affairs. Since 1900, Puerto Rico and the United States have lived in economic union. In 1917, the citizens of Puerto Rico were vested with United States citizenship. This created a fundamental link between the islanders and the mainlanders. In 1950, the Congress, recognizing the full political maturity attained by the people of Puerto Rico, offered them a compact embodied in Public Law 600, 81st Congress. Under the compact, the people of Puerto Rico were to adopt their own constitution. The relationships to exist between the new body politic and the United States were embodied in what is known as the Puerto Rican Federal Relations Act.

Overwhelmingly the people of Puerto Rico accepted the terms of compact and within its framework created their Commonwealth. Congress ratified the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The Commonwealth is now a fait accompli. It has been for 4 years. Today the people of Puerto Rico celebrate the fourth anniversary of their Commonwealth. I think we must congratulate them for their achievement. I think we should be groud of their achievements. The people of Puerto Rico have now as much control over their own political life as the people of any State of the Union. With few exceptions, the laws of the United States apply in Puerto Rico equally as if Puerto Rico were a member State of the Union.

The Commonwealth is indeed unique in our political system. The Spanish language lacking one word which would be the exact equivalent of Commonwealth, the Puerto Ricans call themselves an "Estado Libre Asociado". Retranslated into English this would mean a "Free Associated State". This is indeed a true description of their status. They have not been admitted into the Union, but they are associated to the Union, in a manner compatible with its Federal nature. And thus, in spite of distance, in spite of dissimilar historical origins and culturs, a firm bond of common loyalties and allegiances between the people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States have been established and consecrated. Thus we practice what we preach in advocating freedom for all peoples. I believe it fitting to bring these facts to the attention of the Senate. I believe that the fact that Puerto Rico has so uneventfully attained the political status of its people's wishes, that they are enjoying freedom in security in association with the United States, cannot but help cement the sentiments of solidarity and cooperation so necessary for the entire Western Hemisphere in its determination to maintain these lands, presented to mankind by the genius of Columbus, as the bulwark of freedom, democracy, and peace, lands hallowed by free peoples who base their political principles in the unswerving respect for the dignity of man.

Judicial Review and the Amending Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thought-provoking article entitled "On Judicial Review and the Amending Process" by Dr. W. S. Jenkins, of the Department of Political Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, N. C.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the light of Justice Douglas' dissent in *New York* v. *United States* (326 U. S. 572 (1946)), that the action of the Court was in reality amending the Constitution, it appears germane to examine in reverse order the nature of judicial review as a control over the process of formal amendment. In the group of historical cases that have been presented to the Court relating to procedural and substantive defects of particular amendments, the Court has never used its processes to negate the operation of the amending provision. Instead judicial review has served to clarify and expedite the operation of the amending provision and to validate the action taken by the political departments. In the leading case of *Coleman* v. *Miller* (307 U. S. 433 (1939)), Chief Justice Hughes speaking for the Court made use of the traditional expedient of the political question formula in ruling that procedural questions relating to the ratification of the child labor amendment were not justiciable in character. He said, "these conditions are appropriate for the consideration of the political departments of the Government. The questions they involve are essentially political and not justiciable."

Justice Black in a concurring opinion, joined by Justices Roberts, Frankfurter and Douglas, seems to have considered that there was a more basic judicial incompetence involved in the Court's apparent self-denial of jurisdiction over these questions, an incapacity which barred the Court from participation in the formal amendment of the Constitution. In place of the Chief Justice's deference under the political question formula to the departmental prerogative of Congress in the implementation of formal amendment, Justice Black went a long way toward placing the entire amending process as something apart from and above the realm of separation of governmental powers. He said:

"In the exercise of that power, Congress, of course, is governed by the Constitution. However, whether submission, intervening procedure or congressional determination of ratification conforms to the commands of the Constitution, call for decisions by a political department of questions of a type which this Court has frequently designated "political." And decision of a political question by the political department to which the Constitution has committed it 'conclusively binds the judges, as well as all other officers, citizens, and subjects of * * * government.'"

Justice Black seems to have grapsed the Taney conception of political power as the attributes of sovereignty and his thought on the nature of political power would logically associate formal amendment with the constituent process, where it legitimately belongs. In turn Justice Black's thinking would identify formal amendment with an act of sovereignty, an ultimate act of residual authority springing from "we the people," and with the essence which permeates the Constitution and clothes it with sanctity of lex legum.

If these conclusions are sound, then can we not say that Justice Black is developing here the classical thinking of Calhoun on the nature of sovereignty, the germ of whose thought grew in the conceptualism of John W. Burgess and was cultivated in the teachings of W. W. Pierson: sovereignty being the Constitution-making, sustaining, amending, and destroying power. In final analysis, whether we take the position of Chief Justice

Hughes or that of Justice Black, the Court in the Coleman case did repudiate a role in the formal amendment of the Constitution. It therefore becomes the more inconsistent that the Court in the segregation cases exercises the role of informal amendment.

This role of constructive amendment assumes surpassing importance viewed in the light of reversal of long-standing precedent. Just as the Brown case overruled the 58-year precedent of "separate but equal" schools, so it also overruled *Barron* v. *Baltimore* (7 Peters 243 (1833)), and a precedent of 121 year standing of judicial abstention from participation in informal amendment and from interference in the basic right of the State to provide for needed "safeguards to liberty from the apprehended encroachments of their particular governments" through their own formal amending processes.

Chief Justice Marshall in his scholarly opinion in *Barron* v. *Baltimore* had forecast the incapacity doctrine of Justice Black. In that case the Court had its initial opportunity to change a basic principle of federalism through constructive amendment. The Court might have nationalized the Bill of Rights by extending the due process limitation of the 5th amendment from the general Government to the States, in absence of such an impowering little rights amendment as the 14th. The Chief Justice declined however on lex legum principles to accomplish such a judicial intervention into the internal affairs of the States as was done in the Brown case. Marshall said:

"The question of their application to States is not left to construction. It is averred in positive words. If the original Constitution, in the 9th and 10th sections of the first article, draws this plain and marked line of discrimination between the limitations it imposes on the powers of the general Government, and on those of the States; if in every inhibition intended to act on State power, words are employed which directly express that intent; some strong reason must be assigned for departing from this safe and judicious course in framing the amendments, before that departure can be assumed. * * * Had the framers of these amendments intended them to be limitations on the powers of the State governments, they would have imitated the framers of the original Constitution, and have expressed that intention. Had Congress engaged in the extraordinary occupation of improving the constitutions of the several States by affording the people additional protection from the exercise of power by their own governments in matters which concerned themselves alone, they would have declared this purpose in plain and intelligible language. * * * These amendments contain no expression indicating an intention to apply them to the State governments. This Court cannot so apply them."

The profound "We search in vain for that reason" opinion of the learned Chief Justice in refusing to change the constitutional arrangements for formal amendment stands in severe contrast with the opinion of Chief Justice Warren in the Brown case in which there is no suggestion of the sovereign character of amendment and nothing revealed of the basis of decision for the overthrow of constitutional law except, in answer to the question presented whether a new authority of psychology supported the decision, a magisterial "We believe that it does." If long-established constitutional law is to be upset, the Court should find a better reason than this. The perplexing thing is that this nutshell of the stuff-of-decision is small matter to provide enlightenment on the organic growth of a living Constitution and this shorthand reason-of-decision reveals to the profession little of the factors that make the "constitution we are expounding." (Marshall's words in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*).

Professor Corwin has pointed out some of the important uses that judicial review has:

"Especially does it present an admirable forum in which to rationalize and clarify, to authenticate in terms of broad principle, the determinations of political authority, and to articulate them with the more durable elements of tradition." (Constitutional Revolution, Ltd., p. 115.)

It is a consideration of such factors as these that is the grist of decision which provides for the lex legum growth of a written constitution. The disturbing thing about the Brown opinion is that it provides only a thin veneer to cover up within the Court the practice of dissent which has been also vital in providing that growth. And we come also face to face with wonder over the lack of consideration in the Brown opinion of the profound concurrence of Justice Black in the Coleman case in which he said:

"Congress, possessing exclusive power over the amending process, cannot be bound by and is under no duty to accept the pronouncements upon that exclusive power by this Court or by the Kansas courts. Neither State nor Federal courts can review that power. Therefore, any judicial expression amounting to more than mere acknowledgment of exclusive congressional power over the political process of amendment is a mere admonition to the Congress in the nature of an advisory opinion, given wholly without constitutional authority."

May we not then with the same alarm about judicial absolutism as that feared in the Letters of Brutus, (1788) view the present crisis in constitutionalism and ask: Has not the Court departed from the role of defender of the Constitution and assumed the Hamiltonian loudspeaker role of constitution-maker and has it not thereby lost the original justification for the exercise of judicial review? Has the Court not departed from constitutional law as the basis of decision and thus lost its juristic nature as umpire of the Federal system?

Democrats and Security Risk Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democrats and Security Risk Bill," written by David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS AND SECURITY RISK BILL—WHETHER PROGRAM COVERING ALL AGENCIES IS PASSED IS SEEN UP TO PARTY LEADERS

(By David Lawrence)

Will the Democratic Party leadership in Congress go into the coming campaign with a record of having sidetracked legislation designed to keep Communists, disloyal persons, and security risks out of any Government position?

In 1952 the charge was made that the Democratic Party was soft on communism. It was one of the major issues which caused a large number of Democrats to leave their party and vote Republican.

Today two able and persistent foes of communism, Representative WALTER, of Pennsylvania, and Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi—both Democrats—have introduced bills to permit the President to cover all agencies in the Government under the security risk and loyalty program. These two Democrats have done their part. But what will the Democratic leadership, which has the say in whether legislation shall be passed or postponed, do about it? This has not been clarified as yet.

The anti-Communist issue is a very live topic in many districts. There is an awareness that the "left-wingers" would like to stall or kill the proposed legislation altogether.

Attorney General Brownell has come out flatly for passage of the bill introduced by Representative Walter. Contrary to an editorial twist in a recent news dispatch from Washington to a large Eastern newspaper, the Attorney General is anxious to have the new bill passed. His brief letter of indorsement was misrepresented as a coolness toward the measure, when the truth is he felt that the longer letter presented at the same time by Philip Young, chairman of the Civil Service Commission, gave all the important arguments in detail. The mere fact that the two letters were sent to Congress together should have been notice of the adminisration's position.

So far as the committees in Congress are concerned, they understand that the Department of Justice and the Civil Service Commission want the new legislation passed so as to correct the peculiar piece of legislation written into a decision made by a majority of the Supreme Court a few weeks ago. In that decision six justices said the President doesn't have the discretionary authority under the Internal Security Act of 1950 to cover both "sensitive" and "nonsensitive" positions. The members of Congress who originally sponsored the law originally sponsored the law pointed in vain to the record, but their statements were ignored. The "Americans for Democratic Action" and other "left wing" outfits are opposing the remedial measures.

The case histories of 17 Government employes in so-called "nonsensitive" positions were described by the Civil Service Commission in a letter to Congress recently as part of the list of 280 persons previously discharged who now are eligible to return. One was a notorious member of the Communist Party in 1945 and is a close associate of many Communists. Another was a member of a Communist cell in the New York post office.

Now it has been argued that the post office isn't a sensitive place, but the Communist Party might like to know what's going on with the mails to certain addresses. Likewise, the Pure Food and Drug Bureau isn't usually regarded as sensitive, but germ warfare could be initiated through food distribution. Only the Executive, with full knowledge of the many hazards in allowing Communists to enter governmental agencies, can decide.

The argument is made that the Government can fire anybody on broad grounds under existing law. But this is a strange point for the left wingers to make, because they insist that anybody dismissed from the Government service has a right to be given full information on the charges against him. To dismiss a man on one ground while really discharging him on another that is kept secret would be a subterfuge to which the Government of the United States should not be urged to resort in order to get rid of disloyal persons or security risks.

Often persons get into nonsensitive jobs, use Government stationery to get access to important places and fraternize with other Government workers employed in sensitive

positions. This could make espionage easy.

The Democratic Party promised in the 1954 campaign that it would cooperate with the Republican President. Certainly the fight against Communist infiltration is not a partisan issue. But if Congress, controlled in both Houses by the Democratic Party, adjourns without giving the President the power—which the Supreme Court says it is constitutional for Congress to bestow, if it desires—plenty will be heard about the Communist issue on the stump this autumn.

The American people which have a right to ask which political party recommended legislation to Congress to enable the Government to get rid of disloyal persons and which party refused to enact such a law.

The Plight of Independent Agencies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered by me on the subject "The Plight of Independent Agencies."

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLIGHT OF INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

We are entering on that recurring period in our national life when the record of an administration is subject to review in detail in order that the people may express their choice at the polls on the basis of information and understanding. And when, as it appears will be the case in November 1956, one of the candidates for the Presidency is the man invested with the authority of that high office, a more searching examination of his administration must necessarily be made. Those of us who belong to what the British call the "loyal opposition" are gratified indeed that we can present our case, confident that our voices need not be mute in sympathy for suffering, that we need not be silent in compassion. We are glad that the President has regained strength and hope that he will be able to take responsibility on the hustings for the acts of his administration.

This is the way it should be. It would be dangerous to our institutions if the electorate in November were denied the opportunity to analyze the record of the past 4 years, to comprehend in all its implications the somewhat novel concept of the Presidency presented by this administration, to judge if such a concept has resulted in honest and in responsible Government, and to decide if such a concept is adequate to meet the challenge of the next 4 years.

I refer to the concept of the Presidency implicit in a system where the Chief Executive assures the people of the Nation of his honesty and good intentions, his faith in the maxims that govern decent human conduct, while he permits his subordinates and his aides to take such actions which repudiate his promises, ignore his publicly stated intentions, and without his interference they proceed to run the Government according to their private and personal understandings or wishes as to his administration's objectives. This is what happens, I believe, when a President is unable or unwilling to identify those routine and ministerial functions appropriate for delegation, and as a consequence surrenders to his subordinates excessive executive powers, beyond the powers contemplated by Constitution, statute or by tradition. By such delegations the office of the Presidency has been diminished in the Eisenhower administration as the requirements of the office have been adjusted to fit the deep-rooted habits, inclinations and necessities of the President.

I do not now wish to discuss the results in terms of America's prestige abroad, nor to speculate about the effect in chancelleries around the world as the cacophony of conflicting views expressed by officials of this administration assaults their ears. Nor am I going to discuss the confusion in the Congress and the Nation with respect to our Nation's requirements for defense, as divergent views are aired, and contradictory evidence is sifted to get at the truth, while we wait in vain for the responsible Chief Executive to exert the powers of his office to support his public promises.

I wish to discuss the results of the policy of delegation of his responsibilities by the Chief Executive in one specific field, an area concerning which I have some personal knowledge and with respect to which the essential facts I will present as illustration are in the public domain.

I am going to discuss the record of this administration with respect to the conduct of the independent agencies of Government during the past few years. My indictment is a harsh one, for I believe that never since 1887 when the oldest of the independent agencies now existing, the Interstate Commerce Commission, was created by the Congress has there been such a deliberate effort to make those agencies subservient to the demands of partisan objectives. I believe that never before has there been a studied usurpation of their powers, a deliberate erosion of their integrity, and a calculated sabotage of the purposes for which they were created.

For this the President of the United States must accept responsibility, for this attempted prostitution of the Independent Agencies has been undertaken by his personal secretariat as they have seized for their domain responsibilities deliberately assigned by Congrss to other officials, responsibilities never intended to be discharged from the Executive Offices at all. This illicit transfer to the Office of the President of the power to decide issues intended by the Congress to be determined elsewhere has achieved a centralization of authority without accountability wholly foreign to the traditions of democratic institutions, and alien to the spirit in which the independent agencies were created by the Congress.

The unauthorized transfer of power has not been openly attempted. It is not acknowledged, although the record is plain, nor is its significance fully understood. But the transfer has been made, and the schemes of irresponsible cabals in secret have been substituted for the planning of responsible officials. With arrogance and with contempt the will of Congress has been defied as the Bureau of the Budget and the secretariat of the White House have undertaken to control, to manage, to subvert the purposes and to corrupt the administration of the independent agencies of the Federal Government.

This is not forthright government. Honest government is not achieved by the simple assembling of eminent men to play on a so-called "team." Honest government is achieved by faithful execution of the laws enacted by the Congress. When Congress created independent agencies it intended that they should be independent, in fact as well as name. Congress did not intend those agencies to become subordinate divisions of the Bureau of the Budget nor the organization at the White House. These agencies, usually headed by boards or commissions, were set apart from the old-line departments of the executive establishment deliberately. Their isolation was intended to shelter them from the pressures of partisan politics. The bills of divorcement were not accidentally contrived. In each case the nature of their responsibilities was such that in the judgment of the Congress it appeared to be essential that these specific agencies should be insulated from the shifts in partisan fortunes reflected in the quadrennial elections. The statutes creating the major independent agencies are not alike. Nor is there necessarily any similarity in the tasks assigned to them. Some, like the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, perform regulatory, quasi-judicial, or quasi-legislative functions. Others, like TVA and AEC, are distinguished by great managerial responsibilities.

Some of the boards and commissions were given long and staggered terms by statute to assure that continuity in program and policy would be unaffected by changes in administration. By statute some boards and commissions are bipartisan. Others are nonpartisan, nonpolitical in composition. The arrangements and the safeguards differ, but in each case the purpose of the Congress was the same. These great independent agencies were intended to be kept out of politics, to discharge the jobs entrusted to them on the basis of law and fact, in fairness to the people their responsibilities affect. That was the clear intention of the Congress, an intention deliberately ignored by this administration. Today we find the independent agencies of Government whirling at the partisan center of Government, the White House, not moving calmly on the political periphery as Congress intended, and as their responsibilities require. We find the men appointed to administer their affairs subservient to the politicians in the Bureau of the Budget and the White House, the almost faceless secretariat who undertake to run the Government in the name of the President of the United States.

This is something new in Federal administration. It is a total change in climate. Only 10 years ago the Atomic Energy Commission was created. The awesome nature of the tasks before it made it clear that its decisions should be unaffected by partisan considerations, and the confidence of the public required evidence of its total separation from political pressure. The requirement was so self-evident that, to the best of my recollection, it caused no particular comment that a Democratic President appointed to the first Commission four Republicans and one man described as an Independent. No Democrat was chosen. No one commented on the political significance of his selections. There was no political significance.

The first Commission was composed of Lilienthal (then an Independent in politics; in 1952 announced his affiliation with the Democratic Party); Strauss, Republican; Pike, Republican; Waymack, Republican; Bacher, Republican (Dr. Bacher was a scientist; his political affiliation is not given in Who's Who; it is stated by his friends that he is a registered Republican).

Those five Commissioners were expected to act not as Republicans, or Democrats, or political independents, but as public servants invested with specific responsibilities under their statute. They were not members of a partisan team. All that is changed. Today it is not rare, it is commonplace in fact, for the press to refer to the AEC Commissioners by partisan tags, to identify the opinions, and the testimony, of Commissioner Murray, for example, as those of the sole Democratic holdover remaining in office, and the Chairman of the Commission is most celebrated for the end runs he attempts on the partisan team of which he is a member. Today the heads of all the independent nonpolitical agencies of Government are expected to be members of a political team, and the plays

are called by the Bureau of the Budget in the Office of the President.

Now the Bureau of the Budget has important functions to perform, legitimate functions that are essential to the administration of the Executive Establishment. But no where among its duties can be found the responsibility of managing the independent agencies of Government. Yet that is precisely what the Bureau has undertaken to accomplish under the present administration. That is exactly what was attempted in the case of Dixon-Yates. The illicit exercise of power was the source of the corruption, now acknowledged. There would have been no scandal at all, if at the very beginning the will of Congress had been recognized, if each agency concerned had performed the functions assigned to it by statute, if accountable officials had made the decisions, and the Bureau of the Budget had been restrained in its calculated program of usurpation.

In that one episode—the affair of Dixon-Yates—we can see what has happened to some of our independent agencies of Government during the past 3 years. In that one episode we can see what happens when the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of the President usurp authority, defy the statutes adopted by the Congress, and endeavor to marshal the independent agencies of Government in support of the narrow partisan objective they asume to be desired by the Chief Executive. In that one episode we can observe the methods employed, the devices used. From the history of that one episode we can appraise the understanding or attitude of the President with respect to the place and function of independent agencies in the Executive Establishment, his comprehension of their statutes and traditions, his concern for their integrity. In that episode with its lengthy public record we are free to judge the ethical standards, the probity, and the wisdom of his advisers. From that one episode the people can consider just how much of the routine of Government safely can be delegated to his subordinates by the President of the United States, just how much compliance with the acts of Congress he has demanded of his agents as they discharge his delegated duties.

Let me make clear that I do not rise to say "we told you so." I am not going to discuss the "Answer of the United States" filed in response to the claim for damages asserted by the private power combine as a consequence of the order of the President that the contract I am discussing should be canceled. Suits for breach of promise are somewhat foreign to my experience. In this, as in other cases, the courts must determine the degree of injury, if any, sustained by castoff favorites. I am concerned with a question of public morality, of administrative probity. I am using Dixon-Yates as a case study of what happens when men attempt to pervert the statutes enacted by the Congress. I am using Dixon-Yates to show what happens when the Bureau of the Budget, and the Office of the President, usurp responsibilities for which other men are accountable under the law. I am using it to show what happens when political considerations are permitted to abrogate statutory obligations, and I am using it to demonstrate how little the actions of his subordinates have reflected the public statements of the President, how long such statements have been used to conceal wrong doing.

So far as the public was concerned, I suppose, the story of Dixon-Yates began on June 17, 1954. Then the President of the United States, clothed in his constitutional powers as head of the executive establishment, advised by his Attorney General, ordered the AEC, over the objections of a majority of the Commission, to contract with Dixon-Yates to provide a supply of power to deliver to TVA primarily for sale by TVA to the city of Memphis. But there was a story behind the story, and that tale began in early November of 1952 when the State I have the honor in part to represent, the region, and the Nation, read the promise of a candidate who said:

"If I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency."

What private commitments had been made on his behalf I do not know. What conflicts arose between public and private assurances, I am not aware, but it was early apparent that the President of the United States regarded the future of TVA as a troublesome problem about which he preferred to remain uninformed. The continuity of its efficiency was one of the routine problems delegated to his staff. It is a matter of record that he never conferred with members of the Board of TVA to get the facts. Under the new concept of administration, the President, elected by the people, responsible to them for the execution of the laws enacted by their representatives in Congress, made an exception of those statutes administered by "holdovers." Responsibility for the nonpolitical, nonpartisan agencies of Government was delegated to the politicians, and the men who decide who will see the President failed to recognize that the members of the Board of TVA were not holdovers by chance or political ineptitude, but by deliberate design, because the Congress planned it that way. Their terms of statutory length were specifically intended to provide a new administration with the advantage of advice based on knowledge of the problem of the law, of the facts. The men selected by the President to manage his time refused to recognize that holdovers were simply officials accountable under the law. They were not hostile politicians, nor were they saboteurs. They were men of honor, administering the laws adopted by the Congress. Throughout the Government they were ignored, as the politicians took over the area marked "nonpolitical" by the Congress.

In the case of TVA the responsibility for management appears to have been delegated by the President to Mr. Joseph Dodge, a banker of Detroit, then Director of the Budget. He passed the test of party regularity no doubt, and the more exacting standard of personal compatibility. The weakness of the delegation lay in the fact that Mr. Dodge knew nothing whatsoever about the problem, that he had never taken the special oath required by Congress for that particular job. The rules of the team to which Mr. Dodge was appointed prevented him from consultation with the responsible officials, but happily for his peace of mind he had connections in the world of finance, and there was made available to him "for the payment of expenses only" the services of one Adolph Wenzell, a vice president of First Boston Corp., well known as a private utility financing house, and Mr. Wenzell was secretly established at the Bureau of the Budget to plan the future of TVA, to determine, we are asked to suppose, how the promise of the candidate that "if I am elected President, TVA will be operated and maintained at maximum efficiency," would be honored by the Chief Executive of the Nation. Mr. Wenzell conferred, but not with TVA. There were rounds of conferences and consultations about the future of TVA, consultations with AEC and FPC, with private utility magnates who had fought the TVA for over 20 years. There were no consultations with the men who were charged under the law with responsibility for the agency's management, none with the men who were sworn to uphold the act as it was adopted by the Congress.

And slowly out of all the secret meetings Dixon-Yates was born. With that act the illegal transfer of power was clear. The Bureau of the Budget in the Office of the President had seized in secret the responsibility given by statute to the Board of TVA. With that act, the intention of the Bureau of the Budget under this administration was crystal clear. The Bureau was prepared to nullify the acts of Congress which have created independent agencies of government. The Bureau had assumed control, and in secret from a central point the independent agencies of government were expected to be run. The destruction of one independent agency, TVA, was the objective the team was first required to take, and as it developed one of the consequences was the surrender of the integrity of other independent agencies as their chairmen were ordered into play. The Chairman of the AEC, Admiral Strauss, was on the team. He overrode the objections of a majority of the Commission he heads to play a leading part. The newly appointed Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Kuykendall, was assigned a position. The Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission won his letter, and the Attorney General of the United States gave his nod of approval to the assault on TVA. The team was solid, well-trained and coached. Each man was in position behind the then Director of the Budget, Mr. Rowland Hughes, who had succeeded Mr. Dodge, when, on June 15, 1954, Mr. Hughes recommended to the President of the United States that he should assert his constitutional powers as head of the Government and order the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into a contract with Dixon-Yates.

It was Mr. Hughes who had piloted the negotiations to this conclusion. It was Mr. Hughes who deceived the President about the facts in the situation, but there is no record that the President subjected him to serious questioning, and we can assume the Director of the Budget thought he was responding to the President's desires. There is no record in the whole affair to indicate that the President made a searching examination of the facts. There is no suggestion that he was aware, or that he cared if he understood about this gross invasion by one independent agency of the jurisdiction of another. Mr. Hughes may have realized, in small degree, the vulnerability of the arrangement he proposed. Adroitly he inserted a concluding sentence in his memorandum, a sentence intended to insulate the President against the doubts which might be stimulated by public discussion of the contract so secretly negotiated.

He wrote in this final sentence of his memorandum to the President:

"Hearings are scheduled for the very near future in the Congress, at which Admiral Strauss and his staff will explain the terms of the proposal prior to actually entering into the contract. These hearings, if held, will undoubtedly bring out further orations about the TVA."

Well, Mr. Hughes was right. There was some oratory. In the hearing room and in this Chamber the illegality and the unwisdom of the contract was debated at considerable length. But Mr. Hughes was correct in the judgment about the effect on the President. The oratory which he had taken pains to discount in advance had no influence at the White House, and during the debate a deluge of misinformation about the TVA, a barrage of vicious attack, flowed in a steady stream to the Senate from the Bureau of the Budget, and from AEC. The "team" was hard at work, its confidence unshaken.

Our arguments were ineffective here, the Congress adjourned, and plans for Dixon-Yates went forward at the White House, at the Atomic Energy Commission, in the Securities and Exchange Commission, all coordinated under the watchful eye of the Director of the Budget. Plans went forward, but problems multiplied too.

By mid-August the President felt obliged to advise the press that the entire record

of the Dixon-Yates negotiations would be made public. He appeared to believe that such a promise of "full disclosure" would give the people confidence in the probity of the whole proceeding, a confidence somewhat shaken by that time. Partial and selected disclosure was considered adequate by his subordinates, however, and the record shows that the public promise of the President was not respected by the subordinates to whom he delegated performance. Months later it was discovered that on order from the Bureau of the Budget, the name of Wenzell had been stricken from the chronologies of events made public. The President had spoken to the people to reassure them. But the Bureau of the Budget had spoken to AEC. In August, of coure, no one outside the "team" knew there was this significant deletion. No one could contrast the public statement of the President with the private performance of his aides. No one but members of the team knew about Mr. Wenzell, and they were silent. His function as the architect of TVA's destruction was a secret within the inner circle. His participation in Dixon-Yates was hidden.

In August of 1954 little was known of the steps by which the President had been led to make this calamitous decision. The partial record released in response to the direction of the President outlined only a part of the history. Before the whole story was revealed there had to be hearings before committees of the Congress, repetitive and wearying, as official after official refused to answer questions on the grounds of his confidential relation to the White House. There had to be hearings before the SEC on questions raised by the State of Tennessee and the distributors having contracts to purchase power from TVA. Long and tedious sessions were endured before the facts were developed. If the controversy was reported to the President, we may assume that the legal issues raised, the discussion of equities involved, the questions of probity presented were all explained away as the "oratory" so sagely predicted by the infallible Mr. Hughes.

But the slow disclosure of the truth was underway, and at length the name of Wenzell was added to the lengthening roster of personnel involved in Dixon-Yates. The public first heard of Mr. Wenzell, long of First Boston and late of the Bureau of the Budget, when on February 18, 1955, a Senator rose in his place in this Chamber. The distinguished senior Senator from Alabama, Mr. HILL, first brought to the attention of the Congress and the public notice of Mr. Wenzell's participation in the affair. The Senator corresponded with Mr. Hughes about it in an effort to get the facts, and his later testimony revealed that the Director of the Budget had discussed the matter with the President and that he had advised the Chief Executive that the charges of the Senator from Alabama were not based on fact. They were probably described by Mr. Hughes as more "TVA oratory" for the President to ignore.

The explanation of the presence of Mr. Wenzell offered to the Senator from Alabama by Mr. Hughes underestimated the sagacity and the knowledge of his inquirer. Mr. Hughes advanced the peculiar explanation that Mr. Wenzell had been employed as a consultant by Mr. Dodge to study TVA's methods of cost allocation and accounting. That was all. Now the Senator from Alabama knew, if Mr. Hughes and Mr. Dodge did not, that a study of TVA's accounting procedures did not require the importation of an investment banker from New York. He knew that under the law TVA's power accounts are kept according to standards prescribed for utilities by the Federal Power Commission, that they are subject to annual audit by the General Accounting Office, and that they have been widely praised by persons not necessarily fully approving of the program entrusted to TVA by the Congress to manage. The recent Director of Internal Revenue, T. Coleman Andrews, for example, testified before a committee of the Congress when as a member of the General Accounting Office staff he was in charge of TVA's annual audit. He said:

"TVA probably has the finest accounting system in the entire Government and probably one of the best accounting systems in the entire world. It is an excellent system. There is no private enterprise in this country that has any better."

This devious explanation for the presence of Mr. Wenzell in the Bureau of the Budget was not good enough for the Senator from Alabama. It was not good enough for the senior Senator from Tennessee, who later summoned the banker to testify before the Committee over which he presided, and before whom the outline of the story was finally revealed. It was not good enough for any one with an inquiring mind, or a reasonable fund of relevant information.

It was good enough for the President of the United States, however, although it was indicated in correspondence between Mr. Dodge and Mr. Wenzell, later presented to the Senate committee, that the President had known about the presence of Mr. Wenzell in the Bureau, that he had read and commended his written report. If he had in fact read the lengthy document, he knew that it was no report of accounting matters. It was a charter of dismemberment for TVA. But the explanation given by Mr. Hughes to the Senator from Alabama was repeated by the President 4 months later. And even later when general understanding of the role of Mr. Wenzell was fairly clear, a record of a conference with the press reveals this final reference to Mr. Wenzell:

"Question. Mr. President, on the basis of what you have been told about the role of Adolphe Wenzell in this Dixon-Yates contract, do you regard that role as proper?

"Answer. Indeed, yes." (From the President's press conference, July 6, 1955. New York Times, July 7, 1955.)

Apparently the President had not been told enough about the activities of his subordinate to form a reasoned judgment, and he was too complacent and indifferent to find out for himself.

It is true that the President was deceived by his advisers, but it is just as true that the deception was easy to acomplish because he was so ill-informed and indifferent to the basic problems. If the basic issue had been recognized he would never have suffered the humiliating consequences he must now endure. He would never have so belatedly discovered that the contract he personally ordered in his capacity as head of the Government was conceived in fraud, that it was illegal in execution, and that its real objectives were concealed. He would never have intervened as he did, with a personal letter to "Dear Stub", the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to demand a "waiver" of the statutory period for consideration, a "waiver" that the Department of Justice of the United States now admits the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy could not legally grant. He would never have signed a letter incorporating in its text the long familiar contentions of the private power lobby, which has for more than 20 years tried to nullify the acts of Congress creating TVA. If the President had understood the issue he would never have presented Mr. Wenzell to the public in the guise of a consultant employed in connection with a study of bookkeeping problems. He would not have told the public that the banker's role was "proper." If the President had understood the issue he would not have permitted the grave questions raised by responsible officials to be dismissed as "oratory" by his aids.

It is true, as I have said, that the President was misled by the advisers he had selected. It is true that at the time they presented a united front. In July of 1954 the President told the people through the press that the Attorney General had advised him of his right to order AEC to enter into the contract over the objection of a majority of the Commission. In October the records of his conferences disclose the limitations of his information but he assured the public that the Federal Power Commmission considered Dixon-Yates a proper contract, and further, as justification for his decision, the President remarked that the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission "was at the focal point of making this contract," and added that he "couldn't think of any man in Government whom he trusts more as to his integrity, his commonsense and his business acumen."

This is an extraordinary concept of the responsibility of the President, who was willing to substitute the "commonsense and business acumen" of Admiral Strauss for the provisions of statutes enacted by the Congress. The President should have been aware, if Admiral Strauss was not, that his good opinion of the admiral's "business acumen" endowed the latter with no right to use the prestige of the great agency he heads to promote the scheme hatched in the Bureau of the Budget to destroy the TVA. The President should have been aware of that.

The power of the President to decide is a solemn power. It is a lonely grant of authority. And when the power is exercised without concern to know the facts, or without the will to understand the issues, then the power to decide is a frightening responsibility. The basic question in Dixon-Yates was not the propriety of a specific contract. That was collateral. The basic issue was a question of administration integrity, not the provisions of an agreement. The basic question raised related to the faithful execution of statutes enacted by the Congress, execution based on understanding of the statutes' purposes. The President of the United States should have known then that by these recommendations the Director of the Budget was usurping responosibilities assigned by Congress to other and accountable officials. The President should have known then what the Department of Justice now admits, that the contract proposed for AEC to sign was not within the subject matter assigned to AEC by Congress.

This secret and illicit assumption of power by the Office of the President is at the heart of the scandal of Dixon-Yates. The President failed to understand that the independent agencies of Government, the nonpolitical boards and commissions, are not to be managed from the White House or the Bureau of the Budget. He has failed to comprehend that it is essential for them to remain outside the arena where partisan issues are fought. If he had made this clear to his aides there would have been no problem. There would have been no "team" play required. The head of the Securities and Exchange Commission would never have been ordered by Mr. Sherman Adams, sometimes described as Deputy President of the United States, to adjourn a hearing so that the testimony of Mr. Wenzell might be postponed lest his statements influence action pending in the Congress. The whole shameful corrupting business could have been avoided if the President had understood and accepted the acts of Congress which require a special place in the executive establishment for the agencies which report to him, to the Congress, and to the people, as independent agencies of Government.

It is time for the Congress to speak up about this disturbing development. The court will determine the equity of the claim advanced by Dixon and Yates. The President must decide what to do about his faithless advisers. The Congress itself must speak out in defense of the integrity of

these agencies it has created. They are captive now to politicians, through control by the Bureau of the Budget. This is a matter of equal concern to both sides of the aisle. It is as important to Republicans as to Democrats that probity of administration be guaranteed in the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the TVA, AEC, and all the others. It is a responsibility of the office of the President to preserve their independence, to protect them from political invasion, to shield them from the special interests who would destroy or corrupt them. It is as important to one party as another to know that the men who decide are the men who are accountable under the statutes they administer, that they are not subject to manipulation by the Bureau of the Budget, nor the Assistant to the President.

The Congress cannot delegate its responsibilities to speak, to protest, the responsimility of its Members to interpret the record for the people.

Coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the New York Times dated July 18, 1956, from J. Harvie Williams, on the subject of the coalition of the Southern Democrats and Republicans.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN DEMOCRATS' ROLE—EFFECTIVE COALITION WITH REPUBLICANS CONSIDERED POSSIBLE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your discussion of the political problem of Southern Democrats on July 17, under the title of "No 'Secession,' But—," you say: "The South, as represented by its leading political figures, is watchful, worried and suspicious lest the segregation issue be pointed up so sharply at the convention that comprise becomes impossible. But it doesn't want to leave the party, if for no other reason than it has nowhere else tc go.'

Gov. Allan Shivers, of Texas, does not agree with you that the South "has nowhere else to go." Discussing this point in his recent speech at the National Press Club here, Governor Shivers observed that the Democratic dilemma "arises from the presence in the party of individuals and factions who are poles apart in their political philosophies"; that the "Democratic blanket has been stretched to the tearing point in an attempt to cover such strange bedfellows as, for example, Harry Byrd and Walter Reuther." He then noted that Reuther's solution for the dilemma is "to turn the southern branch out of the party and go ahead with business as usual at the northern and eastern stands."

Granting, without agreeing that Reuther might be right in presidential elections, Governor Shivers raised the question of what would happen in Congress to the 22 Senators and 106 House Members from 11 Southern States. "Would they," he asked, "be lost souls, wandering in the limbo of Capitol Hill, or would they be expected to join up with the Republicans—thus formalizing and making more or less permanent an unofficial but effective coalition that has often functioned in the past?"

OFFICIAL MAJORITIES

Later, in response to a question, Governor Shivers pointed out that southern Democrats and Republicans could vote together to organize the Senate and House of Representatives and thus make themselves the official majorities of the Congress, inasmuch as the rules of the two Houses speak only of the "majority" and the "minority" rather than of "Democrats" and "Republicans."

This possibility raises the question of whether the Republicans would prefer to be in the majorities of the Houses of Congress occasionally (twice in th last 13 Congresses) or continuously in the lifetime of the present members. For the addition of at least 16 seats in the Senate and 80-odd in the House would give a "Republican-southern Democrat majority" a long-time control of the Congress.

Of course, in any such new majority arrangement the seniorities of its members on committees would be continued and merged. Thus the senior committee members, whether Republican or southern Democrat, would be committee chairmen.

This formula, implied by Governor Shivers, would maintain a strong position in Congress for the southern Democrats and strengthen the Republicans from the North.

Indeed, the southern Democrats do have somewhere else to go.

J. HARVIE WILLIAMS.
WASHINGTON, *July 18, 1956.*

For Aid With Strings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Leader for January 9, 1956:

FOR AID WITH STRINGS
(By Peter Meyer)

The diplomatic struggle between the free and Communist worlds has been marked in recent months by several highly paradoxial developments.

Take the repercussions which the recent Geneva Foreign Ministers' Conference has had in Germany: At Geneva, the Western Powers acted as champions of Germany's basic national interests. They demanded German unity. The Soviet Union refused to allow it. They fought for the right of a united Germany to decide by free elections whether to ally itself with the West or the East, or remain neutral. The Soviet Union denied the German people this elementary freedom. The Western Powers came to Geneva supporting the basic goals of the German nation: Unification and self-determination. The Communists came as blackmailers; they showed clearly that they would allow German unity only on terms which would condemn Germany to the fate of Czechoslovakia.

One would expect this to enhance the West's prestige and influence in Germany and destroy that of the Soviet Union. Yet, the opposite seems to be true. Never was there so much talk that Germany must negotiate independently with Moscow and make a deal behind her allies' backs. The Social Democrats are ready to give in to Soviet blackmail to the point of dropping the NATO alliance. Western chancelleries are trembling lest the Government parties follow this lead if something should happen to Chancellor Adenauer.

Take another example: The United States and all the democratic powers supported Japan's membership in the United Nations. The Soviet Union vetoed it. One would expect an outburst of indignation against the Kremlin in Japan. But, instead, the Japanese Socialists propose a resolution in Parliament blaming * * * the United States. At the same time, correspondents report that the whole affair may strengthen Soviet influence in Japan and that the latter may have to yield to Soviet blackmail in the current peace-treaty negotiations.

Thus, the champions of German and Japanese interests are punished and their enemies rewarded. And nobody seems surprised.

Why is this so? Obviously, neither the Germans nor the Japanese have any great love for Russia or the Soviet system. They are merely being "realistic." If they want something from the Soviet Union, even such an elementary right as national unity or representation in the United Nations, they have to pay for it, pay an immense price. On the other hand, if they want something from the United States, even something like economic and financial support which is not theirs by right, they can rely on a loud chorus demanding that such support be given "with no strings attached."

This article seeks to make two points: First, in the worldwide struggle against totalitarian tyranny, America must be prepared to give liberal aid to her friends in this struggle, without pinching pennies or extracting economic privileges for herself. Second, giving economic help to our enemies or their supporters is stupid, irresponsible and immoral.

Every nation in the world has the right to self-determination and to freedom from foreign rule and oppression. We should support this right equally as regards Indo-China, Tunisia and Morocco, or East Germany, Czechoslovakia, the Ukraine and Uzbekistan, or Goa and Kashmir. Every nation also has the right to decide freely how to organize its economic life and utilize its natural resources; so long as the decision is arrived at in a democratic way, we have to respect it.

But may we not modestly claim the same right for the people of the United States? This Nation does not live by exploiting colonies, and its income is essentially derived from its own resources and its own work. It has the right to decide how much of its wealth to give to whom and on what conditions. Unquestionably, we have a moral obligation to share some of our wealth with the unfortunate inhabitants of underdeveloped countries. But that obligation is matched by the no less forceful moral obligation of all who are free from totalitarian tyranny to defend freedom that it may not perish from the earth.

If India falls into Communist hands, the Indians will suffer and so will we. If America succumbs to Soviet power because of the betrayal of neutralists all over the world, the "neutral" countries will be quickly enslaved. Thus, the moral obligation is mutual. If a non-Communist government wants to barter the common interests of freedom for some economic favors from Khrushchev and Bulganin, or for their support in attacking another free country, America's answer should be: Not with our money, gentlemen. Such a government should not get a penny of United States aid.

One can, of course, argue that the right to self-determination includes the right to national suicide. But surely we are not obliged to cooperate in such a suicide. We must warn against, offer our help if the suicidal policy is reversed, and withhold it, openly and clearly, if it is pursued. If the

Afghan Government wants to put its neck in the Soviet noose in return for Soviet aid in its drive against Pakistan, let us tell them to beware. If the rulers of Egypt want to use Soviet arms to start an aggressive war in the Middle East, let us not force our economic and military aid on them. The High Dam at Aswan is a meritorious enterprise and should be supported—on condition that Egypt stops flirting with the Soviets.

We must pay no heed to the threat that refusing to help will push the wavering governments deeper into the Soviet camp. What we are dealing with here is blackmail, and it never pays to give in to the blackmailer—it only increases his appetite. America does not have to fear competition between Soviet and American economic aid. If we really resolve to help our friends without penny-pinching, we need not fear a comparison of the countries helped by us with those "helped" by the Kremlin.

George F. Kennan was right when he wrote, in Realities of American Foreign Policy, that favors habitually granted or unduly prolonged cease in time to be regarded by the recipients as favors and come to be regarded as rights. Then, of course, withdrawal of the favor becomes an injury to be resented even though the recipient may have had no actual right to the favor in the first place. Kennan went on to say that the policy of aid cannot be effective unless people feel that, while our favor is a possibility offering certain advantages to them, our disfavor is also a tangible possibility attended by certain disadvantages.

For decades the American Federation of Labor had the slogan, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," and no liberal ever found anything wrong with this commonsense maxim. But apply it to international policies, and the same people will tell you that the right policy is to offer the left cheek to every blackmailer who has just slapped your right one.

Proclaiming the principle of "no strings attached" only opens American policy to the reproach of hypocrisy. Since the need for help is immense and the means limited, America's enemies everywhere will claim that their country did not get enough, while another nation, more friendly to American policy, got more than it deserved. Even if the United States poured billions into India, the pro-Soviet intelligentsia would never stop complaining that the Pakistanis, who are ready to defend the subcontinent against Soviet invasion, received more help than the Indians, who do everything in their power to sabotage collective defense and to deliver Formosa and Vietnam to Communist slavery. So, why not say clearly: Our help goes first to those governments which, in their own interests as well as those of other free nations, are ready to participate in common defense?

The only possible objection is that peoples should not be made to suffer for the policies of their governments. Philanthropic aid to the population of nonfriendly countries should not be excluded, provided it is distributed to the needy and under such controls that it cannot be misused by the governments (as UNRRA supplies often were in Communist-ruled countries). United States agricultural surpluses could certainly be used to great benefit in many places.

But many countries are in need of industrialization, electrification, mechanization of agriculture, greater efficiency in public administration, and consolidation of their armed forces. The resources are limted, and one must make a choice. South Korea, Vietnam, Pakistan, and Turkey have no less need of the benefits of civilization than countries whose leaders consider it the height of statesmanship to serve as impresarios for the Khrushchev-Bulganin circus.

If we cannot help everybody and must make a choice, let us establish an order of priorities. Those who are able and willing to participate in the common defense against totalitarian tyranny should certainly have first priority. Nations with democratic institutions which combine traditional neutrality with a firm resolution to defend themselves against attack—like Sweden or Switzerland—should be given help if they need it.

But governments which side with the totalitarians and help them, politically and diplomatically, to enslave other parts of the free world certainly cannot expect to receive American aid with no strings attached. The United States Government should greatly increase the scope of its foreign economic aid. But it should be used to drive home the point that it pays to defend freedom and does not pay to betray it.

Life of Stephen Benton Elkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a book review by Mr. Brooks Cottle, editor, Morgantown Post, of Morgantown, W. Va. This review by Editor Cottle is of a book about the life of one of our former illustrious colleagues, Senator Stephen Benton Elkins, of West Virginia.

Senator Elkins was a truly distinguished Member of the United States Senate from 1895 to the year of 1911. The author of the book referred to, Dr. Oscar Doane Lambert, has said of him:

His vision, like a great stream, pushed far ahead of his time, carrying with it his recommendations for a national department of labor, with a secretary of cabinet rank, purity of foods guaranteed by law, severe restrictions on child labor, legal regulation of corporations.

Stephen Benton Elkins was descended of Virginia pioneers who migrated to the wild Ohio Valley and he was named for Senator Tom Benton, who duelled Andrew Jackson to a draw. He belonged to the age of Kit Carson, Wild Bill Hickok, and John J. Fremont, the days of the Oregon Trail and the California gold rush.

Lawyer, teacher, politician, railroad builder, statesman, industrial pioneer, he founded and named an important West Virginia industrial town. He was Secretary of War under President Harrison and a United States Senator.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Morgantown Post of March 1, 1956]

A LONG DELAYED BIOGRAPHY—LIFE OF STEPHEN BENTON ELKINS IS TOLD IN DR. LAMBERT'S BOOK

Not until nearly a half century after his death have the people of West Virginia had an opportunity to become fully familiar with the life and career of the most powerful political figure ever to serve the Nation in their name. This need is met today with the publication by the University of Pittsburgh Press of Dr. Oscar Doane Lambert's biography of "Stephen Benton Elkins, American Foursquare" (336 pages).

Having had for many years a special interest in the life of Senator Elkins, Dr. Lambert decided to write this biography following the acquisition of the Stephen B. Elkins Papers by the University Library. These papers are described as "a gold mine of information, containing letters from seven different Presidents of the United States, industrialists, politicians, and foreign diplomats, speeches, and a raft of newspaper clippings from 1870 to 1911."

Coincidentally, the University Library also acquired the private papers of numerous other West Virginians whose careers were contemporaneous with that of Senator Elkins. These included the papers of Henry G. Davis, Alston G. Dayton, William E. Glasscock, Nathan Goff, Ira S. Robinson, and Albert B. White.

With his fertile source material at his elbow, Dr. Lambert began a study of Senator Elkins which led him to many other sources of material and which has enabled him to present a remarkably detailed account of a life that was lived between 1841 and 1911.

For those to whom Stephen B. Elkins is only a name, vaguely suggesting Republican politics and West Virginia coal development, a brief statement of the man may be helpful by way of introduction.

Born in Perry County, Ohio, in 1841, Mr. Elkins grew up in Missouri where his family moved when he was 3 years old. During the Civil War, he went to the territory of New Mexico and began the practice of law. Almost immediately he was elected a member of the territorial legislature, then served from 1867 to 1873 as territorial district attorney, and from 1873 to 1877 was the territorial representative of New Mexico in Congress.

In 1877, while still retaining his legal residence in New Mexico, he began the practice of law in Washington, D. C., and the following year moved to New York City.

While he had become interested in West Virginia in 1875 when he married the daughter of Senator Henry Gassaway Davis, he did not transfer his legal residence to this State until 1888.

He served a little more than a year (from December 1891, to March 1893) as Secretary of War in President Harrison's Cabinet. In 1895 he was elected United States Senator and continued to hold his seat until his death in 1911. Such are the barest surface facts of his career.

The first impression gained from Dr. Lambert's biography is that Mr. Elkins had a remarkable talent for making money. Although without any formal training in the law, he began the practice of this profession at the age of 22 in the sparsely settled Southwest where his chief initial asset was a quickly acquired ability to speak broken Spanish. Within 2 years he had saved $9,000, and before he had reached the age of 30 he had an annual income of $17,000, including a retainer of $7,000 a year from 1 client. This high earning power was attributed chiefly to Mr. Elkin's expertness in dealing with questionable and confused land titles in the territory. Indeed, it was not long before he held nearly 2 million acres of land in his own name.

But the law was only a minor source of the fortune which Mr. Elkins quickly began to accumulate. For $50,000 of borrowed money, he acquired control of a bank in the process of organization and became its president. Within 2 years, his bank earnings enabled him to pay off the $50,000, and during the period of his control the bank never paid less than 20 percent dividends.

Later when his marriage into the Davis family brought him into contact with the possibilities of coal and railroad developments in West Virginia, Mr. Elkins seemed to have the golden touch in directing those investments which produced the maximum returns. This was true although after the

first few years in New Mexico he appears to have devoted a relatively small percentage of his time to his investments.

Curiously enough, though Dr. Lambert gives precise figures on the size of Mr. Elkins' estates at various stages during his early career, no mention is made of the size of the fortune he left at his death.

The second impression to be gained from this biography is that Mr. Elkins possessed a similar magical touch in acquiring and exercising political influence. As early as 1874, only a legislative accident prevented his pulling off the grand coup of having New Mexico admitted to statehood. He became a member of the Republican executive committee as early as 1875 and served as national chairman in 1884. He was a campaign leader for James G. Blaine in 1876, 1880, 1884, and 1888, and at the 1884 national convention he carried a letter from Blaine giving him "entire and absolute discretion to speak for me."

Had Blaine won the Presidency in 1884 when he was the Republican nominee, Mr. Elkins might have achieved even greater political eminence than he did. Thereafter, he never enjoyed quite the same authority in the national councils of the party that he had before. He supported Harrison for the nomination in 1888 and was a leader of the successful Republican campaign that year. But Harrison did not have quite the same feeling of gratitude that Blaine had always entertained. Mr. Elkins backed unsuccessful candidates for the Republican nomination in 1896, 1900, 1904, and 1908, and as a result was defeated in his hopes of being nominated for the Vice Presidency. Ironically enough, the Democrats in 1904 chose his father-in-law as their candidate for Vice President.

Early in the 1890's, Mr. Elkins decided his chief political objective would be to win election as United States Senator from West Virginia. He more conspicuously established his domicile in this State, though he never spent more than a small part of his time in actual residence at his home in Elkins. Working principally through lawyers he had retained in expanding his coal and railroad empire in West Virginia, he built up a potent political organization which resulted in his election in 1895 and his reelection in 1901 and 1907.

Dr. Lambert gives unusually detailed accounts of the national political activities of Senator Elkins after 1895, and particularly of the legislation he sponsored. Unfortunately for those whose interest is chiefly in the impact which Senator Elkins had on the economic development of West Virginia, the account of the way he and his father-in-law build up their industrial empire is much less detailed.

As early as 1901, Senator Elkins and his father-in-law had 90,000 acres of coal land in central West Virginia which they valued at $34.8 million. Later these holdings were greatly enlarged and diversified.

Civil Rights Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 627) to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the ideal of equality under law has always been a great and distinctive American goal.

This bill under consideration here, H. R. 627, the "Civil Rights Act of 1956," is designed to assist in the accomplishment of this great goal by strengthening the law-enforcement functions of the Federal Government in the entire area of civil rights.

There is no doubt that the more effective enforcement of rights already guaranteed by law will go far toward expanding freedom in the United States. On the one hand, this is done by providing an additional Assistant Attorney General in charge of a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. On the other hand, the Attorney General is armed by H. R. 627 with additional civil remedies to more effectively enforce certain civil rights. This is particularly true of the right to vote. Finally, a Commission on Civil Rights in the executive branch of the Government is created to determine the precise extent to which deprivation of civil rights is being suffered.

These measures were proposed to Congress in an executive communication dated April 9, 1956, from the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States. They had been previously proposed to Congress by President Truman in his message to Congress on civil rights on February 2, 1948.

The purpose of this legislation is clear. It is to make more certain that rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States will be enjoyed by all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

It is directed at no particular section of America. Certainly, no area of the country can claim achievement of full equality under law. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives recognizes its distinct duty to enact wise legislation which will guarantee that the words of promise spoken by the Constitution will be fulfilled in every corner of the Nation. It is also realized that American leadership of the free world is aided greatly by practical demonstrations of our historic commitment to the ideal of equality under law.

To shirk this high responsibility and leave the protection of Federal rights to State or local Governments would represent, at best, an unjust imposition of Federal duties on these overworked State and local law-enforcement officials and, at worst, dereliction of sworn duty to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Finally, to fail to take appropriate action to provide adequate tools for the protection of rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States would amount to gross faithlessness to the great American ideal of equality under law.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly believe that an examination of the provisions of this proposed civil rights measure will convince any fair-minded person that it is a moderate and reasonable bill designed to first preserve and then grant increasing protection of the fundamental civil rights of every American citizen of any description.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that any temporary passions, prejudices or partisanship will be put aside today in order that we may render an historical legislative accomplishment in our own national interest and also provide a legislative inspiration to all peoples everywhere on this blessed earth.

Automobile Franchises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following letter speaks volumes:

RITZ CENTRAL MOTORS, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., July 23, 1956.

The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Our Ford dealership at 5518 Lake Park Avenue, Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill., is being taken away from us.

We will lose our investment in leasehold improvements of $85,000, in shop equipment, wiring, exhausts, heating, etc., in the amount of $60,000; in furniture and fixtures and signs in the amount of $21,000; and in possible inventory loss of approximately $50,000. A grand total of $216,000.

We do not own the building in which our business is established. We are merely tenants, and as a result of condemnation we are forced to go out of business and we are faced with bankruptcy and a loss of well over $216,000 as well as the loss of 10 long, hard years devoted day and night in establishing whatever good-will exists.

One partner loses also 20 years of prior work in the same location as a garage operator.

Our business employs over 50 people with an annual payroll of $285,000. All of them will lose their jobs. Both my partner and I (we each own 50 percent of the stock in our corporation) have earned a living for our families through this Ford dealership. Now our means of livelihood is being taken away from us.

Perhaps a bit of background will give you further insight into the horror of what this means.

Prior to 1947, we, Mr. Morris Cohen, and the writer, Edward France, applied to the Ford Motor Co., for a Ford franchise. After 6 long months of waiting and praying we obtained their consent.

We both invested practically every cent we had in the world, money that had been slowly saved over many prior years, in order to get our business started. Over the period of these last 9 years we both worked practically day and night and many times into the early mornings trying to build up a business that we felt had the possibilities of continuing for many years to come, one which would provide security for us even as we grew older. That security is now being taken away from us by Government condemnation without 1 cent of payment.

At the time that we obtained our franchise, we negotiated a 10-year lease with our present landlord. We agreed that we would make certain leasehold improvements and as a result received a reasonable rental. We since have put in many times the original amount committed.

Just a couple of years ago we were in new negotiations with our landlord for a 10-year extension of our lease. Everything was agreed upon and all that had to be done was

to sign the lease. The papers were drawn by our attorney and everything was all set. Then the news of the contemplated Hyde Park redevelopment came out. Our landlord, upon advice of his counsel, then refused us an extension.

Unfortunately there is no place in the immediate Hyde Park area to which we can move. We must, under the terms of our franchise with Ford, stay within a 1-mile radius, and there is no such place. With no place to move, and not enough money to move all of our equipment nor to remodel a different place if there were something else available, we have no alternative but to close up our business, just lock the door and walk away from it broke.

Of course we can hold a public auction to sell some things, but have you ever witnessed a distress auction? Valuable parts and equipment usually bring about 2 cents to 5 cents on the dollar. The bulk of our investment is attached to the building, some of which cannot be moved or would be too costly to move.

I cannot find words in the English language to describe this situation other than the word "horror."

When we have read in the papers, in the past, of certain foreign governments appropriating private businesses and "putting out on the streets," its owners, I am sure that we have all been horrified at this gross injustice. Nonetheless, here is a situation about which we have no one to whom we can raise our voices in complaint or askance.

Does this all seem fair? Can a business be completely destroyed and wiped out, its owners bankrupted, its employees discharged, with absolutely no consideration to its owners because they happen to be tenants rather than property owners?

Does it seem fair to ask men who have built up a valuable Ford business, who have invested their life's savings, who have undertaken certain personal obligations such as, among other things, purchasing homes for their families, who have worked 20 years of working hours in less than half that time, to walk away from their business—broke?

It is most amazing to know that practically every lawyer, every politician, and every layman who has heard of our problem, just won't believe it. They are all so certain that at least we will be partially reimbursed for something.

Would to God that this were so.

However, it merely means trying to start all over again after 20 long years of work and savings.

Is there no help for us or others like us, despite our large investment?

Please visualize for a moment our positions being reversed and this is happening to you or yours. After building, and working, and saving, and sweating, and worrying, everything is taken away from you, through no fault of yours, and you are left broke, with no one to talk to about it, because the "law is quite clear," it can take whatever you have because you happened to have been a tenant in your business as against being the owner of the building?

Need I say more?

My purpose in writing is to show that any contemplated Federal aid law certainly should provide some help to those who stand to lose large fortunes as well as small ones. We are given to understand that the current legislation being considered will assist businessmen up to the amount of $2,000. If this is correct, it certainly would represent a very fine gesture, but would not, even remotely, bring about the result for which it was originally intended, namely, to prevent businesses from sustaining such heavy losses, as is apparent in our particular case.

May we take this opportunity to thank you personally for every effort you have bent in order to rectify a most unjust situation, and may the good Lord smile upon you in your every activity.

Yours very truly,

RITZ CENTRAL MOTORS, INC.,
EDWARD FRANCE.
MORRIS COHEN.

P. S.—At this writing the newspapers have just announced that the pending legislation has been pigeonholed, which could mean no assistance whatsoever. Every day lost means that many more people will suffer terribly.

How Trade With Communist Countries Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Konrad Bercovici, on the curious distortion of Communist logic whereby down becomes up and bad becomes good:

FIGURES LIE
(By Konrad Bercovici)

At a Moscow trade conference participated in by delegates from all the satellite countries, a Russian economist told how the People's Republics could improve the trade relations between themselves.

"Here," he said, "is an example of how this can be done. It is a fact that Bulgaria produces bricks. Large quantities of the bricks should be exported to Poland which will give Bulgaria manufactured clothing in exchange."

The Bulgarian comrade started to applaud but the speaker stopped him and continued:

"Bulgaria, however, should not keep the clothing for herself but should export it to Czechoslovakia, in exchange for sewing machines manufactured by that sister republic."

The Bulgarian, thinking it was an excellent idea—that with those wonderful sewing machines his people could make the needed clothing themselves—started to applaud again only to be told by the comrade not to interrupt the speaker.

"As it happens, Comrade," the Russian continued "Hungary is in great need of Czech sewing machines. Therefore Bulgaria should export those machines to the sister republic and receive in exchange excellent Hungarian salami."

Anticipating the taste of that good salami, the Bulgarian delegate smacked his lips and forgetting the injunction of a few moments before, he really applauded.

"Will the Bulgarian delegate stop interrupting me?" the speaker shouted. "The salami should then be exported to the Soviet Union, which will send to Bulgaria an excellent quality of clay for brickmaking in exchange for the salami."

The import and export statistics published by the satellite countries enumerate large quantites of products not produced by the exporting countries. Many a Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian, Albanian delegate to Moscow trade conferences has learned by experience what it means to argue against this system of trade improvement. Those who had dared to disagree have found themselves denounced as Titoists, nationalists, bourgeois reactionaries, non-cooperatives, and accused of all the crimes in the jargon of communism.

Report of Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement on the report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

Copies of the report have been provided to the Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, the chairmen of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate, the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of both the House and Senate, and to the President of the United States.

In this connection, there is also included a copy of a letter from the President to Dr. James P. Baxter III, Chairman of the Board of Visitors.

The 1956 Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy and the letter indicated follows:

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, 1956

To the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives.

1. APPOINTMENT OF BOARD

The Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy was appointed in accordance with the provisions of sections 1055–1056 of title 10, United States Code. Pertinent extracts from the code are appended to this report, marked exhibit A.

2. PERSONNEL OF THE BOARD

The membership of the Board as constituted for the year 1956 was as follows:

Senators: RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; LISTER HILL, Alabama; WAYNE C. MORSE, Oregon; CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan.

Representatives: CARL T. DURHAM, North Carolina, representing CARL VINSON, Georgia, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa; EDWARD T. MILLER, Maryland.

Presidential appointees: Gen. Lucius DuB. Clay, chairman of the board, Continental Can Co., New York, N. Y.; Dr. John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.; Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Francis M. Dawson, dean of the College of Engineering, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa; Dr. James P. Baxter III, president, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.; Dr. John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Col. Charles J. Barrett, professor of foreign languages, United States Military Academy, was appointed Executive Secretary for the Board by the Superintendent, United States Military Academy.

3. PRELIMINARY DATA

In the summer of 1955 the Chief of Legislative Liaison, United States Army, consulted with Members of the Congress concerning suitability of dates for the annual visit. After consideration of all factors affecting the choice, the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy notified the members whose terms extended into 1956 that the period of February 2–4 had been desig-

nated for the visit. Announcement of those dates was sent to all new members as notification of their appointment was received.

The Superintendent likewise caused to be distributed to all members certain reports and informational material, and a suggested program for the visit. A list of the data furnished is appended as exhibit B.

4. CONVENING OF THE BOARD

Present for the annual visit were the following members: Mr. Kelley, Mr. Evins, Mr. Hoeven, General Clay, Dr. Dickey, Dr. Carmichael, Dr. Dawson, Dr. Baxter, Dr. Hannah.

Dr Baxter was unanimously elected Chairman of the Board of Visitors for 1956.

Illness and pressure of congressional business combined to prevent the attendance of Senator RUSSELL. Illness also caused the absence of Mr. DURHAM. Conflicting responsibilities made it impossible for Senators HILL, MORSE, and POTTER and for Mr. Miller to participate in the visit. The members of the Board actually in attendance were beset by similar conflicts and many of them were forced to arrive late or to depart early. All of them devoted the maximum available time to the inspections and deliberations of the Board.

Dr. Dickey was in attendance on the first day of the visit only and departed shortly thereafter for a 3-month mission in Europe. He therefore did not participate in the preparation of this report.

5. PROCEDURE

The program followed by the Board in its visit is appended hereto, marked exhibit C.

It is appropriate to note that the annual visit began with snow, rain, and icing conditions, and that the review which terminated the formal part of the visit was held in a snowstorm. Except for travel delays, the visit was not appreciably affected by the weather.

6. COMMENTS

(a) *Morale*

1. Cadets: The Board in all its contacts with cadets found evidence of excellent morale. Cadets are proud of the military academy, proud of its role in the history of our country, and proud of their part in maintaining the standards for which the military academy is known. The Board has been informed that the period after Christmas leave, and particularly that part of it which immediately follows the semiannual examinations, in a time of low spirits. If what the Board saw is low spirits, no concern need be felt for the morale of the corps of cadets.

2. Remainder of the command: The officers and enlisted men observed by the Board were alert, intelligent, and interested in their work. They seemed to be deeply aware of their part in accomplishing the mission of the military academy and to find their reward in realization of the importance of the tasks entrusted to them.

(b) *Discipline*

Problems of discipline appear to be effectively handled and high standards are being maintained.

(c) *Curriculum*

The Board realizes that the curriculum of the United States Military Academy is tailored to the mission of preparing its graduates for a single career; i. e., that of on officer in the military service of our country. The Board is, however, greatly interested in the extent of extracurricular endeavor, principally in the educational field, which is open to all cadets, particularly those who are intellectually gifted. Seminars in progress at present range from the commonplace problems of personal finance to the more abstruse matter of relatively. The Board also notes with approbation the widespread interest of the cadets in debating, which should bear dividends in effectiveness of expression and the ability to make a logical presentation.

(d) *Instruction*

1. Academic: The Board is pleased with the methods of instruction in use at the United States Military Academy, and particularly with the maintenance of small sections, in which individual work and participation are possible. To some extent this lessens the rigidity of the curriculum, permitting the more able students to penetrate more deeply into the subject matter while others accomplish only the minimum.

The Board was impressed with the caliber of the instructors it observed in the classrooms. They appeared not only to be thoroughly conversant with their subjects but also to possess those qualities which permit them to draw their students into discussion, thus permitting the latter to derive the benefits of active participation in group work.

2. Military: No actual tactical instruction was observed. The Board visited the instruction plant of the Combined Arms Detachment of the 1802d Special Regiment where it saw adequate and well-maintained equipment and talked with several instructors, particularly with noncommissioned officers who conduct the weapons training and the basic tactical training of the cadets. Training aids are up-to-date and embody many interesting features. It is believed that the military instruction is up to the standards of the military academy.

(e) *Physical equipment*

The conversion of the riding hall to academic space has now begun, and is tentatively set for completion in September 1957.

Removal in 1957 of the academic activities from the present West Academic Building will permit the first step to be taken in alleviating the crowded housing conditions of the Corps of Cadets. More than two-thirds of the cadets are living 3 in a room designed for 2 occupants. Beds, study tables, clothespresses, and racks for the equipment of three cadets occupy most of the available space. While no health problem appears so far to have arisen, and the morale of which mention has already been made is excellent, a very distinct disadvantage to the cadet exists in the lack of suitable study conditions. Were study rooms available in the barracks, present conditions would be immensley improved. But since the cadet lives, works, and sleeps in the same crowded room where the distractions of 3 occupants greatly outnumber those of 2, he cannot devote to his studies the attention which they merit. Considering his limited study time, he is working under an academic handicap.

It is to be noted that the overcrowding is most prevalent in the fourth class, which is precisely the one in which the cadet is often faced with the need to develop new habits of concentration in the preparation of his daily tasks.

The facilities for housing cadets at West Point are substantially below the standards maintained in civilian colleges and universities which provide housing for their students.

It is planned to convert the West Academic Building, after 1957, into additional housing space for the Corps of Cadets. Its location immediately adjoining the present barracks area contributes to the desirability of the plan. It will not eliminate the overcrowding, but any reduction of the overcrowding is a step in the right direction.

It is the belief of the Board that the plans for conversion of the West Academic Building to barracks space should be carried to the point where the work may be started immediately upon release of the building. Meanwhile planning for barracks space in addition to that to be obtained by conversion of the academic space to be out-dated in 1957 should be undertaken, and actual construction should be accomplished as soon as possible. Expansion of the Corps of Cadets beyond the figure which is currently projected should be deferred until the physical plant is made adequate for its housing.

(f) *Fiscal affairs*

Though all major items of equipment are available for training the Corps of Cadets and for maintenance of the Military Academy, there is apparent a sensible economy in administration. No indication of extravagance or of assigning high priority to the procurement of minor items has been seen.

(g) *Filling cadet vacancies*

Currently the Corps of Cadets is below its authorized strength and it was also below strength before the departure of those who failed the first term's work. The Military Academy has not been filling its vacancies at a time when civilian institutions of learning are being deluged with applications. The Military Academy is in competition with civilian colleges for the same outstanding young students. The education at Government expense which is characteristic of the service academies is offset by the scholarships, some of them carrying both tuition and board, which are available in many colleges today.

It is important that the Military Academy obtain its share of the outstanding young men who enter college each year. Any tendency toward mediocrity in the officer corps of our military services must be combated in every possible way.

It is currently proposed to increase the number of Presidential competitive appointments to the Military Academy. These appointments have been reserved for nearly a century for the sons of members of the regular components of the Armed Forces. Increasing the number of appointments from this source would permit the admission of a greater number of young men familiar with military life and possessing a high degree of motivation for a military career.

Authority exists under the law for appointment of qualified alternates and qualified competitors to fill vacancies which exist after the composition of a new class has been determined. A limiting factor here is the size of the pool of qualified prospects. There are many young men of suitable academic ability, character, and leadership potential who are not eligible for Presidential appointment and who would be interested in a military career and enrollment in the Military Academy were they aware of its opportunities.

It is suggested that inconsistencies of geographical distribution, lack of familiarity with the approaches to Congress, or the accident of birth into a family without service connection, be offset by authorizing the Superintendent to fill vacancies still existing after the entrance of a new class, plus the qualified alternates and qualified competitors whose admission is currently provided for by law. A suitable procedure might conform to the following outline: Any interested young man could make application for admission directly to the Superintendent; the applicant would be required to establish his eligibility for admission as prescribed for all prospective appointees; the Superintendent could then select from this group the individuals to fill any remaining vacancies, considering the same factors which are used in the selection of the qualified alternates and the qualified competitors.

It is a certainty that there are young men in the country today who are unaware of the opportunity West Point offers, or who consider appointment to the Military Academy unobtainable. Greater dissemination of information about the Academy is necessary and the Board is pleased to note the scheme of expanded publicity which was reported to it. It is hoped that these proposals may be immediately implemented in order that the country at large, and particularly its eligible young men, may know more about the Military Academy.

The Board hopes that the corps of cadets may be soon returned to its authorized strength and that every measure, including

necessary legislation, will be taken to assure that the annual quota of admissions be filled.

(h) Possession of money by cadets

For many years receipt of money from outside sources by cadets was prohibited. This was in the interest of democracy; it placed all cadets on a plane of financial equality, making it impossible to distinguish the rich man's son from the poor man's son.

In past years—the exact time it not known to the Board—the prohibition was removed. Possession of outside funds is now both recognized and tolerated. Though changing norms of social behavior undoubtedly have their effect among the cadets, there remains a question concerning the desirability of preserving the former standards in money matters.

In view of the increased compensation recently authorized for cadets, an increase which it was expected would be sufficient to permit all cadets to graduate free of debt, it is believed that study should be given to the desirability of returning to the democratic principle which was in force for so many years.

(i) Status of permanent professors

There is at West Point a devoted group of officers who have been selected for the 21 permanent professorships (the dean of the academic board is included). In addition to their educational qualifications, they possess the characteristics and abilities sought in general officers. Five of them were actually general officers before they accepted their present responsibilities; in the past 10 years there have been 2 others, 1 of whom is now retired, 1 deceased.

While these patriotic officers have been devoting their finest efforts to the preparation of tomorrow's leaders in our Army, many other officers of no greater ability or promise have been promoted to general-officer rank. And whereas in the small Army of 50 years ago there were relatively few colonels and that grade carried considerable importance, today's expanded numbers have so submerged the professors of the United States Military Academy as greatly to diminish their prestige.

The Board considers it unjust that professors should be denied the opportunities for advancement in rank and recognition to which their qualifications would entitle them in other military fields. In the view of the Board their responsibility for training future military leaders is fully as worthy of recognition and rank as are the assignments of other general officers of the Army. Since promotion is the most tangible recognition of worthy performance of important duties, it should not be denied to outstanding officers willing to make a lifetime career of training future military leaders.

The Board believes that the relative importance of the direction of instruction at West Point vis-a-vis that of other general officer assignments has not been properly evaluated. It believes that steps can be taken within the general-officer ceiling figure whether as now established or as it may later be amended, to permit recognition of the worth of distinguished teaching officers at West Point. It believes that the time has come for providing suitable advancement for meritorious officers whose service to the country has been distinguished, deserving, and apparently insufficiently appreciated.

(j) Chaplain, United States Military Academy

The moral and the spiritual are among the most important phases of instruction at the United States Military Academy. This Board has reviewed, and concurs in, the comments of the Board of Visitors for 1955 concerning the chaplaincy at West Point. The present method of selection of the Chaplain should be continued. The pay of the office should be sufficient to attract to it young clergymen of suitable caliber. In addition, the size of the Corps of Cadets is now such as to require the time and labors of more than one man. Currently an assistant is provided, utilizing the chapel fund for his payment. It is proper that the need for an assistant be recognized and that provision be made by the Government for his maintenance and remuneration. Legislation has been introduced (S. 2137) to authorize the appointment of an assistant and to establish a suitable pay scale for both clergymen. This Board considers the proposed legislation worthy of support.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Board makes the following recommendations:

(a) Barracks

That detailed planning be undertaken so that the present West Academic Building may be converted to barracks space for cadets as soon as the building can be released from its present use; also planning for the construction of sufficient additional barracks to permit housing all cadets, two to a room, with adequate additional study space in all barracks buildings.

(b) Filling cadet vacancies

That the Superintendent be authorized to fill the corps of cadets to its authorized strength each year, after the new class and qualified alternates and qualified competitors have entered, from among those qualified young men who have made application to him and whose academic ability, character, and leadership potential warrant their selection for a military career. Such procedure, if adopted, must not jeopardize the present method of filling vacancies by congressional appointment nor reduce the number of appointments to which each Member of the Congress is entitled.

(c) Dissemination of information

That every step be taken to inform the youth of our country of the opportunity which West Point offers, and to interest them in the military career, so that the Military Academy may receive its share of the talented young men who enter college each year.

(d) Possession of money by cadets

That a study be made, with report to the Board of Visitors for 1957, of the feasibility and desirability of limiting the amount of money in the possession of cadets to that which all receive alike from their cadet pay.

(e) Improvement of status of permanent professors

That the senior officers permanently assigned to the Military Academy receive the same opportunities for increased rank and recognition to which their qualifications would entitle them if serving at stations other than West Point.

(f) Chaplain, United States Military Academy

That the present method of selection for this important post be continued, that the chaplain's pay be set at a figure which will provide him a living comparable to that in other important posts of the Protestant clergy, and that he be given the necessary assistant in his ministration to the United States corps of cadets.

8. CONCLUSION

The members of the Board of Visitors, as citizens of the United States, take pride in the work of the United States Military Academy and in the spirit which characterizes the performance of all who are connected with it. In our judgment the loyalty and enthusiasm of the Corps of Cadets, reflecting the same qualities in the members of the faculty and of the staff, would be an inspiration to every American. It is our belief that the Military Academy is accomplishing in full measure its mission and that its graduates go forth today with the same high ideals and same fine qualities which have made their predecessors worthy defenders of the American way of life.

AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
United States House of Representatives.
JOE L. EVINS,
United States House of Representatives.
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
United States House of Representatives.
FRANCIS M. DAWSON,
Dean of the College of Engineering, State University of Iowa.
JAMES P. BAXTER III,
President, Williams College, Chairman.
LUCIUS D. CLAY,
Chairman of the Board, Continental Can Co.
LEONARD CARMICHAEL,
Secretary, Smithsonian Institution.
JOHN A. HANNAH,
President, Michigan State University.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 23, 1956.

Dr. JAMES P. BAXTER III,
President, Williams College
Williamstown, Mass.

DEAR DR. BAXTER: I have reviewed the Report of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy with great interest, and have forwarded it to the Secretary of Defense for further study and initiation of appropriate action on its recommendations.

It is gratifying to me, as I am sure it was to the Board, that the conversion of the riding hall to academic space is underway, and is expected to be completed in the fall of 1957. It is encouraging to see the recommendations of a previous year being brought to fruition. I hope the suggestions now presented for further improvements in the physical facilities, so as to permit housing all cadets two to a room, as well as those concerning the filling of cadet vacancies can meet with the same favorable results.

Through this report—and through the interest and effort that lie behind it—you and the other members of the Board continue to make a valuable contribution to the future of the Military Academy. Please convey to each member who participated my sincere appreciation.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

One Plank We Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington News:

ONE PLANK WE WANT

There is, as Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, has observed, a very powerful group in this country working for the admission of Communist China to the United Nations.

There is also, in the U. N. a strong Communist and "neutralist" group working for the same end.

The danger is that either or both together will try to pull a fast one after Congress goes home and after the November elections—using the General Assembly meeting November 12 for an opening wedge.

And meanwhile they'll try to build up the belief that the only people in the United States who oppose admitting the Peiping

regime to the U. N. are "reactionaries" or members of the nebulous "China lobby."

The truth is there scarcely is a public issue on which there is such unanimity of American opinion; that we must neither recognize Red China nor aid in any way its entry into the U. N. This is attested not only by public opinion polls but by the repeated congressional resolutions—all voted unanimously—against the Communist aggressor whose forces killed so many American youths in Korea.

The Senate yesterday approved such a resolution 86 to 0, the House last week by 391 to 0—for the fifth time since 1951.

There is one more effective way of getting across this blunt fact and reminding other U. N. members that the American people never will accept final subversion of the U. N. to appease the Communists. It can be done if the Republican and Democratic conventions next month will adopt an identical plank along this line in their national platforms.

We believe such action is dictated by the nonpartisan feelings of the American people. The committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations has proposed a draft plank that would ideally represent this feeling.

This plank—or one similar—should be adopted by the two major parties. It would be apt and timely expression of American sentiment backed up by the November 6 voting—on the very eve of the U. N. meeting.

Congressional Quarterly Versus Raymond Moley: Presidential Support by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 19, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable controversy in the Congress over the accuracy of the statistics published by the news magazine Congressional Quarterly regarding the support given to the President's legislative proposals by Members of Congress from the two major political parties.

The initiator of the controversy was Raymond Moley, author of an article in Newsweek, who said Congressional Quarterly had "created a fatal bias" through the exclusion of certain important issues from consideration and including many nonimportant items. This article was read into the RECORD on July 16. Congressional Quarterly replied to Mr. Moley in a letter addressed to the editor of Newsweek. In the interest of fair play, and because I feel that this letter would be of great interest to the 148 congressional subscribers to the Quarterly, 66 of whom are Democrats and 82 of whom are Republicans, I should like to include that reply as a part of my remarks. The letter follows:

JULY 13, 1956.

Mr. JOHN DENSON,
Editorial Director, Newsweek,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. DENSON: Raymond Moley (Newsweek, July 16) is entitled to take whatever issue he pleases with Congressional Quarterly's methods of analyzing the votes of Senators and Representatives. But his statement that these methods "created a fatal bias" in Congressional Quarterly's findings is the first such challenge to Congressional Quarterly's nonpartisan policies, long recognized by responsible journalists.

For 11 years, at great cost in money and effort, Congressional Quarterly has sought methods for recording the activities of Congress that would be free of the very "bias" Mr. Moley attempts to impute to Congressional Quarterly. However one chooses to judge the success of this effort, it remains a fact that Congressional Quarterly's solid reputation among editors and politicians of both parties rests on its factual, nonpartisan anad unbiased approach. It is a serious matter to have that good repute sullied in such a casual fashion.

While we have no wish to quarrel with Mr. Moley's method of determining the extent to which Republicans and Democrats have supported President Eisenhower, it is impossible to refute his charge of "bias" in Congressional Quarterly's method without at the same time pointing out the curious paradox in his own analysis.

Mr. Moley contends, in effect, that support of the Republican leadership in House and Senate is the same as support for President Eisenhower. He confuses party regularity with effective support for the President's own program, as transmitted in messages to Congress or in other statements.

The validity of this concept may be judged in the light of the Senate's vote on June 28 on a move to cut out of the foreign-aid bill all assistance to Yugoslavia. President Eisenhower had asked for aid to Yugoslavia, and his Secretary of State had made a strong plea to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to allow the aid.

Yet it was Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, of New Hampshire, chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, who offered and urged the amendment to cut off aid to Yugoslavia. Said Senator BRIDGES: "I want to say that no one has higher regard for President Eisenhower than I * * * but that does not preclude me from performing by constitutional duty to debate this issue."

When the roll was called on Senator BRIDGES' amendment, 15 Democrats and 23 Republicans (including Senator BRIDGES and Minority Leader WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, California, voted for it, while 29 Democrats (including Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, Texas; Majority Whip EARLE C. CLEMENTS, Democrat, Kentucky), and 21 Republicans voted against it. Thus a majority of Republicans present and voting supported their own leadership against the President, while a majority of Democrats supported their leaders and the President against his own leaders.

Nevertheless, according to the method accepted by Mr. Moley of determining who supports the President, the majority of Republicans who voted to cut off aid to Yugoslavia would be credited with backing the President, while the majority of Democrats who voted against the cut would be charged with opposing the President.

By the same token, use of this method precludes consideration of the House vote July 5 on the Powell antisegregation rider to the school-aid bill. The President was clearly on record in opposition to the rider. Yet a 3-to-1 majority of Republicans followed Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Republican, Massachusetts; Assistant Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, Republican, Indiana; and Whip LESLIE C. ARENDS, Republican, Illinois, in voting for the Powell amendment, while a majority of Democrats voted against it. However, since Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, Massachusetts, also voted for the rider, one could not say the two leaderships were opposed. Thus, using the method Mr. Moley advocates, the vote on the highly controversial Powell amendment, which was opposed by the Presilent, could not be included in tabulating support for the President.

So much for the leadership standard of measuring Presidential support. Now for Congressional Quarterly's method, which, incidentally, was established before President Eisenhower was elected. Congressional Quarterly computes two separate items: support for the President and party unity.

In computing support for the President, we tabulate only those rollcalls which are clear-cut tests of his program and leadership. In short, it must be proved from his own public statements whether he would have voted "yea" or "nay" if he had been Congressman Eisenhower.

Mr. Moley complains that this method, as used in the Congressional Quarterly's weekly report of August 26, 1955, and included in the 1955 Congressional Quarterly Almanac, resulted in a "curious selection of issues," since it included many rollcalls on which there was little or no opposition by Members of either party, and excluded other record votes on which the two parties were opposed.

We see nothing curious about a method which credits the President with a victory and the Members of Congress with an assist when they vote unanimously or nearly so for a measure which he has requested. Nor do we see anything curious about a method of measurement which ignores rollcalls on which the President's views are not a matter of public record, even though these votes may reveal sharp splits between the parties. Such votes, whether or not the President has revealed his views on the subjects, are recorded as separate statistics, known as party unity votes.

The ground rules for the Congressional Quarterly's analysis of Presidential support, set forth in full in the issue to which Mr. Moley refers, acknowledge the difficulty of devising an unassailable method. But they conclude that "the Congressional Quarterly decided that any attempt to eliminate or weight rollcalls would be subjective and arbitrary." If this method leads to a curious selection of issues, it is at least free of the subjective and arbitrary assumption that the President's congressional leaders inevitably and invariably do his bidding.

May we suggest that Mr. Moley keep his eye out for the Congressional Quarterly's forthcoming analyses of Presidential support and party unity during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, in order that he may clarify the apparent confusion regarding these two standards of voting and the rules by which the standards are applied.

Very truly yours,
THOMAS N. SCHROTH,
Executive Editor.

The Townsend Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have been one of the original supporters of the Townsend plan here in the Congress and I have signed discharge petition after discharge petition to try to get this legislation out on the House floor for a vote.

Under leave to extend my remarks today I would like to submit an editorial and a letter that appeared in the July 22 issue of the Fargo Forum. The Forum

is generally considered one of the foremost conservative newspapers in my State. I am indebted to Mr. S. F. Aldridge, of Fargo, N. Dak., for bringing the material to my attention.

The information follows:

TOWNSENDITES STILL THINK THEIR PLAN IS WORKABLE

With the Nation embarked on a full-scale social-security program for retired wage earners and their wives, plus aid to the needy aged, the blind, the physically handicapped, and dependent children, most people undoubtedly think that the Townsend plan of the 1930's is a dead issue.

But, as a letter on this page demonstrates, the supporters of this idea still believe in it. They hold national conventions and are convinced that the Townsend plan would eliminate the need for all the other social-security and charitable programs carried on by the State and Federal Governments.

The Townsendites have modernized their plan by reducing the qualifying age from 65 to 60, but their fundamental theory remains unchanged. They argue that elderly people are entitled to a monthly payment from the Government as a matter of right—and that all of them should receive the same amount monthly, with their prior earnings, their marital status, and their financial status having no bearing on the size of the check.

Their only stipulations are that the persons be retired, and also that they spend every cent they get from the Townsend plan every month. As soon as people start hoarding, they contend, prosperity will disappear. The failure to save does not endanger the individual pension receiver, they claim, because he is assured of a check each month throughout his lifetime as long as he remains retired from gainful employment.

The Townsend checks would be financed by a gross-transactions tax of 2 percent. It's different from a sales tax, which is collected only once on each item sold in the retail trade. The transactions tax would apply to the sale by the manufacturer to the jobber, by the jobber to the wholesaler, by the wholesaler to the retailer, and by the retailer to the consumer.

Because the various transactions are at different price levels, the Townsend people contend that the total tax would be about 4 percent of the retail price, instead of the 8 percent indicated by the application of the transaction tax 4 different times as a commodity moves from the manufacturer to the consumer.

The Townsend plan may still seem impractical to many people, but when you compare what the Government is doing today as against the nothing it did when Townsend first became a national figure, who will be the first to scoff?

ONLY TWO FROM FARGO ATTEND TOWNSEND PLAN CONVENTION

To the EDITOR:

The Townsend National Weekly carries all the happenings of the 16th national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America at St. Paul.

My wife and I were the only delegates from Fargo. We have been members for 20 years or more. That seems like a long time, but we have come a long way at that and are getting closer to our goal every day. Had it not been for the Townsend movement back in the thirties there would not be any social security today.

By continuing our battle every year through the thousands of Townsend Clubs in the 48 States, we gradually force the lawmakers to improve on social security from time to time. Why, just this week they are falling over themselves in Washington trying to improve just a little.

But Townsendites are not satisfied with their little dribbles. We want what is right, and we are going to get it. Many of us wrote to our Congressmen to tell them that if we have billions to throw to the foreign countries, why not leave a little of it here in the United States to help the older people who built up this country. And don't think we don't get answers. They want these several million votes scattered over the Nation.

There are a few businessmen who are backing us also. They are the ones who are getting our business. We at least have one Congressman and Senator in North Dakota who are on our side and have been for several years, USHER L. BURDICK and WILLIAM LANGER.

I have been told that the Fargo Forum is unfriendly to the Townsend plan. Is it because they do not understand the Townsend plan? I think it is.

S. F. ALDRIDGE.

Cumberland University, Famed Tennessee Law School, Continues To Serve the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to include the reproduction of an article written by Mr. Hugh Walker which appeared in the July 22, 1956 edition of the Nashville Tennessean magazine concerning Cumberland University at Lebanon, Tenn., in the district which I have the honor to represent.

Cumberland University for more than 100 years has produced outstanding leaders in this Nation. Many of these leaders have served in Congress and several are serving at the present time. Friends and former students of this great institution will be pleased to learn that while the celebrated law school at Cumberland University will continue to function in its traditional manner, the literary department of the school will be reopened in the fall semester.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to further request that there be reproduced in connection with this article, so that the articles appear jointly, another article which appeared on March 23, 1949, outlining the first century of progress of Cumberland University.

The articles follow:

CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY

(By Hugh Walker)

Like painted clocks and watches everywhere, the clock in the tower of Memorial Hall at Cumberland University says its 18 minutes past 8.

Some say those painted faces mark that tragic moment in history, back in 1865, when Abraham Lincoln died. Others contend it is the time of day when the hands are in balance on the dial, and best display the name of the watchmaker.

Be that as it may, the people of Lebanon tell you the big clock tells the wrong time of day.

They are sure that it's just before the dawn at Cumberland.

In September, they're going to reopen the "lit school," more formally known as the school of arts and sciences.

There is a feeling of happy anticipation in Lebanon now that the historic old school "on the city's western border" will again open her doors, offering a liberal arts education to boys and girls of middle Tennessee.

"Folks here in Lebanon have always been proud of their university," Allison Humphreys, Jr., a Cumberland graduate whose law career has carried him to assistant attorney general of Tennessee, said last week. "They are proud of the culture it created, the scholars it graduated, the growl of the big red Bulldog on the football field."

Now, through a happy marriage of town and gown, the people of Lebanon and Cumberland's administrators are shaping a future for the school they believe will be bright.

Only through the continued operation of the university law school has Cumberland retained unbroken her link with the past. During the 5 years that the School of Arts and Sciences has been closed, the law school has never missed a class. Attendance has been small—but regular.

Now the university (it once had many schools) will reopen with the freshman class of a 2-year college, offering courses in secretarial science, English, languages, physical education, mathematics and science, biology, chemistry, music, voice, and religion.

Thirty students have already signed for the freshman class—and school officials are hoping for a round hundred. Scholarships given by Lebanon firms, clubs, and individuals are expected to swell the total.

Out on the campus, during the hot summer days, there is a growing sense of expectancy, of a long-worked-for event about to happen.

The catalog is printed. The classrooms with their tall windows and old-fashioned desks, are painted and clean. The grass is freshly cut.

Equipment in the new cafeteria is gleaming and ready for use. In the library long rows of carefully dusted books await the student who would "explore the frontiers of man's achievement."

The new president, the dean, the business manager, the registrar, members of the faculty—all are working with an eye on the calendar. They have geared their efforts to be ready for the great day when the bell rings, the doors swing open—and the new students come buzzing down the hall.

For Dr. Charles Havens, Cumberland's boyish 33-year-old, brown-eyed president, the battle is nearly won. As Lebanon's chosen "commanding general" in the campaign to revive the institution, he is in a good position to judge.

"Cumberland will open," says Havens, "and move forward, a step at the time."

The people in Lebanon don't doubt it. They believe every word of it. And they have said so with hard cash. "Havens is the man for the job," said a young doctor. "If it can be done, he will do it."

"Havens is just the man we were looking for," said a Lebanon druggist. "The people want the university to operate, and he will make it go."

A young educator remarked: "A college will be worth more to Lebanon than a new factory."

It is easy to see that the attachment between Havens and the community is mutual. The young educator, puffing his pipe and singing and whistling as he works, has brought a great reserve of brain and muscle to Cumberland. People appreciate his spirit and drive—in the best tradition of the historic Cumberland Bulldog.

"This is a democratic and cosmopolitan community," Havens said. "There are many people here who are truly educated. They don't care how much money you've got, or what kind of car you drive. If you're working, they're for you."

Havens came to Cumberland from Martin Junior College at Pulaski, Tenn. He received his A.B. degree from Centre college in Kentucky and his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees at Vanderbilt university.

Upon assuming the presidency early last year, Havens was faced with the immediate task of moving the law school from Memorial hall to its historic quarters at Caruthers hall, on West Main street, two blocks from the main campus.

The move required money, and there was none for the purpose. Havens went to the alumni for help. The old grads came through.

More than 21,000 law books were transported in handmade crates to the "law barn," as it is affectionately called by the students. A secondhand truck was secured and president, professors, and students pitched in to make the move in 35 truckloads.

Havens knows exactly what he is working for.

"We are going to have a liberal arts college," he said. "We are tied to no sect, church, or denomination. We have no thought control and no 'party line' of any kind, and we never will have.

"Our school will be founded on the principles of Christianity, democracy, and freedom.

"We are not going to try to imitate the big universities. An intercollegiate athletic program, at this time, would be an overextension of our ability. We will encourage intramural athletics and physical education, and when we grow big enough we'll see about taking on others our size.

"I believe that a successful school must have good teachers, good meals, clean classrooms, and clean toilets. We will have them."

Havens beams with pride as he ushers his visitors into the refurbished and historic Caruthers Hall, built in 1877 and named for Judge Robert L. Caruthers, founder of the university. In spotless rows the 21,000 books are arranged in perfect order, including the latest books and documents in the legal field. He is proud of the fact that the university, out of its slender resources, is spending $5,000 a year to keep the law library up to date.

The school of arts and sciences has been closed since 1951. In that year the Southern Baptist Convention, which had operated the university since 1947, returned the school to its original board of trustees, purchased the Ward-Belmont college property, and moved to Nashville to establish and operate Belmont Baptist College.

The law school, with Judge Sam B. Gilreath in charge as acting president of the university, never did close, but temporarily moved its operations to Memorial Hall.

Cumberland has had a long and proud history. The school was organized in 1842, the main building being located on College Street, Lebanon, about a mile from the present campus. Judge Caruthers was president of the first board of trustees.

Cumberland was originally a Cumberland Presbyterian Church school. In 1906, following a merger of the churches, it became affiliated with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The university since 1951 has not been affiliated with any church body.

More than 8,000 lawyers received their degrees from the school of law. The most famous was Cordell Hull, of Carthage, Secretary of State under Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II. The office building of the law school faculty is named for Hull, and a lounge in the building displays an oil painting of the distinguished statesman.

Many Members of Congress, Supreme Court Judges (State and Federal), 9 United States Senators and 9 State governors were graduated from Cumberland.

Ex-Govs. James V. Allred, of Texas, and Fuller Warren, of Florida, received their law degrees at Cumberland, as did Judge A. B. Neil, chief justice of the supreme court of Tennessee, and the present Governor of Florida, Leroy Collins. Many prominent members of the Nashville bar and a good portion of the Tennessee State Legislature are Cumberland graduates, and Gov. Frank Clement was a student there.

At various times during its long history the university has operated a school of theology, a preparatory school, a medical department (in Memphis), a school of music, a business college, and the Cumberland annex, the former Lebanon College for Young Ladies.

In 1863, during the War Between the States, the main building of the university was burned to ashes.

Goodspeed's History of Tennessee relates that the building was set afire by a Confederate soldier, a former Cumberland student, who became incensed at Federal occupation of the university campus.

"Endowment, buildings, and real estate were swept away," wrote Dr. W. P. Bone in his History of Cumberland University. "All that the school had left were its debts and its good name. But the institution still lived in the hearts of men."

It was at this time that the legend of the phoenix became a part of Cumberland's history. Dr. W. E. Ward, an alumnus of the college of arts and founder of Ward Seminary, Nashville, visited the ruins of the burned buildings.

On the one column still standing Ward wrote the word "Resurgam" (I will arise), and later the motto "E cineribus resurgo" (I arise from the ashes) appeared on the university seal.

The phoenix, ancient and legendary Egyptian bird of immortality, is pictured on the seal, rising from the fire of its own cremation with a great flutter of golden wings.

Cumberland yearbook is called "The Phoenix," and the spirit of "rising from the ashes" has helped the school through many a crisis.

But students at Cumberland, and professors, too, have enjoyed their lighter moments on the gently sloping, shady campus.

In the fall of 1934 Judge Albert Williams of Nashville, then a member of the law school faculty, addressed the entire student body during the weekly "assembly" at Caruthers hall, at the start of the school year.

"Cumberland has produced many great men," said the judge proudly. Her graduates serve in the Congress of the United States. Some of our boys have become great lawyers and judges, great teachers and preachers." Then he looked the students straight in the eye.

"And some of our boys," he continued, "are in State penitentiaries. What will you do, and what will you be, when you leave Cumberland?"

Cumberland had fine athletic teams, and in the old days her red-shirted Bulldogs held their own against such teams as Sewanee, Vanderbilt and Georgia Tech.

It was against this last-named team, however, that the doughty Bulldogs came to grief in a manner never equalled anywhere in the United States, before nor since.

In 1916, just prior to World War I, its athletic program impaired by growing demands of the military, Cumberland had no football team. It did, however, have a contract to go to Atlanta and play Georgia Tech, for which the Bulldog team was to receive the then-considerable sum of $400.

As the date for the game approached, an enterprising law student named George Allen conceived the idea of "making up" a team on the spot, traveling to Atlanta by rail and engaging the redoubtable Yellow Jackets according to schedule.

The young promoter found plenty of "takers" and everything worked out as planned—except that Tech won the game 222 to 0. The Yellow Jacket backs just ran until they were exhaused, charging up and down the field.

Cumberland's greatest gain of the day was a two-yard loss.

The story is told by the old grads that a Bulldog back, having received the pass from center, dropped the ball, and it bounced in the direction of a teammate.

As the charging Yellow Jackets bore down, the fumbler yelled, "Pick it up! Pick it up!"

"Pick it up yourself," said the other back. "You fumbled it!."

Now a golfing companion of President Eisenhower, Allen was also a friend of President Truman and President Roosevelt. He is author of the book, Presidents Who Have Known Me.

Surviving members of the two teams who played in the 1916 game are planning a reunion this fall in Atlanta.

In modern times the university had its best football team in 1934, when the team won a never-to-be-forgotten 14 to 0 victory over Sewanee. The team's captain, quarterback Lindsey Donnell, led the Nation that year in number of yards gained from scrimmage.

Back in 1842 the citizens of Lebanon put up $10,000 in cash to bring Cumberland to the town, and from that day to this it has been the people of the community, with the loyal help of the alumni, who have kept the school going. Practically all the $10,000 came from the original board of trustees, which included Jordan Stokes, Sr., Robert L. Caruthers, and Josiah S. McClain, the first white child born in Wilson County.

In 1895, when Memorial Hall was completed, it was announced that $20,000 was still due the contractors. The greatest part of the money previously used, Dr. Bone writes, had been raised in Lebanon, and Lebanon had been apparently drained dry. It was simply a question of getting $20,000 more from people who thought they had already done their utmost.

Judge E. E. Beard, the school treasurer, said "We can raise the money, and we will." He made a stirring appeal, the people of Lebanon dug deeper, and the money was raised.

It was in a similar situation, in the spring of 1954, that the people of Lebanon contributed $56,000 toward the opening of the university this fall.

Druggist Homer Shannon explained the bond of affection between "town and gown" in Lebanon: "Lebanon people love the school. Many of them went to school there. They have put tehir money into it because they want it to live, and it will."

Lebanon banker Roy Cripps said: "In Cumberland Lebanon has a valuable cultural heritage, passed on to us by great men of another generation. We are not going to let it die."

Athens Clay Pullias, president of David Lipscomb College, is a graduate of both the law and literary schools at Cumberland, and a member of the board of trustees.

"Cumberland University has achieved a tremendous place for itself in the unique history of American education," Pullias said. "I am confident that as the school population doubles in the next 15 years the school will develop another generation of outstanding public servants, in the rare image of Cumberland men and women of the past."

In Nashville Edward Potter, Jr., president of the Commerce Union Bank and chairman of Cumberland's board, said:

"I am not an alumnus of Cumberland, but I came from Watertown and Smithville, and I have known and admired the school's history and tradition for a long time.

"I like the kind of men that Cumberland turns out. As long as it lives, and as long as I live, I am going to support the school."

Recently, Dr. Lacy Laban Rice, former president and chancellor of the university,

was in the Cumberland observatory repairing and adjusting the fine telescope he gave the school several years ago.

Working for love and not for money, Dr. Rice labored from dawn to dark at his task. He first joined the Cumberland faculty in 1894. He is 86 years old.

Lebanon people close to Cumberland agree that one man, more than any other, has kept Cumberland's charter and name in Lebanon, and had never lacked for determination and faith in the fight to reopen the Lit School. He is William D. Baird, once a football and baseball star at Cumberland, now mayor of Lebanon.

Over in Caruthers hall President Havens has put small plaques on the walls. They say that the paint was given by one Lebanon firm, the paper and plaster by another, the venetian blind by still another. The electric drinking fountain, the portable aluminum ladder, the librarian's desk and chair—all are gifts of people who love Cumberland.

Havens' "buck a month" club, organized among graduates of the law school, brings in a small but steady trickle of dollars from men who want the old school to survive.

Rubbing his chin and thinking of the people who are helping him, Havens said thoughtfully: "They don't come any better."

And because of that, he believes, old Cumberland will open her doors this fall, and resume her rightful place in the many-towered Camelot of American education.

And once again the great bird will rise from the ashes, with a mighty fluttering of wings.

Cumberland University, Famed Tennessee Law School and Historic Christian Educational Institution, Enters Second Century of Progress

(Remarks of Hon. Joe L. Evins, of Tennessee, in the House of Representatives, Monday, March 28, 1949)

Mr. Evins. Mr. Speaker, Cumberland University, located at Lebanon, Wilson County, within the Fifth District of Tennessee, recently rounded out its first hundred years of service as a great southern educational institution.

On the occasion of this great and famed old university entering upon its second century of progress, I desire to commend the record of service and achievement of this historic school in Tennessee, and to add my own tribute to the rich tradition of accomplishment which has characterized the long existence of Cumberland University both as an academic and literary institution and as a school of law.

The tributes and felicitations to Cumberland University have been many and deserved. Some of the tributes have taken a material form and constitute an expression of confidence in the future of the institution. Other tributes have been in words of appreciation for the great work and great contributions of this Tennessee institution. These expressions emphasize the role of importance in Southern education that has ever been the part of Cumberland University.

Cumberland has produced many outstanding leaders for our country. From its halls have passed young men and women who have taken their places in the fields of Christian education, the legal profession, and other phases of public service, and in that highest calling—good citizenship.

Cumberland University counts among its distinguished alumni, a Secretary of State; 2 Justices of the United States Supreme Court; 16 United States Senators, one, the distinguished Senator from Idaho, the Honorable Bert H. Miller, being now a Member of the United States Senate.

In this body, Mr. Speaker, many sons of Cumberland have served with distinction. I am pleased to note, Mr. Speaker, that more than a hundred Members of the House of Representatives of the United States have been educated at Cumberland University. Of that number, 12 may be counted today as Members of this present body.

These distinguished alumni include our colleagues the Honorable Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi Fourth District; Hon. Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico at Large; Hon. Oren Harris, Arkansas Seventh District; Hon. Wright Patman, Texas First District; Hon. Omar Burleson, Texas 17th District; Hon. Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky Fourth District; Hon. Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri Second District; Hon. Anthony F. Tauriello, New York 43d District; and five members of the delegation from the State of Tennessee, including the dean of the Tennessee delegation and national president of Cumberland University Alumni Association, Hon. Jekre Cooper, Ninth District; also Representative Albert Gore of the Fourth, and Tom Murray of the Eighth District of Tennessee. As the Representative of the Fifth District, in which Cumberland University is situated at Lebanon, it was also my own great privilege to have attended this great school in Tennessee.

The continuing progress in education at Cumberland University has been noteworthy in every respect and its citations for advancement and continuing excellence have been numerous. It was of interest to the alumni as well as the countless friends of Cumberland when the American Bar Association added its own accolade of deserved praise with official scholastic recognition of the excellent attainments of Cumberland's School of Law. This recognition was richly merited.

As a tribute to this institution, I should like to quote briefly from G. Frank Burns, writing in the Lebanon (Tenn.) Democrat:

"The real gift of the Cumberland University School of Law, looking back over the century * * * is not its graduates who have won fame and renown but rather the spirit of faith in the lasting tenets of democracy, passed on, like an unfailing torch * * * to five generations of young men and women."

The worth of this fine old school lies in its achievement of fine men and women, humble and great. Its external growth from a one-room institution of learning a century ago to its present plant of fine buildings is but the material evidence of its surging and progressive spirit.

Recently, the president of Cumberland University, Dr. Edwin S. Preston, visited Washington and called upon President Truman and invited him to visit Cumberland University in Tennessee. There was also a meeting of Cumberland University alumni in the Washington area on the occasion of Dr. Preston's visit in the Capital at which some 70 alumni of the university gathered to hear an address by Dr. Preston and a report on plans for the second century program at Cumberland University.

In this connection I desire to include in the Record a portion of a transcription which was presented at this meeting and entitled "The Romance of Cumberland University"—a great and inspiring story written by Col. Dixon Merritt, of Tennessee.

I request that this be included in the Record because of the general interest in the progress of this famed law school in the heart of Tennessee and because of the best wishes which countless friends extend to Cumberland as it begins its second century of progress.

The story is as follows:

"The Romance of Cumberland—The Story of a Christian Institution

"That May morning of 1842 was a great day for a university to be born and the name by which it was christened—Cumberland—was already a great name not alone in history and geography but even then in education. The place, too, was great. Lebanon, the city of cedars, the city of settled and seasoned culture, the city where Sam Houston had practiced law—Sam Houston, Governor of Tennessee, the "Raven" of the Cherokees of Oklahoma, the hero of Texas independence. Three of Lebanon's citizens—a governor, a Congressman, and a Supreme Court Justice were members of Cumberland University's first board of trustees appointed in that good national year of 1842.

"Eighteen forty-two—how long ago was that? The gulf is hardly to be spanned by a mere measure of years. Stephen Collins Foster was publishing his first song and furnishing a musical setting for the Old South. Missouri and Arkansas were America's farthermost west. John Tyler in the Presidency was muddling the Whig Party's greatest opportunity, and Clay and Webster were maneuvering, each striving to be the one to supplant him, and Hayes and others were maneuvering to lead the Democratic Party back to mastery.

"But best-laid plans of mice and men—no one of the four were to succeed through Clay won the Whig nomination. In the cool of the shade of the Hermitage, 18 miles west of Lebanon, sat Andrew Jackson, worn out with 8 years in the Presidency, with a long life of unparalleled turmoil. He sat and planned—planned deeper and better than the recognized leaders of either party. It was his protege, James K. Polk, who was to lead the Democrats back to power to crush the mighty Clay in his final bid for the Presidency, to win for the United States Texas and the all but illimitable lands beyond—the new Southwest which was to furnish from that day to this so large a part of the patronage of the new university. In that decade, Tennessee, heart of the old Southwest, was in a position almost of dominance in varied fields. For 1842 was the middle year in that remarkable stretch of 44 years during which Tennessee placed one of its sons on a national ticket in 8 of the 11 national campaigns.

"Into that kind of Tennessee, Cumberland University was born. Its early years were lush, green years. The civilization of the Old South was at its high tide and plenty rode on a springing harvest.

"The general assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the people of Lebanon thought it hard to find the funds to get the university going. When did people anywhere not think it hard to raise money for any cause? They thought it hard then, but a quarter of a century later in the great war's bitter aftermath they looked back with longing on those early days and knew that the first great task was an easy one. From 1842 to 1860—only a little while, the space from babyhood to a high-school diploma—in that 18 years the alumni of Cumberland University had come to fill in large measure the places of importance in the wide land. Some of them were already in the Congress of the United States, where from eight decades down to the present, Cumberland University graduates were to outnumber those of any other university in the United States.

"Other and more numerous sons of Cumberland were in the branches of State and Federal courts of both original and appellate jurisdiction. They were filling chairs in colleges all over the United States and were administering the affairs of colleges and seminaries and other educational institutions. Still numerous others were in administrative positions in the church bodies, were in the pulpits of important churches, and were carrying Christian civilization to far places on the mission fields of the world.

"Cumberland was powerful—a young giant in a young land and its prospects opened out fair and full to a glorious future.

"The great red flower of war sprang up and shadowed the land. Prejudice and passion and hatred raged. Brother's hand was at brother's throat and all the splendid fabric wrought through the prosperous years was

ready to split into tatters. Lebanon was not on the whole secessionist and Cumberland was not. A majority of its trustees, mostly citizens of Lebanon, opposed secession and a number of them remained staunch Unionists through all that followed. The faculties were divided and students, of course, were divided also. Cumberland's magnificent building stood deserted not destined to withstand the shock of war—that building lay in ashes before the end, but there remained wrecked amid the ashes a lone Corinthian column, the building pitiable, but it was a valuable asset, for there was found written upon it, when friends of the university returned, the single Latin word 'resurgam,' in translation 'I will arise.' The word was marked up there with a piece of charred wood by Dr. W. E. Ward, an alumnus, who stood sorrowfully among the ashes of his alma mater. That word scrawled in charcoal became the voice of faith crying among the desolation and Cumberland did arise, not bigger, but stronger, than in the booming years before the war. Friends who in the old days had given of their wealth now gave of their poverty and the institution struggled into motion.

"The new day had fully dawned and the board of trustees recognized it by conferring upon Judge Nathan Green, Jr., the title of chancellor rather than that of president. For more than 30 years Chancellor Green directed the affairs of the university. For 63 years he occupied one of its chairs of law. Yet his position cannot be called unique because he had a faculty hardly less notable than himself for length of service. His great colleague in the law school, Dr. Andrew B. Martin, taught for 40 years; Andrew Hayes Buchanan taught mathematics in Cumberland 45 years and made his living through working during vacations with the United States Geodetic Survey; William Duncan McLaughlin taught Latin and Greek 45 years and made his living milking cows; and John Iradelle Dillard Hinds taught chemistry for 31 years and supported himself by filling prescriptions in the drug store. Walter Verrell Vester taught for 44 years; Winsted Paine Bone, 47.

Against such a record of devotion, brick and mortar and money and bonds do not count. Out of a century of that tradition of special training and Christian service what has Cumberland produced?

It is easy to see and measure the fruit of this as of other trees—they are on the topmost branches. Of the thousands of Cumberland University alumni who have done the world's work in common ways, no record stands out, but among the lot have been almost 450 ministers of the Gospel. There have been some 50 college and university presidents, some hundred college professors, 116 Congressmen, 11 Governors of States, some score of Federal judges, 2 United States Ambassadors, 2 Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and 1 Secretary of State of the United States. In all, more than 12,000 public servants have been numbered among Cumberland alumni.

Judged by its fruit, it is a goodly tree which early in 1946 the Tennessee Baptist convention received from the friendly hands of the trustees who had conducted the affairs of the university under Presbyterian auspices. At that time, Tennessee College for Women, a Baptist institution located in Murfreesboro, was incorporated into the university. Since then the convention board of trustees and administration of Cumberland University have diligently labored and constantly toward developing a strong and practical second-century program. There has been no pruning of the tree—there will be none. There has been some strengthening of the branches. The school of law, lustiest, shall it be said, of the branch has been strengthened and enlarged in its program in accordance with recommendations of leading educators and representatives of the legal profession.

On the other main branch, the college of arts and sciences, Cumberland stands stanchly by the liberal arts' ideas. One of the immediate goals is attainment of approval by accrediting agencies, and these goals, if not definitely in reach, are clearly in sight of attainment. Drawing closer to attainment is a larger and better faculty and adequate buildings for administration. Close to the heart of the sponsors is the goal of a large residence for women where special facilities and opportunities will be provided.

The second-century program does not contemplate a different Cumberland—it does contemplate a stronger edifice on its existing foundation. It is not expected now or ever that Cumberland will become large. It will remain a small Christian institution. As such it will continue to afford opportunity for broad basic education and specialized training in a few selected fields to a limited number of young men and young women without regard to Christian affiliation. Thus Cumberland University faces the future. May the promise of the future ahead measure up to the performance of the century that is passed.

Col. George W. Combs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in Washington, the news capital of the world, it is not easy for one reporter to win distinctions that cause him to stand out among his fellows. But such a reporter is Col. George W. Combs. As an example of the esteem in which he is held by his friendly competitors, he has been elected treasurer of the National Press Club 14 times, establishing a record in the 48-year history of journalism's largest professional organization. This distinction is illuminated by the fact that he has never sought the office; he has been drafed each year for the past 14.

On Freedom of Press Day last year, the Press Club unveiled its first official flag at ceremonies here. Casting about for a fitting speaker, one who symbolized the things for which the day and emblem stood, the newsmen selected Colonel Combs.

He spoke briefly, but his talk was a stirring affirmation of the constitutional right of the people to have the news reported accurately, fairly and fearlessly. His admonition to the press to preserve and protect that right might well be a text for today's schools of journalism, yet they came out of nearly half a century of practice, the fruit of a good newspaperman's life.

I had long been told of the legend of Colonel Combs and had been a faithful reader of his stories, and his column "Maryland in Congress," which always kept Maryland citizens abreast of all legislation of interest to our State. Following my election to Congress, it was my privilege to learn firsthand of his devotion to his work, and the way in which he regularly visited the Members of the Maryland delegation to discuss their activities on a personal basis.

It was with real regret that I learned of the Colonel's decision to retire. He will be greatly missed.

Under his guidance several of the newer recruits of the Washington Bureau of the Sun have learned the intricacies of covering Capitol Hill. The Colonel can retire with the confidence that these reporters will perpetuate the great traditions that George Combs established.

Long-Term Trends in German Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a condensation by Dr. Zoltan M. Szaz of his article "Long-Term Trends in German Foreign Policy," which will appear around August 12 in the Free World Review:

LONG-TERM TRENDS IN GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Dr. Zoltan Michael Szaz)

The future course of German foreign policy seems to depend on a solution of the problem of German reunification. While reunification remained a moot question during the last 6 years, recent developments had placed the issue on the agenda of international conferences, even if no agreements were reached. Furthermore, the fact that the Soviets have an ambassador at Bonn keeps the possibility of Soviet-West German talks open. Yet, it has to be noted that the prospect for a possible detente between the United States and the U. S. S. R. does not necessarily depend on a solution of the German question, and that such a view is adhered to by the Kremlin. The framework of Western policy which in the past consisted of intensified armaments for a probable, though not inavoidable war, is being replaced in Washington as well as in London and Paris by the concept of a peaceful, though competitive coexistence with the Soviet Union. While efforts may be made to reunify Germany, such a solution would involve major concessions from both the Western and Eastern bloc, as they have mutually exclusive intentions. Thus the possibility exists that no such mutually agreeable solution may be found, and the frontiers of the two blocs may remain frozen even during the period of coexistence. This danger is reenforced by the following factors:

1. The Western Powers seem to accept the premise that major wars should be avoided even at the cost of renouncing some of their former political objectives, at least temporarily. The Soviets, too, in the view of Bulganin and Khrushchev, seem to have no present intention of launching a third world war. This means a practical disavowal of a forcible roll-back policy of the West in eastern Europe.

2. Both the United States and the German Government have reemphasized their former views on June 15, 1955, and on June 13, 1956, stating that neutralization of Germany will not be considered as a feasible solution of the problem of German unity, and that the West

German Government would honor its obligations and would not accept the theory of "no entangling alliances." Simultaneously, the United States and the West German Government demanded Soviet withdrawal from Germany, though she would remain within NATO. Neither Washington nor Bonn had, however, produced any acceptable counterconcession to the Kremlin which would enable Russia to evacuate East Germany without an undue loss of face.

3. Though presently no vocal opposition is raised to the return of Germany as a significant military power, the sentiment is far from nonexistent in France. The attitude of the French Government at the Berlin conference of 1954 toward German unity failed to evoke favorable response in Germany. The ratification debates dealing with the Paris agreements also demonstrated that only extreme American pressure combined with the threat of France's exclusion from NATO could induce the Paris Assembly to consent to the admission of Germany to the Atlantic alliance on equal terms. Even during the discussion between President Eisenhower and the Federal Chancellor in June 1955, the French Foreign Minister expressed his misgivings about any possible bilateral German-American agreements with regard to German unity.

Soviet intransigence has been in the past, and continues to be chiefly responsible for the separation of the two German states. While in 1955 there were some indications that the U. S. S. R. might agree to a unified free Germany which would leave NATO but remain a member of the Western European community, Soviet policy again changed at the 1955 Conference of Foreign Ministers at Geneva. Recent statements of Soviet leaders and the East German-Soviet communique of July 19, 1956, show even more signs of recalcitrance. Yet after the 1957 elections, when they hope to have the Chancellor's policy of "strength" and "Western integration" discredited, Soviet overtures on German unity can again be expected, that time on a German-Soviet basis, especially if a Socialist-dominated coalition should come to power.

Under such circumstances the Bonn government adopted the following policies:

(a) A continuation of the present armament policy aimed at a quick implementation of the Paris Agreements. Though the Moscow visit of the Chancellor caused some delay, the passage of necessary legislation including a conscription bill shows that no compromise can be expected on this issue.

(b) German neutrality before reunification cannot be a subject for discussions with Moscow, and complete freedom of action for the future German Government remains a basic demand.

(c) Though Germany will not at the present time reopen the question of her eastern frontiers or of a peace treaty, she will uphold her right to do so after an all-German government has been formed.

(d) Germany's economic ties with the West European states will not be loosened under any East-West or German-Soviet agreement. They would serve as a guaranty for Western help against unprovoked Soviet attack even if Germany should leave NATO.

(e) The Federal Government wants a settlement of German unity in the following phases:

(aa) A four-power or German-Soviet agreement with Western approval, followed by Allied withdrawal from the heart of Germany to the respective frontier sections.

(bb) Creation of a National Assembly and an all-German government as a result of free elections.

(cc) Convocation of a peace conference after the creation of a European security system in which Germany would participate.

(dd) A peace treaty based on free negotiations and acceptance containing an equitable solution of the eastern frontiers and a withdrawal of Allied and Soviet Forces from German territory.

All these objectives on the issue of German unity fails to answer the ideological position of Germany and her mission within the new framework of international politics. The recent restlessness within the coalition, and the absence of enthusiasm for the policies of the Chancellor reflects the lack of a new goal. In order to fill this ideological vacuum, new ideas and policies will have to be forthcoming during the next years. It is likely that such changes will not be abrupt ones and that the present framework of the Western alliance will be retained even after a full-scale reappraisal of German policy objectives.

Judged by available evidence, the present trends seems to favor renewed emphasis on national consciousness, as renewed emphasis on reunification offers a good starting point for reviving nationalism. While nationalism is usually connected with the right in Germany, the left, too, adopts nationalist slogans. It would make no difference whether the Social Democrats acted from party considerations trying to prevent a loss of prestige with the voters, or whether they were motivated by patriotic reasons. Indeed, the trend could move into two diametically opposed directions.

The primary trend may be a Socialist-Neutralist one. It would come about should the present government be replaced by a coalition of the Social Democrats and some of the minor parties, including the FDP. The improbability of such a development is lessening by every day, especially in view of the recent Wurzburg convention of Dr. Dehler's FDP, and could well be the result of the elections of 1957. Such a change would exert great pressure on the Western Powers to conclude an agreement with the Soviets on German unity, or the government would itself agree to a German-Soviet detente calling for the withdrawal of Germany from NATO. Though anti-Communist, such a regime may find it difficult to check Communist infiltration effectively, because of Soviet pressure for "Maintaining some of the social and economic accomplishments of the German Democratic Republic" in a united Germany. The regime would also oppose the elements on the conservative Right and Catholic liberals which groups mostly support the present Chancellor. Another result would be the cooling off of Franco-German relations, already burdened by divergent objectives of the two governments. Finally, such changes would ultimately necessitate the United States to revert to a strategy of "peripheral defense." Despite the fact that such development is far from inevitable, policies corresponding to them should be devised, and the trend energentically counteracted.

A secondary trend would be less dangerous though not overly favorable to American interests. This would be the reemergence of conservative nationalism as distinguished from a socialist-nationalist appeal to the masses as represented by the Third Reich and some elements of the SPD in Germany today. As the German people are more hostile to communism than to France, and are aware of the fatal mistake of their leaders during the two World Wars, such a nationalism would be directed against the East. Conservative nationalism as such is not represented by any particular political party in present-day Germany. Its concepts are followed by some CDU, and many FDP and FVP deputies together with the members of coalition splinter parties. Of course, reliance on German nationalism, whatever its present orientation, could possibly increase tensions with the East in order to force unification and return of lost territories. Yet the reemergence of a conservative brand of nationalism in Germany seems to be the only alternative to a socialist-neutralist orientation of a future Germany. And conservative nationalist influence will undoubtedly increase as the creation of a German army whose generals and senior officers are selected mostly from old Wehrmacht officers' proceeds. As long as the Federal Chancellor remains on the political scene, these changes may go on unnoticed. For he is able to hold together the liberal and conservative elements in his coalition under pro-Western leadership. Should he retire in 1957, the situation might change in favor of the conservative elements of the coalition.

Of course, the emergence of a conservative nationalist leader in the CDU or FDP to power would also deny to the United States the use of Germany and France as possible alternate bases for European defense, and would lead to a complete reliance on Germany as the major military power in Western Euhope, in order to prevent Germany from making a separate bargain with the U. S. S. R. It has to be remembered that the idea of a Soviet-German detente was contemplated by Stalin as late as early 1944 as a means of preventing Anglo-American domination of Western Europe.

Reliance upon a third alternative, the perpetuation of the present liberal Catholic internationalist regime which places less emphasis on reunification than upon the expansion of its ties with the West, seems to be unwarranted. However, without the survival of Catholic liberalism in the coming years as a potent, though not dominant, political force, American objectives in Germany would be doomed to failure. The relative strength of these elements, now so ably led by Dr. Adenauer, may spell the difference between Germany's bolting the Atlantic alliance or her preserving the ties with the West. Therefore, they should be granted continued support.

For a successful implementation of American policy in Germany, however, it might be advisable to establish closer contacts with conservative nationalists, too. The latter are, in general, friendly toward the United States. With us, they have in common their realistic appraisal of Soviet policies and the belief that the Soviets have to be opposed by adequate military strength rather than by appeasement. They are feared by the Soviets who are devoting increased attention to them by emphasizing in their propaganda the unwillingness of France to become a bona fide ally of Germany and the alleged willingness of the United States to agree to a permanent partition of Germany. For the rules of the Kremlin know that any emerging German militarism, unless diverted, would turn against the Soviet Union, and the lessons of two wars on Soviet generals had not been lost.

A return to conservative nationalism would not means the defeat of western ideas in Germany and the rise of a neo-Nazi regime. Many of the conservative nationalists, including Professor Oberlander were dismissed from their positions, and imprisoned during the Third Feich. They have little predilections about the Socialist brand of nationalism supported by Hitler. Though time has not yet proved the correctness of this assumption, there are at present no discernible trends warranting the conclusion that the National Socialist movement with its chiliastic ideas would stage a comeback in Germany.

After having analyzed the possible danger of future developments in Germany, may the conclusions be closed with a more cheerful note referring to the revolt of the East Berlin and Soviet Zone workers of June 17, 1957. They, though unarmed, succeeded for more than a day to wrest control from the Communist masters, until dispersed and defeated by Soviet armored divisions. This event also has shown that German reunification would reinforce rather than weaken Germany's loyalty to the West.

Darius-Girenas Memorial Exercises, Sunday, July 22, at Lithuanian Plaza in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. MURRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, July 22, 1956, more than 40,000 Americans of Lithuanian ancestry gathered at a section in the city of Chicago, named by the city council of the city of Chicago "The Lithuanian Plaza." The purpose of their meeting was to commemorate the deaths of Stephen Darius and Stanley Girenas, two Chicago Lithuanians who crashed in a trans-Atlantic flight in 1933. The Darius-Girenas flight was to reaffirm the friendship between America and Lithuania.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan delivered a stirring address to the throng. I would like to incorporate in the RECORD Governor Williams' address:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS AT THE LITHUANIAN CELEBRATION, MARQUETTE PARK, CHICAGO, ILL., JULY 22, 1956

It is a real privilege to be invited here to join with you in the dedication of the Lithuanian Plaza. As Governor of Michigan I have been proud and grateful for the opportunities I have had to work with so many of our great citizens of Lithuanian birth and parentage. I am equally grateful for this opportunity to meet their brethren in Illinois.

When I was so kindly invited to speak here this afternoon, I was told about the beauties of the area which is dedicated today as the "Lithuanian Plaza." Words do not do the plaza justice. Your beautiful hospital, church, convent and school are monuments to the creative spirit and genius of the Lithuanian people, just as the statue honoring Stephen Darius and Stanley Girenas is a permanent tribute to the courage and hardiness of the Lithuanians.

We in America are proud of our tradition as the Nation which has drawn its strength from the many strains of nationalities and races our people represent. We are particularly mindful of the heritage which our people of Lithuanian birth and descent have brought to us. One of the most significant traits of those who came to America from the shores of the Baltic was their respect for literature and education. At this juncture in our national lives, America must have this respect in great abundance.

The Lithuanian culture boasts many achievements. The roster of Lithuanian writers and poets yields to no other Nation. Such names as Duonelaitis and Vidunis have added greatly to the rich European treasury of literature. Such contributions could not be otherwise given the magnificent language of Lithuania. While recognized as the oldest of the living languages, it is also proclaimed as Europe's most beautiful. Reclus, the greatest student of language in the history of Europe, said this of the Lithuanian tongue: "If the value of a nation in the whole of humanity were to be measured by the beauty of its language, the Lithuanians should rank first among the inhabitants of Europe."

The greatest gift we have received from the Lithuanians, however, has been their love of freedom and liberty. We should be permanently in the debt of the Lithuanian people if for the sole reason of the great deeds on behalf of American liberty by Kosciusko, a Lithuanian by birth. Our debt is further compounded by the brave service performed by Lithuanians in our country's armed service.

But most of all, we owe so much to the Lithuanians because of the fervor and constancy of their centuries-long struggle for freedom in their native land. Despite their almost continual occupation by neighboring nations, they never relinquished their goal of freedom and self-government. From the time of the infamous last partition in 1779, down to the first World War, the Lithuanians resisted foreign oppression.

In 1917, patriotic Lithuanians convened at Vilna and demanded the establishment of an independent government. Independence was officially proclaimed in 1918, and official recognition was extended by the Western Allies in 1922.

The new nation became a model of democracy in the ensuing years. All citizens were equal before the law. The economy of the country flourished. The educational system of Lithuania was recognized as one of the finest in the world, and its University of Kovno received worldwide acclaim.

Above all, freedom of religion was guaranteed by the new constitution. The people of Lithuania have drawn much of their vigor from the firmness and strength of their faith. The buildings which mark the area dedicated here today are eloquent testimony to that fact. This faith has served to fortify them in their fight for what they regard as the state of life which God intended for all men; the enjoyment of liberty.

In June of 1940, the Soviet dictator dispatched his tanks and hordes into the young democracy of Lithuania. It has since been incorporated into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, along with its sister nations of Latvia and Estonia.

The Lithuanian people in America have never accepted this action, nor has the Government of the United States. We know also, that the people of Lithuania itself have never accepted their domination by Communist Russia. We know that their valiant struggle for freedom goes on in whatever manner open to them.

This afternoon I would like to talk to you about my beliefs about the future of Lithuania and all other nations behind the Iron Curtain.

We in America are still looked to as the world's best hope for freedom. Our own history of freedom, dating from our War for Independence, has earned us a reputation of dedication to liberty wherever men of good faith assemble. Our ready granting of citizenship to all who came to our shores for most of our history gave proof that we were respectful of free people everywhere. Our traditions of anticolonialism are recognized throughout the world. The passionate words of Wilson's 14 points are still whispered wherever the light of freedom has been extinguished.

It is America, indeed, who must provide the hope and inspiration to all people who are, for the moment, under the heel of tyranny. How can we do this?

We must first vigorously reaffirm our belief in the equality of all men. This great idea, which was once the heartstone of our Government, has been abased by the insidious philosophy represented by the McCarran-Walter Act enacted over President Truman's veto. We must immediately remove the incomprehensible quota system contained in that act.

That quota system proclaims to the world that we believe that some nations are better than others. It will grant admission to thousands of people from one country while only permitting hundreds from another.

The quota system based on nationality should be immediately repealed. It should be replaced by a system that admits people on the basis of their personal qualifications and which ignores such discriminatory qualifications as race and national origin. At present, we have long waiting lists of people desiring admission whose native lands are Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia and Poland. They are barred from entrance to this land, not because of their lack of talent or energy or belief in American ideals. They are barred solely by a quota system conceived in ignorance and bias. They are barred because the quotas for their country are used up, while the quotas from other nations go begging as they have for years and years.

The second step we must take if we are to provide hope for those behind the Iron Curtain is to so direct our foreign affairs as to bring about a climate of hope and freedom around the world. Many of you here today undoubtedly have friends and relatives in countries under the domination of the Communists. Their continued subjugation is a denial of all concepts of human dignity.

We cannot, nor would we wish to hold out false hopes—liberation, upon a silver platter. We resent those who play lightly upon the hopes of Americans who have relatives and friends in Soviet controlled lands. When we speak of freedom for the Baltic nations, we must act in a manner which will insure that freedom.

We must exemplify in our foreign policy our belief in self-government for all men. I would suggest that some of our recent activities have served to confuse our friends about our real goals. We have not met the independence movements throughout the world with the kind of reception we so devoutly wished would be given our own some 180 years ago, and which was given by some nations.

We must certainly keep ourselves strong to combat the threats of Communist imperialism. If we do not see to the defense of freedom where it still reigns, the people who have temporarily been deprived of theirs will have no hope.

We must recognize that economic stability and self-assurance is necessary to preserve national self-respect and international balance—that peace is inspired by economic hope and contentment.

We must increase our efforts in the area of communication. The recent uprisings in East Germany and Poland prove that drive for freedom is still overwhelming among the people. How much of the uprising can be traced to the messages received from the Voice of America and like organs cannot be measured, but we know that it is substantial. We must continue and greatly expand these facilities—funds for them must be increased.

Let us pledge ourselves today, as we properly dedicate this Lithuanian Plaza, to a redoubling of our efforts to restore liberty to men everywhere. The rich history of similar efforts by the people of Lithuania should provide us with every conceivable bit of inspiration.

Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania, spoke about the present oppression of the Lithuanian people by their Soviet captors. I should also like to include in the RECORD the remarks of the consul before this gathering:

ADDRESS BY PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, AT THE LITHUANIAN PLAZA, CHICAGO, ILL., JULY 22, 1956

The Darius-Girens American Legion Post and the initiators and founders of the Lithuanian Plaza merit great thanks and honor. In the name of the representatives of the Republic of Lithuania I express those sentiments to them.

The Lithuanian Plaza gives us a symbolic corner of Lithuania, a little Lithuania. Within the plaza, the St. Casimir Convent

reminds us of Pazaislis in Lithuania, the new church—of Siluva, and the Darius-Girenas monument—of our nation's heroes from whom we draw our strength and inspiration. In this plaza, as a matter of fact, there is a small part of Lithuania—the cornerstone of freedom which was donated to Lithuania some 10 years ago by the limestone industries of Indiana.

On the wings of the symbolic Darius-Girenas plane we fly from this plaza to Lithuania: We recall both the cheerful and the painful scenes. We see free Lithuania and Luthania being seized, occupied, and enslaved. We see there our parents and brothers and sisters tilling Lithuania's soil and doing their work freely; we also see them being tortured and deported to Siberia and elsewhere by the occupants of Lithuania. We sight both triumph and tragedy. We cry in sorrow, we condemn the occupants and their quislings, we are inflamed with love of Lithuania and with determination to regain Lithuania's freedom.

This sorrow and this resolve is smoldering within us for the 17th year. Sixteen years ago yesterday Moscow struck a vital blow to Lithuania by its resolution to sovietize Lithuania. Sixteen years ago today Minister of Luthiania Zadeikis and other representatives of Lithuania uttered their protests against the invaders and usurpers of Lithuania, in the name of the country and the nation they presented protest notes to the governments to which they were accredited. Tomorrow will mark 16 years from the day on which the United States denounced the occupancy of Lituhania and pledged itself not to recognize the fruits of aggression and injustice.

The United States has kept its word. It did not and does not recognize the Soviet treachery. It considers Lithuania to be an independent state occupied by the Soviets.

For this we are most grateful to the United States of America. In like measure, we are grateful to the United States for the recognition of Lithuania de jure in July 1922 and for the help and support it has granted and is granting Lithuania and its people. Expressing our gratitude, we remind the United States and the entire world with great pain and sorrow that Lithuania is still in the hands of the occupant, that our country and its people are still being exploited and annihilated by the occupants who continue to ship into Russia Lithuania's resources and people, especially Lithuanian youth. There is information that during this year many hundreds, perhaps thousands of Lithuanian youth will be deported to Siberia and other parts of Russia. First transports of them left Lithuania July 1 and 8.

We beg America and the free nations of the world to show stronger concern for the fate of Lithuania and its people, to remind Soviet Russia and the world at every opportunity that Russia violated peace and state sovereignty treaty with Lithuania, that she is unlawfully occupying and ruling Lithuania, that she must withdraw from Lithuania, and allow the people of Lithuania to conduct their lives in a free and independent fashion, without pressure and interference from Russia or any other power.

Dues for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the plan for campaign financing initiated by the Democratic Party of Lancaster County, Pa., under the chairmanship of Dr. David R. Eaby.

This plan, called "Dues for Democracy," is one method for obtaining the funds necessary for political campaigns in times when the costs are continually rising. It obviates the obligations that may arise from the acceptance of single large contributions.

Five envelopes, with a covering letter, are sent out to large numbers of people. The people are asked to keep the envelopes carefully at hand, and at the first of each month to enclose a single dollar bill in one of the envelopes and mail it back to the Democratic Party when the regular monthly bills are being paid.

In this manner a total contribution of $5 is made to good political activity in a relatively painless fashion.

The success of the early returns from this plan indicates that it might well be duplicated elsewhere. The Democrats of Lancaster County are to be congratulated on their plan for financing political activity in the best democratic spirit.

Address by Thomas Lazzio, of Paterson, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the record of the Republican Party in its relation to labor was ably documented by Thomas Lazzio, of Paterson, N. J., a member of the New Jersey State Assembly and a CIO leader, in a recent address before the Young Republican Leadership Training School here in our Nation's Capital. Mr. Lazzio's address follows:

I am pleased to be here with you young Republicans for I know you are dedicated to the Republican Party fully realizing that it is the party which best serves the interest of all the people of this Nation.

I am pleased to say that I am a 365-day Republican and a 365-day labor man and I want to dispel the belief tht republicanism and labor are not compatible. The records will prove that the real friend of labor has been and is the Republican Party.

A few years ago I had the pleasure of touring Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, where I found that the union members and the Social Democrats were one and the same. Fortunately they are in control of the Government so they enjoy a good economy and full employment.

Later I visited France and Italy lecturing to free trade unions on methods and means of combating the Communist unions. Here union members also made up the political party but they were out of power—workers were being exploited to the *n*th degree and unemployment ran high.

The American labor unions having the benefits of these observations decided it was better to remain impartial in politics but to help those who were partial to them regardless of party affiliations thereby remaining a constant pressure group. How does this really work out in practice or have they put all their eggs in one basket? Where does the Republican Party stand in this confusion?

The Republican Party's attitude of ignoring statements against it is dangerously wrong.

Some of these statements are so erroneous that we Republicans feel they are unworthy of retort. But it must be remembered that regardless of our belief if a statement goes unchallenged many will accept it on the strength of hearing it repetitiously.

This morning we will shatter the myths which have been constantly used against us and have become traditional.

First and foremost the myth of the "Millionaire Cabinet" and its supposed partiality toward big business.

Our opponents' favorite theme—that the "big guy" gets all the benefits of the Eisenhower Republican prosperity while the "little guy" is not getting his full share is "baloney."

National income, for the Nation as a whole, has risen and so has labor's share. Under 7 Truman years, labor's share was about 65 percent; under Ike's first 3 years it has risen to about 69 percent.

Conversely, corporation incomes after taxes have accounted for only 6 percent of the national income under Ike as compared to 7.7 percent under Truman.

Former President Truman and other Democratic spokesmen have tried to give the impression that the tax deduction voted by the Republican 83d Congress was exclusively for the benefit of big business. Let us look at the record. The first tax legislation passed by the 83d Congress was the extension of the excess-profit tax which was due to expire on June 30, 1953, and which President Eisenhower requested be extended for an additional 6 months in order to pay off the I. O. U.'s left by Harry Truman. This imposed an additional tax on corporations of $800 million. It helped make possible the reductions in personal income taxes which took place in 1954.

At the request of President Eisenhower the Congress has extended the Korean corporate income tax rates which were scheduled to decline in 1953. The most recent extension will produce an additional $2 billion in revenue for the Federal Government. Contrary to the claims of the Democrats the corporations are the only group still taxed at the full Korean tax rates. This is hardly favoritism to big business.

The statistics show that President Eisenhower's administration is not operating for the exclusive benefit of big business and stock market gamblers as Harry Truman suggests.

Let us talk of the Millionaire Cabinet bearing in mind that former President Roosevelt had 8 millionaires in his Cabinet including billionaire Jesse Jones who has recently died. Truman had 5—Ike has 5, even though the Cabinet has increased.

Let me remind you that prior to 1939 President Roosevelt used to indulge in attacks on the leading members of the business community. However, when the chips were down and it became necessary to mobilize our resources to fight the Nazis, to whom did Roosevelt turn? He asked William Knudsen, the president of General Motors; Edward Stettinus, then chairman of United States Steel; Donald Nelson, president of Sears Roebuck; Charles Wilson, president of General Electric; and William H. Harrison, a vice president of the American Telephone & Telegraph, and countless others of similar capacities and abilities. A certain Senator from Missouri, Harry S. Truman, proceeded to impugn these people. He questioned the distribution of defense contracts and asserted that undue favoritism had been shown big business. Early in 1941 the Truman Committee was established which plummeted Harry Truman into the Vice Presidency, and

then the Presidency. A few years later, when confronted with the Korean emergency, what did Harry Truman do? He asked Charles E. Wilson, the president of General Electric, to take over the Office of Defense Mobilization, one of the most important positions in the entire Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the Democrats when in power have recruited business leaders for many important posts. Let me remind you that our first Secretary of Defense, an unusually capable man, James Forrestal, was a Wall Street banker, W. Averell Harriman, President Truman's Secretary of Commerce, was not exactly a barefoot boy. The Biddles and the Morgenthaus would not qualify as little business men.

We shall explode the criticism that the tax cut program was beneficial to big business rather than to the working man.

In 1948, we had a Republican Congress, it was the notorious Do-Nothing 80th Congress.

Public Law 471 provided for individual income tax reductions. This bill, was passed over the veto of the former President Harry Truman. It is the bill which increases the personal income tax exemption from $500 to $600 and provided tax relief in a fair and equitable manner for all our taxpayers.

There are some things it did not do. It refused, for example, to institute peacetime price, wage and salary controls as requested by former President Truman. Republicans kept their pledge to reduce taxes—by a whopping $7.4 billion in 1954, the largest tax cut the American people ever enjoyed in a single year.

Individual income taxes were reduced by about 11 percent beginning January 1, 1954, the first tax cut since the Republican 80th Congress. Only because the Republican Congress and administration slashed Government spending by billions of dollar was the $3 billion income tax reduction possible.

By contrast, under Democrats taxes reached an all time high in 1952. In fact Democratic Congresses voted 14 out of 15 income tax increases and only 3 out of 10 tax reductions given the American people since the first income tax law was passed in 1913 by Democrats.

The Republican program embracing the excise tax meant the saving of some $999 million and stimulated business activity and employment. The excess profit tax on business was continued for 6 months and added some $800 million to our Treasury. Larger medical expenses affected some 8,500,000 people.

A housing bill permitted lower down payments, longer payment terms up to 30 years and increased mortgage limits up to $20,000.

By a merger of the FHA Mortgage Insurance available funds were increased to $1½ billion. A new urban redevelopment program to clear slums, and redevelop blighted housing areas went into effect.

The small business administration was set up to make loans to small business, helped small producer to bid on defense work and pressed prime contractors to subcontract to small firms.

A Republican Congress extended unemployment compensation to cover 4 million more workers, and provided $200 million to strengthen State funds.

A Republican Congress added 10.2 million more persons into the Federal Security system plus increasing the benefits.

Next the age old "Bugaboo" of the Taft Hartley Law.

This act is not a perfect solution to all labor-management relations problems, but it is significant that it has remained on the books unchanged through the 81st and 82d Congresses controlled by the Democrats with Harry Truman in the White House. When President Eisenhower requested changes in the act to carry out promises which he made to labor in the 1952 campaign, every Democrat in the Senate voted to recommit the bill which incorporated his proposed revisions. Today we again have a Democrat controlled Congress and the law remains unchanged. I am sure that with the benefit of 10 years of experience many revisions in this law could be made to advantage. However, any law which remains on the books unchanged for a decade must have some unusually good features.

President Eisenhower made the following suggestions, there should have been no quarrel:

1. To disallow an employer to petition the NLRB to challenge the representation of a striking union and also to prohibit consideration of a petition on the part of any other union during a strike.

2. That no injunction could be served where collective bargaining relationship existed until the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Board impaneled a special board to meet with the party affected.

3. No contract could be reopened for the purpose of bargaining where the subject was not a matter of negotiations when the contract was made unless both parties mutually agreed.

4. That the union would not be held responsible for the action of a member solely because he held union membership.

5. An employer be obliged to sign a Communist form disclaiming membership in the same manner as union leaders are required by this act.

6. A secret vote be taken by the members of a striking union to determine future activity.

7. Reports required from unions concerning their organization and finances be simplified to eliminate duplication.

8. Congress should initiate a thorough study of the welfare and pension funds with a view to enacting such legislation as will protect and conserve these funds for the millions of working men and women who are their beneficiaries.

Unions have claimed that it is futile to go before the NLRB. Why? For they too are supposed puppets of big business. Let us see. On November 15, 1954 in the Truitt Manufacturing Co. case it was held that an employer who refused to allow a union to examine his books when he has refused a wage increase on an economic basis is in violation of bargaining.

October 18, 1954, in the Richfield Oil case, it was effected that an employer must bargain with the union before putting into effect a stock purchasing plan.

On October 30, 1955 in the Borg Warner case, it was held that an employer may not press to an impasse certain points such as a strike vote, ratification and others which may undermine the status of a union.

The President announced a policy of keeping the Government out of labor disputes and moved to restore collective bargaining to its full force and effect.

Let us review what Truman did: In Truman's 1946 recommendations to Congress during the railroad dispute he asked the authority to draft into the Armed Forces all workers who were on strike against the Government. He stated: This is no longer a strike between labor and management—this is a strike against the Government itself. This kind of stirke can never be tolerated.

Truman asked for an injunction to forbid union leaders from encouraging union members to leave jobs or refusing to return to work. In addition he asked for the right to deprive workers of seniority rights if they persist in striking against the Government; also said there should be criminal penalties against employees and union leaders who violated this act. He also asked that if and when the Government took over an industry, the net profits, if any, would go into the United States Treasury.

Truman sought injunctions against Atomic Trade and Labor Council A. F. of L.; Amalgamated Meat Cutters, A. F. of L., the United Packing House Workers, CIO; United Mine Workers, CIO; Telephone Workers Union, CIO, and Maritime Workers' Union. Through the efforts and insistence of ex-President Truman, John L. Lewis, and the United Mine Workers were held guilty of criminal contempt and were subsequently fined exorbitantly.

This type of action against the working man and his leaders went on endlessly. Yet Ike without use of injunctions cut man-days lost due to strikes down more than 50 percent.

What was the record of the Democrat administration from 1949 to 1953?

A Democrat President and a Democrat Congress, mind you—check the party platform promises of 1948. It is one of the skimpiest, do-nothing records in the political annals of this country.

It was in fact, a new record of futility and failure on virtually every platform pledge dealing with major domestic issues. Therefore, the attack on Mr. Eisenhower as a "do-nothing President" is with poor grace. I am willing to accept the judgment of Secretary Quarles, a great scientist, Secretary Wilson, an engineer and industrialist, and President Eisenhower, a great military strategist, in preference to the new crop of scientific wonders the Democrats are displaying. Adlai Stevenson has also joined Harry Truman in criticizing President Eisenhower's foreign policy. He said Ike's foreign policy was rigid and unimaginative. I sometimes wonder if he himself really believes it, or is he trying to convince himself it is true. What could have been more imaginative than President Eisenhower's open skies proposal "End the arms race." Do away with the impetus to war. Open up the skies so that no nation need fear surprise attack by another nation. Let's have disarmament—one in which the whole world may rest easily—a disarmament with inspection.

His efforts to arrive at international control and utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes have won him the gratitude of all.

If the Democrats would stop attacking him and proceed to enact his legislative program, they would be doing a great deal more for the people of the United States.

It is common knowledge that under the Democratic-controlled Congress almost all committee chairmanships fall to those who have a history of placing States' rights above Federal interests. They are consistent proponents of anti-labor legislation and have effected in their States "Right to work" laws which are detrimental to union progress. These laws exist in 18 States—comprising the bulwark of the Democratic Party. An estimated 2 million low wage workers largely in the South benefited by the increase in the Federal minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.

In reality the 84th Congress, under Democrat leadership, has become a do-nothing Congress. Here are a few of the President's legislative proposals which are waiting action by a Democratic Congress: an expanded highway program; a school-building program; a health-building program; the revision of our labor laws; and a soil bank. There are many others which would benefit people.

Eisenhower in his message to the CIO said: "Trade unionism has become a vital part of American life. The activities of the American labor movement have brought about social and economic reforms which have enriched the lives not only of union members but of millions of other Americans. Union efforts to help strengthen our general welfare, our national prosperity and our democracy have earned sincere gratitude among our people."

What is state of the Union? How does it compare in employment? In 1940, 47.5 million (Roosevelt); 1950, 60 million (Truman); 1955, 63.2 million (Ike).

Unemployment: In 1940, 8.1 million (Roosevelt); 1950, 3.1 million (Truman); 1955, 2.6 million (Ike).

Bear in mind Ike's is without regimentation, this is peacetime employment and Federal payroll padding has been eliminated for Ike has reduced Federal jobs by 225,000.

Let us look at average weekly earnings: In 1940, $25.20 (Roosevelt); 1950, $59.33 (Truman); 1955, $76.52 (Ike), also let it be known that these raises are in real money not inflationary as under Truman. We now have stability of the dollar and of the cost of living.

How has this affected the unions? The more people working the greater their potential membership: In 1940, 9 million; 1950, 14 to 16 million; 1954, 17,022 million.

Also the finances of the unions have risen tremendously.

The foregoing record should impress everyone with the fact that the Republican Party needs no apology in its relationship to labor. It has geared its interests to the needs and requirements of the workingman. What lies before our party is an effective and dynamic educational program. We must bring before the American people, and especially union members our activities in their behalf. Contrary to the propaganda we must make the people realize that the Republican Party is one to which they can turn with confidence and security in the time of their needs and difficulties. Apprise your constituents of this record. Let us roll up our sleeves and put our shoulders to the wheel and let us remember that success is due, not to the labors of a few, but, to the faithfulness of many.

Civil Rights Act of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to H. R. 627, the so-called civil rights bill, for many reasons.

In the first place, this measure is aimed at the Southland, that great section of the country which I have the honor to represent. It presumes that the only place in America where a citizen's civil rights are impaired is in the southern part of this country.

Another objection I have to the bill is that it specifies the only civil rights that need special consideration on the part of the Federal Goverment are those rights that are denied a citizen by reason of color, race, religion, or national origin. In this debate already we have observed that rights are denied citizens by reason of their sex and by reason of their age. I believe in many sections of the country that women, for example, are discriminated against in the matter of employment, and are not granted equal pay for equal work. I am sure that there are literally hundreds of thousands of women in America who should be given equal consideration before the law in the protection of their civil rights if we want to embark on this new program. I am also very much concerned about discrimination against citizens because of their age. One of the tragedies in American industrial life today is the fact that merely because a man reaches a certain age, he is no longer granted the right to work. Mr. Chairman, the right to make a living is one of the most precious necessities an American has. I think it is grossly unfair to assume that if we embark upon a program of broad civil rights investigation, we deny the possibility of our older people being given the privilege of this special investigation.

It is my understanding that there are a minimum of 3 million aliens in America today who are voting illegally, and there is some evidence to point out the fact that there are probably nearer 6 million aliens in America, who by reason of their dishonest suffrage are denying all honorable Americans civil rights because honest votes are being negated by those who illegally exercise the suffrage. Why then should not this so-called civil rights measure look into this field of the illegal voting of aliens in our large city areas?

I wish the American people had a chance to study thoroughly this bill under the terms of which a so-called Civil Rights Commission would have almost unheralded power. I am very much shocked to see that in the original terms of this bill, there is no procedure to safeguard the precious rights of those Americans who might be called before the Commission. Although we have now adopted an amendment to grant some rights and consideration to those who might be charged with violating the civil rights of citizens, the bill is still most distasteful to me.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, it has been pointed out that none of the officials of our 48 State governments has appeared before the House Committee on Judiciary to ask for this bill. What then is the reason for it? We have laws to protect the civil rights of our people, but now just before a national election it seems that we want to focus attention on this area of civil rights for political reasons. Of course, the paramount reason why I object to this bill is because it is an unwarranted invasion of States rights. If this measure were to pass and be enacted into law, it would mean the end of States rights. I hope with all my heart that this bill is decisively defeated as it deserves to be.

Democrats Shed Tears for Party Line Followers, But Ignore Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, if you are a Government employee and face a loyalty-security problem, you can rest assured that your position will be adequately and vocally defended; in fact the Democrats are now urging that the taxpayers pay legal costs for the defense of bureaucrats who fight the charge of being security risks

On the other hand, if a Government employee is removed for other reasons than loyalty or security, the Democrats and the left-wing liberal groups are blind to these abuses, even though the employee was attempting a patriotic duty.

The Chicago Tribune in its editorial of Wednesday, July 25, ably points out this situation. Their editorial is as follows:

NO HEARING FOR A PATRIOT

The Democratic majority of a subcommittee studying loyalty and security procedures in the Government has dropped many tears in the course of a 548-page report over wrongs supposedly visited upon payrollers who come under suspicion. The Democrats urge that the taxpayers pay legal costs for the defense of bureaucrats who fight the charge of being security risks.

All bureaucrats who face a loyalty-security review are already assured of a full and fair hearing. Yet the implication of the Democratic report is that they are being abused when they are compelled to defend themselves against derogatory information.

But the report is deaf and blind to a very real abuse involving Federal employees who may be removed from their jobs for reasons other than those of loyalty or security. In such circumstances, only a war veteran is entitled to have his case considered on its merits by the Federal Civil Service Commission's Appeals Examining Office, and by the Commission's Board of Appeals and Review.

The dismissed employee may appeal to these bodies, but they are not obliged or even permitted to consider the merits of the charges by which his superiors have effected his dismissal. If these charges are drawn up in proper form, the Civil Service Commission cannot question them or demand proof that they are true or valid. The charges may be vague, but they will be sustained. The agency concerned has complete discretion and is a law unto itself in the removal of a nonveteran.

These circumstances prevailed in the case of Donald M. Dozer, assistant chief of the State Department's Division of Historical Policy Research. He fell into disfavor with the Democrat who presides over this section by criticizing the foot dragging of the Division in meeting pledges made to Congress concerning the publication schedule of volumes relating to the Nation's diplomatic relations with other countries. He also made himself unpopular by protesting the political suppression of part of the record of the Roosevelt-Churchill-Stalin conference at Yalta.

Mr. Dozer was removed from his post a year ago, but won reinstatement when the Civil Service Commission found that the State Department had failed to make any concrete charge against him. Upon returning to duty, he was again discharged. This time his superiors were at pains to meet Commission requirements as to specificity of charges and explanation of their decision to dismiss him. In other words, although Dozer's chiefs bungled it the first time, they did it right the second.

The Civil Service Commission had no authority to go beyond the allegations made against Dozer. It was not empowered to decide whether they were true or whether they were the real reasons for his being fired. Dozer was never allowed to appear in person to defend himself.

In the outcome, the Commission ruled that, while his dismissal from his post as historian must be sustained, he was eligible for reinstatement without commission approval to any post in the competitive Federal service for which he could qualify. This right extended even to any position in the State Department except that from which he had been fired.

The Commission ruled that Dozer had such right of reemployment because he had not been removed in the first instance or any reason of questionable loyalty, for activities prejudicial to national security, or because of infamous conduct, sex deviation, or conviction for a felony. Nevertheless, he has been unable to obtain a different job within the Eisenhower administration, although he is a Republican.

So the situation is this: If this loyal American had been fired as a loyalty or security risk, he would have been entitled to an exhaustive hearing, but, because he was a loyal and honest citizen, with no Red taint at all, he was deprived of any right to defend himself or to show that the case against him was made out of whole cloth. Yet this manifestly unfair condition fails to arouse any anguish in Washington. All the lamentations arise from abuse of the party liners.

California-Japan Great Circle Airline Route Is Essential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, as I have previously advised my colleagues, I am particularly interested in having the Civil Aeronautics Board approve Pan American World Airways, Inc., application to furnish direct service from the San Francisco Bay area to Tokyo and points beyond. Approval of this application is vitally important to the natural development of business and social association between our residents and the Orient; and, in support of Pan American's application, I am submitting a statement by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce:

CALIFORNIA-JAPAN GREAT CIRCLE AIRLINE ROUTE IS ESSENTIAL

In 1935, more than 20 years ago, Pan American World Airways inaugurated air transportation across the Pacific to the Orient, from California and has been serving the California gateways since that time. It was well aware that the great circle route was by far the shortest one to the Orient, and as early as 1931 made aerial surveys of this route However, because of obstacles of a political character then existing, the route was not available to it. For that reason it established its route across the Central Pacific via Honolulu, Wake, Guam, and Manila to Hong Kong. In 1946 it was authorized by the United States Civil Aeronautics Board to serve both Tokyo and Shanghai from California, but was denied the right to use the great circle route which it then sought, even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter from California to Tokyo. Instead, it was confined to the Central Pacific route, and Northwest Airlines was authorized to use the great circle route for a competing service from the United States to Tokyo. Since that time Pan American has made repeated efforts to be released from the arbitrary Civil Aeronautics Board restriction which requires its Tokyo services from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island en route.

In the most recent proceeding, the Trans-Pacific Certificate Renewal Case of 1953, Pan American's authorization to serve Tokyo was temporarily extended to April 10, 1960. At that time, Northwest's authorization was temporarily extended until April 10, 1962. Again, however, Pan American was restricted to the longer central Pacific route.

The proceeding has been reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board, at the direction of the President, to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the Great Circle route to the Orient.

The question of permanency of the authorization was an issue in the proceeding. However, in a decision by the President only 18 months ago he took the position that the time was not yet appropriate for the issuance of permanent certificates, either to Pan American or Northwest, for service to and through Tokyo. Rather, it was pointed out that the temporary certificates should run their course, and the situation be reviewed in the light of the operating results near the end of the temporary period. Nevertheless, the question has again been raised by a new application filed by Northwest for a permanent certificate, and is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If a decision is now to be made as to the permanency of the certificates for service to Tokyo, there is then no question that Pan American, the carrier which pioneered the Pacific routes and which has been serving the United States-Orient traffic for over 21 years should be given first consideration for permanency. The manifest fairness of this statement is pinpointed by the following facts:

1. Japan generates better than 50 percent of the total United States-Orient traffic.

2. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through the California gateways.

3. Despite the handicap of restrictions which force Pan American to serve Tokyo by a route more than 1,000 miles longer from California, Pan American has been carrying nearly 70 percent of the United States-Tokyo traffic.

It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification must first apply to the primary gateways and the primary carrier. In this case, California and Pan American.

The matter of subsidy is not involved, since both Pan American and Northwest were free of subsidy in the Pacific operation during 1955. However, this will not remain a fact with respect to Pan American in the event it is denied the right to use the great circle route to the Orient for its west coast gateways, including Portland and Seattle, whether the certificates remain temporary or are made permanent.

Northwest alleges that they are faced with a very real hardship for lack of permanent operating rights to Tokyo and urges that money is being invested to promote services on the strength of a temporary certificate. Changes in equipment and services required by the advent of jet aircraft are a very real and pressing possibility. Time delay will cause damage that may well be irreparable. These arguments apply even more forcefully to Pan American. Pan American did not hold back on ordering jet aircraft. It has anticipated the public need by placing orders for such equipment amounting to approximately $243 million, including a fleet for its transpacific services, at a time when the Tokyo certificates of both carriers were temporary, and there was not the slightest indication that one would be extended on a permanent basis without the other. Failure to now grant Pan American a permanent Tokyo certificate, while at the same time granting Northwest such permanency, would cast such a cloud over Pan American's continuance on the Pacific that in Pan American's case, the damage would be irreparable.

In the postwar years, Tokyo has come to occupy the dominating position as the gateway to the Orient. Plainly, a carrier excluded from Tokyo, or placed under a severe handicap in respect to serving Tokyo and other countries of the Orient through Tokyo, would be in a hopelessly inferior position. At the same time, the California gateways which such carrier is serving would suffer from the inferior service to which they thus would be restricted. They could enjoy none of the advantages which true and effective competition can bring to them.

Failure to grant Pan American the great circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted Northwest would be manifestly unjust, not only to Pan American, but to the west coast gateways which it serves.

Status of Forces Agreements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK. T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Republic of Germany became a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance on May 5, 1955. This was coincident with the ratification of the agreement restoring sovereignty to West Germany. The NATO Status of Forces Agreement provides that it shall be open to accession on behalf of any state which accedes to the North Atlantic Treaty. Notwithstanding this, the status of troops in West Germany is determined by agreements which were in effect prior to May 5, 1955, were then extended by agreement for 1 year, and which have been again extended pending agreement among the countries most concerned.

The negotiations which are said to be continuing are clothed in security, but it is not difficult to speculate why the various countries may be reluctant to submit their troops to the criminal jurisdiction of the others. They know the systems of laws of those countries and the dungeons used to imprison culprits. They have observed the procedures in trials. They are aware of the animosities that frequently motivate prosecutions. They are exhibiting a degree of caution which unfortunately our own diplomatic representatives did not exercise in negotiating the original NATO Status of Forces Agreement, the Japanese agreement and many similar agreements affecting our servicemen.

The hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee disclosed that neither the State Department or the Defense Department in their negotiations had given any thought to the laws, procedure or penalties imposed in other countries. No heed was paid to the centuries old dungeons that might be the place of imprisonment of an unfortunate culprit. The blithe way in which our diplomats surrendered the constitutional rights of our servicemen, while maintaining their own immunity, will always remain a blot on the escutcheon of diplomacy.

The representatives of those countries now marking time in extending the NATO Status of Forces Agreement to Germany were not unwilling to enter into the original agreement. They knew

perfectly well that in spite of the pretended reciprocal features of the agreement that the United States servicemen would be the only ones to suffer. The fact that this surrender of criminal jurisdiction is really a one way street as far as we are concerned is now confirmed by the unwillingness of the countries concerned to expose their own men to the perils of such reciprocity.

I trust that this reluctance of the countries concerned to submit to each others' style of justice will persevere so that we may thereby continue to retain the jurisdiction over our own servicemen in Germany that we now have. I recall the statment of a former attorney for the courts of the Allied High Commission in Western Germany, which appeared in the December 1954 issue of the American Bar Association Journal, as follows:

One must visit a German courtroom to understand how different their procedure is from ours. The state's attorney sits at the bench with the three judges while the defense attorney has little participation except to take notes of the proceedings for possible appeal. All questioning is done by the judges who have before them the police dossier of investigation and interrogation. This in itself is a predetermination of guilt by a police magistrate. There is no right against self-incrimination and hearsay evidence is admissible. It is much easier to convict in a German court than in an American because of the difference in procedure and theory which boils down to a presupposition of guilt rather than innocence.

A Fishy Shipping Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 24, 1956]

A FISHY SHIPPING BILL

Senators who watch the public purse ought to guard against a last-minute effort to slip through a new giveaway in the form of a shipping trade-in bill. This bill purports to encourage coastwise shipping operators to trade in old vessels to the Government at world market prices so as to promote the construction of new tankers. In the process it would confer a wholly unwarranted windfall on some operators. It would commit the Government, for example, to buy some 35 tankers from the Pan-Atlantic Steamship Corp. at $1,600,000 each even though the company purchased these self-same tankers from the Government 9 years ago for approximately $960,000 apiece.

Surely it is not necessary to permit artificial enhancement of this sort in order to encourage new ship construction. This is precisely the problem that dogged the Government after World War II and led to some messy scandals. World market values can harly be a valid criterion for ships acquired from the Government at low prices, in this instance pan-Atlantic, after using the depreciation tankers for nearly 9 years, would end by geting back nearly twice what it paid for them. Other shipping operators, some of them enjoying operating subsidies, would benefit in similar fashion. Such brazen invitations to raids on the Treasury tend to discredit worthwhile efforts to modernize the merchant marine.

The House passed the Bonner bill on the unanimous calendar after a slippery maneuver that brought the measure up when few members were on the floor. Courageous opposition led by Representative ZELENKO previously had prevented approval. In the upper House Senator WILLIAMS has fought the bill vigorously, and he ought to be joined by others who see the bad precedent it would set. Obviously the bill would be a wonderful bargain for the shipping companies, but for the taxpayers it would be no bargain at all.

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES,
Washington D. C., July 24, 1956.

Mr. ROBERT H. ESTABROOK,
Editorial Page Editor,
The Washington Post,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ESTABROOK: I have read with interest the editorial appearing in the Washington Post this morning, A Fishy Shipping Bill.

I never inject myself in the editorial policy of the papers, yet I do think papers should be careful in the slanting of their editorials, and in the correctness of the facts on which they are based. Evidently the writer of this editorial did not take occasion to read the bill itself, the report, or the hearings.

The fact of the matter is that over the past 18 months of this Congress the Merchant Marine Committee has held many days of hearings, examining every phase of merchant shipping, in an effort to find ways and means of getting new ideas and new life into water transportation. The inability of domestic shipping to revive or even survive with traditional methods of cargo handling and traditional ships was painfully evident from all of the testimony. The Pan Atlantic Steamship Corp. is one of the first existing operators to develop a workable proposal. In fact, in my 16 years as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House of Representatives, this company is one of the few that has advanced a new idea in coastwise waterborne commerce.

The bill would authorize the charter of war-built T-2 tankers from the Reserve Fleet under 5-year firm charters at a rate based on the current going rate of charter hire for charters of that duration. The charter period would begin with the delivery to the charterer of each pair of tankers by the Government. The charterer would be obliged to build on each tanker, at his own expense, a new superdeck, costing approximately $200,000 each, in order to fit the vessel to carry trailer bodies full of dry cargo. The deck installation would have to be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of Commerce and by the Secretary of the Navy. At the expiration of the charter and the return of the converted tanker, in class, to the reserve fleet, the superdeck would remain on the vessel and be the property of the Government. The idea of fitting superdecks on tankers was employed with tremendous success in World War II, to permit the carriage of fully assembled aircraft and other vital military supplies overseas to the war zones. The Navy strongly endorsed the proposed type of conversion, and testified that in such case the tankers would be more valuable at the expiration of the charter period than they are at the present time.

In addition, at the time of receiving delivery of each pair of tankers under charter, 2 C-2 dry-cargo vessels would be traded in to the Government for an allowance of credit to be applied against the cost of construction of 1 completely modern, high-speed, 32,000-ton combination cargo-tanker ship of not less than 18 knots speed. The superdeck, speed, and size of the new combination ships to be built were strongly endorsed by the Department of Defense. The program for delivery to the operator of the chartered tankers in pairs and the trade-in to the Government of the dry-cargo vessels in pairs would run concurrently. Thus, any default by the operator in carrying out his obligations to proceed with the desirable new construction would mean forfeiture of the valuable trade-in vessels.

The bill provides an allowance for the value of the traded-in C-2 dry cargo vessels of an amount equal to whatever the world market value might be on the day of trade-in, to be applied directly to the building of the new vessels. The payment would be made directly by the Government to the shipyard.

In the event of enactment of the legislation, Pan-Atlantic's program contemplates charter of 20 Government-owned tankers, the trade-in of 20 12- to 14-year-old C-2 type dry cargo vessels, and the construction of 10 new cargo-tank ship vessels.

In order to achieve its purposes, the bill provides that the entire program must be started within 2 years from date of enactment. The authority of the bill is available to any operator who can meet its conditions.

I might call to your attention that the C-type vessels, of which the C-2's are one class, were the best and most modern dry-cargo vessels built in the World War II program. It was testified that the acquisition by the Government of these vessels would up-grade the Reserve Fleet, and that they are far too valuable for national emergency reserve purposes to be permitted to be sold foreign.

When this proposal was made I directed the committee staff, along with the attorney for Pan Atlantic, to collaborate with the Maritime Administration in drawing up a bill to be submitted to the committee, which bill I introduced. The Maritime Administration objected to the fixed charter and the fixed allowance for the traded-in dry-cargo vessels. The committee felt that the charter rate for this length of time was fair. Under present law, the Department of Commerce has authority to allow the foreign value for traded-in vessels, which price was therefore fixed in this bill as being fair to the operator if the Government denies him the right to dispose of his property to his best financial advantage.

Now, with respect to the procedure in the House, this bill was placed on the Consent Calendar. It was objected to. I announced that I would go to the Rules Committee for a rule, which I did the afternoon after the Consent Calendar was called. Later the Rules Committee called us for a hearing on the application for a rule. We were before the committee 2 days. The bill, as usual, remained on the Consent Calendar. I was called out of town because of the death of a very close friend. When I returned to the House, the Consent Calendar was being called, and this bill had been called and passed, without objection, before I reached the floor. Had I been present, I would have brought to the attention of the House that a rule had been requested, but I would not have objected to the bill, because I have utmost confidence and faith in its fairness and its constructive purposes.

Finally, I wish to call to your attention that there is no provision in the bill whatsoever which would, as your editorial reads, "commit the Government, for example, to

buy some 35 tankers from the Pan Atlantic Steamship Corp. at $1,600,000 each."

A copy of the bill and report are enclosed.

With assurance of my high esteem.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

Cumulative Voting by National Banks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the recent Senate action, which would eliminate existing requirements for the compulsory election of directors of national banks through cumulative voting, is very ably commented on by Mr. Hal Thompson, financial editor of the Chicago American in his column of Sunday, July 22.

Mr. Thompson's conclusion is that the cause of banking democracy would best be served if such preferential treatment were not accorded to national banks. His article is as follows:

CUMULATIVE VOTING FOR NATIONAL BANK DIRECTORS NEARS DISCARD

(By Hal Thompson)

Compulsory election of directors of the Nation's national banks through cumulative voting seems to be on the way out.

Legislation which would eliminate existing requirements in the National Bank Act providing for such action has been passed by the United States Senate and only last week was approved by the House Banking Committee.

Thus the only hurdle facing the proposed reform measure is an affirmative vote by the House.

FLAWS POINTED OUT

Cumulative voting permits a stockholder to cast as many votes as are represented by his holdings multiplied by the number of directors to be chosen. His votes may be cast for one nominee for a directorship or prorated among all of the candidates.

Passage of the legislation has been urged by the American Bankers Association and spokesmen for the administration.

Speaking on behalf of the bill, Joseph E. Healy, of the American Bankers Association declared that cumulative voting for directors has been used "to secure the election of individuals who are disposed to put their own personal interest above that of the bank."

He further maintained that the cumulative voting could be used by a minority group of shareholders "prompted by selfish interests and could result in the election of directors whose activities might be detrimental to other minority interests." Such directors, he contended, could very well disturb the sound operation of a bank.

In his endorsement of the bill on behalf of the Treasury Department, Comptroller of the Currency Ray M. Gidney said such cumulative voting by shareholders "does not facilitate the election of undesirable individuals to the directorates of national banks." He testified that he knew of no instance where cumulative voting has proved to have been a beneficial force in the affairs of national banks.

Speaking in rebuttal and demanding retention of the present statutes, Fred Walker, director of the First National Bank of Arlington, Va., said that ending of cumulative voting would "make possible the self-perpetuation of entrenched management."

PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT CITED

He argued that a "49 percent minority ownership is justly entitled to a vote in the management of their investments by the same taken as the 51 percent majority ownership. Minority representation on the board, he maintained, acts as a check and balance and "does not permit complete one-man dictatorship of directors."

The issue would seem to boil down to this—should national banks be entitled to preferential treatment if they desire.

They will be placed in this status if this permissive legislation is enacted—for corporations in many States including Illinois, are required by State laws to choose directors via cumulative voting.

In our humble opinion the cause of banking democracy would best be served if such preferential treatment would not be accorded to national banks. Some stockholder minorities may become obnoxious—but far better they be permitted to do so than to provide the means to keep poor management in office.

Civil Rights Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am gratified at the action of the House of Representatives in passing H. R. 627, despite the volume of acrimonious debate and extravagant and emotional statements made by opponents of the bill.

But let there be no doubt as to the limited scope of this bill and the harsh realities which block its enactment into law. H. R. 627 would provide only a modest first step toward the safeguarding of the civil rights of all Americans. It would establish a 6-member, bipartisan civil rights commission, named by the President to investigate charges that citizens are being denied the right to vote, or are being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures because of their color, race, religion, sex, or national origin. It would authorize an additional Assistant Attorney General, as head of a civil rights division in the Justice Department. It would provide civil remedies for persons interfered with in their right to vote and would permit the Justice Department to initiate civil actions in behalf of persons whose civil rights are denied.

These are not unreasonable or harsh provisions. What is amazing to me is that the Congress of the United States must be called upon to legislate these safeguards and establish these agencies to deal with basic rights which, under our form of government, should be enjoyed by all citizens in every village, town, city, and State in our Nation, without reservation. However, shocking cases of violations of these basic rights in many parts of our country, makes it clear that this legislation is necessary. I regret that it does not go far enough in meeting this obvious need for action.

Civil rights legislation is far too important to be used as a pawn in partisan politics. It is an issue of vital concern to all Americans, and should be considered on its merits alone. Yet unfortunately, politics has been injected into this debate, distortions of fact have taken place, logic and reason have often been drowned out by shrill prejudice and emotionalism. For this reason, I feel that certain facts should be reemphasized.

Republicans have boasted of their record on civil rights, yet the facts show that for more than 3 years the Eisenhower administration offered no civil rights program. Finally, in this election year it presented a watered-down version of Democratic civil rights proposals, pending in committee without even an acknowledgment or reply to committee requests from the Justice Department for the administration views on these civil rights bills.

Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to the 1952 Republican civil rights platform promising Federal action toward the elimination of lynching, Federal action toward the elimination of poll taxes, and Federal legislation to eliminate discriminatory employment practices? The Eisenhower administration has failed to mention these pledges in its legislative program and has also failed to support Democratic legislation to accomplish these objectives.

Nor is this Republican doubletalk on civil rights limited to the administration in Washington. In my own State of Pennsylvania there were five separate attempts to enact Fair Employment Practices legislation in the Pennsylvania State Legislature during the period 1945-53. In every instance a Republican governor was in Harrisburg, and in 4 out of the 5 cases the Republicans controlled both houses of the legislature. During these sessions, there were seven votes in an attempt to obtain favorable action on FEPC. Democrats voted unanimously in support of FEPC with an overall total of 260–0 on these 7 votes, while the Republican overall total was 454–17 against FEPC on these same 7 votes.

I am proud to say that under the leadership of our present Democratic Governor of Pennsylvania, George M. Leader, the Pennsylvania Legislature finally passed the fair employment practices legislation. It was signed into law on October 27, 1955.

I fully support the provisions of H. R. 627, despite their shortcomings, because I am convinced that they are at least a beginning, a beginning which should have been made many years ago when President Truman's civil rights legislative program was first advanced.

Mr. Speaker, the continued violation and denial of civil rights to many of our citizens because of their race, color, religion or national origin is a serious threat to our efforts to stem the tide of Communist imperialism in the non-Caucasian areas of the world. How can we continue to preach the blessings of freedom and democracy if these very principles are subverted in sections of our own country? How can we win the trust of these peoples of the great uncommitted areas of the world if certain

actions at home make a mockery of our beliefs in the fundamental precepts of our great democracy?

Enactment of this bill would do much to dispel the shrill voices of the Kremlin propagandists who exploit our inadequacies in the field of civil rights. Let us put aside prejudice and narrow sectional differences and unite in the common effort to prove to the world that equal justice and fair play still prevail and apply to all citizens of our Nation.

Labor-Management Cooperation or Class Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the veteran labor lawyer Louis Waldman delivered a very interesting address at the Sheldon-Claire conference in Chicago, June 15, 1956, on the subject America's Destiny—Labor-Management Cooperation or Class Struggle. Mr. Waldman is a consultant on labor-management relations for the past 40 years. I commend this address to the attention of all my colleagues:

AMERICA'S DESTINY—LABOR MANAGEMENT COOPERATION OR CLASS STRUGGLE

(By Louis Waldman)

I am happy to have been invited by President Lew Shalett to speak before you tonight. You are pioneers in a movement for adult education in the labor-management field. And education in labor-management cooperation is one of the most important and constructive contributions of this mid-20th century.

I

The subject of my address tonight is America's Destiny: Labor-Management Cooperation or Class Struggle. I have selected this subject with a view to underscoring certain aspects of our industrial and social life which we can ignore only at our peril. In the unfolding of this American Destiny, men and women doing the type of work performed by the Sheldon-Claire organization are in a position to play a crucial role.

To say that America is at the crossroads is to utter a commonplace. We in common with the other nations of the Western World have been at the crossroads for a least a full generation.

On November 6, 1955, at a meeting held in Moscow to commemorate the 38th anniversary of the October Bolshevik Revolution, the Soviet Union, through Lazar M. Kaganovich, its First Deputy Premier, declared in a major foreign policy pronouncement that communism will triumph this century throughout the world. Mr. Kaganovich said:

"If the 19th century was a century of capitalism, the 20th century is a century of the triumph of socialism and communism."

This declaration was coupled with the following warning:

"No one will ever be able to break the close bonds linking the Soviet people with the broad people's masses, with the working class of all countries of the world."

We have been familiar for some time with the Communist boast that capitalism is doomed and that the triumph of communism is inevitable, being so decreed by history. But rarely have we been challenged by a high Soviet official with such a blunt statement of the timetable.

Unfortunately, this dismal prophecy may well prove correct if our Nation, as the leader of the non-Communist Western World, falters in its purpose, becomes confused and divided or fails properly to evaluate the nature of the enemy and the influences let loose by it. We must never forget that in less than 38 years the Communist dictatorship has not only established complete control over the giant Russian nation but has also spread its power through China, Indo-China, and other parts of Asia, and has included within its orbit Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and now perhaps Yugoslavia.

So many billions of dollars are being poured into our military bastions; so much energy is being devoted to tracking down espionage and other Communist criminal activities—all quite necessary—that we tend to ignore the enemy's principal weapon.

II

The principal weapon of world communism in the class struggle

In utilizing this weapon the Communist apparatus is able to exploit the fact that the principles of the class struggle have been part of the education of millions of Americans and hundreds of millions of Englishmen, Frenchmen, Italians, Germans, Scandinavians, Dutch, Belgians, and Swiss—in a word, all of our principal allied and associated powers in what we call the Western bloc—not to speak of the countries within the Soviet sphere of domination. This education goes back over a century and has permeated the culture of the entire Western World.

Nothing fundamental or effective has been or is being done to meet this threat or to neutralize the influences created by the permeation of class-struggle education in our historical, sociologic, political, and economic thinking.

One hundred and eight years ago, in the year 1848, there was first published the Communist Manifesto, by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. This manifesto opens with the following words:

"The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles."

The manifesto then continues:

"Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: bourgeoisie and proletariat."

While these declarations are cast in terms of a philosophy of history, for over a century they have served as far more than a mere academic historical thesis. They have been a call to action; a plan of campaign; a means of attaining victory.

Forty years later, when the manifesto had already become a bible for social and political action, Frederick Engels, its co-author emphasized the importance of the manifesto's opening declaration in the following words:

"The whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinctions and class struggles."

With the coming of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 new and dangerous forces came into the world. The Communist movement now had a base from which to operate, a gigantic nation with tremendous resources to manipulate. Breathing the philosophy of force and violence, of lawlessness and dictatorship, the Communists began to read the words of the Communist manifesto in shriller and more ominous tones. The transition was easily made from class struggle into class war and from class war into civil war. And the class-struggle doctrine became the justification for class rule, for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and for the ruthless elimination of all those designated as class enemies.

This doctrine covers a multitude of sins, the most venal being the conditioning of man's mind to an acceptance of the most despotic of tyrannies in history—the Communist police state.

For the past 38 years the concept of class struggle and civil war has been dinned into the ears of millions of people in accents most emphatic and determined, and through mass mediums of communications unequaled in all history. At present the Kremlin can boast truthfully that the Communist philosophy governs countries with over 800 million souls. It is true that many of these people are unwilling subjects of that rule, but the tragic fact remains that once communism is allowed a foothold in a nation's government, that nation has reached the point of no return. It has made a mistake that cannot be corrected, a step both irretrievable and irreversible.

The Communist transition from class struggle to class and civil war is not limited to civil war within one nation or any particular nation. Communists regard international war between Communist and non-Communist nations as a form of civil war. Under this doctrine, the Communist adherents in the non-Communist countries owe their allegiance to the Communist side, not to that of their own country. It is in this context that the Communists carry on both their cold and their hot wars. It is for this reason that the Communist Parties the world over are truly fifth columns. And it is in this background that Kaganovich's statement that "no one will ever be able to break the class bonds linking the Soviet people with the broad people's masses, with the working class of all peoples of the world" must be understood by us just as it is certain to be understood by the Communists and their followers.

The subject under consideration has special urgency for Americans today because of the most recent developments in Moscow, designed to revive and intensify the class struggle weapon to create internal disorder and dissension and thus bring about communism in the 20th century. My survey of these recent events and my evaluation of them will, I hope, help you and all other Americans concerned in strengthening our own democratic weapons for the unity of our people and the advancement of our prosperity.

Unlike some of our Nation's leaders, I do not think we can derive any comfort from the developments at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party held in February, 1956. A great deal of confusion and bewilderment has been created by those developments, and many of our experts, both in and out of Government, seem to be unable to make up their minds what the present Soviet line portends for us and our future.

In this confusion and bewilderment lies Russia's strength and our sad weakness.

Some of our leaders talk about Russia's new look. Some—and these include our Secretary of State and the President himself—think that the so-called new look is the result of Russia's weakness. I believe that both of these concepts—that Russia has adopted any significant new look and that this supposed change results from Soviet weakness—represents mere wishful thinking.

What the Communists' 20th Congress actually unveiled was not a new look but a

new offensive against the United States and the entire non-Communist world. To be sure a shift in party line has taken place on the weapons to be used, but not on the basic objective or the basic target. There will be no relaxation in the battle against Western civilization and against our country as its acknowledged and most powerful leader.

The speeches at the 20th Congress were heavily laden, of course, with Communist jargon, but insofar as our country is concerned, Communist Party Chief Khrushchev had these very plain words to say:

"Of course in countries where capitalism is still strong and where it controls an enormous military and police machine, the serious resistance of the reactionary forces is inevitable.

"There the transition to socialism will proceed amid conditions of an acute class revolutionary struggle."

Mr. Khrushchev then outlined the role of the Communist fifth column during this period of what he euphemistically calls transition.

Lest comfort is sought to be derived from the sensational publication of Mr. Khrushchev's speech viciously attacking Joseph Stalin, I desire to make one strong warning to my countrymen. To treat that attack as a softening or change of heart on the part of the present Soviet leaders, would be fatal.

Everything Khrushchev said in his speech concerning Stalin, he and his colleagues knew since Stalin's death. Yet, on November 6, 1955, less than 4 months before Khrushchev's denunciation of his predecessor, Kaganovich had this to say:

"After Lenin's death, the Bolshevik Party, which he created under the leadership of its Central Committee and the true comrade-in-arms of Lenin, the great Stalin, successfully carried out Lenin's plan."

Kaganovich's speech was made on behalf of his government and the Communist Party and in the presence of Khrushchev and the other Russian leaders. It is unthinkable that the party leaders did not pass upon and approve Kaganovich's speech.

But, if, as Kaganovich said, Lenin's plan was carried out by "the great Stalin," "the true comrade-in-arms of Lenin" then Khrushchev's description of Stalin as a brute, half-mad, savage, power-crazy despot, must be part of a colossal hoax and fraud.

Certainly the record of Stalin's crimes bears out the Khrushchev accusations with something to spare. The point I make is not that Stalin was innocent of the charges but rather than we must dispel most emphatically the illusion that the Kremlin leaders have shown any change of heart.

Khrushchev's explanation that the new line is based upon collective leadership as against the cult of hero worship of a single leader, is nothing but a hollow mockery. For in the very same speech, every second sentence glorifies Nicolai Lenin as a miracle worker. If Lenin can be deified why not Stalin or a later successor. The answer must be sought elsewhere than in this claimed repudiation of the single leader cult.

Our wishful thinkers also feel that because Khrushchev attacked the Stalin purges, there has been a change of heart on the use of terror and violence by the Soviet leaders. But, that too is refuted by Khrushchev's own speech. For in denouncing Stalin, the present Communist chieftain said:

"Stalin's report at the February-March Central Committee Plenum in 1937, 'Deficiencies of party work and methods for the liquidation of the Trotskyites and other two-facers,' contained an attempt at theoretical justification of the mass terror policy under the pretext that as we march forward toward socialism class war must allegedly sharpen. Stalin asserted that both history and Lenin taught him this.

"Actually, Lenin taught that the application of revolutionary violence is necessitated by the resistance of the exploiting classes, and this referred to the era when the exploiting classes existed and were powerful.

* * * * *

"This terror was actually directed not at the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes but against the honest workers of the party and of the Soviet state."

Here and in other portions of his speech, Khrushchev makes clear that "revolutionary violence" is permissible and justified if directed at the "exploiting classes." And the exploiting classes, my friends, means all the non-Communists.

What then is the explanation of the Khrushchev speech?

To me as a lawyer it seems like a carefully prepared defense of justifiable homicide against a possible imminent pending charge by somebody in the know that Stalin was murdered. And judging by the timing, I would say that the necessity for such a defense did not arise until after Kaganovich's declaration of November 6, 1955 that the "great Stalin" was the "true comrade-in-arms of Lenin" and "successfully carried out Lenin's plan."

The Communist Party's 20th Congress was significant to Americans in other respects. Included in the "new" party program was that old standby, the united front. The united front is the younger brother of the doctrine of peaceful coexistence. Whereas the latter applies to the nations, the former operates in the trade union movement and among Communist and Socialist political parties everywhere. The united front is the chosen instrument for penetration of the non-Communist world and for intensification of the class struggle.

The revival of this tactic, which has many times in the past led to the downfall of non-Communist governments, is of the greatest danger to us in the United States, to the other western nations, to the uncommitted Asian countries, and to large areas in the Middle East. More dynamite is packed in this weapon than in an arsenal of hydrogen bombs. To meet it—to defeat the Communist boast that their philosophy will control the world in the 20th century—we in the United States must understand the nature of the enemy, we must educate our people in the falsity of its propaganda and in the menace of its tactics, and, above all, we must develop positive programs to meet effectively and successfully the challenge that has been thrown out to us.

III

It would be a mistake to think that the proponents of the class struggle in America have to break new ground by spreading their doctrine among a people previously unprepared for it. On the contrary, for the better part of a century the class struggle doctrine has been spread among large numbers of men and women. Here, as in other countries, the avant garde has embraced this doctrine and propagated it.

Nor has its acceptance been limited to Communists. Many non-Communists who are honestly repelled at the violence and brutality of the Soviet regime, accept either consciously or unconsciously the basic philosophy of the inevitable war between classes.

As applied to the United States, at its present stage of development, the class struggle doctrine holds that American society is divided into two main classes, the working class and the capitalist class; that there is an irreconcilable conflict between these two classes; that this conflict is inherent in our present-day society; and violent and sometimes hidden or even unconscious. According to this doctrine: (1) the employers' profits are greater in proportion, as the workers' wakes are smaller, and vice versa; (2) there is a natural desire of the employer for a greater share of the dollar produced by business enterprise and an equally strong desire of the workers for a greater share of the same dollar; and (3) this conflict creates and perpetuates an irreconcilable class struggle.

This doctrine, not only in our country, but the world over, has given rise to an elaborate philosophy calling for the organization of workers' political parties to aid in the economic struggle—a struggle declared to be both a battle for survival and a battle to abolish the capitalist system. As part of the same program, class educational institutions were established throughout the world and class newspapers and periodicals sprang up by the thousands. A trade-union movement based on class identification was built and organs of education and culture were established, financed, and fostered.

In many areas the class struggle was viewed as a philosophic and sociologic doctrine to be attained through lawful political and economic means. These followers of the Marxist doctrine engaged only in lawful activities, but based on the fundamental premise of an irreconcilable struggle between worker and employer.

For myself, since I first became interested in labor-management relations, and in the social movements of our time, I have felt that the doctrine of the class struggle, even as interpreted and applied by sincere anti-Communists, was false and pernicious. As interpreted and applied by the Bolsheviks and Communists it is outright criminal.

I believe it was Herbert Spencer who once said that there was a grain of truth in all things erroneous. Of course labor and management compete for a larger share of the dollar which their joint efforts have earned. That is the grain of truth in the otherwise erroneous doctrine of the class struggle. But labor and management will each receive a much larger share if more dollars are produced by the enterprise, while the shares of both are likely to suffer if the enterprise is torn by strikes, lockouts, animosities, and internal economic warfare. And what is true of a single enterprise is true also of the economy as a whole.

But the doctrine of labor-management cooperation does not rest merely on the dollar advantage to either labor or management. It rests on far more fundamental values and considerations. The common interests of labor and management along with that of the rest of us in preserving a democratic system of society, the integrity of the individual, the opportunities that human liberty affords for expansion and growth—all far outweigh the disagreements which may arise between labor and management over the division of the dollar.

Basically, these facts are recognized by American labor. The trade-union movement in this country, which now numbers over 16 million members, wishes by and large to bargain with management for a fair share of the industrial dollar. Labor wishes to share with management control over the conditions under which its members work. But it does not visualize the collective-bargaining table as a political arena for the seizure of power and the replacement of private ownership by collective or State ownership. Of course, trade unions seek a greater share of the dollar for the workingman, just as businesses compete for a greater share of the consumer's dollar, but this is done through the democratic system, by negotiation, compromise, and agreement.

Strikes are not viewed as instruments for the sharpening of labor militancy with the end of overthrowing the present system. Trade unions in the main accept the framework of our present economic and social fabric, although they may of course differ,

as all citizens do, on whether this or that institution operates effectively or fairly.

But this is not so with the believers in the class struggle, and there are quite a number of them in the labor movement and on its periphery. Some function openly, some do not. They operate at various levels, from the rank and file union member to shop steward, local official, and all the way to the top. Many of them are well trained in the theory of the class struggle. To them every strike sharpens the militancy of the "working class." Every labor dispute, every bargaining session is a step not merely for the accomplishment of some immediate, concrete end but a maneuver directed at larger and broader political ends.

Every move that is made by responsible labor leaders toward cooperation with management is viewed by the disciples of the class struggle as a step backward, a weakening of labor militancy, a surrender to capitalism.

The American goal of a peaceful, stable, and constructive society is set forth admirably in the President's economic report presented to Congress on January 24, 1956:

"The underlying goal of Americans is better living in all of its aspects, not merely indefinite increase in per capita income and possessions. The cherished intangible components include improved health of mind and body; more wholesome family life; availability of useful work, full-time or part-time; lessened drudgery, severity and monotony of labor; more leisure and increased opportunities for learning; greater opportunity for all and lessening of indefensible disparities; and larger protection against the hazards of life. Gains in all of these respects profoundly improve the quality of living, to which we attach high importance. The notable advances registered in the past have been in part a by-product of our economic progress, but in part also a response to major innovations by private groups and all levels of our Government."

In this connection and bearing on the problems we face, it should be borne in mind that we are living in an age of the highest technical and scientific industrial progress. I call your attention to recent important studies by a group of faculty members of the California Institute of Technology made public on May 20, 1956. These scientists conclude that within the next 100 years the earth's population will multiply several fold, from its present 2,600,000,000 persons to perhaps as many as 30,000,000,000, but that our rapid and revolutionary scientific discoveries will enable mankind to be free from shortages in food, clothing, shelter and the other necessities of a civilized life. The fruits of our scientific progress will then be spread over the entire earth, and high standards of well-being will not depend upon richness in natural resources. The air, the sea, ordinary rock and sunlight will become sources of energy and material.

The scientists make only two conditions: that the world remain at peace and that our industrial mechanism, under the guidance of an ever-increasing supply of scientific brainpower, not be disturbed or interrupted. For the highly complex factories must work together toward a heightened world civilization, and their very interdependence will make the entire mechanism all the more vulnerable to economic disruption in any one of its parts.

But this condition of uninterrupted operations creates basic and fundamental problems of civil rights, such as the rights to strike, to lock out, and to free collective bargaining which these rights guarantee. At the same time this condition places new weapons and opportunities in Communist hands for paralyzing production and creating threats to our economic survival, by what they call "peaceful" economic action. This places the highest degree of responsibility on those who govern the destinies of management and labor. And it puts the highest premium on the imaginative creation of techniques which will lead to the peaceful, intelligent and just resolution of the problems underlying labor-management relations in a free world. Unless we can create the spiritual and intellectual climate under which stable labor-management relations can flourish, the alternative may very well be the Soviet prophecy of communism in this century.

The race is between the advocates of class struggle and those who desire labor-management cooperation.

On May 25, President Eisenhower in a speech at Waco, Tex., called upon American universities and private foundations to unite in establishing a ring of cultural centers, as a sort of educational point 4 program for the underdeveloped countries of the world. But more engineers, more scientists and more technicians, though important to our future, will not solve the much broader human problem of what to do with this sensitive, complex industrial mechanism which the scientists and engineers will create. There is a crying need for the establishment of an intensive educational program in our own country and in other countries as well, to teach management how to deal with labor and labor how to deal with management.

When the Communists train scientists and engineers they indoctrinate them at the same time with their social philosophy of the class struggle. In educating the new representatives of management and the new representatives of labor, we must familiarize them with the dynamics of labor-management cooperation and ground their training firmly in an understanding of economics, psychology, history and human relations.

It is in this educational process that the work now being pioneered by the Sheldon-Claire organization takes on such a vital role. I look forward to the day when your organization will become universally recognized throughout the land as a great American institution devoted to the promotion of greater prosperity, greater well-being, and higher standards of living through intelligent, fair and just labor-management cooperations.

This is a full-time task and labor and management cannot approach it on a hit or miss, here or there basis. In two world wars we have learned that in times of great national peril, labor and management find a way to cooperate for increased production, for the removal of artificial barriers and for the mutual recognition of the rights of all. Once war is over we let our guard down, we tend to relax.

That can no longer be the case. In the cold war that is bound to continue for some time, western civilization must not only survive but must win. Human freedom throughout the world is too precious to be allowed to perish. With the rapid march of science on the one hand and totalitarianism on the other, America's destiny calls for redoubled efforts toward labor-management cooperation and the preservation of our cherished liberties.

Sad Sack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of July 25, 1956:

SAD SACK

Depending on your idea of humor, the case of Harold Stassen's maneuver to dump Vice President NIXON gets funnier and funnier, or sadder and sadder.

Mr. Stassen's announcement that he would promote Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, for second place on the Republican ticket hardly got out of his press conference before his little world started caving in around his ears.

GOP Congressmen got together in groups and jeered him. Republican Senators hooted him. President Eisenhower dealt him a smart jab to the chin. From left and right, he was cuffed and mauled. Democrats howled in glee.

Then came the haymaker. Governor Herter, the man Mr. Stassen was going to use to eliminate Mr. NIXON, let it be known he would put the Vice President's name in renomination at the Cow Palace convention next month.

And while Mr. Stassen was trying to pick himself up off the floor, we were reading a biography which glowingly said of him: "He is a durable politician who can't be counted out."

No wonder. He never hears the bell.

Some Comments on the Joint Policy for Land Acquisition on Reservoir Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the joint policy for land acquisition on reservoir projects approved by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior January 13, 1954—Order No. 2744, as published in the Federal Register—provides for the acquisition in fee title of the bare minimum of land in connection with such projects. By action of its board of directors, meeting at Rolla, Mo., June 20, 1954, the National Wildlife Federation protested that this policy tended to ignore the wildlife and recreational values adversely affected, or created, by such developments. The federation pointed out that the general public, which pays or helps pay for Army Engineer and Reclamation projects, has a right to expect access to Federal reservoirs for recreational purposes. Furthermore, the failure to protect wildlife and recreational values, or to take advantage of the opportunities created by many such projects to enhance wildlife and recreational values, is the opposite of conservation. The federation's resolution follows:

The board of directors of the National Wildlife Federation, representing through its 47 State affiliated wildlife organizations more than 3 million sportsmen-conservationists, respectfully urges the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Army to give reconsideration to section 6 of Order No. 2744, approved January 13, 1954, for publication in the Federal Register establishing a joint policy for land acquisition on reser-

voir projects for the following reasons, to wit:

1. The values of federally financed impoundments of water used in seeking appropriations in Congress take into consideration recreational and wildlife values to the general public.

2. The tremendous increase in the numbers of hunters, fishermen and recreationists in the United States requires full utilization of all recreational resources to meet increasing demands.

3. Nonreimbursable Federal funds invested in governmentally financed impoundments and structures are derived from taxes imposed upon all citizens of the United States. Fair and adequate development of wildlife and recreational values alone can justify the taking of such tax money for local and sectional flood control and irrigation projects.

Under the present policy the general public will be denied the enjoyment of recreation and wildlife values reasonably incident to a coordinated and comprehensive development of such projects. On the contrary the greatly enhanced benefits and increased land values will accrue not to the public, but to the riparian owners of contiguous land. Wildlife and recreation values, including adequate public access to and public use of impounded water and contiguous riparian land, should be protected by acquisition of reasonable land areas in depth above the high watermark of all such federally financed projects.

Legislation like H. R.159 and H. R. 160, providing for reconveyance of lands acquired for the Belton and Whitney Reservoirs in Texas, has been proposed as retroactive application of the Army-Interior joint policy. Several similar bills, pertaining to other Federal reservoirs, have been introduced. Two such reconveyance bills were enacted during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, one applying to the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Georgia and Florida, the other to the Demopolis Reservoir in Alabama.

The National Wildlife Federation and other conservation organizations did not protest the Jim Woodruff and Demopolis Acts because the language specified that lands required for public purposes should not be reconveyed. It seemed clear that Congress previously had provided for recognition of wildlife management and public recreation as public purposes in the Coordination Act—Public Law 732, 79th Congress—and in section 209 of the Flood Control Act of 1954, which reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Army is also authorized to grant leases of lands, including structures or facilities thereon, in reservoir areas for such periods, and upon such terms and for such purposes as he may deem reasonable in the public interest: *Provided*, That leases to nonprofit organizations for park or recreational purposes may be granted at reduced or nominal considerations in recognition of the public service to be rendered in utilizing the leased premises: *Provided further*, That preference shall be given to Federal, State, or local governmental agencies, and licenses, or leases where appropriate, may be granted without monetary considerations, to such agencies for the use of all or any portion of a reservoir area for any public purpose, when the Secretary of the Army determines such action to be in the public interest, and for such periods of time and upon such conditions as he may find advisable: *And provided further*, That in any such lease or license to a Federal, State, or local governmental agency which involves lands to be utilized for the development and conservation of fish and wildlife, forests, or other natural resources, the licensee or leassee may be authorized to cut timber and harvest crops as may be necessary to further such beneficial uses and to collect and utilize the proceeds of any sales of timber and crops in the development, conservation, maintenance and utilization of such lands.

As a matter of fact, under the specific authority of the aforementioned laws, the Army had granted a 25-year license to the Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission of Florida to manage 7,273 acres of the Jim Woodruff Reservoir lands as a waterfowl-management and public-shooting area.

The Army insisted, however, that under Public Law 300 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, even the lands licensed to the State of Florida had to be sold back to the former owners. This resulted in a nationwide controversy and in introduction of H. R. 11197 by Congressman BOB SIKES. The purpose of Mr. SIKES' bill, which was passed by the House July 23, 1956, is to hold in public ownership the excellent waterfowl marshes on the Florida side of the Jim Woodruff Reservoir.

Since the disillusioning Jim Woodruff experience, the Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and other conservation organizations have opposed reconveyance legislation unless amended to provide adequate protection of the public interest in the wildlife and recreational values. H. R. 159 and H. R. 160 contain no such protective language. Amendments approved in committee further restrict consideration of conservation values by changing the words "public purposes" to "project purposes."

The conservation groups also have indicated these bills, and other pending reconveyance bills, because they propose the sale of project lands to a favored group at a price which does not reflect the increased value accruing as a result of the expenditure of public funds. It is a sheer hand-out to the former owners or to the speculators who have cornered the options.

The nationwide significance of this problem was discussed by Mr. Harold Titus, the noted conservation editor of the magazine Field and Stream, in the issue for August 1956. The article by Mr. Titus follows:

While South Dakota conservationists watched fences go up and food and cover plants flourish on seven new game-management areas along the Fort Randall Reservoir, residents of Florida and Georgia just about abandoned hope that the Jim Woodruff Reservoir on their boundary would ever support similar projects. Bewildering shifts in Army engineer land policies had game officials in those Southeastern States completely confused and frustrated.

It has been reported in these columns that land acquisition around new impoundments constructed by Federal construction agencies is being curtailed. Instead of purchasing enough acreage so that public access and public recreational areas on newly created water would be assured, it now appears that in most cases the shoreline is to remain in private ownership. Furthermore, on certain projects where descriptions bordering the reservoirs have already been acquired, those portions which are not to be flooded seem due to be sold back to former owners at bargain rates. At least this is the interpretation placed on recent Army decisions by several of the country's largest national conservation organizations.

The situation came to attention when the Army reversed itself on an agreement involving the Jim Woodruff Reservoir. Back in January 1955 a 25-year license was granted the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission to set up a game-management area on 72,000 acres of lands along the reservoir that had been acquired by Army engineers. Then, a few weks ago, Army brass informed Florida that, after all, the land in question would serve no public purpose, that because it fails to do so the Army has no authority for retaining it, and that it would be offered for sale to former owners. Tupelo-notch waterfowl marshes on the Georgia side of the impoundment also appeared to be going up for sale to private parties.

The Georgia Conservation League made a roaring protest, and Congressman BOB SIKES of Florida introduced a bill to prevent reconveyance of any lands that Florida can use for public purposes. The fate of these efforts may have been decided by the time this reaches print. And the chance that South Dakota isn't going to benefit from those Fort Randall improvements may possibly have materialized as well.

This is no localized controversy. Plans for wildlife projects on Engineers Corps lands are pending in Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Mississippi, according to the National Wildlife Federation. If the Army's current determination to reduce all reservoir ownership to flooded acres prevails, many hopes entertained by conservationists for needed recreational facilities are going out the window. As this is written, the situation is far from clear.

San Francisco Host to National Japanese American Citizens League Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to the 14th biennial national convention of the Japanese American Citizens League—JACL—which will be held in San Francisco over the Labor Day weekend, from August 30 to September 3, with headquarters in the historic Sheraton-Palace Hotel.

JACL, as most Congressmen are aware, is the only national organization of Americans of Japanese ancestry; its name identifies its constituency and the reasons for its being. All of its members are native-born or naturalized citizens of the United States; most, but not all, are also of Japanese ancestry.

Its twin slogans, which express its purposes and objectives, as well as summarize its activities and achievements, are "For Better Americans in a Greater America" and "Security Through Unity."

CONVENTION PROGRAM

The convention begins with a meeting of the national board, composed of the elected officers and district council chairmen, on Thursday morning, August 30. The national council, composed

of the official delegates representing 88 chapters and members in 32 States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Hawaii, and Japan, begins their deliberations the following day, Friday, August 31. Climax of the convention is the traditional banquet on Labor Day, when the outstanding Japanese American in the United States for the past 2 years will be announced as the Nisei of the Biennium. The last such award was presented to Sgt. Hiroshi Miyamura, Gallup, N. Mex., Congressional Medal of Honor winner and one of the 10 outstanding young men in the Nation as selected by the United States Junior Chambers of Commerce. Guest speaker at the banquet will be Maxwell M. Rabb, Secretary to the Cabinet of the United States and adviser to the President on minority problems. The final event will be the Sayonara ball on September 3.

For the first time, special events will be held for the newly naturalized citizen parents, for the ladies, and for the younger citizens. And Convention Queen Sharon Nishima of Sacramento, representing the host district council, will reign over the festivities.

Jerry Enomoto, immediate past president of the San Francisco host chapter, is the convention chairman.

OFFICERS TYPICAL AMERICANS

Typical of the cross-section of America that comprises JACL are its officers.

National president is George Inagaki, of Venice, Calif., a former nurseryman recently turned real estate salesman.

National vice president is Ken Tashiro, of Orosi, Calif., a farmer.

National vice president is Tak Terasaki, of Denver, a pharmacist.

National treasurer is Dr. Roy Nishikawa, of Los Angeles, an optimetrist.

Board secretary is William Mimbu, of Seattle, an attorney.

Thousand club chairman is Shig Wakamatsu, of Chicago, a chemist.

Dr. Thomas T. Yatabe, first constitutional national president, of Chicago, a dentist, and Hito Okada, immediate past national president, of Salt Lake City, Utah, an insurance agent, are also members of the board.

Chairman of the Pacific Northwest district council is Dr. Kelly Yamada, of Seattle, another optometrist.

Chairman of the northern California-western Nevada district council is Yas Abiko, of San Francisco, a newspaper publisher.

Chairman of the central California district council is Jin Ishikawa, of Fresno, another attorney.

Chairman of the Pacific southwest district council is Dave Yokozeki, of Los Angeles, an attorney and motion picture executive.

Chairman of the intermountain district council is George Sugai, of Payette, Idaho, a businessman.

Chairman of the mountain-plains district council is Robert Horiuchi, of Denver, an accountant.

Chairman of the midwest district council is Abe Hagiwara, of Chicago, a social worker.

Chairman of the eastern district council is William Sasagawa, of Philadelphia, an engineer.

National director is Mas Satow of San Francisco; Washington representative is Mike Masaoka of the District of Columbia; Pacific southwest director is Tats Kushida of Los Angeles; and legal counsel is Frank Chuman, also of Los Angeles.

SAN FRANCISCO APPROPRIATE SITE

The city by the Golden Gate, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, is particularly appropriate for a gathering of this kind, for no other city in America has been more closely identified with Japanese Americans and their destiny than San Francisco.

Gateway to and from the Orient, it was through this port that the first immigrants from Japan arrived three quarters of a century ago, to make their own significant contributions to the building of Westen America. It was here that the Treaty of Peace was signed 5 years ago, opening a new and greater era of friendship and cooperation between the United States and Japan.

San Francisco has always been closely associated with the Citizens League movement since its inception in the midtwenties. One of the earliest chapters was organized here. In 1929 in San Francisco, a meeting of the California chapters decided to federate into a national association to promote the citizenship of the then young Japanese American minority and the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in this Nation, who at that time were subjected to considerable legal and other forms of racial discrimination. Though the First Biennial National Convention was convened in Seattle in 1930, and the Second Biennial 2 years later in Los Angeles, the Third Biennial which established the present organizational structure of the JACL was held in this city by the Golden Gate in 1934.

National headquarters before the war was, and at the present time located in San Francisco.

Probably its most memorable meeting was in the spring of 1942, when an emergency meeting of the National Council was held in San Francisco to determine the course of action which Japanese Americans should take in a war in which they were too often confused with the enemy. It was decided that Japanese Americans would agree to cooperate with the Government in their own evacuation, although they thoroughly disagreed with the necessity for such action and the reasons for what has been describe as "our worst wartime mistake."

But, the dedicated loyalty of the Japonese Americans was demonstrated in that mass movement, and the Government and the public at large were forced to reappraise the devotion and allegiance to the United States of these unfortunate victims of wartime hate and hysteria.

"CHANGING PERSPECTIVES" THEME

Symbolic of the changed and improved status of Americans of Japanese ancestry is the convention theme, "Changing Perspectives."

Using the tools of democracy, JACL has in the 10 short years since the end of World War II, been able to provide that leadership which has enabled Americans of Japanese ancestry to be accepted as welcome and worthy partners in the American way, whereas a decade ago they were held to be suspect by their own Government.

Through the Congress particularly, and State legislatures as well, JACL has been able to eliminate legal sanctions which at one time numbered more than 500 discriminatory statutes directed against people of Japanese ancestry. The great and priceless privilege of citizenship at long last, in 1952, at a time when the 12th Biennial National Convention was in session in San Francisco, was granted to loyal resident alien Japanese. At the same time, the Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 was repealed and token immigration from Japan authorized under our quota system. The courts of the United States and of the several States, struck down as unconstitutional, laws which discriminated against those of Japanese ancestry solely on the basis of race and, at that time, "ineligibility" to citizenship. The American public at large has come to recognize Japanese Americans for what they are—individual citizens who have demonstrated in combat and at home during World War II that their loyalty is second to none.

Now that their legal status as first-class Americans has been secured under JACL's leadership, "Changing Perspectives" as the convention theme offers some 2,000 or more official delegates and boosters, a challenge to chart the future program and objectives of the JACL in the light of the greater opportunities now available to all Americans of Japanese ancestry.

It is my hope that the members of the JACL will never forget or abandon the basic purposes of the organization. I believe there will always be a valid place in our country for community and national service through active citizens groups dedicated to the goal proclaimed in JACL's mottoes, "For better Americans in a greater America" and "Security through unity." The spirit of self-sacrifice and devotion to a splendid cause which have always characterized and motivated both the JACL leadership and membership should also be retained, for these are rare qualities which are sorely needed in this troubled world today.

I know that my colleagues in Congress join with me in the wish that the 14th Biennial National Convention to be held in San Francisco over the Labor Day weekend will result not only in enjoyment and fellowship for JACL members, but also in the formulation of constructive and forward-looking plans and programs which will bring a greater measuse of happiness and prosperity to our Japanese Americans and to their fellow citizens in the years to come.

But How Did We Get It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun of July 23, 1956:

BUT HOW DID WE GET IT?

Along the Potomac, we gather, they are cheering a rare occurrence in the Federal Government.

Official figures now announced that at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, the Government finished in the black for the first time since 1951. And only for the fourth time since 1930.

The surplus is $1,754,000,000.

But the surplus wasn't gained by less spending. It was the sixth biggest spending year in the Government's history. And in 4 of the other 5 years we were at war.

The surplus came about only because the taxpayers, enjoying the most prosperous era of all time, kicked in $8 billion more than the budgeteers had estimated.

The story of the last surplus (1951) is similar. It wouldn't have happened if the Korean war hadn't permitted the Agriculture Department to unload, without loss, the huge surplus farm commodities it had been buying up.

The whole trend is for more spending, not less. There is no telling what the next year's total will be, what with both the administration and Congress adding to the outgo.

Also, there still is the debt: $272,361,216,429 as of June 30.

Let them cheer along the Potomac. But the taxpayers, and not the Government, can take credit for those figures in the Treasury books.

Turkey Celebrates 33d Anniversary of the Declaration of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of 1 of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to send greetings to the people of Turkey, President Jelal Bayar, and His Excellency Haydar Gork, Ambassador of Turkey, on the occasion of the celebration of the 33d anniversary of the declaration of the Republic, October 29, 1956.

Turkey has enjoyed uninterrupted independence since the formation of the Ottoman Empire in 1299. Republic Day stands for the Turkish people for what an independence day stands for any free nation. It is a day consecrated to celebrations in remembrance and confirmation of the principles of the Ataturk Revolution, which made the continuation of the independence of Turkey possible and on which the existence, freedom and way of life of modern Turkey is based.

Modern Turkey dates from October 29, 1923, when it formally became a republic with Mustafa Ataturk as its first president. The creation of the new republic marked the birth of the new Turkey. Under the dynamic leadership of Ataturk, a vigorous reform program was started and quick progress was registered in industrialzation and modernization of the country. The major aims have been to increase agricultural, raw materials and industrial production; to encourage the investment of domestic and foreign capital and to expand Turkey's export trade to increase the income of the country and to produce goods from indigenous raw materials, thereby saving foreign exchange. Thus, Turkey has set up fine goals for the country. It is trying to turn Turkey from the backward country that it was three decades ago into a modern state equipped to exploit its rich resources so that it can both pay its way in the world and afford a steadily rising standard of living. A great deal has been done in this direction. Turkey's revolution has not been merely a change in government; it has been moving forward the calendar from the ox-cart age to the machine age.

Turkey has been held up as a shining example of how to make a peaceful transition from autocracy to democracy. Justifiably proud of its enormous progress in recent years, Turkey continues to work and plan for even greater economic development in the future. And to assume a climate where peaceful progress can flourish, it fulfills an invaluable role as one of the strongest and most determined partners in the free world's defense force.

In a notoriously troubled region, Turkey is looked upon as a solid bastion against Communist expansion, prepared both to defend its frontiers and to persuade its neighbors to guard their own. This stanch nation, which has made phenomenal strides in its relatively short history as a modern republic, has no delusions about the Communists and their aggressive intentions. "We Turks are proud of our freedom and we are ready to die for our freedom." So reads a sign at the last Turkish station in the foothills of the Caucasus facing the Soviet border—a simple declaration that is amply supported by Turkey's actions as a member of the free world's united defense forces.

Stassen Won't Play Ball

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of July 25, 1956:

SPEAKING OF STRIKEOUTS—THE TROUBLE IS, HAROLD JUST WON'T PLAY BALL

(By Jack Steele)

Harold E. Stassen may yet set a new strikeout record for the political major leagues—if somebody doesn't take away his bat. The former Minnesota Governor, once called the boy wonder of the GOP, was a great bush-league politician.

But he has done nothing but whiff since he was bitten by the presidential bug in the early 1940's and tried to move into the big leagues.

And now he apparently has pulled off the unusual feat of striking out on a single pitch.

TURMOIL

Mr. Stassen threw the GOP into a turmoil on Monday with his proposal that Massachusetts Gov. Christian A. Herter replace Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON as Ike's running mate this year.

In quick succession Mr. Stassen was repudiated by the White House, all but publicly snubbed by Ike, and denounced by virtually every Republican Member of Congress.

And within 24 hours National Chairman Leonard Hall threw him the strikeout pitch—announcing that Governor Herter had agreed to nominate Mr. NIXON at the party's national convention next month.

Mr. Stassen fanned so fast that one reporter here in Washington quipped:

"The boy wonder seems to have turned into a 1-day wonder."

For he has proved himself to be a highly durable—even though often unsuccessful—politician.

ELECTED

Mr. Stassen started his public career at the age of 23, when he was elected to his first office as district attorney.

In 1938, when he was only 31, he was elected Governor of Minnesota—beating well-entrenched farmer-labor Gov. Elmer Benson by a whopping majority.

Republican victories were mighty scarce at the time, and reporters and GOP politicians hurried to Minnesota to find out what made Mr. Stassen tick. They sent back glowing reports.

Mr. Stassen had set up a liberal Republican reform movement which caught the public fancy in Minnesota.

In 1940 he first hit the big time as keynoter of the GOP National Convention in Philadelphia and floor manager of Wendell Willkie's successful quest for the nomination.

Reelected governor in 1940 and 1942, Mr. Stassen was riding the political crest when he resigned to enter the Navy—quickly becoming flag secretary to Adm. William F. (Bull) Halsey.

BLUNDER

He was still in uniform in the Pacific when he made his first big political blunder.

Unable to put off his presidential ambitions until the war was over, he notified the Secretary of the Navy in 1944 that he was not a candidate but would accept his party's nomination.

Wartime regulations provided that avowed political candidates had to get out of uniform. But Mr. Stassen managed to stay in service while henchmen ran his campaign in absentia.

The campaign got nowhere as then New York Gov. Thomas E. Dewey won the nomination with ease.

Mr. Stassen made his big pitch for the nomination in 1948. He had served as a delegate to the United Nations conference and toured the world to prepare for his candidacy.

Mr. Stassen started off like a house afire, winning the early primaries against Mr. Dewey and the late Senator Robert A. Taft.

TWO MISTAKES

Then he made two serious mistakes.

First he announced that he was going to enter the Ohio primaries against Senator Taft—breaking the political rule against going into the home States of other candidates.

Senator Taft's typically blunt comment was "Mr. Stassen has made a great mistake." Events proved him right. Mr. Stassen won only nine delegates in Ohio and lost his early lead in the presidential race.

He threw away his chances entirely in Oregon in a debate with Dewey. With the Nation's interest centered on the race, Mr. Stassen argued that the Communist Party should be outlawed. Although this seemed at the time the popular side, Mr. Dewey outtalked and outmaneuvered him and won both the primary and the nomination again.

Mr. Stassen decided then to turn to education, becoming president of the University of Pennsylvania. But in 1952 he was right back in the presidential race again.

DELEGATES

With Ike and Senator Taft fighting it out for the nomination, Mr. Stassen's campaign got nowhere. But he managed to throw his handful of delegates to Mr. Eisenhower at a crucial point in the convention rollcall, and thus again salvage something from defeat.

The President appointed him administrator of the foreign aid program and, when that job ran out, named him a special assistant and adviser on disarmament problems.

It was from the latter post in the President's "official family" that Mr. Stassen was able to launch his apparently short-lived boom for Governor Herter for Vice President.

Cambodia Celebrates Its Third Anniversary of Independence November 9, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference.

Because the House of Representatives will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the people of Cambodia, His Excellency Khim Tit, Premier of Cambodia, and His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador of Cambodia on the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of independence of Cambodia, November 9, 1956.

On November 9, 1953, Cambodia achieved real and complete independence. That was the date when the French Government turned over to His Majesty Norodom Sihanouk, former king of Cambodia, effective command of the National Army and full military power throughout the kingdom. At the same time it granted the Royal Cambodian Government full political, economic, financial, diplomatic, and judicial powers as well as control of the police.

At the end of World War II, King Sihanouk succeeded in getting France to renounce its protectorate over Cambodia. On January 7, 1946, a modus vivendi was signed giving Cambodia a certain measure of autonomy. Three years later a new agreement was signed on November 8, 1949, which recognized Cambodia as an independent state associated with France in the French Union. This independence was nonetheless too theoretical, since much of the power and many services were still in French hands.

During the same period King Sihanouk set in motion the transformation of the absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy and the creation of a unicameral legislature elected by universal adult male suffrage. A Constitution was promulgated on May 6, 1947.

In June 1952, anxious to give his people and his country real freedom, the King decided to take the powers of government into his own hands and to engage in an all-out campaign for full independence. The open defiance of the French by King Norodom echoed far beyond the confines of Cambodia.

The main theme for the campaign, later called the Crusade for Independence, was that to be able to ask the Cambodian people to fight the Communist menace, it was necessary to grant them complete liberty, to give them courage and a reason for fighting. The people would have no incentive to sacrifice and die, only to see their country still dominated by a foreign power.

In the words of His Excellency Nong Kimny, Ambassador of Cambodia:

His Majesty then initiated negotiations with France. These talks were long and difficult. The King himself traveled to the United States, Japan and Thailand in an attempt to draw world attention to the indomitable will for liberty which the Cambodian people were displaying. This liberty was a primary condition for uniting the nation to defend itself against Communism.

At the end of almost 2 years of constant effort, on November 9, 1953, Cambodia obtained full and true independence. It was this independence that permitted King Norodom Sihanouk to unite his people under the banner of the battle for independence and against the menace of Communist invasion. It gave them the will to defend their liberty and the determination to repulse an overt Communist attack in June 1954. It gave them the courage and incentive, in international diplomacy, to negotiate on equal footing with the Communist powers concerning the armistice agreement of Geneva (July 21, 1954).

Only a year before energetic King Sihanouk succeeded in achieving complete freedom from the yoke of colonialism for his kingdom. He was not prepared, therefore, to see the newly won independence bargained away at Geneva. It was a David and Goliath scene as Cambodia stood its ground. At Geneva the Cambodian delegation was the only one to obtain advantageous concessions for its country.

Only by granting full independence to the Asiatic peoples can the Communists be deprived of the contention that they are liberating those peoples from colonial rule. Full sovereignty for all people is the only way to rally them at this hour to the cause of the West and to persuade them that it is in their own interests to fight to the death against the Communists.

As Cambodia approaches a new year of national life it is my hope that she will continue to maintain her independence and I sincerely wish for her peace and prosperity.

Flood Insurance

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not this bill in any sense carries any relief from the high levels and the high waves we have had along the shore of Lake Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. It was along the lines of that general subject that I intended to address my remarks.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am sure that the gentleman knows the problem which we have had for many years.

Ms. O'HARA of Illinois. As the gentlewoman knows, we have in Chicago, and in many other cities, of course, after heavy rains, the overflowing of our sewerage and drainage systems.

In the effect of a flood on property there is not any difference between that of an underground stream used for drainage and sewage purposes and that of a river flowing on the surface. So the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS], representing a Detroit district, and those of us coming from cities similarly situated were interested that the definition of flood in the bill before us should be sufficiently inclusive to cover flood situations that might be caused in our own sections of the country. Let me read the definition:

"Flood" includes any flood, tidal wave, wave wash, or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landslide due to excess moisture, and shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed by regulation of the Administrator.

There was some thought in the committee of eliminating the words "shall have such other meaning as may be prescribed", and this elimination I opposed. The gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] and others said, "No; if that is done, how can we go back to our constituents in Michigan, Illinois, and other inland States saying that while we were seeking to help the people on the Atlantic seaboard and elsewhere and were drawing up a flood-insurance act for them we forgot the welfare of our own people." They could very well say to me in Chicago, "Here you were helping to protect the victims of floods and water damage through this insurance program in the other parts of the country; but why did you not think of Chicago, where we, too, suffer from floods?"

Along Lake Michigan we have another very serious problem, that of erosion, which causes great damage to property. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs.

CHURCH] on numerous occasions has brought this effectively to the attention of the House. I can say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that I think we have gone as far as we possibly could, certainly in the definition of flood that I have read, to make it clear that water damage is the test and that the Administrator has the authority to include in the coverage those properties that suffer through erosion.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. I merely want to say I am glad the gentleman agrees with me on the extent of the definition of the term "flood" in the bill. I hope to offer an amendment later to narrow that definition.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Do I understand that the gentleman, coming from the great city of Cleveland, would wish to deny or to limit the coverage we expect in Chicago, Detroit, and other places?

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON. Let me help the gentleman by pointing out that I do not come from the city of Cleveland; that I come from a district which extends along the shores of Lake Erie all the way from the city of Cleveland to the Pennsylvania border.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Eleventh Anniversary of Independence of Indonesia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of independence of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Because Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the Indonesian people, President Sukarno, and His Excellency Moekarto Notowidigdo, Ambassador of Indonesia, on the occasion of the celebration of the 11th anniversary of independence of Indonesia, August 17, 1956.

By far one of the most important of the southeast Asian countries recently emerged from colonial status into nationhood is Indonesia. The question of Indonesian independence was a burning issue in the postwar era. The rapidity with which Indonesia became the focus of international attention was likewise phenomenal.

Surprising though the strength of the Indonesian independence movement may have been to the outside world, various nationalist groups in the East Indies had been developing since as early as 1905. Western ideas infiltrated mainly in the wake of economic penetration. Not only did a small intellectual class receive European education, but the traditional life of the villages changed with every decade. With the war's end the colonizing power in Indonesia was faced with a fait accompli—Indonesian independence. On August 17, 1945, the Indonesian people proclaimed their independence. Therewith the sign was given to break forever the traditional colonial bonds.

Despite persisent attempts through military force, economic pressures, and widening of internal cleavages, restoration of colonial rule was impossible. Fortunately Indonesian leaders understood the gravity of the problems facing a nation in such a period of transition.

Dr. Sukarno vigorously enunciated the democratic principles and ideology of law to which the new Republic would be dedicated. He spoke of a physchological foundation of free Indonesia, a philosophy with deep thoughts and spirit and thorough desires on which to erect the building of free Indonesia, stable and eternal.

Dr. Sukarno made the following appeal to his people:

If we want to live as a nation, a free nationality, a free member of the world, to live with humanism on a democratic basis in a society with social justice in peace and security, then we must not forget one condition to make this true: We must struggle, struggle and struggle again. Don't think that with the creation of free Indonesia our struggle comes to an end. No, I tell you, in free Indonesia our struggle must be carried on, only in another form. We shall fight on together as one united people.

Indonesia strongly desires peace. In the words of Mohammed Hatta:

Only in a peaceful atmosphere can it rehabilitate its war-damaged economy and lift its citizens out of the poverty in which they have lived so long.

The Republic realizes that cooperation with other countries is essential. It has made the United Nations the focal point of its overall policy of seeking good relations with all other nations. Indonesia is intent upon pursuing a policy of peace and friendship with all nations on a basis of mutual respect and noninterference with each other's structure of government.

Writing in the periodical Foreign Affairs, April 1953, Mohammed Hatta very aptly delineated the guiding philosophy behind Indonesia's foreign policy:

Talk of the brotherhood of man in a world in which racial discrimination makes possible the existence of such a policy as "apartheid," or talk of everlasting peace in the atmosphere of the cold war, indeed seems incongruous. Be that as it may, the Republic of Indonesia feels it its duty to strengthen the ideals of peace, however weak its voice or feeble its power. It believes that these ideals will become reality in the long run. It believes in the commonsense of mankind. The peoples' desire for peace, as opposed to their lust for war, becomes stronger from century to century. Evil often prevails over the forces for good and destroys what civilization has built up over the ages. But man, rational by nature, will eventually make a positive and definite choice of good over evil, peace over war. The discovery of weapons of war which become progressively more terrifying and destructive will strengthen men's love of peace and arouse hatred of war. It is this conviction that leads the Republic of Indonesia to believe that the struggle for world peace is today a policy based on reality.

This explains why the Republic of Indonesia has not alined itself with either the American bloc or the Russian bloc in the existing conflict, and why it is not prepared to participate in any third bloc designed to act as a counterpoise to the two giant blocs. To do that would merely create new suspicions and new enmities. And though Indonesia's policy has often been termed one of neutrality, it is not that either "Neutrality has a precise meaning in international law, defining a condition of impartiality toward belligerent states. * * * As a member of the United Nations, the Republic of Indonesia cannot adopt an attitude of neutrality. It is committed to international solidarity. * * *

But in practice, of course, international solidarity has not been achieved; world solidarity has cracked into two pieces. Under present conditions it would not be possible for Indonesia to be other than neutral if a war broke out. The existence of war is a special case in the life of nations. * * *

Western nations tend to hold that there is no middle position for the weaker countries, and that they must choose. * * * Indonesia plays no favorites betwen the two opposed blocs and follows its own path through the various international problems. It terms this policy "independent," and further characterizes it by describing it as independent and "active." By active is meant the effort to work energetically for the preservation of peace and the relaxation of tension * * * through endeavors supported if possible by the majority of the members of the United Nations.

Daniel F. Jantzen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Peoria Times, of Peoria, Ariz., on July 13, 1956. This editorial very fittingly eulogizes one of the great educators of Arizona. Daniel F. Jantzen for the past 48 years had been an active leader in the educational field in Arizona, having served as principal and superintendent of some of the largest schools of Arizona. From 1925 to 1943, when he retired for reason of age, Mr. Jantzen was superintendent of Peoria public schools. From that time until his passing, he continued his active interest in education as financial secretary at Peoria High School.

The editorial follows:

DANIEL F. JANTZEN

This week both old and young alike were saddened by the death of Daniel F. Jantzen.

He was noted as an educator and people also loved him because he was their friend.

During his long and fruitful career he guided many thousands of students with his wisdom, his kindness, and his encouragement. He was more than a teacher, he was an inspiration to the countless students who came to him for advice and guidance, instilling in them the basic quality of humanity.

Some knew him as Dan, others as "The Professor" and others as Mr. Jantzen. Some

had known him for many years and some for only a short while. But all who had the privilege of knowing him considered him as a friend.

Students would greet him at school with a cheery "Good morning, Mr. Jantzen." There was some special quality in their voice when they spoke. It was as if his warm smile and pleasant voice were reflected in their greeting.

In the passing of Daniel Jantzen Arizona has lost a great educator—and we in Peoria have lost a great friend.

Iraq Celebrates 24th Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of independence of 1 of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Congress will not be in session when Iraq celebrates her 24th anniversary of independence on October 3, 1956, hence, I wish to take this opportunity today to salute the people of Iraq, His Majesty King Faisal I, and His Excellency Moussa Al-Shabandar, Ambassador of Iraq, in honor of this occasion.

The day Iraq was admitted to the League of Nations as a full-fledged and sovereign member, October 3, 1932, marked the beginning of her era of independence. The Iraqis political background before that momentous event tells the familiar story of imperialism and colonialism. In the words of Mr. Adnan Pachachi, Secretary of the Embassy of Iraq:

Prior to the first World War Iraq was an integral part of the Ottoman Empire. As a result of the war and the disintegration of that Empire Iraq was placed under British mandate in accordance with article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations. The Iraqis who had hoped to gain independence after the overthrow of Ottoman rule were naturally disappointed with the arrangement and revolted in 1920. As a result of that revolt the British Government * * * agreed to the establishment of an national government with a wide measure of local autonomy. However, through negotiations lasting 9 years, Iraq, under the wise guidance of His Majesty King Faisal I, was able to terminate the mandate and gain for its full independence. In 1930 a treaty of friendship and alliance was concluded by which the British Government recognized the independence and sovereignty of Iraq and undertook to sponsor its application for membership in the League of Nations. When the Assembly of the League unanimously approved the admission of Iraq on October 3, 1932, Iraq became a fully independent and sovereign nation.

Since independence, the people of Iraq have continually devoted considerable efforts in the complex area of economic development with a view toward bettering conditions and raising living standards. In this connection, a generous portion of the Nation's revenues has been earmarked for economic improvement, new irrigation canals and ditches have been built; thousands of pumps have been installed along the riverbanks to supply water to the adjacent lowland. However, much remains to be done and other long term projects are planned which will eventually raise the level of living of the people.

A Disgrace to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we hear so much about discrimination against the colored people in the South. Always somebody claims that this kind of information hurts our cause in Europe. Further, they point to the fact that there is joy in Russia when information like this is broadcast to the world.

I wonder what these same people have to say when they read in the public press of the raping of a white girl by seven Negro soldiers in Bamberg, Germany. This kind of information does bring joy in Russia. Incidents of this kind, more than anything else, have caused us to lose more good will in Germany and the remainder of Europe, than all the incidents in America combined.

Mr. Speaker, to point out this fact I enclose newspaper articles on this subject. To be certain that the incident I have in mind cannot be questioned I have verified the newspaper reports, and I enclose herewith a letter from the Department of the Army, confirmed by the Department of State, to the effect that the raping of the white girl in Bamberg, Germany, was committed by seven Negro soldiers, whose names are included in the letter from the representative of the Department of the Army, dated July 23, 1956.

This incident has not appeared in any Washington paper, so far as I have been able to ascertain. I wonder why?

SEVEN SOLDIERS HELD IN ASSAULT CASE AT GERMAN CITY

BAMBERG, GERMANY, July 14.—United States Army commanders here promised today to do all they can to improve German-American relations, despite a wave of local German anger at GI's.

The Bamberg City Council Thursday demanded the withdrawal of American troops stationed here after the alleged criminal assault of a 15-year-old girl by seven American Negro soldiers.

The soldiers, all members of the United States 85th Infantry Regiment which came here last November from Fort Riley, Kans., have been arrested on formal assault charges.

GERMANS ANGRY AFTER SEVEN GI'S RAPE SCHOOLGIRL, 15

BAMBERG, GERMANY, July 13.—United States Army commanders moved quickly today to patch up strained relations with local authorities after the Bamberg City Council last night called for withdrawal of American troops from this Bavarian city.

The unprecedented demand was sparked by the alleged raping of a 15-year-old schoolgirl by seven American soldiers. Formal charges against the 7 were filed yesterday, less than 72 hours after the alleged assaults occurred.

United States 10th Infantry Division commander, Maj. Gen. Barksdale Hamlett, came here today to make a personal investigation of the case. He met Bamberg Mayor Luitpold Weegmann to inform him of the Army's action in the case.

The Bamberg City Council also decided last night to limit official German-American relations here to the "minimum necessary" and ordered American soldiers barred from the biggest outdoor swimming pool because they were "causing a public nuisance."

Army officials seemed taken aback by the city council resolution. It was the most vehement protest in a barrage of criticism by local authorities and the West German press against what the Germans claim is an increase in Allied—and in particular American—indignities. The United States Army has denied there is any upward trend in the number of incidents involving GI's, but added that it is "not standing on statistics."

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of July 17, 1956]

DISGRACE TO UNITED STATES

People of Bamberg, Germany, are incensed at the gang-raping of a 15-year-old girl by seven American soldiers. It is not difficult for us to sympathize with the fury of those townspeople.

Through insistent questioning the News and Courier has learned from the Associated Press that the seven United States soldiers are Negroes. The continued stationing of an army of occupation 11 years after the end of a war is irritating enough to a proud people. (The South bore Reconstruction the same length of time.) The assignment of Negro troops to an all white country is an additional affront. When the troops—of any race or color—behave like criminals, our country is degraded.

As to supplying Communist propaganda—a charge often hurled at Southerners who defend segregation—what couldn't the Communists do with the Bamberg story?

JULY 18, 1956.

Lt. Gen. WALTER L. WEIBLE,
Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.:

Advise me today if seven United States soldiers of the United States Army accused of raping 15-year-old girl in Bamberg, Germany, were white or colored.

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., July 23, 1956.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RIVERS: In further reply to your telephonic inquiry of July 20 regarding the incident in Bamberg, Germany, involving seven American soldiers, I am able to furnish the following information.

On July 9, 1956, in the vicinity of Armeestrasse, Bamberg, a German National, Erika Loos, born: October 1, 1940, allegedly was assaulted and raped by seven American soldiers. The soldiers accosted her while she was walking in a wooded area near Armeestrasse in company of a German national, Wilfried Pillukat, age 23 years.

The following soldiers are involved in this case: Pfc. Edward L. Brown, RA12472599, age, 18 years; Pfc. James E. Wilson, Jr., RA13529546, age, 18 years; Pvt. Raymond L.

Kasey, RA13518257, age, 18 years; Clifton Franks, RA17428325, age, 20 years; Pvt. James Gordon, RA53193867, age, 23 years; Melton S. Carter, RA13347072, age 24 years; and Pfc. Fred R. Chandler, RA17440356, age, 21 years. All of these soldiers are assigned to Company H, 85th Infantry Regiment, APO 139, and, as you were previously advised, all soldiers involved in the incident were Negroid.

Preliminary investigation indicates that one soldier did not actively participate in the crime, but was present throughout the time the offense was committed. Another soldier attempted rape but did not accomplish the act. On July 11, 1956, all soldiers were charged with violation of article 120 (rape), Manual for Courts-Martial, 1951. All soldiers are now confined in the provisional guardhouse, Nuremberg subarea, APO 696, pending completion of a full investigation and probable trial by general court-martial.

I trust that this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,

LEWIS F. SHULL,
Lieutenant Colonel, GS; Deputy Chief, Liaison Division.

Iran Celebrates the Birthday of the Shah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference, I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Congress will not be in session when Iran celebrates the birthday anniversary of the Shah on October 26, 1956, hence, I wish to take this opportunity to send greetings to His Imperial Majesty Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi Shah-In-Shah in honor of this event.

Iran, usually known in Europe as Persia, has many thousands of years of recorded history, and museums of great cities the world over hold many relics that bear witness to her glorious past. Since early times, Iran has been both victor and vanquished, but it has always succeeded in maintaining its culture, traditions, and customs. In addition, it has also greatly influenced the invaders with its own high civilization.

Iran has made noteworthy contributions to world culture. Iranian artists and master craftsmen have produced superior examples of paintings, carpets, brocades, mosaics, ceramics, to mention only a few areas of achievement. Persian literature and philosophy has throughout the centuries enriched the minds of great writers and thinkers the world over.

In the past two decades Iran has been making steady progress in its economic affairs. During this period, substantial advances have been made in modernization and public works throughout the country. The government is aware of the towering economic problems confronting the nation and is exerting great effort toward seeking methods of improving all sectors of the Iranian economy. In its program of economic development Iran is placing major emphasis on agriculture, industry, development of mineral resources, expanding commercial activities, increasing exports, with the objective of raising the standard of living of the people.

Another major factor in the improvement of the country's economy has been the cooperation extended through the United Nations and the United States technical assistance programs which have been operating in Iran.

Spokesmen for Iran sum up her hopes and aspirations thusly:

As the basis for the progress of the nation has been laid, Iran looks toward the future with optimism. Iran seeks only peace and friendship with the rest of the world and the opportunity to provide a greater measure of well-being for all its inhabitants.

No more laudable policy could serve as the guide for any nation.

Dr. Benjamin Reifel, of South Dakota—American Indian of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement concerning Dr. Benjamin Reifel, of South Dakota, who has been named as American Indian of the year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR CASE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

All of South Dakota joins in congratulating Dr. Benjamin Reifel in his selection as American Indian of the Year. It is an honor richly deserved. The 1956 award to the outstanding Indian will be made August 5 as one of the highlights of American Indian Days at Sheridan, Wyo.

Dr. Reifel was born on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota of Indian and German stock. He speaks the Sioux language and is thoroughly familiar with Indian conditions and Indian life.

His elementary education was obtained at a Rosebud Indian Reservation school and the public schools of the State. He completed his secondary education in 15 months at the South Dakota Agricultural Preparatory school. He graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture from South Dakota State College in 1932.

In 1933 he entered Federal service as farm agent at Oglala, S. Dak., under the Pine Ridge Indian Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, in which capacity he served 2 years. From 1935 to 1941 he was given a greater responsibility as organization field agent which required traveling throughout the United States in assisting Indian tribes and bands to organize tribal and business councils.

In 1941, Dr. Reifel responded to the call of his country and entered the military service of the United States. He served through World War II and when released in 1946 had attained the rank of lieutenant colonel. Part of this service was in the European theater. He is currently a member of the Reserve Corps of the Army.

Following release from the military service Dr. Reifel returned to employment with the Bureau of Indian Affairs as tribal relations officer with headquarters at Billings, Mont.

After a short term as tribal relations officer he was appointed superintendent of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota. After 3 years of service in that capacity he resigned to enter Harvard University where he completed his work for a doctorate at public administration. During this period he was awarded a John Hay Whitney fellowship. So far as I know he is the only Indian in the United States holding a doctor's degree in public administration, or for that matter in any other field.

After completing his work at Harvard he returned to North Dakota to resume the superintendency at Fort Berthold. Later he was transferred to the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation of South Dakota, his native State, where he served as superintendent. Following approximately 2 years of service as superintendent he was appointed area director by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable Glenn Emmons, in August 1955.

Dr. Reifel has dedicated himself to the well-being of his people, the American Indian. Not only the Sioux Indian, but all Indians, can take pride in the honor that has come to one of them and is so well deserved.

Tucson as Others See It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, Arizona is this country's fastest growing State. This growth does not come by accident but rather by the work of men dedicated to our principles of Government and economy. One of these men—the father of my administrative assistant, Mr. Charles Farrington, of Tucson has written an interesting article on the phenomenal growth of Tucson that appeared in the Tucson Daily Citizen of July 23.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TUCSON AS OTHERS SEE IT: TUCSON BUILDING SUCCESS STORY OF THIS DECADE

(By Charles J. Farrington)

Throughout the Nation capital expenditures for new plants, the expansion of established businesses and the development of new processes are setting an all-time record, and Tucson is working diligently to obtain its share of this economic growth. All records of industrial payroll already are being broken each month in Tucson.

Notwithstanding soft spots in some lines where overproduction has caused a depressed market temporarily, the substantial growth of the Tucson area is clearly demonstrated by the previously unheard-of monthly advance in retail sales—particularly during the summer months. Five months ago Tucson was in fifth place among the top 10 cities showing a percentage gain over the previous month. Now Tucson has reached the posi-

tion where it is the second city in the United States in retail sales increase, according to Rand and McNally.

This enviable record is no mere accident. It is the result of a fabulous growth of payroll based upon the following annual income statistics:

Military payrolls	$51,762,000.00
Industrial payrolls (on and off airport)	49,733,568.00
Mining payrolls and sales	134,914,164.00
Tourist income including conventions	37,595,000.00
Principal nonindustrial payrolls	26,046,000.00
Agriculture income and sales	15,500,000.00

Do these figures give the complete picture? Not at all. All anyone has to do is to close his eyes and the landscape changes. These changes are not confined to any particular section; they fan out in all directions from downtown Stone Avenue to desert areas where improvement was not considered feasible 20 short years ago. New plants, buildings, churches, modern schools, university facilities, hotels, motels, highways and overpasses, recreational centers, hospital additions and other needed facilities, are either under contract and construction or will be this year. The entire face of the Old Pueblo will be changed when the more than $15 million worth of new buildings are completed on Stone Avenue.

The building program of this area alone would be considered by most cities twice the size of Tucson as a major industrial development, while most of us just take it for granted.

As the result of many alert citizens promoting the new hospital and recreational facilities so urgently needed to bring industry to Tucson, with the University of Arizona keeping well ahead of most institutions of higher learning—including the expanding engineering school and its Bureau of Atmospheric Physics—Tucson is building the success story of this decade.

These are but a few of the selling points we have when we approach a new and expanding industry about locating here. These are some of the reasons why the industrial development committee of the chamber of commerce has a long list of live prospects. Still there is a very hard job of selling to be done to bring about the proper diversity of industry and employment in order to establish a balanced economy.

Competition for industry is fierce throughout the 48 States with more than 1,500 locations now being offered industry. To get our share we must pull out all the stops and remove all obstacles that will tend to slow down our efforts. There is no easy way or magic formula.

Agricultural Price Supports Hold Key to National Prosperity

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, we are today debating a proposal to increase the capitalization of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This increase in borrowing authority for CCC is absolutely essential to the operation of the price support program. Commodity Credit is the very heart of that program.

In recent years we have materially expanded and strengthened our research, educational, and extension programs under the United States Department of Agriculture to develop and bring to our farm people the knowledge that will enable them to improve their farming operations. We are spending a great amount of money on these programs and I believe it is well spent, but if we do not receive parity and a fair market price for our farm-produced commodities nothing else will be of any real value. Farmers must have a fair return for what they produce or all of our research and extension work in the final analysis becomes meaningless.

The price support program was expressly designed to help farmers secure full parity out of the market. To do its job properly, the Commodity Credit Corporation must have adequate capitalization so as to be able to make whatever loans are necessary to protect our farm price level.

EVERYBODY BENEFITS

The primary beneficiary of the price support program is, of course, the farmer who produces the commodities affected. However, as we strengthen the farm economy we directly advance the economic interests of all the merchants, business and professional men, and the people they employ, in the rural communities doing business with farm people. Yes, this means prosperity for all people in those areas.

If our farmers do not profit in their operations they have no spendable income and then it is the small town people who really suffer. Our farmers have demonstrated their ability to weather some pretty severe economic storms, but in these times of high prices and high overhead the small town merchant is soon crowded to the wall if his rural customers quit spending money in his establishment.

ALL GROUPS ARE PROTECTED

There has been some criticism of the price-support program here today. Questions as to reciprocity have been asked. While we are talking about that, let us remember this: Following World War II industry was given, directly or indirectly, over $40 billion in amortizations and in tax writeoffs. Also, remember that during World War II there were subsidies to consumers amounting to several billions of dollars so the public could buy food cheaper than would have been possible otherwise.

Whether we like it or not, our economy is subsidized from one end to the other. By law, we guarantee minimum wages for working people. We subsidize the shipping industry. We subsidize the airlines. The Army engineers have spent billions of dollars on our navigable rivers. We have necessary tariffs on foreign goods to protect American working people and their employers from foreign competition. This is an indirect subsidy because the higher prices our people pay go to protect domestic industry. My farmers have not protested against this action of our Government in helping these Americans.

By operating our postal system at a loss, we subsidize all the people who use the mails. The administration wisely asked for adjustments in postal rates to help the post office pay its own way and just last week I noted the large number of our colleagues who voted against us on that bill. They wanted to keep their postal subsidies and yet many of them object most strenuously to so-called agricultural subsidies, and to a fair price floor beneath what the farmer produces.

There is a whole host of subsidies in our economy too numerous to mention. We in our seventh district pay our share of all of these subsidies. Somehow, it is the price-support program which is held up as the horrible example of the evils of subsidies—and yet all groups are protected in some way through Government assistance.

WE HAVE INDUSTRIAL SURPLUSES TOO

Critics of the price-support program are constanlty raising the question of surpluses. They say nothing of the surplus war material we dumped and destroyed by the billions of dollars all over the world following World War II rather than sell it in our own markets and thus injure the potential industrial market.

Reference is often made to the great quantities of food and fiber in storage, but similar questions are seldom raised as to our multi-billion dollar stockpile of so-called strategic materials. A cloud of secrecy hangs about the millions of tons of raw materials we have stored away for our industries at Government expense, but everyone seems to have something critcal to say about our stores of agricultural commodities which would be equally vital in event of war or any other national disaster. No one questions the fact that our strategic stockpile has been used to remove price-depressing surpluses of an industrial nature, but the beneficiaries of that program are not at all reluctant to attack the agricultural commodity program.

BLESSINGS OF ABUNDANCE

These critics forget how fortunate we are to be blessed with a surplus of food rather than be cursed with a shortage as is true in most of the world. They should see for themselves the starvation condition existing among hundreds of millions of human beings. I believe they would change their minds.

Instead of condemning this surplus of food, we should make it an important instrument of our foreign policy. I have talked to hungry people in the Near East and have come home convinced that our food is far more attractive to them as individuals than our dollars devoted to foreign aid of an industrial nature.

COSTS ARE RELATIVE

Another criticism refers to the cost of the price support program. Yes, the Government has suffered some losses. That is to be expected. One of the primary purposes of the program is to have the Government share to a degree the market risks of our farmers. Our people, in turn, are assured an ample supply of food at a reasonable price. Create a food scarcity and the poor people of our Nation suffer in direct proportion.

It is possible that in a 25-year period of operation since 1933 we might balance out the books and find that the Commodity Credit Corporation had lost as much as $5 billion. But surely we are justified in expending $200 millions annually to hold up farm income to a

parity level. That is a modest investment for so much return.

No one likes to see our Federal Government do business at a loss. I have fought deficit financing throughout my 18 years in the Congress, and I am happy to see that my administration has kept its pledge of fiscal responsibility and has balanced the Federal budget. In my opinion, this is one of the truly great accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration. The substantial surplus on the books this year was a moral victory, at least, for those of us who have fought the rising national debt all these years.

WHY HELP EVERYONE BUT AMERICANS?

Actually, what could the price-support losses possibly be in comparison with about $55 billion of foreign-aid money we have distributed with such generosity throughout the world since World War II? On next Monday there will be coming up on this floor an appropriation of $3.6 billion to subsidize the economies of people in other countries. This money will be given to them by our American taxpayers with no prospects for any return on our investment. The most we can expect is their friendship, and even that is questionable. At least, with the price-support program for American agriculture we are helping our own people, our own economy, and we end up owning any surpluses that may develop. Such surpluses are storable. They have market value. They are valuable reserves. They are part of the material wealth of this Nation.

FARM PROSPERITY MEANS NATIONAL PROSPERITY

The most critical questions are raised here today by our colleagues from the industrial East. It is understandable that they should ask these questions and they are entitled to an answer. They ask what this investment of Federal funds in agricultural price support means to their constituents who are not themselves farmers.

The answer is simple. It is improved farm markets for the commodities produced by their working people in their mills and factories. It is farm markets for the thousands of different articles flowing through the commercial arteries of this great Nation which makes us the richest and best-living people in the world. Above all, it is assurance of ample food at a price their people can afford to pay.

The greatest single market in this Nation for industrial goods is the farm market. Farms are highly mechanized and they require vast quantities of the things made in our industrial centers and distributed through our commercial channels. Cut off that farm market and we paralyze the industrial East.

Perhaps some of my colleagues have grown weary from hearing my constant pleas through the years for parity for agriculture. Those who hail from nonfarming districts, and they are in the considerable majority in the House today, have probably thought in terms of only 13 percent of our people being involved because that is about all we have on farms today. They may have thought that the serious economic problems of these farm people growing out of falling farm income was no real concern of theirs.

The fight we from the great agricultural Midwest have made for a fair share of our otherwise booming national economy is not for our farm people alone. We have made this fight equally for the merchants, the professional and businessmen, and all the other people in our districts who are dependent upon the state of the agricultural economy for their own economic well-being. We are fighting for a healthy economy in our areas for the good of the entire Nation.

Let me show you by responsible facts and figures what this slump in the agricultural Midwest means to non-farm people. I believe you will agree that our colleagues from the industrial and commercial centers of the Nation have a big stake in our economy.

When you get back to your district and your constituents in the manufacturing, wholesale, brokerage, or similar businesses speak about sales tapering off or slumps in their markets—you can refer to what I say today as one of the major causes of the difficulty. When working people in the automobile and other plants come to you to complain about layoffs, you can refer to what I say today to find the lost markets that cost them their jobs.

FORTY-FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR MARKET POTENTIAL LOST

In my congressional district alone, lost retail markets due to the slump in our farm income total at least $45 million this year. That is a very conservative figure based on the trend in retail sales from 1948 to 1954, and our general area saw a further decline in net farm income of 21 percent from 1954 to 1955. That is spendable income, and that income decline means just that much less in the way of local markets in my district.

Think how many automobiles, tractors, combines, washing machines, or other goods which that lost market in my district alone would buy. In the last 6 years, farmers in our Nation spent around $16 billion for farm machinery. They own over 2½ million trucks—almost 30 percent of all the trucks in the Nation.

Farm income is down and we see layoffs in the farm implement and automobile industries. Think how many laid-off workingmen and women would have never lost a day if you had not lost that potential farm market.

I represent the most intensely agricultural district in America, so it offers a good illustration. From 1948 to 1954, retail sales in our district rose from $285 million to $326 million—a total of 14 percent. In some purely agricultural counties we had no gains and even some declines in that period, according to Department of Commerce reports.

In that same period, retail sales in the State of Minnesota rose 20 percent on an average—and nationally they rose 30 percent. Those sales were the lifeblood of our booming national economy. Without that 30 percent national increase in retail sales we would have stagnated instead of expanding. Now think what the national economy would have done if retail sales in our agricultural areas had kept pace with the national average. But how could our retail sales expand when the net farm income in our area declined 21 percent in just 1 year from 1954 to 1955?

If retail sales had risen in my district by 30 percent as they did nationally, instead of only 14 percent, it would have meant an additional retail market in my district alone of $45 million a year which did not exist because of the drop in farm income. In 1955 this situation became even worse. The lost retail market in rural America, the lagging behind of agriculture in its relationship to the rest of our economy, accounts in large measure for the lay-offs in industry today. The merchants and businessmen in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota felt the pinch last year, and Detroit is feeling it this year. Yes, Detroit at last report had 900,000 unsold new cars.

I advise you to think this over while you are home. Discuss it with your constituents who look to our markets for their own prosperity. Explain these facts to them and then ask them whether they have any real interest in our prosperity, or the lack of it, in the farming areas. I am sure what their answer will be.

SOIL BANK WILL HELP

I believe we will overcome this problem of a falling farm economy. I have great hopes for the soil bank program enacted at this session of the Congress. It is not perfect by any means, but it can be perfected. As the first Member of Congress to propose this forwardlooking program which was later adopted by President Eisenhower as the No. 1 point in his 9-point program, I feel personally that I have made a major contribution to the solution of this all-important problem of surpluses and low commodity prices. By the voluntary retirement from production of surplus-producing areas into conservation status, we have as our goal a reasonable balance between production and consumption. Having once reached that goal, the price support operation will function more as an orderly marketing device and will be of little or no cost to the public generally. The ultimate result should be a farm economy on a parity with the balance of our economy and that will be good for everyone.

Remember, it is not just the 5 million farm families who are involved. It is the merchants in the rural areas who sell the goods produced in the industrial and commercial sections of this Nation. It is the men and women who work in the retail stores, on the railroads and trucks, in the warehouses and factories throughout the land. It is the entire Nation which ultimately feels the effects of a rising or falling farm economy.

The President of the United States employed forceful language in describing the problem of our declining farm economy. Let me quote the opening paragraph of President Eisenhower's farm message of January 9, 1956:

> In this session no problem before the Congress demands more urgent attention than the paradox facing our farm families. Although agriculture is our basic industry, they find their prices and incomes depressed amid the Nation's greatest prosperity. For 5 years their economy has declined. Unless corrected, these economic reversals are a direct threat to the well-being of all our people.

We will be back next year, most of us, and this same question of prosperity in

rural America will once again be before us. I feel confident that we are approaching a real solution to these problems, but we will need the sympathetic attention and the full understanding of the Congress to perfect the programs we have begun. We should and must agree that full parity for agriculture is a national objective.

The Plight of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include a very timely editorial entitled "Time for Ike To Act," which appeared in the July 20, 1956, issue of the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times.

The article graphically points up the difficulties affecting the textile industry through no fault of its own and emphasizes it has now become vitally necessary indeed for the President to carry out the promise he made to the textile industry and the industry workers.

The article follows:

TIME FOR IKE TO ACT

The plight of the American textile industry, fighting for its life against an influx of cheap imported goods from Japan, has been reemployed this week by industry spokesmen and public officials.

On Monday, New England's six governors adopted a resolution noting the deterioration of the textile situation and calling upon the President to impose quotas on textile imports from Japan.

On Tuesday, Willam F. Sullivan, counsel for the Northern Textile Association, warned that more textile mills, not only in New England but in the South will be forced into liquidation unless something is done to curb Japanese textile imports. He emphasized that no American textile manufacturer, in New England or elsewhere, can compete successfully with Japanese mill operators who pay their employees 15 cents an hour and buy American cotton cheaper than it can be bought in this country.

On Wednesday, the Senate passed a resolution expressing grave concern over import problems of the textile industry. It urged the President to take immediate steps to curb the flow of cheap Japanese goods into this country.

Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams assured the textile industry and Members of Congress that their pleas will be given sympathetic consideration.

Seabury Stanton, chairman of the executive board of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., conferred with Adams Tuesday and was told the administration recognizes the seriousness of the problem and intends to work with the industry in an attempt to solve it as soon as possible.

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., the House Republican leader, previously had discussed textile import problems with Adams and was advised the administration is most anxious to bring about a satisfactory solution.

These are encouraging words from Mr. Adams, but assurances alone will not save the jobs of American textile workers.

Congressman MARTIN had a similar pledge from President Eisenhower himself 17 months ago.

On February 17, 1955, just before a crucial vote on the reciprocal trade bill, MARTIN read on the House floor a letter from Eisenhower promising the trade program will be administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure.

Largely on the strength of the President's promise, a move to kill the reciprocal trade bill was defeated in the House, 206–199.

But the American textile industry has been placed in jeopardy, in spite of the President's promise.

The time has come—if, indeed, it is not overdue—for President Eisenhower to back up his promise with action to curb Japanese textile imports and preserve the jobs of American workers.

The Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Let's Take It," which was published in the Washington Post of July 24, 1956. The editorial has to do with the housing bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S TAKE IT

Under the extreme regimentation imposed by the Rules Committee, the House this week will have a chance to choose between two housing bills, neither of which is agreeable to the Senate, or to reject them both. No amendments to either will be allowed. And if one bill does pass the House, the leaders reportedly have arranged things so as to bar any conference with the Senate on its bill, which proposes far more public housing than either of the House measures. It will be a double-rigged case of take it or leave it.

Despite this high-handed maneuvering by opponents of public housing, the present picture is a good deal better than that a week ago when it appeared that the House Rules Committee would allow no vote on the question at all. And at this late date, it seems to us wise to take what is offered rather than let several vital features of the housing program expire.

The compromise House bill offered by Representative WIDNALL, which apparently has the only chance of enactment at this session, would provide 35,000 units of public housing a year for 2 years—the current rate and the amount favored by the administration. This certainly is a minimum to keep slum clearance and redevelopment going. This bill also extends the college and military housing programs and the FHA home improvement program, and liberalizes the present unworkable provisions for insuring financing of low-cost private housing. All of these features are extremely important and apparently are not seriously opposed.

We should prefer to see a return to the original 1949 goal of 135,000 public housing units a year, as proposed by the Senate, or, at the least, the 60,000-units-a-year program favored by the House Banking Committee. But progress has been made for several years at the 35,000-unit figure. It would be foolish to let opponents of public housing kill the whole program by inducing in its supporters a stubbornness to match their own.

Facts About the Fund for the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House the following bulletin, dated June 1956, issued by the Fund for the Republic and describing its activities:

CIVIL LIBERTIES: A 3-YEAR EFFORT FOR THE DIGNITY OF MAN

The Fund for the Republic was established as a wholly independent corporation in December 1952 and received a total grant of $15 million from the Ford Foundation. The trustees of the Ford Foundation had earlier stated the purposes which led to this grant. Believing that "general acceptance of the dignity of man" is "basic to human welfare," they wished to further the concepts that "society must accord all men equal rights and equal opportunity"; that "human welfare requires tolerance and respect for individual social, religious and cultural differences"; that it "requires freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of worship and freedom of association," and that "within wide limits every person has a right to be free from interference or harassment because of nonconformity."

In applying to the foundation for the operating grant, the directors of the Fund outlined a number of "areas" to which they proposed to direct their attention in support of these concepts. The areas included the internal menace of communism and its implications for civil liberty; they also included the protection of minority rights, the operation of Government security procedures, censorship, restrictions upon academic freedom and other subjects in which the basic principles of civil liberty and due process appeared to be in question. It was in the light of these proposals that the Ford Foundation made its grant.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

A review of all the Fund's operations over the subsequent 3 years, analyzed not only for scale and effectiveness but for the adequacy with which they have fulfilled the purposes for which the Fund was established, shows that at least some work has been done in each of the areas outlined in the initial proposals of the board of directors.

In the 3 years (to March 31, 1956) the fund spent or committed on all projects, grants, and fellowships a total of $5,347,502. About 12 percent of this has gone to churches or church organizations; about 25 percent to civic and educational organizations other than church groups; about 9 percent to law schools and bar associations, and 29 percent to major projects initiated by the fund itself. About 4 percent has gone to individuals in the form of fellowship grants; most of the remaining 20 percent has gone to a variety of publications, radio and TV activities.

All the fund's varied operations can be logically grouped into the five following general categories, each relating to the others and to the basic objective of furthering, in the domestic field, a "general acceptance of the dignity of man."

The study of communism—Total allocated, $594,241, 11.1 percent

The fund accepted as one of its first responsibilities the study of the internal Communist menace, its impact on our institutions and its implications for civil liberty. One step was a public-opinion survey, under

the direction of a committee headed by Prof. Samuel A. Stouffer, of Harvard, of attitudes toward communism and civil liberties. The results, published in book form in April 1955, attracted much attention and comment.

As another step, the fund secured the compilation of a bibliography on communism in America, a digest of the public record, and the reduction to microfilm of the records of 23 important trials involving communism. There has been a large demand for this material which was prepared under the direction of Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, of Harvard, from scholars, libraries, and Government agencies.

These projects helped provide tools for one of the fund's major research undertakings, a study under the direction of Prof. Clinton Rossiter, of Cornell, of the history and influence of communism in principal areas of American life.

The product will be an analytic history of domestic communism and Communist infiltration, to be issued in at least 10 volumes by different authors of special competence in their respective sectors of the field.

Equality of opportunity—Total allocated, $1,652,250, 30.9 percent

To advance equality of opportunity and maintain the equal protection of the laws is today mainly to face the problems of racial minority groups. The fund has put almost one-third of its effort into questions of race relations. Its principal allocations in this field—more fully described in the previous issue of the Bulletin—have been in support of the Southern Regional Council, an organization of white and Negro southern citizens devoted to reducing race tensions and easing the difficulties of school desegregation in the South, and in establishing a commission on race and housing to examine all aspects of minority housing problems and discriminations through the country as a whole. Under the chairmanship of Mr. Earl B. Schwulst, head of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, the commission expects to report concrete and workable proposals to bring about better living conditions for all Americans.

The fund has also supported the work of numerous church and other educational groups in interracial relations, both in the South and elsewhere; it has supported investigation of the treatment of migratory Mexican laborers in the Southwest, and it plans to undertake a study of the rights and liberties of American Indians.

Due process—Total allocated, $686,570, 12.8 percent

The third category of fund activities concerns the maintenance of due process of law and of the principles of justice and fairness which underlie the concept. This is the area which embraces all problems involving the protection of the rights of the individual against unjust encroachment by the State or the community. A wide variety of issues have arisen here. They concern the scope and procedures of the security screening system for Government and private employment, private pressures of boycotting and blacklisting, congressional investigatory procedures, the procedures governing the exclusion, deportation and denaturalization of aliens, adequate representation by counsel for indigent or unpopular defendants.

The fund has not attempted to take a position on these issues, but it has devoted about one-eighth of its allocations to examining them, to ascertaining the facts, and bringing them to public notice and discussion.

A major allocation in this area was a grant enabling the Association of the Bar of the City of New York to establish a committee of eminent lawyers to study and report on the loyalty-security screening system. The fund has had no control over or participation in this study; it did, however, conduct a preliminary study, under Mr. Adam Yarmolinsky, of all the available facts of some 350 actual loyalty-security cases, the results of which were made available to the committee for whatever use it cared to make of them. The publication of a group of these cases provided virtually the first real public knowledge of the routine operation of the security system.

Another important allocation was in support of a factual study, under the direction of Mr. John Cogley, of all aspects of the problem of blacklisting in the entertainment industries. The results, to be published in July, should be of interest to the general public as well as the industries directly concerned. The fund also financed the work of the Special Committee on Individual Rights as Affected by National Security of the American Bar Association. This committee studied the procedures used by congressional investigating committees, and among other things, proposed a procedural code for such investigations, which was adopted and widely circulated by the bar association.

Lesser fund allocations have supported law-school studies of civil liberties matters, the establishment of legal referral services and other similar activities.

Freedom of speech and belief—Total allocated, $582,506, 10.9 percent

The fourth category is distinguished from the third because it includes guaranties designed not only to protect the individual in his right to speak, but also to protect the community in its right to have all opinions heard, its right to benefit by freedom of information and discussion. Some of the fund's exploratory efforts in this field have proved unfruitful; other projects give promise of valuable results. One is a study by the University of Pennsylvania Law School of governmental censorship through the postal and customs laws and regulations. Another project is a study, under Prof. Paul Lazarsfeld, of Columbia University, of the extent of the pressures of fear upon academic freedom in the colleges. This is again a factual analysis, starting from no preconceived viewpoint. The results will be published in December 1956. Another allocation in this area has been in support of the freedom-of-conscience program of the American Friends Service Committee for assuring fair trial and adequate counsel.

For the Bill of Rights—Total allocated, $1,831,929, 34.3 percent

One-third of the fund's total effort has gone into a great variety of programs and projects intended to make the Bill of Rights as a whole a living document. These cannot readily be classified under the preceding categories; they are directed not toward solutions of specific problems but toward giving vitality to the broad principles underlying all concepts of civil right and civil liberty.

They include major grants in support of the freedom agenda program of the Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, a national discussion program on civil liberties participated in by the League of Women Voters and other national organizations. They include the establishment of a news film clip service, to cover news events with a civil liberties interest anywhere in the United States. These films are distributed (without charge) to television networks and news film syndicates or at times to local stations. The program has helped to interest network and local news departments in civil liberties subjects.

The fund has established the Robert E. Sherwood awards to recognize outstanding television productions in the fund's fields of interest. It has also given special awards to local groups or organizations in order to call attention to instances in which the principles of justice and civil liberty have been applied and upheld. It distributes, to varying lists of organizations and community leaders, books and papers which seem to the fund of particular interest. It has maintained a small program of fellowships and grants-in-aid to assist individuals in completing promising studies in many fields relating to civil liberties. It has supported special conferences or more general discussion programs in many parts of the country. It has explored, sometimes with promising results, sometimes less successfully, many possible ways of utilizing the mass media—newspapers and national magazines as well as radio and television—as vehicles for popular education in the importance of the Bill of Rights and the principles which it enshrines.

THE FUTURE

The Fund for the Republic began its operation with the expectation that it would spend its capital within a few years, and then go out of existence. With the inclusion of administrative costs it has now spent or committed about two-fifths of the total. It is constantly searching for new, more effective ways of discharging the mandate under which it was created. It foresees that all its remaining activities will continue to fall within one or another of the five categories indicated above; it is not satisfied that the methods it has explored so far represent the limits of what can practicably be done.

The fund conceives that in all the issues which have arisen in recent years over the liberties, the rights and the dignity of man two matters are of first importance. One is to ascertain and make known so far as possible the relevant facts. The second is to clarify and define the issues surrounding these facts, to bring the nature of these issues into the public consciousness and so to make possible their rational discussion and resolution.

National Commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart Urges Commander Wagner, of the American Legion, Not To "Go It Alone," but Cooperate With Other Veteran Organizations in Securing First Priority Legislation for Widows and Combat Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Ted Healy, national commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, an organization composed completely of combat wounded veterans, has sent the following telegram to Commander J. Addington Wagner, of the American Legion:

JULY 21, 1956.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander,
American Legion:

The 84th Congress is now drawing to a close with no important legislation beneficial to the veteran being passed. As you will recall, on several occasions I personally offered to cooperate with you and the American Legion in working up beneficial legislation. Since you and the Legion prefer to go it alone and bring the wrath of Congress upon all of us, I feel it time to speak out and ask that you immediately withdraw your pension bill H. R. 7886, since we feel

that it is blocking much vital legislation concerning widows and combat disabled veterans and other beneficial legislation. As national commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which is composed entirely of combat wounded veterans, I urge you to strongly back H. R. 12038, which would give our Nation's 2 million disabled veterans a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation.

TED HEALY,
National Commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gracious gentleman from South Carolina, who has helped me in many ways. I appreciate very much the opportunity to say a word or two in tribute and appreciation of DICK RICHARDS. Before he left I spoke one day on the floor of the Congress about him.

One of the reasons I felt so intensely sorry to leave the Committee on Foreign Affairs when I became chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was that I would not see and work with DICK RICHARDS on that committee any more. I enjoyed working with him for many reasons. He was always a great fighter, a great American, always fine, never bitter, never cruel, and it is so easy for us to become cruel and bitter in our struggle here in the Congress.

I would have enjoyed serving under DICK RICHARDS as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I would have valued his advice if I had stayed and taken the chairmanship of the committee. We lived through terrible war years when I served with him. He was always ready to be helpful. He was always the same whether he was talking with kings and queens or the presidents of other countries or to other high foreign dignitaries or whether he was talking to the so-called man on the street or the people who came from his district and from your district and mine before the committee—he was always the same. He is a fine, true gentleman. He was never awed by anybody. He thought that the little man was just as important as a king or queen or President of the United States. I would like, if you will, Mr. RIVERS to take back to your lovely wife my great felicitations and my regret that she, too, is going. She was a real help and a very, very lovely woman. They had a very happy relationship with each other and with their family. I wish I could tell you all that is in my heart and in my mind about this great man. May he be extremely happy and not give up entirely his fine patriotic work for our country.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentlewoman.

The Federal Personnel Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the New York Young Democratic Club, Inc., a very fine organization of dedicated and eager-minded young men and women before whom I have been privileged to speak a number of times, has been working on a draft platform for the Democratic National Convention. One of the issues that has attracted special study on the part of this fine organization is the Federal personnel security program. This organization has made and printed a formulation of its views on the Federal personnel security program—a formulation which impresses me as a very constructive one indeed. It is a sober and mature document. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL PERSONNEL SECURITY PROGRAM

(A statement by the New York Young Democratic Club, New York)

INTRODUCTION

We recognize that our Government must have an adequate personnel security program, but we insist that such a program can and must at the same time safeguard individual rights by guaranteeing that no individual is denied a job on security grounds without due process of law.

We are strongly critical of the following aspects of the present personnel security program:

1. The present scope unnecessarily compels millions of persons in nonsensitive jobs to undergo security checks.

2. The standard and criteria have too frequently been mechanically applied and have proved unreliable in terms of their purpose.

3. If charges are brought against an employee, he may be suspended without pay pending a decision on his case, thus causing him unnecessary and undue hardship.

4. In hearings many of our traditional judicial safeguards do not apply: There is no power of subpena; the employee can almost never confront and cross-examine the witnesses against him; the burden is on the employee to prove he should be security-cleared; and he has no appeal beyond his department or agency head.

5. Applicants, the largest group to be affected in the future, in most instances have no rights whatsoever to know the charges against them or to answer them.

6. Members of the Armed Forces have been given less than honorable discharges for associations or activities that occurred prior to induction.

7. Not only Government workers, but persons employed in private defense plants who fail to achieve security clearance are frequently dismissed by their employers although they may be completely suitable for a nonsensitive job.

As a result, the present program has—

1. Violated individual rights.

2. Stigmatized individuals, damaged reputations, and ruined careers unnecessarily.

3. Impaired the morale and weakened the effectiveness of the civil service by discouraging independent thought and judgment.

4. Deprived the Government of competent and qualified personnel.

5. Injured the Nation by corroding its fundamental liberties.

6. Been needlessly expensive.

7. Confused the security issue and hampered the development of an effective security program.

PROPOSALS

Purpose of a security program

We believe a proper personnel security program should have as its purpose the barring from sensitive jobs of those persons—and only those persons—whose employment is reasonably deemed to constitute a danger to the national security.

A security program should not be aimed at nonconformity. Nor on the other hand are security proceedings a trial for any crime; the detection and prosecution of persons engaged in sabotage, espionage, or subversive activity is a function of our law-enforcement agencies. A security program is aimed at ascertaining trustworthiness and reliability as they might affect national security, and since this is the purpose, it must be made clear that an individual who fails to be cleared for security may nonetheless be completely loyal.

Scope

An estimated 8½ to 10 million persons who are civilian employees of the Federal Government, members of the Armed Forces, or employed in plants doing classified work for the Government must now pass some sort of security check. An incalculable number of applicants are also checked. Most of the jobs involved have no significant relationship to security.

The program should be limited to sensitive jobs. The Supreme Court has held, in a 6–3 decision rendered June 11, 1956, that removal of an employee from a nonsensitive job under the act of August 26, 1950, on which the security program is based, is not authorized by the act. The Court has thereby given judicial sanction to a policy which commonsense and fairness have long demanded.

Sensitive jobs should be defined in terms of access to classified information and of policymaking that could affect national security. The determination as to which jobs are sensitive should be continuously reexamined by each department head, and a procedure for reviewing such determination should be set up within the executive branch of the Government.

Standard

The present standard established by President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450 is whether employment or retention in employment "is clearly consistent with the interests of national security." We believe many judgments reached under this standard have been unreasonable and even absurd in terms of the needs of national security. We propose that the standard should be whether employment or retention in employment is reasonably deemed to constitute a danger to the national security. Depending on the finding, the employee should be deemed "security-cleared" or "not security-cleared." The term "security risk" with its attendant stigma should be abandoned.

Security personnel

Because the personnel administering the security program can spell the difference between fair and unfair procedures and results, such personnel should be very carefully selected and be given special and extensive training.

Application of due process

The present practice of most Government agencies of rejecting without explanation or hearings applicants about whom any derogatory information is received is not only unfair to the applicant but doubtless deprives the Government of the services of numerous qualified individuals.

The right not to be deprived of a job on security grounds without due process should extend to the otherwise qualified applicant

just as to the challenged employee. This right should also extend to probationary employees and to applicants for transfer or promotion to sensitive jobs in Government employment.

Investigations

The transmitting by investigative agencies of information the accuracy and source of which have not been investigated is unsound and unfair to the individual. These agencies should investigate the accuracy of any information received by them. In transmitting any such information to the employing agency involved, the investigative agency should be required to state the nature of the source of the information, the extent of its investigation, and the results thereof.

Screening

Since employees in a high proportion of security proceedings ultimately have been cleared of charges against them, there is need for more careful screening of charges. To reduce the number of unjustified proceedings, screening officers should avoid mechanical and arbitrary application of criteria and should take into consideration such factors as the type, degree, and time of involvement of the individual in an organization, activity or personal association.

The Attorney General's list

No organization should be listed by the Attorney General until public hearings are held at which the organization has an opportunity to be heard. The Attorney General should be required to publish an opinion setting forth the basis for his determination and providing a chronological history of the subversive activity of the listed organization with the specific nature and dates of such activity.

Treatment of an employee about whom a security question is raised

In order to minimize the hardship necessarily involved in security proceedings, all suspensions of employees against whom security charges are made should be with full pay pending final determination.

Hearings

1. The employee should receive a clear and complete statement of the charges against him, including the time and place of the acts or occurrences upon which charges are based. If the charges are amended at the hearing to include new matter, an adjournment should be granted for a reasonable time to enable the employee to prepare his rebuttal to said new charges.

2. Hearings should not be public, but a full stenographic record thereof should be made and supplied free of cost to the employee.

3. The burden of establishing that the employment of an individual is reasonably deemed to constitute a danger to the national security should rest with the Government.

4. The power of subpena should be granted to the hearing board, the Government, and the individual against whom charges are brought.

5. The use of evidence from anonymous informants with no opportunity for confrontation and cross-examination is unjust and unfair. The full right to confront all witnesses who testify against an employee is essential.

The recent action of the Atomic Energy Commission in providing for questioning of secret witnesses by the hearing board represents a significant advance over present methods where even the board cannot confront anonymous witnesses. But no adequate substitute can be devised for personal confrontation by the charged employee. Without it he cannot defend himself against malicious informants, for only he may have the necessary facts to refute the accusation.

We are mindful of the national security arguments which have been urged against stripping away anonymity. Yet we are convinced that ways can be devised to do so without endangering security. Since security proceedings do not involve employees engaged in espionage (such an employee being subject to criminal prosecution), an employee against whom a secret Government agent has reported derogatory information can safely be observed until such time as the Government has obtained documentary evidence, or has produced a witness whom the employee can cross-examine without jeopardizing the anonymity of the Government's secret informant, or has determined that it can reveal the identity of its secret witness. Increased funds should be made available to investigative agencies to meet any additional needs which the disclosure of witness identity may entail. The inconvenience caused the Government, by limiting a secret informant's role to that of producing leads until it can reveal his identity, does not endanger our national security and is no greater than the inconvenience entailed for the sake of due process in the prosecution of violators of any Federal criminal law where secret informers are used to detect the crimes.

6. The final determination of the hearing board should be based only upon evidence adduced at the hearing in accordance with due process. This determination should be a commonsense weighing of all the evidence, considering unfavorable information in the context of positive evidence as to character and achievements.

7. Decisions in writing setting forth the basis thereof should be rendered within 60 days after the completion of the hearing. Such decisions should be binding unless reversed on appeal.

Review and appeal

To assure more uniform treatment of security cases, both the Government and the individual should have the right of appeal to a central board of review composed of private citizens appointed by the President. Appeal from this board should only be to the courts.

Action re not security-cleared persons

Where an employee is not cleared for security in a position requiring security clearance, he should where possible be transferred ingrade to a different and nonsensitive job. If this is not feasible he should be permitted to resign voluntarily.

The armed services

The armed services until very recently have given undesirable or "general" discharges on security grounds for preinduction activities. The Defense Department announcement that it is discontinuing this practice is to be commended, for we believe that the type of discharge given a man should be based solely on his record and conduct while in service. However, cases are still pending in the courts and the services apparently have been slow in implementing this announced policy. The Defense Department should insure that its new policy is promptly put into effect throughout the services.

Industrial security program

Many of the abuses set forth in this report with respect to the Federal employee security program are to be found in the industrial security program, which is designed to protect classified Government information made available to private industry and involves some 20,000 employers and millions of employees. The problems and needs of a security program for private industry are similar to those of Government. Accordingly, no industrial employee should be deprived of a job without due process, and the proposals regarding purpose, scope, standard, screening, treatment, hearings, appeal, and final action set forth herein with respect to Government employment should be applied to the industrial employment program.

CONCLUSION

We believe that the foregoing proposals would better protect basic individual rights and, at the same time, afford greater national security than does the present Federal personnel security program. They would permit a greater concentration on the real problem of national security by limiting the scope of the program, and, by adhering to due process, would help to insure that only those persons who are not trustworthy and reliable in terms of national security are denied jobs on security grounds.

But the successful achievement of these goals depends not only upon the adoption of specific reforms but upon the climate of opinion, both within the Government and in the country as a whole, in which the program operates. Only when, under the leadership of the Government, there is full understanding and acceptance of the nature of the problem and purpose of the program, and when persons who fail to achieve security clearance are looked on as wanting in merely one of many prerequisites for Federal employment, will present injustices be corrected.

By deed and word, the Government must make clear that effective security measures do not lessen its obligation to preserve our traditional liberties and concepts of justice.

Atomic Power Deferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOMIC POWER DEFERRED

Defeat in the House of the Gore-Holifield bill for the construction of atomic-power reactors is a tribute to the obstructionism of Lewis Strauss. The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission mesmerized the administration into opposing the bill on the ground that the job of developing atomic power can be handled adequately by private industry. This is the same sort of soft soap Admiral Strauss has consistently handed out respecting radiation hazards from nuclear weapons. His begging of the essential questions on the status of atomic-power development so infuriated the House Appropriations Subcommittee that it accused him of "duplicity" and "fraud."

In point of fact the private versus public power issue was wholly extraneous. The reactors to have been built by the Government would have provided power for the Atomic Energy Commission only—and as an incidental to their main purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of various types of reactors. Only one privately constructed reactor is now in the building stage. Additional plants have been proposed, but because of the cost of atomic reactors and the availability of plentiful cheap power from other sources, there is little incentive for private industry to build on a scale necessary to test new reactor techniques. There will be very little incentive at all unless the House passes a separate bill to provide gov-

ernmental reinsurance for private atomic power reactors.

The pity of all this is that the administration, through the Strauss influence, was placed in the position of sabotaging President Eisenhower's own bright dream of plentiful atomic power for the world. What the House has said, with administration blessing, is that this country will take no practical step to advance American leadership in atomic-power development. In other words, we leave the initiative in underdeveloped areas to the Russians.

Insurance Against Flood Damage

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN PHILLIPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 3732) to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about the position I take today, or the position I took Saturday, on this bill, I am not asking you to vote "no," and I am not asking you to vote "yes," leaving that to your own decisions. I am in favor of insurance for any contingency which may be covered by insurance. I am willing, if necessary, for the United States Government to go into the insurance business to that limited extent necessary in extraordinary situations, or to cover an area into which a private insurance company, or group of companies, may not properly enter. We will have an example of this shortly in a bill which will give the Government the authority to insure against a disaster resulting from some unknown condition which might arise after an atomic reactor is put into operation.

Nobody in this Congress, and certainly no member of a committee familiar with the atomic-energy program familiarly called atoms for peace, has any idea there will be such a disaster. We are dealing with a new industry, based upon an unknown and fearful power. Private insurance companies are willing to go into the field and to insure a private powerplant, using a reactor for the heat unit, to the extent of, say, $65 million. Suppose however, as a remote possibility, something should happen which would cause widespread damage in a congested area. Would $65 million cover it? Who knows? Therefore, the Government is asked to insure above this $65-million limit. This seems reasonable to me.

More important in this discussion, the Department of Agriculture has had long, and at times painful experience, with an effort to put the government into the insurance business, to cover crop failures. When I was on the Committee on Agriculture, the first 4 years I was here, this was an ever-present problem in this committee. Our intentions were excellent; the methods of working out the problem were strictly bureaucratic.

The regulations were so loosely drawn that a farmer could wait, almost until he could foresee failure, through a probable drought or other disaster factor, and then take out the insurance.

It was not necessary for insurance to be taken out widely over a possible disaster area. This is the fundamental concept of all insurance. Insurance requires to be successful, that a large group of people insure themselves against whatever the hazard may be, at low premiums, so that these premiums are not burdensome on any of them individually, and then when a disaster strikes one of the insured, the entire group is able to carry the loss, and the insurance company is able to stay in business. The only way a government insurance company can stay in business is to draw on the taxpayers of the entire United States as if they were all policyholders in the company.

Another problem we faced was—and I think this was subsequent to the reorganization of the crop control programs—the elimination of a disaster area from future insurance. Is this the intent of flood insurance? If, for example, a flood strikes the area of some of my friends from Connecticut, will the government pay the insurance contracted for under this bill, and then say that the area is barred from future insurance indefinitely, because it happened to have one disaster?

Coming back to the crop insurance program, which is still in operation, it was authorized by an act passed in 1938. The first policies were written for the 1939 crop year. From 1939 to 1947, inclusive, the Government lost $73 million. The program was then revised and limited. Between 1948 and 1955, inclusive, the loss was an additional $11 million. These figures do not include administration costs and I would estimate that such costs, for the 17 years, would come to another $1 million.

When I say "revised," I mean the program was limited to a certain few counties. It was not offered widely, as this flood program will be. Starting in 1948, with only 394 counties, it is now offered in almost 1,000 counties. We are trying here to cover "disaster," from natural causes, unlimited, which is a very different thing from crop failure in designated counties. The crop insurance program has a requirement that 200 farmers, or one-third of the producers, in any county must sign up, before that county is eligible for the insurance protection. It is a continuous contract, subject to cancellation by either party on or before a date specified in the contract.

I suggested on Saturday, Mr. Speaker, that I would try to get together a few questions and submit them to the Banking and Currency Committee, to be answered immediately if that is possible, and certainly to be answered before any program of this kind is offered to the people at large.

Is it the intent of the committee that this program shall be written as if all taxpayers in the United States were policyholders; that is, will the entire body of taxpayers subsidize this program, benefiting a limited few? If so, then we are openly taking the money of a large number of people, for the personal benefit of a few people, many of whom are at least partially responsible for the damages they have suffered, as I will try to explain.

If we are not to consider all taxpayers as premium payers, without benefit, then the presumption is that the premiums charged the policyholders in this program will be adequate to pay all costs and all losses. Is this the intent of the program, and of the committee which brings it to the floor? It is not so in the crop-insurance program.

If the committee says that it is the intent to cover all losses by the premiums collected, as would be necessary in a private insurance company, then does the committee mean that this will also include the overhead costs, or will the taxpayers be expected to set up a new agency, or a section in an existing agency, to carry on this program, without this overhead cost being charged against the fund built up by the premiums? If the Government is to set up such an agency, then I hazard a guess that there will probably be 50 percent more employees in it than would be required to conduct the same operation under private enterprise. Will the taxpayers be expected to pay for this, as they pay for the other operations of bureaucracy?

I am quite sure the Banking and Currency Committee cannot answer the next question, but I will ask it: Will a trained insurance executive be placed in charge of this program? Will actuarial methods be employed in setting it up, and setting the premiums?

Will an entire area be designated in advance as a distress area, and will a minimum number of policyholders be required for the area, in order to make residents eligible for such insurance? In commercial insurance, we apply the risk to an entire group of hazards, for example, automobile accidents, or fires, or deaths, or whatever it may be; in this program, the hazard must necessarily be applied to an area which might be struck by a flood. It is very important to know whether a few individuals will be given insurance in an area which meteorological records indicate is subject to periodic floods? In that case, it would almost be a safe bet that the policyholder would win. The experience of the Department of Agriculture would be helpful here.

Is it the intention to remove a flood area, where losses have been paid? This has been done with crop insurance. What percentage of the probable value, or the probable loss, will the policyholder be required to cover? Will the State, or the county, or the municipality, or any similar governmental agency or division, be required to join in this program, by helping underwrite the losses—for many of which they must take at least partial responsibility) or is this to be entirely a Government subsidized and managed program? To what extent will the people be required to protect themselves, against floods or similar hazards? Out where I live, we form "flood control districts," as the gentleman from Cali-

fornia [Mr. McDONOUGH] pointed out on Saturday. We tax ourselves, we underwrite various flood-control projects, quite often with the help of the Army engineers, as well as with the State or county engineers, and we do everything we possibly can to protect ourselves from the losses which will be covered in this sort of insurance. Will the people of other States be required to do the same thing or are they being asked to put their entire faith in a Government which seems to think that a blank check is the sure cure for anything, from international friendship to producing more scientists in our schools?

Will the people be permitted to build, either individual residences and stores, or entire subdivisions, in areas which are known to be flood hazard areas? This is a common practice—human nature being what it is—in regions where floods are intermittent, but which history shows comes along at intervals, with some regularity? If so, what interval will the committee establish for a flood to be considered a disaster, rather than a recurrent problem to be expected according to established statistical tables?

Out where I live, we have rivers, as I said to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], where, if we fall in them, we get up and dust ourselves off; yet any year, if we have a heavy snow in the mountains, followed by a sudden hot spell and a rain, the waters rush down these rivers, completely filling them, and occasionally washing away heavy bridges the casual observer would never think could be affected. Yet I have seen, time and time again, homes and business properties built in these areas, with the customary optimism of the people of America, calm in the assurance that nothing could happen to them, or perhaps with a synthetic assurance, produced in the last 20 years, that if anything does happen, even if it is their own fault, the Government will take care of it.

As a matter of fact, what is a flood? There was a picture in the paper, Saturday morning, showing the picture of a home in Falls Church, with a flooded cellar. Is that a "flood," eligible for the insurance we are talking about? Certainly the waters that rushed down the streets of another city, to a height which flooded the stores and made it necessary for the police and firemen to check cars to see if there was any loss of life, is definitely a "flood," but how could anyone have known in advance, either that the floods would hit that particular spot or that his home would be the one hit, or that his car would be parked at that particular spot on that particular day? Is he to be permitted to come in after the accident, and take out insurance?

Carrying it a little farther, what about hurricanes, and the floods connected with hurricanes, which are actually not self-starting floods, so to speak, but disasters connected with some greater disaster? Are we to read the fine print on the back of these policies and find out that unless the flood started of its own accord, due to an excess of water, the policy will not pay off? We are not unfamiliar with the fine print on the back of insurance policies?

Will the proposed program retain the features discussed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON]? In the coal areas, where I was born, entire communities are undermined by shafts and tunnels, which are constant hazards to the communities, with or without floods. The people living in these communities have been familiar with this situation, sometimes for three geenrations. Will they be permitted to shift this known hazard to the Government, or will all the people of the United States be expected to underwrite it, or will you have a situation where one house falls down because water happens to get in an old mine shaft, in which case the Government will call that a flood and pay for the damage, while residences a short distance away will fall down simply because the earth collapsed due to the mining operations underneath, with just as much damage to the property holders, but in that case, the Government will assume no responsibility?

I think I have asked this question by indirection, but I will ask it specifically. Will the United States designate in advance the distress areas where insurance may be written, or will anyone in the United States be permitted to buy the insurance?

Will we now open offices in every State in the United States, and possibly in counties inside the States, even if we have very few policies in force in that State or that county? If that is to be the program, then I suggest that this bill should carry, as its short title, the following: "Congress's Gift to Bureaucracy of 1956."

How long after a storm is reported as heading for Florida, or Connecticut, or Massachusetts, just for example, will a property be allowed to take out this insurance? As I remarked above, we had that little problem during the early days of crop insurance. Has any attempt at all been made to figure out the cost of this program to the American taxpayer? I can assure you that this is not a minor item in setting up this program, nor in passing this bill.

The paragraphs, in both the bill and the accompanying report, concerning which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] and I had some exchange on Saturday, actually does give the Administrator the right to reduce premiums to groups of people who, in the Administrator's personal opinion, cannot afford to pay premiums based on actuarial requirements. This is the first time I have seen this concept of "ability to pay" applied to an entirely statistical program, such as insurance. I would really like to know whose idea that was, and how it got into the bill.

Finally, did anyone consult the Housing and Home Finance Agency, regarding this particular bill, or are we facing here a situation which is not entirely new to the Congress? In this instance, it is known that the idea before us sprung from a casual remark by the President at a Connecticut airport when, startled by the flood damages, he made a perfectly natural remark that there ought to be insurance against that sort of disaster. Now we are told this is the President's bill. Yet the Senate version of this bill was different from the House version. Are both of them exactly what the President wants? How can that be? I have no information whatever that the President specifically and personally approved either bill. Have we any indication that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or the Federal Housing Administration in particular, which will inherit this headache, has indicated an approval of this particular bill, or of either bill? We cannot cover both in a blanket approval; they are different in important details, and these details might spell success or failure for the entire program.

The three important questions, boiled down, are obviously these:

First. Will we supply a crystal ball, on request, to any property owner? If not, how is he to know that he faces a flood hazard, and therefore should take out insurance? How many of the people who suffered losses in Florida or Connecticut or Massachusetts would actually have held flood insurance policies, when the floods hit them last year?

Second. Will the Government designate areas as flood-hazard areas, eligible for flood insurance? How about the individual who does not live in that area, but gets hit by an unexpected flood? In other words, why is this porgram better, or as good, as a straight disaster relief plan, such as we have had for years, and which we reactivate or enlarge for any emergency—flood, hurricane, fire, or any other disaster? If we have this insurance, will all these other sufferers be barred from relief in the future? Or is this just an additional program, conceived to get and spend more money, and employ more people in government?

Third. How much will it cost the taxpayers? We know it will cost $7½ billion, because that is the authorization. How many Members are optimistic enough to think that will be all, Mr. Chairman? Not I, for one.

I suggest the committee reread the testimony of the representatives of the crop insurance program, in their own hearings, at page 75 et seq. This, as I said before, is a noble idea, but I challenge any member of the committee to say that it has been carefully thought out and the details and problems studied, as they should have been.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of insurance, for any purpose to which insurance may be applied. Like the President, I wish there were some way to insure against disasters. I think at the moment there ought to be some way to insure the Congress against having bills like this one, highly technical in nature, brought to the floor at 5 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon, in the last few days of a confused and confusing session.

Television's Role in Combating Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "On the Question," written by D. L. Provost, vice president and general manager, Television and Radio of the Hearst Corp., and published in the June 1956 issue of the Catholic Veteran, Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE QUESTION

(By D. L. Provost, vice president and general manager, Television and Radio Hearst Division)

What is television's role in combating juvenile delinquency?

In less than a decade the miracle of television has rushed to adulthood with such vigor that today it stands as a Goliath in the realm of mass communication.

Never before in history have the minds of so many been at the mercy of a medium with such impact. There was no exaggeration recently when an English professor stated on NBC that more people were watching the network presentation of Richard III than had ever seen it on all the legitimate stages of the world.

So it is that serious-minded people have have just cause to wonder what effect television is having on our citizenry.

The Catholic Veteran in querying TV's role in combating juvenile delinquency, has asked a major question and I am grateful for the opportunity to answer it.

There are, I believe, three areas for discussion in which the answer can be found.

SHOW BUSINESS

First, one must consider the nature of the medium itself. Television is, of course, show business and, as such, is entertainment. But more and more, culture and information are replacing meaningless programs, and with dramatic suddenness the network and local stations have been upgrading their shows to provide a more adult diet for the viewers.

Think of some of the great highlights television has brought to the people in recent years—the political conventions, senatorial investigations, Peter Pan, the Sadler Wells Ballet, operas, medical programs, Richard III and countless other programs of major stature.

All of these, each in its own way, add to the information and education of the public, supplementing the day-in, day-out impact of the news and public service programs.

When you acknowledge that ignorance is basically the poison that fosters juvenile delinquency, then it follows that television is serving a tremendous function—is, in fact, embarked on a vital crusade—in its long-range endeavor to improve the minds of the people.

SELF-CENSORSHIP

The second area for consideration concerns an organization known as the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters to which most independent television stations subscribe.

Nearly every TV set owner has from time to time seen a slide flashed on his screen stating that such and such a station is a subscriber in good standing to the NARTB's seal of good practice. Few viewers realize the import behind that message. Here, briefly, is the story.

Believing that an industry has an obligation to police itself, and that in the long run this is the best of all possible systems, the NARTB some years ago developed a television code, which lays down a standard of practice for its members' stations.

We at WBAL-TV are subscribers to the NARTB and its code and our executives are instructed to adhere strictly to its tenets. This is also true of most stations in the industry.

As to the immediate question, a section of the preamble to the code states:

"Television, and all who participate in it are jointly accountable to the American public for respect for the special needs of children, for community responsibility, for the advancement of education and culture, for the acceptability of the program materials chosen, for decency and decorum in production, and for propriety in advertising."

The code itself is a lengthy document and I won't dwell on it unduly, but it might be interesting to the public to know that, among many other restrictions, we are dedicated to avoiding such indiscretions as the following:

"Profanity, obscenity, smut and vulgarity are forbidden.

"Attacks on religion and religious faiths are not allowed.

"The administration of illegal drugs will not be displayed.

"The presentation of cruelty, greed, and selfishness as worthy motivations is to be avoided.

"Criminality shall be presented as undesirable and unsympathetic."

And so it goes—item after item designed to insure the practice of avoiding telecasts that would in any way demoralize viewers or foster such unfortunate evils as juvenile delinquency.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Finally, there is the third area germaine to the problem—the direct, positive action that a local station can take.

At the moment on both our radio and television station we have scheduled a great number of spot announcements endorsing State's Attorney Anselm Sodaro's widely circulated campaign against delinquency.

More than 2 years ago, however, WBAL-TV, in cooperation with a Baltimore TV producer Bert Claster, produced a program entitled "Teen Canteen." The program itself was simple in format—merely calling for pictures of teen-agers dancing in our studios. An important condition was attached, however—only youngsters belonging to an organized youth group with adult supervision could appear on the show.

As a result hundreds of youth groups were created in the city. The city's social agencies, with the department of recreation in the foreground, endorsed "Teen Canteen" and, further, banded with other social agencies to oversee the progress of the program.

This is a clear-cut example of a positive approach to the problem.

Hon. Tom Underwood

SPEECH
OF
HON. NOBLE J. GREGORY
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. GREGORY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Thomas R. Underwood leaves a void in many fields difficult to fill. Kentucky has lost one of her most illustrious sons and one loved by all Kentuckians. Tom not only was loved by all who knew him in Kentucky and on the national scene, but was respected by all for his great contribution to his native State, the Nation, and his fellow man.

Tom Underwood was a newspaperman without peer, a gallant leader in the Democratic Party which he served with such distinction both in the House and Senate of the United States. His judgment was sought in party circles and his influence was broad, far reaching, and constructive. He made a great contribution to the racing industry so prevalent in central Kentucky, and his leadership in the promotion and advancement of the tobacco program will long be remembered.

He was public spirited, a civic leader, always in the forefront in the promotion of the well-being of Kentucky and her citizens. Above all, he was a Christian gentleman—considerate and thoughtful.

In the untimely passing of this fine man, his dear mother has lost the one person she loved above all else in this world and of whom she was justifiably so proud; his wife, Eliza, a devoted and close companion; and his sons, Walter and Thomas, an indulgent father to whom his wisdom and counsel have meant so much; and I with many, many others a very, very dear friend whose place cannot be filled.

Disabled American Veterans Urge Commander Wagner of the American Legion To Withdraw Support of H. R. 7836 in Favor of Compensation Bill, H. R. 12033

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Melvin J. Maas, former distinguished Member of this body and national commander of Disabled American Veterans, has sent the following wire to J. Addington Wagner in a final effort to secure legislation for our service-connected disabled. I am including the following telegram which General Maas sent to Commander Wagner:

JULY 23, 1956.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

In order for service-connected disabled veterans, many of whom are members of our two organizations, to receive needed compensation increases it is believed of vital importance that you withdraw support immediately of nonservice-connected pension bill, H. R. 7886, advising Members of Senate to that effect and urging immediate committee and Senate action on H. R. 12038. I also urge that you request Senators immediately not to amend compensation bill but to support

without change H. R. 12038 to give 2 million service-connected veterans very much needed compensation increases now.

MELVIN J. MAAS,
National Commander, Disabled American Veterans.

The Great Conspiracy—The Soviet Road to World Conquest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, today, we behold a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries but also by antagonistic philosophies. One is based upon man's dignity as a human being, the other upon atheistic communism. This half-slave, half-free posture of world affairs and individual attitudes is a carefully planned conspiracy to which I, as a member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, have devoted a considerable number of my weekly newsletters.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to these observations pertaining to the Soviet road to world conquest, Mr. President, by asking unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERNATIONAL GAME OF CHANCE

WASHINGTON, May 2, 1955.—Once again, a seemingly changeable and inexact foreign policy, especially as it relates to the Far East, has brought this Nation to the brink of another major crisis, the outcome of which should be of great concern to all Americans.

Before proceeding further, however, let me state most insistently my fervent prayers that this country, and its allies, will not be "euchred" into a situation, the real nature and extent of which is beyond our present powers of comprehension. The word "euchred," in this context, is a deliberate choice, for by definition, the verb "euchre," in a game of chance means "the defeat of the trump-making side by winning three tricks." In my judgment, it is the one word which best describes the circuitous, almost masterful scheme, which the Communist conspirators are now attempting for the third time to perpetrate on the entire free world.

In this sense, I regard the "trump-making side," on all scores, as the community of free nations—all moral and ethical principles are inherently on the side of decency, freedom, and justice.

History already records the harassment and frustration which have accompanied the Korean Truce Conference of 1953 and the Far Eastern Conference, held in Geneva, Switzerland, in early 1954. Typically, and ingeniously, these discussions have been used as a propaganda device to facilitate the ultimate admission of Red China into the United Nations.

With complete disdain and impudence, the Red Chinese have ignored the provisions of the Korean Truce Agreement. In direct violation of this armistice and international law, they have imprisoned, without logical reason, American citizens, and the delay in the repatriation of these "forgotten men" has long since become the symbol of a betrayed trust. In addition, there is little argument that the Geneva Conference was a complete fiasco.

Now, we are importuned to sit down again at another conference. In the light of past performances, this, from our standpoint, could well be the third "losing trick." But, in any such international "game of chance," there must be some degree of risk, and I for one want to see the situation in Formosa settled quickly, if possible, as an affirmative step toward lasting peace. If a cease-fire can be negotiated with honor, if all imprisoned American citizens can thus be returned to their families, and if the Red Chinese demonstrate a heretofore nonexistent rigidity in the observance of the stipulations of all agreements, I would support the informed judgment of the President, consistent with the authority recently granted him by the Congress.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION AND NATIONAL SECURITY

WASHINGTON, May 9, 1955.—All too frequently, we as freedom-loving people overlook the real meaning—or more aptly, the real menace—of the international Communist conspiracy. Unfortunately, we often seem to forget the creepy conquests of the Russian dictatorship, and the inhuman brutality and devious cunning of these conquests. As a dictatorship and conspiracy, world domination is the all-pervading goal. The evil operations of the Kremlin, its agents and pawns, influence practically every phase of our free society.

This penetration is ceaseless, taking many forms, and is but part of a precisely conceived plan. Responsible experts have concluded that more than 20,000 trained, hard-core Communist Party members continue to function in this country, mostly in cloak-and-dagger secrecy. Unimpeachable testimony records extensive and repeated exposures of Communist infiltration in our industrial and defense plants. In accordance with a basic Communist doctrine that "the end justifies the means," it can be accurately predicted that infiltration is a prelude to active sabotage and subversion.

With utter abhorence of the frightening prospect of another global conflict, and with full realization of the delicate international situation, there is no alternative to preparation and security. We must be alert to any eventuality. It is in this setting that I have introduced legislation which would prevent access to all defense facilities of persons likely to commit sabotage, espionage, and other subversive acts.

As expected, the self-appointed saints of American liberalism, with neurotic denunciation, are attacking this measure on the grounds that the rights of workers will be violated. These deluded individuals endeavor to popularize such idioms that my proposal would result in "a lot less freedom but no more security." These unfounded assaults tend to cloud the true purpose of the legislation and the vital need for adequate precautions. Contrary to these assertions, this bill would protect the rights and freedoms of all Americans and simultaneously safeguard our Nation.

I would remind these self-styled liberals that: "Communism is the religion of the devil; it is a distillation of evil; it is the very anti-Christ. We will never be safe from this evil faith until it is driven back to the hell from which it came." These are the words of Adm. William H. Standley, a wartime Ambassador to Russia, who can, with authority, attest to the real meaning and foreboding of the Communist conspiracy.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

A PAUSE FOR REORIENTATION

WASHINGTON, June 13, 1955.—This Nation's foreign policy respecting Yugoslavia, as a result of the recent, and much publicized, visit of Soviet officialdom in Belgrade, momentarily exists in a necessary atmosphere of indecision and imprecision. This needed pause for reorientation affords a calm, careful evaluation of the settlements reached between two countries dedicated, in varying manner, to the dogma of communism.

It will be recalled that in June of 1948 Yugoslavia severed relations with its patron benefactor when Marshal Tito refused total subservience to the Kremlin. Through this unprecedented breach, the community of free nations—in an early attempt at coexistence with totalitarianism—acquired a strange ally, an orphan of communism. Seemingly, with unusual haste, the origin and true nature of Tito's regime were ignored in a swell of economic and military aid.

In the years since World War II, the United States, as a part of its mutual security and other programs, has extended Yugoslavia grants-in-aid amounting to almost $644 million. This figure does not reflect military funds for obvious reasons. Curiously enough, while the Belgrade jamboree was in progress, the Congress was considering additional aid for Tito's Government.

Any appraisal of the effectiveness of this generosity would be shabby in the light of these late developments. The quiet and guarded renewal of diplomatic relations in 1953 should have telegraphed the intentions of these two quasi-partners to solidify again their mutual interests and problems—all stemming from the ideology of Godless communism.

While creating the illusion that the so-called neutralism of Yugoslavia will be maintained, it is interesting to note that the Belgrade conferences brought forth proposals, to which Russia and Yugoslavia affixed their approval, urging the admission of Red China into the United Nations, reunification of West and East Germany, peaceful use of nuclear energy, disarmament and the abolition of atomic weapons, the anexation of Formosa by Communist China, and others. This entire affair can best be characterized as another clever propaganda device, at which the Communists are most adept.

Much supposition surrounds the real motives of the mended Belgrade-Moscow axis, ranging from Russia's internal disorders to Tito's duplicity. In any event, the constant deceitfulness and depravity of the communist conspiracy must condition our future relations with Yugoslavia.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE

WASHINGTON, June 20, 1955.—To suggest that our country should not participate in the forthcoming "meeting at the summit"—if it can be called that—is hardly a popular view. Public opinion has crystallized a pervading attitude, rightfully so, that every conceivable avenue of consideration in the search for lasting peace should be fully exhausted before any overt action is even contemplated.

With many of the unfortunate experiences of the Yalta and other conferences still fresh in memory, more especially as a consequence of the recent release of the Yalta papers, it can be reasonably assumed that our negotiations will reflect an enlightened understanding of rapport with the Communists. Moreover, we must never close our eyes to the real motivations, objectives, and treacheries of the international Communist conspiracy. The mistakes of the past most certainly must set the stage for any con-

ference involving the extremely tenuous and complex problem of global peace.

At this point, it would seem timely and pertinent to observe that, in the past 25 years, the Soviet Union has been a party to 52 international agreements, 50 of which they have blithely violated. These have been the end result of some 3,400 meetings between representatives of the United States and Russia since 1933. But, in 7 or more years of discussions of more recent vintage, no semblance of accord has been reached on such major issues as the control of atomic weapons, the reunification of Germany, settlement of lease-lend, disarmament and world peace. Unproductive though this record might be, it nonetheless must be the setting for the coming four-power meeting, and we would be more than naive—if not indeed asinine—to expect that another series of discussions will cause an immediate or early abridgement of deep-seated differences between antagonistic philosophies of life and government.

Senator KNOWLAND, last week, properly summarized the sentiments of many when he said, "I do not believe we are bankrupt in our negotiating power. On the contrary, I believe we have an opportunity to cause some grave concern to the Soviet world." At Geneva, next month, the free world will be at another crossroad in history. Rather than peace at any price, the path to peace must be charted by a solid demonstration of honor and goodwill on the part of the Russians in conjunction with an unflinching willingness to remove from bondage the many enslaved people now trapped in the shadow of the Iron Curtain.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE LEOPARD AND HIS SPOTS

WASHINGTON, September 12, 1955.—Are the partisans of world communism genuinely sincere in their recent grandiose efforts to create the countenance of men of good will, interested primarily in peace on earth? This question is on the lips of all God-fearing, peace-loving people everywhere.

Time, of course, will provide the answer. But the repugnant, historical pattern of world domination, conceived by Marx and Lenin, and implemented by the Bolshevik terrorists immediately following World War I and since, would seem to mitigate against an affirmative answer. Through constant and devious subversion and infiltration it envelops all it touches, and the free world—indolent, apathetic, and partially blind to the true nature and goal of the Red menace—often seems unable to summon the strength, the courage, and even the interest on which the very survival of freedom and liberty depend.

Let it not be forgotten that international communism has but one objective—world domination and total subservience to its philosophy and its ends—the accomplishment of which has followed a definite plan of several phases:

First, the overthrow of the Czarist regime in Russia after World War I for the purpose of obtaining a national base for international operations. Second, in the years prior to World War II, the consolidation of Russia under Communist control. Third, a program of expansion to assure support from surrounding satellite nations. Fourth, the instigation of moral, economic, and political turbulence in Europe. Fifth, the mastery of Asia by either direct or indirect means, the latter having proved most effective. Sixth, the mastery of Africa with its vast storehouse of natural resources. Seventh, the control of Latin America as a prelude to the economic strangulation of the United States. The fourth to seventh steps of this phased program have accelerated despite the recent conundrums at Geneva. None of these requires direct military intervention by Russia; on the contrary, results are obtained through the typical Kremlin-inspired tactics of subversion, subtle infiltration, and vicious propaganda. In the past year the scope of these tactics has been broadened to include a campaign of negotiated economic ties with the Communist orbit—thus the buildup of the Soviet merchant marine is no accident.

Since the meeting at the summit it would appear that there is a tendency to minimize the Red menace, and its spreading control in all corners of the globe. Rest assured the leopard has not changed its spots—our guard must not be dropped.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

A MATTER OF INDIFFERENCE

WASHINGTON, October 10, 1955.—It is unfortunate that so many of our own people do not realize to this day the hazard of Communist infiltration of free institutions, that they do not recognize the footprint of the Kremlin in our Government, our labor unions, and even our schools. "What can 25,000 card-carrying Communists do?" they scoff.

Ask the people of Estonia, Latvia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia. Ask them how a handful of people in the right places were able to open the gates of their country and place the lackeys of Red Russia in the very seat of their governments? Ask the people of Germany what six men and a painter by the name of Adolph Hitler were able to do to their homeland? Ask the people of the Soviet what Lenin and a few faithful followers were able to do to the Russian bear and her untold millions of martyred people? Ask the Christian world what 12 simple men, filled with dedication and purpose, were able to do in transforming the spiritual face of the earth?

Dedication and purpose, those are the keys that give a single man the power and strength of an army. That is a point the scoffers might well heed. And, all the rest of us have to do to betray America is precisely nothing. Be neutral and indifferent. Continue in our complacency long enough, and all of our troubles will be over. Neither an honorable dead man nor a cringing slave worries about maintaining the strength and integrity of free institutions.

Some of our own good neighbors may be an unwitting accomplice of those who exploit the decency and the traditional tolerance of our country. Not, I say, because they do not love America, but because they do not know the evil that would enslave them. If they could clearly see the beastliness of communism and the falsity of its pretended concern for peace and human welfare they would surely be able to summon the moral courage and the necessary action to oppose this diabolical philosophy in all its many guises.

The problem of protecting and enriching the fundamental principles upon which the American faith is based may cause some differences of opinion. But the meaning of those principles, their value to the continuation of our way of life, and our firm determination to preserve them are elements on which the American people must remain united. These issues are beyond political partisanship. On this common ground we can meet any challenge, and with God's help, I know we shall.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

IN THE BALANCE

WASHINGTON, November 7, 1955.—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It was thus that the great American tradition was begun. Here was the acknowledgment that man as a creature of God possesses a dignity which distinguishes him from the animal creation. He alone is endowed with the power of reason.

It has been upon this philosophy that our American institutions have been built. By our continued adherence to these fundamental truths, we are at the same time the envy of those who would destroy us and the hope of all men who cherish liberty.

Today we behold a world divided not merely by geographical boundaries but also by antagonistic philosophies. One is based upon man's dignity as a human being, the other upon atheistic communism. The latter, as its name discloses, denies the very existence of God. With equal fervor, it regards man as a mere slave, a pawn existing for the state. By false promises it deludes man's mind. It fosters dissention and creates turmoil. It first enslaves the mind of man and then by force and fear it destroys his liberty of action.

In an atmosphere of confusion, created by the false prophets of communism, the half-truths and the beguiling platitudes of their propaganda find so ready an acceptance by the unwary. In carrying out their program they are bound by no morality, for they recognize no moral law. Thus they lie, deceive, and by every diabolical tactic and device they penetrate, infiltrate and seek to capture and dominate man's every legitimate organization and institution.

There are many among us, however, who fail utterly to comprehend the magnitude of the menace or the proximity of the danger occasioned by the continual penetration of Communists and those who do their bidding. To them, I say it should require no extended argument, at this late date, to demonstrate that the problem of communistic infiltration and domination of our free institutions poses a constant threat to the maintenance of our hardwon liberty. The present counterfeit smiles of the Russians are but a continuing evidence of this menace, and should be dealt with accordingly.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE

WASHINGTON, November 14, 1955.—That a staccato of Russian inspired frustration and deceitful Communist propaganda has accomplished the present Big Four Conference in Geneva cannot be denied. Equally true is it that the international Communist conspiracy—its devilish purpose and method of operation—has thus been exposed and illuminated to the scrutiny of freedom-loving people everywhere.

Following President Eisenhower's dramatic proposals "at the summit" in July last, a new hope for world peace was born in the hearts of all men. An unprecedented period of seeming goodwill on the part of the Russians popularly called "the spirit of Geneva," has since had a far-reaching impact. This climate has been cleverly and carefully cultivated by Soviet Russia. Here, many said, were the genuine evidences that the Communists wanted to live in harmony with the balance of the world. Now, they added, tensions could be relaxed.

As a poet once wrote, "Is life, then, a dream and delusion, and where shall the dreamer awake?" Recent events in Geneva can only shake these dreamers to reality—a shuddering, stark reality which reveals, for all to see, the hocus-pocus and falsity of the Red menace. The truth of this conclusion is demonstrated by Secretary of State Dulles' statement of last Friday that the Russians have practiced "grotesque propaganda" in an "infamous" attempt to delude the world.

In the costumes of masqueraders and puppets, with a great fanfare of snythetic gentility and friendliness, the agents of the Kremlin have effectively stymied the Big Four Conference. From the outset, this has been their design. These partisans of atheistic communism have not changed. They never shall. Their hostile plan for world domination and subservience, as conceived by Marx and Lenin, drives them irrevocably. But, there is something to be learned from this recurring duplicity of the Russians. It is this:

"By the fruits shall you know them." So does the Bible warn against those who make prideful, hypocritical speeches of their high intentions but whose actions are the opposite of their words. This bibilical quotation states a principle so fundamental and obvious that it is difficult to realize how our sometimes wavering and confused allies—and occasionally ourselves—have missed its application to Soviet Russia.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE DOPE OF COMMUNISM

WASHINGTON, November 28, 1955.—Any goal of world conquest, as envisioned by the international Communist conspiracy, must of necessity include the use of all possible military, political, and economic weapons. Among others, these include psychological warfare, espionage, subversion, sabotage, propaganda, and the promotion of internal strife—all of which have already been practiced with alarming success by the Communists. But, the minions of the Kremlin have introduced another thoroughly inhuman device—that of moral ruin—which has received little attention. To carry out such an objective the Communists have established a far-ranging system for the distribution of narcotics.

Official emphasis as to the seriousness, both present and potential, of this new threat can be found in the repeated warnings by United States Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, who has brought to light documented facts establishing that "the United States is a target of Communist China to be supplied with a flood of foreign-exchange-earning, health- and morale-devastating heroin."

Commissioner Anslinger urged that this evidence "offers additional dramatic proof that we are not dealing with a petty adversary but rather with a formidable and far-reaching plot to gain foreign exchange (dollars) and at the same time to demoralize the people of the free world. Spreading narcotic addiction and obtaining funds for political purposes through the sale of heroin and opium is not just the policy of one man in the Communist regime. It is the policy of the entire Communist regime in mainland China."

Warfare, in the minds of the vast majority of our population, is pictured solely in terms of direct combat, and the horrible recollections of two world wars and the Korean crisis, with their vast mortality and destruction, are indelible memories. But, the all-inclusive concept of indirect, yet constant, warfare, as a doctrine of the Communist movement, is something new to most of us. The danger of this concept cannot, and must not, be taken lightly.

Communist tactics are aimed at the destruction of freedom and the will to resist. They are based on the principle that a country can be destroyed as surely and as easily from within as from without. The evil traffic in narcotics and drugs, with its demoralizing results, in combination with the other more familiar weapons of subversion and infiltration, is in accord with these objectives, and brings into clear focus another monstrous wrong which the philosophy of communism permits and promotes in its followers.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

GREAT IS THE FORCE OF TRUTH

WASHINGTON, January 9, 1956.—In his message of last week to the Congress, President Eisenhower expressed the belief that the Communists have shifted their methods of operations. Instead of "violence, and the threat of violence," the President reported that the Communists are now relying upon "division, enticement and duplicity." To divide and conquer—an ancient device which, in the Communist scheme of things, knows no limits, respects no morals, observes no ethics.

Capitalizing on a mood of the times—universal hatred of war—the Soviets seek to accomplish their goal of world domination through tactics subtle and sinister. The Kremlin masters are admittedly dedicated to the overthrow of our Government, of our way of life. Yet with increasing clatter, always under the guise of so-called "liberalism," a significant minority in this country continues to attack and denounce—even pooh-pooh as ridiculous—the actions of our Government intended to safeguard our national security and freedom as we know it. Duped though these misguided, often well-intentioned, persons might be, they and all of us can take heed of President Madison's lasting words, "security against foreign danger is one of the primitive objectives of civil society."

Of late, these fanciful denouncements have been directed at the use of secret informers in matters of security, infiltration and subversion. On this point, J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Director, has warned: "The inroads that Communist propaganda has made in influencing law-abiding Americans, who fail to realize that criminal conspiracies are conceived behind closed doors under the cover of darkness, are disheartening. It is through the efforts of confidential informants that we have been able to expose the Communist conspiracy in the past and through them we must stake much of the future security of the United States."

Confidential informants are not something new. The Old Testament records their first use. Through the ages, as in our courts and law enforcement procedures, faceless informers have been the means of fortifying the absolute truth. To the press, and many of our financial institutions, the use of secret sources of information has become a custom zealously protected.

Freedom, liberty and justice are on the anvil, and it is utterly absurd to suggest that our destiny is to be shaped without urgent warnings and essential knowledge of any and all origins.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

WASHINGTON, February 20, 1956.—The full crescendo of military and political propaganda was unleashed last week by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy. By its timing, one can only suppose that its purpose was deliberate. At the Soviet Communist congress, the remarks of party chief Nikita S. Khrushchev were pointedly phrased to dispel any wishful-thinking on the part of the free world that the Soviet empire would be torn asunder by internal disunity. More significantly, however, is the general impression that these vigorous top-level statements were intended to counteract the recent declaration of Washington, between the United States and England, which equally as vigorously accentuates the never ceasing menace of the Communist plot.

To understand the impulse of these fresh Soviet pronouncements is to understand the original battle plan of communism conceived by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels more than 100 years ago. These fundamentals, published as "The Communist Manifesto" in 1848, advocated the defeat of all enemies, not by armed force, but by a devious process of "slow-decay-from-within." It was not until 1903 that another Communist luminary by the name of Nicolai Lenin introduced the idea of the overthrow of freedom and liberty by force or violence.

In subsequent years, the Marx-Engels-Lenin dogma, in only slightly varying form, has dictated the growth of the Communist sphere of influence and control. For many years, the latter-day benefactor of world communism, Josef Stalin, firmly charted the course of eventual world domination. But now, the leaders of Red Russia, in a spasm of accusation, have attacked this atheistic idol by condemning "the cult of the individual as being alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism (in) making a particular leader the hero and miracle worker." With the knowledge that the seeds of the so-called practice of coexistence were planted during Stalin's regime, these latest proclamations suggest that the "slow-decay-from-within" philosophy, supplemented by armed intervention when necessary, is to be accelerated.

That this philosophy has succeeded is evidenced by the fact that the number of persons held forcibly under the Communist yoke has increased from 200 to 800 million in the last 10 years. This progress no doubt inspired Khrushchev's observation that "communism is on the march throughout the world, and will win through." The ultimate goal of communism has not changed in any respect since Marx defined it more than a century ago, and in the face of persistent activity, the free world must stand alert.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE CHILL OF INDIFFERENCE

WASHINGTON, April 9, 1956.—"Today we stand at the crossroad. Our Christian faith is challenged—our country is on the defensive. * * * The world's spotlight is on the United States of America and China. On this stage will be resolved, either the eventual destruction of Communist domination or the complete enslavement and ultimate liquidation of the Christian world—the free world." With a depth of understanding, Bishop O'Gara, recently released by the Chinese Communists, places in focus for all to see the continuing war for the minds of men.

In the past, when the enemy was recognizable, the problem of defending our heritage—liberty, justice, and freedom—could be more easily met. Not so today, for within our borders and ofttimes in high places, the enemy has been found; and, even more frequently, we are unable to see him.

The conspiracy of international communism is the facsimile of an enemy threatening our country and western civilization. The task of dealing with it is difficult, for at the threshold we are met with the startling fact that in the lexicon of atheistic communism there is no such thing as truth. Confusion is its greatest weapon. A thinly concealed piety of purpose is its principal tactic. For those to be destroyed are the first to be confused.

The danger lies not alone in the false doctrines which emanate from those who advocate communism, but in the apathy of our people toward the nature of this awful menace. Slogans of beauty to catch the unwary—promises to those whose desires are great but whose industry is negligible—first capture the unsuspecting mind. Then through fear, retain possession of it.

We have seen followers of communism and those who make common cause with them belittle its effect and degrade those who oppose it. We have seen its manifestations when men of large intellectual capacity but no faith in God would betray our country and subvert our free institutions. We have seen its allies spread evil over a large portion of the earth.

Some of our own good neighbors may be unwitting accomplices of those who exploit the decency and traditional tolerance of our

Nation. Only because they do not know the evil that would enslave them. If they could clearly see the beastliness of communism and the falsity of its pretended concern for peace and human welfare they would surely summon the moral courage and the necessary action to oppose this diabolical philosophy in all of its many faces.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Q. E. D.—THAT WHICH WAS TO BE DEMONSTRATED

WASHINGTON, April 16, 1956.—Though not on the best-seller list, a recent report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am privileged to be a member, has already gained wide popularity. This report is entitled "The Communist Party of the United States of America—What It Is—How It Works." To those who minimize the scope of the Communist conspiracy—to those who have been duped by the false platitudes of communism—to all Americans seeking to safeguard our bastion of freedom—this publication, reflecting as it does careful documentation, is sincerely recommended.

The opening paragraph, in terse terms, sets the theme of this very helpful booklet. It reads: "Founded in September 1919, the Communist Party of the United States of America is an organization unique in American history. It is not a true political party and differs fundamentally from all political parties in this country. It is in fact a Russian-inspired, Moscow-dominated, anti-American, quasi-military conspiracy against our Government, our ideals, and our freedoms."

Unlike the two major American political parties in which organization and discipline often leave much to be desired, the Communist Party, even within our borders, is a coordinated network of regimented agents, fully versed in the jargon, treachery, and objectives of the international Communist movement: "world conquest and more specifically the destruction of the American Government." As this Internal Security Subcommittee report states. "Since the Communist Party, USA, is in fact simply the American branch of the Russian Communist Party, it follows faithfully the conspiratorial pattern laid down by its parent body."

The report continues: "The Communist Party functions at all times of the year, every day of the week, and at all hours of the day. It is a full-time organization which is not restricted to election campaigns. It persistently seeks to permeate every phase of American life for its own subversive purpose. Communist agents may be found wherever and whenever there is an opportunity for Communist propaganda or the promotion of civil strife, whether it be the factory, the union, the church, the school, or the neighborhood. * * * Internally it thrives upon promotong clashes: between employee and employee, landlord and tenant, white and Negro, native-born and foreigner, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew; between the American people and their Government, and within every non-Communist organization."

Truly this is A Handbook for Americans for all Americans to read.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

HARDLY A STATUS QUO

WASHINGTON, May 28, 1956.—The ceaseless struggle between freedom and communism came closer to grips last week with the recognition of Red China by Egypt. Thereby, it is widely believed that the stage is set for another attempt to gain admission to the United Nations for Communist China. It is anticipated that out of the shadows of the Iron Curtain other countries will join in supporting this new drive to obtain a cloak of respectability for an aggressor nation.

This development poses many crucial questions, not the least important of which are these two: (1) What is the true relationship between Soviet Russia and Red China? and (2) how can this campaign in deceit be repulsed?

As to the first question, U. S. News & World Report magazine has published a condensed version of a book, titled "At Last—The True Story of Red China," written by a businessman, released only recently after more than 30 years in that country, which includes these timely statements: "The fact is, China has been conquered almost as thoroughly as if there had been a direct Soviet military invasion, followed by the establishment of a Russian-model military government that could control the cumulative power of 580 million people." Also, "Superficially it appears that the ties between the Soviet Union and Communist China are ones of partnership based on an identity of interest rather than domination of one by the other. But the evidence presented in this book demonstrates that China today is a giant slave state being exploited by the Soviet Union to conquer all of Asia as a major step toward world domination." Obviously, to admit Red China to the United Nations would be merely to extend and strengthen the tentacles of world communism.

To answer the second point, it may become necessary for the United States to exercise the much-discussed veto in the United Nations. The alacrity and frequency with which the Russians have used, or misused, this unusual power should dispel any moral or procedural reservations held by many Americans. Significant here is the incontrovertible evidence that the United States, in shouldering the burden in Korea, lost 33,000 young men with another 110,000 wounded or maimed—a costly sacrifice for the cause of freedom which Egypt and a few other countries blithely ignore in their mad haste to do the devil's bidding.

I shall continue to oppose, with all the vigor I can summon, the admission of Red China to the United Nations. The American people must face this issue squarely.

JOHN MARSHAL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE GREAT CONSPIRACY

WASHINGTON, June 4, 1956.—The world is today witnessing a transformation in windowdressing. With skillful propaganda and astute timing, the master puppeteers of the Kremlin are again embarked upon a campaign of duplicity, cleverly intended to lull the free world into an attitude of resignation—or an attitude of "let's get along with the fellows, they're not really scoundrels." It can safely be reasoned that the extensive travels of top Communist leaders, the announced reduction in the Russian army, the latter-day denunciation of Joseph Stalin, plus other equally transparent gestures, are part of the same old package but with a new design and new wrapping.

Time and again, the Congress has found that there exists an international Communist conspiracy which, in its origins, its development, its persistence, and its present practice, is a worldwide revolutionary movement whose purpose it is, by treachery, deceit, infiltration into other groups, espionage, sabotage, terrorism and any other means deemed necessary, to suppress and subjugate western civilization. In the face of incontrovertible history and mounting evidence, there can be little dispute on this point.

With an agility which can only come from decades of double dealing, it is possible for the Soviet Union to pursue a policy of "peaceful coexistence" or a policy of sympathetic support of actions to undermine the cause of freedom—whichever is momentarily profitable. It can even be said that both ends can be simultaneously served—witness the pilgrimage of Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia to Moscow while at the same time top military representatives of the community of free nations are being invited to observe the Soviet air force show in Moscow later this month.

You might ask, What can we as a Nation do to frustrate the international Communist movement? And, indeed, it should be made clear that the Soviets want us to lower our guard and that they want our attention distracted by side issues. The response to this question is contained in a more vigorous prosecution of anti-Communist legislation, increased exposure of Communist activities, and realistic warnings, widely publicized, of the dangers inherent in these new Communist tactics.

Make no mistake—the objectives of the great conspiracy have not changed. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, "The Communist leopard frequently changes his spots, but the same blood—bad blood—continuously flows through his veins."

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE HOUNDS AND THE HARE

WASHINGTON, June 18, 1956.—Ancient history records the tale of Mithridates VI, King of Pontus and Bithynia (about 63 B. C.), who concocted a confection, composed of 72 ingredients, which he claimed gave him special immunity. Now, it would seem that Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, has hit upon a similar formula though the ingredients are considerably different and more in numbers. The principal ingredient would seem to be a curious blending of American dollars with the Communist teachings of Karl Marx.

Just 1 year ago, the minstrels of the Kremlin, who wander with a purpose, journeyed to Yugoslavia. By way of a return engagement, only recently, Marshal Tito, with much pomp and ceremony, made a pilgrimage to Moscow. Simultaneously, on both occasions, this Government was being importuned to send more economic and more foreign assistance to Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to note that, since the end of World War II, the community of free nations has furnished Yugoslavia nearly $2.5 billion in aid. Of this amount, the United States supplied an estimated $2 billion. In the sense that Tito has added more ingredients to his Mithridates, he has also obtained financial help from Communist-bloc nations totaling about $464 million equivalent.

Singly, and together, these events are fully consistent with the duplicity which has sparked the spread of world communism. The plan of operation never changes. Such a double and deceitful game was once described as "to hold with the hare and run with the hounds," or to run with the hounds as if to catch the hare, all the while being the secret friend of the hare. Those among us who have any doubts as to Marshal Tito's real motives might ponder the meaning of this old adage.

These two meetings have served to strengthen the Belgrade-Moscow axis. There can be little mistake about this. These two partners have again demonstrated a solidness of mutual interests, interests which fit the pattern of the international Communist conspiracy, interests which are contrary to those of the free world. Support of this point of view can certainly be found in the coming gathering of Tito, of Yugoslavia; Nehru, of India; and Nasser, of Egypt; all of which has been carefully cultivated in advance by the Foreign Minister of Soviet Russia.

The need for a reappraisal of our policy with all of these countries is now more pressing than ever.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

THE POLISH UPRISING

WASHINGTON, July 16, 1956.—Food, the staff of life—or, more precisely, the lack of it—was the springboard for the recent insurrection at Poznan, Poland. The inadequacy of food is a problem which has long plagued the Communist world. Until food supplies can meet the needs—something more than a meager bill of fare—of the Iron Curtain, the Kremlin manipulators face a major dilemma. The history of communism is filled with instances of agricultural innovations. The now forgotten Russian 5-year plans to the contrary, these experiments have not brought the desired measure of stability and sufficiency.

Probably the most notorious illustration of the manner in which the Soviets have in the past handled this problem of inadequacy was the manmade famine engineered in the Ukraine during 1932–33 to force collectivization (state control) on the Ukrainian farmers. It is difficult to estimate the number who starved as a result of this famine, but it was between 4.8 million and 6 million people.

A unique solution, indeed, to a difficult problem—destroy the people, and the dilemma takes care of itself. The mastermind of this diabolic famine of 1932–33 became known as the hangman of the Ukraine. He is the same Khrushchev who today masterminds the international Communist conspiracy, and who today endeavors to persuade the free world that he is a person of good will. From late reports, apparently only vast quantities of vodka will still Khrushchev's persistent nightmares of these mass murders.

It has been suggested that the Poznan uprising was similarly engineered to accomplish some devious Communist purpose. Certainly such a presumption would be in keeping with the duplicity of this foul conspiracy. But it might be more logical to assume that this was symbolic of a growing unrest among all oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain. It might conceivably trigger a renewed groundswell of hope for the liberation of these enslaved nations. To that worthy end, our Government and our allies must stand firmly with the courageous people of Poland. Anthony T. Bouscaren, director of the political science department of Marquette University, reflects public opinion on this issue when he says:

"Our foreign-policy theme must be liberation from Communist tyranny and opposition to a world half slave and half free. If the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains know for a certainty that we stand on their side without compromise, the forces which caused Khrushchev to denounce Stalin will grow and revolts on the East German (and now Polish) pattern will become a possibility. And this time we must be prepared to act."

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

TWO BIRDS WITH ONE STONE

WASHINGTON, July 23, 1956.—Yesterday's newspapers, in reporting on Russian affairs, blazoned front-page headlines such as these: "Khrushchev Sees New Soviet Gains," "Bulganin Admits Unrest in Satellite Countries," "Bulganin, in Warsaw, Assails Vacillation in Soviet Ranks." Each of these articles spring from comments by the two Soviet leaders, and it would certainly seem that these mouthpieces for communism are engaged in an annoying sally of double talk. Through the years, similar contradictions have been voiced to achieve some timely objective in advancing the cause of worldwide communism. There is much reason to suspect the same devious purpose in these latest instances.

In denouncing and downgrading Stalin, a long-time Communist idol, the Kremlin masters in the judgment of many seek "to kill 2 birds with 1 stone." First, all blame for unhappiness of life behind the Iron Curtain is laid firmly at the feet of the dead Stalin. And, secondly, by carefully cultivating the illusion that the Soviet Union cherishes peace, these same dictators hope to convince the free world of the absurdity of further expenditures for armaments. When viewed in these terms, all mystery is shorn from the actions of the Communist regime during the past year.

Said another way, the Communist policy has returned to the popular-front device, fashionable during the 1932–52 period in this country, of wooing and winning the cooperation of humanitarian and democratic organizations throughout the world. People of good will are now asked to believe that communism, without Stalin, offers the only hope for a peaceful and ideal way of life. In all of this, with typical propaganda deceit and thoroughness, freedom, justice, and universal welfare are the major themes. But the lasting historical fact is that communism, with or without Stalin, is still tyranny. And this tyrannical oppression of the Soviet Union extends to 11 satellite states and some 700 million enslaved persons, with what could hardly be described as durable control—witness the recent uprisings in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and elsewhere.

Transparency of these efforts "to kill two birds" is indicative in the reality that Khrushchev, while denouncing Stalin, has persistently refrained from attacking the doctrines of communism. The political philosophyy of the Soviet Union is still, as always, based on godless communism, one of the most impelling objectives of which is the destruction of all capitalistic nations like the United States.

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Small Business Administration Loan Plan Thrives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Lesser Business Thrives Through SBA Loan Plan," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of July 24, 1956.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESSER BUSINESS THRIVES THROUGH SBA LOAN PLAN

The Small Business Administration has doubled its lending activity in the fiscal year recently ended. Its report of June 30 shows 5,224 loans, worth $126,379,521, compared with 2,258 loans for $63,848,000 in 1955.

The figures are not large, considering the national field to be covered, but the good they have done for small business, in small communities usually, is not to be measured entirely by the amount. Many of the loans, even those of only a few thousand dollars, represent the difference between success and failure in some project designed and carried on by a man with a good idea, but one held back, possibly, by lack of capital for building and enlarging. It may also be one hampered by lack of promotional ability or the time in which to make a campaign in behalf of his product.

On such occasions the ends of small business are best served. Minnesota has seen man of its small-business men, some of whom have come a long way since SBA help became available, receiving loans which have met the immediate problems, enabled them to weather difficulties, change their output, and add to their employment rolls. Most of these transactions have been in villages or in the smaller cities outstate, but not all of them. A study of the ingenious ideas some of the men behind them have developed gives confidence that the small manufacturer, processor, wholesaler, or retailer, can succeed and help his community in so doing, if needed assistance can be had in times of emergency.

The number and dollar value of SBA loans has increased so markedly in the last year that there can be no doubt about the plan's popularity. And the confidence the various communities have in such financing is seen by the fact that more than 70 percent of the loans are made by the SBA in cooperation with local banks.

Holding War Seizures Hit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Holding War Seizures Hit," written by Mr. John B. Crane, which appeared in the Ft. Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinal of May 4, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

HOLDING WAR SEIZURES HIT

(By John B. Crane)

Our Government after the end of hostilities in 1945 confiscated over half a billion dollars worth of foreign-owned private property located in the United States.

These properties belonged to German and Japanese individuals and corporations.

An increasing number of American jurists and political philosophers are asking these questions: Was it constitutional to confiscate these private properties even if owned by foreigners? Was it morally just to confiscate such properties? If we refuse to return the properties confiscated, how will this affect our relations with Germany and Japan as military partners? And what effect will our confiscation have on the safety of the $23 billion of current investments which Americans own in foreign countries?

Since the confiscation of German and Japanese private property in this country, 36 separate bills have been introduced, designed to rectify the situation. Many of these bills call for 100 percent return of all foreign-owned assets which have been seized. Others call for only a partial return.

There are many reasons being advanced for full return of confiscated properties. The weightiest is perhaps the argument that the American Constitution guarantees private

property against confiscation without due process of law. Such a provision of the Constitution says nothing about whether the private property protected is owned by American citizens or by aliens. Apparently it covers all private property regardless of the nature of the private ownership, whether domestic or foreign, whether individual or corporate.

PRECEDENT IN OTHER WARS

In past wars the United States has seized and sequestered foreign-owned, private properties located here. But after the wars ended, our Government returned such foreign-owned properties to their rightful owners.

World War II has been over for 10 years, so far as the fighting is concerned, but this time our Government has not returned the hundreds of millions of dollars worth of foreign-owned, private properties. Why not?

Some observers fear our continued retention of German-owned private properties will have an adverse effect on our future relations with the German Government.

Mr. James Finucane, executive secretary of the Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, writes, for example:

"Our Government states it as a cardinal point of its policy toward Germany that we favor its reunification * * * How can the Germans believe we sincerely want to give them back the missing parts of their territory, which we don't have, when we won't give them back their private property which we do have?"

VIOLATES OUR CONSTITUTION

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Herman Abs, banking adviser to the Adenauer government, have both made trips to Washington to try to get America to agree to return confiscated private German assets, but with little success.

The best they could get was a promise from the United States Department of State to return confiscated assets of individuals up to $10,000 per person. Such a compromise solution is unfair and discriminatory to both corporations and large private property owners. It violates the guaranties of the American Constitution.

Leading American thinkers have recently come out publicly in favor of full return of confiscated properties to their German and Japanese owners. Among these are Bernard Baruch, unofficial adviser to more Presidents than any other American in history; John J. McCloy, head of the powerful Chase Manhattan Bank in New York; and Judge Learned Hand.

In fact, Judge Hand said the confiscation of these foreign-owned private properties in America is a "step back to savagery."

An Unusual Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of the most interesting experiences that any Member of this body has are the many unusual letters that we receive.

On yesterday I received such an unusual letter I believe it should become a permanent part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

JULY 24, 1956.

Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: Many thanks, sir, for your continued active opposition to the foreign giveaway boondoggle. The record speaks for itself. Nobody respects an officious, ingratiating, obsequious do-gooder, a sucker who actually pushes his money on other people, telling them we owe it to them, that it is in our own selfish interest, that if they will only take it it will bring Utopia to them overnight. Human nature is the same today as it was 2,000 years ago. Maudlin, self-perpetuating, no-questions-asked institutionalized charity outrages every commonsense principle; it actually subsidizes the weaknesses of people; it irritates and builds up a greedy appetite for more in the recipient as well as contempt for the donor.

I don't mind my Government helping other peoples in emergencies or catastrophies, but, like the Community Chest which was organized during the depression years to deal with an emergency situation, charity once institutionalized goes on and on forever, preoccupied with self-perpetuation and bureaucratic empire-building and actually subsidizing and therefore encouraging chronic indigence and the weaknesses of people.

There was a time when our national policies were designed to appeal to and build up the stronger and nobler instincts of the human race both at home and abroad. The New Deal—Fair Deal, like socialism, communism, and other isms, changed all that, as they rise to and maintain power by appealing to and fostering people's selfish, baser instincts, a conditioning process which leads people to sell themselves into the bondage of the superstate in exchange for the mirage of "security," the welfare state. Once tasted, Government subsidies and handouts are like narcotics, they become habit-forming and difficult to give up even when it is more and more obvious to the victims that paternalism is at the high price of the loss of their individual liberty and in our case the American way of life.

Our bureaucracy of one worlders, do-gooders, and empire builders are using the fruits of our system of free enterprise to subsidize bankrupt, socialistic governments and lethargic, don't-give-a-damn people all over the world. We are abjectly submitting to blackmail of the crassest kind, but perhaps we are getting back some of our dignity and commonsense if our latest policy on Egypt's Aswan Dam means anything.

Thanks again, and more power to you.

Sincerely.

Pure Water for Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pure Water for Egypt," written by Mr. John B. Crane, which appeared in the Ft. Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of June 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURE WATER FOR EGYPT

(By John B. Crane)

CAIRO, EGYPT.—The widespread poverty, ignorance and disease which characterize the millions of rural and town dwellers in Egypt have been described in earlier articles.

It has been pointed out that 85 percent of Egypt's 14 million rural population could neither read nor write when corrupt King Farouk was overthrown in 1952 and a new revolutionary government took over.

The vast majority of these 14 million worked as virtual slaves for a few cents per day on large landed estates or else eked out a miserable existence on one- or two-acre plots of their own. The typical farm laborer earned only 35 cents per day and worked from dawn to dusk. Thus he received only 3 cents per hour for his labors.

Besides his poverty and ignorance, he was plagued with various diseases of the intestines, stomach, liver, bladder, genitals and eyes. Over 90 percent of the rural population were diseased and perhaps as many as 80 percent are still suffering from disease today.

One of the principal ways that disease was spread was through drinking or bathing in polluted water. Clean, pure drinking and wash water was rarely available. It was customary for the 14 million villagers, with few exceptions, to drink from the Nile and irrigation canals. These same waters were also used (and still are) for washing clothes, taking baths and outdoor toilets.

POLLUTION IS VERY GREAT

On a recent auto trip from Alexandria to Cairo through the Nile Delta I saw the following take place in one of the irrigation canals in one short stretch: Children urinating; women washing their clothes; men in bathing; girls filling earthen pitchers with water which they carried on their heads to their homes in the villages; and, finally, a stinking dead water buffalo half-submerged in the waters. In Egypt, water is water.

When Nasser's Revolutionary Junta came to power they took immediate steps to correct the shocking conditions which prevailed. Since the 1952 revolution, new schools have been built at the rate of 300 per year. The last year fat, lascivious King Farouk was in power only two new schools were built.

The new revolutionary regime is also proud of the progress it has made in providing Egypt's millions with pure drinking water.

As early as 1937, the Eyptian Government decided something should be done about the bad water in Egypt. But nothing happened until 1941 when a plan was agreed on for supplying safe water to 14 million of Egypt's present 23 million population.

King Farouk did little, however, to convert his national water program from a paper project to a reality. After 11 years, by 1952, only 14 percent of the plan had been carried out.

PROGRESS UNDER NASSER

Since the 1952 coup d'etat, however or within less than 4 years' time, 36 percent of the total plan has been implemented. In other words, progress toward giving Egypt's thirsty millions safe water has been 800 percent faster under Nasser than under Farouk.

Is it any wonder that Egypt's masses worship Nasser almost as a god? He has promised to complete the National Potable Water Program by February 1959. Total cost of the program will be about $100 million. To date the project is 50 percent complete.

Of Egypt's 4,200 villages (average population 3,000), some 2,500 villages under the plan will get their water from artesian wells. In 1,400 of the larger villages it will be lifted by mechanical means, but in the remaining villages the inhabitants will have

to use a hand pump. The water supplied will equal 10 gallons per person each day, which compares with 50 gallons of water per person each day available to Cairo's 3 million residents.

The Egyptians hate the British, but they give them credit for one thing: Establishing a safe water supply system for Cairo.

Proposals for a Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, a consideration of ways to improve our Foreign Service is perhaps more necessary today than at any time during our history. It is well known that the friendship of foreign nations cannot be purchased by material goods or by money—and this has never been the purpose of any aid program of the United States; however, such friendship can be gained through well-trained Foreign Service personnel, those possessing an intimate knowledge of the country in which they are stationed. To provide for an adequate number of such people I propose the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy.

To best represent the United States abroad our Foreign Service officers require an educational background considerably wider than what is afforded by the normal undergraduate training. A successful representative of our country should be not only better educated than the average university training affords with respect to the world outside the borders of the United States, but he should also have an exceptional understanding of his own country. He should be better equipped than the average college graduate in all those things which contribute to his ability to observe and interpret a foreign environment, in the things that appeal to the eye and ear—architecture, applied arts, industrial processes, methods of agriculture—in all those things, in other words, that make up the outward expressions of custom, tradition, and belief. The Foreign Service officer should have sufficient experience with real scholarship, in the genuine academic sense, to understand at least the meaning of that concept, and to distinguish an unscholarly and unsound bit of intellectual work from a scholarly and sound one.

As the Army, Navy, and Air Force have recognized that special training and education are necessary to develop the qualities needed in officers of the Armed Forces, so also have some of the Members of Congress felt that there is a need for a similar program to train our diplomats for the duties required in preserving the peace.

Others feel that the analogy between the armed services and the Foreign Service is not strong enough to warrant a similar academy for the latter, as the Army, Navy, and Air Force have a need for highly specialized and highly technical personnel, while the qualifications for a Foreign Service officer are much more general. A Foreign Service applicant should possess, the opponents of an academy hold, a wide cultural background and training in the liberal arts, which the average university can better provide.

A number of bills to set up a Foreign Service Academy were filed in the House in 1954, and some during the first session of the present—84th—Congress. No action has been taken on any of these bills. The State Department, whose responsibility it would be to set up such an academy, has gone on record against it, saying:

> In taking this position the Department has stressed that it did not imply any lack of appreciation of the importance of preservice training in foreign relations. Rather, it has been the judgment that this preparation could be accomplished in any of the colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Recognizing the need for encouraging interested and capable young men and women to enter this field, the State Department, on the advice of its special study committee, has recommended that, to help recruit personnel for the Foreign Service, at least 470 training scholarships be provided for juniors and seniors in the schools of higher learning. Requiring congressional approval, this plan would cost about $2 million a year.

Bills to implement the recommendations were introduced during the first session of the 81st Congress. They were titled "Foreign Service Scholarship Program" and were designed to provide the Foreign Service "with a more constant flow of qualified candidates representing the different segments of American life." Candidates for the program would be chosen from all the States after passing examinations prescribed by the Secretary of State. The successful recipients would be enlisted into a 2-year training program at the end of their sophomore year at college. They would be offered a Federal grant of $900 a year to permit them to complete their studies at an accredited institution of higher education of their own choice. In return for this they would be required to agree to serve in the Foreign Service for a period of 4 years.

The Foreign Service Journal of December 1955 contains an article by David Felix entitled "Three Suggestions for Strengthening the Foreign Service," which contains some of the views of people within the Foreign Service. It states, in part:

> A properly conceived Foreign Service Academy would be of enormous value. It could serve as a leader to other universities in demonstrating the need for training of a kind they do not provide in normal circumstances. The Academy should be built around a 2-year post-graduate course, later to be extended to 3 years, for persons intending to enter the Foreign Service. It should, of course, be accredited to give post-graduate degrees. Its basic function would be to fill the gaps left by the inadequacies of the typical American university education. It could, thus, correct the deficiency in the case of an over-specialized student by giving him a broader grounding, while permitting the student with a typical liberal arts training to achieve an effective command in a useful field.

The Foreign Service Academy graduates, ideally, should be specialists in one field relevant to their work in, for example, economics, law, administration, or political science. They would, moreover, be well-balanced culturally, with a firm background in philosophy and history. One of the most important weaknesses to be corrected would be in the field of languages. We could expect of a 2-year academy course that it would give its graduates a complete speaking and writing command of one foreign language and the ability to read one other language. A 3-year academy course could require complete command in two languages.

More important than specific details of learning would be the general influence of the Academy on its graduates. It is infinitely more important that our foreign-service personnel learn to think and generalize well than that they learn details. The primary function of the Foreign Service Academy would be to train intelligent leaders.

Study in the area of interest of a candidate can be a valuable aid to him. The Academy should establish rules sufficiently flexible to permit candidates to spend a year of their Academy enrollment time in a foreign university. Academy examination could insure the effectiveness of the foreign study.

Arguments presented against the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy have been that such a school would tend to develop a one-way mind, whereas recruiting from a nationwide selection of universities would bring in a better representation of national views and attitudes. It has also been feared that an Academy would tend to build up an undemocratic caste system.

On the other hand, those in favor present equally strong arguments, saying that such a school would provide a steady stream of recruits into the lowest rank of the Service; that it would provide the opportunity for qualified young people of limited means to receive the education and training necessary to prepare for the Service; and that it would assure a curriculum adequately tailored to provide an education suitable to the needs of the service.

Especially today with such stress and emphasis on international affairs the urgent need for such a program is more than amply supported. It is my fervent hope that this matter may be given the attention and consideration it deserves in the next Congress.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Were There Other Hodge Banks?" which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 22, 1956:

WERE THERE OTHER HODGE BANKS?

T. Earl McNamara, of Streator, president of the Illinois Bankers Association, has issued a formal statement which says in part:

"The shocking disclosures concerning the operations of Orville E. Hodge and the fact

that a bank was involved are matters of greatest concern to the banks of this State.

"The Illinois Bankers Association calls upon its member banks to lend every help they can to law enforcement agencies so that every aspect of this sordid affairs may be uncovered and the guilty punished."

Mr. McNamara's expression of deep concern most assuredly is in order. Edward A. Hintz, the ex-president of the Southmoor Bank and Trust Co., which cashed many of the fake checks that were put through the State auditor's office before Hodge was found out, is a former official of the Illinois Bankers Association. Certainly a very heavy load of responsibility falls squarely on the banker who made possible this fantastic plunder of the taxpayers' money, now estimated to have cost $800,000.

One way in which the Illinois Bankers Association can help is for its members to identify any similar operations in the Hodge regime about which they may know. Was the Southmoor bank the only one engaged in this shocking traffic in faked checks, indorsed with forged signatures?

The impression is growing in Illinois that the disgraceful scandals that have overtaken one member of "the Stratton team" are not the whole story. Mr. McNamara is entirely right in calling for the uncovering of "every aspect" and punishment of all who are "guilty." Let the bankers join prosecuting and investigating officials in the most thorough search.

The people of Illinois can count little if at all on the other State officials at Springfield since Orville Hodge, of Granite City, was one of their boys, renominated and slated for reelection—until the mess came to light.

Address by Dr. José A. Mora to Council of the Organization in Commemoration of the Congress of Panama of 1826

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Dr. José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States, delivered at the special session of the Council of the Organization in commemoration of the Congress of Panama of 1826. It is gratifying to note that this historic gatheriing of presidents of the American Republics has been organized by a statesman of the stature of Dr. José Antonio Mora, who, for many years, served brilliantly as Ambassador of Uruguay to the United States. It is also worthy of record that, during the current year, Dr. César Tulio Delgado, Ambassador of Colombia to the Organization of American States, is rendering distinguished service as chairman of the Council of the Organization. I am sure that my colleagues will find Ambassador Mora's address of exceptional interest and value. I am happy to make this insertion in the RECORD at the suggestion of my good friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. JOSÉ A. MORA, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, AT THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION IN COMMEMORATION OF THE CONGRESS OF PANAMA OF 1826, PANAMA CITY, JULY 19, 1956

This return of the Americas to the fountainhead of their solidarity and this rendezvous in Panama through the Organization of American States, as an act of homage and gratitude to the Congress of 1826 and the memory of the liberator, has significance far beyond the gesture of respect long due to the hospitable city Bolívar himself selected, with unerring instinct, as the predestined place for the consideration of fundamental problems of the New World.

With this meeting, the Council of our Organization underscores and reinforces the continuity of the Pan American movement, a dream that never faded and, living on in the souls of all Americans, has finally materialized in the structure of the charter signed at Bogotá.

We may affirm that Simón Bolívar's ideal endures today in the conscience of the Americas. The amazing thing about that luminous figure is not so much his having conceived at an early date the idea of the perpetual union of the American nations, but that he was able to make his vision a reality by convening the Conference of the Isthmus, where memorable agreements were reached. His concept still operates as one of the creative forces of our system of hemispheric coexistence, and is a permanent inspiration in our daily effort.

Many were the men who felt the urgency for a union or federation of American nations. In Chile, in the River Plate region, in Peru, in Central America, in Mexico, and even in Venezuela before Bolívar's day and in his own, similar proposals were advanced, in one form or another. President James Monroe, for his part, had launched his famous doctrine of vital interest to the Western Hemisphere, and John Quincy Adams accepted the invitation to the Panama Congress in the sincere conviction that, far from conflicting with the advice given in Washington's Farewell Address, this was a step toward a united hemisphere. But only Bolívar was capable of blazing the trail with his sword, of climbing over mountain ranges, descending into the abyss, crossing rivers and plains, to bring to pass the convocation of the amphictyonic meeting.

Bolívar's living thought animates the Organization of American States today. The originality of the Americas and, doubtless, their genius, consists in their having succeeded in adapting to the needs of the day an examplary institution, one whose provisions never oppress and cannot in any way affect the political independence, the sovereignty, or the absolute personality of any of the member states.

Our organization is not merely the aggregate of the norms that govern it; neither does it consist solely of the backbone structure of our charter. The existence of our organism is expressed in action, in effort, in the will to advance each day the common task. The Organization of American States lives forward into the future, since life is an operation that is performed for the future. And to live consists, inexorably, in doing, all the time, as José Ortega Gasset has told us.

Thus we see the liberator's influence as a propelling force in our program and as a vigorous incentive for new achievement. The liberator sowed what the men of the Americas would reap over the centuries. More than the political order of his day, he laid the foundations for the future order of the entire continent. Bolívar, first in glory and without peer in sacrifice and personal misfortune, was an impetus toward the future.

In reviewing the past and paying the tribute of our admiration to the Congress of Panama and the precursors of our organization, we must also be responsive to the needs of America today. The Bogotá Charter fixes no limits for the extent of our contribution. We should rather regard it as a platform from which to launch new flights, winging through space in search of the higher peaks in the development of our institutions and the political, cultural, and social progress of our countries. After the manner of Bolívar, our plans must be long range. Noble objectives, however remote they may appear, always have the power to evoke the enthusiasm of the peoples. The duty of the present generation is to receive the heritage of the past, adding to it new achievements and instilling it with the spirit of our times. Thomas Jefferson, that other herald of American liberties, predicted that each generation succeeding to the knowledge acquired by all those who preceded it, adding to it their own acquisitions and discoveries, and handling the mass down for successive and constant accumulation, must advance the knowledge and well-being of mankind, not infinitely, as some have said, but indefinitely, and to a term which no one can fix and foresee.

The defense of the spirit is our mission, as proclaimed in the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man. We see this as the highest goal to which we are dedicated, without therefore neglecting any of our other responsibilities toward the welfare of the individual and of society. "It is the duty of man" says the preamble to the declaration "to serve spiritual development with all his strength and resources, inasmuch as this is the supreme end of human existence and the highest expression thereof."

Let us therefore strive to hold the Southern Cross, placed by destiny in the American firmament, as the enduring symbol of the hope and salvation of all men on earth.

Reimbursement of the State of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, extracts from House and Senate Reports, 74th Congress; the report on June 8, 1955, of the House Judiciary House Subcommittee on Claims, and a statement prepared by me on May 3, 1955, all relating to H. R. 5253, relating to the claims of the State of California.

The matters follow:

[From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Daily Digest of June 8, 1955, p. D526]

"Claims: Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Subcommittee No. 2 ordered reported to the full committee H. R. 5253, amended, for the relief of the State of California."

Following is the favorable report on the bill, H. R. 5253, providing for the payment for the sum found by the Court of Claims to have been expended by the State of Cali-

fornia, as determined by that court pursuant to the Knowland Act of September 25, 1950 (64 Stat. 1032):

"H. R. 5253

"A bill for the relief of the State of California

"This bill was introduced by Congressman CECIL KING, of California, and provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the State of California, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of money expended by such State as reported in findings Nos. 24, 31, 33, 35, 36, 38, and 40 of the commissioner's report to the Court of Claims, filed May 28, 1953, No. 49912. Such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the State of California for reimbursement for all expenses incurred by such State in maintaining its militia and in recruiting, equipping, and supporting voluntary forces for the national defense during the War Between the States, including expenses resulting from indebtedness incurred for such purposes.

"In 1861 Congress passed an act authorizing the payment of the claim, but the Government contended that under the Chase (then Secretary of the Treasury) regulations, which the act did not set aside or waive, the law in regard to interest could not be complied with.

"Here the matter has rested ever since. The amount expended by the State of California at the request of the United States Government has never been in dispute; nor has it ever been contended that this claim was not the obligation of the United States, under the wording of the appeal made to California by President Lincoln.

"Finally Congress passed an act, Public Law 834, in the 81st Congress, 2d session, conferring on the Court of Claims jurisdiction to make findings of fact, waiving the Statute of Limitations. The Court of Claims gave judgment for a part of the claim, but found that in its judgment, under the Chase regulations, some claims for interest were not reimbursable.

"The court did find and make the following conclusions in the report of the commissioner filed May 28, 1953 (No. 49912):

" 'MILITIA EXPENDITURES

" '24. Under the direction and superintendence of certain high ranking officials of the California militia, the State expended pursuant to the foregoing statutes the sum of $468,976.54 on account of its militia forces, itemized as follows:

Equipment	$179,000.00
Subsistence	37,075.47
Transportation	63,589.97
Supplies	64,805.78
Incidental expenses	8,779.16
Drill expenses	70,251.15
Organizational expenses	6,778.61
Pay of militia:	
State staff officers	7,063.82
Militia generally	30,902.58
Band	730.00
	38,696.40
Total	468,976.54

" 'Of the total sum of $179,000 expended on equipping the militia, $70,140 was for uniforms and cavalry equipment with an additional $32,511.25 for like purposes, and the balance of $76,348.75 was applied to purposes which are not disclosed in the record.

" 'The commanding general of the Department of the Pacific, United States Army, consulted with and advised the governor and members of the California legislature, and at all times promoted and encouraged the reorganization and strengthening of the California militia, but it is not shown that he or any other official of the United States requested or demanded the course of action taken with respect to the militia, or directed, superintended, or conducted the program.

" 'EXTRA PAY TO VOLUNTEERS

" '31. Pursuant to said acts, the State of California expended the principal amount of $1,459,270.21 as extra pay to the California volunteers for their services in the United States Army. In addition, California expended $3,000 to print the relief or extra pay bonds.

" 'BOUNTY PAYMENTS TO VOLUNTEERS

" '33. The bounty payments made by the State of California pursuant to said act, amounted to the principal sum of $900,839.50.

" 'RECRUITING EXPENSES—VOLUNTEERS

" '34. By an act approved April 10, 1863, Statutes of California, 1863, at 246, the California Legislature appropriated the sum of $24,260 for the purpose of meeting the expenses incurred in recruiting various units of California volunteers then in process of formation. The specific sum appropriated was identified as the moneys then in the State treasury arising from the exchange of gold for legal tender notes in the payment by the State treasurer of the Federal war tax assessed against the State of California.

" 'The sum appropriated was apportioned so as to provide the commanding officer of each regiment and battalion with $898.51 for each of the companies of his command, to be distributed to defray recruiting expenses in the proportion of $498.51 to each captain, and $200 to each lieutenant. It was provided that the recruiting officers would produce vouchers for necessary travelling expenses, for subsistence of their recruits previous to being forwarded to the general rendezvous, and for all other necessary incidental expenses.

" 'The entire sum was distributed by the State treasurer to the various commanding officers of the regiments and battalions. A complete set of vouchers with respect to expenditures made by various recruiting officers was filed by only one of the commanding officers, whose regiment received $8,985.15 under the act. The record in this case also indicates that some other company officers of a battalion filed proper vouchers, but the amount of their expenditures is not shown.

" 'Except for the sum of $8,985.15, there is no satisfactory evidence that the sum appropriated was properly expended by the recruiting officers.

" 'PAY OF VOLUNTEER OFFICERS

" '35. Under United States War Department regulations the pay of line officers, including those in the California volunteers, commenced as follows: (a) Captains and second lieutenants from the date the company was raised to the full minimum number, or when mustered in by special order; and (b) first lieutenants from date the company was raised to one-half the minimum number. In paying line officers, these rules were applied by the United States without exception.

" 'In California, officers commissioned by the State of California, who were engaged in raising volunteer troops, had difficulty bringing the enrollment to the mustering-in strength. As a consequence, their Federal pay did not commence until considerable time and effort had already been expended by them. To compensate their officers for such premustering services California enacted the act approved April 4, 1884, Statutes of California, 1863–64, at 424, the preamble of which provided:

" ' "Whereas the burden of raising the Volunteer Companies of this State for the service of the United States is borne principally by the captains and lieutenants of those companies, after having been examined and accepted by a board of Army officers, and after receiving their commissions from the State; and

" ' "Whereas the said officers receive no pay for their services until they are declared mustered into the service of the United States, which with a flirst lieutenant, is when his company is raised to one half the minimum number, and with a captain and second lieutenant, [fol. 91] when the company is raised to the full minimum number, or when it is mustered in by a special order; and

" ' "Whereas, owing to the tardy manner in which volunteering has progressed under the governor's call for volunteers of February 5, 1863, the officers of the companies called for have been subjected to great expense in raising their companies, in some cases having been compelled to abandon the enterprise in order to procure the means to subsist themselves and their families."

" 'This act set up the line officers' relief fund. It provided for the payment from the fund to the line officers of the California volunteers the same pay and allowances as received by the regular United States Army officers of the same grade for the period from the time the volunteer officers received their commissions to the time of their muster into the Federal service. The act further provided that there was to be deducted from the amount thus computed any amounts received by such officers during the abovementioned period, either from the Federal Government for services or from the State under provisions of the act of April 10, 1863. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act, the sum of $65,000 was appropriated, and it was further authorized that bonds in this amount be issued, bearing interest at 7 percent per annum, redeemable July 1, 1874.

" 'Pursuant to this act, California paid $23,277.34 to its volunteer line officers to compensate them for services performed prior to their induction into the Federal forces, and for which they were not and could not be compensated under the War Department regulations.

" 'CALIFORNIA ADJUTANT GENERAL'S EXPENSES

" '36. By an act approved April 25, 1855, Statutes of California, 1855, at 136, concerning the State militia, the California legislature provided that the State adjutant general was quartermaster general and inspector general, and was charged with the protection and issuance of all arms and property, to receive and keep reports and records, and to make an annual report. His salary was fixed at $3,000 per year.

" 'By the act approved April 24, 1862, heretofore referred to in finding No. 18, the organization and function of the (fol. 92) State militia were more broadly defined. The adjutant general was designated to serve as exofficio chief of staff, quartermaster general, commissary general, inspector general, and chief of ordnance. His salary was continued at $3,000 per year.

" 'The regular staff of the adjutant general had consisted of 1 assistant and 1 clerk. During the war years his office was responsible for the payment of bounties and extra pay and his clerical help was considerably increased.

" 'The California expenditures for its adjutant general during the period from April 15, 1861, to August 20, 1866, amounted to $14,850.05 for the salary of the adjutant general, and $23,233.12 as wages of clerks and porters, or a total of $38,083.17.

" 'In addition, the sum of $2,639.34 was expended for rental of office space for the adjutant general during that period.

" 'After the war the adjutant general's office continued to administer the affairs of the militia which later became the National Guard.

" 'INTEREST PAID ON EXTRA PAY AND BOUNTY INDEBTEDNESS

" '38. The interest paid by the State of California between April 27, 1863, and July

1, 1839, on the original relief (extra pay) and bounty bonds, issued pursuant to the California acts of April 27, 1863, and April 4, 1864, to the date of their redemption or conversion at times prior to July 1, 1839, amounted to $302,364.60 on the relief bonds, and $366,206.26 on the bounty bonds, or a total of $668,570.86.

" 'By an act approved April 2, 1870, Statutes of California, 1869–70, at 646, the California legislature authorized the issuance of bonds known as the State funded debt bonds of 1873, to bear interest at the reduced rate of 6 percent per annum, for the purpose of liquidating and refinancing the funded indebtedness of the State. Pursuant to said act, and on January 2, 1873, various new bonds were exchanged for relief bonds to the extent of $239,500, and for bounty [fol. 93] bonds to the extent of $605,000. Thereafter and until July 1, 1889, the State of California paid interest on such new bonds in the sum of $233,025 on the converted relief indebtedness and in the amount of $598,950 on the converted bounty indebtedness or a total of $831,975.

" 'The total interest payments to July 1, 1889, on the relief and bounty indebtedness amounted to the sum of $1,500,545.86.

" 'After July 1, 1889, and until July 2, 1945, when all of the State funded debt bonds of 1873 were redeemed, the State of California paid interest on the new bonds issued in exchange for the original relief and bounty bonds, to the extent of $789,693.34 on the relief indebtedness, and in the sum of $2,032,900.85 on the bounty indebtedness, or a total of $2,822,594.19.

" 'The total interest paid by the State of California on all bonds covering the indebtedness incurred to finance the extra pay and bounty payments amounted to $4,323,140.05.

" 'CLAIMED DISCOUNT LOSSES ON BONDS

" '40. The State of California sustained net losses in the sum of $318,022 in the way of discounts on the sales of the original relief and bounty bonds because of stringent economic conditions during that period, and by reason of the premium of 7 percent allowed on the State funded debt bonds of 1873, which were exchanged for the old bonds. This net loss is established as follows:

	Relief bonds	Bounty bonds	Totals
" 'Discount on bond sales	$87,400	$175,160	$262,560
Less: Discount earned on redemptions	3,653		3,653
Net discount expense	83,747	175,160	258,907
Add: Seven percent increase in par value of State Funded Debt Bonds of 1873, exchanged for relief and bounty bonds and redeemed at par value	16,765	42,350	59,115
Total loss on discounts and additional cost of redemption of bonds exchanged for relief and bounty bonds	100,512	217,510	318,022'

"Totaling the amounts found due the State of California from the findings of fact set forth above, we find the amount due the State of California to be $7,537,243.15.

"No claim is made to moneys under finding 34 of the Court of Claims and hence the bill should be amended to eliminate that from the bill.

"This matter has been fully before the Court of Claims with a complete history of it from the beginning. It was sent to the Court of Claims for the express purpose of finding out what was due, and it would seem that we have no special duty to perform except to authorize an appropriation to pay the claim.

"Respectfully submitted.

"USHER L. BURDICK, M. D."

[74th Cong., 1st sess.; House of Representatives; Report No. 1162]

REIMBURSEMENT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

(June 10, 1935, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed)

Mr. HOEPPEL, from the Committee on War Claims, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 1932):

"The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1932) for the relief of the State of California, after a hearing and careful consideration, report the bill back with an amendment and, as amended, recommend that the bill do pass.

"The State of California made large expenditures in aid of the Federal Government during the War Between the States under the act of July 27, 1861, which act in general terms invited and encouraged the States to contribute their own funds for purposes of national defense and promised reimbursement thereof.

* * * * *

"The records further show that California was prompt in complying with the call made upon the State by the National Government and furnished all the financial and material aid in its power to help the Government in the common defense. * * *

* * * * *

"A bill on all fours with the California case was passed by Congress and approved by the President in the 70th Congress to reimburse the State of Nevada. Nevada's war expenditures were made under exactly similar authority and circumstances, and on the recommendation of the Commanding General of the Pacific, as were those of California. The exigencies impelling the Legislature of Nevada to pass acts authorizing such expenditures were identical. Even the acts of her legislature were copied after those enacted by the Legislature of California. The considerations in the one case cannot be differentiated from the same consideration in the other. California should be reimbursed for the same reasons that Nevada was repaid.

"All States other than California incurring expenditures for national defense have been reimbursed by the United States, principal and interest, under general and special acts of Congress. * * *

* * * * *

"The total loss suffered by the State of California on account of the discount at which the orignal bonds were sold and on account of the discount at which new bonds were given in exchange for the old amounted to the sum of $318,027, which sum should undoubtedly also be reimbursed the State of California under the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury in the Pennsylvania case hereinafter referred to, but which has not been taken into the account by the Comptroller General in the accounting rendered August 14, 1930.

* * * * *

"The Secretary of the Treasury issued certain rules for the preparation and settlement by the Treasury Department under the acts of Congress approved July 17, 1861, and July 27, 1861, of claims for reimbursement of expenses properly incurred by the States, respectively, on account of their troops 'employed in aiding to suppress the present insurrection against the United States.' These rules are divided into nine sections. Section 8 of these rules reads as follows:

" 'Bounties or donations to men or their families to induce men to volunteer will not be recognized. Such bounties as may be authorized by law will be paid by the United States directly to the men authorized to receive them. Voluntary contributions, either by State or local corporations, or by individuals, in aid of families of volunteers, etc., constitute no charge against the United States, and will not be refunded.'

* * * * *

"The expenditures which were made by the State of California in order to compensate its volunteers for the depreciation of the currency, as it affected their rate of pay, could not be considered a wasteful expenditure of public funds, nor was it a bounty in any proper sense, but was, as the Army board reported, 'to do a plain act of justice.'

* * * * *

"Had it not been for this particular paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California.

* * * * *

"It is only upon such a technicality presented under the so-called Chase regulations, narrowing and limiting the plain intent of the act of 1861, that up to the present the State of California remains unreimbursed.

"CONGRESS DECLARES EXPENDITURES VALID

"However, Congress after many years of consideration of the expenditures as made acknowledged the merit, justice, and validity of such expenditures and thus swept aside this technical construction of the act of 1861 under the Chase regulations which the Army officers themselves stated were unjust and inequitable to apply thereto. * * *

* * * * *

"PRECEDENT

"No other State in the Union, with the possible exception of Oregon and Nevada, had to contend with such extreme, abnormal conditions during the period of the Civil War as California had to contend with; and for that reason the reimbursement of California at this time, in view of the reimbursement of Nevada during the 70th Congress, should create no apprehension as to establishing a precedent. * * *

* * * * *

"The failure to reimburse California at that time was solely due to the narrow construction of the act of 1861 by the Treasury officials made under circumstances described by Comptroller Gilkeson in his report to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of November 21, 1892 (embodied in the Secretary's annual report to Congress), as follows:

" 'The National Treasury was empty. He (Secretary Chase) was expected to devise ways and means to carry on the war and to defray the expenses. He knew that it was only by practicing the greatest economy that he could succeed. * * * It is not strange, therefore, that at that time he put a construction on this statute now regarded as a narrow one. * * * None of the conditions that surrounded Secretary Chase pertain today. It is the duty of those who control affairs to see to it that no wrong shall be done to the loyal States whose people so nobly sustained the Government.' "

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 3, 1955.*

RE H. R. 5253 (84TH CONG.) INTRODUCED MARCH 28, 1955, BY REPRESENTATIVE KING, OF CALIFORNIA

Under this bill California will be paid for claims she has proved in the Court of Claims

under Public Law 834, a jurisdictional act approved September 25, 1950, for moneys advanced and expenditures made at the request of the Federal Government, in aid of the United States during the Civil War.

Senate Report No. 2446 and House Report No. 2696, 81st Congress, state:

"All States, except California have been reimbursed for moneys actually expended for costs, charges, and expenses in enrolling, equipping, transporting and paying volunteer troops during that war.

"Bills for direct reimbursement [all sponsored by Senator Hiram Johnson] have passed the Senate 9 times.

"All States other than California incurring expenses for national defense have been reimbursed by the United States, principal and interest, under general and special acts of Congress."

The House Committee on Wars Claims (now a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee) approved the California claims unanimously (H .Rept. No. 1162, 74th Cong.). Representative CELLER (now chairman of the House Judiciary Committee) was a member of that committee; see page 63 of that report.

The Court of Claims gave judgment in March 1954 under the above 1950 act for only a small portion of the claims. It held that because of the regulations of Secretary of the Treasury Chase respecting such claims, certain items were not reimbursable. Although the court found that California had actually advanced and expended nearly the entire amounts claimed, in aid of the Federal Government, it disregarded the following statements of both House and Senate Judiciary Committees:

"Had it not been for paragraph 8 of the so-called Chase regulations, so narrowly interpreted, the legislation enacted by Congress on July 27, 1861, would have been sufficient long ago to have enabled the Secretary of the Treasury to have settled the requests for reimbursement on behalf of the State of California."

The House and Senate committee reports each stated that in 1929 Nevada was reimbursed for expenditures "made under exactly similar circumstances," and that Nevada was "finally reimbursed for all these military expenditures and for the interest paid on money that was borrowed for the purpose of meeting such expenditures."

CONCLUSION

1. California's claims have been approved nine times by the Senate;

2. The House committee has reported favorably on these claims;

3. The Court of Claims has found that California advanced and expended the money at the request of the Federal Government;

4. A special Army board created by Congress has also found and reported to Congress that "the money was actually expended by the State" and approved the reasonableness of and the necessity therefor;

5. The Comptroller General has certified the aggregate expenditures as "the balance found due" to the State; and

6. Previous Congresses conducted no less than seven investigations into the merits of the claim and have reported their findings in the Senate and House reports.

Under H. R. 5253, California will receive back the money admittedly owing to her for so many years. Passage of the bill will remove the necessity of further action by Congress to amend the jurisdictional act of 1950 to require additional litigation and further delay in payment of the claim described on the Senate floor "as sacred an obligation, in my judgment, as the national bonds."

The Governors of California, its attorneys general, State treasurer, secretary of state, and State collector have urged Congress to enact this legislation.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entiled "Watch Every Move," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 19, 1956:

WATCH EVERY MOVE

"Through the auditor of public accounts, the people of Illinois exercise controls over all expenditures of State money, over the accuracy of the financial records of State agencies, the inventory of State property, and the supervision of State-chartered financial institutions holding deposits of private funds."—(Orville E. Hodge in Illinois Blue Book, p. 407.)

The author of these words has answered all questions put to him in the investigation of the scandals involving about $800,000 in Illinois public funds. So says the State's attorney of Sangamon County, George P. Coutrakon.

But even if Orville E. Hodge, of Granite City, has answered all questions this does not necessarily mean that all is going as it should in the clean-up of the scandal-ridden State Republican administration at Springfield.

Dr. Lloyd Morey, president emeritus of the University of Illinois and an expert accountant, has been sworn in as interim State auditor to restore confidence in an office that Hodge had to give up when it became clear that Governor Stratton and his 1956 running mates could not ride out the mounting storm.

But the presence in the auditor's office of a man so scrupulously honest as Dr. Morey does not mean that Illinois taxpayers have nothing further to worry about with respect to the important office for which Mr. Hodge had been renominated only last April as a key member of the Stratton team.

Actually the reports of "complete cooperation" and the pledges of "full restitution" ought to put the people of Illinois additionally on guard. Just how can a State official get himself into a jam of more than a half million dollars and then blithely promise to make everything good, presto, as if he had a magic wand?

And how can Governor Stratton and Attorney General Latham Castle expect the people of Illinois to regard them as knights in shining armor, directing a thorough cleanup, when they took up the scandals publicly at such a late hour?

Did Governor Stratton and his running mates not know that they slated for reelection a State auditor who owned 4 automoiles, 2 airplanes, and a yacht?

Did they not know that Mr. Hodge had not only a large home in Granite City, but also a lavish estate on Lake Springfield and a large apartment hotel in Fort Lauderdale, Fla., to which he sent guests for visits "on the house"?

Did they not know that he maintained suites at hotels in Springfield and Chicago and that for a period of 40 months his accommodations at Chicago's Drake Hotel cost an estimated $25,000?

But assume that Governor Stratton and his colleagues on the Republican ticket were alert enough to know these facts about Orville E. Hodge. Then did the question not enter their minds as to whether a man who lived on such a lavish, spendthrift scale was the man to continue in the office of State auditor for the next 4 years?

The conclusion is inescapable that not until the scandals broke upon the public did Stratton, Castle & Co., entertain even the slightest doubt as to the propriety of running Orville E. Hodge on the same ticket with President Eisenhower next November.

The people of Illinois will make no mistake if they keep the sharpest eye possible on all officials at Springfield, in Chicago, and anywhere else who are engaged in getting at the facts about this far-reaching set of scandals.

Let the people of Illinois be on guard against attempted coverups of whatever kind or size. Let them be vigilant as to the possibility of long-term political deals.

The stakes are mighty big in the Illinois scandals. They are far bigger than the $800,000 that has come to light. The stakes include the possible defeat of every member of the Stratton team running for reelection.

In a situation so desperate almost anything might be attempted.

Magna Carta Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a statement prepared by Oswald Ryan, a native of Indiana, a former Chairman of the United States Civil Aeronautics Board and former General Counsel of the Federal Power Commission, with reference to the present status of foreign-owned private property in the free world.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SANCTITY OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

(By Oswald Ryan)

For the past century and a half, the principal nations of the Western World have given allegiance to the principle of the inviolability of private property located within their territories, but owned by citizens or subjects of other nations. This principle, long recognized and approved by international law and practice, evolved as an integral part of the western concept of justice and freedom. By the end of the 19th century it had come to be regarded as an impregnable rule of international law and practice.

Of late, however, strange voices have been heard in the free world, calling for strange and new allegiances. Spokesmen for those rsponsible for the current worldwide ideological struggle are pleading for the elimination of private property and for the substitution of the totalitarian state as the owner of all things. Their plea is a natural offspring of that philosophy which asserts that man exists for the state, not the state for man.

While the free nations have not accepted the Communist philosophy which wars against private property and private enterprise, the aggressive efforts of international communism, aided by conditions of economic

misery born of two world wars, have not been wholly without influence in weakening loyalties to the historic principles of orderly freedom. The new climate created by this ideological struggle and the widespread acts of confiscation imposed upon private property by the newly established Communist governments in Europe and Asia has tended to make compromise of principle and departure from time-honored traditions appear to be less reprehensible than before.

Ten years ago representatives of 18 nations of the free world met in conference in Paris and formally agreed, contrary to the established principle of international law which forbade the confiscation of former enemy-owned private property, that each would hold or dispose of the German external assets within its jurisdiction in a manner designed to prevent their return to German ownership or control. The property thus seized was intended to be reparations in partial compensation for damages caused by Germany in the late war. It was believed that this method was preferable to direct reparations levied against the current productivity of the defeated nation—a plan which had been tried with unsatisfactory results after World War I.

Within 2 years of the action taken at the Paris Conference the United States Congress adopted an act which made mandatory the confiscation and liquidation of all German and Japanese external assets within its jurisdiction, and provided for the allocation of part of the proceeds to the payment of personal injury and property damage claims arising out of the war. The remaining assets were to be held for later disposition by the Congress.

Nations signatory to the Paris Agreement severally adopted various measures with respect to the disposition of the vested German and Japanese property within their respective territories.

Subsequent events, having no direct connection with the foreign property problem arising from the war, have also affected the status of foreign holdings. In 1951, the Government of Iran nationalized the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. In 1953, the Government of Guatemala expropriated part of the property of the United Fruit Corp. located within its jurisdiction without paying adequate and just compensation to the foreign owner. More recently, the successor to the Peron Government in Argentina blocked the external assets of a number of foreign-owned companies which operated in that country. The cumulative effect of these events has been to leave the historic principle of the sanctity of private property owned by foreign nationals in dangerous uncertainty. While it would be unjust to question the sincerity or the motives that impelled the various governmental acts of expropriation, it cannot be questioned that the acts themselves were contrary to international law and inconsistent with the high traditions of western civilization.

The principle of the sanctity of private property is historically associated with human freedom and its sanctity derives from that association. The principle is an organic part of the concept of individual liberty. Property is the fruit of labor and sacrifice, and without the right to own, possess and enjoy property, legally and justly acquired, man cannot be free. The rights of liberty and property, therefore, are one and inseparable. The greatest declarations of human rights in modern times, including the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, the Bill of Rights of the American Constitution, and, by implication, the American Declaration of Independence, have documented this truth. The right of the human being to be secure in his person and in his property is one of the elementary guarantees of our western civilization.

The principle of the inviolability of private property has long been held applicable to property located within the territory of one country, but owned by the nations of another. For the past century and a half, international law has recognized the principle that such property, at the outbreak of a war, might properly be taken into cuostody by the government to prevent its use against the national interest during the war, but that the government is under a solemn obligation, after the hostilities have ceased, to return the property to its rightful owners or provide its equivalent value in just compensation.

The rule against the taking of such property without just compensation has its roots in justice and morality. The private investor who entrusts his property to the government of a foreign country has a moral and equitable right to full protection for his property; and the government that invited or permitted the investment to be made in its territory is under an equally solemn duty to provide that protection.

Other considerations emphasize the inherent injustice which underlies the confiscation of private property belonging to the nationals of belligerent countries. Judge Story, one of the greatest judges of the last century, pointed out one of these in a notable decision dealing with this problem: "It is not the private character or conduct of an individual that gives him the hostile or neutral character. It is the character of the Nation in which he belongs and where he resides. He may be retired from all business, devoted to more spiritual affairs, and yet his domicile will prevail over the purity or innocence of his life. Nay, he may disapprove of the war and endeavor by all means to assuage or extinguish it * * * he is an enemy."

The language quoted is particularly applicable to the case many of the German citizens whose property outside of Germany has been confiscated as a result of the recent war. Many of these Germans were opposed to Hitler and the acts of aggression that produced World War II. Many had close cultural, commercial, and family ties with citizens in the free countries to which they had entrusted their property. To deprive permanently these citizens of their property without just compensation offends against common justice.

The principle of the sanctity of private property is a necessary requisite to the success of the present foreign policy of the Western nations. That policy envisages a free and democratic Germany and Japan as essential to world peace. It is directed toward strengthening and unifying the free world and integrating Germany and Japan in that policy as allies and partners. Germany is also allied with the Western free nations as a member of NATO and is committed to supply 12 German divisions for service in the line. Vast sums of money have been spent by leading nations of the free world to rehabilitate and strengthen Germany and Japan economically that they may be in a position to make effective resistance against aggressive Communist forces that thrive on economic depression and misery.

Alongside this policy, however, is another policy of bewildering contradiction under which hundreds of thousands of German and Japanese nationals are being deprived of their private property by free nations of which Germany and Japan are now allies. This policy was conceived and issued at a time when the heat and anger engendered by the war still survived to influence men's minds. The political conditions which, in 1945, moved the allied free nations to consider the dismantling of German industrial plants and the expropriation of the external assets of German nationals as a reasonable reparations policy no longer exist. A wartime ally of the free world has become a cold war enemy, and the wartime enemies have become allies of the free nations. But, while the conditions that produced the policy of expropriation have vanished, the policy remains to confuse and weaken the allied program of friendship and good will toward Germany and Japan, and to reduce the moral and political effectiveness of the allied resistance to Communist imperialism.

The Federal Republic of Germany has been an active factor in the efforts to thwart the Communist thrust to win economic and political control over the underdeveloped, backward countries of Africa and Asia. It would be wise statesmanship for the free nations of the West to aid the German and Japanese efforts by reversing a policy which is incompatible with enlightened standards of international conduct and the traditions of the free world. If the free nations were to reaffirm and reestablish the historic and humane principle of the sanctity of private property and would return to its owners the private property seized in war, they would encourage respect for private property rights among the people of Africa and Asia and would promote the acceptance by those peoples of western concepts of private enterprise. They would be proving to peoples everywhere, including the millions in the undeveloped countries and the many thousands of victims of Communist confiscation in Europe and Asia, that the free nations of the West actually believe in and live by those principles of democracy and individual rights that are the bedrock of the western faith.

The principle of the inviolability of private property also has an important influence on international economic policy. Sound international private trade and private investment contribute importantly to the security and progress of the family of nations. Private investment devoted to the expansion of foreign enterprise has already rendered invaluable service in providing capital for national development, increasing production and employment and raising the living standards in foreign countries, and in stimulating a greater volume of business activities at home.

Despite the unusual growth of foreign investment in recent decades and the continued urgent need for new capital, the free flow of foreign capital into countries that need it has been seriously impeded by the political instability and military uncertainties which today crowd the international horizon. Private investors have a high sensitivity to events that threaten the security of private property, and unless the governments involved exercise their sovereign powers to safeguard its integrity, private capital and private enterprise will avoid those countries. The continued adherence of influential nations to a policy of expropriation would be certain to undermine the confidence and stability that must always support international trade and investment.

In the present critical state of the world, international trade and investment are indispensible to world cooperation and peace. But the nationalistic policy of confiscation bears a deadly enmity to these important activities of international life. For confiscation is opposed to the reign of law. It rests upon the proposition that every nation, in dealing with matters affecting the status of foreign-owned private property within its territory, should have the right to do that which is right in its own eyes. The state thus becomes a law unto itself, unrestrained by the rights of others or by the general interests of mankind. It is obvious that the spread of such a practice ultimately could break down the basic structure of an orderly international life, since it would leave nations free to live by "the good old plan that

he shall take who has the power and he shall keep who can."

Charles Evans Hughes, an eminent American jurist of the present century who served with distinction as Secretary of State and later as the Chief Justice of the United States, offered a wise comment on this question in an address delivered in Philadelphia on November 23, 1923, when he said: "A confiscatory policy strikes not only at the interests of particular individuals but at the foundations of international intercourse, for it is only on the basis of security of property, validly possessed under the laws existing at the time of its acquisition, that the conduct of activities in helpful cooperation is possible. * * * Rights acquired under its laws by citizens of another state—a state—is under an international obligation appropriately to recognize."

We are concerned here not with rules for the passing hour, but with principles for the expanding future. Principles must govern the relations between nations if the international life of the world is to rest upon sound foundations, and the more secure the principles the fewer will be the problems that create conflict among nations.

The enlightened free peoples of the West are committed to collective security as a necessary measure of defense against wars of aggression; it is equally important that there be collective security against attacks upon the inviolability of private property if the reign of law is to be supreme over the forces of anarchy in the international life.

That security can be provided by a concert of the free nations that will act to reaffirm and reestablish the historic principle of the sanctity of private property and will clarify the rules of fair treatment necessary to the sound implementation of that principle. Such action will dissipate the cloud of uncertainty which now obscures the status of private property in foreign lands, and it will enlarge the area of the rule of law, thereby giving new stimulus and encouragement to peaceful international trade and investment.

Attempts have been made to justify the confiscation of the German and Japanese property on the ground that the property was seized as reparations for war damage and that reparations constitute a legitimate debt of the defeated powers. It is claimed that the course here pursued was preferable to a direct levy against the productivity of the defeated nations—the policy which was used with detrimental consequences after the First World War. There can be little question that the end sought was desirable and worthy. The same cannot be said of the means.

One of the oldest mistakes in history is the idea that the end justifies the means. With certainty it can be said, that, however, valid and worthy the objective may be, the employment of a means which inflicts injustice and hardship on innocent people cannot be defended.

The debt of reparations involved here was a debt of the governments of Germany and Japan, not a debt of their individual nationals who had entrusted their property to free nations in which they had faith and confidence. The confiscation of the private property of individual citizens as a means of discharging a government debt which those citizens individually do not owe can find no sanction in morality, justice or international law.

That the Paris Reparations Agreement would not be a bar to restitution is further indicated by the acts of a number of the signatory nations taken under it. Greece, Belgium, Denmark, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Turkey and the Union of South Africa have each undertaken, in one form or another, to return, in whole or in part, the German assets it had seized. Although Japan was not involved in the Paris Agreement, it may be noted that seven nations have taken similar action with respect to the return of Japanese property that had been taken.

It has been stated in defense of the retention of German property that in the Bonn Agreement as amended by the Paris Protocol of 1955 the West German Government has assumed the obligation of paying the German owners of the vested property compensation for their losses, and that these actions have cancelled the rights of the owners to receive compensation from these nations that took their property. Under the Paris Agreement of 1955 the Federal Republic was directed "to insure that the former owners of the property seized" should be compensated although neither the measure of the compensation nor the time of the payment was specified.

The claim that this undertaking of the German Government alters the confiscatory nature of the retention of the German property has no support in reason or in equity. Certainly it would not change the confiscatory character of the action expropriating the Japanese external assets, since no such undertaking was exacted from the Japanese Government in the treaty of peace with Japan. The German owners of the property taken were not consulted by the governments responsible for the undertaking; and their concurrence was never given. It is evident that the Federal Republic itself reluctantly consented to assume the financial responsibility involved in the undertaking only after great pressures had been brought to bear upon it.

The validity of this assumption by the German Government must also be judged in the light of the fact that, owing to tremendous financial obligations amounting to billions of dollars which the German Government has assumed in connection with its external debts, grave doubt arises as to its ability to fulfill its promise to reimburse its nationals for the loss of their property. The substitution of a bad debtor for a good one under such circumstances cannot satisfy the demands of justice in a democratic society dedicated to individual freedom and the sanctity of individual rights.

Various compromises have been proposed which contemplate, as a final settlement, a partial return of external assets of German and Japanese nationals seized in the late war. Compromise is a useful and often necessary device in resolving conflicting interests in a democratic society, but compromises purchased at the cost of the surrender of principles vitally essential to the well-being of a free society stand in a diffrent position. By granting a partial return of property which rightfully belongs to its owner, the proposal concedes the principle and, by withholding the remainder, it violates it.

The justice meted out to those who have had their property taken from them without fair compensation must be equal justice, distributed without discrimination. The exclusion of corporate entities from the rights and benefits of restitution for private property taken in the public interest and the restriction of such rights and benefits to natural persons would not meet the requirements of equal justice. When the corporate veil is lifted from these business entities, numerous natural persons of modest means are revealed as the individual shareholders and owners of the corporate property and they are entitled, in equity, to the same consideration as the individual owners.

We must recognize this issue for what it is—an issue of right and justice. No policy can be politically right that is morally wrong.

Less than two decades have passed since the free nations of the West struggled through the deadly, shattering years of a world war. Millions of the world's youths gave their lives in that war that justice and right might be vindicated. But justice is not an episode; justice is continuous; and the free nations must continue to see that right and justice prevail in international life.

That ever-present safety valve of a democratic nation—the sober, second thought of its people—has already raised doubts in the free world as to the wisdom and justice of the policy of confiscation which was adopted in the bitter aftermath of war. The time is ripe, therefore, for a reconsideration of that policy and for a return to the historic principles that so long guided the western nations in their relations with one another.

Social Security—Don't Confuse Us With Facts, Our Minds Are Made Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following exchange of correspondence setting forth the opposition of the Los Angeles County Medical Association to social security and my reply thereto:

LOS ANGELES
COUNTY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 28, 1956.

Mrs. MARY A. SMITH,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR MRS SMITH: Thank you for your letter inquiring as to the reasons the medical profession opposes the expansion of the social security bill now being ocnsidered by the United States Senate. The prime reason is simply one of economics. Those who are aware of the true facts know that the Social Security Administration is not solvent and that under present conditions it never will be. Practically every cent of the billions of dollars which have been contributed to social security has been spent by the Government and most of the present social security payments now come directly out of the general fund. Thus the taxpayers of this country are paying twice, once to social security and once to replenish the money taken from the general fund. In view of this factor, the medical profession does not believe it wise to add further debt to social security by lowering the requirements of those who could receive payments.

Of course, there are other factors. Speaking broadly and without reference to any specific case, we know that if there is no incentive for a person to rehabilitate himself, his efforts to again make himself self-supporting after illness or injury will be diminished. We believe social security would take this incentive from the ill or injured person.

This is a topic upon which actually a book could be written, however, I believe that the above will give you some idea of the reasons for our opposition to expansion of social security.

With every wish for an early improvement in your health, I remain,

Sincerely,

J. NORMAN O'NEILL, M. D.,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1956.

Mrs. MARY A. SMITH,
San Pedro, Calif.

DEAR MRS. SMITH: This is in response to your letter requesting comment on a letter which you received from Dr. J. Norman O'Neill, secretary-treasurer, Los Angeles

County Medical Association, setting forth reasons why the medical profession opposes the expansion of the social security bill now being considered by the United States Senate. (This bill passed the Senate yesterday, July 17, 1956.)

These reasons are presented in two paragraphs. The first, and longest, paragraph is an attack on the financial soundness of the present social security system. The second paragraph refers to vocational rehabilitation. As is often typical of those who attack the whole social security system, opposition is expressed in broad general statements, unsupported by any factual material. The points made by Dr. O'Neill will be considered and answered in the order in which they were set forth in his letter to you.

First, there was mentioned the matter of economics, and it was alleged that "the Social Security Administration is not solvent and under present conditions it never will be." The simple fact of the matter is that the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund is completely solvent and actuarially sound. The total assets of the trust fund as of June 30, 1955, were $21,141,001,461.71. The source of this figure is the report of the Board of Trustees of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, Senate Document No. 119, 84th Congress, page 9. (The members of the Board of Trustees are: George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury; James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor; Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and Charles I. Schottland, Commissioner of Social Security.)

The law requires that these assets be invested only in direct interest-bearing obligations of the United States and obligations guaranteed as to both principle and interest by the United States. In other words, the assets are invested in United States Government securities, which constitute the safest form of investment. This fact of course is recognized by businessmen throughout the country and, indeed, laws in every State of the Union class government bonds as the No. 1 preferred form of investment for regulated insurance companies, trusts, and so forth. Further, the interest which is collected from these securities goes into the trust fund. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, alone over $438 million in interest was received. The total amount of interest since the inception of the trust fund amounts to approximately $3.7 billion. In connection with the operation of the trust fund investment I hope you will read carefully pages 7 and 8 of the enclosed annual report, under the section entitled "Reality of the Trust Fund." As you will note, that report discusses and completely refutes the type of charge made by Dr. O'Neill in his letter to you.

Second, and in support of his first statement, Dr. O'Neill asserts that "practically every cent of the billions of dollars which have been contributed to social security has been spent by the Government and most of the present social-security payments now come directly out of the general fund"; and he further charges that "thus the taxpayers of this country are paying twice, once to social security and once to replenish the money taken from the general fund." These statements are misleading and are completely contrary to the facts. They have been repudiated time and again. The investment of the assets of the trust fund in government securities, as required by law, is entirely proper. Amounts equal to 100 percent of contributions under the Social Security Act are permanently appropriated by law to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund which is completely separate from the general funds of the United States Treasury.

The allegation that the public will be taxed twice for social security has been answered fully and completely on a number of different occasions. For example, the report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, in August 1949, said with reference to this:

"The investment of the excess income of the trust fund in government securities does not mean that the people have been or will be taxed twice for the same benefits, as has been charged."

Also, I refer again to the Annual Report of the Board of Trustees, signed by Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, as follows:

"When the Treasury pays back money borrowed from the trust fund, the public will not be taxed a second time for social security. If taxes are levied to redeem the securities held by the trust fund, these taxes will not be levied for the purpose of paying social security benefits. Rather, they will be levied for the purposes for which the money was originally borrowed, such as the costs arising out of World War II. Taxes would have to be raised to pay back the money borrowed to cover the cost of the war, whether the obligations were held by the trust fund or by other investors. The fact that the trust fund, rather than other possible investors, holds part of the Federal debt does not change the purpose for which these taxes must be levied."

To state the matter as simply and concisely as possible, the United States Treasury borrows from a number of different sources, including individuals, mutual savings banks, insurance companies, and various other classes of investors, including the OASI Trust Fund. Government securities in the hands of the OASI Trust Fund are fully as valuable as are Government securities in the hands of other investors. The investment of this trust fund are handled much the same as are other types of insurance systems set up by the Congress, such as Civil Service Retirement (established in 1920), United States Government Life Insurance (established in 1924), and others.

Facts about our Social Security System are readily available to Dr. O'Neill as they are to anyone who is broadminded enough to seek the truth. Actuarial estimates presented to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, of which I am proud to be a member, and to the Senate Committee on Finance, show that the contribution rates now in the law make the system wholly self-supporting. These actuarial estimates do not take into account the probability of a continuing rise of wage levels as has occurred throughout all American history. An increase in wage levels would have the effect of increasing income in relationship to outgo in the fund. In this connection, the Ways and Means Committee in its report on H. R. 7225, said:

"Your committee has always very strongly believed that the system should be actuarially sound. Your committee continues to believe that the tax schedule in the law should make the system self-supporting as nearly as can be foreseen, or in other words, actuarially sound.

In consideration of H. R. 7225 in 1955, as in all previous years, the committee was very careful to provide adequate financing for the new benefits provided. Actuarial testimony presented to the committee indicated that the system would be actuarially sound if the contribution rate was increased beginning with January 1, 1957. The committee nevertheless concluded that in order to be absolutely certain of the fund's actuarial soundness the increase in the rate should go into effect on January 1, 1956. As stated in the committee's report on the bill:

"The old-age and survivors insurance program as amended by this bill would be actuarially sound, and in fact its actuarial status would be improved since the cost of the liberalized benefits is more than met by the increased contributions scheduled (with such rise going fully into effect immediately with the inauguration of the new benefit provisions)."

As I have indicated above, the major portion of Dr. O'Neill's letter consisted of his first paragraph in which he attacked the financial soundness of the social-security system itself. He then said, "Of course, there are other factors." He then referred merely to the matter of rehabilitation, stating that social-security disability benefits would remove the incentive from ill or injured individuals to rehabilitate themselves.

This argument deserves close examination. Rehabilitation is, indeed, vitally important and I yield to no one in the desire to encourage and promote efforts to rehabilitate and return to useful and fruitful life and work those individuals who unfortunately have been injured or disabled. As the report of the Committee on Ways and Means clearly demonstrates, the committee did carefully and thoroughly consider this whole subject in connection with disability benefit provisions. The committee states in its report: "We believe that everything possible should be done to support and strengthen vocational rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, where it is possible, is the most economical method of providing for disabled persons and is the most satisfactory for the individual." The committee, in order to avoid setting up barriers to vocational rehabilitation, specifically provided in the bill that a person who performs work while under a State rehabilitation program will not, solely by reason of this work, lose his benefits during the first 12 months while he is testing out a new earning capacity. At the same time, in order to prevent malingering, the committee included in the bill, as a specific safeguard, a provision that would stop the benefits of anyone, who, without good cause, refused rehabilitation available to him.

The arguments against disability benefits on the grounds that such benefits will prevent rehabilitation seem to ignore the very basic consideration that important as rehabilitation is, it cannot be a substitute for disability benefits, since (a) many disabled persons cannot be rehabilitated, and (b) even those who can be rehabilitated will need assistance during the process of rehabilitation. It is a mistake and misunderstanding to believe that a disability benefit system, as contemplated in the bill passed by the House of Representatives, is really antagonistic to or a substitute for rehabilitation. Actually such a system not only supplements but actually strengthens the rehabilitation program.

Dr. O'Neill may not be aware of the fact that the American Medical Association has taken a position with respect to workmen's compensation that the payment of disability benefits should make rehabilitation more feasible and effective. In December 1955 the house of delegates of the American Medical Association approved a report of a special committee on medical relations in workmen's compensation which stated in part:

"The physician's interest involves recognition that the amount and method of indemnification have a direct and important bearing on an effective rehabilitation regime. While overgenerous indemnity can dull the will for rehabilitation, inadequate indemnity requirements can destroy an employer's incentive to support rehabilitation by providing him with an easier or cheaper alternative. More important, inadequate indemnity can lower patient morale, or force return to gainful employment in advance of clearcut medical indications."

That report proceeds to discuss important relationships between indemnity and methods of indemnity to the rehabilitation effort. It seems somewhat strange, both from the standpoint of commonsense and from the standpoint of logic that the medical profession could, on the one hand, agree that indemnity benefits under workmen's compen-

sation are necessary and at the same time oppose disability benefits for the permanently and totally disabled as an entire group.

No other arguments are provided by Dr. O'Neill in his letter to you. He completely ignores the numerous safeguards written into the disability insurance benefit provision of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. For example, before an individual can qualify for disability benefits under that bill, he must be permanently and totally disabled as defined in the bill; he must have had at least 1½ years of coverage under the act during the 3-year period ending with the quarter of his disablement and he must have had at least 5 years of coverage during the 10-year period ending with the quarter of his disablement; and, in addition, he must be fully insured under the act. Benefits would be payable only after a 6-month waiting period. Benefits would not be payable to dependents of the disabled worker. Benefits would be suspended in the case of refusal without good cause to accept vocational rehabilitation.

All circumstances considered, the program of disability insurance benefits contemplated by the bill constitutes a very conservative program, and includes very tight prerequisites which much be met before a worker may become eligible. For example, the definition of the term "disability" requires inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of any medically determinable physical or mental impairment which can be expected to result in death or to be of long-continued and indefinite duration is more exacting than the disability provisions of commercial insurance policies now being issued, which permit a total disability that has persisted for 6 months to be compensated on the presumption that it is permanent until shown to be otherwise.

I hesitate to take this much of your time in responding to your letter, but I consider it so vitally important that the true facts about our social-security system and the lack of any real factual basis for the malicious charges which have been made against it that the time to discuss these issues is warranted.

Sincerely yours,

CECIL R. KING,
17th District, California.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Saturday, July 21, entitled "Full Restitution—With What?"

FULL RESTITUTION—WITH WHAT?

Not only did the office of Orville E. Hodge as State auditor do a fake check business totaling at least $800,000 in State funds. Now, as the Post-Dispatch disclosed Friday, this recent member of the Stratton team is listed as owing more than $400,000 in complicated real-estate deals.

These real-estate transactions range all the way from an indebtedness of $20,000 at the Granite City Bank & Trust Co. to a $200,000 mortgage on Hodge's beach-front apartment hotel at Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

Yet in this fantastic situation, Orville E. Hodge has blithely said that he would make full restitution. What, the Illinois taxpayers may well ask, is he going to make restitution with? Is their resigned State auditor likely to raise much more money on property already carrying heavy mortgages which are unpaid?

About the only banker we can think of who might lend Illinois Republican Leader Hodge any money just now would be Edward A. Hintz, the ex-president of the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co. Hintz was the bank president who arranged to have his bank pay over money on the crooked checks from Hodge's office.

Certainly it is time for State's Attorney George P. Coutrakon, of Sangamon County, to get busy presenting information to a grand jury. His announcement that he will seek 46 indictments against Hodge from the grand jury on Monday is welcome. The grand jury is the people's weapon against such faithlessness. The sooner it can get into action the better.

The Clergy in Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the need for active participation by the clergy in civil defense activities should be obvious to cleric and layman alike, but efforts expended by religious and related groups in this truly vital field have been limited to a potentially disastrous degree. At first glance, this deplorable condition might appear the fault of the Federal Civil Defense Administration; such an impression, however, is erroneous. The Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 specifically, and repeatedly, placed primary responsibility for effectuating civil defense upon the States and local political subdivisions. The national agency cannot order anyone to do anything. It can only advise and recommend. In the field of religion it has offered a comprehensive plan for the integration of religious aspects into State and local civil defense programs.

To coordinate its own recommendations, as well as to receive and evaluate the suggestions of interested citizens, the FCDA in February of 1955 established a Religious Affairs Office, headed by a clergyman. The new group has met several times with the National Religious Advisory Committee to the FCDA, an organization first set up in February 1951, to work out a religious-activities program which can be integrated into civil defense systems at State and local levels. It is hoped that a pattern acceptable to civil defense officials and clergymen alike will be realized. Thus far, the State and local civil defense units have given pitifully meager attention to the role the clergy should assume in our struggle to preserve America's identity.

Some of the basic responsibilities in the preattack phase of civil defense which the clergy must accept, it seems to me, are these:

First, the ministers, priests, and rabbis must strive to instill in their congregations recognition of the need for all to maintain their composure and resolution under the most trying circumstances. Second, they must inculcate a sense of responsibility in our people and, at the same time, clothe them with spiritual security. Such goals can perhaps best be attained through personal ministration to both families and individuals.

A third responsibility of the clergy in the preattack period is to encourage the enlistment of volunteers for civil-defense services, while assigning members of their own organization to serve as chaplains to the various components of the local civil-defense systems, such as the warden, rescue, and fire-fighting units. A fourth responsibility is that of planning and arranging the role of clergymen both in the mutual-aid compacts which most of the States have already negotiated and in the mobile-support programs which constitute one of the more important aspects of such compacts.

A fifth, and perhaps most vital, service to be assumed by the clergy is the affording of material assistance and spiritual comfort alike to those of us who have to evacuate to reception centers in response to warnings of anticipated or actual air attacks. Whether the threat materializes or not, people massed at designated points of refuge would be less than human if an awful thread of fear did not run through them, one and all. It must be a primary responsibility of the clergy to prevent this apprehension from developing into catastrophic panic.

In this many faceted program to impart courage and faith, children, of course, must receive a large measure of attention. The shadows of fear which already are clouding their impressionable minds could be largely dissipated through the establishment, among other expedients, of regular programs of religious education. The children should be taught that God's saving grace envelops all mankind; but that He expects them to help themselves through mutual cooperation and by instant response to the instructions of their parents, their teachers, both clerical and lay, and the civil authorities.

Should Providence decree that we must endure the ordeal of a nuclear war, the responsibilities of our spiritual leaders will, of course, be enormously magnified. They will be called upon to administer rites for the seriously injured, the dying, and the dead. They will have to comfort and counsel the bereaved, the confused, the homeless. They must extend pastoral care and counseling to all whose fears and anxiety leave them emotionally disturbed. Inasmuch as terror, grief, guilt, and hostility will all be manifested, the clergyman must be more than a dispenser of Scripture; he must be prepared to exhibit sympathetic understanding of human foibles, feelings, and aberrations. Should the inevitable tensions not be alleviated, the home front could easily disintegrate, and the war be lost. There could be no worse disaster: America as we know it would be no more.

Assuming that the clergy will be successful in helping to maintain public morale in general, its members will have many other important, if tangential, functions to perform. They will help in the referral of individuals to appropriate professional services, such as emergency welfare and health units. They will build and equip temporary places of worship. They will help families, groups, and institutions prepare to receive the wounded and the evacuated. They will present themselves at first-aid stations, hospitals, and morgues.

For the clergy to be effective in the performance of thier manifold duties, detailed plans for the integration of their services must be worked out now by State and local civil defense units acting in concert with religious advisory committees. Among the more important matters to be considered are these: First, ecclesiastical authorization of assignments of clergymen in the overall aspects of civil defense; second, their transportation to places of special need in times or both war and peace; and third, their inclusion in practice drills and exercises.

America's survival will depend in no small measure upon how well the soldiers of God carry out the many missions they must assume.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 23, 1956, entitled "They Are Indicted":

THEY ARE INDICTED

"Commercial warrants (State checks for regular bills on the State of Illinois) require the most detailed examination and verification.

"It is plainly here that the Illinois State auditor's duties, as stated in the Illinois constitution and the statutes and interpreted by the Illinois Supreme Court, entail a greater obligation to ascertain that the voucher (for the work charged) is correct and the claim is just.

"The auditor's voucher control section handles all these vouchers manually in order that greater care may be exercised. Mechanization has been applied at every step possible, but the proper degree of accuracy and verification of charges has never been sacrificed."—(Illinois Blue Book, p. 411.)

The man who proudly took credit for these words in a detailed description of the duties of his public office in the Illinois Blue Book, or official State manual, Orville E. Hodge, of Granite City, now stands indicted by a Federal grand jury.

The charge against this key member of the State Republican team of Governor Stratton, until the scandals broke open, is that he conspired to mishandle $872,000 in State funds through his office. Whether the final total has yet been reached is not known. The figures have been going up every day.

Indicted along with Orville Hodge are Edward A. Hintz, the ex-president of the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, where many of the faked and forged State checks were cashed, and the messenger Edward A. Epping of Lebanon, Ill., who was on Hodge's own payroll at $1,000 a month.

Meantime the State grand jury at Springfield, under the leadership of Sangamon County State's attorney, George P. Coutrakon, was ready to receive information on which State indictments can be issued.

The new Illinois scandals thus appear to exceed anything in a long line of episodes of corruption dating back through Dwight H. Green, Frank L. Smith, Len Small to William Lorimer and the outright purchase of a United States Senate seat almost 50 years ago.

The question that taxpayers all over Illinois are asking themselves now is this:

How could there have been a plunder operation of such gigantic proportions without other State officials in the Stratton administration knowing about it?

Are the preparation of budgets, the drawing of appropriations, the voting of bills in the Republican legislature and the signing of money measures into law so loose, so slipshod, so careless, so hit-or-miss that not a single other official in the Stratton administration even suspected that something was mighty rotten in Springfield?

If that is so, then Illinois State affairs are much worse off than the Hodge scandals have so far revealed.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in the tributes being paid DICK RICHARDS, our distinguished colleague and friend from South Carolina.

Vermonters are sometimes considered a bit cold and austere by those who meet them for the first time. But once this veneer of reserve is broken one finds a warmhearted and friendly people who only desire a little time in which to appraise a man's true worth.

So, as a Vermonter, perhaps the highest compliment I can pay DICK RICHARDS is to say that should circumstances require him to establish a residence in the Green Mountain State he would be accepted immediately as one of us. His virtues and qualities, so readily apparent, are those which Vermonters cherish the most: love of liberty, strength of character, rugged independence of thought, and a willingness to fight for one's convictions.

This has been a better House because DICK RICHARDS has been a Member. Men of his stature cannot be replaced. We can only hope that his record will inspire others to try and measure up to the high standards of effective and devoted public service which have been so evident throughout his political career.

We hope that he and his charming wife will enjoy many years of good health and happiness together.

J. Addington Wagner, National Commander of the American Legion, Turns His Back on Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every Member of this House knows that if Mr. Wagner would tell the Senate that he would accept H. R. 12038 as No. 1 priority legislation without amendments that it could become law and give the service-connected disabled of our country $172 million next year. I am including the following telegram sent to Mr. Wagner and his reply:

JULY 20, 1956.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, the American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion non-service-connected pension bill, H. R. 7886, is blocking many pieces of legislation now pending in the Senate designed to help widows and combat-disabled veterans, including H. R. 12038, the bill which would give the Nation's 2 million disabled veterans a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation. Our service-connected disabled veterans will go without needed increases in compensation unless the American Legion immediately repudiates the non-service-connected pension bill, H. R. 7886, and advises Members of the Senate that compensation increases for the service-connected disabled should have the highest priority and that such legislation should be brought to the floor of the Senate immediately, with assurance from the American Legion that no attempt will be made to amend the bill to include non-service-connected pensions. Action on your part is imperative if our service-connected disabled veterans are not to become the victims of an ill-conceived drive by the American Legion for non-service-connected pensions. I tried in the committee to obtain first consideration for the service-connected disabled and lost to American Legion demands. I tried again on the floor of the House to give increases to the service-connected disabled priority over the American Legion pension bill and again lost as a result of American Legion pressure. In a third and final effort, I urge you to stand up and be counted on the side of the 2 million veterans of this Nation who suffered service-connected disabilities in its wars and restore to them priority consideration which the American Legion legislative program has denied.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives.

JULY 21, 1956.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives:

Re telegram July 20, apparently you are confused. The United States Senate is well able to conduct its business. I doubt very much that the Senate is in need of a directive from either you or the American Legion in order to evaluate and carry out its responsibilities. The American Legion heartily supports H. R. 12038 providing compensation increases for war widows and combat disabled veterans. We supported it in the House and we support it in the Senate. We believe that both this bill and our war veterans security bill, H. R. 7886, offer reasonable and vitally needed improvement in

the present veterans' benefit program. We earnestly hope that the Senate will enact both of these bills into law.

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander,
The American Legion.

Veterans Bills

SPEECH
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 12, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been greatly disturbed by the delay we are experiencing with regard to the final passage of pending veterans legislation.

Since my service in the House first began, one of my greatest concerns has been for the veterans and their dependents. I will not recite here the character and scope of my interest and activities for the cause of the veteran.

The stark fact is, however, that while we have been engaged in ladling out of the United States Treasury billions of dollars for foreign nations and foreign causes, many of which are of doubtful value, and some of which are entirely without justification, Congress has failed up to this time to pass highly necessary and urgent legislation in behalf of the disabled veterans who have offered their lives and sustained serious impairment of their bodies, while engaged in fighting our country's battles.

The Congress usually extends most careful, painstaking attention to all measures affecting the interests and welfare of the veteran and his dependents.

During this session, the House has considered and passed pensions for veterans of World War I of $90 per month, at the age of 65 whose income is less than $1,400 if single, or $2,700 with dependents. This measure also contains increases in disability pensions for those under 65.

COMPENSATION

This feature of current legislation, H. R. 12038, also passed by the House, is important to more than two million veterans since it increases the rates of service-connected compensation for veterans of all wars and broadens eligibility for increased compensation for dependents as well as the rate available for this purpose. It increases the rate of widows, with proportionate increases for widows with children.

Because of the technical parliamentary situation that developed when the omnibus bill was pending before the House and delayed consideration in the other body, these measures have had a somewhat uncertain legislative history. But it would seem clear at present that they will pass the Congress without material changes.

WAR ORPHANS

Another measure, which is of greatest concern and benefit, is the so-called War Orphans Education Act, which has been adopted by the Congress. This law provides for 36 months educational assistance to the children of servicemen, who died as the result of service in World War II and Korea. It enables them to obtain a college education or post-high-school training. The program should be of great advantage and help to many children of veterans, who otherwise could not secure a higher education, or would have to do so under great handicaps. As was the case with previous similar training programs, this particular program will also be administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Because of the persistent, continuous efforts of those who are endeavoring seriously to curtail parts of the overall veterans program, it has been necessary during this session for friends of the veterans in Congress to exercise constant vigilance and exert special attention to various aspects of the veterans legislative program.

The principal opposition to present or proposed veterans' programs stems from tax-conscious sources, which appear to be more intent upon effecting tax savings for their own benefit than they are about proper medical care, compensation, training, and other benefits for the veterans and their dependents. Up to this time, I am happy to say, the Congress has rejected their crippling proposals. But we know, from past experience, that this struggle is by no means over, that determined efforts will continue to be made to try to prevail upon the Congress to discontinue some veterans' benefits, to reduce others, and to reorganize and reshape the present agencies, which are, for the most part, satisfactorily discharging their functions.

Many proposals decidedly adverse to the cause of the veteran have emanated from prominent and high-placed national figures in the name of economy as if they were the only people in the country interested in economical administration of Government. It is true that these elements are for the most part special pleaders seeking to cut literally billions of dollars from the veterans' budget to effect tax savings. These same elements virtually at the same time favor, propose, and work for the most lavish expenditures of billions of dollars for foreign-aid programs all over the world.

They have not quite marshaled sufficient boldness to come out in the open and make extended public arguments for their point of view. But let us not delude ourselves. They have laid down the program. They have placed it before the bar of public opinion in a way calculated by them to be politically skillful and insinuating. They are endeavoring to sell their ideas to the American people by appeals to self-interest and under the guise of budgetary reform and tax savings.

True friends of the veteran will not be deceived by these activities because they have seen them before. As I have noted many times in this Congress, I am in strong support of the economical administration of the affairs of this Government. I am in favor of honesty, integrity, and efficiency. I favor men of ability, experience, and courage in public offices and positions. I yield to no one in sponsoring prudent, economical management. There is plenty of room for savings, for economies in our governmental affairs, particularly in our foreign relief activities. And there is plenty of room for tax reduction if the question is tackled with real determination, discriminating judgments, and sincerity. There is, not only room, but a distinct urgency, to revise the tax structure before our economic system becomes shot through with apathy, lack of incentive, and lack of enterprise, which confiscatory, oppressive taxes generate.

But I believe that there is one distinct principle that the American people strongly support and will not deviate from and that is the principle of providing most generously and most humanely for the veterans and their dependents, for those who have made such great sacrifices for the Nation and their dear ones. When the time comes that this Nation, through its Congress and representatives of the people, refuses to discharge in full the solemn obligation we have to provide for the veteran and his dependents, we shall have surrendered completely to materialism. We will have turned our backs on the humane promptings of our conscience and we will be prepared to surrender something infinitely precious to all Americans—the sacred resolve of gratitude and patriotic acknowledgment and intent to uphold the interests, the well-being and welfare of those, who on more than one occasion have saved the Nation from its enemies.

There can be a hundred Bradley Commission reports with its search for economy at the expense of the veterans, but there can be only one real safeguard for the Nation in time of emergency and that is the willingness of the sons and daughters to fight for its security and perpetuation. The American people will insist on remembering the unpayable debt we owe our veterans. The Congress must honor this debt by continued, vigorous and solicitous attention to all the problems of the veteran and his loved ones.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on Friday, July 20, 1956, entitled "Now It Is Up to $800,000":

NOW IT IS UP TO $800,000

So much attention has centered on Orville E. Hodge that the tendency has been to lose sight of the ex-president of the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co., Edward A. Hintz. He is the man who made arrangements to cash many of the forged Illinois State checks now totaling some $800,000.

Banker Hintz, a former official of the Illinois Bankers Association, says he knew he was doing something that no banker ought to be doing. But he is quoted as saying that he assumed the procedure was the regular

one among politicians, "to collect their cut on public contracts."

Actually this explanation by a veteran banker is more amazing than the racket in State warrants operated by the State auditor's office in Springfield when Orville Hodge occupied it. Banker Hintz cannot dismiss his wrongdoing by saying that he was stupid. For it is far worse than being stupid for him to assume that men in public life generally are expected to be crooks.

We are glad to see that Senator DOUGLAS of Illinois has asked the Senate Banking Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, to send investigators to Illinois. There can hardly be too many honest investigations of the Illinois scandals until all the facts are known and all the participants stand revealed.

The latest ramifications of the Hodge connections, as disclosed in yesterday's Post-Dispatch, apparently reach into the underworld. And yet this man, Orville E. Hodge, was slated without opposition to run to succeed himself for the next 4 years on the Republican ticket as a member of "the Stratton team." He was even talked of for governor in 1960.

The very thought grows the more fantastic as the scandals continue to unfold.

AMVETS Tells Commander Wagner, of the American Legion, To Withdraw Support of H. R. 7886 or Shoulder Responsibility for Killing Legislation for 2 Million Service-Connected Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the following letter which Rudolph G. Pesata, national commander of AMVETS, has written to Mr. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the American Legion, urging that he take action to restore service-connected war veterans to No. 1 priority in the American Legion legislative program:

JULY 24, 1956.

Mr. J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, American Legion, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COMMANDER WAGNER: Under date of June 18, I directed a communication to you urging that you instruct your rerpesentatives to join with AMVETS in supporting a substitute for H. R. 7886 that would provide an equitable increase in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans, and that would, at the same time, have some reasonable chance of enactment into law during the current session of Congress. I have not as yet received even the courtesy of an acknowledgment of that communication. That fact, however, is relatively unimportant. Subsequent actions by representatives of your organization force me to the reluctant conclusion that you have rejected the premise that war disabled veterans and their dependents are deserving of the highest priority consideration.

It was obvious on June 18 that a compensation increase for war disabled veterans could not be obtained if it were tied to a costly measure to increase and liberalize pensions for veterans with either no disability or none connected with military service. In spite of the insistence of representatives of the American Legion that this fantastic package be sent to the Senate to die in that body, a superb parliamentary maneuver divorced the two subjects. Thus, the House of Representatives was in a position to pass a modest compensation-increase bill, H. R. 12038, that warranted favorable action by the Senate and White House.

Both bills, H. R. 12038, the AMVET-sponsored bill for the service connected, and H. R. 7886, the American Legion bill for the nonservice connected, are pending before the Senate Finance Committee. As this 84th Congress draws to a close, it is readily apparent that no action will be taken on war disabled veterans' compensation legislation because of the unreasonable demands of your representatives that non-service-connected pensions deserve priority or equal consideration.

I am certain that the American Legion has no desire to assume full responsibility for the failure to obtain compensation increases for more than 2 million disabled veterans. Unless you withdraw your support of H. R. 7886, however, your organization must shoulder that responsibility.

In the hope that you share AMVETS' concern for disabled veterans and their dependents, we urge you to abandon your position in support of H. R. 7886 and expend your future energies in obtaining prompt and favorable action on H. R. 12038, the compensation bill for service-connected disabled veterans.

Sincerely yours,

RUDOLPH G. PESATA,
National Commander (AMVETS).

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, DICK RICHARDS and I entered the House of Representatives in the 73d Congress, more than 23 years ago, and we soon became devoted friends.

I consider the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] one of the most outstanding Members we have had during these years. He is always sound in his thinking and convincing in his argument. This is one reason he is so highly regarded by the Members on both sides of this aisle. He never takes a stand until he is convinced he is right, and then he never varies from it. This was demonstrated sometime ago when he defeated the leadership on both sides of the aisle on an amendment to the mutual security bill.

I appreciate the friendship of this beloved, able Congressman throughout the years. His advice on many and varied problems, especially on foreign affairs, brought up on the floor of the House has been most helpful.

I do not know of anyone whose absence from this Chamber will be felt more than that of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [DICK RICHARDS]. His retirement is a voluntary one. I hope he will get some needed rest and that all good things will come to him, his lovely and devoted wife, and their fine family.

Which Is Superior, the Supreme Court or the Congress?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Which Is Superior, the Supreme Court or the Constitution?" which was written by Dr. W. W. Pierson, dean of the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina, who is a recognized authority in constitutional history, political science, and related fields. One of the greatest privileges enjoyed by me as a student at the University of North Carolina was that of sitting at Dr. Pierson's feet.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CONCEPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Most of us in the United States, as citizens or voters or officeholders, have taken an oath to support, uphold, and defend the Constitution. Is this an obligation that is taken lightly or is it an undertaking to which our loyalties are attached by abiding convictions? It is believed that the great majority of thoughtful citizens of this country would like to think of the Constitution as embodying a set of principles, which form the chart by which the way of public life is steered and to which faith is anchored, unalterable except by the means duly set forth in that instrument. Is this not what loyalty means? This idea of the Constitution as the law of laws (lex legum) gives the heartening assurance that all acts of Government—of whatever department or organ—must conform to and be authorized by the Constitution as supreme law. Some regard this opinion as classical or traditional by which the quest for political stability is respected and achieved and at the same time the means of progress and change are provided under law. A long list of writers could be cited in support, including our own Hamilton, Jefferson, and Webster; older foreign writers like Siéyès, Condorcet, and Tocqueville; and modern authors like Kelsen, Cassirer, and Garcia Pelayo.

DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

The supremacy of the Constitution is regarded, we think properly, as the cornerstone on which rests the edifice of modern political law. To this end many ideas of the defense of legality have been advanced, including the idea of the civic duty to resist a government which adopts and persists in measures that are oppressive, tyrannical, and unconstitutional. But the means that have in history been adopted to assure conformity of governmental acts to the Constitution have been, formally or informally, one of the following: (a) Review by the judicial power; (b) by a political branch, especially the legislature; (c) by a combination of the political and judicial powers; and (d) by a distinct entity created for the purpose. It may be recalled that the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776 established a council of censors, to be chosen by the freemen of cities and counties, to inquire whether the Constitution had been preserved inviolate in every part, to pass public censures, to order impeachments, to propose amendments, and to call conventions. This institution was short lived in that State, but in Vermont wherein a similar

agency was established it endured for about three-quarters of a century and exercised its functions with significant effect. In both States the courts were not authorized to exercise review functions of issues of constitutionality. In the country at large, however, we have constructively evolved the system of judicial review. We submit that the doctrine of judicial review in this country was founded on the principle that governmental acts ultra vires and contrary to the Constitution are invalid and void. As Chief Justice Marshall put it in the well-known case of *Marbury* v. *Madison:*

It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the Constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or that the legislature may alter the Constitution by an ordinary act.

Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it.

If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the Constitution is not law; if the latter be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable.

If we may adapt the words of Marshall, we might say: The Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary judicial decisions and legislative statutes., alterable when the legislature or the Supreme Court shall please to alter it. The Court has so far held the Congress not to have this power. Now the question is: Does the Supreme Court have what Marshall called an "illimitable power"? Recent decisions of the Supreme Court raise the old question: Quis custodiet ipsos custodes? If the Supreme Court may alter the Constitution by ordinary decisions has the Court not stepped out of character as defender of the Constitution and assumed the role of constitution-maker?

It is our conviction that the role of the Supreme Court has developed in American history primarily because of the desire and need for an umpire or impartial tribunal to act in defense of the Constitution. Judicial review has been supported or acquiesced in because of a confident reliance that performance of this role would be governed by this principle. The Court has deservedly won great prestige as a defender of the Constitution. In the course of time, however, it has step by step or by accretion added to this function, until it has assumed new powers without full awareness by the public that the powers were new and even revolutionary.

Prof. Charles A. Beard, in his book entitled "Contemporary American History" (1918) made use of the phrase "the revolution in politics and law" with reference to the reversals in decisions and opinions of the Supreme Court, 1873 to 1898, regarding the application of the "equal protection" clause of the 14th amendment to corporations and with regard to expansions of meaning of the interstate commerce provision. He considered that the Court had engaged in and had accomplished a "revolution in law." In the present era, has not the Court, using precedents established by extant personnel, openly departed from the Constitution as framed and from law as a basis of decision?

In the last decade the Court has definitely rested some of its opinions on history and intent of framers of law; in other cases, the Court has renounced history and by use of a widening interpretation affirmed the incompatibility of the text of the Constitution with existing circumstances. In pursuing the latter mode of reasoning the Court has in the segregation cases definitely stated that it is not governed by the intent of the 14th amendment and has proceeded to base its opinion upon considerations other than law, which gives rise to the question: If a decision is not based upon the law, is the decision law?

THE CRISIS IN CONSTITUTIONALISM

Many writers record their reflections on the question: Is the Constitution the supreme law? Among others we shall mention the names of Carl Schmitt, Georges Burdeau, Rudolf Schmend, Maurice Hauriou, Dietrich Schindler and Manuel García Pelayo, all foreigners.

The last-named author, a distinguished student of comparative constitutional law, after referring to the extraconstitutional role in policymaking expansion and development of functions and powers in the executive department, to the mutations in the Federal system, and to the widening influences of political parties, says: "What truly possesses importance for our object is the birth of a series of situations, relations, and institutions which on some occasions go beyond the scheme constitutionally provided and on others are in manifest contradiction with it. Thus, for example, the functions authentically political and in a certain way legislative, of the Supreme Court of the United States; * * *." These developments, he holds, radically transform a constitution. The thought is that the Court may legislate without resort to the Congress and may exercise constitution-making powers without resort to the processes of amendment. Is the citizen aware of this prospect?

If the Constitution is what the Supreme Court says it is, the thoughtful, conscientious loyal, and law-abiding citizen should read the opinions of the Court rather than the text of the instrument before taking an oath to defend the Constitution. When the Court reverses itself, what is the plight of the law-abiding citizen? Does the fact that one decision is later in time than a contradictory one give it the greater logical validity? Does not the prestige and sanctity of the Constitution suffer in a case of the *Supreme Court* v. *the Supreme Court?* If the Court can exercise the constituent power and amend the Constitution in one particular why cannot it do so in any? Could it not on petition of a class, called in a certain ideology the "proletariat," declare the body of legislation which prescribed conditions of the system of free enterprise invalid on the ground that competition, even if defined as fair, is a denial of the equal protection of the law?

Questions such as those previously asked might indicate something of the plight of the thoughtful citizen who wishes to be law abiding. This citizen abides by what law? Is it the Constitution? Is it the acts of Congress, in which body the Constitution reposes all legislative powers? Is it law made and declared by the Federal judiciary, in which organ of government no legislative power is constitutionally vested? If the last question is answered affirmatively, must we not conclude, according to the reasoning of Chief Justice Marshall, that written constitutions "are absurd attempts on the part of the people to limit a power in its own nature illimitable"?

Eisenhower Crusade Successful in Bringing Cost of Living to Record High

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald today, July 25, 1956. The article, written by Liz Hillenbrand, staff reporter, entitled "Living-Cost Index at 116.2, Hits Record High; Food Is Major Cause," follows:

LIVING-COST INDEX, AT 116.2, HITS RECORD HIGH; FOOD IS MAJOR CAUSE

(By Liz Hillenbrand)

The cost of living climbed seven-tenths of 1 percent last month to reach an all-time high, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics reported yesterday.

Food prices were primarily responsible for the rise. Washington's retail food prices, up 2 percent between May and June, reflected the nationwide average.

The June living cost index stood at 116.2 percent of the 1947–49 average, compared to 114.4 a year ago.

Ewan Clague, chief of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, said the rise was the largest since the period of January to February, 1951, when the index rose 1.2 percent. Clague predicted that the overall consumer index probably would rise again next month.

The new price level means wage increases for several thousand workers whose contracts are tied to the cost-of-living index. The largest group embraces 100,000 General Electric employees who will get a 1 percent raise averaging more than 2 cents an hour, reported James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, AFL-CIO.

Clague, who said food prices make up nearly one-third of the index, explained the rise as "partly seasonal and partly because this spring was a bad crop year."

Prices were higher for 65 of 78 food items. Fresh fruits, vegetables and pork accounted for most of the increase. Decreased supplies pushed pork chops up 9 cents a pound over the May average. Ham and bacon cost about 2½ cents more a pound. Prices of frying chickens and eggs declined.

In Washington, prices of all classes of food increased between May and June. Fruits and vegetables led with a rise of 8.7 percent.

At $1.11 for a 10-pound bag, potatoes alone were more than 18 percent higher here than their previous peak in August 1952. Although pork chop prices were up 13.2 percent, at 86.6 cents a pound, they were still nearly 7 percent below 1954.

Small advances were reported in costs of housing, medical care, and other services.

International Farm Youth Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, one of the programs in which I have taken a deep interest is the international farm youth exchange program. One of the many countries which has participated in this exchange program is Israel. Israel farm boys and girls have lived and worked on American farms, and our boys and girls have lived and worked on farms in Israel. To Israel, our youth have brought American energy and know-how; from Israel, they have brought back a view of the pioneer spirit of the people of that State.

Recently, the Antidefamation League of B'nai B'rith, in cooperation with the National 4–H Club Foundation, one of the cosponsors of the International Farm Youth Exchange Program, published an excellent and a most interesting and informative pamphlet, Other Hearts in Other Lands, which describes the experiences and reactions in their own words of the American boys and girls who visited Israel. These words are eloquent testimony to the success of the program.

The pamphlet is too long to be printed in the RECORD in its entirety. I have, therefore, selected some representative excerpts and quotations, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OTHER HEARTS IN OTHER LANDS

Agriculture has played a leading part in the growth and development of the State of Israel. Since its founding in 1948, Israel has more than doubled its population. Thousands of immigrants have settled on the land and are building new farms and farming communities. Some 370,000 people, almost 22 percent of the population, are now living on one of the many types of agricultural settlements.

In their short stay in Israel, the IFYE's spent a few weeks at each of several types of private and communal settlements, where they could observe the variety and spirit of Israel farming.

FRIENDLINESS OF THE PEOPLE

I already feel like a member of the Kibbutz even though I've only been here 2 weeks. The cooperation is wonderful. * * * We worked (in the fields) and that is one of the advantages of Israel, because there everybody works regardless of where you are from. You really get to know the people much better when you are working in the fields with them. Of course (cooperation), is necessary in a place like this but it's still hard for me to realize that people from such different backgrounds and countries can live so peacefully and comfortably together. There's Murray, a lawyer from Australia who is boss of the bananas; Sam, an optician from Scotland who packs grapes and plums; another man, a pharmacist in Egypt, but now a general worker. Other people are from Iran, Iraq, Yemen, Africa, Morocco, Hungary, Germany, England, etc. They worked all together on their days off to build a swimming pool which is about the most beautiful I've seen. (Donna Childs, R. F. D. No. 1, Box 98, Profit, Va.)

ISRAEL ADMIRATION OF AMERICAN KNOW-HOW

At this Kibbutz and the other farms that I visited only modern machinery and practices are used. Several times the Israel farmers would tell me that they farmed like American farmers. For instance, a man who worked in a chickenhouse told me that the chickens were fed according to a formula developed in the United States. Each day we mixed the feed exactly by the American formula. The Israelis seem to admire the American know-how. They, too, want and deserve praise for the tremendous work they have done with the desert soil. All over the country one is aware of great activity. Something new is constantly being done. New ways of doing things are being found every day. (Marilyn Holman, Route No. 3, Union City, Obion County, Tenn.)

THERE IS STILL A LONG WAY TO GO

Israel is truly a country of contracts. In one field a Massey-Harris combine is busy harvesting the grain, while in the next a sled pulled by oxen breaks the husks on the grain and the chaff is blown away as it is tossed into the wind. In the market areas farm produce is being unloaded from trucks while numerous burros and an occasional camel await their turn for unloading. On one side of the road one often sees cactus-covered parched earth, while on the other, green fields of corn, alfalfa, vineyards, fruit groves, etc. (Harry Light, Summit Point, W. Va.)

CITY CHILDREN HELP ON FARMS

An interesting experiment that Israel is doing is bringing the city children (high-school age) to the country to live and work on the farms for 2 to 3 weeks during the summer. This gives the town children an opportunity to know how the farmers live and also helps with the labor problem during the harvest. I was working with a group of these children, picking up and sacking potatoes after the potato digger. If we hurried real fast we could get our two rows picked up before the digger came around again. Then we would sit down and sing American popular songs. I was surprised that they knew more songs than I did. (Carolyn Vandiver Jenkins, Rural Route No. 2, Leonard Shelby County, Mo.)

LOVE OF THE LAND

The desire to pass land from father to son and from generation to generation is very prevalent in Israel, even if the land doesn't belong to them—only the lease. This is particularly true of the families living in the Moshavim. My family at Kefar Vitkin had four children. Eagle, the oldest, was very lucky to take over a vacant farm in the village. Mr. and Mrs. Azri were rather concerned about which of the 3 other children will stay at Kefar Vitkin, as the 1 small farm will produce enough for 2 families at the most. But I did understand that one of them definitely will take over the farm and he, in turn, will pass it down to his children. The youth who get shoved out of the Moshavim in this way are urged to help develop new Kibbutzim or to train members of new Moshavim, particularly in the Negev. The people in Israel know the development of the land is the only thing that will keep Israel on her feet, so from the time the boys and girls are quite young, this fact surrounds them constantly. Schools stress agriculture as do the clubs they belong to. The folk dances sing praises to such things as "mayim, mayim" (water), and the songs are many times prayers for mayim. The religious festivals also center around agriculture. (Donna Childs.)

DEVELOPING NEW LAND IN THE NEGEV DESERT

Before Israel became a state in 1948, the Jews living in Israel had a fairly high standard of living. But when they proclaimed their new constitution, the standard of living dropped. Why? One part of the constitution says something to this effect: "Any Jew is welcome to come back to Israel, and if he wishes, he will be a citizen as soon as he steps on Israel soil." Many Jews took advantage of this—Jews from over 60 countries. These Jews brought their own standard of living, language, culture, and social customs. Few of them knew agriculture, so Israel has the problem of training these people. Who teaches these people? The Israel people. I lived in one village where 40 men were going to live in the Negev for 2 years teaching these people how to do many new things. My father was one of the men who went. That left his wife and 2 children, 7 and 2 years of age, to do all the farmwork besides keeping the home going. These people feel this is important enough to sacrifice comfort of home and family because they realize it's these people who will help develop Israel and if they get discouraged and no one helps them, they will go back to their old country. The citizens in Israel want a land of people with a high standard of living, and the only way these immigrants will raise it is to have someone teach them. (Donna Childs.)

SABBATH EVENING IN A JEWISH HOME

Shabbat was always my favorite day. This was the day the Israel people do as little as possible and they had time to talk and look at pictures, so we usually went to a continuous line of homes Friday evening and all day Saturday. I liked many of their customs, particularly having fresh flowers in the home on Shabbat and having lighted candles Friday night. This was the night that everyone put on their "Sunday best." Even the tables were dressed for the occasion. If the family owned china, crystal, or linen, they always used them for this evening. After drinking a wine toast and saying "lachaim" (to your health), the meal began. Usually chicken was served for the Shabbat meal and broth from the chicken was used to make chicken noodle soup. White bread (hallah) was the order of the day, while dark bread was eaten during the week. (Donna Childs.)

SUCCOTH, THE "FEAST OF TABERNACLES"

Succoth, or the Jewish Thanksgiving, was the holiday I most enjoyed. This is a thanksgiving for the harvest and the blessings of God, just like an American Thanksgiving. An outdoor shelter or room is built with an open roof so the stars and sky can be seen, just as those Jews returning from Egypt many years ago built this kind of home in their fields. My family let me help build our Succah. We used baled straw for three sides and set it against the side of the house for the fourth. We made a small open roof with chicken wire and scattered corn stalks over it. From this we hung strings with green peppers, yellow corn, red apples, and other vegetables that had been grown on the farm. We set the kitchen table and chairs in our room and ate our meals there for a week.

This seemed to me a wonderful way for farmers—either Jewish or American—to celebrate Thanksgiving. We could look up and see the stars, and give thanks to God, with the fruits and vegetables to remind us of a few of the things we, as farm people, had to be thankful and humble for. (Carolyn Vandiver Jenkins.)

WALKING THROUGH THE LAND OF THE BIBLE

It was hard to realize that we were actually walking the paths where Abraham, Joshua, Elizah, and many other biblical characters had walked thousands of years ago. If we had known our Bible as well as the Jews know their Old Testament we would have probably gotten more out of our trip to the Holy Land. Isaac, the Israel IFYE, showed us many places of interest when he came back to Israel after his stay in the States. We carried a Bible with us, found the passage and read it while we stood where it happened thousands of years ago. Everything I saw impressed me in a way I can't explain and I'm sure it impresses everyone this way. Mount Zion was a small hill in comparison to what I had pictured it to be. I guess I had imagined a huge mountain. (Donna Childs.)

EVENINGS AT THE FARM SETTLEMENTS

The young people in Israel like to get together and enjoy themselves just as we do here in the States. On the sabbath, many times we went on a planned tour to a historic or scenic spot. They hitch a wagon on behind a tractor and load all the young people on, and away we would go. As we rode along we sang old songs at the top of our voices.

At night the favorite recreation seemed to be to gather outside and sing songs or do folk dances. * * * They also like picnics or an evening at home with a few friends, playing parlor games—monopoly, tongue twisters, or musical chairs.

The thing that surprised us most was the way the conversation among the young people always goes back to the farm. Most of the talk was of the crops, the market, and the future plans for the farm. (Carolyn Vandiver Jenkins.)

A BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

No other day can ever quite equal my 21st birthday. * * * On this day Mr. Szyncer, from the Ministry of Agriculture, came to take us to visit Ra'ana and other villages in the Sharon. * * * It was a lovely trip, but the climax came when I returned to my host family.

I found that everything was immaculate. The whole family—mother, father, and three sons—must have done nothing but scrub and sweep during the time I was gone. A tasty meal was being prepared for family and guests. Joel, the eldest son, was closeted in the bedroom, appearing periodically to whisper to his mother, but I was not allowed to come near.

After the milking had been done we sat down to a fine meal. Then friends from the village arrived to share in the evening festivities. We talked, played records, and ate the three cakes Mrs. Alon and I had baked the day before. My contribution was angel food.

At a signal from their mother the 3 boys came to present me with the family gifts—yellow roses and a picture of the 3 sons in one of Israel's nice copper frames. The picture was carried on a tray encircled with rose petals. With the gift was Joel's handiwork of the afternoon, a card, written once in English, once in Hebrew, wishing me a happy birthday, bordered with a floral design drawn with colored pencils. What a fine birthday it was. My family really made me feel as one of them. (Miriam Bovic Engle, Extension Service, Court House, Wooster, Ohio.)

A MEMORY OF ISRAEL

It is wonderful that all these people from about 60 countries can live together and have such a wonderful country. I heard someone say, "Israel is not a melting pot like America, it is a pressure cooker." Everything happens so quickly. People with different cultures and backgrounds and experiences, some with really fabulous experiences, have all come together and forgotten their past, at least outwardly. They all have different accents and speak different languages; people of high standards of living are working with people of lower standards of living. It is really remarkable. You will not find that in any other country in the world. (Jean Smith, R. D. No. 2, Manlius, N. Y.)

A NEW UNDERSTANDING OF THE JEW

No Jews live near my home. I suppose some Jews attended my college while I was there but I didn't know any. I had no prejudice against Jews but I had heard people speak of them. Somewhere I had gotten the impression that Jews had large noses, dark complexions, and black curly hair. I found as many colors of hair, eyes, and complexions in Israel as in the States, so now I realize there is no one cut and dried type of Jew.

After talking with people there and reading some books, I realize now that it wasn't the fact that the Jewish people hated the land and the manual labor that went with it—it was the fact that no one these past thousands of years have let the Jews own land in Israel or anywhere else. This economic pattern of life which most Jews are known for in the States has been ingrained in them generations ago, and even though they could own land in the States, they would rather do what comes naturally, like most generations of farmers would rather stay on the farm than try a business. But in Israel today you'll find this set pattern being broken. For example: the lawyer who is now foreman of the banana plantation; the pharmacist who now picks plums; the department store owner who now is a carpenter; the ex-lawyer who now works in the citrus groves. All these examples are true—I could tell you each one of those men's names. This change hasn't been easy for these people but they are true idealists in the sure sense of the word, and if it weren't for these idealists working toward a better Israel—one that will become more and more self-supporting in the years to come—Israel would not succeed. I have all the faith in the world that she will succeed and develop into a peace-loving country that the whole world will be proud of. (Donna Childs.)

BISCUITS AND BORSCHT

The first night Joseph Levi (Israel IFYE to US) was at our house my mother baked a big pan of hot biscuits, thinking he would enjoy them as much as our family does. To her surprise he did not touch one—Israelis do not eat hot bread. But then didn't we IFYE's refuse borscht (beet juice soup served cold) the first time it was served, or some of the salt herring for breakfast? Our eating habits are different but it was not long until Joe was eating biscuits and I was eating salt herring for breakfast in Israel.

Joseph started work on our farm just as we IFYE's did in Israel. Many of the men in the neighborhood were soon betting he could outwork any of the better workers there. No matter what his job was he pitched right in and helped like a real trooper. On Sundays when the men would be resting he would be in the kitchen washing and drying the dishes and helping mother with her chores.

It was not long until he was worrying about too much rain just like the rest of us or if the lambs were going to be old enough for the summer shows and sales.

My family found (as I had in Israel) that religion or living on the other side of the world doesn't make farm people any different. We all have the same basic hopes and fears and plans for the future. Also the same fervent prayer for understanding and peace in the word. (Carolyn Vandiver Jenkins.)

"DO THOU LIKEWISE"

Each day increases my awareness that differences such as language and religious faith are not so great when a better understanding of one another is acquired. It isn't the differences that are important; the really important thting is that deep down inside, where it really counts, people are the same.

When we realize that people are so much alike we are left wondering just why there is the conflict today among the people of the world. It seems rather obvious that the Man of Galilee who lived and taught in this small part of the world 2,000 years ago had the answer to that problem. If we could but follow His command of "Do thou likewise" in accepting every man of the world as our neighbor, certainly many of the differences which promote conflict would be forgotten. At least His suggestion is worth a little more consideration than the world seems to be giving it today. (Harry Light.)

THE ISRAELIS LEARNED FROM THE IFYE'S

It must have been a little strange, the way I said goodby to you. I really hated to see you go and all I had in mind to say to each one of you just didn't come out. You see, for me you were like a window into a world I know so little about, except by reading. I was very happy to find that people all around the world still have so much in common, in spite of different backgrounds, traditions, and beliefs. I was also happy to discover that there is a possibility of human friendship without any tint of prejudice and narrowmindedness, which seem to be so prevalent in the world. I learned a lot from you and it was all good. (Amiel Klutch, to Marilyn Holman after she left Israel.)

Japanese Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay before my colleagues a letter that I received from Mike M. Masooka, so well and favorably known to all of us.

You will remember that he has an honorable and enviable record as a member of the celebrated 442d Field Combat Team of World War II. Nor was Mike the only one of his family to so serve our common country. One brother gave his life for us, another is permanently disabled and between all of them—five in number—they have dozens of military decorations received in battle.

He writes me in his personal capacity as a friend but I know you recognize him as one who can speak with authority when we deal with Japanese relations.

I urge you to read this letter carefully.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 26, 1956.*

Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
Congressman From California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLER: Inasmuch as you have always demonstrated in the more than 10 years you have been in the Congress your belief that international trade should be encouraged in the national interests of the United States, and because you are familiar with Japan and her problems from your recent visits to our Pacific ally as a member of the Armed Forces Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, may I write you in these closing days of this Congress of my concern that certain sections of our domestic industry are attempting to erect a "quota curtain" around the Nation.

This concern stems from the same considerations which have prompted me from time to time as the Washington representative of Americans of Japanese ancestry in the United States for the past decade to solicit your cooperation on other matters which have been of interest to us. As an American citizen, I am, of course, most devoted to that which in my judgment is best for our country. At the same time, because of my Japanese ancestry, I believe that I have a real appreciation of the feelings, hopes, and aspirations of the Japanese, as well as an understanding of the vital necessity in these troubled days of retaining the friendly cooperation and desire for mutual security of the nations and peoples of the Far East, especially Japan.

PLANNED CAMPAIGN AGAINST IMPORTS

During the present Congress, in the first session and particularly in the second session, I have become increasingly aware of the steadily mounting pressure from certain areas to restrict the importation of Japanese products into our Nation by demanding absolute quotas against such commodties, by organizing boycotts, and by disseminating misleading information.

Not content with such activities, these same interests have succeeded in persuading two States, South Carolina and Alabama, to violate the terms of an international treaty and require discriminatory identification to discourage the sale of Japanese textiles.

These parties plan to attempt to influence other State legislatures to adopt these

prejudicial statutes, which seem to hark back to the days of the Articles of Confederation in our American history when we were in reality many States instead of one United States.

To one who believes in the larger national interest involved in international trade and commerce, these vicious undertakings are completely contrary to the general welfare of all Americans and, at the same time, quickly weaken our leadership of the free world by driving Japan, and our other allies too if we enlarge upon these policies, into doing business with the Communist countries. If Japan is forced to trade with Red China, for example, in an international exchange program, we thereby increase the already vast potential of the Communists while decreasing our own.

It is important, therefore, that careful scrutiny be given to the allegations of domestic industry in order to determine whether they are legitimate and clearly supported by facts that make it evident that imports are solely or principally responsible for the claimed difficulties.

EXAMINATION OF FACTS NEEDED

Since Japanese textiles are the major objectives of these demands for building a "quota curtain" around the United States to keep out these particular imports, let us examine the allegations against the facts and determine whether these domestic interests are actually suffering, or whether they are denouncing Japanese textiles to conceal or excuse other factors—such as inability to compete with synthetics and other man-made fibers, or in the case of New England mills with competition from southern establishments; as efforts top prevent the unionization of mills and factories; as means to hide employment losses actually caused by mergers and consolidations, improved machinery and techniques, and tax write-offs; etc.—which may be contributing as much or more than imports to the real reasons for their complaints.

It is interesting in this connection to observe that the complaining industry, instead of seeking administrative relief as established by law, is concentrating its efforts, especially in this presidential and congressional election year, on the political level, that is with the Congress and with the Administration.

TARIFF COMMISSION RECORD

For 3 years now, to the detriment of our international relations with Japan, which presently is our first line of defense against Communist attack from Asia, these special interests have charged that Japanese textile imports are "flooding" our markets, and thereby, in the language of the statute "cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products."

And yet, in this same 3-year period, only 7 applications for relief were filed with the Tariff Commission by this same domestic industry which manufactures hundreds of varieties of textiles.

Of this number, one petition was withdrawn (cotton blouses), another was dismissed because of the failure to submit the requested proof (knitted goods), another was concluded with no recommended change in rates (wool gloves and mittens), and still another resulted in a recommendation for tariff increase (linen toweling). Three (velveteens, cotton pillowcases, and ginghams) are currently under investigation.

TARIFF COMMISSION FINDINGS

If it is manifestly clear that imports are causing these complaints, why is it that domestic industry has bypassed the Tariff Commission with its trained investigators and experts in the field, especially in the light of the general attitude of its members and staff to give every consideration to the petitioners as their responsibility is to American industry?

Why is it too that these same interests insist upon a political solution to what is basically a tariff and trade problem?

Is it because they know, as the Tariff Commission reported to the Senate Finance Committee this year that:

"Despite the widespread concern that has developed about imports of textiles from Japan, it appears that such imports are not offering serious competition to most segments of the domestic textile industry. The fact that some such segments are in a relatively strong position vis-a-vis import competition is indicated by the substantial export trade of the United States in textile products. The United States exports cotton manufactures to a far greater extent than it imports them; and the exports go principally to countries—such as Canada, Venezuela, the Union of South Africa, Indonesia, and the Dominican Republic—in which articles of the United States enjoy no preferential tariff treatment over those imports from other countries, including Japan. The United States exports some cotton manufactures even to Japan. (They were valued at $253,000 in 1954 and $281,000 in 1955.)"

The Tariff Commission concluded that "it is clear that textile manufacturers in Japan do not have an 'across the board' competitive advantage over the textile manufacturers in the United States. Such injury as may be caused or threatened by increased imports of textiles or textile manufactures from Japan—or from any other country—is bound to be confined to a limited number of categories, most of which, experience has shown, will be narrow."

While it is acknowledged that textile imports from Japan have increased in the past several years, the reason is that Japan has rebuilt her war devastated economy and is attempting to regain her prewar markets. Percentagewise the increase can be described as substantial but it must be remembered that during World War II and thereafter for some years Japan did not export textiles to this country; therefore, any import percentagewise is substantial. As a matter of fact, Japan's imports at this time only approximate her prewar totals.

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY SOUND

Meanwhile, American textile industry profits shows steady increases. The Securities and Exchange Commission and the Federal Trade Commission recently reported net incomes of textile corporations in the first quarter of 1956 were 23 percent more than in the same period a year ago (1955). Profits after taxes of domestic textile corporations in 1955 totaled $709 million, an increase of over 100 percent over 1954. Last year's (1955) profits were the highest since 1951.

According to an analysis of textile shares by the banking firm of Courts & Co., in the July 19, 1956, issue of America's Textile Reporter, "At current prices and indicated dividends, textile common stocks on the average provide substantially higher yields than those of other industries. Ten-year average yields on current prices make an exceptionally favorable showing."

The analysis then lists specific stocks of the leading textile companies to prove their point.

The domestic industry, however, attempts to minimize these statistics indicating healthy economic conditions by indicating that its profits per dollar of sales are less than those of the average of all manufacturing industries. This argument is beside the point, for this differential is an accepted fact of the trade. For 20 of the past 27 years, including the years involving World War II and Korea, this condition held true. The reason is large volume sales, at low profit margins. Grocery stores, for instance, strive for only 1 percent profit on sales, which was less than half of that of the textile industry in 1955, while drug stores operating on less volume than grocery stores must have a higher margin of profit to remain in business.

CONSUMER DEMANDS DICTATES IMPORTS

Some have charged that restrictive quotas on textiles from Japan are necessary because the Japanese industry concentrates on a few items in an effort to capture the market.

Refutation is simple. American buyers in Japan place orders only for those items which they believe can be sold at a profit. Consumer demands, as judged by buyers, dictate the items and the quantities to be imported.

Diversification in imports is desired by the Japanese too, for diversity assures a more stable economy. But, unless our tariff rates are lowered, Japanese textiles for the United States markets are limited to a relatively few items. Therefore, if domestic industry is sincere in encouraging diversification of textile imports, it should take the lead in urging lower tariff schedules for all textiles.

JAPANESE WAGE SCALE

Admittedly, Japanese textile workers receive low wages compared to employees in this country. But, Japan's wages are still the highest in the Orient and are going higher. And Japan's textile workers receive a higher average wage than other Japanese workers.

Wages are only one factor in computing costs. Other considerations which tend to increase the selling price of imports include fringe benefits for workers, round trip transportation costs in the case of American cotton, tariffs, individual productivity, etc. When all these factors are taken together, near equalization is reached.

It should be noted that the 10 biggest textile companies in Japan are 100 percent unionized, with its democratic, pro-America unions federated in an international association with our own AFL-CIO. In this country, while the percentage of unionization is about 80 percent in New England, it is only between 15 and 20 percent in our southern States, where more than three-fourths of the cotton mills are located.

Cotton producing and cotton manufacturing nations, such as India as an illustration, have substantially lower wages than those paid in Japan. Still, imports from India are not significant, indicating thereby that more than wages control textile imports into this country.

TRADE AND COMMERCE

International trade and commerce is not a one-way proposition. Weighed in the balance, the United States sells considerably more to Japan than we buy back. All this adds up to an inescapable conclusion relating to Japanese trade: if we raise a "quota curtain" on her textiles, we destroy one of her major sources of dollars to buy our products.

Japan is our best customer for our farm products. She purchases approximately 35 percent of our raw cotton exports, 40 percent of our rice and soybean exports, 30 percent of our barley exports, and 17 percent of our wheat exports. What she returns in textile products of cotton, for example, in 1955, was less than one-fifth of the raw cotton she purchased from us.

California exports large quantities of cotton, rice, soybeans, and other agricultural products, along with manufactured items, to Japan.

Because of the nature of her economy and her population pressures, Japan must trade to exist. If she trades with us, she earns dollars which help her balance her deficits in inter-United States-Japan commerce. If she cannot sell to us, she not only cannot buy from us but also must find other mar-

kets for her wares and other sources for her raw materials. Her alternatives are easy, the China mainland and Red Russia. And the United States loses one of her best customers and her most powerful ally in the Far East.

JAPANESE SENTIMENTS

Information from Japan reveals that they are puzzled by the demands of our domestic industry for restrictive import quotas on their products. They cannot comprehend the agitation of the American industry over Japanese imports when the domestic industry controls over 98 percent of the entire United States market.

The Japanese are a proud and sensitive race, well aware of their precarious position in the world today. Even at considerable sacrifice to themselves and to the nation, they will exercise self-restraint in order to avoid unpleasantness and unseemly arguments.

In Japanese textile circles, therefore, without considering the invalidity and intemperance of the charges made by our domestic industry, on their own initiative and with substantial hardship to all concerned, they voluntarily imposed quotas on their exports to the United States, setting their maximum figures at less than one and a half percent of the total American production. To curb accusations of pirating and stealing, they established their own textile pattern and design center and promulgated enforcement regulations. To avoid excessive production which might force them to "dump" their products, they requested and the Parliament complied with legislation controlling the number of spindles in annual operation.

In spite of these self-imposed restraints, United States industry, unfortunately, is not willing to accept their sincerity at face value; the textile industry jumps on these voluntary restrictions as admissions of guilt. The Japanese can only point to their 1937 agreement with American industry in which a limitation was placed on Japanese imports. Though this agreement was found to be in violation of Federal antitrust and restraint of trade laws on the part of the domestic industry, Japan unilaterally lived up to its terms in every detail. They ask only that they be given the opportunity to demonstrate anew their sincerity and their good faith.

CONCLUSION

The realities of the world today are such that the United States can ill afford to deny our allies an opportunity to trade with us, especially when these same allies purchase far more from us than we purchase from them. Our national self-interest cannot tolerate any efforts to erect a quota curtain to satisfy the complaints of any industry or segment thereof, for to do so would contradict our national policies and jeopardize our international leadership.

The Congress was able to withstand the demands of the domestic textile industry this session to legislate arbitrary and fixed imports quotas. I am hopeful that the administration too will continue to reject their spurious claims of serious injury to their industry, and that the next administration and the new Congress will reaffirm our now historic belief that trade and commerce among the free nations are the foundations on which are built international relationships capable of securing a peaceful and prosperous world.

Please forgive the length and the detailed arguments presented in this letter. I trust that you agree with my analysis and with my conclusions.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

MIKE M. MASAOKA.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, Democrat, of Michigan, on Proclamation of the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, the following proclamation of the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America which was issued on the occasion of the fifth annual SS. Cyril and Methodius pilgrimage at Scranton, Pa., on July 8, 1956.

Freedom to worship as we choose is among our most cherished liberties in America. I believe that it appropriate to remind ourselves that others are not so fortunate and to offer our prayers that all men will again be able to worship as they please.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

We Americans, members of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America (eastern district) of Slovak origin, assembled here, recall with gratefulness that in this land of freedom we can perform our religious and civic duties without restriction. This SS. Cyril and Methodius pilgrimage is proof of that.

We are descended from a nation of profound faith. Already at the end of the eighth century Christianity penetrated into the territory of Slovakia, and in 833, Prince Pribina of Nitra already had built a Christian church. Thirty years later our forefathers joyfully welcomed the advent of the saintly brothers of Salonika, Cyril, and Methodius, who spread the Gospel of Christ and translated the sacred books into the language of our ancestors. The Slovak nation is a nation blessed by its patrons SS. Cyril and Methodius.

A profound faith it was that enabled the Slovaks to overcome even political thraldom, and it is the living faith of our people which maintains them even today when Slovakia is suffering under the terrible ordeal of Communist dictatorship already in its 12th year.

Deeply moved, we recall that already in 1945, 2 Slovak Bishops, John Vojtassak and Michael Buzalka, and some 200 priests were imprisoned, and that thousands of our people were deported to Siberia by the Communists who never returned to Slovakia.

At the present time, the status of the Catholic Church in Slovakia is very sad, indeed. After a theatrical trial in 1951, the Communists imprisoned Bishop Michael Buzalka and Paul Gojdic for life, and Bishop John Vojtassak was sentenced to 24 years. Later, Bishops Stephen Barnas and Basil Hopko received 15 years, and Bishop Robert Pobozny was taken to an unknown place. Bishops Edward Necsey, Joseph Garsky and Ambrose Lazik are under constant police surveillance; their offices and residences are surrounded by Communist police and they can leave their home only with a police escort. Practically, therefore, the entire Bishops Council in Slovakia is imprisoned or under house arrest.

Furthermore, some 700 priests are in prisons or concentration camps. The Communists dissolved all monasteries and convents, incarcerating or sending into forced labor camps all monks and nuns. There is no Catholic press in Slovakia; prayer books, rosaries, and other religious articles are not available; and Slovak Catholics are denied the right of assembly. The entire Church is under the strict control of the State.

The sorrowful condition fills us with fear for the future of our brethren in Slovakia, because we do not know when liberation shall come.

We, therefore, respectfully remind the American Catholic Hierarchy, all Catholic institutions, the Catholic press, Catholic educational institutions, and the entire Catholic population of America, about the extremely unfavorable, practically hopeless situation of the Slovak Catholics. We also respectfully remind responsible political factors that every movement tending toward so-called "co-existence" only prolongs the Calvary of Slovak Catholics, as well as the suffering of all nations behind the Iron Curtain.

We appeal to our American Legislators and to our Government to demand that the United Nations issue a Resolution to the effect that Slovakia be given the opportunity as soon as possible to hold free elections under the control of U. N. Representatives. We are certain that the Slovak Nation can best secure its National existence and welfare of Slovak Catholics, who constitute 82 percent of the total population of Slovakia, with its own freely elected government.

We respectfully request for the Slovaks the kind of freedom we ourselves enjoy here in our free and blessed America.

Given this 8th day of July 1956, in Scranton, Pa., at the Fifth Sts. Cyril and Methodius Pilgrimage of the Eastern District of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

REV. JOHN E. SENGLAR,
National Spiritual Director,
Philadelphia, Pa.
REV. PAUL PEKARIK,
Executive Board Member,
Emmaus, Pa.
REV. JOSEPH BARAN,
Executive Board Member,
Lansford, Pa.
REV. MICHAEL DITSKY,
Eastern District Spiritual Director,
Egypt, Pa.
REV. JOSEPH OLSOVSKY,
Executive Board Member,
Raritan, N. J.
MR. MARTIN KOPUNEK,
Chairman, Executive Board,
Lansford, Pa.

Budget Estimates and Appropriations, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith certain tabulations dealing with work of the 84th Congress on appropriation bills as compared with budget estimates submitted by the President, and pertinent related facts.

The first tabulation is for the second session and is in usual form by bills, segregated as between fiscal years 1956 and 1957. The second table is similar, but in condensed form, for the 1st session of the 84th Congress. Permanent appropriations—those which recur automatically under substantive law without annual action in the appropriation bills—are included for sake of completeness but necessarily on an estimated basis at this time.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Title	Estimates considered by House	Reported to House	Passed House	Estimates considered by Senate	Reported to Senate	Passed Senate	Public law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1957 bills:								
Treasury-Post Office:								
Treasury	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	$643,434,000	−$5,073,000
Post Office	3,000,000,000	2,973,900,000	2,973,900,000	3,000,000,000	2,994,780,000	2,994,780,000	2,984,340,000	−15,660,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	
Total	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	3,618,699,000	3,649,872,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000
Interior and related agencies:								
Interior	287,682,600	277,172,600	277,172,600	295,993,200	285,126,800	285,151,800	280,857,250	−15,135,950
Forest Service	96,773,000	96,773,000	96,773,000	96,773,000	106,348,500	106,348,500	100,970,750	+4,197,750
Related agencies	42,292,600	42,017,600	42,017,600	42,376,100	42,376,100	42,376,100	42,106,100	−270,000
Total	426,748,200	415,963,200	415,963,200	435,142,300	433,851,400	433,876,400	423,934,100	−11,208,200
General Government matters	15,014,475	14,849,275	14,849,275	15,014,475	14,969,975	14,969,975	14,969,975	−44,500
Independent offices	5,783,704,000	6,005,157,260	6,010,543,290	5,783,704,000	5,916,997,258	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826
Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:								
Labor	421,084,000	389,348,500	389,348,500	421,321,000	389,963,000	389,963,000	389,785,500	−40,535,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,925,898,400	1,903,181,781	1,903,184,781	1,925,988,400	1,977,341,781	1,977,841,781	1,972,121,781	+46,133,381
Related agencies	16,576,000	13,277,500	13,448,500	16,576,000	13,718,500	13,718,500	13,473,500	−3,102,500
Total	2,363,648,400	2,296,810,781	2,296,981,781	2,363,885,400	2,372,023,281	2,372,523,281	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381
District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	(179,797,800)	(179,797,800)	(182,899,500)	(181,682,050)	(181,687,490)	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)
Federal payment	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,708,650	22,708,650	22,558,650	+200,000
State, Justice, and Judiciary:								
State	181,207,285	171,506,737	171,506,737	182,142,285	176,125,872	176,125,872	175,065,872	−7,076,413
Justice	235,889,000	215,965,000	215,965,000	235,889,000	219,451,910	219,451,910	216,043,650	−19,836,350
Judiciary	37,582,535	35,395,635	35,395,635	37,582,535	37,193,735	37,193,735	36,321,435	−1,261,100
U. S. Information Agency	135,000,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	135,000,000	115,000,000	115,000,000	113,000,000	−22,000,000
Refugee relief	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Total	598,169,820	541,367,372	541,367,372	599,104,820	556,271,517	556,271,517	548,930,957	−50,173,863
Commerce and related agencies:								
Commerce	1,453,568,000	1,313,153,000	1,313,153,000	1,453,568,000	1,376,706,000	1,377,456,000	1,347,872,000	−105,696,000
Panama Canal	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,660,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	15,410,000	−250,000
Related agencies	53,445,000	53,440,000	53,440,000	53,445,000	53,450,000	53,450,000	53,450,000	+5,000
Total	1,522,637,000	1,382,003,000	1,382,003,000	1,522,673,000	1,445,566,000	1,446,316,000	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000
Defense:								
Office of the Secretary	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	
Interservice activities	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	−13,500,000
Army	7,761,425,000	7,497,582,000	7,497,582,000	7,761,425,000	7,545,787,000	7,545,787,000	7,539,280,000	−222,145,000
Navy	10,047,600,000	9,999,534,000	9,999,534,000	10,047,600,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,497,000	−48,103,000
Air Force	15,666,500,000	15,479,125,000	15,479,125,000	15,666,500,000	16,779,125,000	16,579,125,000	16,459,125,000	+792,625,000
Total	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	33,635,066,000	34,147,850,000	34,983,734,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	1,987,302,268	1,983,512,568	1,983,512,568	1,989,841,668	2,016,771,068	2,018,331,068	[1] 1,993,744,968	+3,903,300
Public works:								
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	5,357,000	
Department of Interior:								
Power Administrations	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	28,478,000	
Bureau of Reclamation	195,789,000	164,767,000	167,612,000	195,789,000	188,850,000	188,850,000	181,114,500	−14,674,500
Army civil functions	588,877,000	588,851,000	589,311,000	588,877,000	649,201,000	649,501,000	641,777,500	+52,900,500
Total	818,501,000	787,453,000	790,758,000	818,501,000	871,886,000	872,186,000	856,727,000	+38,226,000
Legislative branch	93,664,903	89,376,450	89,376,450	122,496,933	117,804,058	117,804,058	[2] 117,804,058	−4,692,875
Mutual Security	[4] 859,975,000	3,425,120,000	3,425,120,000	4,859,975,000	4,105,420,000	4,110,920,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000
The supplemental, 1957	1,222,849,525	1,555,535,425	1,555,589,275	1,254,364,525	1,722,089,675	1,724,639,675	1,691,341,875	+436,977,350
Second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	2,341,895,000	1,941,895,000	[3] 3,516,053,038	[3] 3,461,691,438	[4] 3,466,442,438	[3] 3,058,029,438	−458,023,600
Rescission of "Federal-aid highway" funds contained in other bills above				−900,000,000	−875,000,000	−875,000,000	−875,000,000	−25,000,000
Net, second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	2,341,895,000	1,941,895,000	2,616,053,038	2,586,691,438	2,591,442,438	2,183,029,438	−433,023,600
Subtotal, fiscal year 1957	59,424,426,241	58,115,166,981	57,724,082,861	60,200,836,809	60,806,363,320	60,630,489,708	[5] 59,655,107,628	−545,729,181
II. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1956:								
Urgent Deficiency, 1956	64,505,201	61,504,201	64,670,201	64,505,201	70,195,066	65,695,066	65,695,066	+1,189,865
Labor (Bureau of Employment Security)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	
Second Supplemental, 1956	835,902,923	795,743,823	795,768,823	878,136,527	858,864,176	838,864,176	852,414,896	−25,721,631
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956 and prior	900,408,124	[4] 857,248,024	860,439,024	942,641,728	929,059,242	904,559,242	918,109,962	−24,531,766
III. Grand total, session	60,324,834,365	58,972,415,005	58,584,521,885	61,143,478,537	61,735,422,562	61,535,048,950	60,573,217,590	−570,260,947
Permanent appropriations estimate							7,564,859,833	
Grand total, regular annual, supplemental, deficiency and permanent							68,138,077,423	

[1] Includes $1,250,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[2] Includes $400,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[3] Includes $1,650,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[4] Does not include $1,200,000,000 contained in H. R. 10654, which the House did not act upon.
[5] Includes estimates of $1,150,500,000 and appropriations of $1,150,300,000 out of permanent highway trust fund, to reimburse general fund appropriation accounts for expenditures made subsequent to June 30, 1956, and such reimbursed appropriation accounts to be rescinded not later than June 30, 1957; Public law column includes only $800,300,000 for such purpose.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong.

	Estimates	Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−), appropriation compared with estimates
1. Fiscal year 1956 bills:			
Treasury-Post Office	$3,360,385,000	$3,322,488,500	−$37,896,500
Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare	2,432,148,861	2,373,516,500	−58,632,361
Interior and related agencies	314,523,056	317,573,627	+3,050,571
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	898,384,574	883,051,623	−15,332,951
Independent offices	5,640,155,000	5,842,458,500	+202,303,500
State, Justice, and Judiciary and related agencies	483,531,912	466,302,415	−17,229,497
Defense	32,232,815,000	31,882,815,726	−349,999,274
District of Columbia	(175,462,020)	(168,843,440)	(−6,618,580)
Federal payment	21,892,700	19,892,700	−2,000,000
Commerce and related agencies	1,366,393,000	1,245,360,000	−121,033,000
General government matters	28,777,700	27,166,300	−1,611,400
Public works	1,801,465,000	1,365,613,500	−435,851,500
Legislative	92,692,911	92,808,972	+116,061
Mutual security	3,266,641,750	2,703,341,750	−563,300,000
The supplemental, 1956	2,123,351,072	1,656,625,802	−466,725,270
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956	54,063,157,536	52,199,015,915	−1,864,141,621
2. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1955 and prior	981,176,193	925,805,300	−55,370,893
3. Estimates not considered	156,500,000		−156,500,000
Grand total, session	55,200,833,729	53,124,821,215	−2,076,012,514
4. Permanent appropriations (estimate)		7,303,736,276	
Total appropriations		60,428,197,491	

SUMMARY FOR THE SECOND SESSION

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House during the second session totaled $60,324,834,365. Against these requests, the Committee on Appropriations submitted total recommendations of $58,972,415,005, a net reduction of $1,352,419,360. Bills as passed by the House totaled $58,584,521,885. Estimates considered by the Senate aggregated $61,143,478,537 and bills passed by that body totaled $61,535,048,950. Final amounts enacted total $60,573,217,590, a net of $570,260,947 below estimates of appropriations submitted by the President. In addition, rescissions of prior appropriations included in the several bills aggregate approximately $900 million bringing the total reduction of spending authority to about $1,470,260,947.

As to the net appropriation decrease of $570,260,947 below corresponding budget requests, several items need especially to be mentioned. In the Department of Defense bill, the Congress added $900 million not budgeted by the administration to accelerate B–52 and fighter plane production as vital to the readiness of our defense forces and to assure that we do not fall behind in missile and aircraft research and development. It will be recalled that the Government's expenditure reductions in the past 4 years have been largely in national security programs.

In the independent offices bill, the appropriation of the Government's share to the civil retirement fund is $230 million above the budget. The administration failed to include provision to meet the Government's share. By this increase, the Congress sought forthrightly to move the annual contribution toward the currently accruing level.

The budget for military public works construction, in the supplemental bill for 1957, included an item of transfer of $357 million from revolving funds in lieu of requesting direct appropriation. The effect was to hold down new requests and thus show apparent lower totals though in fact the spending requests were higher. The Congress decided the cleanest way was to rescind outright the idle funds and appropriate directly. Thus the increase on this account is apparent only.

BUDGET DEFICITS

Mr. Speaker, the administration is taking credit for a budget surplus for the fiscal year 1956 just closed. It is claiming that the 1952 campaign pledge of a balanced budget has been redeemed. The official administration announcement stated:

> This means a great deal to the people of this country.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does mean a great deal. It means that the surplus was achieved through burdensome taxes on individual taxpayers. It is only the ever-increasing national income which has spared the administration another year of fiscal embarrassment. It means, also, that it was not achieved by economy in Government as I shall conclusively show in a few moments. No credit is due for the achievement—in fact, it is not an achievement. It just happened. We have the largest national income in peacetime history. Practically every segment of the economy except the farmers are prospering—but paying heavily for it in high taxes and inflated dollars. That is why the budget was balanced. Real Government economy contributed nothing to the result; in fact, if we had real economy we could have a balanced budget and tax relief at the same time.

Here are the statistics to support these statements, taking from a tabulation released July 19 by the administration:

Budget receipts, expenditures, deficits, and surplus

[In billions]

	Actual, 1954	Actual, 1955	Actual, 1956
1. Receipts (net)	$64.7	$60.4	$68.1
2. Expenditures (net):			
National security	48.2	42.6	42.1
All other items	19.6	22.0	24.3
Total	67.8	64.6	66.4
3. Deficit or surplus	−3.1	−4.2	+1.7

NOTE.—In fiscal 1951, under the previous administration, there was a surplus of $3.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, these figures summarize the real record of expenditures in the first 3 years of the present administration, and show how claimed savings have been brought about. National security programs account for the savings—cut from $48.2 billion in 1954 to $42.1 billion in 1956. Much of that was to be expected once fighting stopped in Korea as President Truman so accurately prophesied in his last budget message submitted in January 1953. So no claim should be made that this decline constituted real savings of the kind the people were promised and had every right to expect. As a matter of fact, the Congress had found it necessary to restore some of these cuts as regards the vital airpower buildup.

What about the nondefense programs and agencies of Government? The figures speak for themselves—from $19.6 billion in 1954 to $24.3 in 1956, a whopping 24-percent increase. Where is the promised retrenchment? And what is even more disappointing, the administration proposes to keep on increasing expenditures. Up-to-date estimates for fiscal 1957 are not yet available, but last January's budget guess of $65.9 billion—at the time itself a shocking $1.6 billion above the prior year—is far below the mark if judged by what happened in fiscal 1956 and the unending stream of new spending proposals coming to the Capitol these past months and weeks. Fiscal 1957 spending might go up several billion more. Actual spending in 1956 turned out to be exactly $4 billion more than estimated by the President when he first submitted his budget for that year. And this is on top of the $1.8 billion increase in 1956 over 1955. This, and the almost certain further increases in fiscal 1957, constitutes a deplorable reversal, a running start in the other direction—upward.

The first session of the 84th Congress cut appropriation requests by $2 billion, thereby preventing that much of a drain on the Treasury. Further cuts in appropriations during the present session, though not of the same magnitude for reasons given, will aid further in this respect.

As noted, there is another side to budget results—taxes. Individual income tax collections rose from $32.4 billion in fiscal 1954 to $35.3 billion in fiscal 1956. In contract corporation income taxes, during the same period, dropped from $21.5 billion down to $21.3. The individual taxpayer is carrying the burden of these increased expenditures and he is the very one who so badly needs tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, these facts demonstrate beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the last 3 years have been anything but economy years. Objective appraisal of the record shows that the economy pledge of 1952 has not been kept and will not be kept.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, the size of the national debt is appalling. It is so huge as to defy comprehension. We are paying $7 billion a year just to carry it. But what is worse, it has consistently increased under the present administration despite

repeated, categorial promises to the contrary in the campaign of 1952. These administration pledges have been broken. And they cannot possibly be redeeemed in the few remaining months of the administration. In a speech at Providence, R. I., in October 1952, President Eisenhower said:

Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

The following facts conclusively show that bigger debts have been piled upon the American people during the present administration.

The public debt during 3 fiscal years of this administration

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
Fiscal 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
Fiscal 1955 (July 1954)	271.3
Fiscal 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
Fiscal 1957 (July 1956)	272.7
Increase during 3 full fiscal years	+6.6

CONTRAST WITH PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, the $6.6 billion increase is in sharp contrast to the record of the previous administration under similar peacetime conditions. During 4 full peace years—that is, fiscal years in which there was no war operation—under the previous administration, the debt was reduced by $12 billions, as follows:

	Billions
June 1946	$269.4
June 1950	257.4
4-year decrease under previous administration	−12.0

Mr. Speaker, there is no real tangible hope for improvement—tax relief and debt reduction—under present administration policies because Government expenditures are increasing, not decreasing, as I shall point out in more particulars in a few moments.

The administration, 2 years running, asked that the old debt ceiling of $275 billion be raised to $281 billion. Again this year, the request was renewed, this time for $278 billion. I wonder how many people realize that in December 1955, the debt reached its highest point in history—the stupendous sum of $280.8 billions—and that this, in a year of peace, was $1.6 billion above the peak reached during World War II, the greatest war in all history?

Mr. Speaker, present expenditure trends of the administration arrestingly indicate that this limit may have to go on indefinitely. Certainly under those circumstances it would have to if long-needed tax relief is ever granted.

APPROPRIATION RECORD OF THE LAST 4 YEARS

Mr. Speaker, when the present administration took office President Truman had just submitted his budget for fiscal 1954. The war in Korea was still on and no knew when it would be concluded. The present administration immediately began to revise that budget and send new recommendations to the 83d Congress. And they really revised it—downward, that is, to the tune of $12,029,351,862 during the first session. That was the dramatic big splash—the new broom sweeping clean. It amounted to almost a 20 percent cut below the budget of President Truman which was a wartime budget, not a peacetime budget. This is the budget the present administration delights in looking back to and continually deprecating. I want to come back to that in a moment, but first on the big first year cut of $12 billion plus. What items were cut? Over $8 billion was in the Department of Defense and about $5 billion of that was against the Air Force. Fiscal salvation was on the way, so it may have seemed. A $12 billion cut is truly an impressive sum—but of course two-thirds of it was against national security items.

The 2d session of the 83d Congress received estimates of $50,253,323,985, about $4.3 billion less than appropriations in the 1st session. Appropriations enacted by the 2d session of the 83d Congress totaled $47,642,131,205, a further reduction of $2,611,192,780 of which $1.4 billion was against Defense. Meanwhile, expenditures for nondefense items continued to increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, comes the reversal—another big splash, but this time in the other direction. Estimates submitted to the 1st session of the 84th Congress totaled $55,200,833,729—that's $7.5 billion above prior year appropriations. The Congress cut these requests by $2,076,012,514. What about the present or 2d session of the 84th Congress? Appropriation estimates received from the President come to a net figure of $61,143,478,538, or $8 billion above 1st session appropriations. And, Mr. Speaker, this does not reveal the whole story. When the final tabulations are made some weeks hence, I am certain they will show total obligation authorizations in all forms such as to fully justify the conclusion that no real administration economy-program exists.

The following tabulation substantiates the foregoing statements:

Estimates, appropriations, and reductions—last 4 years

[NOTE.—Grand totals except permanent appropriations and miscellaneous private acts]

Congress and session	Estimates	Law	Decrease (−)
83d Cong., 1st sess (calendar 1953)	$66, 568, 694, 353	$54, 539, 342, 491	−$12, 029, 351, 862
83d Cong., 2d sess. (calendar 1954)	50, 253, 323, 985	47, 642, 131, 205	−2, 611, 192, 780
84th Cong., 1st sess. (calendar 1955)	55, 200, 833, 729	53, 124, 821, 215	−2, 076, 012, 514
84th Cong., 2d sess. (calendar 1956)	61, 143, 478, 537	60, 573, 217, 590	−570, 260, 947

Mr. Speaker, as mentioned, the administration takes great delight in comparing present budgets with the last budget submitted by President Truman. Admittedly, that budget could have been cut just as any budget can be cut. But they never overlook an opportunity to make comparisons with it—favorable to themselves and of course unfavorable to the previous administration. The import of these comparisons is that succeding budgets have deleted from the 1954 budget the expenditures and items so severely called into question during the 1952 campaign—meaning, of course, the several nondefense departments and agencies. So I recently compared the new obligation authority—authority to contract and spend—requested by President Truman in the last budget to which such frequent comparison is made and President Eisenhower's budget of this past January on which we have now concluded action. The statistics follow, taken from table V, page A9, Budget for 1954, and table on page M–20, Budget for 1957:

New obligation authority requested for other than defense military functions and foreign aid—budgets for fiscal years 1954 and 1957

[In millions of dollars]

	President Truman's budget, 1954	President Eisenhower's budget, 1957	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Legislative branch	85	87	+2
The Judiciary	29	41	+12
Other Executive Office of the President, funds appropriated to President	8	20	+12
Independent offices (including GSA and HHFA)	[1] 8,271	8,495	+224
Department of Agriculture	1,659	3,150	+1,491

New obligation authority requested for other than defense military functions and foreign aid—budgets for fiscal years 1954 and 1957—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	President Truman's budget, 1954	President Eisenhower's budget, 1957	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of Commerce	1,078	1,635	+557
Department of Defense, civil functions	688	665	−23
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	1,773	2,654	[2] +881
Department of the Interior	664	582	−82
Department of Justice	187	236	+49
Department of Labor	332	502	+170
Department of the Post Office	669	[3] 120	[3] −549
Department of State	[3] 197	239	+42
Department of Treasury	7,101	7,813	+712
District of Columbia	12	35	+23
Contingency reserve	50	250	+200
Total	22,804	26,524	+3,720

[1] Excludes $404 million, AEC reappropriation, and $706 million RRB taxes, for comparability; includes $135 million for USIA.

[2] Reflects estimate of $350 million in revenue resultant from pending postal rate increase bill.

[3] Excludes $135 million for USIA transferred to independent offices.

One thing stands out. Of the 16 departments or groups on this table, all but 3 show that President Eisenhower requested more spending authority for 1957 than President Truman did for 1954. And in total, the 1957 request exceeded—I repeat, exceeded—the 1954 request by $3,720,000,000. When final tabulations are available, the difference will doubtless be much greater.

In the face of these facts—and every figure cited is documented—who, Mr. Speaker, can demonstrate that the present administration has kept, or shown any signs of trying to keep, its economy pledges?

Footnotes at end of table.

Retirement From Senate of Senator Millikin, of Colorado, and Senator George, of Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, much has been said on the floor in tribute to two of our retiring colleagues, Senator EUGENE MILLIKIN, of Colorado, and Senator WALTER GEORGE, of Georgia. I should like to offer my further remarks in connection with their long and distinguished service as United States Senators in the form of statements which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREDERICK PAYNE ON THE RETIREMENT FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR EUGENE MILLIKIN, OF COLORADO

It grieves us all to note that the senior Senator from Colorado finds this his health will not permit his offering himself for another term of service in the Senate. This body and the whole Nation will be poorer as a result of the loss of his guidance and leadership.

EUGENE MILLIKIN is the sort of man who was a continual inspiration to his colleagues. He was constantly sought out for advice and counsel by those on both sides of the aisle, by colleagues equal to him in terms of service as well as those many years junior to him. Possessed of a warm and friendly nature, a keen sense of humor, a brilliant mind which he employed so skillfully in every debate in which he engaged, EUGENE MILLIKIN was one of the most capable Americans ever to have taken a seat on the Senate floor. His cognizance of every situation which came before the Senate Committees on which he served down through the years were an invaluable contribution to the legislative process.

Not only has GENE MILLIKIN been a lasting friend to all of his colleagues, but he has been a great Republican, and one who has put the interests of all Americans before party and before the interests of the section of the country which he represented so well for so many years.

It is my hope that the Senator's retirement after a career of which he can well be proud, will restore his health, so that he may enjoy many years of pleasant rest which he so truly deserves.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREDERICK G. PAYNE ON THE RETIREMENT FROM THE SENATE OF SENATOR WALTER GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

I feel it a humble privilege to pay tribute to my beloved colleague and friend, WALTER GEORGE. When the Senate adjourns this summer, it will be losing one of the truly great men to have served in this body.

Statesman, lawyer, wise and patriotic American—Senator GEORGE has reached a position in life that few men are privileged to achieve. In his 34 years as United States Senator from Georgia, he has shown his stalwart character, his concern for humanity, and his personal magnitude to the entire world. This Nation can be grateful that WALTER GEORGE, following a brilliant judicial career in his home State, chose to answer the call of public service in 1922. As a junior Senator he worked long and hard, and fought for enactment of legislation in the interests of all the people. Rising in stature during the turbulent 'thirties, WALTER GEORGE emerged as one above mere personal consideration and political party. Never bracketed, never joining a wing or faction, and using his calm, common sense, Senator GEORGE won the admiration and respect of both sides of the aisle for his stands on legislation and for his position with respect to international affairs.

Like the clock above the President's chair, steadily measuring off the minutes of American history, WALTER GEORGE has sat in the Senate down through the years, the very conscience of the American way of life; and he has stood steadfast in his own beliefs, beliefs that have inspired two generations of Americans.

I, for one, believe that Senator GEORGE has left his greatest philosophic imprint in the minds of us all, for his role as one of the great peacemakers of our time. He has supported the bipartisan foreign policies of both Republican and Democratic administrations. He has risked censure from his own party, fearlessly following the dictates of his own convictions. Knowing the personal grief of war in the loss of his son in World War II, the Senator became firm in his determination to work for everlasting peace.

The true greatness of Senator GEORGE rose to new heights when, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he stood behind the President and the administration on the Formosa resolution to save the peace in Asia from the immediate threat of Communist aggression. As a man of peace, the Senator played an important role in the formation of summit conference talks at Geneva in 1955.

The accomplishments of our most respected colleague are great and many. As President Eisenhower's ambassador to NATO he will carry with him to the council tables of freedom these years of patient understanding, of cautious sagacity, and of toil for humanitarian ideals.

I want to wish the senior Senator from Georgia and his good wife God's blessings in the years ahead, and to join with a grateful Nation in thanks for a job well done. Few men have served their country as nobly as has WALTER GEORGE.

The American Legion Is Helping Keep America Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, service to the community, State, and Nation is truly personified in the work of the American Legion and its auxiliary through the boys' and girls' State and Nation programs. These projects are helping perpetuate our democratic form of government by affording our youth on-the-job training in government operations.

The Kansas American Legion and auxiliary can point with pride to one of the finest boys' and girls' State programs in all of the Legion departments. Sunflower State, as it is called, has given thousands of Kansas boys and girls an opportunity to peek behind the scenes and take part in learning about good government.

The outstanding Kansas department has just recently inaugurated a new project which is designed to allow more young men and women a chance to learn about government. It is a county government project. The Legion works jointly with the Kansas State Department of Education in presenting a bird's-eye view of county government operations.

The membership of the American Legion and the Auxiliary are to be highly commended on their untiring efforts to keep these programs active and growing.

The following editorial, entitled "Boys' Nation," which appears in the Thursday, July 26, 1956, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald newspaper of Washington, D. C., applies equally to Girls' Nation. I wholeheartedly concur with the sentiments contained in this fine editorial:

BOYS' NATION

In these days when youthful crime, delinquency, and lack of discipline are so frequently emphasized it is gratifying to note the proceedings at the University of Maryland, where 94 high school students averaging 17 years of age are going through the motions of organizing a national government. Each year the American Legion sponsors this learn-by-doing project. First it selects some 20,000 outstanding youngsters for paritication in its Boys' State programs. The boys organize imaginary State governments and seek an acquaintance with State and local institutions and activities. Then the "governors" of these Boys' States and one other outstanding leader in each group are sent to Washington for a close-up view of the National Government, discussion of legislative problems, and the election of youthful statesmen to offices in their Boys' Nation. It is a salutary introduction to civic life in a free land, and it may well have an impact on the actual politics of a later day.

The Honest Elections Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from last night's Washington Daily News entitled "It's Still Their Duty." It deals with the so-called honest elections bill sponsored by 85 Senators, which will die when the Congress adjourns.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S STILL THEIR DUTY

The so-called honest elections bill, sponsored by 85 Senators is dead as a doornail.

But that does not relieve those who promised so much in introducing it from the duty they owe the country.

One of the basic provisions of the bill—conceived in what appeared to be indignation over the oil and gas lobby; killed in the apathy of the session's end—was for full-as-possible disclosure of campaign contributions and expenditures.

Matter of fact, full disclosure may be the best way to insure honest elections.

It is the responsibility of the Senate and House this year in all races—presidential, senatorial, congressional—to see that there is full disclosure. Let the voters know where the candidates get the money, who gets it, who gives it, who spends it, and for what purposes.

Each House already is equipped with a group that can make known the facts.

There is a special committee in the House to investigate campaign expenditures and contributions.

There is a standing Senate subcommittee with broad powers, and a couple of hundred thousand dollars of expense money, to do the same thing.

The McClellan committee, created to investigate oil and gas lobbying and efforts to influence votes and voters, has done almost nothing—and is not likely to do much. In any event, it is more concerned with what's gone before than what's ahead.

The Senate's permanent elections subcommittee has the responsibility of policing this election; the House special committee shares this duty. Both of these groups—if their chairmen are intent on doing a bang-up job—should get busy.

Now.

If United States Disarms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in today's Washington Daily News, entitled "If United States Disarms."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF UNITED STATES DISARMS

(By Marshall McNeil)

A congressional economic expert has painted a rosy picture of American domestic progress under disarmament.

But it was more than that. It was the answer of Dr. Grover W. Ensley, executive director of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee, to a devilishly clever piece of Russian propaganda.

The Reds, Dr. Ensley said, aim particularly at great uncommitted regions of the world their claim that our peace efforts are insincere because our economy "demands constant militarist stimulation."

"Statements like this," Dr. Ensley said, "reflect ignorance of a basic characteristic of the American people * * *. We do not shrink from, but rather welcome, the challenges which disarmament poses. Our focus is primarily on the opportunities it will present."

Dr. Ensley's statement is a fitting corollary or—a good business basis for—President Eisenhower's steady and enthusiastic approach toward disarmament, expressed to Congress again recently in a report on our participation in United Nations.

Recalling his atoms-for-peace proposals that had dramatic impact throughout the world, the President explained that as he "originally proposed the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy I had this in mind: that if the world could cooperate and move ahead significantly in this field, this might make it easier to move ahead in the far more difficult field of disarmament."

Still convinced this is so, Mr. Eisenhower said: "Disarmament, and by this I mean the controlled reduction of military forces and of conventional and nuclear weapons, remains one of the most vital unsolved problems facing the world."

In the decade since World War II, Dr. Ensley said, the Federal Government has spent $310 billion on goods and services for national security. Manpower requirements of our present defense effort total between six and seven million persons. But he thinks the real costs of armaments and defense are better expressed in terms of additional advances that might have been made in civilian life if we had not been required to spend so much for defense production.

"For instance," he said, "the cost of one destroyer is enough to provide new $10,000 homes for over 3,000 families. The price of 1 modern heavy bomber would provide hospital facilities for a population of over 125,000 people."

He believes that "in the broadest sense, the principal economic consequence of disarmament would be the opportunity for a major reorientation of economic activity toward more complete satisfaction of the virtually infinite variety of human wants."

He believes our economy would have little difficulty finding outlets for resources released by reducing defense outlays should disarmament ever become possible.

Our Surplus Foods as a Potent Weapon For Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 has some very constructive provisions which are little known to the people of the United States.

I speak of those provisions of the law which authorize the use of our surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy people in foreign lands.

The law provides that our surplus foods may, under certain conditions, be transferred by the Government to friendly governments for the use of persons in need. It also provides authority for the transfer of surplus foodstuffs to American voluntary agencies, together with funds to cover the ocean transportation costs of moving these foods to foreign countries. It is this latter authority which is unique and which, I believe, opens the way to the accomplishment of a great deal of good throughout the world.

Last fall, during an inspection of the refugee problem in the Far East, I had the opportunity to see first hand the manner in which the American voluntary agencies were taking advantage of this law to advance American prestige in Asia. It is a well-known fact that a long series of Communist aggressions and tyrannies, instigated by the Russian despots, have caused great human sufferings among the people of Asia. In particular, I refer to the Communist wars of aggression against China, Korea, and Vietnam. Millions of people have perished through the Communist aggressions and millions more suffer the privations of being exiled from their native lands because the Communists are in occupation of them.

It is a little known fact to the people of the United States that the self-help projects of the International Cooperation Administration, many of which are carried out under the leadership of the American voluntary agencies, have accomplished a great service in easing the suffering of millions of victims of Communist aggression. The people of Asia who have had an opportunity to see these projects in operation know about them and shall never forget the good that has been done to help them and their fellow Asians.

I had an opportunity to observe these self-help projects in operation in Korea, Formosa, Hong Kong, Macao, and Vietnam. In my report to the Committee on the Judiciary covering my inspection trip to the Far East, I had this to say about that work:

That the United States International Cooperation Administration is deserving of commendation for sponsoring and advancing self-help projects for refugees in the Far East such as low-cost housing and for the child-feeding program in Hong Kong.

The child-feeding program in Hong Kong has been made possible by the authority granted in Public Law 480, which we are about to act upon. American surplus food has made possible the feeding of never less than 25,000 and as many as 40,000 children each day in the Crown Colony of Hong Kong. These are the children of refugees from communism and for the vast majority of them, the only food they get each day is that provided by the one meal per day per child plan which the American agencies have developed. I found that this program had the universal support as well as commendation of all elements of the population in Hong Kong. The British officials were very proud of the program and told me that it would be a terrible tragedy if circumstances ever made it necessary for us to stop that program. The Chinese welfare workers told me that this program spelled the difference between life and death for many children who came from large refugee families and where the father could barely earn enough to provide a small place for the family to sleep, but never enough food for all the members of the family. I could not help but think as I observed this program in operation that if the American people could see, first hand, the great good that is being done by using the bounty of our agricultural surpluses, they would demand that similar programs be started wherever there was such a crying need.

I discussed with American voluntary leaders and American Government officials in the Far East the question of making further use of our agricultural surpluses in critical areas of need in the Far East. There was unanimous agreement that everything possible should be done to further that objective. This led me to make the following conclusion in

my report to the Committee on the Judiciary:

That there is an abundance of opportunity in the Far East for the productive use of United States surplus agricultural commodities which would in no way disturb normal commercial markets.

I feel that the use of our surplus commodities for bettering the lot of the Refugees from communism in Viet-Nam, and in Macao, would bring further credit to United States interests in the Far East. In free Viet-Nam there are over 600,000 refugees from communism. The Government of President Diem has done a remarkable job of providing emergency care and assistance for these victims of Communist aggression. But from my own personal observation, I can say that additional good can be done among these friends of freedom by using our surplus agricultural commodities.

There is a similar situation in Macao where over 30,000 Chinese victims of Communist aggression are practically stranded because there is no economic opportunity for them in this small colony. These people are proud and industrious. I was told that they would not accept charity, that they begged for work, but I was also assured that our surplus agricultural commodities would be welcome by the American voluntary agencies working with these good people because they knew where the need was greatest and where the greatest amount of good could be accomplished. The child-feeding programs and other programs utilizing our agricultural surplus commodities in Korea have been a grand success. There the victims of Communist aggression have learned that we Americans are unselfish in the use of the wonderful bounty with which our country has been blessed. However, I was informed that there was still a great need in Korea for programs utilizing our surplus foods and that these programs would be necessary for some time to come.

On Formosa the possibility exists for establishing a supplemental food program which would have practical advantages for as many as 300,000 people. I should like to point out that the leaders of the Republic of Free China have done a remarkable job in striving for the goal of a balanced economy and, insofar as possible, a self-sufficient economy on Formosa. However, there are still areas in which a supplemental food program would advance the cause of freedom among the people living on Formosa.

It has been said by people in a position to know the facts that one-half of the people of the world go to bed hungry. Unfortunately all the nations of the world do not have the great facilities for the production of food that we here in the United States have. In some countries the food requirements of the population greatly exceed the ability of that nation to earn foreign credits through which the needed food might be purchased. In many of these countries, programs utilizing our surplus foods would be most welcome and certainly would fill a crying need.

Until we, in cooperation with other nations, are able to work out plans whereby all countries will be able to satisfy all the food requirements of their people, we should be putting our surplus food products to work for the cause of peace.

It is a certain fact that programs such as those which have been developed by the American voluntary agencies using our surplus foods, develop bonds of friendship and understanding with the people of foreign countries. It is well for us to remember that bonds of friendship are necessary if we are ever to have understandings between people and that we will never have a just and lasting peace until we do attain a warm understanding between all the people of the world.

I think it will be of interest for Members of the House to know which of the American voluntary agencies are carrying out these successful programs in the Far East. Those agencies are the Catholic Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the Lutheran World Federation, Church World Services of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, and the Aid Refugee Chinese Intellectuals, Inc.

A significant amendment to Public Law 480 is that which will permit our Government to transfer directly to friendly governments our surplus agricultural commodities. This provision should broaden the positive activities now under way for the use of our surplus agricultural commodities to benefit needy people.

I sincerely hope that the International Cooperation Administration will do everything it possibly can to advance additional programs which will utilize our agricultural surpluses for the benefit of friendly people in foreign lands. In commending the American voluntary agencies for the substantial contribution they have made to the spiritual and material strength of the free world, I also express the hope that they will continue the present programs and will establish many new ones in those parts of the world where they are aware of the great need that exists.

United States participation in and contribution to a wide range of products to assist victims of Communist aggression has proven, in my judgment, to be one of the soundest investments made by the American people.

Invocation Delivered at the Dedication of the Lewis and Clark Salt Cairn in Seaside, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a moving and eloquent invocation delivered by Rev. R. J. Enquist, of the Lutheran Church of our Saviour, in Seaside, Oreg., at the dedication of the Lewis and Clark salt cairn in Seaside on August 22, 1955.

I had the honor to speak on this occasion, when Reverend Enquist so appropriately paid tribute to the courage of the frontiersmen who first crossed our contient and came down to the Pacific seaboard. His prayer symbolizes the debt of all of us to the Almighty for this vast and great land of ours.

There being no objection, the invocation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER AT THE REDEDICATION OF THE LEWIS AND CLARK SALT CAIRN, SEASIDE, AUGUST 22, 1955

O Almighty God, who of Thy power and love hast created this bountiful land, and who of Thy providence didst lead our fathers to the discovery of it; we thank Thee for the richness of our inheritance both in the wealth of our country and in the courage of its pioneers.

Grant that we may be duly thankful for all Thy benefits by sharing in that same spirit of adventure for the common good which inspired our fathers in the past.

Lead us to seek the cause of peace over strife for selfish gain, the cause of justice over stuggle for material profit, the building up of a community dedicated to the doing of Thy good will rather than the perusal of individual interest and greed that this land which Thou hast given us may, by Thy grace, become the land of our Lord and of His Christ, through the same, Thy son, our Saviour. Amen.

Unfinished Business of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has acquitted itself with distinction in many respects but we must acknowledge that in some important areas we are closing the door on much unfinished business.

While the enlightened program of Dwight D. Eisenhower has been the spark and inspiration for the good legislation enacted by the 84th Congress, we have failed to set as outstanding a record as we might have done if we had followed his direction more completely. Let us take stock of those items left undone in the single field of health, education, and welfare as we prepare to "close up shop."

I refer you first to the President's state of the Union message January 5, 1956. The President said:

To fulfill the individual's aspirations in the American way of life, good education is fundamental. Good education is the outgrowth of good homes, good communities, good churches, and good schools. Today our schools face pressing problems—problems which will not yield to swift and easy solution, or to any single action. They will yield only to a continuing, active, informed effort by the people toward achieving better schools.

The need for additional classrooms was the core of the report that came out of the White House Conference on Education, which made history as the first con-

ference on education ever called by a President of the United States. In 1955 and again this year, the President brought before Congress a sound, long-range program designed to bridge the gap between the present and projected need and the anticipated and reasonable increase of schoolbuilding by the States and local school districts.

This is the plan he offered for meeting one of the most urgent problems facing our people in the effort to achieve better schools:

So far as the Federal share of responsibility is concerned, I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of Federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms. Such a program, which should be limited to a 5-year period, must operate to increase rather than decrease local and State support of schools and to give the greatest help to the States and localities with the least financial resources. Federal aid should in no way jeopardize the freedom of local school systems. There will be presented to the Congress a recommended program of Federal assistance for school construction.

Such a program should be accompanied by action to increase services to the Nation's schools by the Office of Education and by legislation to provide continuation of payments to school districts where Federal activities have impaired the ability of those districts to provide adequate schools.

The essential qualifications set down by the President were contained in S. 2905 which never saw the light of day. In the House these same essentials were embodied in the McConnell amendments which were defeated on the floor of the House. The final defeat of all legislation to relieve the critical shortage of classrooms is one of the tragic blunders for which we will be held accountable.

A vital piece of legislation which passed the Senate but became bottled up in Committee in the House is S. 3620 and its House counterparts H. R. 10620 and H. R. 11253. These bills which are identical in purpose would have authorized grants to institutions of higher learning and State educational agencies to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children.

It is estimated that there are approximately 1.5 million school-age children and youth who are so mentally retarded as to need special help from the Nation's schools. It is known that thousands of such children who could profit by some kind of educational program are not in school; others are not provided with curricula and services suitable to their needs. The major limiting factor in providing for these children is the severe shortage of professional personnel trained in the field of the education of mentally retarded children.

The legislation I refer to would have provided $500,000 for the first year of operation, which would have supported approximately 200 persons in training to teach or conduct research in fields related to education of mentally retarded children.

In my State of Pennsylvania—and I am sure in many of the States represented by my distinguished colleagues the need for teachers for these children is both critical and distressing. How can we in good conscience go home without having done our utmost to meet this need in the face of the President's earnest request in his state of the Union message for "special attention to the problems of mentally retarded children"?

It is a matter of considerable concern to me and to other Members of the Congress that children generally didn't fare very well at the hands of the majority in this session. Of course children don't vote, and particularly those children who are categorized as dependent,, neglected or delinquent are sometimes forgotten in the press of the urgent business of some of our more impressive interest groups.

In spite of the Presidents' expressed concern for "increased child welfare services," and an "intensified attack on juvenile delinquency" the legislation that would have furthered both of these programs received little attention from either House.

Identical bills, S. 3297, H. R. 10283, and H. R. 10284, to amend and improve the child-welfare provisions of the Social Security Act, title V, part 3, were introduced in both the Senate and the House early in 1956.

The child welfare services program was initiated in 1935 to serve predominantly rural areas. By 1956, 21 years later, considerable progress in developing public child welfare activities in rural areas has been made. Today the number of children in the most urban State receiving child welfare services per 1,000 in the population is lower than the number of children in rural areas.

This legislation would have made it possible for States to make their own decisions as to where their need is greatest for child welfare work and allowed the use of the Federal funds in urban as well as rural areas. It also authorized the use of Federal grants to pay for foster care of children. Grants were also made available to encourage demonstration projects in special programs for children of either regional or national significance.

The Children's Bureau request for authorization for grants to the States of $12 million in 1958 and $15 million thereafter was amended to a flat $12 million.

Though hearings were held in the House no other action was taken.

The administration's legislative proposal contained in S. 894 and H. R. 3771 providing for grants to the States for the purpose of strengthening and improving State and local programs for the control and treatment of juvenile delinquency suffered a similar fate, in spite of hearings which were held by the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of both the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Many witnesses have testified to the urgent need for grants to the States to enable them to improve the work of juvenile courts, probation services, juvenile police, and institutions for delinquent children. The need for funds to increase the opportunities for training professional and nonprofessional workers and to increase research work was repeatedly emphasized.

The most recent reports from the Children's Bureau indicate that the number of delinquent children coming before the juvenile courts in 1955 increased by 9 percent over those so reported in 1954. Since 1948 the total increase is estimated to be 70 percent.

This, unfortunately, like the weather is another problem which everyone talks about but no one does much about.

Another major item of legislation on which no action was taken is H. R. 7770.

Consolidated reporting of wages for income-tax and social security purposes was recommended by the President in his budget message, in which he stated:

I am recommending legislation to reduce the frequency of information returns made by employers withholding income and social-security taxes and to strengthen enforcement of these taxes. These amendments will not only cut down the reporting burden on private business but will also increase budget receipts, especially in later years.

This administration proposal provides for receiving annual reports from employers of their employees earnings rather than quarterly reports as under the present law. This change would have eliminated some 200 million wage items a year. To further simplify reporting for employers, the employee-filed statements of wages and of taxes withheld would be used for both income tax and old-age and survivors insurance purposes.

Of course I am fully aware that any process that would simplify procedures, cut red tape and save the taxpayers time and money could not expect to win approval from my good friends on the majority side of the House.

In his state of the Union message to Congress President Eisenhower said, in requesting "a well-supported, well-balanced program of research":

As an integral part of this effort, I shall recommend a new plan to aid construction of non-Federal medical research and teaching facilities and to help provide more adequate support for the training of medical research manpower.

In his budget message the President again called for "legislation to authorize Federal assistance for the construction of medical and dental research and teaching facilities," and he reiterated his request in his health message on January 26 of this year.

The administration's proposals, H. R. 9013, H. R. 9014 and S. 3252 provided for both of these programs by assisting professional schools to achieve a desirable balance between research and teaching programs. As we know, S. 849, which passed, provides for medical research construction, but not for teaching or training facilities. This is buying the cart without the horse to draw it. I ask you, of what benefit will the finest research facilities be if we have no one to teach or train those who would do the research?

The logic of this half a loaf escapes me, when we might so readily have had the whole loaf and thus met the dual need.

In 1955 and again this year President Eisenhower recommended to Congress legislation to provide mortgage insurance for the construction of health facilities. The recommendation was included

in the Administration's Omnibus Health bill, S. 886 and H. R. 3458, as title II of that proposal. When the so-called baby omnibus health bill was drafted, containing the bulk of the administration's program, this important provision was omitted.

Obviously this legislation would have facilitated the financing and development of needed health facilities. It would also have stimulated on a self-sustaining basis, a continuing flow of private credit to finance the construction, expansion, modernization and conversion of privately owned and operated health facilities.

Also omitted from the health bill enacted by the 84th Congress was the provision for public health grants as contained in title V of the administration's omnibus health bill.

This title would have authorized grants for support of public health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services, as well as providing grants for special projects.

And that is not the end of our sins of omission.

In spite of the plea of the President in his health message and also in his budget message Congress failed to enact the administration's proposal for provision of sanitation facilities and services on Indian reservations and tribal lands. The administration bills, S. 3112 and H. R. 9150 and H. R. 9209 would have authorized the Public Health Service to conduct surveys as to the need for domestic and community sanitation facilities and to develop and keep current a program of projects for the construction of such facilities.

Sanitation for the Indian population has been neglected for so long that the sanitary conditions under which thousands of Indians live are nothing short of primitive. No other group of persons in the United States lives under comparable conditions. The Indian population is, in fact, about half a century in arreas with respect to the application of sanitary science to disease prevention.

Also there was the failure of this Congress to take legislative action to carry out the President's recommendation in his budget message, which I quote:

I recommend the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University, with provision for construction of a new teaching hospital.

The proposals contained in H. R. 11788 and S. 4132 are substantially in agreement with the recommendations made by the members of the Freedmen's Hospital Commission. This was a group of outstanding citizens with specialized experience and knowledge in the fields of hospital administration, nursing, medicine, and professional teaching, who were appointed by the Secretary of Welfare to study the complex problems affecting Freedmen's Hospital, Howard University's medical school, and the Washington community.

To have failed to enact this legislation deprives the historic and outstanding Howard University of an up-to-date and appropriate teaching facility and the citizens of Washington of a critically needed modern community hospital.

No more important nor courageous group of public servants exists in our entire Government structure than the officers and employees of the Public Health Service and the Food and Drug Administration. On May 29 a bill was introduced by one of our distinguished colleagues to furnish some protection for these devoted officers and employees. This bill, H. R. 11513, contains provisions for punishment and penalties for killing or assaulting Federal officers and employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on official duty engaged in enforcing the food and drug or public health laws of the United States.

I am informed that there have been numerous cases of assault, bodily injury, and threats of harm to such employees in pursuing their course of duty. Can you imagine the reaction these people, who have dedicated themselves to the enforcement of the very laws that protect the health of ourselves and our families, must have for our callous ingratitude as we put on our hats and walk away; without so much as a concern for their safety?

Again may I refer you to the words of the President of the United States in his special health message:

Since World War II the costs of medical care have been increasingly met through voluntary health insurance. More than 100 million persons are now enrolled in prepayment health-insurance plans of some type. But health-insurance coverage is still not available to many who need it, and the character and amount of insurance protection in important respects remains inadequate.

Health-insurance protection must be made more available to older persons and those living in rural areas, to the self-employed and those working in small organizations who cannot be reached through ordinary group-enrollment methods. There is particular need for much broader coverage against the cost of long term or other especially expensive illness, which can be a financial catastrophe for many families.

The need for more and better health-insurance coverage can best be met by building on what many of our people have already provided for themselves—the voluntary health prepayment plans. Much can be done to encourage more rapid expansion and improvement of such plans.

In line with this recommendation the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare presented for the consideration of Congress the provisions contained in S. 4172, H. R. 12140, and H. R. 12153. These bills provide for the pooling of health-insurance plans in order to extend their coverage and protection.

Although this legislation was introduced late in this session, we have had ample time to act on such a vital measure. It could now be law if our friends in the controlling majority had had as passionate a concern for the ill, the aged and the people of rural areas, who would most benefit from this legislation, as they will loudly proclaim throughout the coming campaign.

If they mean what they say they should recess this Congress until September and come back and complete much of this unfinished business of the 84th Congress before the November election.

The Democrat Party has a choice of going to the people with a horrid record of things not done, or of following the advice of our great leader Dwight D. Eisenhower whose inspired program for the health, education, and welfare of our fellow human beings should be promptly enacted. For the responsible Democrat Party to adjourn this Congress now is proof that they no longer deserve the confidence of the people.

Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I happen to be one of those individuals who feel that the claim of special status of the American veteran is an imminently sound and valid claim. Having served for almost 3 years in the Armed Forces during World War II, of which approximately 2 years were overseas in combat, and having been an officer of the American Legion on both the post and district levels, I have had the opportunity of assisting many veterans with filing claims for service-connected disability compensation and other problems. If I knew of some way of drawing a line between the service-connected disability cases and those who are suffering from ailments actually incurred in or aggravated by the service, but who have been turned down because of lack of evidence, I would be satisfied with the present VA programs.

However, I know from personal experience with members of my own family that there are many thousands of deserving veterans who are walking the streets looking for work, or are bedfast, and are in that position due to the service they gave their country. Through no fault of their own, but due to lack of evidence, they are denied service-connected disability compensation. There are also thousands upon thousands of World War I veterans whose lives have been shortened materially by their service to their country and who now find themselves too young for a social-security pension and too old to work. Many of them are forced to go on relief, and I say without any reservation, they are the "forgotten group."

I hope this Congress will not adjourn without passing bills allowing increases in compensation for service-connected disability veterans and also the Legion war veterans security bill for much needed assistance to World War I veterans. I was completely flabbergasted and disappointed, to say the least, to read the recommendations of the Bradley report, particularly at a time when the Congress was considering a much needed increase in veterans' benefits.

I think former National Legion Commander, Donald R. Wilson, of West Virginia, expressed the sentiments of all veterans when he said, "The Bradley

Commission and its staff have labored mightily and expensively to bring down a very small bird."

Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine in southern Illinois, the Honorable John Stelle, former national commander of the American Legion and former Governor of Illinois, has written a letter which was published in a column entitled, "Sound Off," which I would like to have reprinted, as follows:

SOUND OFF

(By John Stelle)

THE RIGHT MAN?

Sir: In view of Gen. Omar Bradley's repeated assertions that the Government has no special obligations to veterans, it was probably only natural that he should have been pushed into the forefront to lead the fight against veterans' benefits. However, I submit that those who gave him the ball would have been better off if they had handed it to someone else on their team. The trouble is, the general is too busy a man for this sort of thing. He draws full-time pay as a general on active duty, by special act of Congress. This amounts to $20,543.36 a year, and he also has two lifetime military aides, plus permanent quarters in the Pentagon. We don't know what the general does, but obviously the Army isn't paying that kind of money just to have him hang around a watercooler in the Pentagon. And that isn't all. The general holds down another job, as chairman of the board of research and development of the Bulova Watch Co. This is said to pay him $50,000 a year, and he also has living accommodations at the Bulova watch headquarters. On the face of it, the general's job with the Bulova watch people is of great strategic importance since last year they sold $27 million worth of goods to our Armed Forces. This entire set-up puzzles me no end, and I think an investigation is in order. I think it is shameful that a grateful Government makes it necessary for a general of the Army to take a part-time job to make ends meet. Mind, I am not implying that the Army isn't getting full value for its $20,543.36 a year, and I'm quite sure that Bulova isn't being cheated. Still, it is unfortunate that the general has to work so hard when it is obvious that he'd rather write reports proving that veterans who fought the war at the lower echelons never had it so good.

Charlie Deane

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I did not have advance notice that my colleague, the Honorable CHARLES B. DEANE, of North Carolina, intended to deliver a farewell address following the close of business in the House last Monday. If I had known about it I certainly would have remained in the Chamber to listen to him.

I have read the very fine address delivered by Mr. DEANE in his farewell talk to the House, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 12889, and wish to express to him my profound thanks for delivering one of the most important statements made in Congress in a long time.

I join CHARLIE in his belief that if we are to win the struggle for the minds of men around the world, we should put more emphasis upon moral and spiritual values and less upon material things. The people of the world know that the citizens of the United States enjoy the highest standard of living the world has ever known; that they possess an abundance of all of the material things that make for good living; that an automobile, a washing machine, an electric refrigerator, and a television set, are all within reach of almost every American citizen. I am not so sure they understand the reasons why we have become such a great nation, with so many material blessings, in the relatively short period of 169 years.

The reasons are not hard to find. Accident played no part in it. These reasons may all be summarized in one short phrase—the American way of life—based upon a deep spiritual faith, upon our precious heritage of individual liberty and upon our competitive or free-enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to add that I appreciate the opportunity I have had to serve here with CHARLIE DEANE. I have been profoundly impressed by his deep sincerity and by his determination to practice what he preaches. I do not know what he intends to do in the future but I freely predict that he will carry the same faith and determination to follow the dictates of his conscience in whatever he undertakes. I am happy to have this opportunity to commend him on a decade of fine and outstanding service to the people of his district and to his country and to wish for him long life, good health, prosperity, and happiness.

The World of 2000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD a very interesting address by Mr. Morehead Patterson, chairman and president of the American Machine and Foundry Co., on the occasion of the commencement exercises of the Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland, Ohio:

THE WORLD OF 2000

Address by Morehead Patterson, chairman and president, American Machine & Foundry Co., at the Commencement Exercises of the Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, Ohio, June 7, 1956

Time was when commencement speakers spoke "Down" to the newly graduated from the rostrum of age and experience thus:

"You are on your own—you newly fledged, overeducated young men. You may think that your labors—successful labors though they may have been—in this great institution of learning have fitted you for success in the great world outside—that you have but to announce your presence and availability and all barriers to fame and fortune will fall before you. You are wrong, you 'young-men-in-a-hurry,' your education has but opened the door. It is up to you now, to show what you can do through long days and nights of hard labor. Remember, you can get out of life only what you put into it."

This approach was particularly popular in the early 1930's—and at that time, many engineering graduates went into sales work. Apples were available on every street corner.

Today, what a vast change. Commencement speakers must adjust to the necessity to talk "up" to the graduates.

And so I say to you:

You are very fortunate young men, not because there is any special virtue in you as individuals, but because the stream of life—world life—is running full tide and going providentially in your direction. You have a tailwind in your favor. You are the generation with opportunities unlimited. Each of you has been approached, interviewed, tested, recruited, by any god's quantity of the Nation's greatest industrial organizations, who have begged and cajoled you, with every promise, to join their payrolls at starting salaries only exceeded by those of optioned baseball players.

I urge you to take every advantage of this pleasant situation, remembering that almost all the great things of this world have been accomplished (with appropriate apologies, perhaps, to Sir Winston Churchill) by young men—young men who refuse categorically to pay any heed to the principle of the dangerous precedent. May you be equally fertile. Remember that you can do a thing for the first time only once—and try to be the one who does it.

The world is your oyster. What we have today is small in comparison with what lies ahead in the not too distant future. We are better off than ever before; we earn more, we live better, we can enjoy more leisure and we can look to the future without too much fear.

We have barely turned the corner of this midcentury. Already scientists, engineers, and industrialists are busy with their crystal balls, looking ahead to the 21st century.

They are forecasting a world population of 7 billion compared with 2.6 billion now. They are expecting technological developments that will feed, clothe, and house all those additional people adequately and easily. They are contemplating the use of air, sea water, ordinary rock, and sunlight as sources of food, power, and materials.

This sounds like fantasy, but consider what our great-grandfathers would have said in 1856 had anyone predicted the kind of world in which we live today. About that time there was in England serious consideration of abandoning the patent system on the ground that everything had obviously been discovered that could be discovered.

Do you realize what it means to double the world population in 50 years?

It means that one new human being is added every second. Every time I snap my finger, another person is added. By the time you leave this hall at the end of these ceremonies there will be no less than 7,200 more human beings. Tomorrow at this time, when you are, I hope, thinking about my wise words, there will be 85,000 more. Every 15 days from now on, there will be enough new people to populate a city the size of Cleveland, 1½ million in all. All these figures are net after taxes, deaths, plagues, pestilences, and other catastrophes. What a market for business and science.

Viewed in this perspective, the predictions of the scientists for 2050 seem modest and restrained. Yet there are qualifications to these forecasts for a brave new world 100 years hence. First, they may not come

about unless we can find a way to overcome a major shortage—lack of trained brain power.

Our scientists show more concern about this than anything else. In the United States already there is a tragic waste in the development of such talent. Half of the young men and women who have the requisite mental ability are not fully educated and one-third of those with exceptional talents—high IQ's—do not pursue their training to the ultimate goal.

I hope that many of you will decide, after you have had some outside experience, to return to your colleges and go into the teaching profession. Today, we are consuming the "seed corn" on which we must rely to educate our scientists, engineers, and technicians of the future. The teachers of the future will determine our success or failure.

Again, and second, lack of adequate industrial power could threaten the fulfillment of the hopes of all peoples for a better life and for peace.

Last summer, at the Geneva Atomic Conference, a carefully prepared paper predicted that the world power requirement would rise by the year 2000, only 44 years from now, to a figure 8 times what it is today.

Cross the steady rise in world population with the constantly increasing pressure for a higher standard of living and it is not difficult to believe that the world, by the year 2000, will demand an eightfold increase over 1955 in its requirement for power energy.

Industrial power requirement is, in the final analysis, a sensitive index of demand by the people of the world for goods and services and for constant growth and progress.

Power does not stand naked and alone—the Zulu does not throw his boomerang with more effect because of electric power. Power can only express itself through machines and apparatus of all kinds.

A requirement of eight times our present power consumption on a world-wide scale in the year 2000 will mean, among other things, 8 times the present world economy in goods and services, 8 times the washing machines, 8 times the factories, 8 times the powerplants.

Increasing as it is all over the globe, this great demand represents the greatest opportunity ever given to world leadership to attach to itself the positive elements required for peace and prosperity for many years to come.

Even now the world resources of fossil fuels and hydropower are fast becoming inadequate to meet this increasing demand.

The most immediate hope of continued world progress, therefore, lies in the rapid development of atomic energy as a supplement to other fuels. We cannot wait until the year 2000, with its 8 times power requirement, to decide what we are going to do about providing the power. This is a problem that we are going to be forced to solve and program within the next decade.

We have used fossil fuels as our principal source of energy in the past. There are still good supplies of them and we shall continue to use them at an increasing rate in the future. Technologists are constantly discovering ways of increasing their efficient utilization. We won't run out of coal, oil or gas overnight, but we are using these fuels at such a rate that it is obvious we must look for additional sources of power.

Rising demand for the fossil fuels will decrease their supply while it will increase their cost. At the same time the cost of atomic energy will come down. I am confident our engineers and technicians, backed by forward-thinking industrialists, will se to that. The time is not far distant when energy from the atom will meet the rising cost of energy from other sources. The curves should cross in the next 15 years. When we reach this historic point, the atom will come into its own as the chief fuel for the new powerplants of the world.

Apart from this, the chemicals contained in fossil fuels are becoming increasingly important. I venture to predict that some day a law will be passed forbidding the burning of fossil fuels under boilers for the mere production of heat. It is really a sin to waste nature's million-year-old gift when atomic means are so ready at hand.

I have mentioned the pressure that exists for a higher standard of living. I believe that this is the underlying surge that is causing the great nationalistic revolutions in so many countries.

And there are further straws in the wind. For example, consumer credit is a well-known American way by which more people can get more of the better things of life. Many countries, including France and England, which have never used such business methods on a large scale, are now using consumer credit. Even in the Eastern European satellites, consumer credit is being tried as a means of obtaining high-level economies. And now Russia.

All this can be a reality in less than 45 years and definitely within the lifetime of most of you here today. This great economic and political development has been greatly aided by President Eisenhower's 1953 decision to move ahead with the great principle of atoms for peace. The administration has moved forward politically to set the stage for the actual application of the peaceful atom. Briefly, this is the record of the past 2 years:

On the domestic front, the United States Government and private enterprise are now cooperating in an excellent program for developing large quantities of electric power from atomic sources.

Atomic reactors of all types, large and small, have been put into development through private, as well as public, agencies. Research and development of fuel elements, essential to the success of these reactors, have been undertaken.

At the initiative of the Atomic Energy Commission, a vigorous rural electrification program is about to get underway, bringing atomic energy to the farmers of America.

Great strides have been made in applying the use of radioactive isotopes in industry, where the annual savings have already approached $100 million on the farm and in the clinics and hospitals.

In the international field, the United States has placed its vast knowledge of atomic technology at the service of mankind. Through distribution of libraries in all areas of the world, through training courses open to the scientists and engineers of other countries, through a bilateral treaty program to encourage the construction of atomic research centers abroad, the United States has sought to encourage friendly nations to develop their own programs and increase the number of their atomic scientists and technicians.

Assistance to and cooperation with those nations of the free world having the most advanced abilities in the field have been supplied through bilateral agreements.

The United States has taken the lead in negotiating the charter of an International Atomic Energy Agency, as proposed by President Eisenhower, to receive contributions of fissionable materials and arrange for their distribution in such a manner as to secure efficient utilization and the greatest possible general benefit all over the world.

The United States has set aside for the international power program 20,000 kilograms of enriched uranium.

"The world is your oyster"; "O Fortunate young-men-in-a-hurry!" May you open it, not with the sword, as in Shakespeare's comedy, but with the sharp point of your wits and the wonderful training you have had. The great tailwind of the world demand is blowing you along.

There is criticism that our technical education, today, neglects the humanities. So here I give you some Latin.

In ancient Rome, when the gladiators paraded in the colosseum, they raised their swords in salute to the tribune and shouted, "Ave, Imperator, morituri te salutamus."

"Hail, Imperator (you, who use the imperative tense; you, who command the future); we, about to die, salute you."

Today, I reverse the process. The tribune shouts to you gladiators, about to go into the world fight:

"Hail, you leaders of the future. We, who may not be around when you make your greatest contribution to the world, salute you."

"Ave, Imperatori, morituri vos salutamus."

Anthony Akers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, needless to say in these closing hours of the 84th session of Congress, realizing that my own Congressional career is about to close, I look upon the experience which I have had in Washington with great pride and extreme satisfaction.

As you know, I am not a candidate for reelection, having been nominated by the Democratic and Liberal Parties for judge of the court of general sessions, where I hope to resume the judicial career which I left to become a Member of this great body.

My purpose now is not to tell you about myself, but to tell you about another who it is my hope will soon be a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the 17th Congressional District of New York. Anthony Akers, the Democratic and Liberal Party candidate for Congress from that district, will be a splendid addition to the New York delegation here, for he possesses a warm sympathetic understanding of the problems which confront us.

He knows the social problems which cry out for solution, and he knows and is proud of the city which I trust he will soon represent. He is presently serving as director of the New York City office of the New York State Department of Commerce. In New York City we have a magazine known as New York City Highlights. Recently this publication contained an article by Tony Akers, which I think is worthy of the attention of this House.

I ask leave pursuant to my unanimous consent request to insert the same at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

NEW YORK: CITY OF ENDLESS GROWTH

(By Anthony B. Akers)

New York City is a vast, ever-increasing spring of vitality that overflows in all directions to spread new commercial, economic, scientific and cultural activities into all its environs. As a welling spring engenders

fertility and productivity, so for a century and a half the city has been the fountainhead for growth and development of all America.

Today, as it has been historically, New York City is Metropolis, United States of America—big, vital, growing. By its sheer enormity it defies comparison. There is no accurate measure yet devised by which New York can be set in its true perspective to measure either its greatness or the entire sweep of its influence upon this country.

The proportions of its growth challenge imagination. To cite but one facet of its magnitude, a 20-year growth here adds to it nearly a million inhabitants—a number greater than the entire population of America's sixth largest city.

Such growth carriers with it a powerful physical vitality. In the 10-year period, 1947–1956, 68 new office buildings with aggregate rentable area exceeding 17 million square feet will have been constructed and occupied just in the Borough of Manhattan. This increase alone nearly equals the total of all present office space in the city of Chicago. It would house the entire working population of the Salt Lake City metropolitan area. It represents 25 percent growth in rentable offices in New York City since World War II. By contrast, America's second largest city in the same period had a multistory construction activity amounting to one single office building of 44 floors.

But New York's vitality never ceases. A highly significant evidence of this is the newly opened Coliseum which places New York into undisputed first rank as the Nation's top exhibition and convention city. It is a modern four-story building with a 20-story office building at one end. It cost $35 million and consist of 4 large exhibit halls, comprising 300,000 square feet or 7 acres. It will increase the city's annual take in exhibition and convention business to a startling $265 million.

A different yardstick of city growth is found in the report of the Department of City Planning that nonresidential building from 1946 to 1953 reached the total of 6,561 structures. One's perspective becomes lost when we try to compare development of such size with the scale of building activity recorded for a similar period in any other city on earth, past or present.

Perspective gets out of focus again when we describe New York merely as the country's greatest manufacturing city, in which every major manufacturing classification is represented. Actually, more people are employed in manufacturing in this one city than in any other city in the world—more also than are employed in manufacturing in all of Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Peru put together—or in all of Norway, Denmark, Ireland, the Saar, and Luxembourg combined.

Yet manufacturing does not hold the greatest relative importance in New York City's total employment picture. The 40,000 manufacturing firms here hire almost a million men and women. Yet in New York nonmanufacturing employment is more than 2½ times greater than the total of manufacturing employment.

Basically, our city's place in the national economy derives from its location at the gateway connecting the most industrialized sections of the country with the rest of the world.

Its population of over 8 million includes an extraordinary variety of skills and abilities—specialized business service, shopping facilities, entertainment, and cultural programs not found in a like combination anywhere the world over.

Here businessmen have services of patent attorneys, advertising agencies, packaging experts, specialized banking, credit and insurance firms, accountants, specialists in labor and industrial relations and transportation consultants whose range is the globe. And to help avoid the pitfalls of trial and error in the production and distribution of a product, the services of the Nation's leading technicians and market reesarch firms are readily obtainable in the city.

More than 300 industrial laboratories in New York City are staffed and equipped to undertake research and to test new and existing products. Laboratories and consulting services are supplemented by vast resources of universities and colleges, technical librarians and Government agencies.

Accessibility of these numerous and extensive business services, in turn, is a primary factor in making New York a favored location for new firms and headquarters of well-established corporations. Personal and consumer services lend additional emphasis to New York as a place to live in or to visit.

Because of the range and variety of these ultramodern business and consumer services there simply is no standard of measure by which New York City realistically can be compared with any other city.

Perhaps the best evidence of New York City's position as a trading and financial capital of the world is the volume and diversity of its wholesale trade. More than in any other center, New York wholesalers function on a national and international scale. Wholesaler transactions here this year will aggregate well over $40 billion. Growth in this vital phase of the city's economy is represented by the impressive 1,000 new firms added since 1949, bringing the total approximately to 32,000 wholesale firms employing more than 368,000 individuals.

And while New York City is a supplier to the entire world, it is the domestic shopping center for a nearby trading area outnumbering the whole Dominion of Canada.

The 104,000 retail establishments in New York City provide the world's largest outlet for manufactured consumer goods. At the same time they display for consumers the widest possible assortment and selection of goods. Retail stores employ a half million people in New York City. Their business volume this year will exceed $10 billion.

Compared with the rest of the United States, New York City occupies a place similar to the great city-states of the Middle Ages and more ancient times when, from the standpoint of commerce and economic development, a single city gained dominance. Yet New York, by its magnitude, is Athens, Carthage, Rome, Florence and Genoa rolled into one. Gotham has advanced to a position of world preeminence which literally stuns the imagination.

The City of New York today more than ever is the land of abundant opportunity. Fundamentally it is a city of progress—ever growing, building, expanding, maintaining its leadership. Population growth here over the years has evolved a city considerably more than double in size any other in the United States. And just as mere numbers fail to measure the bigness of its economy, so does comparison of New York's population with other American cities fail to present an adequate picture by whatever standard employed.

Incorporated in 1653, our metropolis long ago reached maturity. Its population growth today is sound and readily absorbed. In the decade 1940–50 the Census reported 436,932 persons added to the population. Between 1930 and 1950 New York City increased by 961,511. This means that in 20 years New York City added more people than constitute the whole population of centers like Baltimore, Cleveland, St. Louis, Washington, D. C., or Boston.

Within the 315.1 square miles that is New York City there is a density of 25,046 persons per square mile. By contrast there are 17,450 persons to the square mile in Chicago, 16,286 in Philadelphia, 13,249 in Detroit, and only 4,370 in Los Angeles.

Over 27,000 acres of the city are given to park areas including the famous 840-acre Central Park, Bronx Zoo, and the Bronx and Brooklyn Botanical Gardens. New York has the finest park system in the world, embracing 7 municipal salt water bathing beaches, 17 outdoor swimming pools and 10 municipal golf courses.

Healthful and invigorating climate with an average mean temperature of about 50° is as much a permanent asset as the city's wonderful harbor. While New Yorkers enjoy pronounced seasonal changes, extremes of heat and cold are rarities indeed. And to assure its 8 million inhabitants against air contamination, the city can boast of the most advanced program on air pollution control.

Smooth and efficient operation of this colossus among cities requires a transportation system of comparable size. New York City has experienced difficulty keeping pace with the demands of growth and development. It has tried to face up to its problems as they arise; it has encountered real problems in the rapid-transit field.

Giant, modern air-terminal facilities have grown with the newest form of transportation as the metropolitan area adjusted to the demand of the air age. The four airports of the Port of New York Authority—LaGuardia, Idlewild, Newark, Teterboro—last year served 9.3 million passengers. More than one million of these were overseas flights. Improvements to these installations are being made for an envisaged increase to 13 million flight passengers by 1956. New York International Airport (Idlewild) will handle all overseas travelers and 37 percent of the domestic passengers. A $60 million air terminal development program at Idlewild is scheduled for completion by 1960.

In just the few 6 years of its existence, New York International Airport has become the air crossroads of the world. International air traffic into and out of New York City today exceeds the combined total for London, Paris, and West Berlin. The two city airports, LaGuardia and International, together handle four times as many passengers as the two London airports.

Idlewild today represents an investment of $126.5 million. Size of this great airport is such it could contain the Polo Grounds, Yankee Stadium, Ebbets Field, Madison Square Garden, Governors Island, Ellis Island, Bedloes Island, Empire State Building, Chrysler Building, Grand Central Terminal, Pennsylvania Station, Port Authority Bus Terminal, the New York Coliseum, U. N. headquarters site, Rockefeller Center, St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York Public Library and Bryant Park, City Hall and its park, and the 252-acre Bronx Zoo—and still leave 100 acres for further expansion.

Fully three-quarters of the Nation's ship-traveling public en route to or from foreign places will pass through the port of New York this year. In terms of value, the port of New York will handle more than 40 percent of the Nation's waterborne trade. Twelve railroads and 750 over-the-road trucking firms serve the port.

The rail and waterborne freight into and out of New York City annually is so great it cannot reasonably be compared with volumes handled at our other cities. Rather, it compares with volumes handled by foreign nations. Waterborne freight, for instance, annually exceeds the total ocean cargoes of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden combined.

Highlighted among advancements for motor vehicle transportation in New York City right now is the Major Deegan Highway, connecting the city with the New York State thruway, to be finished this year. A recent study of motor travel recommends new bridges connecting the Bronx and Queens, and construction of the Narrows Bridge linking Staten Island with Brooklyn.

While these and other suggested improvements will enable the city to handle increased traffic, they will not eliminate traffic congestion. The tremendous volume of business conducted within such a narrowly lim-

ited area, plus the constant growth of the city, makes congestion an ever recurring problem. Other outstanding advantages of a New York location are more than sufficient to offset traffic congestion.

The bellwethers of calamity can scarcely ignore the fact that traffic in New York City is a growth barometer. When we have no traffic problem there it will be time to mourn over our city's future. Meanwhile we do have problems associated with absorbing an economically healthy and sound development. But these are problems of growth—not of decadence.

Today there are crepe hangers and professional critics who would have us believe that these huge increases in New York City's growth are "shrinkage," but these same critics view lesser increases elsewhere as great growth and development.

Gloomy prophets of doom as to New York City's future should be answered, not only by official and private agencies, but by every New Yorker—certainly by every businessman and all others with an interest in our town.

The basic elements which made New York great and which continue it today as so important a community, will still remain strongly in evidence in the future: unequaled location; unrivaled port and harbor; concentrated population with widely diversified skills, professions and occupations; highly developed industry and a far-reaching network of transportation, communication, financial and other services.

The vitality of the city in finding improved uses for these basic advantages is nowhere better reflected than in the huge volume of construction recently completed, currently underway and planned. Some of this construction will provide facilities demanded by growth; some will renew the city, transforming old and deteriorating sections into new usefulness and restored property value, so the rebuilding and expansion of our great metropolis continually goes on.

New York is by far the Nation's biggest and strongest city, yet it is most advanced—the most vital—the most civilized—the Nation's pacemaker. It needs no apologist, no boastfulness. As long as there is a champion who towers over all, there will be those who howl calamity and predict how the champion is to be knocked from the ring. But the heavyweight class so far has produced no real contender for the crown New York wears.

The city of New York is the embodiment of strength—the strongest single reflector of life in America in the 19th and 20th centuries. As the leader it is here to stay—and to grow.

Ward Quaal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include an editorial which appeared in the Mining Journal, Marquette, Mich., on June 30, 1956, concerning my friend, Ward Quaal.

Mr. Quaal is one of the youngest and most dynamic leaders in the radio and television business in this country. His recent appointment as vice president and general manager of radio station WGN in Chicago is another step up the ladder. Those of us who are privileged to have his friendship desire to pay tribute to his great qualities of leadership and his dedication to the perpetuation of the soundest kind of American ideals and principles, both in business and government.

The editorial follows:

GOOD LUCK TO MR. QUAAL

The Cincinnati Enquirer recently had some kind words to say about an Ishpeming man who has made quite a name for himself in the communications world. The occasion was the appointment of Ward Quaal as vice president and general manager of radio station WGN in Chicago. Prior to the appointment, Mr. Quaal was vice president and assistant general manager of Crosley Broadcasting Corp. in Cincinnati.

It happens that the Cincinnati Enquirer isn't the only one who is proud of Mr. Quaal; Ishpeming and WDMJ, the Mining Journal station, also are counted among his many admirers. Ishpeming is proud of him because it was there that he was born and reared. WDMJ is proud that was the station at which he began his illustrious career in radio.

Here's what the Enquirer said in an editorial:

"The old bromide holds true with regard to Ward Quaal: Cincinnati's loss is Chicago's gain.

"What Mr. Quaal stood for during his 4 years as vice president and assistant general manager of Crosley Broadcasting Corp. can be stated briefly as the highest broadcasting standards and genuine community and regional service. His voice in the councils at Crosley Square always was on the side of quality and responsibility.

"Mr. Quaal, a leader in the national broadcasting field, became an active citizen of Cincinnati when he came here in 1952 from the directorship of the Clear Channel Broadcasting Service in Washington, D. C.

"In departing to become vice president and general manager of the important WGN, Inc., in Chicago, he must step down as president of the Executives Club. We wish him all good luck."

Blinded Veterans' Association Tells Commander Wagner, of the American Legion, His Position in Support of Non-Service-Connected Pensions as No. 1 Leislative Priority Is "Indefensible"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable W. Marshall Smith, the national president of the Blinded Veterans' Association, has sent the following telegram to Comdr. J. Addington Wagner, of the American Legion:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 23, 1956.*

J. ADDINGTON WAGNER,
National Commander, American Legion, Indianapolis, Ind.:

American Legion stand on H. R. 7886 blocking chance of enactment compensation or pension legislation this session. Sincerely urge Legion switch support to H. R. 12038 so that needs of service-connected disabled veterans can be met. Many our members also Legion members. All would appreciate a Legion reversal of stand in favor of priority for H. R. 12038. Present Legion position indefensible. American Legion's assurances to Senate Finance Committee that H. R. 12038 will be allowed to pass Senate without amendment essential if combat-wounded veterans to get needed compensation increase before Congress adjourns. Legion can reassert true leadership veterans' affairs and earn gratitude disabled veterans and public esteem by favoring passage H. R. 12038 over H. R. 7886.

W. MARSHALL SMITH,
National President,
Blinded Veterans' Association.

Protect Right to Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article in the Fort Wayne New-Sentinel, by Dr. John Crance, the well-known columnist brings very forcefully to mind the ethics of seizing and holding enemy property indefinitely.

As leaders of the free world, it appears that we should resolve the ethical question while we are in comparative peace, and cool and clear-headed. During the hysteria and hatred engendered by war, these questions can never be resolved equitably or intelligently.

The article follows:

PROTECT RIGHT TO PROPERTY

(By John B. Crane)

FRANKFURT, GERMANY.—The Western World badly needs a special magna carta to protect private property rights and to help it win the struggle against communism, declared Germany's leading banker, Hermann J. Abs, in my 2 hour interview with him this week.

Banker Abs, who is sometimes called the Bernard Baruch of Germany and who is special financial advisor to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, expressed great alarm at the growing tendency since the war for various non-Communist governments to confiscate the private property of foreigners.

He cited specifically the recent taking over of foreign properties by the Argentine Government, the confiscation of foreign owned private properties by the Guatemala Government, and the decision of the Austrian Government last year to retain German properties confiscated after the war.

Western civilization is based on protection of the rights of individuals and of private property and will not succeed in its struggle with the Communist bloc unless it vigorously and faithfully defends these rights, he declared.

The refusal so far of the United States to return some $260 million of German properties in the United States, confiscated during the war, is not helping the western world in its struggle with the Communists.

CONFISCATION ENCOURAGED

On the contrary, asserted Abs, it is actually encouraging other nations to violate private property rights and to engage in policies of confiscation.

With American citizens having over $25 billion dollars invested abroad, it would be appropriate if America would take the lead in promoting a new international organization to work out effective devices for protecting private investments in foreign countries, he continued.

Here in Germany to help achieve this aim of better protection for foreign private in-

vestors, Abs and a group of leading German bankers and industrialists recently formed a special Society for Promotion of the Protection of Private Investments Abroad.

This society is now busy working out a proposed magna carta which it hopes will be adopted by all leading countries of the Western World.

All countries signing this magna carta would take joint steps to punish any individual nation which confiscated or seized the private properties of foreigners located within its boundaries.

The concerted action of the magna carta member countries might consist only of applying economic sanctions but, if necessary, could be followed up by common political action.

COMPENSATION REQUIRED

During my recent stay in Washington, Senate investigators told me that the Government group in Washington which was responsible for the confiscation of German properties during the war and which is fighting to retain the properties confiscated, in spite of the moral principle of private property rights, included Harry Dexter White and several of his pro-Communist friends.

As late as July 11 of last year, Dulles Townsend, Director of the American Office of Alien Property, during hearings on a bill to return German properties in America to their owners, declared: "You hear a lot of nonsense about the sanctity of property as such. As a matter of fact property as such does not have any sanctity. * * * Only the right to hold property is protected in the Constitution."

What Townsend failed to add was that when a State seizes property, it is bound by the Constitution to grant the proprietor adequate compensation.

America, the leading country in the Western World, in preaching individual freedom and the protection of individual and private property rights, could start practicing what it preaches and could help regain its moral leadership by returning to their rightful German owners the $260 million worth of private property seized during the war.

Mr. Humphrey's Bite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, of course the Members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet are interested in the forthcoming campaign. They have every reason and right to be.

But whether they should head campaign committees, thereby involving their high offices, is open to question.

An editorial in the July 26 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald questions the propriety of Treasury Secretary Humphrey's agreeing to serve as chairman of a campaign committee in Ohio. The editorial, edited to conform to the rules of the House, follows:

MR. HUMPHREY'S BITE

The interest of Treasury Secretary Humphrey in helping elect a Republican Congress in November is altogether understandable. Not so much can be said for Mr. Humphrey's judgment in agreeing to serve as chairman of * * * a campaign committee in Ohio. The committee reportedly was undertaken to raise a $400,000 campaign fund * * *.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the ultimate responsibility for ruling on Federal tax cases from all over the country, including Ohio. Although Secretary Humphrey's personal integrity and honorable intentions are not in the slightest question, his position at the head of a campaign raising political funds might lend itself to misunderstanding on the part of persons solicited. The solicitations might be construed as alternatively a command or a come-in for favorable treatment. The chief fiscal officer of the Government, a senior member of the Cabinet, ought to be especially at pains to set an example in his conduct and to refrain from any political activity of the sort that might involve his office even remotely. Surely Mr. Humphrey, when he thinks about it, will see the impropriety of the extracurricular job he has undertaken.

Stassen and His Team Play

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it may be assumed that many are interested in the political situation which confronts the Republican Party at the moment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Is the gentleman addressing the House?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am trying to address the Speaker, because I think the Speaker is more interested than the gentleman. I see my friend from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY] here. I know he is interested in the same situation, which intrigues me, so if you gentlemen will come down here to the front we can discuss the matter face to face. Thank you all.

This is the incident which has been bothering me.

For some time I have been endeavoring to learn the source of and the reason for the opposition to our former colleague, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON. I have inquired of my constituents when I have been home. I have read the papers. I have consulted my colleagues. I have asked the Library of Congress, the Research Department, to see if they could learn just what was back of this opposition to DICK NIXON. I was unable to get any satisfactory answer or, in fact, any answer at all except from some Democratic politicians who said that he was altogether too severe in what he had to say about the Democrats and their political philosophy.

I do not know that he ever said anything very bad about them. I thought that at times he had been rather week in his statements and in criticism. Then, just yesterday it was, some of my colleagues on the Republican side took me aside and said, "Why are you fussing around, trying to find the reason for the opposition to the Vice President. We can tell you." I said, "Well, all right, that is fine. Why did Stassen do that—being a member of the Eisenhower family, the official family and on the team?" Why did he publicly state that with NIXON on the ticket we would get less votes than with some other candidate? If he has any political sense at all he knows better." I do not think he is the quarterback on Ike's team, but I know he is a big fellow and thinks the world of himself and might, maybe, in his conceit, think he was getting his orders direct from the White House. Well, they said, "That is not so. There is a group in New York—not New Jersey, but in New York who have plenty of money and very able, adroit, skilfull—let us put it—lawyers—also some people in the banks and big money outfits who make large loans, do big business with nations and groups abroad. The lawyers get big fees and the bankers get a whale of a big commission or slice and the big Wall Street moneychangers, out of the billions floating around in our dealings with other countries." As I understand it, under the Roosevelt administration which it was said was to drive the moneychangers out of Washington, the drive was not wholly successful. They did not get clear out of the country—they stopped over in New York—they crossed to New Jersey. It would not harbor them.

Mr. TUMULTY. No, they are in the Republican Party now, as I understand it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The big money boys that are Stassen backers are in the Republican Party, or so they claim, they claim they are now reformed, honest, and decent. But in my opinion they are what they have always been—money grabbers—lacking in patriotism, thinking and acting only for their own selfish interests. I congratulate you people over there in Jersey for denying them sanctuary. In any event, they hang out in New York City at the moment. Stassen got in with those gentlemen and the more foreign aid they could get—the aid did not go across—the dollars stayed here but they would send some junk that they picked up from Chicago, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia—none in New Jersey—they picked up this junk for those good dollars that the Congress appropriated and sent it over there. And Stassen was working for that group on a sort of a 50–50 basis.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. That is where they picked Stassen up, going through Philadelphia when he was president of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They made a mistake in getting him. He will do their dirty work—but he is so obsessed with his idea—his conviction of his own importance that he will doublecross them at the first opportunity.

Mr. TUMULTY. We were glad to give him to them. I wonder whether Stassen was a part of the junk they picked up?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; wait a minute. I made a couple of talks here a few years ago about the gentleman. He was not described as good junk. I

never even received a congratulatory message or any message from him at all on either. He did not thank me or publicly approve of it.

Now, this other group is an entirely different group. This gentleman said to me, "You know that drive against NIXON originates in New York. He is just too intelligent, too aggressive, too honest for them. Those boys are furnishing the money with this other group of moneyed men." I said, "Well, who are they?" He said, "Well, they are the friends of those Rosenberg spies who were convicted and executed. He said they blame NIXON for starting that drive against the Commies which finally got the Rosenberg spies when he got after Hiss."

Well, if that is so, you get the picture and now you see the artists who drew it. The big money for the Stassen drive comes out of New York, and you learn that the friends of the Commies are hooked up with the other outfit. It looks as if that is the kind of a drive that Stassen is putting on. But it looks to me as though if he will just publicize the source of his financial aid and the real names of his scrubs and Red backers and let the people of the country know that DICK NIXON is being opposed by these money changers and being opposed by friends of the Rosenbergs, not only will NIXON not lose any 6 percent of the vote—and I admire the Governor of Massachusetts, as we all do—we served with him, and we know he is a wonderful, fine man, a lieutenant of Hoover, who distributed food after World War I. NIXON will get a far larger vote than would any other candidate for Vice President. Stassen is just thinking about Stassen.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Are these friends of the Rosenbergs who are in New York who are the money changers, in your opinion?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, there are two distinct groups. The lawyers and the big bankers, the money chasers whose god is the dollar. You see, they are just one group. That group, on the one side, which handle these international funds. Out of which they get millions and for the appropriation of which Stassen is partly responsible.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And the other ones are the friends of the Rosenbergs?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. And the friends and backers—the supporters of any and all Commies.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And in the gentleman's estimation——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know. I am just repeating gossip which seems to be all too true. Perhaps I should not, but it comes from a source that is reliable and is quite in line with the Commies' procedure.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gossip that the gentleman heard is that these people within the two groups are the people who were supporting Stassen in his opposition to our former colleague, Mr. NIXON.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is the situation. Stassen is working for Stassen, using his pretended opposition against NIXON for his own advancement. But he gets his money from the source indicated and is being used by those who supported the Rosenberg spies and others of that disloyal group.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman will concede that he is not advancing very rapidly.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Who, Stassen?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I saw a cartoon, I do not know whether it was in the Washington Star or the Chicago Tribune I think it was, where he was hanging on to this something coming from the ceiling—on a rope. It was not around his neck but he had hold of it and he was going all right. But the rope broke and he was going down—down through the floor and into the cellar.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Stassen?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; Stassen was going down—down to the bottom—on his bottom.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. He was Stassenated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that—Stassenated? Yes; I think that was the idea.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. He was Stassenated.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I do not think that was all that he deserved. I think he should have something worse than that done to him but that would do for a starter. Stassen does not care anything about that good and great Governor of Massachusetts, Chris Herter. Stassen is just promoting Stassen and aiding his Red international backers.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The rules prohibit discussing exactly what he may have deserved in the estimation of those who think highly of Mr. NIXON.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, we all think highly of Mr. NIXON. I know on your side you are all unanimous in your high regard for him, very much like it was today here with our friend from Massachusetts, Mr. Nicholson—you all loved him and praised but some voted against him. I assume you all respect and admire NIXON. I know you do but some of you of course will vote for your own candidate come November—and with that no one will complain.

If you put up a ticket after Eisenhower is through his next term—which will be around 1960—of NIXON and KENNEDY, if I am around—and I do not expect to be—I will vote for both on that ticket NIXON and KENNEDY. That would make a wonderful ticket of outstanding, patriotic young Americans.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman says our distinguished former colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, is a distinguished and fine representative of the American people and is worthy to be on anyone's ticket?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have it right so far as you have gone—but you might well have said much more in his praise. Having served 6 years with him on the Committee on Education and Labor I cannot do otherwise than agree with you. He certainly is an outstanding, able, sincere young man, and I am sure will be deemed qualified and deserving by the people of this country in time to come for any office he may seek, but I hope that he has a switch in his party convictions. It would be a wonderful ticket, NIXON and KENNEDY, or KENNEDY and NIXON.

But I am not trying to take over Stassen's role of suggesting anyone as a candidate. You know how it is, somebody comes along and suggests something to you and you think you thought of it and then you find you did not, but I wanted to pretend I did, and I think there is something to this idea of the dollar worshipers and Reds backing Stassen in the effort to keep NIXON whom they fear off the Republican ticket.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman think the Scripps Howard paper may have had any support of Stassen's move against our former colleague, the distinguished Vice President, Mr. NIXON?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never had any support from any national newspaper that I know of. I know, having been here a couple of years I am supposed to know everything; as a matter of fact I know nothing at all of the newspaper business.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The basis of my question is that they apparently had some advance information and perhaps fostered this a little with the New York crowd the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Scripps-Howard?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know about that. But they have been against the Reds always. I would not want to say anything about Scripps-Howard papers because I do not know. Have no idea of their political policy.

Mr. TUMULTY. It seems to me that Stassen by his move has demonstrated lack of judgment and lack of regard for his leader. It seems to me he has shown lack of party loyalty.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Where does the gentleman get the idea that Stassen was ever loyal to any party? To any idea?

Mr. TUMULTY. I never got that idea; I was just making the observation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is not that expecting too much of Mr. Stassen—that is that he be loyal to anyone, to anything other than to his own selfish ideas, if he is a member of Ike's team he is throwing his passes the wrong way.

Mr. TUMULTY. We all expect a lot of everyone, but I was speaking by and large.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You were what?

Mr. TUMULTY. Speaking by and large of the Republican Party itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that if the gentleman wants it he be given 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman want me to take the 5 minutes and then yield it to him? I would be glad to do so.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I was just enjoying this colloquy so much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You and I are two at least. I do not wish to longer delay adjournment.

Water Pollution Control Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. KENNETH J. GRAY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 13, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9540) to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was indeed happy to see the House pass H. R. 9540, the antipollution bill. As a Member of the House Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, it was my privilege to play a small part in assisting our able chairman, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, of Minnesota, with this bill in the committee and its final passage on the floor.

The need for accelerated action to abate the pollution of streams is long over due. I would like to quote from a speech made on May 4, 1956, in Cincinnati, Ohio, by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Roswell B. Perkins. He had this to say about the water-pollution problem:

Water pollution is the end result of a great variety of factors which by themselves attract only local and passing attention. The difficulty is that no bells ring and no lights flash to warn the people of a community that the danger point has been reached.

A new factory here, a new housing development there, a new office building somewhere—these are the symbols of our national growth and prosperity, the symbols of 20th century progress. Multiplied all up and down a river system, they are also symbols—to the sanitary engineer—of water supply and water pollution control problems. But in the clamor and clang of a busy and prosperous world, with its endless competing demands for people's attention, the warning voice of the sanitary engineer and those of his associates in the health department are not always heard. And even when public interest is aroused, needed help for constructive action is frequently a long time materializing.

I think Mr. Perkins' statement is very forthright and I am only fearful that the $50 million per year authorization for grants in this bill for sewage disposal treatment plants will not be adequate to take care of the situation. I have many municipalities in my congressional district that are in need of sewage treatment facilities, but due to their limited bonding powers are unable to construct these facilities on their own. One city, Murphysboro, Ill., a fine community of approximately 8,000 people, has been ordered by the courts to build a sewage treatment plan and would be willing, but is financially unable. Legislation such as this will be of material benefit to those communities, which for economic and other reasons are not financially able to comply with abatement orders.

I am hopeful that the amount of money authorized in the bill will be allowed by the Appropriations Committee each year to carry out this very important program, and that the Congress will insist that it be pushed as expeditiously as possible.

I deeply appreciate the time and effort expended by all of the members of the House Committee on Public Works for their diligent and untiring efforts in working out a solution to this complicated problem. I particularly want to congratulate the author of the bill, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, for doing an outstanding job.

Assembly of Captive European Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the Captive European Nations, an organization having members speaking on behalf of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania. The statement concerns the recent uprisings in Poland.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EVENTS IN POLAND AS A THREAT TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

In a telegram to the president of the Security Council on June 29, 1956, the Assembly of Captive European Nations called attention to the uprisings in Poland, and especially to the outbreaks of violence in Poznan immediately prior to that date. In the same telegram ACEN asked the president of the Security Council "that the latter take all appropriate measures to put an end to the violent repression of the Polish population * * * to condemn the regime responsible for crimes perpetrated in Poland * * * to institute an investigation of Soviet aggression, domination, and colonial exploitation."

In virture of article 34 (chapter VI) of the United Nations Charter: "The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security."

There is no doubt that the above-qouted article of the U. N. Charter finds its application to the present-day situation in Poland, because (a) it is a situation which might lead to international friction; and (b) because its continuance is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

THE POLISH SITUATION MIGHT LEAD TO INTERNATIONAL FRICTION

Polish independence, freedom, and right to self-determination through free and unfettered elections have been recognized as an international problem during and after the Second World War. Soviet Russia herself recognized the international character of this problem by submitting it to international conferences, and especially by formally endorsing the Atlantic Charter and subscribing to the Yalta agreement on liberated Europe in which the aforementioned fundamental rights of the Polish nation were solemnly recognized. It was due to the international agreements entered upon in Yalta and Potsdam that the U. S. S. R. secured the right to maintain lines of communication on Polish soil in order to ship troops and supplies to her garrisons in Eastern Germany. The consistent series of one-sided and arbitrary violations of these international agreements by the U. S. S. R. led to continuous frictions among the powers of the United Nations. They resulted in increased international tension, in the cold war, and in a persistent grave threat to international peace and security.

The U. S. S. R.—in spite of her solemnly assumed pledges—has steadily interfered with Polish domestic problems. It was due to her interference that the elections to the Polish Sejm (Parliament) in 1947 were falsified and the Polish nation was deprived of any semblance of freedom. The Polish administration and especially the so-called Polish Government have been and still are obedient tools of Moscow and not public servants of the Polish nation. The Polish Army was placed under the command of Soviet Marshal Rokossowsky with Soviet officers occupying all higher ranks. Human and political rights have been suppressed by the security police built up and maintained by U. S. S. R. citizens. Under these circumstances, there is no ground to assert that the presence of Soviet Russian troops on Polish soil is due to the free will of the Polish nation. If their presence on Polish soil 11 years after the end of World War II can be explained at all, it is only in terms of the international agreements entered into by the United States, Great Britain, and the U. S. S. R. that such an explanation can be given. This, in its turn, proves that the situation in Poland is a result of international agreements violated by the U. S. S. R. The fact that an alleged Polish government—against the will of the Polish nation—consented to the stationing of units of the Red army on Polish soil in no way diminishes the international character of the Polish problem. The international character of the Polish problem has been recognized by the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in their repeated protests against the violations of the Yalta agreements.

Furthermore, the present situation in Poland is the result of the continuous intervention and interference of the U. S. S. R. with Polish domestic order and policies; such Soviet Russian interference has occurred before as well as after the signing of the Warsaw Mutual Assistance Pact by which the so-called Polish Government gave its consent to the stationing of Russian troops on Polish soil. The recent disorders and uprisings in Poland are, thus, the reaction to a situation created by the intervention and interference of a foreign power with the internal matters of a nation whose freedom was curbed from the beginning of the alleged liberation.

This foreign intervention—which finds its visible signs in the presence of the Red army on Polish soil—constitutes in itself clear evidence of the international character of popular uprisings directed against the foreign occupants and usurpers.

THE CONTINUANCE OF THE PRESENT-DAY SITUATION IN POLAND IS LIKELY TO ENDANGER THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

The seriousness of the situation in Poland is not denied even by the Polish Communist Government. The street fightings which

ended only on June 30 in Poznan, had taken at least 200 to 300 lives with hundreds more severely wounded. Even official sources admitted the killing of 48 persons. The seriousness of the uprisings in Poznan has been proven by the fact that they could be crushed only after 3 days of streetfighting by 2 armored divisions and thousands of policemen assisted by units of the Red army. Eyewitnesses reported that during the riots public buildings in Poznan and railway tracks leading to that city were guarded by Soviet Russian troops, giving thus evidence of an inadmissible armed interference of the U. S. S. R. on Polish territory.

Although the popular revolts in Poznan and in other localities of Poland had been quelled by force and violence with complete disregard to human life, the continuance of the causes of tension and unrest in Poland might easily provoke their recurrence and their spreading over neighboring countries where the populations suffer the same plight.

As the suppression of all political rights, artificially created food shortages as well as resentment over the prolonged and indefinitely lasting occupation by the U. S. S. R. are identical causes of popular unrest in a region inhabited by nearly 100 million people, there is safe ground to fear that disorders and uprisings similar to that of Poznan might soon break out in other cities and countries of Central and Eastern Europe. The use of violence in crushing such uprisings would further increase tension and this, in turn, might provoke popular revolts on such a scale as to endanger the peace and security of a considerable part of Europe.

The fact that the uprisings in Poland are not isolated phenomena only further strengthen the view that they endanger international peace. They form a link in the chain of popular revolts started in East Berlin and Pilsen in 1953. All of them were ultimately directed against the interference of a foreign power with the domestic problems of Central and Eastern European nations. As the grievances of the Eastern and Central European nations are the same, as these nations lay the responsibility for their plight to the same door, a contagious spreading of popular revolts is to be feared.

COROLLARY ON THE GUATEMALAN AND ALGERIAN SITUATION

(a) The uprising in Guatemala which occurred in 1954 was not likely to endanger international peace because its whole impact was restricted to the country in question. The causes of unrest, as well as the grievances of the population were restricted in their impact to the territory of Guatemala. No foreign country kept troops in Guatemala in 1954, nor were the Guatemalan insurgents commanded by officers whose allegiance went to a foreign great or small power. There was no danger to the international peace, because there was no fear that the unrests, disorders, and uprisings in Guatemala could spread to any neighboring country.

(b) Algeria has been internationally recognized as an integral part of France. The latter country has never recognized in any international agreement that the Algerian situation was of international concern. No international conference was convened to deal with the Algerian problem with the consent of France.

NOTE ON THE PROPAGANDA VALUE OF THE POLISH QUESTION

In spite of the dissimilarity of the Polish and Guatemalan situations, the case of Guatemala was exploited by the U. S. S. R. in the Security Council for creating the impression as though the events which occurred there in 1954 were due to United States, i. e., foreign interference.

Should the Security Council reject any proposal aimed at ordering investigation into the causes of the recent events in Poland, it would be still in the interest of the free world to stir up debate within the Security Council and to point out the underlying causes of the Polish unrests, figuring first among them, the continuous intervention of the U. S. S. R. in Poland and the actual occupation of Poland by the Red Army under the pretext of maintaining communication lines.

The Decline of Public Regulation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, in reading through the July issue of the Rural Electrification magazine, the publication of the National Rural Electrification Asscociation, I was impressed by an article dealing with public utility regulation. This article is the statement made by Horace M. Gray, professor of economics at the University of Illinois on February 29, 1956, before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee.

I am sure that many Members have already seen this article and have been impressed, as I was, by keen examination of this important problem. Mr. Gray brings to this examination many years of study and experience, and I am convinced that much can be gained by a study of his position. If we are to grant legal monopolies, which is our practice, then the actual efficiency and usefulness of its regulation becomes a matter of critical importance. Mr. Gray makes a through examination of the theory and the practice of regulation, going back to the most basic tenets, and presents conclusions which deserve the serious consideration of this body. I recommend a review of this article and of his position.

The article follows:

THE DECLINE OF PUBLIC REGULATION

(By Horace M. Gray)

My name is Horace M. Gray. I am professor of economics at the University of Illinois, where for over 30 years I have devoted a major portion of my time to the study of monopoly and the efforts of government to prevent it, where competition is technically possible, or to control it, where the technical conditions of production render competition impracticable. In connection with the latter I have given special attention to the public regulation of the so-called natural monopolies (i. e., transportation and public utilities) by independent commissions, both State and Federal. These studies have led me gradually and somewhat reluctantly—for I had hoped for its success—to the conclusion that public regulation, as presently constituted and administered, is ineffective and that it fails to serve the public interest. In fact, there is strong evidence to support the contention that these commissions actually perform a public disservice by aiding and abetting at public expense the very monopolies they are supposed to regulate.

CAUSE OF DECLINE

How may one account for the decline, or institutional degeneration, of public regulation? Why have these independent commissions, which were launched with such high hopes and roseate expectations during the late 19th and early 20th centuries, in the brief span of a few decades so deteriorated in morale, integrity, and devotion to the public interest as to arouse widespread criticism and loss of public confidence? What are the institutional forces at work in our society which have brought it to pass that the independent regulatory commissions, once proudly acclaimed as the fourth branch of the Government, are today in such disrepute as to warrant Congress' investigation? Why do so many former advocates of public regulation, who fought to get it established and to make it more effective, now despair of its success and cast about for alternative solutions? Why is it that today the strongest support for the independent commission system of regulation comes from the regulated industries, who formerly opposed it so bitterly?

It would be easy to supply plausible, yet superficial, answers to these questions. The literature is full of such explanations, such as the appointment of unqualified commissioners, shortage of expert staff, insufficient funds, rapid turnover of personnel, limited powers and jurisdiction, ambiguous statutes, the restrictive consequences of judicial review, and poltical pressure. These are secondary, and doubtless contributing factors, but they scarcely provide an adequate diagnosis of the degenerative process. If the institution were organically sound it could survive these minor ailments without permanent impairment of its vitality, especially since they are all susceptible of alleviation by corrective measures of a practical character. This committee would be ill-advised indeed to devote all its time and energy to investigating these secondary symptoms, particularly the ad hominem argument of unqualified commissioners, to the exclusion of more fundamental causes. If one would ascertain the basic cause for the degeneration of this, or any other social institution, one must push the inquiry back to the underlying conceptional foundation on which it rests. In the long run an institution is sound and immune from decay only insofar as its basic premises are internally consistent and functionally realistic.

The theoretical rationalization of public utility regulation proceeds somewhat as follows. Competition, while preferable in the abstract, is neither viable nor practicable in certain industries, for technological and social reasons (public convenience and necessity). Some form of monopoly, therefore, is essential. Since, however, private monopoly is unthinkable because of its exploitative propensity and public monopoly is objectionable on ideological grounds, a compromise form—legalized private monopoly subject to public regulation—appears to offer the best solution. Under this dispensation private monopoly is legalized and designated as the chosen instrument of society for the performance of some specified function; direct competition is proscribed as inimical to the public interest; an independent commission is charged with regulating this legalized private monopoly with a view toward making it behave in a manner consistent with the traditional ideal of competition. Thus, public regulation, it is assumed, will operate as a substitute for competition.

LEGALIZING MONOPOLY

By this system society avoids the waste and inconveniense of competition; secures the economies of centralized production and large-scale technology, and yet, by the alchemy of public regulation, escapes the ill consequences of unrestricted private monopoly. It is an ingenious, though somewhat naive, synthesis whereby society can enjoy the benefits of competition by abolishing it, and avoid the evils of private monopoly by creating and legalizing it. In short, one can have monopoly and not have it at the same time. This seeming contradiction, it is assumed, can be resolved by

public regulation, which will function as a catalytic agent to reconcile private monopoly with the public interest. It is a reflection of the facile optimism and naivete of the late 19th and early 20th centuries that men generally believed that an institutional arrangement so beset by internal contradictions and based on such incompatible premises could function satisfactorily or long retain its vitality. Perhaps it should be said, by way of extenuation, that these men were institutional pioneers whose limited experience in this area provided no adequate insight into either the nature of legalized private monopoly or the limitations of public regulation under the police power. Certainly, they did not foresee the shape of things to come.

The inexorable process of institutional erosion, it is now apparent, has blighted this earlier dream and undermined the precarious compromise on which it was based. Experience has demonstrated that the lion of legalized private monopoly cannot be induced, by the soothing ministrations of regulation, to lie down peacefully with the lamb of public welfare. The aggressive propensities of private monopoly, enhanced and aggravated by legitimatization, have inevitably triumphed over the weak vacillating and negative restraints of the police power. The lion has devoured the lamb or, to shift the analogy, the servant has become lord in the house of his master. The sovereign police power, originally invoked to protect the public from the aggressions of private monopoly, has in the fullness of time been so completely subverted that today it operates to promote, defend and subsidize the very monopolists it is assumed to regulate. How can this startling institutional transformation be explained?

GAINING SOCIAL APPROVAL

The basic explanation, I suggest, must be sought by a critical analysis of the two opposing institutions—legalized private monopoly and public regulation—which we have vainly attempted to maintain in a state of workable equilibrium. Let us examine briefly the inherent nature of each.

Private monopoly is an organized system of economic aggression in which the monopolist, having acquired some degree of control over the market, exploits this economic power to maximize profit. So long as it is illegal, or exists in a state of outlawry, private monopoly, though inherently oppressive and antisocial, is reasonably tolerable. Being in constant jeopardy, both from the law and competition, it must dissimulate, curb its aggressions and rely on its own limited resources for defense against its natural enemies, the democratic state and free competition. Under these adverse conditions private monopoly can never achieve immunity, security, or total economic power; on the contrary, it is continuously threatened with extinction by competition or legal sanctions, or by some combination of the two. Thus, if the monopolist is to enjoy permanently some satisfactory measure of security, power and profit, he must by some contrivance manage to attain legitimacy. That is, he must gain social approval, recognition, and status, and be accorded standing before the law as the chosen instrument of society for the performance of some essential economic function.

A DEPENDENT SOCIETY

Once he attains such legitimacy, however, the now legally sanctioned and socially approved private monopolist becomes intolerably arrogant, oppressive, inefficient, and corruptive. He is now a ward of the state, immune from both competition and legal prosecution, assured of profit without competitive striving or efficiency, and yet, within a broad latitude of tolerance, still free to aggrandize his monopoly power and to exploit his privileged market position. Worst of all, the society which thus legalizes private monopoly is henceforth increasingly dependent on it; having burned its institutional bridges and given hostages to fortune, the society can neither get rid of the monopolist, nor compel him to behave in the public interest, nor resist his importunities for additional privileges, returns, and subsidies. The servant has now become master. This reversal of roles means that henceforth the society must support its erstwhile servant in the style to which he aspires. Any reluctance to do so is met and overcome by a twofold pressure exerted by the legalized private monopolist—the sabotage of vital economic services and corruption of both public opinion and government. The impact of these pressures on a society already committed to dependency on its chosen instrument is well-nigh irresistible.

Public regulation, under the police power, is a frail reed with which to defend society against such aggressions. In the first place, it is essentially negative in character, operataing intermittently by restraint and veto against particular private actions that are deemed inimical to the public interest. It can interdict certain acts of private management, but it cannot substitute its judgment for that of private management nor compel positive action in the public interest. The positive functions of management, such as planning, organizing, financing, procurement, technological innovation, marketing, and price policy, are beyond its purview or control except as in their execution some peripheral violation may occur. Thus, power, initiative, and decisions—all motivated by private interest—rest in the hands of legalized private monopoly, while public regulation, excluded from the decision making process and relegated to the sidelines, can only intervene on behalf of the public interest when some vetoable transgression is apparent.

Even here, however, the capacity of regulation to protect the public interest is seriously circumscribed. Its veto of private action must run the gantlet of protracted and expensive litigation, with the outcome of judicial review doubtful. The strategic advantage always lies with the private monopolist for he can over-top many fold whatever expenditures a commission dares to venture on such litigation and, then, by virtue of his monopoly power recover it from consumers through the rates for service. Again, the legalized private monopolist can circumvent public regulation, or even compel it to accede to his demands, by propaganda appeals to public opinion or by political pressure brought to bear against the regulatory commission. Here, as in the case of litigation, the outlays for propaganda and political activity can be shifted to consumers through the rates.

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

In the second place, the strategic position of public regulation is further weakened, to the point of being completely untenable, by the ill-fated marriage of the police power with the power of privilege in our system of independent commissions. The commissions, contrary to the generally accepted view, are not solely an embodiment of the police power. Rather, they possess, in addition, the sovereign power to grant special privileges, an ancient prerogative of kings, subsequently transferred to legislatures, still later entrusted to these independent commissions. No greater mistake was ever made, or conceivably could have been made, in the early history of public regulation in this country than to sanction this miscegenation on the fallacious assumption that effective application of the police power requires a foundation of special privilege. Under this pernicious doctrine the granting of special privileges has become the principal business of regulatory commissions and exercise of the police power a minor function. With every grant of privilege legalized private monopoly becomes stronger and public regulation under the police power becomes weaker. Ultimately regulation becomes so attenuated and ineffective as to be almost worthless and regulatory commissions become the prisoners and handmaidens of the privileged organizations they have created. This, in brief, is the tragic history of public regulation in our time.

A careful and critical analysis of the work of State Public Utility Commissions and of Federal Commissions, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, during the past 20 years, will confirm this judgment. Their energies, resources and legal powers have been devoted primarily to promoting, defending and subsidizing the legalized private monopolies under their jurisdiction. The following activities are indicative of this preoccupation with the advancement of private rather than public interests:

1. The granting of exclusive privileges in the public domain, public ways, hydro sites, airways, radio frequencies and television channels.

2. The destruction or limitation of competition, both active and potential, in transportation (highway, water and air), communication (wire, radio and television), and energy supply (electricity and gas) in order to protect established monopolies.

3. The solidification and expansion of private monopoly power by means of additional grants of privilege, discrimination in rates and services, acquisitions, mergers and consolidations, and combinations involving substitute services and technologies.

4. The use of regulatory power to inhibit or frustrate the emergency and efficient functioning of alternative institutional arrangements for supplying services—i. e., Federal, State, local, cooperative, and private enterprises—which pose a threat to legalized private monopolies.

5. The invocation of the police power to raise rates by millions of dollars to cover excessive costs, provide lucrative returns on artifically inflated property values, and to force consumers to contribute new capital for the expansion of private facilities.

6. Permitting private monopolies to recoup from the defenseless public millions of dollars spent for institutional advertising, propaganda, political activity and litigation—all of which expenditures are functionally unnecessary for the supply of services and are relevant only to the preservation of private monopoly.

7. Permitting corporate income taxes to be shifted to the public as a cost of doing business, and allowing tax subsidies, such as accelerated amortization and rapid depreciation, to be treated as costs.

This solicitude for private monopoly and disregard for the public interest produces an almost universal loss of confidence in the independent regulatory commissions. They are commonly regarded as the pliant and subservient agents of the regulated industries. According to this view, there exists a fusion of private economic power and public political power in which private power preempts the sovereign power of government and uses them for its own selfish purposes. Such a system conforms to the Fascist, not the democratic, model. It is not regulation at all, in the traditional sense contemplated by the founders of commission regulation, but rather a system of State-created, State-supported private monopoly in which Government compels consumers and taxpayers, against their will and contrary to their interests, to sustain the excessive costs, inefficiencies and exactions of private monopolies.

When an institution reaches this level of degeneration, or functional obsolescence, it becomes practically worthless—in fact, it

may constitute a menace to social progress and well-being. If so, the time is ripe for a fundamental reconstruction, or transformation, of the institution to bring it into accord with modern realities and social needs. We have, I suggest, reached this state of crisis in respect to public regulation by independent commissions, and are confronted with a major task of institutional reorganization. This is an undertaking in which piecemeal tinkering with the superstructure of regulation will not suffice. The situation calls for fundamental changes in two directions: (1) The eradication, or neutralization, of legalized private monopoly—the principal source of malignancy; (2) the reconstruction of public regulation to abolish grants of special privilege, to provide for positive planning in the public interest, and to protect consumers. To these ends the following courses of action would be relevant.

1. Functions which under proper management could be performed competitively, with only minimum police regulation, should be so organized. The possibilities for competition, while limited, are greater than commonly supposed and should be exploited fully.

2. Where, for technical reasons, direct competition is impracticable institutional competition, or institutional diversity, may provide an alternative to private monopoly. These possibilities should be developed by breaking up private monopolies, on one hand, and promoting the establishment of diverse institutions—public cooperative and private, on the other.

3. In certain situations the familiar "yardstick" principle could be used with advantage to provide standards by which private performance might be judged.

4. In other situations some form of public ownership would be preferable to private monopoly.

5. In still others some admixture of public and private participation—the "partnership" principle—might be advantageous, provided the private interest is subject to effective public control.

6. Where private monopoly must be retained for lack of any satisfactory alternative its power should broken by:

(a) The abolition of all special privileges.

(b) Changing its legal status from proprietorship to agency.

(c) Fixing its compensation on a strict cost basis, including the cost of capital.

(d) Prohibiting all expenditures for propaganda, political activity, and litigation opposing public regulation.

7. Independent regulatory commissions should be stripped of all power to grant special privileges, to limit competition, and to interfere with the development and operation of public and cooperative institutions. On the positive side, they should be charged with responsibility for planning in the public interest for protection of consumers and for strict enforcement of the agency requirements imposed on private monopolies.

This urgent and desirable transformation of public regulation is quite impossible unless the corrosive power of private monopoly is eliminated from the body politic. If they are to become a constructive force for public good the independent regulatory commissions must be freed from their present abject and menial role of handmaidens to private monopoly. This shift of role, however, is impossible so long as private monopolies are free to exert their corruptive influence from behind a sanctuary of special privilege and legal sanctions. The responsibility for breaking the power of private monopoly rests with the legislative branch of Government, at both State and Federal levels. It will do no good whatever to resort to the stereotyped ad hominem, bad man rationalization so commonly used to explain and excuse the decline of public regulation. It is not bad, incompetent or corrupt men who have brought our independent regulatory commissions to this low estate; hence, changes of regulatory personnel can never solve the problem. The first order of business is to eliminate or neutralize legalized private monopoly.

John H. Chandler: His Life a Sermon and Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. ROBSION, JR.
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the oldest and one of the most popular members of the bar of my home city of Louisville, Ky., is John H. Chandler. His record of 57 years as an active practitioner in the Louisville courts is currently unmatched; and it is believed that it is without precedent in the city's history.

During his long practice before the courts of Louisville and the State, John Chandler—now in his active eighties—has given greatly of his time and talents to serve the public welfare and many just causes which, without his efforts, would have gone unchampioned. He is a man of unremitting energy and courage.

While traditionally and idealistically he is a member of one of the two great political parties, he is no narrow partisan, but in word and deed is independent. He is bold and outspoken and never hesitates about crossing party lines when the choice of issues and candidates, in all good conscience, seems to require such action.

He is a devoted husband and father, a Christian gentleman, and universally esteemed and beloved.

Recently at a bar association luncheon in Louisville, Mr. Chandler delivered a brief, but most wise and timely, address. It appears in the June 1956 issue of the Kentucky State Bar Journal. In it he reveals some of the reasons for his fine record as lawyer and citizen.

Throughout his career John Chandler has thought little of the word "fame," but much of the word "duty." Yet in the discharge of duty he has achieved a just and during fame far above his thought and expectation. Indeed, his life and deeds constitute a sermon and example.

Believing that the message given in the bar association address is worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under leave granted, I make its inclusion a part of these remarks:

LUNCHEON ADDRESS OF MR. JOHN H. CHANDLER, SENIOR PRACTICING MEMBER OF THE LOUISVILLE BAR

Mr. President, I thank you for this honor and I thank God that he has allowed me to live to see this good hour.

As one of the oldest practicing lawyers of the Louisville bar—57 years—I wish to speak a word of friendly counsel to the younger generation of my brother lawyers.

The highest reward of a real lawyer is not the money he makes, but the respect and esteem of his fellowmen who know him, and particularly of his brother lawyers who know him best.

The first and fundamental qualifications of a real lawyer is basic moral integrity. Woodrow Wilson once said, "There are some things in life dearer than life itself. One of these is honor."

What does it profit a man if he gains a great fortune, if in doing so he parts with his honor, which no money can buy?

The second, and a very rare qualification, is mental integrity—the ability to think straight, to reason clearly, and decide justly, unswayed by prejudice, religious, political, racial, or selfish interests. Unfortunately most all of us go through life influenced, if not controlled, by one or more of these prejudices.

The third qualification is courage, not only physical, but more important, moral courage, which impels a man to stand up and fight for the right as God gives him to see the right—even at the sacrifice of popularity or self-interest. Lack of moral courage is the main cause of bad politics.

Blackstone says that the high purpose of the law is to "Command what is right and prohibit what is wrong"; most questions finally get down to the question of what is right and what is wrong.

Lord Coke says: "Law is the perfection of reason." Another high authority said: "The soul of the law is justice."

The Ten Commandments are based on moral law.

Seven civilizations have gone down before the barbarians. Ours, the eighth, is now in a life-and-death struggle for survival, not only from communism abroad, but from crime and corruption at home.

LAWYERS GUARDIANS OF JUSTICE

By education and training, lawyers are best fitted to frame the laws and to be the guardians of justice and the liberties of the peoples. Therefore, much of the blame for bad government and bad politics must rest upon the lawyers of the land; for most of the leaders in government and politics are lawyers.

There can be no higher ambition than to be a real lawyer. He must not only have the qualification of moral and mental integrity, physical and moral courage, but he should be not merely a moneymaker, but a patriot and much of a statesman. He should be endowed not only with high faculties of mind, but cardinal virtues of the heart, enhanced by intensive study and industry.

The American Bar Association now, as never before, represents all of the lawyers of the land and is devoted to the high purpose of fighting crime and corruption and cutting out the evils of questionable practice and elevating the profession to the high place it should occupy. Much credit for this is due Messrs. Marion W. Moore and Ben B. Fowler, delegates from Kentucky Bar Association to the ABA house of delegates; Edward A. Dodd, State delegate from Kentucky; and Blakey Helm, member of the board of governors of ABA.

Therefore, I urge every lawyer in Kentucky, who can, to join the American Bar Association in leading a united crusade to save our country from corruption and crime and save the world from communism.

In my later years I found great satisfaction in being a peacemaker first and a lawyer afterward.

It is amazing how many cases can be justly tried across the table, if lawyers will only advise their clients to do the right thing. The fee is not so large, but it is gratifying to know that you have saved your clients much time and needless expense, and thus relieve the overburdened courts from a multitude of cases which should never get to court.

Now, a final word to the younger generation of my brother lawyers. If you, by ap-

plication and industry, can climb the rugged road of the law, which is beset with many dangers and temptations; if you can go through life and maintain your own self-respect and the respect of your fellow men who know you best; if you can look back on much service rendered to your city, State, and Nation, and unfortunate men, without the hope of reward, then you can claim the high honor of being a real lawyer. Then you can sleep at night, keep on speaking terms with your conscience, and leave to your children and your children's children the heritage of a good name which the Bible says is "More precious than riches"; and when you come to face the sunset and reach the journey's end you can say with Paul, "I have kept the faith, I have finished my course, I have fought a good fight"—a fair fight, fair to the court, fair to your clients, and fair to your brother lawyers. You will then earn the highest reward of a real lawyer, the plaudit, "Well done thou good and faithful servant."

And now a word of warning, first to all lawyers, and next to all of our citizens. The American people in this day of unparalleled prosperity are so busy and so dizzy making money and having a high old time, that they do not seem to realize that today we are living in perhaps the most perilous time in all history—the imminent danger of destruction of Christian civilizations and the annihilation of the human race.

The Congressional Crime Commission, the American Bar Association Commission, and Mr. Edgar Hoover have brought out the appalling fact that crime in this country is costing the American people $20 billion a year, and that crime, particularly juvenile crime, is growing by leaps and bounds; that organized crime with seven overlords of the type of Al Capone covers the Nation like a vast spider web, so much so that if not controlled will threaten the very breakdown of Government in this land.

We must realize that the fight for liberty, justice, and the preservation of Christian civilization is an eternal conflict, requiring eternal vigilance and heroic courage.

Lest we forget. Lest we forget.

In the language of Lord Byron: "Awake, arise, or be forever fallen."

Authorizing Secretary of Agriculture To Pay the Expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation

SPEECH
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in relation to giving the Department of Agriculture any more money for anything I would like to comment on an article which appeared in the Columbus (Ohio) Citizen of last Sunday. The article is headed, "Hamilton Cattleman Helps To Square Away Pentagon", and tells about the Deputy Defense Secretary, Reuben B. Robertson, of Hamilton, Ohio, who is supposedly putting the Pentagon on a business-like basis. In the same article, it tells about his herd of 55 black Angus cows back in Hamilton, Ohio, and I quote, "the herd was losing so much money we had to sell them," said Robertson, "but I would say that the Military Establishment is in a pretty business-like condition."

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how anomalous you can get but it is pretty obvious that if Mr. Robertson is the right man to put the Pentagon on a business-like basis then the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, has gotten the agriculture in this country in a horrible mess if this great expert, Mr. Robertson, can run the Pentagon but can't afford to keep his farm.

The Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that this is the 30th anniversary of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which was organized in 1926. This event certainly should not be permitted to pass unremarked. In the opinion of many students of government, the Joint Committee and its remarkable staff, headed by Mr. Colin F. Stam, is the outstanding example of the legislative process at its best.

I had the honor to be chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the 83d Congress. In addition, of course, as Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the same Congress, I had a unique opportunity to recognize and appreciate the extraordinary contribution to good legislation which that staff traditionally has made. Mr. Stam has been its chief since 1938 and during this period of almost unparalleled service to the Congress he has always performed his duties with tireless conscientiousness, with impartial fairness, and with unquestioned integrity.

The Joint Committee staff generally has furnished the entire technical assistance to both the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate on every item of tax legislation, large and small, irrespective of which party happened to be in control of the Congress at any particular time. Thus, the staff has been a truly nonpartisan one, providing an extraordinary reservoir of professional talent available to all Members of the Congress regardless of party.

I know that many, many Members of both the House and the Senate are thoroughly familiar through personal experience with the extent and the caliber of the contribution which has been and is being made by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. There are others, perhaps, who have not had a similar opportunity to know the work of this staff and its chief, Mr. Stam. The staff is made up of some 26 individuals, professional and clerical. It has lawyers thoroughly experienced in the intricacies of the tax law. It has economists who are versed in the economic effects of tax policy and who study continuously the level of the Nation's economic activity in order that tax policy can be developed on a sound basis. It has expert accountants who are able to furnish invaluable information as to the practical application of tax rules in relation to actual business practice. It has statisticians able to provide information as to the revenue implications of tax proposals.

I would like to describe briefly the manner in which this remarkable staff assisted in developing the monumental new Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Throughout 1953, the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation was busy receiving suggestions for changes in the tax laws from individuals and groups throughout the country. It established staff subcommittees, made up jointly of personnel from the Treasury and Internal Revenue Service. These staff groups specialized in a large number of the more important aspects of taxation. They met with trade associations, business representatives, and professional and other groups for many months, and engaged with them in lengthy discussion of tax problems. In addition, of course, many suggestions for improvement in the tax laws were developed from within the Government itself. These many months of work by the staff were followed in January of 1954 by the submission of staff proposals to the Committee on Ways and Means. The committee had already held in the previous session some 6 weeks of public hearings at which literally hundreds of witnesses had testified. That great volume of public testimony had also been available to the joint committee staff in its labors. For about 6 weeks, starting in January of 1954, the committee met in executive session with the staff of the joint committee. Finally, a bill was prepared representing thousands of changes in the tax law. I have no hesitancy in saying that without the work of the staff of the joint committee and Mr. Stam, this extraordinary accomplishment would never have been possible.

Following consideration of the new Internal Revenue Code by the House of Representatives, the bill was referred in the Senate to its Committee on Finance. There the staff of the joint committee, again, became the technical advisory group. As a result, the tremendous experience which the staff had developed with this bill during its many months of work in the House was completely available to the other body. Finally, when the bill went to conference with a large number of Senate amendments, the joint committee staff assisted the conferees in working out the agreement which is represented today by that truly remarkable document, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This procedure which I have outlined above is one which is followed with respect to all tax legislation. I need hardly emphasize the great contribution

to the legislative process which this procedure furnishes. The continuity of staff work between the House and the Senate makes possible, I am convinced, a better type of legislation than could otherwise be achieved.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone into some length with regard to the work of the joint committee staff, not only because it is singularly appropriate on this, the 30th anniversary of its organization, but also because there has been a recent tendency in some quarters to criticize its work. I can think of no greater disservice to the legislative branch than any effort to undermine the effectiveness of the joint committee staff. True, it is not a partisan staff. Therefore, I can understand the dissatisfaction of those who would prefer to conduct tax policy on a partisan basis. True, Mr. Speaker, the basic approach of this staff could be called middle of the road. As a result, I can again understand the dissatisfaction of those whose economic thinking is either far to the right or far to the left.

I believe that the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation under its chief, Mr. Colin Stam, is an institution of which this Congress should be proud, and one which it should maintain and strengthen.

Address by Timothy J. Murphy, National Commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Independence Day Celebration of City of Boston, Mass., July 4, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid address made by Hon. Timothy J. Murphy, national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in Boston, Mass., on July 4, 1956, on the occasion of the Independence Day celebration of the city of Boston, Mass.:

It is a great source of inspiration to be present at this Independence Day celebration in Faneuil Hall, Boston, Mass.—the Cradle of Liberty. I am quite overwhelmed by the great privilege extended to me by Mayor Hynes to be the orator of the day.

I commend you who are participating in these exercises, as you appreciate that patriotism is the most valuable intangible that a Nation may possess. The history of our Nation is steeped in the noble character and sacrifice of our forebears. The flame and fervor of true patriotism must be forever kept alive in new generations.

It has been my privilege to have recently travelled in many areas of the world, including those where there are now tensions and trouble. The people in many of these countries are suspicious that the United States is dealing with the Reds, while urging others not to do so. Many of America's anti-Communist allies and anti-Communist friends in Soviet satellite countries have come to the conclusion that the United States, in spite of public statements to the contrary, is moving closer to the absolute recognition of the Soviet in the status quo.

The people of Poland—a religious and God-fearing people, who through their faith were able to withstand brainwashing and who are now breaking under the yoke of Communist slavery—sacrificed their lives to let the world know that behind the Iron Curtain communism was being challenged. They were turned back by machine guns, Red tanks, and army guns. Many lay dead on the streets in pools of their own blood.

Hope for the Polish patriots and their counterparts throughout the world will be lessened, if we succumb to the Soviet peace and love light opera. Before we change our ideas about the Soviet Union, we should insist upon some definite act of goodwill on its part. This act should be a free plebiscite on German unification and autonomy for Poland and other satellite countries. How can we expect those under the yoke of communism to continue opposition to the Red tyranny if we beat the drums for increased trade with the Soviet? Or will America be held in high esteem as a Government of principle and honor if we acquiesce in deals whereby puppet communist governments are accorded U. N. blessings in package deals with the Soviets?

We are in one of the most dangerous eras of civilization. The greatest threat to life is communism. Yes, we are in an era when scientists, physicists, and chemists have coaxed pernicious destruction out of the most basic element of nature, and great minds of the world are carefully planning how to administer lethal atomic discoveries to mankind. We are in an era of electronic devices, supersonic aircraft, intercontinental guided missiles, nuclear-powered submarines, radioactive fallout, and great technological advances.

We have been advised that in a few years the Soviet bloc and the Western allies will be in a nuclear deadlock and that a nuclear war would result in a minimum of 700 million deaths. It would mean disaster and destruction to the structure of civilization. It is evident, therefore, that civilization will not be saved by the solution of destructive technological or nuclear equations, but will be saved only when we find the solution to the human equation. It is essential, therefore, that we win the war of ideas because the minds and hearts of mankind will determine whether there will be a survival of civilization.

We are in a cold-war crisis which will not wait. The Reds are not impatient. The danger is not immediately imminent—they are projecting themselves into the future. They are not concerned too much with uprisings such as occurred in Poland, as they will stamp those out with blood while they prepare to indoctrinate the next generation with their communistic ideology. The Reds have made great advances without the firing of a shot by the Soviet Army. It has supreme excellence in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting. No world power—past or present—has ever surpassed the Soviet in the successful exercise of this technique. In comparison, Hitler was a rank amateur. But, mainly, Russia continues to be successful in the technique of the indirect approach that has gained so many subject peoples in the last 10 years. The Reds are fishing in the muddy political waters of the world, creating racial differences and exploiting tensions and disagreements. They are infiltrating political, economic, cultural, and religious organizations with the eventual goal of puppet party control. They are advanced in the knowledge of how the human mind functions, and are employing techniques of propaganda and brainwashing which are highly successful in attaining the results they seek.

We must meet this challenge on every front, using to the maximum our economic and intellectual resources, fighting fire with fire, building defense associations and alliances, tightening weaknesses in the defense lines, and standing throughout strong and resolute as a united people in matters of defense and foreign policy. More than anything we must have an exalted spiritual readiness to meet calmly, effectively, and intelligently the portentious days that lie ahead.

We must consider in all our foreign negotiations the morality of proposed agreements and maintain a strict adherence to principle and honor. We must never compromise principle and honor for political expediency. We must give greater stress to our spiritual greatness, because our real greatness lies in the imponderables of the American spirit, in which we as a nation are immeasurably rich. It is our greatest armor and our greatest weapon against communism.

America grew from a group of sparsely populated and poor States to a leviathan among nations. This Union of free States did not just suddenly happen, but is, in the light of history, a culmination—the promised land at the end of the long and bloody road on which man traveled in his qeust for freedom.

It is essential that our young people think hard and straight about the basic American principles; that they appreciate the fact that their colonial forebears put everything on the line—their homes, their farms, their equipment, their livelihood—and ever placed on the altar of liberty their lives—for the cause of freedom. They did this at a time when it appeared there was little chance for success, but they bled, starved, and froze at Valley Forge and on other battlefields to give us this Government under which we have sanctity as individual creatures of God. They gave us the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—the greatest documents known to mankind for the government of men. These documents reflect the solemnity of the Gospel, and we have maintained our strength because we have been a reverent Nation. It is good for us and the world that, by virtue of these documents, we respect and observe the biblical injunctions, and have had leaders who, in hours of crisis, were not ashamed to kneel and ask divine guidance.

Furthermore, this Nation was ordained by grassroots people and not by experts. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution were expressions of the thoughts and feelings of the plain people—farmers, laborers, mechanics, shopkeepers, and artisans. Their unorganized, but deeply felt ideas of a democracy, were, after much debate, given polish in language and exactness in content by such men as Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and the others. This was accomplished at a time when only the most cultured, highest born, and most aristocratic men could hold office in Europe, where the people had little, if anything, to say about the government. But a new race had developed here—one of men who had tasted liberty, and as the repression of their rights became more pronounced, the people rebelled.

As Admiral Morrison, the Harvard historian, recently pointed out: these documents were the product of many plain people, the hard-working, down-to-earth men of simple life, who expressed themselves freely as to the issues and particularly to such things as the Bill of Rights. The talks took place at town meetings, in gatherings at the village stores, in the vestries, and in the churches. Further, as Admiral Morrison wrote, those early people were "tough, but nervous"; "tenacious, but restless." They were a people with few social graces, yet capable of deep friendships and abiding loyalties, law-abiding, yet individualistic. They pioneered a great Nation with Bibles in hand.

To our colonial forebears should go our highest homage, and we who inherited their good earth should keep them in perpetual remembrance. We should constantly take inspiration from their sacrifice and take heed of their counsel. The responsibility of government should never be delegated to so-called specialists or experts or permitted to be assumed by any small group, however high they may be on the economic ladder. Nor should we abdicate our responsibility of determining how our children should be educated to any group of specialists, however impressive their academic degrees might be. There is a small group infiltrating our institutions of learning who, although not Communists, advocate various left-wing philosophies. They are not interested in observances like this one taking place today. They tag veterans and veterans' organizations as hero-worshipers—practitioners of a corny, outdated Americanism. This type of individual is so above the crowd that he thinks little and cares less of what the John Does and Bill Browns think about international issues. The voices of the "grass roots" are to them a thing of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

It is time to grow apprehensive when this group of teachers and articulate so-called intelligensia have access to our educational institutions and belittle the stature and ideals of our Founding Fathers—teachers that call John Adams an unintelligent lawyer, or Thomas Jefferson an insincere demagog, or George Washington a mediocre individual who had aspirations of royalty. Such teachers are purposely trying to weaken our youngsters' belief in the greatest men our country ever produced, and inferentially to belittle our institutions and government. They are not the people we want to teach our children.

Progressive or soft education has tended to produce selfish people instead of selfless people—people concerned with their material resources and with little or no appreciation of their obligations. It has produced, in place of the old-time-tested values, only a kind of vague, emotional do-goodism, such as world government, which has relatively little worth because there is no strong moral conviction to back it up.

No people can remain free if they are selfish or lack discipline and moral conviction, knowledge of their country and how it works, love for it, and a strong sense of duty toward it. The spiritual and inspirational examples of our Founding Fathers and those who followed in their footsteps and gave their all in dedication to the cause of American liberty should be made a reality in every phase of home and school thinking and practice. Sound patriotic education, solid Americanism, supported by facts, will more than anything else develop a profound love of country and a hatred of communism.

The milestones of the past should be the guidestones of the future. When the Declaration of Independence was proclaimed, the anniversary which we celebrate today, this country was poor. There was no industrial might, no rich resources, nor extreme wealth. Yet, many people in the world rallied to the cause of Americanism because they attached great significance to the spirit of America. We were not made great nor did we become a model and ideal for people in all parts of the world because we were rich. Contemporary lessons have proved that we cannot buy our way into the hearts and minds of other peoples.

We, therefore, must have an alertness to the danger of the Communist menace and the necessity of maintaining those high spiritual and moral values, whereby free peoples find inspiration to maintain and defend their basic liberties and possessions.

To repeat: We must give greater stress to our spiritual greatness, because our real greatness lies in the imponderables of the American spirit in which we as a Nation are immeasurably rich. It is our greatest armor and our greatest weapon against communism.

We cannot defeat an evil faith with no faith of our own. We have faith in America under divine guidance.

Eighty-fourth Congress Record in Behalf of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, 821 bills were referred to our Committee on Agriculture in the 84th Congress, to set a new record. In fact, the number of bills dealing with Agriculture was almost twice the previous record of 423 introduced in the previous Congress.

Our committee, with its 19 subcommittees, held 289 hearings.

We reported 113 bills.

We disposed of virtually all of the 821 bills referred to us, approving the best, consolidating the good points of others, and rejecting or passing over others. Among those not reported were a number of good bills that require further study before the Congress can act upon them.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture of the 84th Congress has handled the greatest legislative workload ever undertaken in any Congress, in a dedicated and devoted effort to bring to our farm people a fair share of the Nation's prosperity that rightly should be theirs. Although a Presidential veto defeated our major efforts to raise farm prices, the accomplishments of this Congress are such that each Member who has joined in the battles for our farmers may justly feel proud.

This Congress has made a magnificent record, but the welfare and prosperity of our farm families are a constant challenge. Much yet must be done. I hope in the months ahead, in direct association with farmers in their own fields, in their homes, in the country stores, at the county fairs, all of us may receive a new guidance and inspiration from them, to continue their battles in the 85th Congress when it convenes in January.

Mr. Speaker, while for each of the 11 years—1942–52 inclusive—our farmers had received average prices at 100 percent of parity or better, by the beginning of 1955, when this Congress convened, these prices had fallen far below a full parity relationship with the rest of the economy and farm income continued in a downward and devastating spiral. The average of farm prices had dropped 22 percent below the level of February 1951. Net farm income in 1954 had dipped about 30 percent under the income of 1947. The parity ratio was at the lowest level since 1941. Farm operating costs remained near record highs, and farm debt was increasing. Farmers' purchasing power had declined to the lowest level since 1940.

Our Committee on Agriculture, which it is my honor and privilege to serve as chairman, immediately set to work, in January 1955, to stem this new recession in agriculture, with the firm and resolute purpose of putting our farmers and their families again on the road toward income parity with our nonfarm population.

The most apparent and the most effective action open to this Congress, for quick relief of the farm distress, was to undo the damage of the Agricultural Act of 1954 which required that flexible—lower—price supports should be applied to the major crops.

This Congress approved H. R. 12, calling for an end to the downward flexing of prices; but we were thwarted and defeated by a Presidential veto. The will of the Congress did not prevail, as the President exercised his constitutional powers to reject H. R. 12. This will mean a loss of many millions of dollars to our farm families this year and it is my judgment that the veto has delayed a recovery of the farm economy.

Mr. Speaker, our fight was not in vain. Notwithstanding the veto, the Members should feel great pride in the record of this Congress in its accomplishments for agriculture. Our fight for 90 percent of parity forced Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, to raise the low prices he had set for the 1956 crops. As example, the Secretary had announced the support for wheat at $1.81 a bushel—76 percent of parity. This price was raised to $2 a bushel, or 84 percent of parity. The corn support was increased from $1.40 a bushel to $1.50, rice from $4.04 per hundredweight, to $4.50. The dairy supports were increased. Supports for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghum were lifted from 70 to 76 percent of parity. I believe our effort also brought about better supports for cotton and peanuts than Mr. Benson otherwise would have proclaimed.

This record of the 84th Congress bespeaks a deep interest in the people who till the soil.

The Congress established a $1,200,000,000 soil bank.

It enacted various legislation to protect the interests of small farmers and the rights of tenants and sharecroppers.

It improved the agricultural credit system, with special emphasis on the well-being of family-operated farms.

It improved the machinery for disposal of our farm products abroad.

It opened wider the doors of our warehouses to provide food for needy people in our own country.

It advanced research in agriculture.

It enacted legislation and appropriations to expand and improve rural electrical and telephone service.

It expanded the program to provide milk for millions of schoolchildren.

It improved and extended the Sugar Act, in a way to give our own cane and beet producers a larger share of the American sugar market.

It made great advances for the improvement and conservation of our soil and water resources.

It authorized the greatest appropriation of funds of any Congress in our history for agriculture.

It repealed the Federal tax on gasoline used in farming.

Mr. Speaker, through all our efforts you will find one purpose overshadowing all others—that is: To perpetuate and strengthen the family farm and the rural community economic and social order that is indispensable as a source of spiritual, social, and political vitality in our growing Nation.

And, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure my colleagues here, and the farmers and, indeed, all the American people, that the fight for fair treatment of our farm families will go on. Of necessity, it must go on. The interests of all our citizens requires that this fight continue.

Following is a review of some of the important enactments of the 84th Congress relating to agriculture:

THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—PUBLIC LAW 540

1. SOIL BANK

This act sets up a $1,200,000,000-a-year soil bank, in two parts:

(a) Acreage reserve: This program is designed to reduce acreages of wheat, cotton, corn, peanuts, rice, and tobacco. Payments to farmers are made to reduce their acreages of these crops below their acreage allotments, and these payments may be made as soon as the acreage is measured. Under this authority, the Department of Agriculture has set up 1956 rates of payment per acre, on a national average, as follows: Corn, $40.05; cotton, $45; wheat, $19.80; rice, $59.22; peanuts, $27; flue-cured tobacco, $255.42; and burley tobacco, $295.74. A maximum of $750 million a year could be expended on the acreage reserve for the next 4 years.

(b) Conservation reserve: This program is designed to remove acreage from crop production on a semipermanent basis, for which payments approximately equivalent to the rental value of the land would be made, with an annual national limit of $450 million.

Compulsory features, proposed in other soil-bank legislation, were not included in H. R. 12—vetoed—or in H. R. 10875 which became Public Law 540. Limit is placed on the amounts that can be spent on specific crops, thus assuring an equitable distribution of funds. Provision is made for the protection of tenants and sharecroppers. Procedures are provided for appeal by producers whose soil-bank contracts have been canceled because of alleged violations.

The act directs that the soil bank be commenced with 1956 crops, with a clear congressional intent that the fact that some crops had been planted at the time of enactment is not to stand in the way of starting the program this year.

Many Members of Congress are disappointed with the manner in which this program is being administered. The Secretary has discriminated against those farmers who need the benefits of this program most: namely, those farmers whose crops have been ruined or damaged by drought or flood. It was the clear intent of the Congress to pay farmers who plowed up their crops on a basis of the average yield of the land, but the Secretary has adopted an "appraised" yield payment plan, knocking down the level of payment to take into account any weather or other natural damage to the crops on the land put into the acreage reserve. Thus, where the average yield base might mean a payment of $45 an acre in cotton the Secretary actually is paying as low as $6 under his improvised "appraised" yield. Similar trimming down of payments has occurred in wheat, corn, and other crops.

The major objective of the soil bank and other provisions of the act, relating to surplus disposal and to marketing quotas and acreage allotments, is the adjustment of production to market needs, reduction of the surpluses, conservation of soil and water, and the general improvement in farm income.

2. CORN

The act authorizes four different programs under which corn farmers may receive price supports in 1956, as follows:

(a) Producers in the commercial area who elect to comply with the acreage allotments previously announced by the Secretary—at the rate of approximately 43 million acres—are eligible for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—under that program, without putting land into the soil bank.

(b) For the operation of the soil bank the bill increases the corn acreage allotment for 1956 by 9 million acres to a total of 51 million acres. Corn producers in the commercial producing area may qualify for price supports at $1.50 per bushel—86.2 percent of parity—by planting within their allotment from the 51 million-acre base acreage, provided they put into the soil bank an amount of cropland equal to 15 percent of their base acreage of corn.

(c) Producers in the commercial corn area who do not comply with the regular acreage allotments previously announced nor with the base acreage setup for soil bank purposes will still be eligible for price supports, under the noncompliance program newly announced by the Secretary, at the rate of $1.25 per bushel—about 83 percent of the support level of compliance corn in the commercial area.

(d) Producers outside the commercial area will receive a support at 82½ percent of the level of the support for compliance corn in the commercial area—or about $1.24 a bushel.

(e) The Secretary is directed, not later than December 15, 1956, to conduct a referendum of producers in the commercial corn area to determine whether they favor the present acreage allotment and price support program or would prefer to do away with acreage allotments completely and then let the Secretary fix the corn price support at such a level as he determines "will assist producers in marketing corn in the normal channels of trade but not encourage the uneconomic production of corn." If two-thirds or more of producers voting approved the change, corn then would be removed from the list of basic crops for price support purposes, and the support level thenceforward would be at the discretion of the Secretary, as has been the case in the small feed grains and in other crops.

3. FEED GRAINS

The act sets the price support for the 1956 crop of grain sorghums, barley, rye, and oats at 76 percent of the parity price for each commodity as of May 1, 1956. Thus, the 1956 supports are: Barley, $1.02 per bushel; oats, 65 cents per bushel; rye, $1.27 per bushel, and grain sorghums, $1.97 per hundredweight. These higher level supports thus supersede the 70 percent supports announced by the Secretary, which were 93 cents for barley, 59 cents for oats, $1.16 for rye, and $1.80 for grain sorghums.

4. COTTON

(a) A freeze of 1957 and 1958 national acreage allotments at no less than the 1956 allotment; (b) a provision that no State acreage allotment can be cut in 1957 and 1958 by more than 1 percent; (c) a special 100,000-acre national reserve is created to add to the allotments of small farmers; and (d) the Secretary of Agriculutre is directed to sell Government cotton for export at the price necessary to regain America's traditional world market at around 5 million bales annually.

A program has been put into effect to make cash payments on the export of cotton textiles and cotton waste, to equalize the competitive position of our own cotton textile mills with foreign mills in the use of American cotton.

The act requires that whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other shall be supported at a level which will cause them to compete on equal terms in the market.

Solution of our market problems, particularly in cotton textiles, will be substantially assisted by authority clearly given the President in this act to negotiate voluntary agreements with representatives of other countries with respect to importations into the United States of competing agricultural commodities or products made therefrom.

5. RICE

The act provides that the State acreage allotments for rice for 1956 shall not be less than 85 percent of the final State allotment for 1955; and that the national acreage allotments of rice for 1957 and 1958 shall not be less than the final national allotment for 1956, and shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner as the 1956 final allotment. The act provides a certificate program for rice, at the discretion of the Secretary. The certificate program will not be substituted for the present program unless the Secretary determines and proclaims that the initiation of the problem is "administratively feasible and in the best interests of rice producers in the United States."

6. TRANSITIONAL PARITY

The act freezes transitional partly for the basic commodities for 1957. This will mean that the parity price of corn, wheat, and peanuts—the only 3 basic commodities currently affected by the transitional parity formula—will be 5 percent higher in 1957 than they otherwise would have been. The bill also requires the Secretary of Agriculture to make a thorough study of possible meth-

ods of improving the parity formula and to report to Congress thereon not later than January 31, and to include drafts of any legislation needed to carry out this recommendation.

7. GOVERNMENT-OWNED LANDS

The President is directed to restrict insofar as practicable the leasing of Government-owned lands for the production of price-supported crops in surplus supply.

8. SECTION 32 EXPANSION

Appropriation of an additional $500 million annually is authorized for section 32 funds, for use in surplus removal and disposal operations, particularly for perishable commodities. The section 32 program previously has operated on funds derived from an allocation of 30 percent of duties collected under the customs laws, amounting to approximately $200 million annually. The authorization of a $500-million appropriation, in addition to the amount available from a share of the customs collections, will bring to about $700 million annually the funds available for this program which acts as a substantial price stabilization mechanism for various crops, as well as serving the needs of the school lunch program, making food available for low-income persons and generally aiding in the disposal of surpluses.

9. FORESTRY

The act authorizes broad expansion of cooperative activity between the Federal Government and the States in reforestation. Upon presentation by the proper State official the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to approve a plan for tree planting within the State and thereafter to cooperate technically and financially in such program. With respect to parts of the program carried out on non-Federal lands, the Federal financial contribution cannot exceed that of the State toward the same program. The secretary is directed to cooperate with other Federal agencies and with the appropriate State forester in approving and carrying out such plans.

10. OTHER IMPORTANT PROVISIONS

The act embraces various improvements in the disposal of surplus commodities and other significant provisions.

To facilitate surplus disposal in the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to process food commodities, such as grain, into a form—meal or flour—which can be used in the home and is also given authority long sought by both the State and the Federal Government to devote food commodities to certain penal institutions.

To facilitate surplus disposal abroad, the President is given authority to pay ocean freight on surplus commodities donated for use in other countries and to step up disposal under title II of Public Law 480 from $300 million to $500 million.

The act authorizes the appointment of a Surplus Disposal Administrator in the Department of Agriculture.

Provision is made for the appointment of a commission to study and make recommendations to Congress on increased industrial use of agricultural products.

In addition to these specific new authorizations to deal with the surplus problem, the Secretary is directed to make a study of proposals for disposing food domestically through some kind of food-stamp plan; he is directed to report to Congress within 90 days on this important matter; he is directed to make a similar study and report on the matter of establishing strategic stockpiles of agricultural commodities both in the United States and abroad for use in the event of war or similar emergency; he is directed to use existing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of surpluses generally and long-staple cotton specifically.

An attack is made upon the surplus problem affecting long staple cotton by again placing extra long staple cotton, now exempt from quotas, within the quota set up for all cotton longer than 1⅛ inches.

In order to encourage further the underplanting of acreage allotments, the act authorizes a producer, for the first time, to plant only a part or even none of an acreage allotment for 3 successive years without losing his history and the right to future allotments. This could eliminate the practice of planting merely to retain history for allotment purposes, which is now required.

To make present production adjustment laws more effective, the bill increases to 75 percent of the support price the penalty for exceeding peanut-marketing quotas.

GREAT PLAINS

H. R. 11833—on President's desk—the Great Plains Conservation bill—proposes a broad program, in cooperation with farmers, to restore and conserve cultivated and grazing lands of a wide area in the 10 Great Plains States that often are ravaged by high winds and dry weather. A $150 million program, over a 10-year period, is provided in the legislation. The bill rounds out and makes available a sounder and more workable approach to Federal cost-sharing in meeting the conservation problems on individual farms and ranches of the Great Plains. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to formulate and announce a conservation program for that area and to enter into 10-year contracts with farm and ranch operators to terminate not later than December 31, 1971. The program differs from the soil bank program in that it is aimed at obtaining a shift in land use rather than a reduction in production. It is designed to encourage a permanent shift in land use in the Great Plains, taking into consideration the conditions which are peculiar to that area.

CONSERVATION

The Great Plains program was one of a series of major enactments for the conservation of soil and water resources, in addition to the soil bank law.

Public Law 756 extends for 2 years the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP).

H. R. 8750—on President's desk—broadens the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to include all aspects of the conservation, development, utilization, and disposal of water—not just the "agricultural phases" of these activities as provided in the present act. This means that such things as municipal and industrial water supplies may be included as part of a watershed program. The bill permits the building of dams with a capacity in excess of 5,000 acre-feet, up to 25,000 feet, if the capacity in excess of that figure is for purposes other than flood prevention and the construction cost of such excess capacity is borne entirely by the local cooperating organizations. It provides that the local organizations shall not be required to assume any part of the construction cost of structural measures applicable to flood prevention. Local organizations and individuals will continue to be required to provide rights-of-way, easements, etc., for such structural measures and to carry out necessary land-treatment measures. It eliminates delay in the handling of small projects by providing that only projects involving a Federal contribution of more than $250,000, or a structure of more than 2,500 acre-feet need be submitted separately to Congress through the President, but requires all projects submitted to Congress to be approved by the appropriate committees of the House and Senate. It provides for long-term loans at the Government rate of interest to local organizations for the purpose of financing their share of the cost of programs, and it extends the provisions of the act to Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The 45 day "waiting time" had already been reduced to 15 days in Public Law 734, and is eliminated altogether in H. R. 8750.

Public Law 483 provides that in establishing the national standards for the Agricultural Conservation Program, the Secretary of Agriculture will have the authority, if he chooses to exercise it, of applying water conservation measures as ACP practices in any State. This act struck out the words "in arid or semiarid sections" which previously had limited the area of operation of this program as it relates to water conservation measures.

Public Law 473 enacted into permanent legislation authority which has been contained in the most recent several appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture and which has been exercised, pursuant to those acts, by the Forest Service. The act consists essentially of authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to advance Federal funds in the furtherance of cooperative research projects.

IMPROVED CREDIT

Congress took special note of the need for improved and expanded credit services, especially for family unit farms, in view of the current hard-pressed situation in agriculture.

H. R. 11544—on President's desk—(a) authorizes the refinancing of existing indebtedness of eligible farmers if the borrowers are "presently unable to meet the terms and conditions of their outstanding indebtedness and are unable to refinance such debts with commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible credit sources at rates

and terms which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill"; the bill authorizes the Farmers Home Administration to accept a second mortgage for either direct or indirect loans for this purpose; (b) authorizes FHA to make loans, for the first time, to part-time farmers; loans authorized include those for real estate improvement and development and loans for operating expenses; to be eligible a borrower would have to be a bona fide farmer who historically depended on agriculture for his livelihood and who is conducting a substantial farming operation; such loans may also be made for refinancing of such a farm unit; (c) the bill extends from June 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959, the authority to make economic emergency loans under Public Law 727, 83d Congress, and increases from $15 million to $65 million the amount from the loan revolving fund which may be used for such loans; (d) increases from $7,000 to $10,000 the maximum amount of a loan for operating purposes, with the special provision that not more than 10 percent of the funds available in any 1 year may be used for loans up to $20,000; (e) authorizes the Secretary to extend up to 10 years the repayment period of regular operative loans to farmers in cases of special hardship; (f) a special provision for real estate loans up to $15,000 for the improvement or replacement of tenant houses on farms having not more than three families. Not included in the bill, because existing law contains the general authority, but in the House committee report is a statement of policy favoring the making of emergency replanting loans to orchardists whose orchards have been destroyed by natural disasters with a deferred repayment schedule geared to the time required to obtain a crop from the replanted trees.

H. R. 10285—On President's desk—increases farmer ownership and control of the farm credit system and promotes its efficiency and growth. The bill embraces a congressional policy to (a) provide agriculture with a sound, dependable source of credit; (b) combine the Federal intermediate credit banks and the production credit corporations in order to increase the efficiency of operation and facilitate the retirement of Government capital; (c) encourage and promote the continued growth and development of the production credit associations as self-supporting cooperative lending institutions operating on a sound credit basis with maximum local authority to determine credit needs and loan policies consistent with the maintenance of a national production credit system; and (d) continue to provide other financing institutions making loans to farmers and ranchers with the right to borrow from and rediscount with the combined entity on a basis comparable with the production credit associations.

SUGAR

Public Law 545 (H. R. 7030) reenacts and extends for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments to, first, give domestic cane and sugar-beet producers a fair share of the growth of the United States sugar market; second, bring about a more equitable participation by foreign suppliers in this market; and third, maintain stability of sugar supplies and prices in the United States.

The Sugar Act is one of the most successful of our farm programs, in terms of benefits to producers and dependable supplies at stabilized prices for consumers. Sugar consumption continues to soar under this program. The United States now consumes over 8,500,000 tons of the approximately 40 million tons annual world production, and the consumption is increasing by more than 135,000 tons a year.

This is because the Sugar Act maintains a fair price to housewives, while giving a fair return to producers.

Public Law 545 provides that domestic producers may supply 55 percent of the growth in the American market, in addition to the approximately 4,500,000 tons annually already allotted to them.

This participation by the United States sugar producers in the future market growth restores to them the status they had under sugar-quota legislation prior to World War II. In the Sugar Act of 1948, quotas for the domestic areas were limited to fixed quantities, with all the growth of our market going to foreign suppliers, 96 percent to Cuba. This was done to assist Cuba in making the transition from wartime to peacetime conditions, since Cuba's production has been greatly expanded to meet America's wartime needs. However, it was recognized at the time that the change was of temporary nature and that at the appropriate time the domestic areas should resume participation in market growth.

Cuba, under Public Law 545, retains its status as our largest foreign supplier. The actual tonnage which Cuba will market in the United States is expected to increase from year to year because of her participation in our market growth. Additional quotas granted to other foreign suppliers, as provided in this act, are in line with our national policy of broadening our trade relations.

It should be emphasized here that the sugar program, supported by a small excise on sugar, actually has shown a profit of about $312 million since it became effective in 1937, and American housewives, under this program, pay less for sugar than is the case in many other areas of the world.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Public Law 465: This act, first, extended the special school milk program 2 years to June 30, 1958, increased the amount authorized for it from $50 million annually to $60 million annually for the current fiscal year and to $75 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years, and made certain nonprofit institutions devoted to the care of underprivileged children eligible for the benefits of the program; second, extended the accelerated brucellosis program 2 years to June 30, 1958, and increased the amount authorized for it from $15 million annually to $17 million for the current fiscal year and to $20 million for each of the next 2 fiscal years; and third, extended the veterans and Armed Forces milk program 2 years to December 31, 1958.

Public Law 752 makes the benefits of the school-milk program available to most summer camps, nursery schools, child-care centers, settlement houses, and similar institutions which are operated on a nonprofit basis, removing the previous qualification that limited this phase of the milk program to those nonprofit institutions serving underprivileged children on a special welfare or charitable basis.

PERISHABLE COMMODITIES

H. R. 5337—on President's desk—would, without broadening the scope or original intent of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930, as amended, correct certain deficiencies which have become apparent in the administration of the act, thereby lending greater strength and more effectiveness to the basic legislation. The bill would accomplish this end by (a) strengthening the provisions relating to misbranding or misrepresentation of grade and origin of fresh fruits and vegetables; (b) increasing the maximum annual license fee from the present $15 per year to $25; (c) permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to deny issuance of a license to any person convicted of a felony in any State or Federal court; (d) authorizing the Secretary to deny a license to any applicant who has been involved in bankruptcy proceedings within 3 years unless the applicant furnishes a bond or other assurance satisfactory to the Secretary; (e) empowering the Secretary to suspend the license of a person who employs in any responsible position an individual whose license is under suspension; and (f) providing authority for the inspection of any perishable commodity covered by the act.

TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT

H. R. 11708 amends the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480. This is the law which authorizes the sale of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies, where such sales are in addition to the usual purchases of such commodity by the foreign country. H. R. 11708 increases from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 the total amount of the foreign currency transactions which may be carried out under the law. It also authorizes broadening of the use of the foreign currencies in Public Law 480 operations to include assistance to American schools in countries where such currencies are available. The bill exempts sales of fruit and the products thereof under title I of Public Law 480 from the requirements of the cargo preference laws. It also broadens the provisions of title II of the act to permit donations of food to refugees and similar cases of extraordinary need.

TOBACCO

Public Law 425 adjusted the burley tobacco allotment for 1956 upward, to conform with acreage justified by accurate data on 1955 production which was not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of Public Law 425 was to make most farm allotments the same as they were in 1955.

Public Law 427, House Joint Resolution 521, readjusts the acreage allotment of Maryland tobacco to conform with acre-

age justified by data on production of the previous year not available when the original allotment for 1956 was determined. The effect of this act was to eliminate an acreage reduction of approximately 15 percent for 1956.

Public Law 426, House Joint Resolution 518, adjusts upward the acreage allotments of fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco to conform with acreage justified by data on production of the previous year which was not available when the original allotments for 1956 were determined.

Public Law 609, H. R. 9475: This act changed the statutory deadline from December 1 to the following February 1, for the announcement by the Secretary of Agriculture of tobacco marketing quotas with respect to all kinds of tobacco except flue-cured. The law had required that the Secretary make the announcement of tobacco marketing quotas not later than December 1 of the year preceding the year for which such quotas are established. On December 1 most kinds of tobacco have not yet been marketed. Therefore, instead of the accurate measurement of the quantity of tobacco produced during the current year which the Secretary possesses as soon as the current crop has passed through the markets, he has on December 1 only the estimates made as of November 1. In a number of recent years these estimates have varied sufficiently from actual outturn of crops to have created a situation where the marketing quota announced by the Secretary was substantially different from the quota he would have determined had the actual weight of the crop been known to him. Under Public Law 609, the Secretary now may make the quota announcements at any time prior to February 1 and it is presumed that he will do so with respect to the various types of tobacco at such time as sufficient production and other data are available.

Prior to this enactment, this Congress had approved separate bills to adjust allotments to conform to data that was not available when the allotments were announced—a condition that may be avoided in the future by the use of the authority in Public Law 609.

The Congress, by unanimous votes of the House and Senate, approved House Joint Resolution 317 designating November 16–22 this year as National Farm-City Week, with the purpose of promoting better understanding between farm and city people. The resolution requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the Department of Agriculture, the Land-Grant Colleges, the Agricultural Extension Service and all other appropriate agencies and officials of Government, to cooperate with farm organizations and other groups in programs observing this Farm-City Week, including plans for public meetings, discussion, exhibits, pageants and press, radio and television features.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress, in its two sessions, has approved appropriations and loan authorizations aggregating $3,908,818,000 for the Department of Agriculture, exclusive of the actions restoring the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The previous Congress authorized $2,778,400,000 for the Department.

Liberal appropriations and authorizations were approved for conservation, education, research, school lunch, and all the various action programs.

A compilation of the House Committee on Appropriations figures shows specific appropriations and authorizations of the 84th Congress and the comparative figures for the previous Congress as follows: Research, 84th, $179,044,000; 83d, $129,600,000. REA electric and telephone facilities, 84th, $549 million; 83d, $420 million. Farmers Home Administration loan authorizations, 84th, $367,500,000; 83d, $330 million. Extension Service, 84th, $101,175,000; 83d, $78,800,000. Soil Conservation Service and watershed and flood prevention, 84th, $182,268,000; 83d, $145,011,000. School lunch, 84th, $183,235,000; 83d, $166,601,000.

OTHER ENACTMENTS

Public Law 431: This act made possible the planting in 1956 of an expanded acreage of durum wheat in counties known to be capable of producing this wheat, in order to alleviate the serious shortage of this particular type of wheat, which is preferred in the manufacture of macaroni.

Public Law 607 first, increased by 15,000 acres the lands within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest which may be acquired under the act of June 22, 1948; second, increased to $2,500,000 (from $500,000) the amount authorized to be appropriated for the acquisition of lands under such act; and third, made section 5 of such act applicable to the additional lands described by the bill of June 30. Section 5 provides for payment to the State of Minnesota of amounts based on the appraised value of national-forest lands in the roadless area rather than forest receipts, as provided by title 16, United States Code, section 500.

Bills approved by the Congress and awaiting the action of the President include:

S. 1400, to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act.

S. 1915, to provide for the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions.

S. 2216, relating to occupancy of national forest lands.

S. 3032, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Middle Atlantic Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact.

H. R. 11682, Department of Agriculture Organic Act, providing primarily for permanent authorizing legislation for many activities heretofore authorized by appropriation acts.

Several other measures of local interest were handled by our committee which have become law or which are awaiting action by the President.

Mr. Speaker, the recession in agriculture is reflected particularly in the volume of inquiries coming to Members of Congress and the House Committee on Agriculture, concerning farm legislation. I hope the foregoing summary of important actions in the 2d session of the 84th Congress will assist in furnishing factual information about our work. Those who may be interested in reviewing all the farm major legislation passed during this Congress should refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1955, where, beginning on page A4642, I presented a summary of enactments relating to agriculture during the first session of this Congress.

Ben Millard, Father of the Badlands National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 9, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in 1938 the President of the United States issued a proclamation, pursuant to an act of Congress sponsored by the late Senator Peter Norbeck and former Congressman William Williamson, which formally established the Badlands National Monument.

As the then Representative of the Second Congressional District in 1938, it was my privilege to work on some of the requirements that had to be met before the proclamation could be issued. I came thereby to know how greatly the Badlands National Monument was the outgrowth of a dream by Ben Millard, the sage of Cedar Pass.

Ben was a dreamer who had the capacity of making dreams come true. He knew how to work. He staked all his resources on his faith in the Badlands as a great natural attraction, a resource of all of the people of the United States.

Recently Ben passed away. Many fine tributes have been spoken and written in tribute to his personality and his life.

Under permisison heretofore given, I offer for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following tributes to this man who played so large a place in the establishment of the Badlands National Monument, which now is drawing more than half a million visitors each year:

[From the Brookings Register]

PROPOSES A MONUMENT

The story is told of an old and ardent hunter and fisher who was told that his time had come to die. His reply was, "Well, the forests don't owe me a deer, the streams a fish, or the prairies a bird."

When Ben Millard died recently he must have had something of the same feeling. It was he who is in large measure responsible for the Badlands being made a national park, for the construction of highways through it, and for so wisely promoting it that thousands upon thousands of people visit the area every year to gasp at its unusual beauty.

He was a man of rare vision and spent many years in the Badlands. The resort he developed at Cedar Pass is a delight to everyone who stops off there either for a meal or for a longer stay.

The Register agrees with the Argus-Leader when that newspaper suggests some sort of monument to Mr. Millard should be erected at or near Cedar Pass.

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader]

HILLS GROUP TO RECOGNIZE BEN MILLARD

RAPID CITY, May 14.—Plans are being made to honor the man whose dream of 30 years ago resulted in one of South Dakota's greatest tourist attractions.

Dr. G. W. Mills, Wall, was appointed by President Don Howe, of the Black Hills and Badlands Association, to be chairman of a special committee in recognition of Ben Millard. Serving with Mills will be Hoadley Dean and Ed H. Lighter, of Rapid City.

Millard, who died March 23, is the man largely responsible for development of a virtually unknown area into the Badlands National Monument.

He became fascinated by the formations of rich color, the weird, castlelike pyramids, the pinnacles, the passes, and he devoted 30 years to their development.

In the late 1920's Millard built his camp, a few cabins, a gasoline station, and a cafe along a winding trail. The country was wild and lonely, but there was beauty.

He had to haul water for miles to serve the public. Now at Cedar Pass is a modern resort and the winding trails have given way to modern, hard-surfaced highways.

"The people of this area and of South Dakota can never repay its debt to so great a man, but we are going to try to give him recognition for his great service," Howe said.

A TRIBUTE TO BEN MILLARD (1872–1956)

(By S. H. Witmer and H. O. Chapman)

"We shall not see his like again."

A man who carved out his significant achievements in life painstakingly and with the patience and the fortitude of the pioneer, was Ben Millard.

It is most fitting that to the thousands of people who knew him, in his later years, that his name shall be forever remembered in close connection with the rugged grandeur of nature—as it is reflected in the enduring Badlands National Monument.

Ben Millard typified all that was best in the American way of life, and his own career reveals the strength of character which was his from those sturdy pioneers who, in early days, settled in Minnesota.

Ben Millard was born September 15, 1872, in Blue Earth County, Minn., the son of Riley M. Millard and Mary Frances (Hull) Millard. His boyhood was typical—being spent largely on the farm where he was born. About 1880, his parents moved to Lyons, Nebr., where they established farm operations. Later, the Millard family moved into the area of Pender, Nebr.

At the age of 14, Ben Millard started working on a ferry boat which operated on the Missouri River, from Decatur, Nebr., and later worked as a cowhand on one of the large cattle ranches in the region.

In the year 1890, seeking to continue his education, he enrolled at Shenandoah Normal College at Shenandoah, Iowa, and for his second year of college work was a student at Lincoln Normal, Lincoln, Nebr. In the course of his sophomore year, he was given an opportunity to begin work in the Lesterville, S. Dak., State bank by Mr. W. A. Loveland, a prominent banker at the time in South Dakota and Nebraska. Young Millard worked in this bank for a period of several years, and around 1894 he took advantage of an opportunity to enter the feed store business in Canton, S. Dak.

On May 20, 1896, he was married to Stella Neely, whom he had met while a college student at Lincoln, Nebr. It is interesting to note how this young couple started their married life. Through a program of rigid and consistent saving, they managed to accumulate enough to buy a lot, and the young husband, by working at night, built their first home. The couple's first child, Glen E. Millard, was born while residing in this house in Canton, S. Dak., in 1897. A year later, Ben Millard, through the interest of his friend, W. A. Loveland, was again offered an opportunity—this time that of operating the Artesian State Bank in Artesian, S. Dak. Selling his interest in the feedstore, young Millard went immediately to take up his banking duties at Artesian. Within about another year, his friend, Mr. Loveland, decided to relinquish some of his own bank holdings, and in turn Millard was given the opportunity to purchase the Artesian State Bank. It took all Ben Millard's ability to raise all of the necessary capital, but he managed to do so and entered upon this phase of his colorful career.

As time passed, Millard added to his banking interests, and organized two new banks, one in Fedora and the other in Forestburg, S. Dak. His reputation for fair dealing, honesty, and hard work brought consistent reward and culminated in the result of Ben Millard further being able to expand his interests through the acquiral of farm property in the area.

Following the elapse of some years and around 1910, Ben Millard considered the possibility of establishing his home in California. But, such a move would necessitate closing out all of his interests in South Dakota. Although he spent several winter seasons in California, his heart remained always with South Dakota, and so a complete change was never made.

During the half decade from 1905 to 1910, Ben Millard became interested in a resort development called Ruskin Park, near Artesian. He turned to the development of this type of outdoors project with great enthusiasm and interest, and again his pioneering instincts were revealed as he introduced numerous innovations to make the area accessible and enjoyable by thousands of people.

In 1917, disposing of some more of his bank holdings, Mr. Millard became actively engaged in real estate, and 2 years later moved to Huron, S. Dak., to become the senior partner of a large farm real-estate firm. His boundless energy and interests knew no limit, and a year later, in 1920, he became interested in the automobile business and established the Huron Auto Supply Co., wholesaling automotive parts and supplies.

Now we enter upon a period of years which proved the mettle of Ben Millard's character. Following World War I and in the early twenties, farm property declined greatly and bank failures became to be frequent occurrences throughout the area. As the result of this economic cycle, Ben Millard saw his work of many years vanish in practically complete financial loss. But courage and fortitude marked the man—Ben Millard continued to work and, joining the South Dakota State Banking Department, he was assigned the difficult task of working with banks which had either been closed or were being considered for closing. Once again in the banking field, he was involved in work he knew and loved, and his years of experience and understanding of the financial problems of banks enabled him to create a procedure for handling distressed banks which was destined to become the official formula used by the South Dakota State Department of Banking.

It was during this time in the twenties, while on a bank assignment at Philip, S. Dak., near the Big White River Badlands area, that Ben Millard began to make frequent journeys around the region. The mysterious, gaunt, and rugged beauty of this area appealed greatly to Ben Millard, and he began to be imbued with the feeling that here in this historic and scenic region he wanted to spend the rest of his days. By an interesting coincidence, the late United States Senator Norbeck, of South Dakota, at this time, was equally interested in the Black Hills area, and was making plans to get it developed as a tourist attraction, which he felt positive would hold interest and appeal to millions of Americans. Senator Norbeck and Ben Millard had been close friends for many years, and Millard revealed his own interest of similar nature in the Badlands area. Millard's enthusiasm and projection of the project so impressed Senator Norbeck that he gave his unlimited support and cooperation to Millard.

The balance of Ben Millard's life began to be centered around this tremendous project, and as a result of prodigious work and despite numerous discouragements, Ben Millard had the tremendous pleasure and achievement of seeing, in 1938, the Badlands formally incorporated into the United States National Park System, and become known to thousands upon thousands of visitors as the famous Badlands National Monument. Last year alone over 650,000 people visited the Badlands National Monument region. So indeed, it is most fitting that Ben Millard was known far and wide as the "Father of the Badlands National Monument."

The strength of the man and the breadth of his vision can only be encompassed by the awe inspiring vistas offered by the region which he loved and developed.

Ben Millard passed away amid his beloved surroundings at Cedar Pass Lodge on March 23, 1956.

As dean member of the board of directors of National Reserve Life Insurance Co., Ben Millard's advice, counsel and ability was always recognized and appreciated. As in all his activities, he revealed his honest, upstanding character and reputation for fair dealing.

[From the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader of March 28, 1956]

MILLARD DID MUCH FOR BADLANDS PARK

Ben Millard was a dreamer—a man with a vision. The Badlands of South Dakota were his hobby and long years ago he envisioned the time when they would be set aside for public use and thousands would come annually to see them.

Toward that goal he worked. Despite many discouragements, he made progress. An able ally was the late Senator Peter Norbeck.

Now the Badlands National Monument is known as one of the Nation's primary places of interest. Roads have been built through them. There is the Cedar Pass resort that Millard developed. Tens of thousands of persons drive through the odd and picturesque area each summer and are fascinated by what they see.

Fortunately Millard lived to see his dream become a reality and he was happy about the development. There should be, it seems, some tribute to him in the Badlands monument—a marker or plaque testifying to his share in its development.

The Paralyzed Veterans of America Urge H. R. 12038 for Disabled Veterans as First Priority Legislation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Robert Frost, president

of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, has sent the following telegram, which I am inserting for the RECORD:

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 23, 1956.*

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Comittee of Veteran's Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Paralyzed Veterans of America convention meeting at the Hotel Congress, Chicago, Ill., has voted unanimously the following resolution: We give full support to OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, in his efforts to get priority action for bills H. R. 12038 and H. R. 7534, before action is taken on the non-service-connected pension bill sponsored by the American Legion, H. R. 7886.

ROBERT FROST,
President, Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to these moving tributes to my beloved friend and chairman, DICK RICHARDS, there has gone through my mind something I heard Dr. William J. Mayo say long ago. Most people think that the No. 1 requirement of a good surgeon is skill with his hands. But Dr. Will said they had learned through the years at the Mayo Clinic, where more than one-fourth of all America's medical school graduates apply for postgraduate work, that the first quality of a good surgeon is character. The second is industry. The third is a reasonable amount of native ability, and fourth, manual dexterity. I am sure we would agree that the first quality a man must have to be a good statesman is also, character. That surely is the word that one first thinks of in connection with DICK RICHARDS. The thing that accounts for his remarkable hold upon the Congress, as a body, and upon the affections of all its Members of whatever party or section of the country, is the character of the man.

We on his committee know his ability, his extraordinarily penetrating mind, his capacity to listen to all the arguments of witnesses and then ask an incisive question or two that bring out the crux of the matter.

We know his unvarying fairness; we know his unfailing good humor, and his ability to take a tense and strained situation and relax it by some homely illustration or bit of wisdom from his beloved South Carolina.

We know his loyalty to his party and his friends, transcended only by his loyalty to his country and his God. Some of us were associated with him on issues where he stood against the leadership of his own party, as well as when we stood together and spoke against the official position of my party. His named is attached to amendments and pieces of legislation that made history, believe me, in the development of the foreign policy of the United States.

If I may add a personal word, since the years before 1950 when I was warning on every occasion that if we continued to drift and allowed the Communists to get control of China it would be disastrous to ourselves, he started calling me Cato. I was honored thereby. And he told me one day in more recent years, that while he had called me that jocularly, he agreed that we would either have to find ways to prevent further Communist expansion in Asia or else eventually we would be fighting it ourselves.

All this is so meager and inadequate a tribute to this extraordinarily fine, sterling, rocklike, but kindly character, a man who certainly exemplifies our country at its best, and I daresay exemplifies that part of our country from which he came and to which he now returns and which we lovingly call the South, at its most gracious and chivalrous best.

The Pioneer Spirit in the Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an eloquent and informed talk, entitled "The Pioneer Spirit in the Library," by Cornelia Marvin Pierce, one of the great librarians of the State of Oregon, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask that it be accompanied by a biography of Mrs. Pierce.

This address was delivered on June 13, 1927, at Gearhart, Oreg., but its emphasis on the importance of knowledge on the frontier is still just as true and just as appropriate today.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORNELIA MARVIN, PIONEER

Publication of this address by library trailblazer Cornelia Marvin (Mrs. Walter M. Pierce) is offered by the Oregon State Library in commemoration of its establishment in 1905. Miss Marvin was the first secretary of the Oregon Library Commission, renamed the Oregon State Library in 1913, at which time she became the first Oregon State librarian. The occasion of the address was in itself memorable, the first combined meeting in Oregon of the Pacific Northwest Library Association and the California Library Association.

It was Cornelia Marvin's opportunity and great responsibility to lay the foundation and build the framework for library service in a State of vast distances and sparse population. During her tenure of office from 1905 to 1929 Oregon library law was evolved and libraries in Oregon multiplied from three to more than one hundred. The first mail order library service was initiated by Miss Marvin, a notable contribution to library progress. Books were sent to remote parts of the State, to homes and to schools. The collection of the State library grew to a quarter of a million books; its services brought expressions of praise and gratitude from people all over the State and earned the increasing support of the Oregon State legislature.

Half a century after Cornelia Marvin took office the objectives of the Oregon State library remain as she envisioned them at that early time, and its services have gone forward in the patterns which she set. The very fact of their endurance and firm establishment in the library tradition of the State constitutes the highest tribute to this pioneer librarian.

THE PIONEER SPIRIT IN THE LIBRARY

(By Cornelia Marvin, Librarian, Oregon State Library, Salem)

The States represented in the Pacific Northwestern library association are united by the bond of the trial and the pioneer spirit. Except for our neighbors in British Columbia, we have the common governmental, or rather territorial ancestry of the old Oregon territory. In the course of the greatest migration in history, until the recent transfer of populations of the Near East, the trail divided; there at the forks, weary and discouraged travelers were met by the lure of California, presented by persuasive and picturesque individuals whose glowing descriptions of that beautiful land with its easier trail diverted many of the less determined and hardy from the great trek to Oregon. From those difficult pioneer days to this day, the commercially minded of our own and our neighbor's citizens have persisted in persuasion and propaganda for increase of population and the disposal of products of the soil.

Those of us who are interested in the history of civilizations may look upon commercial rivalry as an interesting game, often overplayed, but we are moved to thoughtful speculation over the historical development of this last continental frontier of the westward movement, which had its origins in the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates. Never had the inhabitants of a long coastline had more diverse gifts of climate, of population and of political and social characteristics. Never has the democratic ideal been sought by three neighboring groups bringing toward its possible solution more strikingly different qualities—the English of Canada dominated by the story of hundreds of years of valiant struggle to protect the political rights of man, the early Latin population of California with its mission fathers and the Spanish and Mexican governors, and Oregon peopled by the hardy and independent Americans drawn from the Northern and Middle States, and the southern border States, to try out a new governmental experiment under pioneer conditions.

With such a difference in the family tree, is it strange that we find it profitable and exhilarating to confer on the problems of our profession—or occupation—and that we shall undoubtedly bring to this conference many and different methods of work? California—the land of sunshine, of mission fathers, Spanish grandees, Fremont and the bear flag republic, the gold rush, San Francisco, the vigilance committee, the Broderick-Terry duel, the Chinese, Bret Harte and Mrs. Atherton, Los Angeles and Aimee Macpherson, the Iowa farmer, and the public burning of radical books and magazines! All charm and glitter and brilliance and sudden movement, stir and prosperity! Oregon with picturesque fur traders followed by the somber missionaries, the hard-working settlers, its Champoeg meeting of determined frontiersmen resulting in the formation of the provisional government characterized by the Beards in their Rise of American civilization as the incident which brought Rousseau across the Rockies "or, rather, perhaps," they say, "the spirit of the Pilgrim fathers had descended upon the distant community." Clearly we

may trace some of our differences to the genesis of our civilization and culture.

In the early days, California Americans came to the missionary schools of Oregon and during the gold rush "one-half of the Willamette Valley farmers sailed down the coast to California or rode down the old fur trail; those who remained at home got richer by selling produce to Californians"; and this "agricultural prosperity gave Oregon a lead which it maintained until the rise of the fruit industry in California.

Serious students of social groups may well inquire into the characteristics which have enabled California to enter the markets of the world through cooperative associations while Oregon records failure in its cooperative ventures and sends its delicious prunes forth under California labels. Oregon is rural, California relatively urban.

We diverge climatically, socially, commercially. We watch each other with an eager curiosity and we believe that our striking differences make us the best of neighbors. Life has always seemed easier in California, and money more plentiful. The way to Oregon was hard overland, and the Columbia bar made difficult the access by water. The pleasure-seeker and the adventurer had also the spirit of originality, and he carried his experiments into social and political fields. He was not so highly individual, so decentralized politically as his sturdy Oregon brother. To be sure he followed in 1911 the Oregon popular government experiment of 1902—the "I and R"—and there has been constant give and take in our political and economic worlds—just now we are studying the Berkeley charter, the California tax system, and the split session.

Our heritage, our educational growth, our political development, all have led to diversity of methods in libraries—in all educational growth and institutions. Oregon in its fundamental law provided for education in adopting the declaration of Nathan Dane's ordinance of 1787 that "religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to the happiness of mankind, schools, and means of education shall be forever encouraged."

Its first public library was opened at Willamette Falls (Oregon City) about 1840. The Multnomah Circulating Library; California following in 1850 with its first in the Monterey library association. The minutes of a public meeting of the inhabitants of Oregon Territory, July 5, 1843, show purchase of several lawbooks, the nucleus of the territorial library for which the first appropriation was made in 1848; California following in 1850. California has the credit for leading the way in county libraries as Sacramento County in 1908 contracted with the city for library extension; but Multnomah County, Oreg., has taken advantage of an act of 1903 permitting service contracts between counties and library associations; in 1911 this Oregon act was extended to the State and provided for other types of county library service. And here again, I remind my hearers that Oregon had the idea at an earlier date, as our first territorial delegate to Congress, Samuel R. Thurston, recorded in his diary on a June day in 1850 that he had written to J. McBride (and to Linn City) suggesting the idea of circulating libraries in Oregon.

County library development follows naturally the larger conception of the possibilities of the educational service of libraries. We know that the small governmental unit is doomed as a means of carrying on fundamental social and educational activities; and that the larger taxing unit makes possible a development and a bond both of which are impossible with city and county acting independently through their local units of government.

In Oregon, we have developed county libraries strangely enough more autocratic in their inception than those of California, but true to Oregon type in becoming more democratic and decentralized through the retention of local boards and some measure of local control. We take pride in our county units for health, agriculture, education, in our fine Multnomah County Library; and in the demonstration libraries of the State library service; but the tables are turned and we sit at the feet of more successful California seeking instruction and inspiration. We think they can tell us how to get financial support for all classes of libraries—local, county, and State. We are certain that we can retain our cherished ideals of democracy and keep to our objectives for library service if we (the libraries) are somewhat more prosperous financially.

The present library aim and problem seems to be, not only finding the reader, but undertaking his education, assuming a task which we cannot reasonably be expected to perform since great educational institutions striving for centuries have apparently failed. At best we can help him to "know who most nearly speaks the truth." These problems of finding the readers and gaining financial support, we have in common as we share the glory of the romantic episodes of Drake and Captain Cook. It was an Oregon legislator who demanded in his official capacity to know whoever reads a book—and, I confess that an Oregon librarian sometimes attempts to locate, by a process of elimination, the "reading public" which absorbs thousands of copies of The Story of Philosophy and This Believing World—is it in city or country, in jail and prison, or at large? The Portland report in the Mercury about the best readers being in jail, and our own experience of finding in the prison our most learned patrons who understand Bertrand Russell's treatises on mathematics lead to reflection on the results of education and study when not accompanied by balanced judgment, creative power and community and family usefulness—do we minister only to individual satisfaction—and not toward the creation of a finer type of civilization? Norman Angell in The Public Mind says, "whether in fact education can help men to think and apply their intelligence to social problems is a question which organized education is only just beginning to ask; much less answer. * * * But no one, who until yesterday, had examined the method and subject matter of the education of our children would have the hardihood to suggest that that education had been devised with a view to strengthening what might be called the social judgment of the rising generation." We need not seek justification for wholesome recreation afforded by libraries.

Well, who reads? We have our great floating population said by Will Irwin to have been converted from destructive radicals to conservative family men by the possibilities of the Ford car and migratory labor in which all the family can share—do they read? We cannot be sure they are held in school long enough to learn to distinguish words—phonic combinations. (An Oregon librarian recently told me of a family sued for grocery bill, living in a tent house on rented ground, owning a new Buick, a victrola, and a player piano.) Members of lodges wrapped in the mysteries of ritual and absorbed in floor-work and competitive drill teams—one lodge alone is said to have 50,000 members in Oregon—do they use our libraries? College and high-school students who have filled to overflowing all our private and State schools—and used a large proportion of our tax revenue—do they read? Teachers who must be professionally trained at public expense, and who are exhorted to become community leaders in all good thought and works—do they read? Women's club members staggering under the accumulation of civic and social burdens assumed or thrust upon them—have they time to read? Members of the parent-teacher associations with the responsibility for elementary education—can they bury themselves under the avalanche of educational literature telling how it has been and ought to be done? Librarians, with all the resources of their libraries, stimulated by association with books and the bookish, with the immense advantages of immediate contact with each other, first access to American Library Association reading-with-a-purpose courses, advisers to the reading public, spenders of public cooperative book funds, custodians of all knowledge—do they read?

Which one of us has followed an American Library Association course? Are we, also, the victims of the mob-reading idea? Do we admit that any graup of popular authors can profitably or advantageously select th reading of thousands? In this age of almost pathetic faith in books and in the magic of education, is there the corresponding knowledge of their beneficial use? Are we in this land of freedom to encourage the mass posture of sitting at the feet of authority where authority does not exist? Have we listened to the American Library Association appeal which demands to know what one does after 5 o'clock? Do we really think all life a void except for working hours and reading hours? Do we never long for more time for social life, for gardens, for family, for voluntary community service? The ALA reports widely the phenomenal use of its reading courses in the Sheridan branch in Chicago, proudly relating the tale of 1 person who had completed 3 courses in 1 year, but the judge and jury still call for exhibit A and ask whether he is in jail or free and what individual satisfaction and public use resulted from the 3 courses. We might be inclined to locate the reading public in the open country did we not recall the marvelous use of city libraries like Portland. We must decide that its limits and boundaries are not geographical. It is a fascinating subject for conference discussion outside the formal meetings—we know it exists. It is our stimulus by day and our anxiety by night.

We know we must place our best library people where they may use wide book knowledge for the benefit of library patrons. We must learn to give reading its right and proper place without exaggeration. We know that the thought stream of the modern world flows through and is controlled by newspapers, radio, motion pictures—and libraries—but do we know how to organize and conduct libraries to play their part?

These are very humble and natural reflections at the opening of a library conference. Let us question ourselves. It is said a leader needs a magnet in his pocket and a compass in his hand—have we the magnet and where does the compass point? We are the political and social descendants and heirs of pioneers who had a passionate belief in the common man and in his ability to organize a society in which he could live a life free from restraint and intolerance, and enriched by all that his predecessors had found good. We are, or should be pioneers in spirit, for library practice is not fully formulated nor are library possibilities all found, nor half foreseen. We must use our best intelligence to find the way to serve—and it can't come entirely through uninspired surveys—let us help the younger generation of librarians by telling them of our mistakes, and let us put them on the right road. It is "not a swan song, but a prospectus," that is needed, as Mr. Dewey said. We are here to plan for working out our common problems in our individual ways, to share our experiences in our small part of this undertaking; a part which we know may be made larger and finer; and we of Oregon have gathered with unusual joy and anticipation because of the opportunity afforded by the presence of our successful neighbors whom we welcome and whose success in our field we willingly and happily applaud.

Insecticides—Boon or Bane?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1956, I introduced a bill aimed at preventing the loss of valuable fish and wildlife resources to the spraying of forest and farm areas necessary to control insects and weeds.

The bill, H. R. 11839, would direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides upon fish and wildlife. I discussed the measure, and my reasons for introducing it, on page A4873 of the June 19 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the current issue of Audubon magazine, Mr. Paul F. Springer, United States Fish and Wildlife Service biologist at the Patuxent Research Refuge near Laurel, Md., discusses the potential effects of some of the more than 2,000 different brands of sprays and dusts on wildlife. Excerpts from Mr. Springer's timely article follow:

INSECTICIDES—BOON OR BANE?

(By Paul F. Springer)

What are garden sprays and dusts doing to birds in my yard? Will BHC, toxaphene, malathion, or other new poisons to control crop insects harm quail and rabbits? Can insecticides be applied safely around farm ponds? Is insect control by chemicals compatible with the maintenance of wildlife? The many inquiries of this kind received each year by Audubon societies, State game and fish departments, universities, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and other conservation agencies are indicative of the great concern of nature lovers and others interested in preserving our wildlife resources.

Before World War II there were, relatively, only a few chemical weapons, such as the arsenicals, nicotine, rotenone, and pyrethrum, that were used against insects. While these afforded a certain degree of protection, the farmer or home gardener could regularly figure on sharing a good part of his crop with the bugs. However, in recent years, due to the great technological advances by the chemical industry, nearly 100 effective new insecticides have been developed. Many of these are commonly spread over millions of acres of farm, forest, range, and marshland each year. Use of the airplane for spraying and dusting these materials has made it possible to treat areas which formerly were inaccessible or could be reached only at prohibitive cost. Certain insects, such as mosquitoes, are subjected to upwards of a dozen or more sprayings a year. All in all, insect control is being practiced on a larger scale than ever before in history.

ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATION FOR USE OF INSECTICIDES

There is convincing economic justification for such a program. The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that insects now cause losses amounting to over $4 billion a year, and certain crops, such as cotton, are affected by more than 100 different kinds. * * *

Despite the enormous good wrought by insecticides, they must be considered in the category of mixed blessings. Being poisons, they can be harmful to birds, mammals, and fish. Damage to valuable wildlife resources has sometimes occurred unnecessarily because insecticides were applied without knowledge of accepted procedures or without full regard for the overall conseqeunces. Some materials are safe for recommended uses as long as label instructions are followed. Others are so poisonous that there is little or no margin of safety for animals that are not intended to be affected. From the viewpoint of the conservationist, a satisfactory insecticide should present minimum hazards to wildlife. When, in the long-range public interest, the advantages gained from a particular insect-control program are outweighed by damages to wildlife, then the insect-control measures should be moidfied.

In problems of this type, wildlife values frequently are ignored as being of little significance. Or safeguards for this purpose may be dismissed as hindrances to economic progress. Actually, hunting and fishing combined constitute the most popular sport in the United States. No less than $8 billion are estimated to be spent by the public each year in pursuit of this means of recreation. In addition, the food value of the game and fish harvested, not including the commercial take, is probably worth one-half to $1 billion.

* * * * *

INSECT RESISTANCE TO CHEMICALS

After World War II, DDT was by far the most popular insecticide and was considered a panacea for insect control. But the insects were not to be counted out so soon. In an amazingly short time, resistant populations of certain species began to appear. Some were able to withstand dosages of DDT 1,000 times greater than those originally needed to kill their ancestors. Now, in many parts of the country, such pests as houseflies, mosquitoes, roaches, body lice, fleas, bedbugs, lygus bugs on alfalfa, saltmarsh caterpillars, imported cabbage worms, cabbage loopers, and codling moths are impossible to control economically with DDT. When resistance of these insects was first noted, it seemed a simple matter of turning to other insecticides for their control. But this didn't always work. While substitutes sometimes proved temporarily effective, it was found that resistance to poisoning by DDT frequently meant they were resistant to other chlorinated hydrocarbons or that resistance to these alternate compounds quickly developed. Hence, there is a need for an entirely different group of control insecticides, which accounts for present increasing interest in the organic phosphates.

DDT still controls many insects effectively and economically, and is very much used. Studies have allayed to a large extent the early fears that it would wipe out wildlife.

* * * * *

HOW MAMMALS AND BIRDS ARE AFFECTED

As with DDT, mammals usually show more resistance to poisoning by the new insecticides than do birds or fish. Tests on laboratory animals indicate that, as a general rule, methoxychlor, TDE, BHC, chlorthion, and malathion are less harmfuf than DDT. Intermediate in their harmful effects on mammals are lindane, toxaphene, and chlordane; more lethal than DDT are heptachlor, aldrin, endrin, dieldrin, diazinon, EPN, parathion, and TEPP. Usually, some variation in response to the various poisons can be expected among different kinds of mammals.

When aldrin was applied to Colorado's rangelands at the rate of two-tenths of a pound per acre in rolled wheat bait to combat Morman crickets, the majority of wild mice on the rangeland treated died, but there was no observed effect on deer and rabbits. However, in California, cottontail rabbits, jackrabbits, meadow mice, and gophers were killed by treatments of one-half to 1½ pound per acre of dieldrin to orchards for control of insects in orchard cover crops. Endrin, although primarily used as an insecticide, is currently being used in several States as a ground spray for control of mice in orchards. These small animals were totally eliminated by applications of 2½ pounds per acre of endrin in Virginia. There have been reports of dead rabbits and birds from these rates of poisoning with endrin. Mice also suffered heavy losses from ground treatments of parathion and toxaphene at 4 pounds per acre in Maryland and California orchards.

The relative order of the lethalness of the new insecticides to birds that have been tested is similar to that observed for mammals, although chlordane appears to be more damaging that DDT. Pheasants and quail are less tolerant of some insecticides than are mourning doves and pintail ducks. However, ducks and geese are very sensitive to diazinon.

Aldrin, one of the most harmful of the chlorinated hydrocarbons to birds, is used to control grasshoppers in Western States. As little as 2 ounces per acre of this chemical resulted in the death of nestling red-winged blackbirds, on rangeland in Montana, and of young waterfowl in marshes of North Dakota. Field experiments showed that the ducks were primarily affected as a result of eating aldrin-contaminated insects. Losses at this low dosage are not altogether unexpected in view of recent findings from feeding tests at the United States Fish and Wildlife Service's Patuxent Research Refuge in Maryland. These revealed that, at a 1-ounce per acre rate of application of aldrin, 1 square foot of ground surface would contain enough of it to kill 1 adult quail or 16 quail chicks; 2 square feet would contain a lethal dose for a pheasant chick; and 7 square feet enough to kill an adult pheasant.

In these same tests, endrin was determined to be similar in action to aldrin while dieldrin was somewhat less poisonous. However, dieldrin applied experimentally for mosquito control at two-tenths pound per acre in marshes of New Jersey killed some songbirds whereas a one-half-pound-per-acre treatment for reduction of the rice leaf miner in California caused the death of a number of herons and egrets and a few shorebirds, mallards, and pheasants.

Some of the other chlorinated hydrocarbons are less destructive to birds. One and one-half pounds per acre of toxaphene applied experimentally to a North Dakota marsh caused only a small loss of ducks and coots. A similar spraying of 1 pound of chlordane per acre reduced the nestlings of marsh birds by one-half, but the adults survived without effect. BHC caused less damage than toxaphene and chlordane in feeding experiments with quail. TDE and methoxychlor were the safest materials tested.

Some of the organic phosphates are very harmful to birds. Numerous blackbirds and bobolinks died in Georgia rice fields when parathion dust was applied at a rate of four-tenths pound per acre. In Washington State, the use of parathion and TEPP to control mites in apple orchards killed pheasants and robins. TEPP is readily absorbed through the skin of animals, and, amazingly, even through the horny covering on the feet of birds.

Certain insecticides have odors and tastes that are disagreeable to humans and may affect birds in like manner. In a feeding test of 3 weeks' duration with bob-white quail, it was noticed that a number of the birds literally starved to death rather than eat more than nominal amounts of some of their insecticide-treated diets. Of the materials used, parathion, chlordane, toxaphene, and BHC was most repellent to bob-whites. More recently, it has been claimed that lindane applied to seed corn will protect it from depredations by pheasants but field tests in various localities have given conflicting results.

Most studies with insecticides have been concerned with the animals present at the time of treatment, and have given the im-

pression that the effects of an application ended with either the survival or death of the individual animals. Recent experiments at the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge at Patuxent on reproduction of birds fed less than lethal amounts of insecticides have shown the possibility of less obvious effects. Adult pheasants that ate extremely small quantities of aldrin and dieldrin—one two-hundred-thousandth of an ounce per day for a 2-month period—produced eggs of reduced hatchability and chicks subject to high death rates. Feeding of one-fifth this amount of each of these chemicals, also of endrin, to adult quail had a similar effect on the survival of their chicks. Studies are being continued to determine whether there is any influence on reproduction by the few remaining young, which have never eaten any of the insecticides. The demonstration of these subtle effects points up the danger of using stable insecticides with high residual qualities.

WHAT HAPPENS TO FISH AND SMALL FOOD-CHAIN ORGANISMS?

Oddly enough, some of the organic phosphates, which are extremely damaging to mammals and birds, appear to be less harmful to fish than the chlorinated hydrocarbons. TEPP breaks down rapidly in water and only its initial effects are important. Less is known about the harmfulness to fish of other phosphate chemicals. EPN had no effect when applied experimentally for control of mosquitoes at applications of less than one-tenth of a pound per acre. However, a dosage of two-tenths of a pound per acre of malathion caused complete mortality of killifish.

Among the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, endrin was the most toxic of a number tested on fish in laboratory experiments. Both dieldrin and toxaphene are considerably more damaging than DDT and have killed fish when used to control mosquitoes at a rate as low as one-tenth of a pound per acre. Ten times this dosage of dieldrin is destructive to almost all kinds of water life. In the South, toxaphene and other insecticides have been used extensively to control insect pests of cotton, and average seasonal applications of commercial dusts may total 50 to 60 pounds to an acre. Large losses of fish in Alabama resulted from heavy rains which presumably washed insecticides from the treated cotton land into ponds and streams. Follow-up investigations 2 to 3 years later showed that some of these waters again supported normal numbers of fish. However, most of the bass, sunfish, and crappies were still absent and populations were unbalanced in favor of undesirable, nongame species of fish. In laboratory tests, heptachlor and aldrin were more damaging than was DDT, but single field applications of up to two-tenths of a pound per acre for control of midges and mosquitoes had little effect on fishlife. An experimental spraying of 1 pound of lindane per acre killed many fish.

Chlordane and methoxychlor are about in a class with DDT in their effects on fish. A single test treatment of chlordane at 1 pound per acre, and sprayings repeated weekly over a 3-month period at one-tenth pound per acre to combat mosquitoes, killed large numbers of fish. All fish succumbed to an experimental treatment of 2 pounds of methoxychlor per acre.

Of the chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, TDE and BHC are the safest to fish and are recommended for use in areas where preservation of aquatic life is a consideration. TDE was used at a rate of 1 pound per acre to reduce the nuisance caused by midges with little damage to fish, but 14 weekly sprayings of one-tenth of this amount for control of mosquitoes caused some reduction in the fish population. Applications of 1 pound per acre of BHC repeated 5 times a summer for 3 years gave good control of mosquitoes and had little or no effect on the survival and growth of fish. However, their flesh may become tainted with the characteristic odor of this insecticide.

Some fish are consistently more resistant than others to poisoning by the new insecticides. In laboratory tests, golden shiners proved to be the most resistant, with bluegill sunfish, largemouth bass, and goldfish showing increasing susceptibility.

* * * * *

The question is often raised as to the effects of insecticides on some of the lower animals, which are of direct economic value, and on those which serve as food for higher forms of animal life. Particular concern is felt for honeybees because of their role as pollinators of crops and garden plants. Toxaphene, methoxychlor, and TDE are three of the least harmful to bees. Chlordane is similar to DDT in its effects on honeybees, and BHC, lindane, aldrin, heptachlor, TETT, malathion, chlorthion, diazinon, and EPN are more toxic. Parathion and dieldrin are among the most destructive insecticides to bees; in fact dieldrin may continue to kill bees a week after it is applied. Crabs, shrimps, and aquatic insects are usually very sensitive to the new insecticides and, as a general rule, suffer damage from even smaller dosages than those that affect fish. Clams, oysters, and snails are more resistant to most of these insecticides.

With higher animals, the indirect effect of a reduction in their food supply, is difficult to distinguish from the direct poisoning of them. In an Illinois bottomland forest, the destruction of crayfish by DDT caused raccoons feeding on them to change their diet to acorns and mussels but had no other untoward effect. However, where insecticide applications have caused nearly complete kills of insects over extensive acreages, as in grasshopper control programs, nestling birds may lose weight and suffer high death rates. Also, under these conditions, parent birds tend to forsake the area. On small treated plots, nestlings may be harmed, but adults on a small 20-acre tract were not adversely affected, probably because many of them normally foraged in an adjoining untreated habitat. It is easier, too, for insects to infiltrate into small areas and repopulate them.

The young of many animals are more severely affected by insecticides than are the adults, and appear to be inherently more sensitive. This susceptibility is aggravated by the fact that the dietary requirements of young animals in relation to body weight are considerably greater than those of older animals. Accordingly, they would normally consume proportionately greater amounts of contaminated food.

* * * * * * *

WHAT SHOULD OR SHOULD NOT BE DONE

* * * * * * *

The primary factors to be considered in appraising the possible damage to wildlife from an insect-control program are (1) the kind of insecticide to be used (2) the rate at which it is to be applied (3) the animals apt to be adversely affected. As has been shown, insecticides are far from specific in their action and show considerable variation in their effects on various kinds of wildlife. Except in an emergency, conservationists have a right to insist upon balanced programs using the safest materials and methods of application consistent with reasonable control. At times, damage to beneficial animals has occurred through use of very dangerous materials or heavy dosages in order to secure quick, and more lasting control at a lower cost. Of even greater significance is the tendency on the part of some users to apply more than recommended amounts of insecticides "for good measure." Such a philosophy not only endangers birds and other kinds of wildlife, but is often wasteful of materials and may aggravate the insect-control problem. Strict compliance with instructions on labels, and following the recommendations in State and Federal insect control bulletins will probably, more than any other measure, reduce the extent of present-day insecticide damage to wildlife.

Time and frequency of application also are important factors to consider in insect-control operations. Hazards to birds are reduced if treatments are made before eggs hatch or after the young are able to fare for themselves. Bees suffer the smallest losses when insecticides are applied in the evening, a few days before the height of flowering, or after blossoms have fallen. Although a single treatment may have little lasting effect on wildlife, repeated applications can again set back populations before they are able to fully recover or can cause insecticides to accumulate until dangerous accumulations have been built up.

Another factor to bear in mind is the size of the area to be treated. Smaller areas will be repopulated by animals much sooner than large ones. If compatible with insect-control objectives, provision should be made in programs covering large areas to leave blocks, strips, or headwaters untreated. Inquiry also should be made as to the manner in which insecticides are to be applied. Spray deposition is less from aircraft application than from ground equipment. In forested areas, leafy canopies may screen out insecticides so that only one-third to one-quarter or less reaches the ground level. However, the drift of insecticides from aerial sprays by aircraft may cause double dosing or result in deposition in other than the area in which control is desired. For this reason, insecticidal spraying from aircraft should be avoided in windy weather and provisions should be made for adequate ground-to-plane control.

Because of the sensitivity of fishes, crabs, and other aquatic life to many insecticides, direct application to streams, lakes, and coastal bays should be avoided as far as possible. The equipment used to apply the insecticides should never be washed in these waters. Caution should also be exercised in applying materials near water and marsh habitats if there is danger of their being washed into the water areas by rain. Smaller quantities of insecticide are recommended for use in emulsions, due to the increased dangers to many aquatic animals.

Although there is little doubt that chemicals are here to stay, the evolution of insecticide-resistant insects, and the suppression of one form, only to cause the increase of others of perhaps even greater concern, has forced entomologists to take a second look at current insect-control practices. As a result, it is encouraging to note in some quarters, an increased emphasis on developing more specific chemicals and methods of application that, insofar as possible, kill only the insect to be controlled, while leaving other animals unharmed. Also, there is greater recognition of the need for learning more about the biology of certain insects and their relation to the environment. Armed with such knowledge, entomologists can often devise measures for reducing losses to insects that are based upon biological or ecological principles. These include the development of varieties of plants resistant to insect damage; attracting and increasing birds and other natural enemies of insects; planting and harvesting crops at particular seasons; proper fertilization and rotation of crops; destruction of insect wintering quarters; intelligent regulation of water; and the manipulation of other biological factors that will reduce insect nuisances. Such measures may never replace completely the need for insecticides. They can, however, serve as a basic approach, and can lessen appreciably the extent of the insect control problem.

Swiss Watch Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 24, 1956, I introduced H. R. 11437, a bill to impose a tax on the processing of certain watch movements. This bill was introduced at the urgent request of the Department of the Treasury because of a rapidly developing problem with regard to the importation of Swiss watches. It has become apparent that, under the provisions of the existing tariff law, there are opportunities by which foreign producers can avoid the clear intent of Congress with regard to the protection of the domestic watch industry.

The Committee on Ways and Means considered this problem in the last session of this Congress and, after full public hearings, reported a bill favorably to the House designed to close this loophole in the tariff structure. No action was taken by the House last session on this bill. As I have indicated, the matter was again brought to our attention in this session, and I responded by the introduction of the bill in question. I believe that it is highly regrettable that the Committee on Ways and Means has failed completely to consider this pressing problem. It is now obvious that no action will be taken prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it absolutely clear that in the next session of the Congress I shall press for early consideration of this matter by the Committee on Ways and Means. Our national security requires that the matter be no longer delayed.

I include at this point a letter, dated July 27, 1956, from the Secretary of the Treasury to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and another letter, under the same date, from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to myself.

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing in reference to H. R. 11436 and H. R. 11437, identical bills imposing a processing tax on certain watch movements which were introduced by Mr. MILLS and Mr. REED, respectively, at the second session of the 84th Congress, and referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The purpose of this legislation, which is supported by the Treasury Department and other interested agencies in the executive branch, is to correct a recently developed deficiency in the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to watch movements.

We understand that you and a number of other members of your committee felt that adequate consideration of the bills would require public hearings and extensive consideration by the committee.

As you know, the Treasury Department and other interested executive agencies believe this deficiency which presently exists in the tariff law is a quite serious one and can be satisfactorily corrected only through legislation.

Now that Congress is about to adjourn, it will, of course, not be possible for this matter to be rectified before next year. However, we plan to propose legislation early in the next session of Congress when there will be ample time to give it thorough consideration. I hope that this can take place as shortly after the Congress convenes as you find it practicable.

Sincerely yours,

G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: Because of your very real interest and help in the introduction of the bills imposing a processing tax on certain watch movements and designed to avoid and correct a recently developed deficiency in the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 relating to watch movements, I am sending you a copy of a letter which the Secretary of the Treasury has sent today to Chairman COOPER.

There is no question but what in the tremendous press of business in the closing weeks of this session it is apparently not feasible for public hearings which have been thought by the Ways and Means Committee to be necessary to be held.

At the same time, as Secretary Humphrey points out to Chairman COOPER, the Treasury feels very deeply about the innate fairness and necessity of this legislation and think it only fair to give public notice that we will renew our request for consideration of the legislation at the earliest possible moment after the new Congress convenes in January.

Again, the very real thanks of the Treasury Department for your help and consideration in this entire matter.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID W. KENDALL,
Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

My 1956 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have made it a practice to distribute widely among my constituents a questionnaire on the topics of the day. The replies to my 1956 questionnaire have now been tallied and I ask unanimous consent to insert the results in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Do you favor:

1. Continued foreign aid for non-Communist nations? Yes, 59 percent; no, 30 percent; undecided, 11 percent.

2. Enforcing Supreme Court anti-segregation decision? Yes, 42 percent; no, 21 percent; undecided, 37 percent.

3. Raising postal rates to cover deficits? Yes, 67 percent; no, 24 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

4. Federal aid for local school construction? Yes, 71 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 10 percent.

5. United States veto of Red China admission to the U. N.? Yes, 93 percent; no, 4 percent; undecided, 3 percent.

6. Making political campaign contributions tax-deductible? Yes, 41 percent; no, 30 percent; undecided, 29 percent.

7. Pensions for all World War I veterans? Yes, 36 percent; no, 34 percent; undecided, 30 percent.

8. A ceiling of 35 percent on income taxes? Yes, 56 percent; no, 19 percent; undecided, 25 percent.

9. Defending the independence of Israel? Yes, 36 percent; no, 38 percent; undecided, 26 percent.

10. An international organization to handle tariffs? Yes, 29 percent; no, 31 percent, undecided, 40 percent.

11. My efforts to:
- Reclaim the Jersey meadows? Yes, 94 percent; no, 2 percent; undecided, 4 percent.
- End Government competition with private enterprise? Yes, 78 percent; no, 12 percent; undecided, 10 percent.
- Provide Federal scientific scholarships? Yes, 67 percent; no, 21 percent; undecided, 12 percent.
- Stop employment discrimination due to age? Yes, 88 percent; no, 6 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

12. The overall record of the Eisenhower administration? Yes, 79 percent; no, 13 percent; undecided, 8 percent.

Address of Hon. John Ben Shepperd, Attorney General of Texas, to the Mississippi Bar Association at Jackson, Miss., June 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on June 22 last the Honorable John Ben Shepperd delivered a truly great address before the Mississippi Bar Association. Because of its splendid qualities and forceful and logical argument I am glad to submit it herewith for the RECORD.

The address follows:

QUO VADIS, PIPS?

I want to talk to you a few minutes about the most important issue now facing the people of the United States—the integrity and stability of the law.

There is an eternal conflict between what is lawful and what some believe to be socially expedient or morally right. And because judges are human, it is natural that they should sometimes open a statute book and wishfully arrive at an interpretation that was never intended.

When this happens, whether the error is intentional or not, government by law is replaced with government by men. When a politically minded or socially motivated judge has tried one important case, the country has had a revolution.

Few thinking men and women today would deny that revolutionary changes are taking place in our national life. This generation, which knows the source of atomic power and the secrets of interplanetary travel, does not know the location of its own government. For this Nation, of all nations, is the only one in which the location of governmental sovereignty is in dispute.

Under the "Pips" doctrine of the United States Supreme Court—paramount rights,

interpretation, preemption and supersession—the rights and powers of State and local governments are being liquidated and piped into the giant reservoir of Federal supremacy.

I don't need to rehearse for you the decision in the recent Nelson case, which struck down the sedition laws of 42 States and 2 Territories; or the Hanson case from Nebraska, in which the right-to-work laws of 18 States, including Mississippi, were smashed, at least in the railroad field; or the decision in *FPC* v. *Oregon* which extended the doctrine of paramount rights beyond the coastal and navigable waters of the States to include every little trickling creek on which the Federal Government happens to own a little frontage.

I don't have to remind you of the recent Slochower decision, which denied local governments the right to protect themselves against Communists on the public payroll; or the Phillips decision, which ignored a clearly-stated intention of Congress in order to clamp a Federal grip on the natural resources of the States; or the ruling in *Castle* v. *Hayes* affecting the right of the States to control their own highways; or dozens of other decisions which have pushed the States out of just about every other field we could mention.

The principles comprising the Pips doctrine are, for the most part, valid in law. It is their grotesque exaggeration that is destroying the stability and integrity of our Constitution.

The most poignant decree to come from the Court in recent years was the segregation decision of 1954.

It is unfortunate that this appalling departure from the most elementary constitutional principles and basic legal concepts occurred in a field where the people of this country are divided on moral grounds. There are good people on both sides of the segregation question, acting in good conscience.

But the Supreme Court decree was so revolutionary that the people were impelled to take sides on the end result before it was realized by what dubious means the integration order was brought about.

The means used to compel integration was a simple legislation by the court—rewriting the Constitution, in order to invade an area of law clearly reserved to the States in the Federal compact, and to effect a change that was in no sense legally obtainable except by constitutional amendment.

Private interests and minority groups are now looking to the courts to gain their ends instead of looking to the legislative bodies established for that purpose. Utilitarianism is being substituted for constitutional law, with the philosophy "If the method works, use it. The law is unimportant."

I believe the people of the United States will soon come to the full realization that in trying to stretch the Constitution, the Supreme Court has torn it apart, and that the aim of those who would centralize governmental power in Washington is not merely to erase the Mason-Dixon Line, but all State lines as well. The pattern could not be clearer if there were a pre-conceived plan at the bottom of it.

The people of the United States have been divided on many things, but there has been no division in the belief that the end never justifies the means.

Our immediate concern is what we can do about it. We should give thought to the basic question, "Does the Supreme Court have the final word?" The Constitution contains no provision saying that the Federal Government is to be the final judge of the extent of its own powers.

There is a great deal that lawyers can do. We have a greater responsibility than lay citizens. The legislatures of the States are dominated by members of the legal profession. In Texas, the great majority of our 198 State boards and agencies are headed or policy-guided by attorneys. I am sure that is true in other States. The branches of the Federal Government are literally loaded with lawyers. The percentage of attorneys in the 71st to 81st Congresses averaged 61.8 percent. If the legal profession were represented in proportion to its numbers, it would have only 1 member in each House of Congress.

Most people do not seem to realize that Congress actually had broad control over the Supreme Court. It can limit the matters within the Court's appellate jurisdiction; can lay down rules for interpreting Federal law, just as it makes the laws themselves; and can correct the Court's decisions by appropriate legislation.

Congress is currently pretty busy correcting a number of Supreme Court decisions. The Budge, Barrett, and Neuberger bills are aimed at rectifying the ruling in *F. P. C.* v. *Oregon;* the Bridges bill (S. 3617), cosponsored by Senator JOHN STENNIS, and at least three similar bills have been introduced to correct the Nelson decision; inherent dangers in the Hanson ruling would be removed by the Goldwater bill (S. 3) and a bill by Senator HOLLAND of Florida (S. 527), which would prohibit the preemption of State police powers in the labor field.

A number of bills have been introduced to rectify the segregation decision either by removing public education from the appellate jurisdiction of the Court or by clarifying that separate and equal facilities satisfy the 14th amendment; and a dozen or more bills are pending which would correct the ruling in the Phillips case.

Senator JAMES EASTLAND of Mississippi is sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 127, aimed at preventing further Federal interference with State authority to regulate internal State affairs.

Many bills have been introduced affecting the judiciary itself. Again, your own Senator JOHN STENNIS is sponsoring a bill to require that at least half the justices of the Supreme Court have 10 years' prior experience on the bench. There are other such bills, bills to limit the term of office of Supreme Court judges, and still others to set up a system to provide a full court for every decision.

On a broader plane, Mississippi's Representative WILLIAM COLMER is sponsoring a bill to establish positive rules of construction under which the Supreme Court could not infer preemption unless Congress has clearly stated its intention to supersede State law. The Senate version of this bill, by Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, is cosponsored by both Senators from Mississippi, and was recently reported favorably out of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

If something is not done to halt the march of Federal encroachment, I do not believe it will be the fault of the Mississippi delegation, nor of the Southern delegations in general. And it certainly will not be the fault of the States that have interposed their sovereignty to protect the people and their constitutional rights.

Recently I spoke of these things in Los Angeles, Calif., and the speaker who followed me—a Californian—said: "Thank heaven for the South. They have been standing guard while the rest of the country slept."

My attitude, and I believe that of most Southern lawyers, was pretty well stated by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who said: "I do not criticize the Supreme Court. I think we in the Senate and all other Americans, however, have a perfect right—in fact, a duty—to be apprehensive about any branch of the Government when we feel it is infringing on the rights of the States."

But it isn't enough for Congress to go on rectifying the decisions of the Court. It isn't enough that a few lawyers in public office are introducing bills and filing suits. The tens of thousands of practicing attorneys in this country cannot shrug the issue off. We are members of the legal profession, just like the justices of the Supreme Court and, as lawyers, we are not without responsibility for every decision handed down. As plain, ordinary citizens we are the accountable custodians of our Government and all its branches.

No court decisions ever stood up for long that were not sanctioned by lawyers in general, either in the same or the next generation. If constitutional government is allowed to die, it will be because the old-time lawyers, with their ideals, traditions, and firm adherence to sound legal concepts are allowed to die out in our generation.

I often wonder how well we measure up to the lawyers of the past, and whether we share equally the responsibility for the unfortunate opinion the public seems to have for the legal profession, as shown by various polls conducted in Iowa, Michigan, Texas, California, and other States. In these polls, as well as in a study recently released by the University of Chicago, attorneys ranked low in prestige; and in estimated contributions to society, we were listed at the very bottom, under eight other professions.

While this opinion prevails, is it any wonder the public pays little attention, no matter how loudly we shout against the present trend in Federal-State relations? Is it any wonder that a Congress full of lawyers can raise a cry against a decision of the court, or sign a Southern Declaration of Rights, and leave most of the country yawning with unconcern?

Too much of the public believes what it has heard about lawyers. A legislative body composed of attorneys, they say, never plugs a loophole in a law, because it's the loopholes that give lawyers a living. In making a new law, they say, attorney-legislators will always leave a door ajar in it somewhere, to assure the success of their future practice. And they say the reason why every court docket in the country is overcrowded, is that lawyers practice the old axiom "long litigation means long fees." I wonder, sometimes, if the public is entirely wrong.

Am I only a nostalgic dreamer, or wasn't there a day when a man laid his problem before a lawyer, and the lawyer said, "You don't have to go to court with this"? Wasn't there a time when a client walked into the office of an old-time attorney and got action without a fee being discussed first? Did you ever know one of those lawyers who, without stopping to check the minimum fee schedule, picked up his hat and said "Let's go"?

Yes—there was a generation of lawyers who got a gleam in their eye when they talked about the law, instead of about their rich clients.

When I was a barefoot boy in a small town, that's the kind of lawyer I wanted to be. There were no lawyers in my family. Nobody talked me into being one. Nobody told me it was lucrative—and sure enough, it wasn't. But somebody, sometime, caught my mind's eye with the idea that our democracy is and ought to be a government by law, and not a government by men.

I used to read of Daniel Webster fighting injustice and dedicating his life to the cause of freedom through contitutional law; I heard of statesmen expounding from a law book the vast, imponderable principles that moved armies to clash on battlefields; and I read of Justice Holmes dissenting time and again to the point of looking ridiculous, unwilling to prostitute the law or compromise his integrity as a jurist. And I am not ashamed that I went through law school on a shoestring, a prayer, and the hope that I too might serve my fellow men.

Our country is badly in needs of old-time lawyers—the kind who will follow their conscience instead of the crowd, and the precedent instead of the party, and who won't submerge a principle to win a point. We

need lawyers who won't sacrifice a dot or a dash in the Constitution to get a dollar sign on the ledger.

We have nothing to fear from the men on the bench, on the floor of Congress, or in the soft leather chairs of the Federal bureaus, if we make sure that the men and women of the bar get to the top by growing instead of climbing, and rise high by staying on the level. We need attorneys who believe it is better to be a good lawyer than a clever one, and who feel better after losing on the right side than they do after winning on the wrong one.

We need lawyers who have a proper respect for the members of the court, as a court, but who will not hesitate as citizens to call any branch of their own Government to account, judicial or otherwise. Freedom dies of cold feet when the custodians of the law are afraid to get into hot water.

At this epochal period in our history, I am thankful for the many members of the legal profession who still realize that the Constitution of the United States was established to secure for the people those priceless intangibles that are not subject to paramount right, perverted interpretation, preemption, and supersession.

Can any man open a lawbook and establish his exclusive title to a sunset on the Mississippi? Can anyone secure or perpetuate by litigation the look of trust and innocence in his child's eyes? No man can go before a court of law and be guaranteed the companionship of a true friend, or the love and devotion of a faithful wife. And there is no court so high that it can fabricate by decree the sound of a mother's lullaby or the laughter of a freeman.

Yet all these things and a thousand more are comprehended in the spirit of that timeless document whose preamble ambitiously purports to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The Constitution is not only a body of law, but a spirit of law as well; and if we have learned nothing else in 180 years of self-government, we should have learned that—

"Freedom is old, not young, yet it is born anew in the first cry of a freeman's son;
It is not a living thing, yet it dies if we do not love it;
It is not weak, yet it must be defended;
It is light, yet it weighs heavy on him who is without it;
It is without price, yet it dearly costs the one who sells it;
It is not small, but great; yet once lost, it is never found again."

The Political Mill—Health Issue an Attempt To Confuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Gould Lincoln which appeared in the Washington Evening Star. The article follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL—HEALTH ISSUE AN ATTEMPT TO CONFUSE

(By Gould Lincoln)

Democratic leaders assert with considerable finality that President Eisenhower's health is to be a major issue in the coming political presidential campaign. Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler still insists—as he has for 2 years—"there is a great possibility that President Eisenhower will not be on the Republican ticket" in November.

Of course, if this halfway prediction of Butler's should be correct, the President's health would cease to be a campaign issue. On the other hand, if Eisenhower remains on the ticket, as he now expects to do, and his health is good, the health issue is likely to dwindle away. The President has said his recent abdominal operation has done him good, not harm. His physicians say he should be in better shape than before that operation.

EVERYBODY'S HEALTH A GAMBLE

Democrats argue that the President may become seriously ill again; to reelect him for another 4-year term would be a gamble. To elect any man President for a 4-year term is a gamble, so far as his health is concerned. To take a recent example, had the late Senator Taft, of Ohio, been elected President in 1952, instead of Eisenhower, the country would have found itself without a President and relying on a Vice President to carry on within the first year of a Taft term. Yet, from a health point of view, Senator Taft had appeared indestructible.

In 1944 the country gambled on the health of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and reelected him. Yet within 3 months of the beginning of his new term he was dead. On the other hand, when it was proposed to nominate Roosevelt for President in 1932, there arose a clamor that he could not survive a 4-year term in the White House; that the infantile paralysis with which he suffered would carry him off. Medical experts clashed violently over this suggestion. Yet Roosevelt served three full terms in the White House and was elected for a fourth. In the last century a tough old warrior, William Henry Harrison, was elected President. He became ill, due to exposure on the day of his inauguration, and died.

Health is a gamble. Woodrow Wilson, who seemed sound enough, was stricken during his second term in the White House and was incapacitated for a considerable period, although he finished out that term.

The other health charge made by the Democrats against President Eisenhower is that he will be only a part-time Chief Executive. That is not the President's conception. He would not seek reelection if he believed he could not serve effectively and fully. He himself believes that he will be able to carry on.

AN EFFORT TO CONFUSE PEOPLE

In recent days it has been charged by Senator MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, that the President has been pushed by Republicans into running again, and that the true state of his health is being concealed from the people. It is a charge, as Senator KNOWLAND, Republican leader of the Senate, has said, against the personal integrity of President Eisenhower. Both during and after the President's heart attack last September the country was kept fully informed about the condition of the President. The President's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, saw to it. Members of the press assigned to cover the President knew it. When President Eisenhower, having fully recovered from the heart attack, was stricken with an intestinal illness, there was no hesitancy on the part of the White House and Hagerty to give all the facts regarding the President's condition as they developed. It is so today, as the President has made good progress during his convalescence.

Opponents of the President have charged, too, that his physicians have been motivated by politics in their statements regarding the President's condition. Where the politics has entered, it has come from those who make these charges. Their purpose obviously has been to confuse and to deceive the voters, to convince them that reelection of the President would be a disservice to the President and to the country. The concern for President Eisenhower, expressed at the same time by critics, has a mighty hollow sound.

Thirtieth Anniversary of Network Broadcasting by National Broadcasting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, we are approaching the 30th anniversary of network broadcasting by the National Broadcasting Co. The existence of network broadcasting has had a profound impact on our national culture. I should like to mark this occasion by having printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement so printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On Monday, November 15, 1926, the National Broadcasting Co. had its inaugural network program, linking, for the first time, 21 charter affiliated radio stations and 4 specially added outlets in cities all over the United States in a presentation of music, singing, and addresses. In that initial program there was set a standard which was designed to, and consistently has adhered to, the principle that only the finest is good enough for the American family. Among the well-remembered names of that first broadcast are those of the beloved Will Rogers, Walter Damrosch, the New York Symphony Orchestra, Mary Garden, the New York Oratorio Society, Edwin Franko Goldman, and many more.

Most important of all, it is well to remember that just 24 hours before this highly significant date, and within the life span of every one present in this Chamber, our great cities still were, in a manner of speaking, island communities. We were, in effect as far removed from each other as our inclination to travel the miles between.

Overnight, the inventive and organizational genius of men like Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff and the men who served with him, made the entire Nation next-door neighbors. In the simple flick of a switch, the amazing world of electronic science was to change the lives of an entire Nation. Mass communication, a notion we dreamed of with Jules Verne and H. G. Wells, was now a bewildering fact.

To comprehend the grandeur of a way of life which we accept without emotion, let us be reminded that it was a fair different means of mass communiction which gave birth to America, one night 180 years ago when three citizens of our sister commonwealth, Massachusetts, rode through the night on horseback, to warn a few farmers in a few villages, that freedom was in danger.

Today, in microscopic segments of a second, 160 million Americans in 10,000 cities, towns and villages can be told what horse is winning the Kentucky Derby; can see and hear an atomic bomb bursting and can listen to pauper, prince or president at the very moment the events take place.

None of this was possible a comparatively few years ago.

Before and during World War One, the United States was almost entirely dependent upon foreign-owned cables and wireless facilities for contact with the rest of the world. Great Britain was the communication center of the world.

Suggestions from our own Navy Department inspired the formation of an American institution, which in December of 1919 became the Radio Corporation of America—parent of the National Broadcasting Company.

The early development stages of what was to come brought about the exciting occasions when individual radio stations transmitted spoken words and music—instead of the heretofore mystical dots and dashes of the telegraphic era.

Having once achieved reproduction of human sound, the engineering geniuses who brought the National Broadcasting Co. into being were not content until they could bring their achievements to the greater number for the greater good.

There were timorous tests and trials by which cities like New York, Boston, and Schenectady were joined in common communication.

Finally the momentous November night when music was for the millions.

As we look back even so short a span as 30 years, it is difficult to try to conceive life when there was no radio or television.

The Town That Wouldn't Die

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, over a year ago one of our Kansas cities, Udall, was struck by a most destructive tornado. By 7:30 the next morning, 71 dead had been picked up and 380 others were in hospitals and on the way. It was one of the most devastating storms that had ever struck our State and in fact one of the most complete destructions of any city from a tornado that I know of.

Despite this tragic catastrophe which overcame this community, it has, 1 year later, been completely rebuilt. This required great courage on the part of its citizens and that courage has been admired by every Kansan and by the people of the Nation.

Recently there appeared an article in the July issue of the Town Journal entitled "The Town That Wouldn't Die," and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOWN THAT WOULDN'T DIE

(By O. K. Armstrong)

The town of Udall died last night. It was killed by a tornado that took scores of lives and destroyed almost 100 percent of its buildings.

So a reporter phoned his paper one morning a year ago last May. And he had every reason to think he was right. It was the most destructive tornado, in percentage of lives lost and in property damage, in the history of the United States Weather Bureau. In just 1 minute, the twisting, roaring mass of air demolished all but 10 of the 170 dwellings in Udall, Kans. Every building in the block and a half business area was obliterated except the post office and bank.

By 7:30 next morning 71 dead had been picked up; 380 others were in hospitals or on the way. Several families were entirely wiped out; others lost 1 or both parents, 1 or several children. Desolation and destruction seemed appallingly complete.

But the reporter, and hundreds of others who came to gaze on the pitiful pile of rubble and who left mute, shaking their heads, had underestimated two things: The fierce spirit of these Kansans, born of pioneer parents, and the Christian compassion of Americans.

When the new modern community high school was dedicated in Udall on a Sunday afternoon last April—with the high-school band marching down the main street, playing for the first time in their new uniforms, and with Governor Fred Hall coming from Topeka to make a speech—it was a symbol of triumph to warm the heart of every American.

A few weeks later, on the anniversary of the storm, there were celebrations all over the place—in the three new churches already rebuilt, in the nice new stores, in the new homes that stand where they were only ruins a year ago.

Today Udall is a bright, new town. Everything is "better than before."

The story starts on the morning after the storm, as the morning light showed the dazed survivors and feverishly working rescue teams the true extent of the disaster. All that day, as the rescue parties continued their search and the trucks evacuated survivors to nearby towns. Udall's Mayor Earl Rowe saw and heard cheering evidence of good neighborliness. Wichita's city manager, C. N. Smith, dispatched 25 policemen to help preserve order and prevent looting, and fire trucks to be ready if needed. Martial law was proclaimed and the highway patrol closed the town to all but authorized relief personnel, officials and the press.

Several shortwave radio "hams" came to Udall with portable sets, while others set up a message center in Red Cross Headquarters at Wichita. From early morning hundreds of blood donors filled the Red Cross offices and hospitals of towns far and near, and by noon the life-preserving plasma was being rushed by ambulances to the injured.

Agents of the State and Federal Governments began arriving, along with newsmen. Important to all these was the question: Where will Udall rebuild? One Federal official explained to Rowe that no money for reconstruction could be allowed until that matter was settled. He argued that there was no use connecting up utilities when nobody could return to use them. "We'll decide that," Rowe responded.

At the damaged bank a correspondent was interviewing the haggard, weary Mr. Tracy Hildebrandt. "Will anyone ever build a house on wreckage like this?" the newsman asked.

"You couldn't keep them from it," answered the banker. "We've still got a good town. You'll see."

Frank Kessler, president of the Wichita Association of Home Builders, brought in a carload of his members, volunteering to help in any way.

"Can you build us a temporary city hall?" Rowe asked.

"We'll build it tomorrow morning," Kessler answered as an architect in the group sketched plans for a one-story frame structure.

Town clerk John Arbuckle, crippled by a boyhood accident, came to the bank with his suitcase. "I guess I'll be leaving here," Arbuckle told Mayor Rowe.

"They're building us a city hall tomorrow," said the mayor. "I'll be needing you, Johnnie."

The city clerk looked into the earnest face of his chief. "You mean you're going to rebuild this town?"

"Whatever the rest do, I'm going to rebuild my house," Rowe responded. Johnnie put down his suitcase. "If you stay, I stay," he said.

Together the mayor and clerk went to talk to calm, gray-haired Tracy Hildebrandt. "Our water mains and sewer system are still in the ground," said Rowe. "We can repair our utilities. We mustn't scatter our people. Let's stay and rebuild."

"I agree with you, Earl," said the banker. The men discussed other assets: How they would get about $300,000 insurance money on the school buildings; how nearly all the citizens owned the land they lived on; and that the town was still just 20 miles from the Boeing plant where so many worked.

To the waiting officials and newsmen, Rowe announced: "We've still got our townsite—that didn't blow away. And so many neighbors want to help us. I don't know of a better place to put a town. We'll rebuild in honor of those who are gone."

The word went out by radio and news service: "Udall Will Rebuild." And back toward Udall came messages from everywhere pledging support.

At 6 o'clock next morning the Home Builders were back, with a squad of 50 workmen and truckloads of material. The lot on Main Street where the Community House had stood was cleared. Shortly after noon, the building, 50 by 80 feet, was completed. The keys were given to Mayor Rowe and everybody headed for the Salvation Army canteen for a celebration banquet of hot dogs and coffee.

Searching among the ruins, servicemen had found a ragged American flag. It had 42 stars, which meant it must have come in with a pioneer of the 80's. The guardsmen hoisted the flag over the new building—symbol of the unconquerable spirit of the town.

Rowe's first conference in his temporary city hall was about the water supply. That done, he greeted Governor Hall, who had flown in with an authorization of $250,000 of Federal credit and word from President Eisenhower that there would be more if needed.

Then a hundred bearded men arrived by truck—members of a Menonite community in central Kansas, 140 miles away.

Rowe assigned some to the rescue teams, others to distributing relief goods. Later they became carpenters, truck drivers, ditch diggers, and even baby sitters. In all, more than 400 of these devout men helped lift the stricken town from its debris.

Gifts of food, clothing, building materials, and money from patriotic organizations, civic clubs, and business firms flowed in. Boeing Aircraft officials and employees raised $20,000. The Reverend Wayne Karlowski of Wichita, who had served at Udall's Methodist Church, organized a telephone campaign for clothing and in 1 day gathered 6 truckloads.

In a mighty flood, letters with money poured in upon Mayor Rowe. Many added such words as "Please give this to any family that needs it," or "here's what I have saved for a new dress." "I read how you are going to build Udall back again," wrote a youth from an Oxford, Kans., Army camp. "Here's $50 to help out." The Girl Scouts of Winfield heard about 6-year-old Barbara Braddy losing her right leg, and sent the money for the artificial leg she wears today.

Officials of nearly every city and town in Kansas, and scores in neighboring States, sent help. Spontaneous collections were taken, as in washtubs, on street corners with signs "For Udall." At Belle Plaine, an antique auto was placed in the business district with a sign inviting all hands to throw in money; it netted more than $1,600. At Winfield, the chamber of commerce erected

a huge thermometer marked "$100 a mile to Udall." In the first afternoon, the device registered $1,700.

When martial law and the ban on travel were lifted, sightseers filled the highways of southern Kansas, converging upon Udall. Young men at Mulvane, mostly ex-GI's, stopped every car.

"Going to Udall? Well, now, we're taking up a collection for those people. We guess you'd like to make a little donation." The young men "guessed" right. They dumped more than $9,000 into Udall's relief fund.

Meanwhile, Rowe called his city council together—all but two. One had lost his life, and the other was in a hospital. They allotted the relief money and received assurances from the Red Cross, the Federal Housing Agency and the Small Business Administration that grants and loans would be available for everyone to rebuild.

Within 2 months after the storm loans were processed for 64 new homes. By the end of April, 11 months later, 135 of the Udall dwellings were rebuilt. Many were on the same lots as before—but not many were on the same plans. "Practically all have many more modern conveniences than the old ones," a builder told me.

A total of $450,000 in Federal disaster allotments helped to restore the utilities and repair the streets. All the business houses have been rebuilt, most of them upon the former sites. There was Lee Beisinger's old feed and produce store, for instance. It was built of concrete blocks in 1884.

"I found a lot of the blocks scattered over my farm a half mile east of town, so I just gathered them up and used them out there," said Beisinger, with a chuckle. "It took a lot of faith to put up this new building, and now I need more room."

Wichita's building trades' unions furnished the materials and labor to build a two-story, brick city hall.

"We women raised most of the money to build the Community House last time, and we'll do it again," Mrs. Robert L. Harris, assistant at the post office, told me.

The new elementary school, latest word in modern design, will be ready for use in September. As each section of the high school was rebuilt, classes moved in. In his speech of dedication, Governor Hall commended the townspeople for rebuilding "in the face of the widespread comment that Udall was destroyed never to rise again."

As the Congregational Church neared completion, Mrs. Ira Scatterthwaite, clerk and president of the women's society, took me on a conducted tour. "I sent out 90 thank you cards to donors, from Boston to Los Angeles and from as far away as Hong Kong and French Morocco," she said. "See our new kitchen? Everything in here donated. And that piano? Given by an elderly couple."

The disaster brought the church people of Udall closer together. Now many join in union services in the summer and engage in other common activities. When a storm struck Drumwright, Okla., last spring, the women of Udall's three congregations sent a donation for relief.

"Best thing about our town now is that everything is better than it was!" says town clerk Arbuckle.

Udall citizens are prepared to protect their lives from future tornadoes. Storm cellars have been built in the town park, for all who do not have caves of their own. An observation tower stands at the edge of town, manned by volunteer spotters of the Ground Observer Corps every hour of the day during the tornado season.

Now Udall is a tourist attraction as hundreds of cars drive in with visitors eager to see the town that so bravely came back and rebuilt.

"It takes a storm like ours to teach what good neighbors we have," says Mayor Rowe. Surely, "those who are gone" would be proud of Udall today.

Our Illegal Fourteenth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an article by Columnist David Lawrence entitled "Our Illegal 14th Amendment," taken from the July 26 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

The article follows:

OUR ILLEGAL FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT—FORCED ON SOUTH IN 1868, IT IS BASIS OF BILL ON CIVIL RIGHTS, TERMED "RIGHTS INVADER"

(By David Lawrence)

Americans would be outraged today if they read that a country calling itself a republic had forced the adoption of a constitution upon its local legislatures at the point of a bayonet.

Few Americans know, however, that this was precisely what happened in supposedly free America in 1868—nearly 3 years after the War Between the States and after the Southern States had been accepted fully into the Union.

Indeed, few people today know the historical background of the "civil rights" bill which the House of Representatives has just passed. Instead, many people, in referring to the segregation issue, talk glibly about the need for "obeying the Constitution," without the slightest awareness that the famous 14th amendment from which the whole "civil rights" controversy has emerged never really was ratified in the constitutional manner by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and by three-fourths of the then existing States.

Without exception, all the historians who have written about that period in American history are agreed as to the facts of what happened. There were 37 States in the Union and, then as now, it was necessary before the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution that two steps be taken—first, approval of a proposed amendment by a two-thirds vote in both Houses of Congress, and, second, ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

In 1866, when the 14th amendment was considered by Congress, the Members of the House and Senate who came from the South were deliberately disqualified from voting by a northern majority in both Houses. Nevertheless, the amendment was submitted to the States for ratification.

The action taken by Congress was in contrast to what had happened in 1865—after the war—when the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, was before these same Members of Congress. Southern Members were not disqualified then. Nor was any question raised as to the legitimacy of the State legislatures when the entire South, through these same legislatures, voted to ratify the 13th amendment. President Andrew Johnson had formally proclaimed amnesty and had recognized the State governments in 1865. To all intents and purposes, they were the legal governments of those States.

When, two years after the amnesty, the 10 Southern States rejected the 14th amendment, this was enough to defeat ratification, inasmuch as 10 States were more than one-fourth of the 37 in the Union at the time. Congress then stepped in and, again without letting the Southern Congressmen or Senators vote, passed the Reconstruction Act of 1867 over the veto of President Andrew Johnson, who in a message formally challenged the constitutionality of the law. Under the terms of that law, Congress attempted to coerce the Southern States. The law declared the existing State governments were to be wiped out, all Confederate soldiers were to be disfranchised and military rule was to be imposed.

The law specifically said military rule would be lifted and the States would be given back their powers and their representation in Congress only after each one had ratified the 14th amendment.

"Rump" legislatures thereupon were set up under military rule, which in turn accepted the conditions imposed on the South by Congress. With ironical disregard of the very words of the 14th amendment which guaranteed "due process of law," this amendment was proclaimed formally in 1868 as an integral part of the Constitution.

There is, of course, no power contained in the Constitution, itself, which can order the States to vote for or reject a constitutional amendment. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, has since sidestepped every case brought before it which attempted to question the validity of the procedure used in 1867 and 1868. To this day, the highest court in the land has never ruled on the legitimacy of the 14th amendment itself.

Since the Supreme Court in 1954 overturned a precedent established 58 years before with respect to equal but separate schools, there are many lawyers today who say the Supreme Court now should reexamine the method by which the 14th amendment was illegally interjected into the Constitution. In fact, a case has just been brought in a Federal court in Tennessee that raises this very issue.

As recently as 1951, the Supreme Court expressed its disapproval of what it termed the conquered province theory that prevailed in Congress after the war and warned that the 14th amendment was not to be used to centralize power so as to upset the Federal system.

Yet the civil rights measure which the House has just passed does mean Federal interference in the operations of State institutions and agencies and the harassment of citizens generally by a Federal commission—even though such citizens are not connected with State governments in any way.

This is perhaps the most far-reaching invasion of the rights of the States that has been proposed since the ill-fated time when Congress coerced the Southern States by means of puppet legislatures into ratifying an amendment that the people didn't want—the antithesis of government by the consent of the governed.

Few voices, unfortunately, are being raised in the North against this defiance of basic principles of constitutionalism. Whether or not one believes in the principle of integration in the public schools wherever the States desire it—as this writer does—the fact remains that the orders to obey integration and the support in Congress for various civil rights measures are based on an alleged amendment to the Constitution that never was legally ratified.

Rates Charged for Electric Power

SPEECH
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are all, friends of the REA,

but as I understand this issue, from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who knows the facts and speaks with authority, the trouble now is that the Southwestern Power Administration, is not making enough money so they can continue to supply the needs of the REA customers. That is unfortunate. We should in some way assist them. There is no one who wants to see them lose money or be deprived of power.

But it appears that the contract which was entered into some years ago and which gives the Reynolds company a subsidy of $900,000 a year—and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHUDOFF] might make note of that figure, even if he does come from Philadelphia, because it is quite a sum out in the country—that contract was made by a previous administration, by Mr. Chapman.

The answer for the making of that contract and which he gives in substance is, "I do not see any reason why REA customers should be deprived of power and made to suffer." I do not either, except that Chapman got them into that hole. Then the gentleman in effect said, "Well, the contract was made during the war," and another gentleman says, "During the Korean War, and those had to be the terms." Who shoved us into the Korean War? Was it not Truman? Republicans did not have anything to do with that. Nor can you lay that to the private power companies. That charge will not wash out. One reason for the plight of the REA customers may be that costs have gone up. Another might be lack of good management.

Another reason for the contract he gives is—and I do not get the hook-up between the two, because if it was during the war then there was no unemployment—but he said it was to give jobs. Well, that doesn't make sense, and that is all there is to his argument.

The whole situation gets back to the fact that the Truman administration or Mr. Chapman stuck us with the contract and it resulted in a whale of a big subsidy every year to the Reynolds private industry which some would like to liquidate.

Along the same line, as mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], for months the subcommittees of the Committee on Government Operations—not all of them, oh, no; but 1 or 2—have been going under the direction of or being directed by Socialists, or former employees in the Department of the Interior, who either resigned because they could not stand the return to sound business methods or were kicked out. They have been directing the activities of this subcommittee. The parent committee, that is the Committee on Government Operations, has had $995,000 for investigations. They asked for $100,000 more, but that went out on a point of order. But they had within $5,000 of a million dollars, a large part of which, in my opinion, as shown by their investigations and hearings they have been using deliberately and with skill, and without regard to the facts, to create and disseminate at the taxpayers' expense propaganda against private enterprise. That is the picture, and, like it or not, that is the way it is. They have been shoving along these reports at this late date, in the last week or two, when there is no sufficient opportunity for us to answer.

Not more than 2 hours ago I had a call from the Department of the Interior—and I was not on that particular committee as a regular member—when they said, in substance, "We just received a a copy of a report which reflects upon our integrity and we would like to answer. Will you make an effort to get time for us to answer?"

I said, "Bless your soul, the hearings, the time for putting in the report, were closed yesterday noon." They gave us all of 24 hours, this generous committee did, to file answers to reports which are based upon the stenographer's minutes where there was no printed record. How do you like it? And what do you think of that kind of treatment?

This Is the Real America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "This Is the Real America," written by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and published in the Family Weekly magazine for July 1, 1956. It deals with the elements which make America great.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS THE REAL AMERICA
(By HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota)

What is America? Ask a hundred Americans, and you will receive a hundred answers. Admittedly, we live in a land of vast resources and mass-production skills. Yet, they who think we are just a combination of skyscrapers, shiny automobiles, television sets, and mechanized kitchens miss the real America.

America is not just efficiency and bigness. America is people—people of many walks of life, prizing varied achievements, but sharing a common regard for the dignity of each other and inspired by infinite hope.

America is a people at work, producing coal and steel, building houses and highways, selling goods and services.

America is more an array of small-town Main Streets than it is glittering Broadways.

America, deep underneath, is the stability and character and willingness to work exemplified by the men and women on hundreds of thousands of American family farms. It is the tradition of family living, church on Sunday, the family picnic, the respect for hard work. It is this that runs through the whole fabric of American life, whether small town or big city.

America is people working together in a thousand voluntary organizations—planning parks, building clean playgrounds and beaches, organizing scouting groups, improving neighborhoods and towns and cities, raising funds for medical research. It is men and women in laboratories and in sick rooms and hospital operating rooms, fighting the daily struggle against pain and fear and death.

America is opportunity, where a man's station in life is what he makes it and not what his birth might indicate. America is where men and women can openly join in organized labor to protect their livelihood and their health and their families; it is where other men and women risk their fortunes and devote their energies and dedication to keeping American industry progressive and dynamic, so that our economy may continue to expand.

America is the excitement of youth, heedless of the cynic and the pessimist, an impatience for fulfillment of even greater promise for each generation.

America is the exemplification of mass acceptance of each individual's human dignity as an inherent right; America is the conscience that pushes us and those with whom we associate in the world toward greater justice for all men, no matter what their creed or color. It is the compassion that sends our hand out to the aged and the sick, to the homeless and the starving, at home and around the world.

America is abhorrence of war and violence and oppression in any form—yet a zeal to uphold moral rights and human freedoms so strong we are willing to fight to preserve them, whatever the personal sacrifice.

America is strength and power from spiritual and moral principles upon which our Nation was founded, with our strength ebbing and flowing as we cling to or neglect those spiritual and moral principles.

It is this indomitable spirit of America that I believe in—the real America. It is to maintain this kind of an America, based upon justice for all, compassion for all, tolerance for all, and respect for all, whether we agree or disagree with their views; it is to this vision of America which I hold dear in my heart that I have dedicated my life and whatever talents God may have given me.

Report From the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including two articles from Newsday, Long Island's leading daily paper. Miss Alicia Patterson, capable and energetic editor and publisher, gives a firsthand report of the economic and political conditions in Egypt. I particularly invite your attention to the observations Miss Patterson makes in regard to the high dam.

The articles follow:

EGYPT DISPLAYS STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES
(By Alicia Patterson)

(From 3000 B. C. to 350 B. C. Egypt was ruled by the Pharaohs. Since that time the country has been governed by practically everyone but Egyptians. The Persians, Greeks, Romans, Caliphs, Mamelukes (Turkish slave rulers), and the Turks, all conquered and reigned; some for a few years, some for centuries. The Turks have the longest record of sovereignty in Egypt, from 1517 until the British took over in 1882.

(Under British control, Egyptian kings descended from the Turks nominally ruled. The last, Farouk, was ousted July 23, 1952, by a military coup led by Gen. Mohammed Naguib and Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser. After a short term as president, Naguib was ousted by Nasser, who instituted military rule on the grounds that he must clear out divisive elements. His strength continued to increase not only in Egypt but in the whole Arab world. This year, he called for a referendum and was elected president by a 99.8 percent majority. There was no other name on the ballot. In the week preceding the election, Egypt staged a series of spectaculars to proclaim her independence to the world.)

CAIRO.—The week-long gala to celebrate the evacuation from Egyptian soil by the British after 74 years is history now. But it is pertinent current history—and its effect is felt very day. Egypt's president, Col. Gamal Abdel Nasser, has gone to Yugoslavia to confer with Tito. The kings and the sheiks from the Arab world, with their okals and burnooses, have returned to Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iraq. Gen. Sir Brian Robertson, the Briton who sat through the ceremonies with stolid British courage, has gone back to his island home—trailing behind him the glory that was England when she ruled the Suez. Dmitri T. Shepilov, the new Russian Foreign Minister, has flown back to report to his superiors in the Kremlin. Shepilov has a fine time here. His report to Khrushchev and Bulganin would have been interesting to hear. He no doubt told them of his great ovation, which at times overshadowed that given to Egypt's leader, Colonel Nasser; of how he was the lion at every party while the decadent British and Americans were nervously watching his triumph. For the triumph was his.

ARMS FOR COTTON

The local papers vied with each other in extravagant adjectives to praise the mighty man. The people screamed their admiration. "Ole. Ole. Ole." Shepilov represented Russia and Russia made the arms deal with Egypt, trading munitions for cotton. There could have been no military parade lasting for 3½ hours without Russia. There would have been no Stalin tanks, no Czech antiaircraft guns, no light tanks, no armored cars, no medium tanks, no MIGs.

It is true that the airplane display was the one sour note in an otherwise glorious Egyptian day. There just weren't many planes (official count 21). And when they did zoom over the grandstand they came in scattered dribs and drabs. "The Air Force display will take place simultaneously with the parade of mechanized units" the program read. And so the audience expected something more dramatic than a few MIGs accompanied by a handful of bombers and twin-engined Ilyushins. The air show just did not strike terror to the heart.

No one explained the lack of airplanes. The Egyptians said, "We are saving them for more important things." The British thought that they had been "flown into the ground." The Americans hoped that Russia just hadn't come across with the full delivery.

But if the planes weren't impressive, the rest of the show was. Most impressive of all was the discipline of the troops, lean, and precise, as they marched past handsome, tireless Abdel Nasser under the broiling sun. Their carriage was British as was the cut of their uniforms. And many wondered what Gen. Sir Brian Robertson was thinking as he watched. Was he thinking perhaps that Britain had sowed the seeds of her own destruction when she wrought this Frankenstein machine? Britain had spent over half a century teaching soldiers how to march like this.

Interspersed with the khaki-clad Egyptian regiments were the troops of the Jordan Army with their red and white okals, those soldiers that Lawrence of Arabia loved so well—and after him Sir John Bagot Glubb, the legendary figure known as Glubb Pasha. There were the Sudanese with brown turbans and brown skirts. There were paratroopers prancing proudly by the dignitaries on the double quick. Standing at attention in the noonday inferno were 1,500 of Nasser's finest. They moved hardly a muscle for 5 long hours. Yes, is was quite a show.

And it was that way all the week. (It must have cost the Egyptians several million dollars to put on a show like that.) The night before the parade there was a mass rally of huge proportions at the Abdin Palace Square. Bright Egyptian cotton decorated the columns and hundreds of feet of red Egyptian rugs covered the ground.

NASSER CARRIES THE BALL

The purpose of the rally was to explain to the Egyptian people and the world the aims and ambitions of the new Egypt. The one speaker was Nasser. No other speaker was needed. Nasser was more than adequate for the job. He spoke for 2 hours, most of the time extemporaneously. Dressed in mufti, with little of the showmanship of the authentic dictator, he cried out to the crowd of approximately 80,000 (the local press set the figure at 250,000): "Today Egypt belongs to all Egyptians and not to a minority or a group of traitors, despots, and exploiters." His reference was not only to the departure of the British but also the enforced departure of fat, corrupt King Farouk who was ousted by Nasser and a handful of fellow officers in the military coup of 1952. Nasser listed in detail the achievements under his leadership.

On and on this tireless man talked as though, by repetition, he could impress on a somewhat apathetic audience the need for further struggle. He promised the people a new constitution, a free press, the end of martial law. "There will be no monopoly, no feudalism, no exploitation, no serfdom and no slavery.' He explained the agrarian reform law by which the land was expropriated from the rich to give to the poor. (No one person can own more than 200 acres of the priceless black earth that borders the Nile.) "Today we are working to build a society where class differences are narrowed * * * where every citizen feels that the country is his and not the property of a very few while he works as a slave or serf."

Nasser continued to plead: "I will never be able to achieve it alone (social justice) no matter how hard I work. The ones to realize this objective are you, the people."

AUDIENCE WAS APATHETIC

The speech was interrupted at set intervals by student claques in the middle of the crowd. Dutifully, they waved their hands and cheered. But they were unable to rouse mass enthusiasm. It was very strange. Here was a man who had freed Egypt from foreign domination and internal corruption. He had built up the military and he had introduced social reforms. He was humble: "Gamal Abdel Nasser is worth nothing at all." And he was apparently sincere. His voice was resonant and he used it well. In appearance he was lithe and handsome and young (age 38). Why then did he not stir these masses?

The only real sign of quickening response came with Nasser's promise to abolish martial law. Egyptians know what martial law means.

Perhaps the answer to the lack of public reaction lies in the history of Egypt. For thousands of years the fellahin (peasant) has been more of a beast of burden than a human being. Ignorant, impoverished, diseased, the average Egyptian cannot understand what Nasser is trying to accomplish or what he is talking about. And Nasser with all his brilliance will not succeed in making them understand unless he has: (1) money, (2) time, and (3) security. He must raise the educational level of the people, who are 75 percent illiterate. He must raise their standard of living, which is pitifully low (the per capita income has been estimated at $117 a year). He must keep the army strong, for his strength lies in the support of the army.

Since Egypt is a poor country, he has to look for outside money. Right now he is looking for $1 million to build the high dam at Aswan on the Nile. This dam, when completed, will revolutionize Egypt's economy. It will irrigate 30 percent of her desert lands for agriculture and it will furnish power for new industry. The dam is more than a dam to the leaders of the revolution. It is the symbol of the new Egypt. The Russians know the diplomatic value that would come from helping Egypt and so do the United States and Britain. For the past months, negotiations have been in progress between Egypt and the western powers for a loan but the ways of democracy move slowly and nothing has been settled to date. During the celebration, Shepilov came up with an offer of a large amount of money at little interest to build the dam, plus technical assistance.

Nasser, from reliable reports, does not want to accept the Russian offer and would prefer to get the money from the Western Powers. He has seen what happens to small countries who have tried to do business with the Bear and he has a strong suspicion that the same fate would await him. He did not want to accept arms from the Soviet. For months he tried to make a deal with the United States. We said yes, then no. We dragged our feet and scratched our head. Nothing happened. Finally the army forced Nasser's hand and the Russians speedily sent the equipment in exchange for cotton. The dam negotiations are following the same pattern.

NASSER'S NEXT MOVE

The pro and con arguments on whether we should subsidize the high dam go like this:

Pro—Nasser is the strongest leader of the Arab world. The United States needs the oil from the great fields of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Kuwait. Without oil, the NATO countries would fall apart in a month. If we can bring Nasser into the free world orbit by helping him financially, we insure our security.

Con—No one man controls the Arab world. Each Arab country has a different problem and there is strong rivalry among them. If we do subsidize the dam we have no guarantee that we will ever get the money back or that we will ensure our security. It is better for the Russians to extend themselves in an expensive and possibly futile project. "You cannot buy goodwill."

It looks here as though Egypt will accept the Russian offer unless the Western Powers move fast. Even now it may be too late.

EGYPT TRIES TO PULL ITSELF OUT OF THE PAST

(By Alicia Patterson)

PART TWO: EGYPT AT THE CROSSROADS

CAIRO—"There is a time to reap and a time to sow. There is a time for peace and a time for war."

For Egypt this should be a time for sowing and peace. She must pry herself loose from the mud of the ages if she is to survive.

No country has had a prouder ancient history. Few countries have a more difficult present. Tourists from across the world come here to visit the Sphinx and the pyramids and the Valley of the Kings and the glittering treasure of Tut-Ankh-Amen.

Tourists also visit the Mousky—the bazaar which twists and teems—where artisans hammer out silver trays and mold amber prayer beads, where camels and donkeys, women carrying jars on their heads and men in thier nightgown gallabeahs jostle and push, making a colorful pattern that looks like a set from Hollywood.

Beneath all this picturesqueness stands the specter of disease and poverty and illiteracy. The man of the Mousky is the classic man of Egypt. Ground under first by the Pharahos, then by outside powers, the fellahin (peasant) has had a tragic subhuman existence.

Fellahin must change

If Egypt is to become a modern nation, the fellahin must be transformed. There are 22 million persons in Egypt and 75 percent of them belong to this class.

The one man in Egypt today who can bring about the transformation is Gamal Abdel Nasser, the newly elected President of the Egyptian Republic. He has a vision of gleaming splendor, of a land with schools and prosperity, with modern machinery and modern ideas. The vision will be hard to come by. What efforts have been made are the ripple in the ocean.

It is problematical whether the small dedicated group around Nasser can work the miracle in the foreseeable future. True, a heroic start has been made. Last year Egypt built 365 schools. "A School a Day" is the slogan. The universities at Cairo and Alexandria turn out 20,000 graduates a year who become teachers, not only for Egypt but for the whole Arab world. Each student is charged with teaching at least one illiterate to read and write.

In agriculture other small steps are being taken. The land belonging to King Farouk's family has been confiscated and parcelled out in 5-acre lots to individuals for more equitable distribution. Until now 94 percent of the landlords owned 35 percent of the land. Now no one individual is allowed to own more than 200 acres. Some modern machinery is being distributed in cooperatives and instruction is given to the new farmers on the rotation of crops and the necessity for fertilizer.

Extensive plans for a synthetic nitrate factory have been drawn that will provide 70 percent of Egypt's needs if and when the high dam is built at Aswan.

The Nile soil is rich and Egypt can raise from 3 to 5 crops a year of cotton, wheat, and grains. But, alas for Egypt, the fertility of the soil is dependent on the Nile. And the Nile is a slender emerald ribbon running over the vast yellow desert. Out of more than 247 million acres—an area about the size of Texas and Arizona combined—only 6 million are now under cultivation. The dam would provide an additional third.

Agricultural experiment

One of the most interesting agricultural experiments is taking place at the Liberation Province between Cairo and Alexandria. Here Director General Major Magdy Hassanein is reclaiming 27,000 acres of desert land by canals and artesian wells. (The Nile waters have seeped under the desert sand in this area.) He foresees the day, 15 years hence, when 1,200,000 acres will be productive. But most observers see this dream possible only with the dam.

The crops will be divided into blocks: fruits 60 percent, vegetables 20 percent, grains 20 percent, for easier cultivation. Fruits and vegetables will be exported from Alexandria across the Mediterranean to western Europe. There are no plans to increase the cotton crop, which has suffered a severe depression from United States competition.

Most interesting angle of the Liberation Province project is the human experiment involved. Fifteen thousand men and wives have been chosen as guinea pigs by the Government to pioneer a new way of life. They are picked in family units and given extensive tests for mental qualifications, for endurance, for health, for adaptability, and for psychological soundness.

The ages for women must range from 18 to 25, for men from 24 to 30. At the time of its induction a family is allowed no more than two children. After a 6 months' training period in agriculture and literacy, the families are sent to villages numbering 300 settlers. Each family is provided with a small cinder-block house (inadequate by American standards) ranged around a compound containing a playground, a mosque, a nursery, and a hospital clinic. The men and women work the fields while the children are cared for and instructed by young women teachers.

Everyone is provided with a uniform. New Egypt disapproves of both the fez and gallabeah. Checkered shirts, dark trousers, white caps for the men; wide skirts, kerchiefs, blouses for the women; denim shorts for the children. The pay runs from 24 to 40 piastres a day (a piastre is worth 3 cents). In the far away future the director general visualizes 20 centers, containing 11 villages, and 12 industrial centers where factories will belch forth smoke and consumer goods and where everyone will live the good life.

An American would be appalled at the regimentation of the human beings, at the robotlike conception of making a machine out of a man. No American could tolerate such an existence. But people must be taken in context. These people never had anything before but misery and despair. When I asked if the settlers were free to move, the director looked at me in astonishment. "Move? Why move? We have so many, many applications for this province that we cannot fill them ever. These pioneers feel the luckiest in the world. And in 30 years they will own the land."

Perhaps the only way to upgrade this undeveloped land is through extraordinary methods like those used at Liberation Province. I wondered what would finally happen as I drove back through the blistering Sahara sands. Would this brave new experiment produce a new generation of conditioned automatons snapping to salute at the leader's command or would these people free themselves through education and sanitation to take their seats in the parliament of man?

Strauss' Report of "Clean" Bomb Draws Challenge From Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 27.

This article was written by two of Washington's most competent reporters in the field of atomic energy application.

This article is a further indication of the reaction of competent press reporters to the recent inadequate and misleading statement of Mr. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is a further indictment of a consistent pattern of veiled statements which are susceptible to misleading conclusions by lay readers, who are not familiar with enough of the acts, to properly evaluate the statements.

The article follows:

STRAUSS' REPORT OF "CLEAN" BOMB DRAWS CHALLENGE FROM EXPERTS

(By Warren Unna and John G. Norris)

Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss' allusion last week to what amounts to progress in developing a "clean" bomb has been challenged by informed Washington scientific, military and political authorities.

Requesting anonymity, for professional reasons, they see Strauss' reference to progress toward a relatively fall-out-free bomb as bringing only false comfort to ourselves, our allies, or even our enemies. They consider the "clean" bomb announcement misleading to civil defense preparations at home. They consider it basically deceptive and enormously disturbing to informed allied leaders who are constantly on seat's edge over what this country will say next about its terrible weapon.

Strauss, in a statement on the current Pacific tests released Thursday, had this to say:

"As a result of this series, we have gained confirmation * * * of making weapons with reduced fallout. Our tests to date have demonstrated that real progress has been made * * * including achievement of maximum effect in the immediate area of a target with minimum widespread fallout hazard.

"It has been confirmed that there are many factors, including operational ones, which do make it possible to localize to an extent not heretofore appreciated the fallout effect of nuclear explosions.

"Thus the current series of tests has produced much of importance, not only from a military point of view, but from a humanitarian aspect. We are convinced that mass hazard from fallout is not a necessary complement to the use of larger nuclear weapons."

Strauss' remarks followed shortly after published testimony by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, Army Chief of Research, declaring an allout nuclear attack on Russia might backwash its radioactive fallout on this country's allies in Europe, causing "several hundred million deaths."

Washington scientific, military, and political authorities see two explanations for what Strauss may have in mind:

1. Some authorities think Strauss' "clean" bomb allusion may connote a high air burst—15,000 to 20,000 feet up. This would keep the bomb's fireball from sucking up pulverized sections of the earth's surface and coating them with the bomb's own radioactivity. These particles are the real fallout menace for they have weight and fall back to earth with their deadly charge.

But by confining their attack to such air bursts, American strategic bombers could not carry out the sort of devastating counterblow that is the basis of the Nation's retaliatory strategy. For the primary target of the Strategic Air Command is the enemy's own long-range nuclear air force—to catch it on the ground if possible, and if not then to destroy its bases so that it cannot return for repeated attacks on this country.

High air bursts can destroy planes on the ground and above-ground hangars, but cannot crack heavy bomber runways, nor underground hangars. If the enemy moves first—and gets its bombers into the air—the United States air chiefs will want to try to smash the bases with ground bursts to prevent successive enemy attacks on both the United States and our allies.

But in bursting the bomb down close to the target, so that the fireball sucks up huge areas of dirt, fallout becomes an inevitable byproduct.

In such a situation, American authorities would have to choose between pulling our punches to avoid spraying some friendly areas with deadly fallout, or trying to smash hard enough to prevent further enemy attacks. And the enemy, needless to say, might not be using "clean" bombs.

Strategists also are concerned for the plane which drops a high burst; how could it escape in time if the major explosive thrust is going to be high up in the air?

2. The AEC Chairman may mean the radioactivity in the bomb itself can now be reduced. Commissioner Willard F. Libby is known to be working on a way to lessen some of the three dozen radioactive ingredients which exist in or are formed from the super-

bomb's outer jacket when the bomb explodes.

This may cut down on such long-lived and poisonous radioactive substances as strontium-90, which are spewed into the atmosphere, and rain down over the whole world, year after year, with cumulatively dangerous effect.

But there will always be some radioactive elements formed in the outer jacket, and scientists feel that some kind of outer jacket is necessary to obtain the high inner temperature essential to permit the explosive fusion of the bomb's hydrogen.

They agree that the fusion reaction can be increased and the fission action in the jacket reduced—thus cutting down the radioactivity somewhat. But this operation reduces the efficiency of the bomb and its devastating blast and heat.

But by far the greatest doubt over the Strauss announcement hovers over the superbomb's inner core—the "trigger" of fissioning uranium-235. Unlike the fuse cap in a boy's .22 rifle, this initial explosion is a bomb in itself, several times the size of those dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaka. These initial A-bombs were no peanuts. They had the explosive power of 15,000 tons of TNT. They averaged some 58,000 deaths apiece, and the produced a hugh radioactive fallout.

Scientists see no way of eliminating the superbomb's trigger, which is also essential to get the "clean" fusion explosion going. And as long as there is this trigger, there is going to be radioactivity.

But assume Commissioner Libby by chance is able to perfect a "clean" bomb, one whose explosive power is completely dependent upon the fusioning of hydrogen particles, a process which causes no fallout. Other roadblocks pop up.

Such fusion components as lithium are far more expensive to produce than the big-bang-per-buck ordinary uranium now used.

Military expediency in the event of war would mean grabbing at our superbomb stockpile. And informed authorities see no way of denaturing these old-style "dirty" bombs to make them conform to Strauss' new formula.

Military strategists may really not want to get rid of radioactivity. A House Government Operations Committee civil defense report out Wednesday quotes the Naval Radiological Defense Laboratory as saying radioactive fallout is our major antipersonnel weapon.

Commenting on the Strauss announcement in a speech on the House floor Wednesday night, Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, Democrat, California, a key member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, declared:

"I am concerned over the repeated pattern of applying advertising agency techniques to alleviate the natural fears of hydrogen destruction which trouble our people and the people of the world * * * An atom bomb or a hydrogen bomb burst on a military target without dangerous radioactive fallout would be a miracle. Such a miracle has not been achieved."

Proposed Project of Union Electric Co., of St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Union Electric's Ingenious Power Project," published in Investor's Reader for July 25, 1956, dealing with a proposed project of the Union Electric Co., of St. Louis, Mo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION ELECTRIC'S INGENIOUS POWER PROJECT

One of the gravest problems of utilitymen is how to handle the peak load. In the public interest a utility must generate enough juice to light the lights for dinner yet at 6 a. m. many of its generators are idle.

A possible answer is a proposed project of mighty, $582 million assets Union Electric Co., of St. Louis. As diagrammed above, the project involves two man-made lakes, one higher than the other and both supplied with Mississippi River water. In peak periods waterflow from the upper lake would generate cheap hydroelectric power. During slack hours the company's idle steam capacity would pump the same water back to the upper lake for use in the next peak period.

Union Electric figures the fall of the water will generate two-thirds the power required to return the water to the upper lake. This sounds like very poor business but the company has also figured the process is cheaper than a whole new powerplant. Most important, the company will get the 2 kilowatt-hours when it is needed and can use the 3 kilowatt-hours to repump the water at leisure when the plants would be idle anyway.

Right now the project is strictly embroyonic. Union Electric is making geological "exploratory core drillings" in the Establishment Creek area, about 50 miles south of St. Louis. Though management is understandably mum about future plans, Vice President Dudley Sanford admits results so far are "not discouraging, though we are not far enough along to say anything concrete." Should the drillings prove successful Union Electric plans a thorough "economic survey" this fall.

Even if all goes well the novel project will not be finished until the early sixties. Reason: "We still have to finish our present program." Union Electric's current plans include some $290 million to be doled out between now and 1960 to provide facilities for expected load growth, "and we'll first need the extra steam units before we pump any water."

As envisioned the twin-lake plan would give Union Electric an additional 800,000 kilowatts. This compares with 200,000 kilowatts at the Bagnell Dam, currently the company's largest hydroelectric station. Even further in the future, a third man-made lake would add another 800,000 kilowatts. The grand total is roughly equivalent to the entire Union Electric system today.

Too Clever?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal of July 19, 1956. I have always maintained that a man in public life is no better than his word. When a candidate indicates his willingness to violate his oath in order to be elected he has, I submit, reached a new low in political opportunism. It looks like some of the newspapers are now beginning to catch up with the Democratic candidate for Senator in Ohio:

TOO CLEVER?

The feeling seems to be growing among political observers that Governor Lausche lost the senatorial election at Atlantic City.

The full significance of Lausche's remark—that if elected, he might vote with the Republicans to organize the Senate—took a little time to sink in.

First, the fact that Lausche gave the statement to Ohio reporters and carefully kept away from newsmen from other States made it pretty obvious that the Governor was trying to be a semi-Republican at home and a Democrat elsewhere.

Then, the reason he gave for a possible bolt to the opposition party became the less convincing the more it was examined. Lausche said he knew from experience that the program of an executive can be mutilated if the legislative branch is controlled by the other party.

The fact is that in his five terms as Governor the only time Lausche has had serious trouble with the legislature was the one time that the Democrats were in control.

Finally, some days passed before rank and file voters woke up to the fact that Lausche was saying in effect that he might disregard the oath he signed when he filed his declaration of candidacy. In that oath he said:

"I further declare that, if elected to said office, I will qualify therefor, and that I will support and abide by the principles enunciated by the Democratic Party in its national and State platform * * *."

If there is nothing in the Democratic platforms to bind elected candidates to vote with the party on so important a matter as organizing the Senate, it is because this is taken for granted.

At first the Lausche statement looked like a clever move to woo Republican support. As time passed, it began to look too clever.

Write for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, wonderful work is being done in the city of Newark, N. J., by the Catholic Advocate to free the captured clergymen from behind the Bamboo Curtain. As evidence of this work, I hereby submit this editorial from the Advocate under date of July 21, 1956:

WRITE FOR FREEDOM

Politicians respect the wrath of an aroused citizenry. For Mao Tse-Tung, head of Red China's Government, a citizens' protest may be a new experience, but it is figured that Mao is a clever politician and he will respect, if not fear, a protest of angry citizens of the United States.

With this in mind, Father Harold Rigney, S. V. D., since his release from a Communist prison in China, has begun a crusade for freedom to obtain the release of other American citizens still held as victims of Communist tyranny. He proposes a campaign of letters from individual Americans, protesting politely the continued imprisonment of our

fellow citizens and reminding Mao of the growing feeling against his actions.

The campaign is simple but it gives the average citizen something positive to do. And we shall add our prayers that our letters will obtain what our diplomacy has not accomplished, the release of Americans unjustly imprisoned.

Certainly all the organizations of men in the archdiocese of Newark will get behind this crusade adopted by the Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men. Details on procedure will be made available to the affiliated men's groups.

We may express the wish that the crusade grow to include other areas, and women, as well. A letter now will be an act of charity to the imprisoned who suffer at Red hands. It will also be a patriotic act since it will lend strength to the moves of our official representatives. America is not weak, and the aroused protests of millions of Americans can bombard Red China's leaders and make them think twice before they disregard a mighty nation aroused.

Wait for the proper procedure of the crusade for freedom to be made clear to your parish units. Then write for freedom.

Brain Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, over the next decade America faces one of the greatest challenges in its history. The Russians have demonstrated that they can produce complex modern weapons based on the latest developments in nuclear science, electronics, and the other branches of modern physics. Our problem is to keep ahead of the Russians in the military field while at the same time increasing our productivity so that we may maintain, and even improve, the living standards of our people.

At a recent conference for engineering educators, conducted by General Motors at its technical center, Mr. Louis C. Goad, General Motors executive vice president, presented some interesting facts bearing on this problem. He said:

One of this country's problems is that its labor force is increasing at only half the rate of the general population. This means both engineering and manufacturing must be stepped up in the future, if the United States is to maintain or raise its living standards.

Science and engineering are at the root of men's ability to translate nature's forces and materials to human benefit. In these United States the growing benefits are shared in greater or less measure by some 167,400,000 people, a number which is increasing by one each 12 seconds.

Of this total about 1 in each 160 is engaged in science and engineering, just a little over one-half of 1 percent. Their success in prying upward the moving curve of technical progress both in engineering and manufacturing makes the life of the average American largely what it is—at least from the material viewpoint.

Today's composite American is 30.2 years old and the national health is so favorable he may be expected to live another 42 years. This median age of 30 is going upward even in spite of a tremendous growth in population of the very young. * * * While birth records are being set, the number of those living past 65 is also moving upward. Since more than half of those past 65 report themselves as retired and because the young, of course, require parental support, it is entirely appropriate that we show the 1956 composite American as willingly bearing the extra burden of a child on his left arm and an older person on his right.

Our 30-year-old man is in the heart of the Nation's labor force. He has too much work to do and it isn't likely that he'll get much help from others than engineers, who can make his muscles and mind more useful.

The labor force is increasing now at the rate only about half that of the general population. In April the labor force was 64 million. * * * It is this 64-million force which is increasing slowly while those in retirement increase more rapidly along with those not yet entering employment.

Each person in the labor force today handles the needs of himself plus 1.6 other people, while in 1940 each man handled his own needs plus 1.2 other people.

Productivity—just to maintain the status quo in material things—has had to increase 33 percent so far as it affects caring for people other than the worker himself or an overall productivity increase of 18 percent just to maintain the 1940 status quo to include himself.

Because of the progress in manufacturing technology, the worker no longer needs to work 60 hours a week and more. He now works 40 hours per week, even while sustaining the very high standard of living we enjoy in relative security as a nation.

On July 5 I placed in the RECORD a statement by Dr. Arnold O. Beckman, former professor at Caltech and president of Beckman Instruments, Inc., and also of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce. He stressed the need of producing more and better high school students trained in science and mathematics if we are to maintain technical supremacy in this complex contest with the Russians.

The Russians have concentrated their educational efforts on the training of engineers and scientists. The Russian child normally enters school when he is 7 years old, and he is 16 or 17 when he graduates from the 10-year school. An American child enters school at the age of 6 and graduates at 17 or 18. The Russian child has gone to school 6 days a week and he works much harder than the American student. Education is serious business for Russian children. He has had 6 years of physics, 4 years of chemistry and mathematics from start to finish, including algebra and trigonometry. In science and mathematics he will be well ahead of the American high-school graduate.

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, the Chairman of the United States Atomic Energy Commission said:

In 5 years our country's lead in the training of scientists and engineers may be wiped out. In 10 years it could be hopelessly outstripped. Unless immediate steps are taken to correct it, a situation, already dangerous, within less than a decade could become disastrous.

Dr. John R. Weir, associate professor of psychology and director of student counseling at the California Institute of Technology, has recently made a study entitled "Brain Power." It deals with the problem of encouraging young people to select engineering and science as a career. It also urges the better utilization of trained technical personnel by industry and government. It suggests that greater opportunities for women in science and engineering would increase our available brain power in this area.

Dr. Weir believes that the only limitation on our future progress is adequate brain power. He is satisfied that we have adequate material resources if we can apply sufficient energy to obtain whatever materials we desire. Dr. Weir said:

The only remaining problem is how to add the energy to the system. Someone must do it. But doing it is not a simple matter—it takes a lot of knowledge, skill, and equipment—and it takes still more knowledge and skill to build the equipment.

So, in effect, we may be limited in the amount of energy we can spend, or in the rate at which we can spend it, by the availability of this knowledge and skill—by the availability of scientists and engineers. As we expend more and more energy in the extraction of materials from lower and lower grade ores, we meet an ever-increasing need for more skilled manpower, for more trained scientists and engineers. So in a very real sense the critical limiting factor on the world's resources is not materials, energy, or food, but brain power.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times, on May 21, published many excerpts from Dr. Weir's report on brain power. So that my colleagues may have the benefit of Dr. Weir's research, I am including the New York Times excerpts from his study as an extension of my remarks.

The excerpts follow:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT ON BRAIN POWER

Discussions of physical and plant resources present a rather reassuring picture of the future. We have all the physical resources we need in the granite of the earth's crust; we have all the food we need in alfalfa. There can be adequate food, clothing, and shelter, as well as quite a few luxuries, for a long time to come, even if our population doubles. In principle, all we need do is expend more energy to obtain whatever materials we desire.

The only remaining problem is how to add the energy to the system. Someone must do it. But doing it is not a simple matter—it takes a lot of knowledge, skill, and equipment—and it takes still more knowledge and skill to build the equipment.

So, in effect, we may be limited in the amount of energy we can spend, or in the rate at which we can spend it, by the availability of this knowledge and skill—by the availability of scientists and engineers. As we expend more and more energy in the extraction of materials from lower and lower grade ores, we meet an ever-increasing need for more skilled manpower, for more trained scientists and engineers. So in a very real sense the critical limiting factor on the world's resources is not materials, energy, or food, but brain power.

As we are dealing with a long-range projection of manpower resources, detailed consideration of the current shortage would not be germane. Authorities are in general agreement that we need about twice our present production of 45,000 engineers and scientists per year.

THE FACTOR OF 10

What are our ultimate potential manpower resources? During every half century since 1800 we have increased both our yearly production and our total supply of engineers and scientists by a factor of 10. Can we continue to do this in the next half century and beyond?

Charts A and B accompanying this text give some indication of the immensity of the waste in the development of intellectual tal-

ent in the United States. We lose half of the capable, a third of the exceptionally talented.

What are some of the reasons for this waste? What would the situation be if we could eliminate it?

The considerations most relevant to the making of a scientist or an engineer readily fall into three categories: (1) Early identification, (2) encouragement, and (3) training.

1. Clearly the earlier we can identify the embryo scientist or engineer the better. We are beginning to know a little about the psychological, emotional, and cultural experiences that are of importance in the ultimate determination of such an occupational choice, and it is now becoming possible to make this early identification at the junior high-school level with some degree of success.

Psychologists are also gaining an understanding of the pattern of mental traits and abilities that characterize the successful scientist or engineer and that distinguishes him from other occupational groups such as lawyers, doctors, authors, etc. Most of these traits and abilities have a large hereditary component, and appear at an early age, thus permitting their early identification.

2. The second set of problems relates to the encouragement or the development, of the budding scientist or engineer. His social-class origin, his home environment, his his parents' attitudes toward intellectual knowledge, the distractions of competing interests and activities, are all important determinants of motivation for continued learning.

In the elementary and high schools, the manner in which science and mathematics are taught and the enthusiasm and understanding of the teacher often have tremendous influence in awakening the spark of curiosity in young students. Similar things may be said about college curricula and college professors. Too often, teaching procedures and course requirements deaden any interest the student might have had.

And finally, there is the need for the removal of financial barriers so that any qualified and deserving student—the capable as well as the outstanding—can complete his education.

3. The third set of problems may be grouped around training or education.

At the high-school level there is a serious shortage of math and science teachers; we are producing only half of what we need, and only half of those produced go into teaching.

At the college level it is valid to point out that a college degree primarily signifies success in conforming with college grading procedures and study requirements, but we are not sure it signifies much more. We would benefit greatly from some external validation of these procedures and requirements. This latter observation is, of course, much less true of in-company training programs.

The final factor falling under training is a basic one. Fundamentally, education is (1) learning new facts and skills, and (2) developing the ability to synthesize these facts and skills into new patterns. Years of research have taught us a lot about the psychology of the learning process, both in principle and practice.

But we know essentially nothing about the psychology of the synthesizing process, that is, about creative thinking. Adequate understanding of how to identify, measure, and develop this ability would add immeasurably to our brain-power resources.

However, if all of these obstacles could be removed, and it is theoretically possible, then we could have available as highly trained graduates everyone with the intellectual ability necessary for college work.

For general college students this would mean all those with a score above 90.

For engineers and scientists it would mean all those above 108.

Clearly we would greatly increase the number of college graduates produced each year. As a matter of fact, we would have graduated about 75,000 scientists and engineers each year for the last 2 years instead of the 45,000 actually produced. Roughly, we would have doubled the number.

ANOTHER FACTOR

So much for the production of engineers and scientists. There are two additional ways of increasing the output of trained technical manpower available.

One is the better utilization of already trained scientists and engineers. This includes a more efficient use of engineers and scientists in their trained capacity by freeing them from administrative or paperwork, by freeing them from semitechnical work that could be done as well by someone not so highly trained, and by improved military manpower policies.

It includes better communication channels between working technical groups, and an increase in the scientist's and engineer's communication skills.

It includes a system of incentives and rewards that is tailored in specific ways to meet the characteristic psychological and emotional needs of engineers and scientists.

And finally, it includes the recognition that company or laboratory organization has an important influence on the job satisfaction and on the level of productive output of the technical people.

The second avenue for increasing the output of technical manpower concerns this matter of creative thinking. It is generally agreed that the most valuable element in any productive activity is the generation of creative ideas or solutions.

However, research efforts are being made and we are beginning to understand some of the factors that are important in facilitating creative thinking in individuals, in groups and in companies. For example, there is the technique called "brainstorming." This procedure has often been very effective in speeding up the production of new ideas in sales, marketing and management. It can be equally useful in research and development.

If these important factors contributing to the efficient utilization of technically trained people were maximized, it would obviously have a very significant effect on our technical manpower output. But here again, while it is clear what to do about some of these problems, only long-term research can indicate the solution to the others. Much further work will be necessary before we will achieve a high efficiency of utilization. When we do, then a plausible estimate of its effect might be a further doubling of our manpower resources.

WOMEN IN TECHNICAL FIELDS

The final matter to be mentioned is the place of women in the technical fields. Among the working college-graduate engineers and scientists in the United States today, only 1 perecent of the engineers and 11 percent of the scientists are women.

Up to the present time there has been no clearly demonstrated psychological or emotional characteristic which would forever preclude women from becoming competent scientists and engineers. There are certainly prejudices, attitudes and value systems currently held by both sexes which prevent women from becoming engineers and scientists in greater numbers, but there are social and cultural in origin and are, therefore, subject to change.

If the technical fields were to be made available and attractive to women, then we would almost double again the number of scientists and engineers produced each year in America.

In a consideration of our brainpower resources in the more distant future, say the end of this century or the next, a factor of profound importance emerges. Apparently, intellectual resources are not the same as material resources. It seems probable that intellectual resources can be almost endlessly enriched.

Behavioral scientists are just beginning to understand the scientific principles governing the origin and development of human behavior. This knowledge will grow. And it will be used both to improve our child-rearing procedures and to increase our psychological and emotional efficiency as adults.

As this happens, a larger and larger percentage of adults will become capable of significant intellectual achievement. The effect on our total intellectual resources will be profound, perhaps lowering the floor of intellectual capacity necessary to do college-level learning and thinking to 80. This would result in a further doubling, or even tripling, of our intellectual output.

So I think we may conclude that there is adequate potential brainpower present in the United States. It is theoretically possible to meet current needs from current resources and future needs from future resources. To do so will require the expenditure of all the money and effort necessary to establish and maintain an intensive research and development program for a long time to come.

It takes 22 years to make a bachelor of science; it takes 30 years to make a professional engineer or scientist. It will take decades to find out what makes them tick.

And it won't occur accidentally; only a deliberate and sustained effort by everyone concerned—education, government, and industry—can mobilize the forces necessary to meet the challenge.

Technology To Be King

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, American industry is giving increasing attention to the problem of broadening its resource base to meet ever increasing requirements for raw materials. Our standard of living is possible because of advanced technology. To continue to improve living standards, as our population increases, will require an even more intensive application of science. Higher grade mineral deposits are becoming exhausted, so we must find ways to use the more abundant but lower grade ores that will maintain our civilization for generations to come, if we know how to use them.

The California Institute of Technology has been conducting a series of conferences with the executives of corporations affiliated with the institute through its industrial associates program. The purpose of these conferences is to review the problems which will confront the world during the next century. The need for more engineers, better technology, and a broader resource base are stressed at these meetings.

As a Representative from the Los Angeles area, I am very proud of the work of the California Institute of Technology.

The New York Times, in its issue of May 21, reviewed the series of confer-

ences conducted by the institute for its industrial associates. On May 22 the lead editorial in the New York Times was devoted to the implications of the findings by the California Institute of Technology scientists.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Times of May 21, and its editorial of May 22:

[From the New York Times of May 21, 1956]

NEW CIVILIZATION DAWNING FOR MAN, SCIENTISTS REPORT—RESOURCES STUDY PREDICTS VAST POPULATION RISE IN WORLD BY YEAR 2050—TECHNOLOGY TO BE KING—ROCKS TO BE SOURCE OF HEAT AND FUEL—CRITICAL NEED IS SEEN FOR BRAINPOWER

(By Robert K. Plumb)

Man is now standing at the gateway to a new flowering of civilization.

The population of the earth will multiply at least 2 or 4 times in the next 100 years. Technology can feed, clothe and shelter these people adequately and in some cases well.

There will be no shortage of minerals, meals or metals. Machine civilization will spread over the earth and it can provide for all from the most common substances: air, sea water, ordinary rock and sunlight.

Only one possible raw material shortage is foreseen—brain power. Educated men and women are needed to plan and design, to construct and operate the machine civilization that will care for the startling increase in world population expected by the year 2050.

Brainpower is the key, education, government and industry must meet in a deliberate and sustained effort to sense the future and to plan for it. There is a chasm that technology must hurdle: raw materials and food already are running short just as the earth's population starts its greatest increase: from 2,600,000,000 persons today to some 6,700,000,000 persons in 100 years. Possibly more.

DISCUSSED BY EXECUTIVES

These conclusions have been discussed in the board rooms of 27 of the Nation's leading corporations in the last few months. Principal officers of eight other corporations will hear the data on which the conclusions are based and will discuss them during the summer.

The conclusions are part of a speculative projection on the resources of the world that has been drafted by faculty members of the California Institute of Technology. The projection, a glimpse into the 21st century, has been presented at private conferences.

One conference was held at the University Club here last week for newsmen. California Institute of Technology faculty members present were Dr. James F. Bonner, professor of biology; Dr. Harrison S. Brown, professor of geochemistry; Dr. John R. Weir, associate professor of psychology; and Robert V. Bartz, director of the industrial associates program of the institute.

Companies and corporations (all affiliated with the institute through its industrial associates program) whose officers have participated in the conferences to date are: Aerojet-General, Avco Manufacturing, Beckman Instruments, Byron Jackson, Convair, Douglas Aircraft, E. I. du Pont de Nemours, G. M. Gianini, Gilfillan Bros., Gulf Oil, Hercules Powder, Hughes Aircraft, Hycon Manufacturing, International Business Machines, Lockheed Aircraft, North American Aviation, Ramo-Wooldridge, Rand Corp., Richfield Oil, Shell Oil, Socony-Mobil Oil, Standard Oil of California, Standard Oil of New Jersey, Texas Co., Union Carbide & Carbon, Union Oil, and Westinghouse Electric.

CONCLUDING CONFERENCES

The series of conferences will be concluded this June and September in meetings with eight additional companies: Bendix Aviation, Continental Oil, Dow Chemical, Elgin National Watch, Ford Motor, Great Lakes Carbon, Stanolind Oil & Gas, and United States Steel.

The California report on world resources is designed to complement regular studies made by individual industries. Long-term trends and prospects, beyond the conventional business purview, are the substance of the study. Thus oil companies heard reports on the exhaustion of the world's oil and gas pools; steel companies heard about the time when iron ores are gone; utilities about the time when nuclear fuels will be about the only available sources of electricity.

The predictions apply only if world catastrophe is avoided. Technology can ease but it cannot solve political and economic problems, the scientists reported.

Speaking for the physical sciences, Dr. Brown speculated that the population of the earth would probably increase to between 5 and 10 billion persons by the year 2050. There conceivably might be a ten- or fifteenfold increase, however; a fifteenfold increase would put the world population a century in the future at more than 30 billion.

Industrialization will spread rapidly, Dr. Brown predicted, more rapidly than it did in the United States and in Europe, because the know-how is already present: each part of a factory will not require invention, since designs and methods of operation are already known.

The per capita demand for raw materials at the "American" level of industrialization will increase rapidly, Dr. Brown predicted. Now, eight tons of steel are in use in the nation for each individual. In a century this might increase to 100 tons. The amounts of other materials in use will similarly increase.

RAW MATERIALS DWINDLING

At the same time, he said, the present raw materials are being used up rapidly. Our ancestors picked up crystals of copper and pieces of coal on the surface of the earth. Now we have to follow coal seams farther underground, drive deep, even under the oceans, for oil. Nations that are not now industrialized will find that their industry must be based on leaner ores, poorer fuels. But our highly complex industrial processes can use low-grade raw materials.

As the population grows, Dr. Brown predicted, machine civilization will have to make use of the most common and abundant raw materials—air, sea water, ordinary rock and sunlight.

Many of the techniques are now known and others will be developed, he predicted, for utilizing low-grade mineral ores, then ordinary granite and finally ordinary rocks.

It works this way: studies at the California Institute of Technology disclose that the average ton of granite contains about four grams of uranium and twelve grams of thorium. These two materials can be used in nuclear reactors (if so-called nuclear "breeding" reactors work) to release the equivalent of the heat from fifty tons of coal for each ton of granite. This is enough heat to extract metals, even though they are of very low concentration, from the granite, and to leave excess energy to distill sea water, power factories and provide a basis for a machine civilization that uses only rock as a raw material.

Dr. Brown drew up a possible plan for the provision of an energy equivalent to the annual burning of seventy billion metric tons of coal for a population of 7,000,000,000 persons living a century in the future at the "American" level. Half the energy would come from nuclear sources, one-fourth from solar energy, another fourth from synthetic liquid fuels made from rocks and from water power and wood. (This energy balance allows for the equivalent of 2,700,000,000 tons of wood to be turned into lumber and paper each year.)

THE PROCESSING OF ROCK

Dr. Brown envisioned the time when great factories around the world could process rock much as oil refineries now process crude petroleum: the factories would operate on the energy from the radioactive materials in the rocks and would pour out a steady stream of metals and other chemicals. The factories would end the present role of mineral resources in world economy and politics.

All this, Dr. Brown emphasized, is a prediction for a period "in the absence of a world catastrophe." And he stressed that machine civilization itself was very vulnerable. If many highly complex factories must work together to provide for civilization, then the system can easily be put out of order. We are now approaching such a "point of no return," he warned.

Furthermore, he said, a civilization based on the utilization of common raw materials—air, sea water, ordinary rock, and sunlight—could not be restarted if anything should happen to it. The rich raw materials to make the complex factories to process very lean raw materials would not be available.

Nevertheless, Dr. Brown emphasized that machine civilization could free man from dependence upon present raw materials if brain power were present and if the planning was done in time.

Food presents no insoluble problem, according to Dr. Bonner. His studies indicate that improvements of conventional agriculture can greatly increase the world food supply and that eventually nonconventional food production techniques will feed any expected increase in world population "if we look beyond the limits of our present agricultural systems."

BRAINPOWER HELD KEY

Dr. Weir emphasized that brain power was the key.

"As we expend more and more money in the extraction of materials from lower and lower grade ores, we meet an ever-increasing need for more skilled manpower, for more trained scientists and engineers," Dr. Weir said.

"So in a very real sense the critical limiting factor on the world's resources is not materials, energy, or food, but brainpower," he asserted.

Already we have a shortage of engineers and scientists; this will certainly get worse in the future, he said. The big problem is the waste in the development of intellectual talent. Half the capable young men and women are not educated, one-third of the exceptionally talented are not educated, he said.

"Fortunately," Dr Weir emphasized, "manpower is the only one of the resources of the earth today that is replenishable. If the population is to increase, then the number of young men and women to be educated must increase."

To reduce the waste of talent, Dr. Weir recommended that society make conscientious effort to identify talented young scientists and engineers early and to encourage them to get an education. Also he suggested that we improve methods of teaching so that creative thinking can be stimulated in the talented. He urged, too, that ways be found to teach difficult subjects to persons who do not possess ability to learn them with present teaching methods.

The brain power to meet the demands of machine civilization where increasing population is multiplied by increasing demands (under conditions where raw materials be-

come scarcer) can be trained only if everyone—education, Government, and industry—rises to the challenge, Dr. Weir emphasized.

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1956]

THE WORLD IN 2056

There seems to be no connection between the awesome explosion of the H-bomb, dropped from an airplane at Bikini, and the role of science a century or so hence as it has been depicted in a "speculative projection" by professors of the California Institute of Technology. Yet the connection is there. We shudder at the iridescent mushroom-shaped cloud that attends the explosion of an atomic bomb and that spells nothing but death and destruction; yet it is energy from the atom on which the world must rely if it is to raise more food for unborn teeming millions, mine more ores, raise the standard of living to new heights.

The professors who have been doing some scientific barnstorming for the industrial firms, most of whose engineers and executives hardly need instruction considering their own public prophecies, take a cheerful view of man's ability to cope successfully with problems that are growing in urgency. The faith of the professors in the advance of science and technology cannot but comfort the millions who have been told that if the world's population increases at the present rate starvation for many is inevitable. But it is a qualified faith—qualified by man's willingness to divert his ingenuity from weapons of war to the application of science and technology to peace. World catastrophe is more to be feared than death from slow starvation and disease or lack of adequate shelter—catastrophe from which complete recovery may be impossible.

There is reason for the optimism of the Californians. It is justified by the dizzy rapidity with which science and technology have progressed. Until the Newcomen-Watt engine was introduced coal was just a fuel. Almost at once it symbolized industrial power with all that power meant in the form of inexpensive clothes and the necessities of life. William H. Perkin, whose discovery of mauve, 100 years ago, is now being commemorated everywhere, opened up the whole domain of coal-tar synthetic chemistry, with the result that we have hundreds of dyes, photographic developers, medicines and fibers that have taken the place of wood and metal.

The technical imagination and skill that produced the atomic bomb can also give the world all that it needs in the way of food and energy, though some of the lavishness that Americans accept almost as a birthright may have to be curtailed. Only 20 years ago we were worrying about our technological fate after our coal and oil resources were depleted. Then came the release of energy from the atom by fission and fusion, with the result that the exhaustion of our fuel resources is no longer a cause of concern.

The story of man's ascent from caveman to engineer in the course of about 25,000 years is the greatest of all epics. And only the first cantos have been sung. What lies before us no one knows, but the Californians are convinced that even in the present state of our knowledge there is no scientific and technologic reasons why half the world should be on the verge of starvation or why there should be so much misery and poverty and disease in backward regions.

The late H. G. Wells was proclaiming all this 50 years ago. Two world wars disillusioned him. His abandoned scientific Utopia may still be far off, but it is not unattainable. The sociologists have been telling us for years that spiritually man has not kept pace with his scientific and technologic development. On this point the California professors had nothing to say beyond warning against the consequences of catastrophe and relying on the pressure of social necessity to bring about a much-needed change in human psychology.

The scientific and technologic revolution that the Californians foresee cannot occur without an understanding of what the humand mind can accomplish. Hence the emphasis that Prof. John R. Weir, a psychologist, laid on what he calls "brain power." We have heard a good deal in the last few years about the shortage of technologists. We are trying to meet that shortage with immediate needs in view. But the shortage will continue. Long before 2056 it will be acute. What has been done in synthetic chemistry and in releasing energy from the atom commands admiration, yet is far less significant than what lies before us. To Professor Weir "the critical limiting factor on the world's resources is not materials, energy, or food, but brain power." The more we draw on what resources we have the more heavily must we draw on brain power. And the resources of brain power are inexhaustible.

Relief of Distressed Economic Areas

SPEECH

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to bring to the attention of the House, to the more than 100 Members of the House, who represent areas classified as distressed economic areas in 15 States in the Nation, and at the same time to bring this matter to the attention of the people in my district, as well as the people in other congressional districts suffering acute unemployment, and to all the people in the country the tragedy of this session.

I regret that in these closing hours of this session of Congress, I must strike this note of disharmony. But strike it I must, because the failure of the administration and the Republican leadership of the House to agree by unanimous consent to permit the aid to distressed areas bill to be called up under suspension of the rules, prevented the passage in this session of that bill.

The Douglas-Flood bill introduced last year in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. DOUGLAS, and by myself in the House and with many bills for the same purpose introduced by dozens of Members from both sides of the aisle. I say, Mr. Speaker such a bill passed the Senate 2 days ago with a 60–30 vote. I immediately moved and obtained the consent of the majority leadership of the House, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] to have this bill called up in the House under the suspension of the rules. Mr. RAYBURN and Mr. MCCORMACK advised me they would do so, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader, would agree. I immediately contacted the two gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON] and enlisted their aid in view of the fact that both Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON represent such distressed economic areas, and each had introduced similar bills this year. The bills introduced by Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON were the administration bills to meet this problem, and were introduced immediately after President Eisenhower, in his message to Congress, urged the passage of this legislation. I was advised by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, that an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Corwin, stated the administration would not accept the Douglas-Flood bill. I talked to the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks, on the telephone immediately, acquainted him with the situation as I have outlined herein above, and he said he would dispatch his assistant, Mr. Mueller, to the Capitol at once, to discuss the matter at my suggestion with Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON. This was done.

Two hours later, Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. FENTON advised me that the administration was adamant and against any bill whatsoever. They advised the administration leadership at the Department of Commerce and in the House that the important thing for millions of people who would benefit by this bill was to get any bill on the floor of the House under the suspension of the rules so that it could be sent to conference with the Senate for the vital purpose of bringing aid to the distressed economic areas in the Nation and to pass the Congress before adjournment. The Democratic leadership was advised by me of each one of these steps hour by hour during the last 2 days of this session.

The Democratic leadership even agreed to call up on the floor for final passage, under suspension of the rules, the administration bill, the very bill the President asked the Congress to pass on this problem. The Department of Commerce spokesman and the Republican leadership of the House refused even to agree to consider the administration bill as proposed by the President.

I make this statement, Mr. Speaker, because as you know, many times during this session I supported important legislation requests by the President, and fought for it in the Appropriations Committee and on the floor of this House, when those bills were frequently opposed by the Republican leadership and by many Republican Members.

Again, for the past 48 hours, I have been working day and night pleading with the administration leaders here to agree to report out their own bill for aid to distressed areas. This they have consistently refused to do, and therefore upon them must rest the responsibility for our utter, complete, and total failure in this session to pass a bill to bring aid to distressed economic areas of the Nation.

I have been in this Congress for a number of years, but never in my experience could I believe that this would happen. It was a bitter disappointment to my Republican friends in the House from distressed areas who know the need and wanted this bill as much as I did, and it is a crying shame that the administration leadership who were 100 percent against this bill, once more rejected a direct request from their own President, refused

to cooperate and join with the Democratic leadership after the Senate had passed such a bill, in permitting a bill, not just the Senate bill, but any bill, including their own administration bill, to be voted on.

I challenge the Republican leadership and any member of the administration, and any Member of Congress, Republican or Democrat, to deny these statements. But they cannot be denied, for these are the facts.

I pledge to the people of my district, to the people of all districts where there is acute unemployment, to my colleagues representing those districts, Republican and Democrat, that the first thing I shall do when the 85th Congress convenes in January, is to reintroduce this same legislation with confidence that then it will become law.

I want to emphasize that this was a completely bipartisan operation between a handful of Republican Members in affected districts, and with myself and my Democratic colleagues from similar areas and the Democratic leadership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I indict the administration and the Republican leadership of the House for the adamant refusal to permit this legislation to be called for a vote under suspension of the rules today.

Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, leaving Congress to go to the court of general sessions in New York as does IRWIN DAVIDSON is like going from one room into another. The closing is the opening door.

IRWIN does not change—but the scene of his activities does. He would do well anywhere.

He returns to his old love—the courts from whence he came here. He made an enviable reputation in judicial circles; now he goes back once more to the milieu of the courts.

Although in Congress but one term, he has made his mark here. His uniform courtesy, his captivating humor, his keenness of perception, his clearness of expression, his high integrity of purpose, his kindness, his loyalty to his friends and colleagues are the facets of the jewel we call character.

I shall miss his quiet demeanor but pronounced wisdom which he brought with him to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IRWIN, during his altogether too brief spell here, played the game. He quickly caught on to the deportment and carriage necessary to the makeup of a good Member. He never marred his record—only heightened it.

Before he voted on a measure, he studied and gave careful scrutiny to it. He always did his homework. He voted as his mind and heart dictated.

He had his eye, not on the next election, but on future generations.

He knows that the art of government is not easy to master. There are no scales to measure. Yet IRWIN has mastered, measurably well, its perplexities and difficulties.

I am sure that in the congressional hurly-burly of debate he has learned much that will stand him in good stead as a judge. He has seen how on the anvil of discourse and discussion and debate we come a step closer to the truth. I am sure that his experience here will make him even more conscious of the dignity of the individual and his need to have a place in the sun. He will be better enabled to judge men, one from the other. He will have developed greater discernment and be better enabled to separate the wool from shoddy. He will have realized that talk sometimes is cheap; that the voluble one is not always wise; that the silent one may hold great learning. He will have realized that certain laws are immutable and cannot be breached with impunity.

We wish him well, albeit we shall miss him sorely.

Aggressiveness and Resourcefulness of Oregon Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Oregon's farmers are not blessed with great nearby markets enjoyed by farmers in many other areas. Consequently, they have to be both aggressive and resourceful to develop their needed markets. How the Oregon wheat growers are going about this business is a story of great significance as told in the May issue of Progress in Oregon, the official publication of the Oregon Development Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the May issue of Progress in Oregon; with an article from Harbor News, a publication of the Portland, Oreg., Commission of Public Docks, which bears the title, "Oregon Wheat Growers Score in Export Push"; and from the weekly publication of the Portland Chamber of Commerce of July 20, 1956, a short article under the heading "Oregon Tops in Dry Cargo Exports for 1954," which also underscores the importance of wheat shipments to Japan.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Progress in Oregon for May 1956]

WHEAT IN OREGON: WORTH $55 MILLION EVERY YEAR—FARMERS NOT ONLY SOW, REAP, BUT PROMOTE SALES THROUGH ACTIVE OREGON WHEAT LEAGUE

It seems only natural to the tourist who traverses the rolling northeastern corner of Oregon that this region be known as the State's breadbasket.

Regardless of the season, the most casual visitor could hardly miss the telltale signs of wheat country. Standing like sentries, Oregon's bulging elevators dot 2 million acres in Wasco, Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, and Union Counties. The life-staff grain is also an important crop in Jefferson, Baker, and Wallowa Counties and portions of the Willamette Valley.

WHEAT NO. 1 CROP

Together these areas raise the State's largest single farm crop worth $55 million in basic wealth every year. The product is mainly soft wheat, suited best for cake, pastry, and biscuit flours.

As early as 1926 the men who sow and reap Oregon wheat realized combined efforts offer the best solutions to their problems. Formation that year of the Oregon Wheat Growers League marked the beginning of a body which is a model for wheat growers everywhere. Early efforts of the league were directed mostly toward increasing productivity and were responsible for boosting yield from an average of 20 to 27 bushels an acre.

But today's Oregon wheat farmer is engrossed in a third factor. In the face of dwindling domestic use, price support programs, and a resulting decline in the export market, the wheat farmer not only sows and reaps his crop, he is promoting its sale as well.

Although the wheat league maintains a large program dedicated to improving the crop, its big job consists of finding new markets and expanding existing ones. In 1947 the legislature enacted the Oregon Wheat Commission law. Five grower members administer it and are permitted to tax growers one-half cent for each bushel sold commercially. As a result about $100,000 is being spent annually to expand the market.

The State consumes about 25 percent of its own output. Per capita consumption in the United States is down from 210 to 124 pounds in the past 40 years. Wheat league home economists promote home baking. The league sponsored baking contests and cooperates with millers to develop and market increasingly popular prepared mixes.

ORIENTAL MARTS BECKON

Rice-deficit areas of the Far East are tabbed as one of the richest potential markets. The league feels the best way to promote its product in the Orient is to educate its people in the uses and nutritional values of wheat.

At the same time Oregon wheat growers have long felt the two-price approach was the reasonable national farm program for wheat. For the past 2 years the commission and league have been working to popularize the domestic parity plan for wheat. Basically the plan would give farmers a fair return on the portion of their crop used for food purposes in the United States. It would let the rest of the crop move into feed, industrial, and export uses at competitive prices.

Final Federal approval of the Oregon plan would be a big plume in the hat of this State's wheat farmer. But whether this man of the soil wears that feather or not, his efforts place him in the forefront of the ranks dedicated to progress in Oregon and the Nation.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Harbor News for June 1956]

OREGON WHEATGROWERS SCORE IN EXPORT PUSH

A shining example of what can be accomplished by planned, intelligent export promotion of basic American products may be seen in the long-range program of Oregon wheatgrowers. Wheat is Oregon's largest farm crop—a soft white wheat ideal for milling into cake, pastry and biscuit flours, and for blending with high protein hard wheats for bread flours. Yet only about 25 percent of

Oregon's wheat crop is used in the State for food, feed, and seed, which means that 75 percent of it must be marketed elsewhere. The picture is the same for Washington and northern Idaho, which with Oregon make up the Pacific Northwest wheat-growing region.

As long ago as 1926, Oregon wheatgrowers felt the need for a united approach to their problems. They organized the Oregon Wheat Growers League. Then, in 1946, growers decided that when postwar world demand for wheat declined, surpluses and acreage controls would be inevitable. A better approach, they decided, would be to put experts on the job full-time finding new markets and expanding existing markets for wheat. The league's executive secretary, R. K. Baum, has been active in direction and participation in the program both in the United States and abroad.

At one time the Pacific Northwest region had a profitable market for its cake flour and soft wheat in Eastern and Southeastern States, but this market has been lost because of high freight rates. This leaves overseas markets as the main outlet. During the early postwar years, Government aid and foreign relief programs helped boost export movement to a volume that cleaned up the crop annually, and the emphasis was on greater production. Pacific Northwest wheat moved to all parts of the globe. This export movement has tapered off, taking less than half the crop in the past two seasons. This is of concern to Portland, too, for the Commission of Public Docks maintains huge grain storage and export handling facilities.

At the request of growers, the Oregon State Legislature in 1947 enacted the Oregon wheat commission law which created a commission of five grower members, representing the main producing areas, and authorized a tax of one-half cent a bushel on all wheat sold commercially. Working closely with growers and checking its projects with the Oregon Wheat League, the commission has been spending an average of around $100,000 a year on a manifold approach to the surplus problem.

The United States sent a grain mission to Asia in 1949 to study markets there and early in 1954 the Department of Agriculture sent out trade missions at a time when surplus agricultural legislation was being considered by Congress. Many Asiatic countries expressed great interest. When Congress passed Public Law 480, providing for sale of surplus agricultural commodities with payment in local currencies, much of which would be re-spent by the United States in the purchasing counrty, new avenues were opened for reaching these markets. The big obstacle of dollar shortage had largely been overcome.

It was decided that a representative each from the Oregon Wheat League (Mr. Baum), from the Foreign Agriculture Service, and from the Millers National Federation form a team to visit Asia immediately to determine specific projects for each country to aid in expanding markets for United States grain products. The previous missions had found a significant increase in consumption of wheat products in Asia since the war and indication that the increase would be retained, although fluctuating with rice production. Too, several governments were willing to encourage wheat foods because they are cheaper than rice and will also result in diet improvement. A third favorable factor is the tremendous increase in population—it is estimated that every ten years there will be 180 million more mouths to feed in Asia and it apears doubtful that food production can be increased to meet these demands.

The team worked in Japan, Hong Kong, Philippines, Singapore, Indonesia, Ceylon, India, and Pakistanand found definite encouragement in several countries where wheat was being adapted to the food habits of people in rice-eating areas. In India a project started 5 years before by the Oregon Wheat Commission and the Millers National Federation to sponsor "nutrition research and extension" aimed at improving the diet of the South Indian people had made tremendous strides. A demonstration car furnished by the commission had proven indispensable in demonstrating the preparation of wheat dishes.

The Oregon wheat groups played an important role in the introduction last year of a new wheat food called bulgor wheat, a popular wheat dish in the Middle East for centuries. It is made by boiling, drying and cracking the wheat, resulting in a product that is high in food value yet easy to prepare into a tasty dish of high nutritional value—cooking time only 15 minutes. In preparation, it has many uses similar to rice. Fisher Flouring Mills was presuaded to make this processed wheat in a new plant and the Department of Agriculture furnished wheat for trying the product in Far Eastern countries. A. C. Hutchison, a representative of Fishers, found ready acceptance of the product by the Japanese from the standpoint of cost and nutrition after only a few months.

The biggest program to increase consumption of wheat by Asiatic peoples is that now underway in Japan, already the Northwest's biggest foreign wheat customer, but which is also believed to have the greatest immediate development potential. Considerable funds became available in Japan under terms of Public Law 480 for the furtherance of sales of surplus agricultural commodities. The wheat team has been in Japan for months working out 11 promotional projects, contracts for 4 of which have just been signed.

Wheat promotion efforts of the Oregon Wheat Growers League at the 15-day International Trade Fair in Osaka, Japan, during April turned out to be almost too successful. The exhibit was literally mobbed by crowds of Japanese. On the final day, in fact, more than 100 police had to be called out to keep the thousands of people from completely overrunning the wheat exhibit. As part of the 5-unit exhibit, baking demonstrations of cake mixes made a big impression on the Japanese public, millers and bakers, as did the scones, sweet breads, and other baked goods. A Japanese home economist and four assistants spent full time preparing and explaining dishes made from Ala, the new bulgor wheat food. Some 100,000 sweet rolls, countless thousands of samples of Ala, and recipe folders printed in Japanese were distributed during the fair. Twice as many people visited the exhibit as had been expected.

As we said, the work of the Oregon wheat people, coupled with the efforts of Government agencies, is a bright example of what should and can be done in promotion of world trade. In addition to having unequalled general cargo facilities, Portland is the leading grain port on the Pacific coast and has the largest tidewater grain elevator in the West. With a constant program of port development, we are keeping pace here at Portland, Oreg.—the progressive port of the Pacific.

[From Commerce, Portland, Oreg., of July 20, 1956]

OREGON TOPS IN DRY CARGO EXPORTS FOR 1954

The Oregon customs district led the Pacific coast in overseas dry cargo during 1954, according to figures released today by Charles Thomas, chairman of the Portland Chamber of Commerce foreign trade and shipping committee. An analysis of census figures published by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco showed the Oregon district to be ahead of the other four Pacific coast districts by a wide margin, Thomas reported.

During 1950 dry cargo shipments from the Oregon customs district, which includes the Columbia River and coast ports, totaled 4,107,182,785 pounds. The San Francisco district, including northern California and Bay area ports, was second with 3,697,204,480 pounds. The Los Angeles district was third with 2,830,006,564 pounds, and the Washington district fourth with 2,410,150,284 pounds. San Diego district dry cargo exports totaled 21,590,408.

TVA Power System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters and a statement concerning the TVA power system, the latter being an analysis of Senate bill 3964 and its effects on the TVA power system, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY,
Knoxville, Tenn., July 20, 1956.

The Honorable ALBERT GORE,
The United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Your letter of July 11, 1956, refers to the fact that TVA has not yet submitted a report to the Senate Public Works Committee on S. 3964, a bill introduced by Senator MARTIN of Pennsylvania, and requests that I advise you of the views of the TVA Board of Directors or of a majority of the Board.

We regret the delay in submitting a formal report on S. 3964 to the Senate Public Works Committee which has resulted from efforts to reconcile differences of opinion within the Board. We expect within the next few days, however, to transmit a report to the Bureau of the Budget for clearance.

In the meantime, responding to your request, there is enclosed a statement which summarizes my views on S. 3964. I have discussed this statement with the other members of the Board and am authorized by Dr. Curtis to say that he agrees with it. General Vogel wishes me to advise you that it does not reflect his position.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND R. PATY,
Director.

JULY 26, 1956.

Dr. RAYMOND R. PATY,
Director, Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR DR. PATY: I thank you for your letter of July 20 and for your analysis of Senate bill 3964, which analysis, I understand from your letter, is concurred in by your fellow board member, Dr. Harry A. Curtis.

This analysis of S. 3964 by a majority of the TVA Board of Directors confirms my own prior analysis of the bill as being unworkable and antagonistic to the TVA.

It is my view that the Senate Public Works Committee will not favorably report this bill or report one even similar in objective and effect. Enactment of Senate bill 3964 would be very damaging to TVA.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT GORE.

ANALYSIS OF S. 3964 AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE TVA POWER SYSTEM

S. 3964 would authorize TVA to issue bonds for the purpose of financing additions to its

power system. However, the authorization would be subject to such limitations and surrounded by such restrictions that the bill could not provide a basis for successful financing and operation of the system.

The principal features of the bill and resultant problems which it would raise are as follows:

1. The bill provides for issuance of bonds up to a total of $200 million outstanding at any one time. This amount is sufficient to finance only about a million kilowatts of generation and transmission capacity. The normal load growth on the TVA system, exclusive of the growth in Federal loads, will be on the order of 150,000 kilowatts a year. The authorization for $200 million of bonds would thus take care of less than 2 years' load growth, and would provide no assurance to the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley area that their long-term requirements for additional power capacity could be met.

2. The authorization for the limited amount of bonds provided under the bill would be accompanied by imposition of extraordinary and unwarranted financial burdens. Specifically, S. 3964 would require that TVA pay a return on the appropriation investment in TVA's power facilities equal to the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury on its outstanding marketable public obligations, while at the same time leaving in effect the existing requirement contained in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act 1948, that TVA repay this appropriation investment over a 40-year period. The double requirement of a return on the Treasury's investment and a repayment of that investment would have a number of effects:

(a) It would drain off so much of TVA's net power revenues and leave so little coverage for debt service on revenue bonds as to make infeasible the issuance of such bonds on a reasonable basis. As a result, unduly high interest costs would be incurred and the net income to the Government as owner of the business woud be reduced.

(b) It would render impossible the use of any substantial portion of TVA's earnings to supplement bond proceeds as a means of financing additions to the system.

(c) This in turn would insure that the $200-million bond ceiling provided under the bill would be reached very quickly.

(d) The Government, as owner of the system, would be withdrawing its equity investment in the business during periods when it was necessary to sell bonds to private investors to finance system expansion. This would represent basically unsound financing, which in the case of a private utility would not be permitted.

3. Under the bill, bonds and revenues, even in the limited amounts authorized or available, could not be used until after affirmative approval by Congress in acting on a budget request. The bill specifically provides in this regard that no bonds shall be sold nor bond proceeds used except for purposes "approved by the Congress in connection with its consideration of the Corporation's budget programs transmitted by the President pursuant to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended." The bill would leave in effect the third paragraph of title II of the 1948 Appropriation Act, which prohibits TVA's use of power revenues for construction of new power-producing projects (except for replacement purposes) unless and until approved by act of Congress. And it would extend this prohibition to include power-producing units and installations, as well as projects, thus making it applicable to additional units at existing plants.

Congress has recognized from the beginning that TVA was engaged in business-type operations which could not be conducted successfully without confiding to management the responsibility for decisions on business matters. Congressional control has been exercised by prescribing the policies which TVA shall follow and by holding the management of TVA responsible for the results of the decisions made in carrying out those policies. In accordance with this pattern, TVA has been accorded a wide discretion to use the proceeds of its power business in carrying on that business under the policies laid down by Congress. Under the provisions of S. 3964, however, issuance of any of the $200 million of bonds permitted under the bill to finance a proposed addition to the TVA power system would be dependent on the same budgetary and congressional approval process which would apply in the case of an appropriation; and the same process would also become applicable with respect to a proposed use of revenues to initiate construction of additional generating units at existing plants. The requirement of express congressional approval would place the initial point of decision on TVA bond issues and the use of TVA revenues for new construction in the Bureau of the Budget, through which the TVA budget is submitted to the Congress. If TVA's recommendations were disapproved by the Bureau, they would not come to the attention of Congress unless Congress should ask for them.

The result of adoption of the proposal in S. 3964 to require express congressional approval of the use of bond and revenue proceeds for new construction would be to deprive TVA, when it was obtaining funds for construction primarily from such sources, of even the measure of financial flexibility which Congress has considered desirable for TVA while it was obtaining such funds primarily from appropriations. The region TVA serves could have no assurance that its power needs would be met under such a situation.

4. S. 3964 does not authorize use of bond proceeds in connection with the lease, lease-purchase or contracts for the power output of a power facility financed by State or local interests. The cost of a lease would be an operating expense payable solely out of revenues received from electric consumers in the valley. In the case of lease-purchase, the costs would not only be paid by the consumers of the valley, but the title would eventually rest in the Federal Government. It would seem to be sound policy to provide for the possible participation of State and local interests in raising the capital required for TVA power expansion if they are ready and able to do so and if the circumstances make it necessary or advisable to raise capital in this way.

5. S. 3964 makes issuance of bonds by TVA subject to sections 302 and 303 of the Government Corporation Control Act. These sections would give the Secretary of the Treasury complete authority over issuance of TVA bonds, and over deposit and investment of TVA bond proceeds and other funds. The Secretary would become, in effect, the final judge as to all details of TVA financing. While his advice might be helpful, control should not rest with him since he carries no responsibility for the success or failure of TVA operations. Moreover, revenue bonds such as TVA would issue, unlike obligations of the Treasury, are issued pursuant to and incorporate by reference long and complicated bond contracts, which contain many covenants affecting the business operations of the borrower. Power in the Secretary of the Treasury to approve or veto the contents of TVA bonds would thus deprive the TVA Board of control over decisions affecting TVA's actual administration. Such Treasury control is inappropriate in the case of revenue bonds because they are not issued on the credit of the United States and would have no impact on Treasury operations. The Treasury does not now exercise such control with respect to bonds issued solely on the basis of the revenues of the issuing agency.

6. S. 3964 contains a provision prohibiting extension of the TVA power service area beyond the boundaries existing on May 1, 1956, or supplying of power by TVA to purchasers outside such area except pursuant to authority hereafter granted by law. The TVA power service area has undergone only a few minor changes since 1945. TVA has no desire to expand this area and has on numerous occasions declined applications for service outside the area. However, the question of fringe adjustments along the border of existing areas will almost inevitably arise from time to time. For example, cases have occurred, and are likely to occur in the future, where an electric cooperative to which TVA supplies power wishes to adjust its service area by exchanging facilities and customers with an adjoining distribution agency, public or private. Again, TVA may be asked to serve a cooperative or small community located outside the limits of TVA's present service area but in the shadow of one of TVA's dams or of a Corps of Engineers dam on the Cumberland River, the output of which is marketed through the TVA system. Under S. 3964, TVA would be prohibited from supplying such a cooperative or community until legislative approval was first obtained.

7. Under S. 3964, TVA bond and power proceeds would be subject to apportionment under the provisions of R. S. 3679. Under the apportionment procedure the Bureau of the Budget could schedule TVA expenditures by months, quarters, operating periods, or other time periods as it saw fit. The primary purpose of the apportionment procedure is to prevent anticipation of appropriations. As applied to funds derived from revenues or the sale of revenue bonds it does not serve this purpose at all, but only transfers to another agency final authority over the amounts and rates of expenditure of funds which have already been raised by borrowing or are derived from revenues.

8. Under S. 3964, the proceeds of bonds issued by TVA would be included in the computations of budget receipts, expenditures, surpluses, or deficits, except for amounts budgeted for payment by TVA to the Treasury. The result would be to treat the borrowings on revenue bonds as though they added to budget deficits or diminished budget surpluses, although this would not be the case since the Treasury would have no obligation to pay the principal of or interest on the bonds.

The Civil Rights Bills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement in opposition to the Attorney General's civil rights bills made before the Senate Judiciary Committee by Hon. John J. Wicker, Jr., of Richmond, Va., a former State senator. I attach to this request an estimate of the Public Printer that the material will fill 3½ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at a cost of $269.50.

In introducing Mr. Wicker the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] said:

I have been privileged to know from the days when I started in the State Senate in

1916, 40 years ago, your next witness, the Honorable John J. Wicker, Jr.

Mr. Wicker has been a member of the State bar, of the bar of Richmond, for the past 41 years, and a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, Federal courts of Virginia, and the United States Supreme Court.

He is a former member of the Senate of Virginia.

He is former chairman of the judiciary committee of Virginia, of the bar association.

He is a present member of the executive council of the insurance law section of the American Bar Association.

He is one of the founders of the American Legion, and he is a former Virginia State commander.

He was the Virginia State manager of HOLC, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, from 1933 to 1937.

He was past president and general counsel of the Road Bridge Corp., 1933 to 1941, which originated and built the Robert E. Lee Bridge as a self-liquidating RFC project.

He was the president of the electoral college of Virginia in 1944.

He was chairman for the first half of the 1945 Constitutional Convention of Virginia.

He has been a member of the Virginia State Board of Welfare and Institutions since 1948.

He was chairman of the War Memorial Commission of Virginia, which recently completed and dedicated the beautiful and inspiring memorial commemorating the service and sacrifice of Virginians in World War II and the Korean war.

But over and above everything else, Mr. Wicker is a loyal and dedicated patriotic American, and I have been privileged to see an advance copy of what he is going to tell you, and I want you to know that I endorse it and I commend it to this distinguished committee, the Members of the Senate, and to the American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. WICKER, JR., ATTORNEY AT LAW, RICHMOND, VA., FORMER VIRGINIA STATE SENATOR AND TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN OF THE 1945 CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF VIRGINIA, OPPOSING PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION (S. 3604, 3605, 3717, 3718), BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, JUNE 25, 1956

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is John J. Wicker, Jr. I am an attorney at law, and for more year than I like to remember, I have been a member of the bar of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, of the Federal courts in Virginia, and of the Supreme Court of the United States. I reside, as I have for most of my life, in Richmond, Va.

While I am appearing here before you today at the suggestion and request of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, my appearance is solely in my capacity as a citizen of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States of America, and not in any representative capacity whatsoever. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am not appearing here, directly or indirectly, in behalf of any of my clients or any of the various organizations with which I am affiliated. In other words, the views that I express here today are purely my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of any other individual or group whatsoever.

OPPOSED TO S. 3604, 3605, 3717, AND 3718

As a citizen I appear to express my opposition to certain so-called civil-rights bills now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary as follows:

S. 3605, authorizing the creation of a Civil Rights Commission.

S. 3604, authorizing an additional Assistant Attorney General who would, according to the Attorney General, direct the activities of a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice.

S. 3718, prohibiting interference with the right of vote, and authorizing the Attorney General to bring civil proceedings, in addition to the criminal proceedings already authorized, to enjoin threatened violations; and abolishing the time-honored requirement that State remedies be first exhausted before resorting to Federal courts.

S. 3717, authorizing the Attorney General to institute civil actions for redress or preventive relief in case of any acts or threatened acts to obstruct the administration of justice or to deprive persons of their general civil rights.

NO NECESSITY SHOWN FOR PROPOSED CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

It is my understanding that in considering proposed legislation, two questions are always highly important. First, is the proposed legislation necessary? Second, does the legislative body before which such legislation is pending have the right, as well as the power, to enact the proposed legislation?

Unless both of these questions are clearly and satisfactorily answered in the affirmative, then the proposed legislation should fail. And I conceive it to be the duty and burden of the proponents of legislation to establish both the necessity and the constitutional propriety of proposed legislation.

I believe I have read practically all of the available testimony heretofore given on this proposed legislation both before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Analysis of this testimony will lead, I believe, inescapably to the conclusion that the proponents of this pending legislation have failed to adduce any evidence or proof whatever as to the necessity of these proposals; and they have also failed to prove that the Congress has any right to enact legislation which would, in practice and effect, deprive citizens of their fundamental right to trial by jury whenever the Attorney General, or someone acting for him, desired to do so.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S TESTIMONY NEGATIVES NECESSITY

The best examples of the failure of proof of necessity for this legislation are to be found in the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States before this committee and before the House committee in connection with this legislation. For example, the principal reason advanced by the Attorney General in support of S. 3605 for the creation of a Federal Civil Rights Commission is a quotation from President Eisenhower's recent state of the Union message in which the President said:

"It is disturbing that in some localities allegations persist that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures."

Now, there are over a quarter million "localities" in these United States. Yet the principal basis for setting up a new Federal bureaucracy which would spread its powerful pressures all over the Nation, not like the creeping socialism which we have heard a lot about, but more like a form of "galloping paralysis," appears to consist of mere allegations that Negro citizens are being unfairly or unlawfully treated, merely in some localities, not in any widespread area or in any considerable number of localities. On this flimsy ground of mere allegations the Attorney General favors saddling upon the entire Nation the mental, spiritual, and financial burden of a new national commission operating independently all over the Nation; applying its inquisitions and intimidations whenever and wherever it chose; dragging citizens away from their homes and businesses at any time and for any distance and to any place the new Commission desired, upon the compelling force of subpenas; merely to investigate whether and to what extent these allegations are well founded and to try and bring about correction of any conditions the Commission determines to be civil rights violations.

As you probably recall, the late and great Senator Carter Glass frequently pointed out the danger of authorizing the use of dynamite and TNT to exterminate a few cockroaches when a small quantity of bug powder would do the job just as effectively and at much less cost and without danger to all the persons and property in the neighborhood.

The utter lack of necessity for the creation of any such Civil Rights Commission as is contemplated in this pending legislation is shown by the testimony of the Attorney General himself. While dealing with another portion of this legislation, the Attorney General stated that in a recent case the United States Supreme Court had denounced systematic discrimination against Negroes in the selection of jury panels in Mississippi and that the Department of Justice thereupon had instituted an investigation. Although the Attorney General said that "according to the undisputed evidence in the record before it" (the Court) "systematic discrimination against Negroes in the selection of jury panels had persisted for many years past in the county where the case had been tried;" nevertheless the Attorney General admitted that the investigation by the Department of Justice "showed that, whatever the practice may have been during the earlier years with which the Supreme Court's record was concerned, in recent years there had been no discrimination against Negroes in the selection of juries in that county."

Now, if the Department of Justice can proceed, by inquiry and investigation, as it did in this case, to determine that the unfair and discriminatory condition denounced in a recent decision of the United States Supreme Court no longer exists, and can do this without any new legislation and without the setting up of any new national Civil Rights Commission, why can not the Department of Justice institute and conduct a similar investigation to ascertain whether or not the disturbing allegations mentioned in the President's state of the Union message are founded upon fact, or are without foundation, or refer to conditions which may have formerly existed, but which do not actually exist any longer?

Even if conditions in the field of Negro voting were such as to indicate the need for some remedial action or investigation, why should the Congress set up a new and independent national Commission, clothed with vast inquisitorial authority and vested with the power to be autocratic, intimidating and oppressive, and necessarily involving the addition of a great horde of Federal investigators, agents, examiners, etc., at great expense to the already heavily burdened taxpayers?

There are many other fields of daily life of just as much and just as vital concern to the national and individual welfare which need investigation and remedial action far more. Yet the Attorney General does not propose setting up any national Commission to operate in these other areas. The safety of persons in their ordinary daily pursuits is certainly just as important as the right to vote.

Robberies and holdups, planned and executed on an interstate basis, accompanied by violence and extreme brutalities, are taking place in ever-increasing numbers, not just in some localities but in large num-

ber of areas, north, south, east, and west, all over the United States. Right here in the Nation's Capital all of you know it is exceedingly dangerous to use the public streets in many sections of the city at any time of night and even sometimes in broad daylight. Gang warfare and teenage hoodlumism, operating across State lines, take their toll of human life and property—frequently including many innocent bystanders—in practically all of the large cities of our Nation, and in some of the smaller places too. The enslavement of large numbers of our young people—beginning even in their youthful public-school days—by the poisonous narcotic drug traffic organized and directed nationally—constitutes a serious menace to the very foundations of our national life. These are just a few areas in which there is far more reason to be disturbed by allegations than in the matter of Negro voting. Some of these matters have engaged the intelligent attention of various congressional committees from time to time, and these congressional committees—composed of duly elected representatives of the people—have accomplished much good. But here we have a proposal for the investigation by a brandnew independent national Commission of merely one area in which there are allegations.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S PRESENT AUTHORITY SUFFICIENT

S. 3604 would give congressional approval and special authorization for the appointment of a special Assistant Attorney General to direct the activities of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, in both the criminal field and the civil field. I submit that there is no necessity whatever for this legislation. In his statement before both the House committee and this committee, the Attorney General frankly stated that the Department of Justice had been operating a "Civil Rights Section" ever since 1939, but that "the noncriminal activity of the Department in the civil rights field is constantly increasing in importance, as well as in amount." Accordingly, the Attorney General feels that "the Department's civil rights activities, both criminal and noncriminal" (should) "be consolidated in a single organization." And he thinks that in order to bring this about a new Assistant Attorney General should be authorized by Congress.

If it is proper for the Department of Justice to busy itself in the civil field of civil rights (as the Attorney General admitted the Department had actually done in some cases) then he can certainly reshuffle his organization and personnel and designate one of his assistants to direct the activities of the Department, both in the civil and criminal phases of civil rights.

In his recent testimony before your committee, the Attorney General was questioned rather pointedly on this proposed new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice and the proposed new Assistant Attorney General to be in charge thereof. And he admitted that he already had authority to assign civil rights enforcement duties to any of the Assistant Attorneys General already authorized and serving under him. As he testified: "The act, under which the Department of Justice is set up, does not specify any particular duties for any Assistant Attorney General."

One reason for the proposal is found in his testimony that the passage of any such legislation would be followed "almost automatically" by increased appropriations for the Department of Justice. Another reason is shown by the testimony of the Attorney General before the House committee in which it was pointed out that the main reason for special authorization of an Assistant Attorney General in charge of civil rights was "to give emphasis and prestige in the enforcement of civil rights."

The Attorney General also said that if this legislation was passed the activities of the Department of Justice would not only be greatly broadened but greatly increased in volume, as well as in scope. That was just a very euphonious way of saying that if this legislation is passed, then the Federal Department of Justice will encroach still further into the daily lives of our people in practically every State—especially the southern States, of course—and will extinguish by mere force and volume and power even more of the safeguards and rights of the citizens to local government in local State affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FRAUGHT WITH DANGEROUS POSSIBILITIES

With the prestige of congressional approval, the Department of Justice would undoubtedly "move in" in various States wherever and whenever the Attorney General thought it to be advisable from any standpoint. And he could subject the governments of those States and the governments of municipalities and counties, and the officials and citizens thereof to intimidations and powerful pressures against which there could be no redress. In fact, the situation could be very much like that which occurs when a surging flooding river overflows its banks and breaks over or through whatever levees may be set up to contain it within its proper bounds and spreads, with devastating force and volume, over many areas which it is not supposed to invade. And even after its muddy tide has receded, great damage has already been done and cannot be undone. So it would be in this case.

If the Department of Justice under a politically minded Attorney General should be armed with congressional authorization and sanction and blessing for this new civil rights division, presided over by a new Assistant Attorney General, he could invade any State or any locality he chose at any time he chose upon any "allegations," no matter from what source they came or how flimsy they were. And he could do this at such times and in such manner as to intimidate the officials and citizens of such States and localities and interfere with them, unjustly and unfairly, in the ordinary exercise of their constitutional and lawful rights. And against this arbitrary and oppressive action—all of which would be paid for by the whole taxpayers of the United States—the victimized States and localities and officials and citizens would have no redress whatsoever. Perhaps after long and protracted litigation they might be able to drive the intruder back but—like the receding flooding river—the damage would already have been done.

Please understand that I do not charge that the present Attorney General would actually and consciously exercise these powers and this new prestige in the oppressive and unfair manner indicated; but I do say that if this legislation were to be passed, then you would be placing these powers in his hands. And I do not believe that the record and the public expressions of the Attorney General give any indication that he would be either cautious or moderate in his approach or in his use of this power if he is vested with congressional sanction, approval and prestige by this legislation.

DEPRIVING CITIZENS OF RIGHT TO JURY

We come now to S. 3717 and S. 3718 which are, to my mind, just about the most dangerous and objectionable of all the proposals being advocated by the Attorney General. These bills would have the effect of enabling the Attorney General, through the Department of Justice, to institute and conduct civil actions and proceedings in Federal courts all over the United States in the name of the United States of America, but really for the private and personal benefit of whatever individuals the Attorney General might choose to recognize or prefer and he could do this whenever those individuals allege that any other person has "engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice" which would deprive the complaining individual of his free and untrammeled right to vote for or against candidates of his own choice for Federal office.

These two bills would also have the effect of enabling the Attorney General, in whatever location and in whatever cases apparently involving civil voting rights he chose to recognize, to deprive the defendant or defendants of the fundamental right to trial by jury. These two bills would also be bypassing and nullifying proceedings in State courts and other State tribunals now authorized to deal with present or threatened invasion of the civil rights of individuals.

All of these effects would do serious damage to our constitutional system of government, and would place in the hands of the Federal Department of Justice, whenever controlled by any partisan political chief, the power to inflict intolerable burden and expense upon individual citizens throughout the Nation and to intimidate State and local officials. And, in a practical even though perhaps not in a narrow technical legal sense, they would authorize judicial conviction of violation of law, or of intent to violate law, without affording the accused the fundamental right of trial by jury.

The testimony of the Attorney General in connection with these bills shows in itself that they are not necessary. In his testimony he told of how the Department of Justice had intervened in a civil suit in Arkansas in a school board case, which was a civil proceeding for an injunction. Likewise, as already noted, the Attorney General testified that the Department of Justice had instituted and conducted an inquiry and investigation in the voting conditions in Mississippi. No doubt the Department of Justice has busied itself in other States and other localities in various civil proceedings having to do with civil rights. All of this has been done under the present laws and without the specific sanction and approval and blessing of any such congressional enactments as the Attorney General now advocates.

PROPOSED CIVIL PROCEEDINGS OFFENSIVE AS CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS

But the Attorney General insists that any activities of the Department of Justice in these matters which might lead to some criminal prosecution would inevitably "stir up such dissension and ill will in the State that it might very well" (do) "more harm than good." By some queer and mysterious sort of reasoning, the Attorney General seems to feel that State and local officials and local citizens would resent any Federal activity that might lead to criminal prosecution for a violation of law. Yet he seems to feel that they would not experience any similar resentment or ill will if such Federal activities were directed along the line of investigations and inquiries leading to the institution and conduct of civil proceedings and injunctions coupled with the threat of punishment by fine, or imprisonment or both, for contempt of court in the event of failure to respect such injunctions.

Such reasoning seems very unrealistic to me. In fact, I believe that the average State and local official and local citizen would much prefer that the issue of his guilt or innocence be determined, after investigation, by customary procedure where he is not only confronted by his accusers but where he has the constitutional safeguard of a trial by jury of his peers. Instead, the Attorney General wants to have a Federal judge, sitting without benefit of a jury, determine either that defendants had been guilty of the alleged law violations in the past, or that they were about to commit these law violations in the immediate future. In either event, it would be necessary to show that the defendant or defendants were guilty. The humili-

ation and worry and trouble and expense to the defendants would be just as great and perhaps greater in such civil proceedings. But they would not have the protection that every accused deserves in the form of a trial by jury.

The Attorney General argues that these civil proceedings could be accomplished without having to subject State officials to the indignity, hazards, and personal expense of a criminal prosecution in the courts of the United States. State officials charged in a civil proceeding, either with past violations of law or with determination to violate the law in the future, and dragged into the Federal courts by the Department of Justice and subjected to long-drawn-out civil proceedings (in which no speedy trial is constitutionally guaranteed, and in which no jury is assured) would be subjected to just as much indignity, hazards, and personal expense as in a criminal prosecution—and perhaps even more.

CONCENTRATING ON ELECTION RIGHTS

The Attorney General argues that while the present statute (sec. 241 of title 18, U. S. C.) makes it unlawful for two or more persons to conspire against the exercise of civil rights by another, the statute fails to penalize such an injury when it was committed by a single individual. However, in his testimony I do not believe the Attorney General referred to another statute, of equal dignity (sec. 594 of title 18, U. S. C.) which makes it a crime for any one person to intimidate or threaten or coerce, or attempt to intimidate, threaten or coerce any other person for the purpose of interfering with such other person's right to vote for or against any candidate for Federal office. While it is true that this latter statute refers only to civil rights in connection with voting, at the same time it is also true that the Attorney General's testimony before this committee and before the House committee indicated very strongly that the principal interest of the Department of Justice in legislation at this time is confined practically to the matter of voting and elections. In fact, in his testimony he conceded that there is really no necessity for any sort of antilynching legislation, especially since no lynchings had occurred in the United States since 1951.

Furthermore, in response to suggestions from the House committee chairman that he might comment upon certain other proposals relating to civil rights now pending before the committee (involving amendments to the two principal criminal statutes intended for the protection of civil rights) the Attorney General testified that there is grave doubt as to whether it is wise to propose at the present time any further extension of the criminal law into this extraordinarily sensitive and delicate area of civil rights.

ADDITIONAL UNTOLD BURDEN ON TAXPAYERS

In the testimony of the Attorney General before both the House committee and this committee, no attempt has been made to estimate the size or extent of the financial burden which would necessarily be involved, if these proposals are enacted into law, by the creation of a new and enlarged division in the Department of Justice, and the authorization of the Attorney General to become the Government paid attorney for whatever complainants he chose to recognize in the vague field of civil rights. Anyone acquainted with Government, as you gentlemen are, will recognize the fact that the burden will not be small or inconsequential. Nor would it diminish as time went on, but instead it would spread and grow with the speed and fertility of noxious weeds. For example, when questioned by the chairman of the House committee as to the expenses of the proposed Civil Rights Commission, the Attorney General testified that supplemental appropriations to cover new expenses "would follow almost automatically, I think, if the Congress authorized it. * * * If this Commission is authorized and the new Division is authorized in the Department of Justice, it would be immediately followed by an appropriation."

EMPOWERS ATTORNEY GENERAL TO "PUNISH" OFFICIALS AND CITIZENS WHO OPPOSE SCHOOL RACIAL MIXTURES

Mr. Chairman, the more I have studied this matter and the more I have thought about it, the more convinced I have become that there is a great deal more to these proposals of the Attorney General than meets either the naked eye or the legislative eye.

In my opinion the enactment of this proposed legislation, as advocated by the Attorney General, would result in the serious evils and grave injustices to which I have alluded. It would also eventually empower the Department of Justice to harass and intimidate and burden and punish citizens who believe that the Supreme Court of the United States went beyond its own lawful powers and usurped legislative prerogatives and encroached unconstitutionally upon the reserved rights of the States when it declared that public education of Negro children and white children in separate schools was unconstitutional.

By the same sort of devious reasoning exhibited in his testimony concerning this legislation, the Attorney General, if vested with the powers and prerogatives sought in this legislation, could very well conclude that the State officials and local officials and private citizens who did anything to preserve segregation in areas where there will not be any public education without segregation, were guilty of conspiring to deprive, or attempt to deprive, Negroes in their localities of some sort of so-called civil rights.

In the public school cases decided in 1954, it was clearly pointed out in the able brief of the attorney general of Virginia and his associate counsel, that Senator Trumbull, of Illinois, the leading sponsor of the 14th amendment and one of the leading sponsors of the Civil Rights Acts of 1866 and 1875, flatly declared "the right to go to school is not a civil right and never was." (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 42d Cong., 2d sess., at p. 3189.)

It was also pointed out in the same brief that the congressional framers and sponsors of the 14th amendment and the legislatures of the States that ratified it were all agreed that public school education was not within the purview of the amendment. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court, in its 1954 decision, blandly disregarded these cogent arguments and historical facts.

Consequently, there can be no assurance that the Supreme Court, as constituted at present, would attach any weight to the declared intentions of the sponsors of this proposed legislation. Therefore, if this legislation is enacted, and the Attorney General then chose to file proceedings against State and local officials, school board officials, officers, and active members of various citizens groups, who believe that the Supreme Court's public school decision was unconstitutional and who, accordingly are unwilling to establish and maintain a mixture of races in their public schools, in all likelihood the Attorney General would be upheld by the Supreme Court. Such proceedings could result in mandatory and injunctive decrees by Federal courts followed by fine and imprisonment upon failure to comply therewith.

Some may think that these forebodings are far fetched, and that the Attorney General, if this legislation is passed, would not take such advantage of the situation and take such extreme measures. But I reply that whenever any court of last resort can completely ignore the plain provisions of the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States while giving to the 14th amendment a meaning completely contrary to the demonstrated intentions and opinions and belief of those who proposed the latter and the States which ratified it, as was done by our Supreme Court in the public school decisions, then there is no fearsome consequence beyond the realm of reasonable possibility.

JEFFERSON'S PROTESTS AGAINST ENCROACHMENTS

If, perchance, anything that I have said about the tendency of the present Supreme Court to usurp the rights of Congress and to ignore the constitutionally reserved rights of the States appears to be somewhat harsh, let me remind you of the opinions expressed over a century ago by one of the greatest Americans of all time. Commenting upon the encroachments upon States rights by the Supreme Court and as to how they might be checked, he said: "By reason and argument? * * * You might as well reason and argue with the marble columns encircling them." Renouncing the use of force, he advocated that the States should "denounce the acts of usurpation until their accumulation shall overweigh that of separation." That was the opinion expressed by Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, in his letter to Giles, December 26, 1825. (See Beveridge's Life of John Marshall, vol. 4, pp. 38–39.)

So, in my opinion of the extreme lengths to which the Supreme Court seems willing to go in violation of the constitutionally reserved rights of States, I find myself in excellent company.

Of course, it may be argued that I am seeing a lot of fanciful situations and that the Department of Justice would not go to any such extremes under any circumstances, and if it did, that the Supreme Court certainly would not fail to interfere. Unfortunately, however, the recent decisions of the Supreme Court have shaken public confidence, and in many areas destroyed public confidence in any assurance that States rights will be protected.

During the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1788, John Marshall, in replying to Mason's argument about possible encroachment by Federal courts, replied that any such idea was "absurd." Then he said: "Has the Government of the United States power to make laws on every subject? * * * Laws affecting the mode of transferring property, or contracts, or claims between citizens of the same State? Can Congress go beyond the delegated powers? Certainly not. If they were to make a law not warranted by any of the powers enumerated, it would be considered by the national judges as an infringement of the Constitution which they are to guard. They would not consider any such law as coming under their jurisdiction. They would declare it void."

Obviously, the man who was later to become the great Chief Justice never had the slightest thought that in later years the Supreme Court would not only fail to protect the separate sovereign States from encroachment on their reserved powers, but would actually become the active executioner of those powers.

During the testimony of the Attorney General before your committee on May 16, 1956, it was brought out that, at various times last year, the late Senator Kilgore, as chairman of your committee, and Senator HENNINGS, as chairman of the Civil Rights Subcommittee, and perhaps others, repeatedly sought to obtain the cooperation of the Department of Justice in connection with several civil rights bills covering practically the same ground as those to which I have specifically alluded. The testimony further brought out that all of the efforts of these distinguished Senators to obtain cooperation from the Attorney General or the Department of Justice in these matters were unsuccessful. It was further brought out that

in connection with those bills, the distinguished Senators were unable to obtain from the Department of Justice either support or recommendation, or, in several instances, even the courtesy of a reply to their official letters.

However, just a few months ago, with dramatic fanfare of publicity broadcast all over the Nation, the Attorney General announced that, in keeping with a White House announcement, an administration program of civil rights legislation would soon be placed before the Congress. The Attorney General's announcement was followed by the introduction of these so-called new bills (S. 3604, 3605, 3717, and 3718) which are substantially the same as the old bills.

But there were two very important differences. In the first place, the old bills, still pending, but on which no cooperation had been obtained from the Department of Justice, were introduced and sponsored by distinguished Democrats, while these new bills now before you were introduced and sponsored by distinguished Republicans. In addition, the old bills were introduced last year when there was no big national election, while the new bills were introduced this year just a little over 6 months prior to the national election.

No doubt, some skeptical or cynical people might possibly suspect from this that the fervent support now being given to these new civil rights bill by the Attorney General and the administration is actuated or inspired, in some way or other, by political motives. But, of course, I would not be so unkind as to intimate any such evil thing.

I do not question nor impugn the motives or intentions of the sponsors or patrons of this proposed legislation, or of the Attorney General or any other advocates. Furthermore, I gladly accord to all of them the same honesty of purpose and sincerity of conviction that I possess. At the same time I must point out that the all-important thing is the possible or probable result or effect of this proposed legislation.

If a mule kicks you in the face, the results and effects are mighty bad even though he may have had the kindliest motives and have been kicking you simply as a friendly gesture.

EFFECTS SERIOUSLY DAMAGING REGARDLESS OF MOTIVES

No matter how high and noble and honest the motives and intentions of this proposed legislation's sponsors and advocates may be, the fact remains, in my opinion and in the opinion of a large number of other citizens, that the results and effects of this legislation, if enacted into law, would be seriously and irreparably damaging to the constitutional rights of the States and of their governments, and of many of their officials and citizens.

For the reasons I have already indicated, therefore, I sincerely trust that this proposed legislation will meet with the defeat that it richly deserves.

Present Strike in the Steel Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT T. ASHMORE
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement issued by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business:

George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, today expressed alarm over what the end results might be as it relates to the present strike in the steel industry.

He advised he has already noted that one railroad has reported the possible necessity of increased passenger rates if wage and price increases come in the steel industry. Burger also stated if the increase is granted the wheels will be set in motion for similar action all along the line. The real victims in this continuous spiral are the public at large, which, of course, includes the small business segment of our economy.

"The heretofore procedure in settling strikes of this nature," he adds, "has solved nothing except to increase the spiral of inflation which if it continues will eventually ruin the economic structure of this Nation." Burger added: "Should the Government mediators determine that the demands of the steel workers are just, then the Government itself should make certain, in definite understandable terms, that the settlement is made from the present profits of the steel industry, with no increase in prices of steel products. The workers themselves, through their accredited leaders, should take cognizance of the fact that their demands do not result in a hardship to all in the working class, including themselves."

Burger concludes: "Any other form of settlement will solve nothing, but will again add to inflation."

The Contributions of One Man Toward Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have before me an article by Arthur Krock, carried in the New York Times for Friday, February 27, entitled "The Contributions of One Man Toward Peace." In this article Mr. Krock discusses the Fulbright program and the great significance of the originator of the program and also of the Fulbright resolution in 1943.

Mr. President, I had the honor of coming to the Congress in the same year with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I think Arthur Krock's reference to him as an extraordinary public servant is well taken. The Senator from Arkansas has made a great contribution to the cause of international peace and international understanding, and the United States and the free world are better off because of the contributions of this one man. He is a man of great ability, great coverage, and great integrity. He has been a tower of strength to many of us with his wise counsel, steadiness, and understanding. The foreign policy of the United States is better because of his inspirational leadership and will become better still if we heed his advice and counsel.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Arthur Krock concerning the Senator from Arkansas may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to ask that the very splendid article appearing in this morning's New York Times, an article written by Arthur Krock, and relating to the outstanding work of one of our colleagues, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], be printed in the RECORD. Since the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has had the article printed, I shall not duplicate the request, but I highly approve of the article.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ONE MAN TOWARD PEACE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, July 26.—In his report to this Congress of the operations of Public Law 584 that was passed by the 79th 10 years ago, the Secretary of State made the following comment:

In terms of lessening the likelihood of another war by promoting greater people-to-people understanding, the program has been described as the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by the Congress of the United States. Altogether, nearly 22,000 persons have been exchanged with 28 countries at a lower cost to the American taxpayers than 5 hours of fighting World War II.

AID PROGRAM'S COUNTERPART

Public Law 584, informally known as the Fulbright Act, is the legislation by which teachers and students are exchanged between this and many other nations—today Israel was added. It was the cultural counterpart to our economic and military programs, all designed to promote through collective security a permanent and durable world peace. Secretary Dulles' report of its effectiveness to that end is not only an impressive documentation of the soundness of the concept. It is a reminder of the extraordinary service to the cause of international peace that has been rendered by one legislator—Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas.

This service began September 21, 1943, with the passage by the House (of which the Senator was then a Member) of the Fulbright resolution, a cornerstone of bipartisan foreign policy and of the United Nations. The resolution committed the House to "the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and to maintain a just and lasting peace, among the nations of the world, and as favoring participation by the United States therein." At a subsequent Republican conference at Mackinac Island, Mich., members of that party who had assisted FULBRIGHT in his project—among them the late Representative James W. Wadsworth and the late Wendell L. Willkie—put through a similar resolution. And, under the sponsorship of Senator Connally of Texas, the other branch of Congress approved the Fulbright resolution.

HULL'S DEBT ACKNOWLEDGED

In his memoirs—published by Macmillan, 1948—Cordell Hull, who as Secretary of State labored ceaselessly for the creation of the United Nations, made a number of appreciative references to the pioneering of FULBRIGHT. "My discouragement at the Soviet Government's rejection of the Four-Nation Declaration," he wrote, "was counterbalanced by the encouragement I received" by the House action. "* * * I felt that the passage of the Fulbright resolution * * *

would give me a real advantage in Moscow because it would show Molotov and Eden that the people of the United States * * * wanted their country to take its full share in an international organization."

Three years after FULBRIGHT's first epochal contribution, Congress passed the Exchange Students Act which was the subject of Dulles' glowing report on its decennial. The gist of the legislation was this:

At the end of the Second World War American military equipment that cost many millions was stored in warehouses all over the world—bulldozers, machine tools, locomotives, food, clothing, etc. But the countries which badly needed these supplies lacked the dollars with which to buy them.

The Fulbright Act provided that these surpluses be sold to such governments for their own foreign currencies and credits. Part of these funds were set aside, through special agreements, for educational purposes only, a precedent having been established with enormous success in Belgium by Herbert Hoover in 1920.

EFFECTS OF THE ACT

By the time the Fulbright Act was 10 years old, over 12,000 foreign students, teachers, lecturers, and scholars had entered American life in cities and towns in all the States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska. Over 9,000 Americans had gone abroad in exchange. Of these two groups Dulles said to Congress:

"Systematic evaluation studies indicate that these people—from abroad—not only return home with a better understanding of the United States, but share that understanding with their fellow countrymen. * * * Many of them are becoming leaders in the national life of their countries: in India, at least half * * * have a voice in policymaking on an all-India level.

"Through their studies—Americans who were sent abroad—are adding continually to our store of knowledge about these countries * * * by example as well as by words explaining our way of life * * * and gaining new insights into America."

The details of the report bear out the claims by the Secretary that the program is "bringing about a new kind of chain reaction which may eventually work more powerfully for peace than nuclear weapons."

Senator FULBRIGHT's renomination by the Democrats of Arkansas, a one-party State, fortunately assures his reelection to continue his constructive labors for peace with freedom.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to join in the commendation of the Senator from Arkansas for the contribution he has made to the exchange program.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I think the Senate should know that the Senator from New Jersey himself played a great part in the success of the program.

Religion and Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN O. PASTORE

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Reverend Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, has called my attention to a recent address by the Honorable J. H. Jefferson Caffery, who has served as United States Ambassador to Cuba, Brazil, France, and Egypt. This address was given before the National Catholic Education Association at its annual conference at St. Louis, Mo. I think it is an interesting and stimulating speech and I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Caffrey's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION CONGRESS, EASTER 1956, ST. LOUIS, MO.

(By Hon. Jefferson Caffery)

Forty-five years ago I entered the diplomatic service of the United States. I have had 44 years of service including over 29 years as Ambassador, Minister, Assistant Secretary of State. If those years have taught me anything, they have taught me to recognize the Providence of God in human affairs, even if at times events seem to go against the Divine purposes. We are witnessing the development of the work of God's Word in the world. However God expects each one of us to do our part. Under the influence of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, each one has his place, and we should endeavor to perform the tasks set for this generation, having in mind the great objective, the establishment of the reign of Christ the King of kings on earth. We are in the world to give glory to our Creator, to collaborate in the extension of His Kingdom over the souls of men. To these ends the Incarnate Word gave Himself a mystical body, glorious instrument of conquest and assimilation for the penetration of institutions and states and even civilizations. If by the grace of God I have come to these conclusions, I must say that from the days before my conversion, one of my surest guides in the human field was the great Saint Thomas Aquinas. Before I became a Catholic I read his entire Summa. He built that work in the conviction that religion is rational and that all knowledge, all science, all understanding and all truth can be harmoniously adjusted because reason is divine. Also, as it has been well said, all intellectual growth consists in the comprehending and coordinating of the truth of God.

Now to go back to beginning, 45 years ago the interest of the American people in international affairs was not very great. We did not have to be interested. We were a going and a growing concern.

We were prosperous, somewhat self-centered, very busy, with few foreign attachments. All that has been changed. The change has been gradual over the course of the years as of necessity our foreign relations were intensified. Now the interest, not only of Government but of press and public, is tremendous, and necessarily so. It is a question of the survival of civilization as we know it, the personal dignity of every human being, the right to worship, true liberty, true humanism, true culture, true education, the right to a decent standard of living. In the face of the danger, we must stay strong, very strong. We must be alert, on guard. We cannot expose ourselves to an H-bomb Pearl Harbor. It is a hard saying, but it could be national suicide for us to stop making H-bombs and A-bombs before we were convinced that the countries behind the Iron Curtain were complying with their promises. Furthermore, we must know what is going on in the world, we must take an active interest, an active part. If we do not, we will simply be left behind, notwithstanding our enormous power, our enormous resources. We must do business with other nations, because if we do not do business with them our own high standard of living will go down. To maintain that standard of living, we must export, and that means we must import, too. Four million workers are involved in the production of goods for export and processing of imports. With this in mind, it it obvious that we need an adequate Foreign Service. In fact, if we do not have an adequate Foreign Service, disaster will ensue. When I was Assistant Secretary of State I was in charge of Latin American matters, and also I was 1 of 2 Assistant Secretaries who supervised personnel matters in the Foreign Service. I know something of the difficulties involved. There is one thing I can say, and that is that almost invariably the really competent men come to the top. That is important, because if we do not have our ablest at the top, again, disaster will ensue. During my 44 years, I served in many parts of the world, in many of the so-called hottest spots. It is well known that public opinion at home has tremendous bearing on our foreign policies. It is most important that our public be sufficiently informed on world affairs, and I was glad to observe last year on some trips I made around our country that people in general are taking a most lively interest in our foreign affairs. This was especially true in our universities. As Catholics, we should do what we can to foster that interest in our educational institutions. As Catholics, we should, more than most, recognize the importance of the role our Nation should play in world affairs. In 1953 the Holy Father remarked that in the community of nations: every state becomes a part of the system of international law, and, hence, of natural law, which is both foundation and crown of the whole. Thomas Aquinas says, "The natural law is a code, which reason reads in the book of human nature, declares obligatory in the name of the Creator, and in which the exigencies of man's nature, seeking, as does every creature, its ultimate perfection, finds a mandatory expression." In a few words, it behooves us as a nation to do our part in the carrying out of God's designs in the world. Very practically speaking, one task we have is to defend our religion, to defend freedom, to defend free man against the advance of the Iron Curtain. As I said before, one way is to be strong, another is to help others. I do not mean indiscriminate giving in this case. I mean helping others who have the same goals that we have to the end they will be able to help us defend our religion, our freedom, our way of life, our standard of living, against aggression. We must cooperate with men of good will all over the world in international organizations intended to further these causes, to build for the world of the future an international edifice acceptable to God. While I was Ambassador at Paris, for about 18 months I was the United States representative for the then called Interim Aid to France and I had opportunity to see what prodigious good that aid accomplished. Later, in Egypt, I had some experience with point 4.

For some centuries before the emergence of the United States as an independent Nation, the practice of diplomacy was concerned more with dynastic affairs and dynastic relations than anything else. Since our appearance on the stage of history, diplomatic practice has evolved considerably but gradually. Diplomacy is now concerned with a multitude of subjects: politics of course and economics of course, the press also, labor, and finance, and agriculture, defense matters of course, aviation, communications, and culture, and industry and business, and petroleum, and education, and science too. The practice of diplomacy has had to adapt its methods to the growth and complexity of world interests. There are a few unchangeable principles and the first principle is to tell the truth. This does not mean tell everything a man knows but it does mean

that when a man makes a statement he should stick to the truth. Furthermore, in the long run, this pays dividends by way of confidence and trust. Back of the Iron Curtain, they say there is no absolute truth, a statement is true if it is useful to the party, there is no other criterion. They say there is no God. The Kremlin takes the place of God and whatever comes out of the Kremlin is for all intents and purposes infallible. That is why it is easy to overestimate the effect on the Russian people of the zigs and zags of Communist policy, the recent attacks on Stalin for instance. We must bear this in mind when we look around the world and see the mighty efforts being made by Soviet states to capture the souls of men, millions and millions of them especially in underdeveloped countries. The struggle goes on too in nations which have only recently achieved their independence. In those nations there is often resentment against former colonial administrators and sometimes against the West in general. The Communists take advantage of that.

My last post was Ambassador to Egypt. By the grace of God we were able to see the conclusion of two important disputes which had plagued Anglo-Egyptian relations for a good part of a century: the Suez agreement and the Sudan agreement. Those settlements removed some clouds of misunderstanding. But there are other problems in the Middle East. The root of many is to be found in the low standard of living. The present Egyptian Government and notably the Prime Minister Gamal Abdel Nasser are dedicated to doing something about that. The project for the high dam just beyond Aswan is a great step in the right direction. The dam will enable the Egyptians to add 2 million acres to their cultivable land, one-third of what is now under cultivation. The lake back of the dam will be a bigger dam reservoir than any now existing. The Government of Irak is putting into effect projects for huge land developments, with their considerable revenues derived from oil production. These are praiseworthy efforts but there is much to be done, and we can and should do a good deal to help. There are practical interests involved: three-fourths of the world's entire proved oil reserves are in the Middle East. Aramco's reserves alone are possibly as large as those of continental United States, four-fifths of Western Europe's petroleum consumption comes from the Middle East. We must recognize that all is not fair sailing in the Middle East. There are many problems. The principal one is the difference between Jews and Arabs. This is a tinderbox situation wherein danger lies of an explosion. It is in our interest, in the world's interest to find a solution, and although I have not been in the Middle East recently and my information is no longer firsthand, I have reason to hope that a way can eventually be found, for a way must be found. We cannot leave the Middle East to its fate.

For the past 8 months we have been in Rome for most of the time. We recently had the privilege of being present at the splendid ceremonies in the Basilica of St. Peter on March 11. Never before, I believe, had there been present in that famous church so many representatives of chiefs of state. There were more than 50. It was an inspiring and encouraging sight to see them gathered together in the presence of the Vicar of Christ. I have been around Rome and I know something of Roman institutions. I take the occasion to express my appreciation of the admirable North American College and of the very effective and efficient work being done there by Bishop O'Connor.

Another thing I have learned during the long course of my years around the world is this, that without sound schooling it is very difficult, indeed, to achieve Christian living. Without sound schooling we will not have sound priests. It is the same in foreign affairs; without sound schooling we will not have sound diplomats. Without sound schooling we will not have sound businessmen or labor leaders, or any kind of leaders, or industrialists, or financiers, or scientists, or teachers, or officials, or officers, or employers, or employees, or workers of any kind, or for that matter artists or musicians. I will not call names, but I have noticed as I lived here and there in this continent or that the type of schooling everywhere has influence on the caliber and character and even the happiness of men. It is evident also that in schooling, of course, charity and kindness and understanding are required, but also discipline. Without discipline chaos is around the corner. Discipline means order. In some quarters protocol in diplomatic affairs has a bad name. That's all wrong. Protocol in diplomacy means order in diplomatic dealings. Natural law means order. There is order in heaven. We should strive to have order on earth and we will get it only with sound schools and sound schooling.

Since writing the above I was asked by Washington to go to Karachi as personal representative of the President for the inauguration of the first Pakistan President as well as the inauguration of the Pakistan Republic. I left Rome on March 20 and arrived at Karachi the next day. The inaugurations were on March 23. In my day I have served as special ambassador at inaugurations of six presidents, and I can say the Karachi ceremonies compared favorably with all of them. The Russians sent their high-ranking Mikoyon as their special representative. I am glad to report that he did not achieve the success they had hoped and intended. Indeed, the President in his inaugural address spoke pointedly of the free world.

I thank you for asking me to come here to St. Louis. This is an aspect of America which is very gratifying for me to know. I say this after the many years I have represented the American Nation and the American people in many parts of the world.

Mr. Stassen's Straw Hat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, we who have over the past more than 3 years of their first term looked with justifiable pride on the constructive and progressive teamwork of our President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and our Vice President, RICHARD M. NIXON, were shocked, amazed, and disturbed that one in the official family should even suggest the breaking up of this team. In my opinion, actions as good intentioned as the party in this case, Harold Stassen, may have believed them to be can only be misunderstood and misrepresented. The future of good constitutional government depends on the continued forward march of the team of Ike and DICK.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Evening Star of July 26, 1956:

MR. STASSEN'S STRAW HAT

Back in 1948, shortly before the election that was supposed to be in the bag for Governor Dewey, the New York Herald Tribune published a cartoon showing a grim-faced Harry Truman perched atop an iceberg with a straw hat on his head. The caption was: "Still Wearing His Straw Hat."

But the Herald Tribune's cartoonist, along with a good many other people, was soon to be confounded, and Mr. Truman's optimism was to receive its rich reward. The same thing may turn out to be true this year of Harold Stassen, who is wearing a kind of straw hat of his own. At the moment, however, it doesn't look as though a political miracle is going to come to the rescue of the President's assistant in charge of disarmament.

Mr. Stassen is standing his ground just as sturdily as Mr. Truman ever stood his. He appeared on a television show yesterday morning to indicate that everything was fine and that nothing had changed as far as he was concerned since he first embarked on his ill-fated campaign to toss Mr. NIXON to the wolves. He had two more public appearances scheduled, and, just for good mesaure, he got in a whack at Republican Chairman Len Hall. It seems that Mr. Stassen doesn't like the way Mr. Hall has been trying to push Mr. NIXON down the throats of the GOP conventioneers.

Meanwhile, it looks as though Mr. Stassen's stop-NIXON bandwagon has just about run out of gas. Governor Herter, of Massachusetts, the Stassen choice, is having no part, thank you, of the Stassen project. In fact—a rather crushing fact—Governor Herter, who wasn't consulted in advance by Mr. Stassen, is going to put Mr. NIXON in nomination. Governor Herter says he considers it "a privilege to make the nominating speech for this valuable member of the Eisenhower team." On top of this comes a Trendex poll which shows that 83.5 percent of the voters who favor President Eisenhower would rather have NIXON as his running made than Herter. Evidently this was not the private poll which convinced Mr. Stassen that the ticket would be 6 percent stronger with Governor Herter in the No. 2 spot.

There are some other discouragements to the Stassen project. The White House remains cooly distant. None of those other Republicans who, according to Mr. Stassen, were in on this deal with him has come forward to lend the slightest support. And Mr. NIXON, the intended victim has been a model of political rectitude through it all. If anything, he has managed to strengthen his position instead of losing ground.

All in all, this adds up to one of the strangest political fiascoes in the memory of man. Some day, perhaps, Mr. Stassen will tell the whole story of the origin of this misdirected project. Meanwhile, he, and apparently he alone, is stuck with it.

Administration of the American Samoan Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the problem of colonialism and related problems of treatment of peoples under the jurisdiction of foreign nations are widely discussed in the world, today. I believe our Nation has a most enviable record in the manner in which it treats native peoples, their economy, their social problems and all other related human problems, in areas where we maintain jurisdiction.

I am sure this reputation is so well established because of the fine people selected by our Government to work in the administrative offices in these countries. One such example, which I take particular pride in mentioning, is the present administration of the American Samoan Islands. The present governor is Barrett Lowe, who comes from my hometown of Madison, S. Dak. The record of his efficient administration is well recorded in two newspaper stories, which I wish to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first article is a feature story, written by Gardiner B. Jones, and published in the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Daily Argus-Leader of July 1, 1956. The second is a special story to the New York Times on June 17, 1956. Both tell the accomplishments of the present governor and his administration. I ask that they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader of July 1, 1956]

LOWE PUTTING SAMOA BACK ON ITS FEET—SOUTH DAKOTAN STERNLY DEDICATED

(Gardiner B. Jones is the writer of the following article as it appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser. He recently returned from a visit to the South Pacific. Gov. Richard Barrett Lowe has played a prominent role in South Dakotan educational circles. He was president of Sioux Falls College and the South Dakotan Educational Association)

Five years ago, the United States Navy pulled out of American Samoa, abandoning the naval base it had maintained for more than 50 years.

It was like pulling the plug out of the bathtub. An island economy which had been geared almost entirely to serving the naval base went down the drain. Jobs and paychecks dried up.

Moving in behind the Navy came the United States Department of Interior, charged with establishing a civil government and restoring the economy.

But for 2 years, nothing much happened. Under a dazzling succession of four either aged and ailing or young and playboy appointed governors from the United States in 24 months, Samoa just drifted. Her people lost heart.

Then, 2 years ago, along came Richard Barrett Lowe, a slight, bald man with dark eyes and a large mustache. If you saw Lowe (pronounced Lau) in a crowd, chances are you wouldn't give him a second look.

And in overlooking him, you would be missing a bet. This former South Dakota educator and World War II naval reserve officer is sternly dedicated to the proposition that the United States must pay off on a moral obligation to the Samoans.

Right now, there is little material benefit to the United States in Samoa. The profit motive is almost entirely absent as far as the Federal Government is concerned. Samoa could become an important way station for trans-Pacific aircraft, but that is almost the extent of it.

But Lowe and his staff feel the United States is under heavy obligation to help the Samoans develop their island to the fullest extent possible and to show them the way to a large measure of State-level self government.

While he is working no miracles, Lowe and his administration have begun to make perceptible headway against the problems of this tiny island and its people.

Samoa's big problem is this:

Her population of 22,500 persons is more than half again larger than it was in 1940. Of her total land area of 45,000 acres, only 15 percent is arable, and the bulk of that is only a few degrees off from the perpendicular. There is little level land on mountainous, volcanic Samoa.

They say Samoan farming is a two-handed affair: one hand for putting in the plants, the other hand for hanging onto the mountainside.

Samoa is far from self-sufficient. She has no diversified agriculture, little industry and must import the vast bulk of what she uses.

In fiscal 1955 the United States poured in $105,000 in direct appropriations and $1,159,000 in grants-in-aid to finance island government and services.

In the first 2 years of his administration, Governor Lowe has been able to chalk up these accomplishments:

An abandoned fish cannery has been leased by the Government to a private United States firm and last year exported to the United States about $1 million worth of canned tuna. The cannery provides work for 350 persons.

A committee has begun the drafting of a Territorial constitution along classic United States lines. At the same time the proposed constitution will embody Samoan customs and traditions. For example, the custom of lands ownership by the family instead of by individuals will for the first time be be embedded in constitutional law.

The island is moving at its own pace and in accordance with Samoan desires toward greater self-government at the Territorial level. The system of village and district councils and chiefs is being retained.

Efforts are being made to develop new agricultural crops, to attract new industry and to develop tourism. Coffee and cocoa have been introduced, and increased production of copra, the island's chief crop, is being encouraged.

Samoa's big—and only—industry, aside from handicrafts, the fish cannery, originally was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation several years ago. Samoans were to supply it with fish. But accustomed only to subsistence fishing, the Samoans did not have the techniques for supplying a production line. The cannery operated exactly 2 hours, then shut down.

The government now has bought the cannery and leased it to Van Camp with the understanding that for the time being, Japanese fishermen would be permitted to supply the fish for the cans. So far, it has worked.

Now Lowe has plans for teaching the Samoans the long-line methods of tuna fishing with the idea of eventually eliminating the Japanese. And he hopes to set up machinery that will allow the Samoans to capitalize their own boats.

The story of the cannery thoroughly illustrates Lowe's overall policy. It is: Samoa for the Samoans, by degrees and in an orderly manner.

As governor, Lowe has nearly absolute powers. He can veto action of the local legislature and there is no appeal, although he can be overridden by the Interior Department. But this serious student of history and government is not anxious to retain those powers.

The constitution now being drafted would bring the Governor's office into a more balanced relationship with the local legislature.

Governor Lowe believes there is a big future for Samoa in tourism. Matson cruise ships will begin calling at Pago Pago this fall with 750 passengers at a crack. The Governor estimated that the Matson visits can boost local handicraft sales to the half-million dollar mark.

Meantime, a new airfield is about to be constructed. Work will begin in September on a 9,000 foot runway to supplant the present 6,000 footer of World War II vintage. The longer field will accommodate the big Honolulu to Australia airplanes and it is possible Samoa will become a keyway point for Pan American World Airways.

With all this, the Governor hopes, will come hotel investment. The only accommodations now are the 19 rooms at the Government-operated Rainmaker Hotel. The Governor hopes either Matson or Pan American will eventually put up a hotel.

Other new industry can be persuaded to locate in Samoa through tax concessions, Lowe believes. Garment manufacturing is one possibility. The Government also proposes to have Congress amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to permit lower minimum wages in Samoa. The level would be in line with South Pacific living standards and costs.

As another means of helping Samoa on its feet, the administration encourages Samoans to exercise their right as United States nationals to migrate to other United States areas. In recent years for example, some 800 Samoans have moved to Hawaii.

The Government school system, running through the 12th grade and also featuring training for nursing, vocations, and commercial work, is able to train Samoans for jobs elsewhere.

The military services also are open to Samoans, and Lowe sees Army, Navy, and Air Force careers for young Samoans as one other means of solving the employment problem.

[From the New York Times of June 17, 1956]

UNITED STATES HELPS SAMOA REBUILD ECONOMY—GOVERNOR SEEKS TO ATTRACT INDUSTRY AND LEAD WAY TO SELF-GOVERNMENT

PAGO PAGO, SAMOA, June 16.—Five years ago the United States Navy left American Samoa, abandoning the naval base it had maintained for more than fifty years.

The island's economy had been geared almost entirely to serving the base. Jobs and pay checks dried up.

Then came the Interior Department, charged with establishing a civil government and restoring the economy.

But for two years, nothing much happened. Two years ago came Richard Barrett Lowe as appointed governor.

This former South Dakota educator and World War II naval reserve officer is dedicated to the proposition that the United States must pay off on a moral obligation to the Samoans.

Mr. Lowe and his staff feel the United States is under heavy obligation to help the Samoans develop their island to the fullest extent possible and to show them the way to self government.

FISH CANNERY LEASED

Samoa's population of 22,500 persons is more than half again as large as in 1940. Of her total land area of 45,000 acres, only 15 percent is arable, and the bulk of that is only a few degrees off from the perpendicular.

Samoa has no diversified agriculture, little industry, and must import the bulk of what she uses.

In the fiscal year 1955 the United States poured in $105,000 in direct appropriations and $1,159,000 in grants-in-aid to finance island government and services.

In the first two years of Governor Lowe's administration, an abandoned fish cannery has been leased by the Government to a private United States concern and last year exported to the United States about $1,000,000 worth of canned tuna. The cannery provides work for 350 persons.

A committee has begun drafting a territorial constitution along United States lines. The proposed constitution also will embody Samoan customs and traditions. For example, the custom of land ownership by the family instead of by individuals will be imbedded in constitutional law.

NEW CROPS DEVELOPED

The island is moving at its own pace and in accordance with Samoan desires toward greater territorial self-government.

Efforts are being made to develop new agricultural crops, to attract industry, and to develop touring. Coffee and cocoa have been introduced. The increased production of copra, the island's chief crop, is being encouraged.

The fish cannery, Samoa's big, and only industry originally was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation several years ago. Samoans were to supply it with fish. But, accustomed only to subsistence fishing, they did not have the techniques for supplying a production line. The cannery operated 2 hours.

As Governor, Mr. Lowe has nearly absolute powers. He can veto actions of the local legislature and there is no appeal although he can be overridden by the Interior Department.

The constitution being drafted would bring the Governor's office into a more balanced relationship with the local legislature.

NEW AIRFIELD PLANNED

Governor Lowe believes there is a big future for Samoa in touring. Cruise ships will begin calling at Pago Pago this fall with 750 passengers each. The Governor estimates that the Matson visits can increase local handicraft sales to the half-million-dollar mark.

A new airfield is about to be constructed. Work will begin in September on a 9,000-foot runway to supplant the present 6,000-foot field of World War II days. The longer field will accommodate the big Honolulu-to-Australia airplanes.

Other industry can be persuaded to locate in Samoa through tax concessions, Mr. Lowe believes. Garment manufacturing is one possibility. The Governor also proposes to ask Congress to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to permit lower minimum wages in Samoa.

As another means of helping put Samoa on its feet, the administration encourages Samoans to exercise their right as United States nationals to migrate to other United States areas. In recent years, for example, some 800 Samoans have moved to Hawaii.

The Eisenhower Program: How It Fares

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Eisenhower Program: How It Fares," which was published in a recent edition of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EISENHOWER PROGRAM: HOW IT FARES

Since his State of the Union message last January, President Eisenhower has sent Congress over 200 requests for new legislation. By the end of its second session this week, the 84th Congress will have acted favorably on about 35 percent of these requests. This is the lowest battling average of Eisenhower's 4 years as President. In 1955 he batted 46 percent; in 1954, 65 percent; in his first year, 73 percent—according to the fairly hard-boiled box scores of the Congressional Quarterly.

The steady decline in the President's influence on Congress is neither unusual nor necessarily discreditable to Eisenhower. Since 1955 he has been dealing with an opposition Congress. His batting average as a whole is better than that of most recent Presidents, notably Truman, who did not break even once in 6 years.

Arthur Larson, Undersecretary of Labor, has written a campaign book called A Republican Looks at His Party, in which he claims that the Eisenhower administration has "for the first time in our history discovered and established the authentic American center in politics. This "New Republicanism" is not easily dramatized in a single legislative issue. As Larson says, Eisenhower "has dared to be obvious when the obvious was right." This obscures the full scale of some of his chief accomplishments; but they were not easy and they did not happen overnight.

For example, one of Eisenhower's campaign promises was to restore honesty in government. A series of hard cases, such as Charlie Wilson's GM stock and Harold Talbott's self-dealing got his administration some bad headlines but also resulted in a lot of resignations. The administration's ethical standards are now generally regarded as the highest in years and much stricter than the conflict-of-interest laws. For another example, it has taken 3 years for Eisenhower to balance the budget but they were 3 years of aiming and working toward that goal. For another example, Eisenhower got us out of one war and kept us out of others. This is an over-simple judgment on his foreign policy, omitting many a crisis; but the difference between life and death is also pretty simple.

In politics, the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, and the record Eisenhower will be running on is a lot bigger than his legislative box score. What follows is a check list of the main features of his program as of July 1956.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Even before he was inaugurated, Eisenhower felt that United States armed strength was committed in too many remote places (notably Korea) and was draining the economy. The ensuing shift in defense policy became popularly known as the "New Look." Its essence; since atomic weapons would be used in any probable war, our strategy should center on them. The chief results of this decision were a smaller standing army and an end of the tendency to whack up defense funds into three approximately equal parts. The Air Force has grown at the expense of the other two services. Controversy over this radical shift continues into 1956; not only have Army spokesmen like Ridgway objected, but the new prominence of the Air Force, inviting comparison with the Soviet air force, has just won it an even bigger 1957 appropriation than Wilson asked. Although these arguments will continue, the new defense strategy has achieved two of its chief objectives, which were continuity (no more violent ups and downs) and economic manageability for the long pull.

The new strategy makes the United States even more dependent than before on strong allies as a defense against peripheral "brush fire" wars. In exposed positions like South Korea, Formosa, and Turkey, United States military aid has maintained the local allied ability to resist. In others—notably NATO—our own deemphasis of infantry has set a bad example for our allies, and the new Soviet foreign policy, necessarily abetted by Eisenhower at Geneva, has still further weakened their interest in self-defense. If there has been one major failure of United States foreign policy—and hence a breach in our defensive strategy—it is the failure to replace the Western alliance's crumbling cement of fear with other cement.

The administration has hoped to do this with its 1956 enlarged foreign aid bill. That bill was still in some trouble with Congress last week. Nor is it adequate to the huge task of creating a greater economic (and political) unity among all the non-Communist nations of the world.

Secretary Dulles, however, has another string to his bow. He once said, "If we can deter such aggression as would mean general war, and that is our confident resolve, then we can let time and fundamentals work for us." The deterrence has succeeded, and time and fundamentals have inded work for us behind the Iron Curtain. The new Soviet line, joint product of Stalin's death, Russia's necessities and Eisenhower's firm prudence, runs deep enough to imply a whole new phase of the great world conflict, a phase which will also require further changes in United States foreign policy. Those changes have yet to be described in terms that would justify abandoning the policies that have kept the peace so far.

THE UNITED STATES ECONOMY

At home, Eisenhower's economic achievement is colossal. The unprecedented levels of output, income, wages, employment, consumption and investment show no signs of letting up after three booming years. The Government's part in this achievement is as follows:

A wholehearted befriending of the private enterprise system that produced the boom.

A resolute attack on that system's most insidious enemy, which is inflation. The stability of prices during the past 4 years is one key to the upward surge of everything else.

Breaking the superstitious connection between prosperity and Government spending; the latter is a declining part (now less than 12 percent) of total spending. Instead of moving further into business, the Government has moved steadily out. The Bureau of the Budget recently announced that the Defense Department has quit some 32 businesses (such as coffee roasting) while other departments have returned synthetic rubber plants, the inland waterways, and many other Government enterprises to private hands.

Favoritism to the private economy without favoritism to any of its parts. A vigorous antitrust policy has won relief in far more suits than its predecessor's and preserved the system's competitive environment despite a wave of mergers.

The budget: Balanced in 1956 (as promised in 1952).

Taxes: cut and reformed in 1954.

This year Eisenhower has finessed further tax cuts by demanding larger appropriations in many fields, notably the gigantic roadbuilding program for which Congress has just authorized a tripling of present outlays. But if such new expenditures are kept under control, and the boom continues, another major tax cut is in sight for 1957. It would considerably broaden the base of the boom's next round.

In 1956, as in previous years, Eisenhower has failed to secure the amendments he wanted to the Taft-Hartley Act. But wages have risen faster than other types of income. The White House has continued its policy of hands off all strikes, including (so far) the current steel strike, the politest strike in recent memory. Labor has no real gripe against this administration.

THE FARMER

The laggard member of the Eisenhower economy is the farmer. Eisenhower and Benson hase been trying to liberate the farmer from his dependence on Government subsidies without letting his income collapse. Their long-range program of flexible price supports, which took a year to write, did not come into effect until the harvest of 1955. This year it cost Ike a crucial veto to keep this big experiment going. The lower support levels should now begin to redirect farm production away from surplus crops, while the $1.2 billion soil bank which Congress also gave him will serve the same purpose and add directly to farm income. Administratively, Benson is struggling to sell off his towering surpluses without breaking normal markets. He has managed to reduce their size by over 25 percent since 1954.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Last week the White House brought strong pressure on the Senate to defeat the Hells Canyon big dam power project; it preferred the existing plan for smaller private dams. But Eisenhower has backed the Fryingpan-Arkansas River Tunnel project to divert west coast water to Colorado. As for the upper Colorado Basin, a vast interstate multipurpose dam project, Eisenhower personally pushed it for 2 years before Congress voted the money for it this spring.

He similarly pushed through the St. Lawrence seaway (1954), the seventh President to favor it but the first to get action. On the other hand, he checked the expansion of TVA in favor of municipal power in the messy Dixon-Yates affair. The pattern of his partnership policy on resources is consistently favorable to their decentralized control, and its opponents are less often conservationists than doctrinaire advocates of Federal electricity.

HUMAN WELFARE

Social security has expanded enormously under Eisenhower, beginning with the amendments of 1954 which added 10 million people to the rolls. The amendments passed last week, lowering women's retirement to 62 and the age limit for permanently disabled benefit to 50, represent Democratic frosting on a Republican (or bipartisan) cake. But Secretary Folsom's $200 million school construction program was first doubled and then stopped cold in Congress on the segregation issue. He has also apparently struck out with his plan for Federal aid to medical teaching and research, and with a Federal health reinsurance scheme dating from 1954.

HOUSEKEEPING, ETC.

Eisenhower has again failed to carry statehood for Hawaii. He has failed to pass his civil-rights legislation, which merely created a filibuster (along with a little campaign material). He has won such housekeeping fights as higher pay for department heads, but has failed on other Hoover Commission recommendations and on the higher mail rates which the Post Office needs. He has succeeded in reorganizing the Defense Department and transforming the nature of the Cabinet. He has maintained an atmosphere of administrative loyalty and teamwork which has all but eliminated that long endemic Potomac stench, the interdepartmental fued. But he has found no smoother than his predecessors the road from the White House to the Capitol.

For a year Eisenhower tried to woo Congress through its Members, performing the unprecedented feat of inviting every one of them to lunch. Since 1954 he has learned to deal with them more at arm's length.

As Congress last week approached the annual climax of its creative tension with the White House (the painful oestrus by which Americans are governed), the House Appropriations Committee let fly a blast at Lewis Strauss of the AEC. It accused him of obstructing the Atoms-for-Peace program which Eisenhower launched, and voted $440 million for commercial atomic development which the administration thinks unnecessary. Right or wrong, this vote illustrates one fair criticism of the administration's policy toward Congress. Although most of its proposals have deserved passage, its best ones have also deserved more persistent and repeated pressure than the White House has given them. Eisenhower programs have a way of being deposited on Congress' (or the world's) doorstep and left there untended. Atoms-for-Peace is one example; the disjointed parts of our foreign economic policy are another. The Eisenhower program needs not a wiser Congress (there is no such animal), or even a Republican Congress (though that would help). It needs more follow-through behind the few important measures that would turn a good administration record into a great one.

As it is, generous in scope and careful in preparation, the Eisenhower program answers as many of America's real needs as Americans are conscious of, perhaps more. And enough of it is in effect to have removed all honest doubt about where the "authentic center" is and what the "New Republicanism" means.

Man of the Year in the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each year the editors of Dixie Business Magazine conduct a poll to elect the "Man of the Year" in the South. This was begun in 1946 and has continued since that time. Recipients of this award represent a cross section of the highest type leadership in the South from many varied fields including industry, business, law and the clergy.

It is fitting and proper that the official ballot for 1956 should include the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, Senator GEORGE.

Senator GEORGE was elected to the United States Senate in 1922. During the course of the 34 years in which he has served in that great deliberative body he has received many honors both in and out of the Senate. He has served as chairman of 2 of the most responsible committees in the Senate; the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Now in the twilight of his long and distinguished senatorial career he has been named to the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" by the editors of Dixie Business Magazine. Limited to 200 living men and women, the "South's Hall of Fame for the Living" is an institution which recognizes eminent Southerners for achievement in their chosen field. It gives well-deserved recognition to those men and women whose outstanding contributions to their profession, to their community and to the South has left its indelible mark.

Senator GEORGE is a worthy addition to this group. He succeeds the late Honorable Alben Barkley to this honored position and joins that group of men whose deeds posterity will measure to determine the success or failure of this generation. His demonstrated ability and his recognized professional and personal integrity merits this recognition.

The Importance of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech by Assistant Secretary of State Robert C. Hill entitled "The Drive Against Patriotism," published in the U. S. News & World Report of July 20, 1956, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The speech is well worth the consideration of the Senate. I urge the Members to read it carefully. Secretary Hill is in charge of liaison between the Department of State and Congress. He has had a varied and interesting career as an aid to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, a vice president with W. R. Grace and Co., and Ambassador, respectively, to Costa Rica and El Salvador. His record, in all fields, has been outstanding and his effective liaison with Congress has amply repaid the trust and confidence placed in him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF PATRIOTISM
(By Robert C. Hill)

What is more appropriate than being in Boston and discussing with friends the importance of patriotism? In the shadow of Faneuil Hall—where the memories of the Old North Church recall the event of "one if by land and two if by sea"—patriotism becomes an earthly reality.

Being associated with the Department of State, where—from 270 embassies and legations—one feels the beat day by day of the waves of world events, one realizes that now, as much as in the days when Paul Revere rode from Charlestown to Lexington, patriotism is of basic importance.

We are all aware that we are being literally deluged with propaganda of all kinds. We are inclined, however, to forget that, since 1917, and with intensified force for the last 2 decades, the Communist masters of the Soviet Union have sought to sell the American people upon the thesis that the Communist system represents the tide of the future. We, on the other hand, have tended to dwell upon our shortcomings and to place our thought upon the faults of our own system, a system that is the envy of all the world.

I think you will concede that in some intellectual circles the very word patriotism has become anathema. It is frowned upon as old-fashioned and somewhat ridiculous.

The cold facts are these: communism—seeking to catch up with the rest of the world—is faced by the fact that today the United States has the greatest industrial and agricultural production of any country in history. Studies indicate that our labor force, because of our mechanization and methods, is equivalent to a billion workers in backward countries of the world.

Apart from its tremendous economic power, our country is buttressed by a new resurgence of religious feeling; to which President Eisenhower has frequently referred. This is a not unnatural phenomenon in a country which formally declares it was founded under God.

It is axiomatic that a nation is as strong as its economy is healthy and as its people are unified. Such a nation is hard to beat, either by force of arms or through infiltration.

That is why there has been a long, covert, intense campaign to make patriotism a nasty word, an absurd, archaic concept. For only if it can weaken our patriotism, and thus our unity, can communism defeat its mightiest opponent.

I think our soldiers knew this in Korea, for they maintained their morale through years of dreary battle there, a battle which under the political ground rules they were prohibited from winning. Only patriotism, sustained under the most adverse conditions, could have maintained that splendid morale in Korea. As Robert C. Winthrop said in a letter to the Boston Commerce Club on June 12, 1789: "There are no points on the compass on the chart of true patriotism."

I think it is vital that we civilians take a new look at our strength instead of our weaknesses, at the magnificent country we have today instead of at its relatively minor faults, which we constantly seek to correct.

I say without qualification that never in the history of the world has common man lived as well as he does in the United States today. What we have achieved in living conditions for the common man has been fruitlessly sought by other peoples down through the ages. We have accomplished what the Communists continue simply to promise to do.

What is the other side of the coin? Through our cooperation with other nations, through regional and bilateral pacts, we have, for the moment, forced the Soviet Union to cease trying to take over the world by armed force. As a result of President Eisenhower's and Secretary Dulles' dynamic policies, the Soviet leaders have found it advisable to shift their basic policy.

Now they are even talking about disarming. I do not intend to discuss this subject now except to say this: President Eisenhower's proposal at Geneva for mutual aerial-and-blueprint inspection, as a basis for disarmament, serves as a beacon toward which the peoples of the world look with deep longing. Disarmament is meaningless unless we can be sure it has actually occurred.

We have just read of a hydrogen-bomb blast seeable 1,000 miles away. It cast the light of 5,000 suns. It demonstrated an explosive power greater than the bombs delivered by all our airplanes in World War II. Obviously, disarmament can only be effective if nations make sure no surprise attack can be made with such weapons. That implies some form of truly effective inspection.

Now that the Soviet Union for the moment has been forced to disavow force of arms, it has turned to trying to take over the world by economic and political penetration.

In the economic field, we and our allies are the acknowledged experts. This brings us to the field of political warfare. It is here, through false promises to the people they mean to enslave, through playing upon internal differences of opinions within countries, and through other tricks from their Pandora's box of deceit, the Communists hope to divide and weaken individual nations so they will fall into Communist hands like ripe plums.

That is why patriotism is as important to us now as it was in the days when Paul Revere made his immortal ride.

It is well for us to recall today the admonition of George Washington, who said in his Farewell Address:

"Love of country is a great virtue. It is one on which freedom sometimes depends. Desposition can demand sacrifice but free society can only ask for sacrifice, and the response is the measure of the amount of patriotism."

We people of today are inclined to forget that we are reaping the benefits for which, in this craggy land of New England, our forefathers worked, suffered and, on various occasions, fought and died.

Today, we take it for granted that we live well, that we are subject to the law, not the caprice of individuals, and that we are not subjected to the constant surveillance and pressures of a police state, where it is made heroic for a son to denounce his own father. We forget that others struggled and sacrificed so that we can exercise our God-given self-will within the single limitation that we shall not harm our society. Not only our forefathers, but many of you in this audience, have fought to protect this right.

Let us be proud of our freedom and of our whole mangnificent heritage from our forebears. Let us be not afraid to take pride in our tremendous strides in recent years. Let us keep it in mind that we are the truly revolutionary nation of the world today, moving forward to make our own country and, in close cooperation with our allies, the world a better place in which to live.

For my part, I am proud to be serving a President and a Secretary of State who have forced the Soviet masters to change the course of their policy and thus brighten the hope of peace. If we can stand firm on the economic and political fronts as we have on the military, that hope will move even closer to reality.

It was because we, and our allies blocked the Soviets militarily that the Communists turned to other forms of achieving their end of taking over the world. We can at least hope that, if we block them on their new course, they eventually will realize its futility. But, to do so, we must husband and employ our confidence in ourselves, in our system of living, and in our Government.

Need for Support of the Partridge Schools for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on a number of occasions, most recently on May 7, I have pointed out the vital challenge facing our country in meeting the needs of the mentally retarded. The group numbers some 4¾ million Americans.

There is no group among them more deservant of our interest than the 1½ million youngsters who are mentally retarded.

Each of these children is precious to us.

Each child's whole life stretches before it. It is a life which can be an agony of despair and futility and neglect or a life in which the child can achieve as much of his or her birthright as is humanly possible.

Here, then, is a vast group of children with a problem—or whole series of problems—which challenge the science, the humanity, the devotion of all of the rest of our Nation.

Here is a group of children whom we can, by apathy, simply leave on the "scrap heap" of society—neglected, forgotten, untended, or whom by constructive work, we can help develop to the limit of their potentialities as fine, useful citizens.

MIRACLES IN PIONEERING

Fortunately, a number of outstanding individuals and groups in our country have achieved what almost seem to be miracles in pioneering in new methods, in helping mentally retarded children.

I am pleased to say that my own State of Wisconsin is in the forefront of this activity, as indicated by remarks which I have previously made in the Senate.

A LIVING MEMORIAL TO A GREAT MAN

It is a source of gratification to those of us in our Nation's Capital who are interested in this subject that nearby—just 35 miles away—in Gainesville, Va., is another outstanding pioneering project—the Patridge Schools.

The schools are run by the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, a splendid nonprofit, nonendowed organization. It was and is designed to meet the growing nationwide need for residential centers for mentally and emotionally handicapped children.

The Partridge Schools are a living memorial to a great American who devoted a half century of effective endeavor to the study and treatment of mental and personality disorders.

It is the good fortune of the foundation to have as its director, his daughter, Mrs. Miriam Patridge Speck, a clinical psychologist. Mrs. Speck was educated at Boston, Yale and Johns Hopkins Universities. She is a former fellow in research at Training School at Vineland, N. J., research asssitant at Yale Psychological Clinic—now the Gesell Institute. She has had broad experience in mental hygiene clinics, as consultant for juvenile courts, and organizer of special classes for retarded children in public and private schools.

BROAD SERVICE AT LOW COST

The Partridge Schools help the disabled child. They help the parent. They help the community.

For the child, the schools mean the blessings of test and treatment tailored to meet individual needs, clinical services at leading medical centers in and near the Nation's Capital, self-reliance and group training for citizenship, speech, occupational and play therapy, academic classes daily except weekends, vocational training-homemaking, handicraft, sheltered workshop projects in furniture restoration, carpentry, and so forth; dairy, poultry, truck gardening, and other farm work; recreation games, music, dancing, TV, parties, field trips.

All these and other services are provided in what are regarded as some of the finest individualized services in the Nation at the lowest possible cost. Tuition costs have been kept at the mini-

mum, while achieving top caliber professional standards.

CONTRIBUTIONS NEEDED

More money—more financial support—is, of course, the key to the future increased success of the schools.

Modest amounts—very, very limited, I understand—have already been raised.

A recent benefit was, for example, held, based on the sale of tickets to a performance by the famous entertainer, Danny Kaye, at the Carter Barron Amphitheater. Mr. Kaye has himself visited the school with friends, and was deeply impressed by the fine work that is being done there.

Washington's newspapers have devoted a good deal of well-merited attention to the schools, and more coverage may be expected.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS NEEDED

But vastly expanded financial aid is urgently needed. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars must be raised to purchase the schools' 560-acre dairy farm near the Blue Ridge Mountains which is now only leased.

Friends and founders contributions have therefore been warmly invited from individuals and groups. Contributions—which are, of course, tax deductible—should be addressed to: The George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, Secretary-Treasurer, Post Office Box 67, Springfield, Va.

I wish the foundation every success. May it serve as an inspiration and a guide for similar fine work all over our Nation.

May it and similar projects receive the support from Federal, State, and local governments which they so eminently deserve.

May I say, incidentally, in this connection, that it is my earnest hope that S. 3620, a bill which I am proud to cosponsor, will not die in the House. We in the Senate have already passed this bill for expanded research in teaching mentally retarded children. The bill has been championed by that tireless friend of the health needs of our Nation, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Finally, with reference to the Partridge Schools, themselves, I ask unanimous consent that a supplementary statement, giving the background of the memorial foundation's noble work be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS

WHAT ARE THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS?

The Partridge Schools are residential, nonprofit rehabilitation centers for mentally disabled children and youths. The first center was established in Herndon, Va., October 1954 for older boys with moderate mental retardation resulting from brain damage. The second unit opened in Springfield, Va., 6 months later. This was to accommodate young boys and girls, also with brain damage and mental and emotional problems. Because of the need to expand, these 2 centers were consolidated on a 550-acre dairy farm, Route 211, near Gainesville, Va. The schools are licensed under the Virginia Department of Mental Hygiene and Hospitals.

Although there is now but one center, the term "Patridge Schools" is still used because additional units to include other types of mental and emotional problems are planned at the present location.

WHAT TYPES OF CHILDREN ARE NOW BEING ACCEPTED?

At present 34 pupils ranging in age from 3 to 23 years are enrolled from Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Brazil. Twenty of these have suffered some form of brain injury, either at birth or in early childhood. Four of these have some form of epilepsy, with seizures now practically under control. Four have cerebral palsy. Twelve have what is called a diffuse damage, in which no one spot in the brain has had any special injury, but where there has been a fine scattering of damage to the nerve endings. In these cases the children appear perfectly normal. They usually express themselves well, and are often mistaken as being normal. However, they usually have some moderate mental retardation. They have difficulty learning academically in spite of enough mental capacity. They are restless, sometimes destructive, and constantly in trouble at school and home. They may become very aggressive, and begin to get involved with the law; or they may withdraw unto themselves and develop serious emotional illness. In addition to these 18 children there are 9 children with mental retardation and emotional disturbances in whose cases diagnosis of brain injury is being considered. There also are four children diagnosed as being mongoloid. The majority of these children, with proper treatment and training in a happy, relaxed atmosphere, can become useful citizens. Those who cannot manage in open society can learn to be productive in the sheltered workshop program being developed at the Partridge Schools. All can be spared a life in a State institution if given help early enough.

HOW DO THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS HELP THESE CHILDREN?

For each child the school emphasizes from the beginning the importance of developing self-control; consideration for others; the building of work habits.

No child is accepted for less than 1 year. Custodial cases are not accepted. As most of the children have had numerous examinations by various specialists, an effort is made to secure all available findings. A conference is held with the child's parents and physicians before any new studies are made. If it seems indicated, a complete medical and psychological study is made. Readjustment of medication or new medication may be decided upon. Various laboratory tests may be found necessary. Facilities in one of the nearby medical centers will be used. A staff conference is held and a plan mapped out for the child's treatment. If delicate, the child is built up physically with special diet, rest, and fresh air.

WHAT IS INCLUDED IN THE SCHOOL PROGRAM?

In a dormitory with five other children his age, under the motherly supervision of a nurse, the child learns independence in his personal-social habits.

Five days a week he attends small classes with trained teachers where special materials and teaching methods are used to help him overcome his handicaps. Speech and occupational therapy are included in his program. For the older children and youths, vocational training in household skills, loom weaving, making of hooked rugs, pottery, furniture refinishing, simple carpentry, farm and dairy projects is given. Physical education and recreational programs are emphasized. Religious education plays a prominent part in the child's life. A nearby small chapel, loaned to the school, called the Children's Chapel, is used for nonsectarian services, as well as for recreational activities. Music and dancing are considered important in the child's training. Field trips, visits to restaurants, theaters, are encouraged and arranged as part of the child's regular program. Every opportunity to help the child learn to conduct himself acceptably in society is given to him.

The school staff consists of: A certified clinical psychologist, who serves as director; a registered nurse and 3 practical nurses; 3 academic teachers; 2 part-time occupational therapists; a workshop instructor and supervisor of older boys' activity program; housemother and housefather; chaperone; cook; laundress; general maid; and chauffeur. A local physician is on call at all times. A pediatrician and psychiatrist serve in consultant capacity. Physiotherapy, speech therapy, and additional special services are available through local clinic facilities.

WHAT ARE THE BROADER ASPECTS OF THE PROGRAM?

Because of the Partridge Schools' location within 35 miles of the Nation's Capital on a four-lane highway easily accessible to the various leading medical centers and universities of the greater metropolitan area, the schools offer an unequaled opportunity to serve as a national demonstration program of rehabilitation for the mentally disabled. Medical and psychological research projects are already underway. Treatment with one of the new drugs is being conducted under the supervision of the school's medical staff. Development of diagnostic testing techniques, special materials and teaching methods for brain-injured children play an important part in the overall program. An in-field-service-training program for graduate students in clinical psychology has been established in collaboration with one of the local universities. Professional workers in the fields of mental hygiene and special education are welcome as volunteers to work under supervision of the school staff for practical experience.

At the Partridge Schools there is an opportunity to develop a rehabilitation center for the mentally and emotionally handicapped which can stand as an example to the rest of the Nation.

WHO SPONSORS THE PARTRIDGE SCHOOLS AND HOW ARE THEY FINANCED?

The Partridge Schools are sponsored by the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, incorporated in Maryland in the fall of 1954. The George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., is a nonprofit, nonendowed, tax-exempt organization. Its purpose is to promote treatment centers for mentally and emotionally disabled children and youth. Dr. Partridge, a noted author, psychologist, and educator, died at the age of 83. He had devoted more than 50 years to the study and treatment of delinquency, mental, and personality problems. A semi-invalid, he overcame his own handicaps to the extent that he was able to lead a highly productive life, and to help others overcome theirs. His family and friends decided that an appropriate memorial would be the development of a program to promote treatment centers for the mentally disabled child, often called the forgotten child.

Few schools have programs to include the child with mental problems. Those which have, tend to exclude the child who is nonconforming or in need of individual attention. Funds are available from State and private organizations for the physically handicapped, but resources for the mentally handicapped are almost nonexistent. Because of the great need of these children, the foundation was set up to solicit funds for the establishment of treatment centers to salvage, whenever possible, lives which can become useful to society, rather than a financial drain. With small gifts from Dr. Partridge's family and friends, and from contributions from parents and agencies sponsoring children enrolled in the schools, the program sustained itself during the first difficult year.

With the expanded program and need for more building space and equipment, additional help is sought for the purchase of the present location—the 550-acre dairy farm and buildings—the center can then help more children.

Fifteen percent of our total child population can be expected to be in need of special treatment and training, because of some mental or emotional problem. The majority of these children can be spared a life in a State institution and can become useful citizens, if given the opportunity for the highly specialized kind of help they require during their formative years.

The Shriners sponsor the physically crippled child; Lions Clubs are concerned with the visually handicapped. No civic organization has yet become interested in the mentally handicapped children. Will not some public-spirited organization come forward to lend a helping hand to the forgotten child?

Please send all communications to: Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, secretary-treasurer, the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc., Post Office Box 67, Springfield, Va. Telephone Fleetwood 4-8655.

The advisory board includes professional and lay citizens interested in the field of mental hygiene.

Trustees of the George Everett Partridge Memorial Foundation, Inc.: President, Mr. Wilton C. Dinges, Baltimore, Md.; vice president, Judge Hugh Reid, Arlington, Va.; secretary-treasurer, Mrs. Miriam Partridge Speck, director, the Partridge Schools; Hon. J. Ridley Mitchell, Washington, D. C.; and M. Philip N. Partridge, Las Vegas, Nev.

Hon. Jackson B. Chase

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to briefly pay my respects to my fellow colleague in the House, the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, JACKSON B. CHASE, who is voluntarily retiring from Congress to return to his home in Nebraska.

Judge CHASE, as he is affectionately and best known to all of us, has given an excellent account of himself during his service as a Member of the 84th Congress. He is one of Nebraska's esteemed citizens, an able lawyer, a former State legislator and district judge, and perhaps is best known in our State because of his legal and judicial background.

Judge CHASE reluctantly left his place on the judicial bench in Nebraska to become a candidate for Congress. It was his high sense of responsibility for public service and the urge of many, many citizens when this vacancy occurred that prompted him to stand as a candidate for this office. Now, he is returning to Nebraska to again seek his first and only love—serving the citizens of our State in a judicial capacity.

It has been a distinct honor for me to be associated with JACKSON B. CHASE, and I can say with assurance that for the short time I have served with him here, my sentiments voice the feeling and impression of his many colleagues, not only from Nebraska, but from other States throughout our country.

I would like to extend my very best to Judge CHASE and Mrs. Chase upon their return home. I wish them Godspeed. They will be sorely missed.

Nebraska is again losing the services of an honest, capable, conscientious, and talented Representative in the Congress.

Tax on Admissions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy with the action the conference committee has taken with regard to H. R. 9875, which provides a tax exemption for the theaters of the Nation. My only regret is that it was necessary for the House conferees to recede and accept the Senate amendment reducing the amount from $1 to 90 cents.

The bill is designed to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It will provide that the tax on admissions will apply only with respect to the portion of the amount paid in excess of $1.

It will be recalled that under the present law general admissions are free of Federal excise tax if the charge is 50 cents or less. Under the law as now amended, general admissions will be free of tax up to 90 cents. The bill will not affect admissions for which the charge exceeds the exemption figure. In other words, the tax on an admission charge of, say, $1.50 would be 16 cents. The 10 percent tax would be based upon the entire $1.50 and not merely upon the portion of the charge—60 cents—in excess of the 90 cents.

I know from my correspondence and from the many friends I have in the theater industry in my district that there is a serious need for even a greater exemption than this bill now provides. I am hopeful that another session of Congress can increase this exemption.

We owe much to the theater industry in the way of entertainment and relaxation, for long before television and even before radio was perfected, the movies provided a fine entertainment and recreation channel. In addition, there is no better documentation of history than the films of yesterday.

The industry made a fine contribution to the war effort and to our national defense during the war years and the postwar years. Our young men in the service found wholesome and educational entertainment in the movie houses throughout the Nation as well as in foreign service.

The small business people who operate the theaters in our towns and cities are having a struggle to survive, and I believe the elimination of this tax will enable them to keep in business. The relief which we formerly gave in lifting the admission limitation to 50 cents or less has been inadequate for the survival and successful operation of our movie theaters. While the increase to 90 cents is still inadequate, I am sure it will be some help until such time as a subsequent Congress can increase this exemption to where it will be more beneficial to a sagging industry.

America's Vital Engineering Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the past several years I have delivered a number of major addresses on the subject of expanding America's vital engineering resource.

I have done so because of the obviously critical need for such expansion, in view of Soviet Russia's enormous strides in technological advance.

Almost everyone in our country is aware that the Soviets are reportedly graduating twice as many engineers and technicians as we are.

In view of my deep interest in this subject, I was pleased to receive an invitation from the National Society of Professional Engineers to prepare an article for the August issue of the excellent magazine, American Engineer.

I am happy to have contributed this article which has become the lead piece of the August issue.

I send to the desk now the text of this article and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRENGTHENING AMERICA'S ENGINEERING RESOURCES

(By Senator ALEXANDER WILEY)

"Danger—we are falling behind in the race for engineering manpower."

This and a hundred other terse warning signals have been hoisted all over America.

From every forum of public opinion, the press, radio, and television, from the world of science and the world of politics and government, from private industry, labor and agriculture, has come the urgent message: "America must expand its engineering resources!"

Responding to this problem, the great engineering profession itself has applied its enormous talents and abilities toward helping to meet the challenge. Of course, too, in Washington, in the executive branch of our Government, significant steps have been taken to take a comprehensive new look at why the Soviets are surging ahead of us in the quantity of engineers and technicians.

In the legislative branch, as well, as the pages of the American Engineer have reflected, our Senators and Representatives in great numbers have focused their attention on this problem.

However, many serious observers are surprised not so much at the engineering shortage, which is, of course, deeply disturbing; they are surprised that it took us so long to wake up to it. They are surprised that only at this late stage have we become aware of

the fact that we are falling behind in this stiffly competitive race.

The danger signs were present for us to see, for a long, long time. Even a layman such as myself, who is not especially familiar with the engineering profession pointed out years ago that America was entering into a dramatic new engineering age in which the engineer would play a more important role than ever before in man's history. I pointed out, too, that in this new age, an ambitious totalitarian system such as that of the Soviet Union could set a top-priority target of scientific and technical progress; and it could reach that target by sacrificing all other so-called nonessential activities.

Unfortunately, many complacent Americans tended to downgrade the Kremlin's ruthless determination to build up its horse-and-buggy economy, as well as its military prowess. Today, we Americans belatedly face up to the acute threefold challenge of Soviet science and technology:

1. In direct military strength, with the world's largest ground force and air force, and second largest navy.

2. In industrial surges on the home front, in vast Russia, itself, 7.8 million square miles with 200 million people, and in the sprawling slave empire of 700 million more.

3. From outside the Iron Curtain, in the so-called cold war, economic penetration of underdeveloped countries.

Our most serious problem arises, of course, from the crucial Soviet military challenge. A day hardly passes without some new warnings that the Russians are making enormous strides in the fields of supersonic jet fighters and long-range bombers; atomic and hydrogen bombs, with an increased punch of more and more megatons; longer and longer range guided missiles, with even deadlier accuracy. The rate for the so-called "ultimate weapon"—the inter-continental ballistic missile—looms by far as the most crucial of all the phases of this many-sided military competition.

But the military race while paramount, is hardly the only competition we face. From my vantage point as senior Republican on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, I can note in civilian fields, the worldwide signs of the forward surge of Soviet engineering. This is evidenced: Inside Russia, in its magnificent buildup of heavy industry, which the Kremlin seeks, as a byproduct to display as showpieces to visiting delegations from underdeveloped nations; outside Russia, in its Khrushchev-Bulganin-type peaceful economic penetration. This latter phase is best illustrated by the numerous Soviet offers of "loans with no strings attached" for everything from new hydro-electric projects to sewerage systems and road paving in the neutralist, uncommitted bloc of the world.

Consider now, both of these civilian phases—internal and external. Within Russia itself, all observers have agreed that the Reds have made enormous strides in industrialization but, of course, at a staggering price of slavery, mass human misery, and deprivation. According to "The National Economy of the U. S. S. R." (if you can believe it) between 1940 and 1955:

Red steel production rose 142 percent—from 18.3 to 45.3 million tons. (In the same period, free enterprise—American steel output—already at mammoth levels—rose 67 percent—to 117 million tons.)

Coal output increased 136 percent, from 165.9 to 391 million tons. (Comparable United States output decreased 3.5 percent.)

Soviet oil gushed up 128 percent to 482.9 million barrels. (United States comparison—a rise of 82 percent to 2.5 billion barrels.)

Soviet electric power—up 252 percent to 170.1 kilowatt-hours annually. (United States kilowatt-hours rose 275 percent.)

The same Red report incidentally quotes Soviet educational enrollment of 50 million students, including 1.9 million in technical schools, 1.8 million in colleges, and 30 million in high schools. It also boasts a jump in the number of civilian engineers from 289,000 in 1941 to 585,000 in 1955—a 102 percent increase. In the United States our total rose 100 percent, from 300,000 to 600,000.

The key fact which must be borne in mind is that all this Red growth was over the base of an exceedingly primitive economy, including an economy devastated in World War II. Obviously, the Kremlin has been absolutely determined to shatter all its previous economic targets—no matter what the price in other sacrifice.

Meanwhile, throughout Asia, the Middle East and Africa, newly sovereign nations with primitive economies of their own, tend to gape in awe at the rise of Communist Russia and China from primitive underdevelopment. What Asia, the Mideast, and Africa may tend to forget is the blood-price exacted in the growth of these Communist countries. That blood price was revealed in all its hideous dimensions in Khrushchev's denunciation of the murderous tyrant, Stalin.

Asia, the Mideast, and Africa may not, however, remember. "If Russia and China could stride forward so rapidly, so can we," say the underdeveloped peoples. "Let us therefore, welcome Soviet and Polish and Czech and Peiping Government help," the neutralists continue.

And so, throughout the world the Soviet engineers and technicians are swarming. So, too, Soviet salesmen, representing Iron Curtain publicly owned enterprises, are offering the widest variety of products in exchange for the products of underdeveloped lands. The Soviets and satellites are particularly willing to take in exchange products which are in surplus and which the free world may not be able to absorb.

Thus, we see the battle for men's minds, as well as the battle for men's pocketbooks and stomachs. Of course, we Americans have been diligent in many respects in combatting the Soviet challenge, militarywise, industrialwise, and aidwise throughout the world.

Our own private enterprise system has been our basic bulwark of strength on exporting both capital and know-how to underdeveloped areas. Private banks and the World Bank, have helped vitally to initiate development projects to supplement the efforts of an agency like the International Cooperation Administration, as well as the efforts of the Expore-Import Bank. Look at a descriptive worldwide summary and at a globe or a map and you can pinpoint hundreds of farflung major engineering projects, representing uplifting work on a governmental, semigovernmental, and private level.

We have literally "transformed the earth" in country after country. We have helped to bring the industrial age to places which were not very long out of the bare beginnings of the iron age. American engineers, representing the great corporations of the United States, have built every conceivable type of installations in foreign parts.

As a matter of fact, one particular fact has always been somewhat disturbing to me, concerning our governmental aid agencies for economic and technical assistance, with their huge budgets, representing taxpayers' hard-earned savings. It is the fact that the agencies have not utilized to the fullest degree that they should, the services of private engineer consulting firms, or for that matter, of top-notch private economic consultants.

There has, frankly speaking, been too much of a tendency for governmental aid agencies to build up their own bureaucratic empires, huge and unwieldy official staffs. Their concern, in turn, has not always been with an actual private enterprise solution of an underdeveloped nation's problem, but rather, often with merely the filing of a sufficient number of papers, forms, and reports for artificial palliatives during a particular fiscal year. My readers may well be familiar with this distinction which I draw and which definitely occurs at times between the work of some Government employees in aid agencies and the work of high-grade private engineering firms. I don't want to be unfair to the former or to overstate the case for the latter, but I have seen a great many instances where private business know-how could have accomplished far more than a Government payroller's relatively amateurish performance.

I first drew attention to this frequent distinction a good many years ago. My readers may be interested in looking up the May 8, 1950, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6676, for a discussion of what I believe to have been the serious deficiencies of the then Truman administration's high-aspiring, but at times low-achieving point-4 program. "Get more private engineering know-how," I urged.

My interest then and now was in getting the most effective job done for Uncle Sam at the least possible cost. Private engineering firms these days are hardly lacking in a sufficient amount of business from purely private sources. So, my interest is not in more Government business for them, as such, but in more constructive results and yes, more economic results for Uncle Sam. I feel that we of the legislative branch in fulfilling our function of checks and balances with the executive branch, have a responsibility to point out facts of this nature.

Private business sources which other members on the Foreign Relations Committee have cited a large amount of impressive private engineering or economic work overseas in true free enterprise fashion which our executive branch might well seek to emulate. Consider the very successful (Daniel) Bell Mission, the current programing of industrial development in the Philippines and in Peru, and the development of sulfur reserves in Mexico. If you want specific instances, I cite these without attempting to judge a larger number of worthy counterparts in other areas. But these particular projects involving engineers of international reputation like Michael J. Deutch of Washington, D. C., and economists like Klein and Sachs of New York, indicate what an objective—I emphasize—objective, professional viewpoint can accomplish, in solving a problem, and not just supplying bureaucratic palliatives.

Meanwhile in our own country, the engineer is coming into his own. One can hardly open the business pages of a magazine or newspaper without reading that an engineer has become president or chairman of the board of some great American corporation. But where is the engineering leadership of tomorrow? And how are we going to get a sufficient number of engineers in the first place? In other words, what are we going to do to lick the engineering shortage?

Let me suggest just a few of what should be our minimum approaches. Let me later spell out background reasons behind a few of these approaches.

1. We must take comprehensive steps to bring effectively and continually to the attention of the youngsters in our grade schools and high schools—particularly our still untapped womanpower—the opportunities available in an engineering career.

2. Basically, in counseling both boys and girls in their early years in school, we must seek the fullest possible emphasis on science and mechanics for those who show aptitude in these fields.

3. We must help improve the overall quality of the great American teaching profession. It is the teacher—math, physics and others—who will help fan the spark of engineering talent which a youngster may show at an early age. Such a teacher must, in turn, be properly paid, must have appropriate recognition from society, must be properly trained in his or her own right in

order to be able to bring out the best in talent.

4. We must increase our understanding of the reasons for dropouts from the grade schools, as well as from the high schools, colleges, and universities of our land. We must take remedial steps to minimize those dropouts, both within school and between the various steps up the ladder of education. Such efforts against dropouts must include: a. Making more generally available accurate, directly useful information on sources of scholarships, tuition grants, loan funds, and the like. b. Considering the expansion of our own Federal programs for scholarships for talented individuals.

5. Through the tax laws and any other means, we must encourage the great private enterprise system of America to help strengthen our engineering resource. We must give encouragement and inducements to industry to broaden the base of our engineering talent and to sharpen its proficiency.

6. We must take whatever steps are necessary to help strengthen the great private and public university system in America, so as to increase its ability to help meet this problem in all fields of engineering.

7. We must strengthen Uncle Sam's own program for recruitment and maintenance of engineering talent. The Federal Government must be able to get, and keep, for as long as necessary, the top talent which it needs in all fields of endeavor, particularly in military application.

8. Simultaneously, the Federal Government must consider still further expansion of its existing university and private contract work for research and development.

These, then, are but a few of the facets of our meeting this shortage problem. I have not attempted to specify all the possible remedies, because I do not presume that any single layman, myself or anyone else, can come up with all or even most of the answers. But I feel certain that by diligent teamwork among all interested sources, we can begin to make a dent in the critical manpower situation.

Now, let me spell out just a few of the background reasons for my suggestions. And let me touch upon a few areas which much of our public may tend to underestimate.

In the first instance, we are not simply seeking a vastly expanded quantity of engineers; naturally, we want an ever-improved quantity of engineers. We have good reason to be proud that our American engineers rank so high from the standpoint of quality. And we are interested in maintaining and increasing that qualitative superiority. I welcome, therefore, the spendid efforts being made by much of American industry in encouraging its existing engineers to sharpen their talent through post-graduate work.

Unfortunately, the percentage of engineers taking postgraduate studies has been dropping instead of increasing. So, many private companies' foresight in now encouraging more of their engineering talent to study for their doctorates comes, at a most opportune time. Moreover, companies have set up programs to send at least a few of their top engineers to graduate schools full time. Others are planning to send their personnel to special graduate courses for a few hours a week on company time. Some are trying to persuade graduate school facilities to set up off-campus schools for their engineers. They are offering to help these schools build facilities and they are even helping to pay instructors.

A second point which many Americans tend to lose sight of is the fact that almost invariably when we talk of the engineering profession, we think of male engineers. Here in the United States, despite the magnificent opportunities which we offer to our womenfolk and despite their usual splendid capitalization on such opportunities, they surely have not made full contribution in this particular field. Since 1953, when bachelor degrees in engineering were granted to 33 women, the number rose to 62 for each of the following years. But of all the students enrolled in engineering in 1955, less than one-half of 1 percent, or only 1,074 were women.

Contrast this with the situation in Soviet Russia. In 1940, the Soviets credited women with constituting 19.4 percent of their engineering force. An analysis in our own country of the 1950 census, reported by the Scientific Manpower Commission, showed that only 0.7 percent of all the employed engineers were women. That certainly indicates the present need of more American lady engineers.

A third point which we tend to overlook is that an enormous number of talented youngsters who could probably make excellent engineers, cease all educational efforts after they graduate from high school. Thus, the Commission on Human Resources and Advanced Training indicated that scarcely more than half of the top graduates from high school go to college, and of those who enter college more than half drop out before graduation. When we apply these figures to the boys and girls in high school who have potential qualities necessary for service as engineers and scientists, we note that 8 out of 10 drop out and never graduate. They probably become good citizens, but they could make an infinitely larger contribution to the technical demands of our age if they were to continue.

Just why do they drop out of school? Lack of finances certainly is an important reason, but there are undoubtedly a good many other reasons as well which we had better examine quickly, and then take remedial action.

Still another phase of the problem is that we don't pay enough attention to preventing drop-outs from schools of engineering. I would like to cite just a few figures from the schools of my own State.

My readers are aware that I have the honor to represent a State with as proud an engineering background as virtually any other in the country. Four of her schools of engineering and technology are so outstanding as to be listed by the United States Office of Education among 216 American schools which granteed first degrees in engineering to 22,589 graduates last year. Unofficial figures for this June's graduations step that figure up to 30,000.

Nearly 60 percent of Wisconsin's engineers are graduated from our great University of Wisconsin at Madison. About 30 percent come from our privately-endowed and world renowned Marquette University at Milwaukee. Two other schools with graduates listed by the United States Office of Education are the fine Milwaukee School of Engineering and the Wisconsin Institute of Technology at Platteville.

Our Badger graduates may be found in top spots throughout our country and the world. Their contributions in all phases of engineering are impressive, and it doesn't take an admitted Wisconsin booster to hail that fact. But here are the enrollment facts to consider. In 1955, the total enrollment of the four Wisconsin engineering schools to which I have referred was 5,712. That represented an encouraging gain over their enrollment of 4,431 in the fall of 1953. Each year's enrollment was around 2.6 percent of that of all engineering schools in the country, which, in 1955, had advanced to 22,488.

In 1953 Wisconsin schools graduated 569 engineers, or nearly 2.4 percent of the Nation's graduate class of that year. In 1955, the new engineers from Wisconin's four colleges numbered 430. Somehow, during four years of college about 150 students dropped out. What happened to cause the drop in potential graduates? Obviously, this is not simply a Wisconsin problem; the factors responsible for the drop-outs undoubtedly prevail throughout our Nation.

Still another phase is the fact that our United States distribution of engineers is not proportionate to the needs in all of your profession's major and growing categories. Again, let me cite the facts in my own State: Nearly 60 percent of Wisconsin's talent is enrolled in electrical and mechanical engineering phases. As important as these specialties are, there results to some degree an apparent and relative underemphasis of such vital fields as aeronautical engineering, architectural engineering, agricultural, geophysical engineering, and engineering physics.

But in the light of recent dramatic developments in, say, aeronautics and the uses of nuclear energy (many of which are reflected in the growing industries of my own State), it would appear to a layman that some of these latter, rather understressed phases of engineering might well be given increased attention in our able engineering schools. Of course, ours is and must remain a free system—with universal, individual free choice and initiative, but we dare not ignore national, yes, international needs, as well. Observing the engineering profession, I have been pleased to note the increasing amount of civic participation by your members in all phases of American life. We truly need the type of cool, factual, objective thinking which our engineers can bring to bear upon local, State, and national problems—on everything from local commercial rezoning to the awesome problems of the shrunken world of the jet age.

It is a fact, however, that our engineers are still under-represented in many high councils of our Government. Look at the membership of the United States Congress, or of your own State legislature, or of your city council, and ask yourself how large a proportion of the members are engineers, as compared, say, with lawyers or members of the other professions. The answer is, of course, very few, too few. That is why the engineer's greater role is essential in all segments of American life. An increasing role on the part of engineers in their own technical and professional societies is likewise necessary. Through these organizations, engineers throughout the 48 States of the Union they could not possibly attain individually, for their profession and for their Nation.

Similarly, the sound registration of engineers throughout the 48 States of the Union is a most welcome step in the engineering profession's history in our country.

We may expect ever higher standards to be established in this profession. And naturally, to the extent that engineers strengthen their own role in America, they strengthen America itself.

In conclusion, as I wrote at the start, danger signals are to be found everywhere—at home and abroad. But so are signals of opportunity, of promise, of hope—if we but use our God-given intelligence and energy. We as a Nation will not fail in this historic hour. With God's help, we will help usher mankind into a new era of fulfillment—of peace and prosperity and freedom.

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, THURMOND CHATHAM, who completes his service with this session of Congress is my

friend. I shall always remember his many acts of good will—a man with a great heart—a man of courage, whom I respect. THURMOND, I could speak many words but just let me say sincerely: may God bless and keep you.

Plain Talk and the Aswan Dam—United States Missing a Propaganda Bet in Polite Rejection of Egypt's Bid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article written by Constantine Brown for the Washington Evening Star. The article follows:

PLAIN TALK AND THE ASWAN DAM—UNITED STATES MISSING A PROPAGANDA BET IN POLITE REJECTION OF EGYPT'S BID

(By Constantine Brown)

Nobody in his right mind could take exception to the administration's decision to withdraw its offer to help build the Aswan dam in Egypt. For more than a year President Nasser has been playing footsie with the Russians and their satellites and has missed no occasion to kick the West in the shins. Not only did he joyfully accept Soviet and Czech arms—which from his own point of view is logical, since he could not readily get them anywhere else—but he made Cairo the headquarters of all Arab and Central African nationalism. All the agitation and intrigues against France and Great Britain emanate now from the Egyptian capital.

Had we been blunt and told President Nasser: "So long as you appeared to us a middle-of-the-roader we were willing to help you build the dam which would have raised your people's standard of living. But when it has become obvious for us that you want to play us for suckers, we withdraw our offer. Go to your Russian and Czech and Yugoslav friends and see whether they can do anything for you except to get you and your people into trouble."

There is no doubt that such language, in a diplomatic form, would have impressed not only the Egyptians but also all the other fringe governments which continue to ask or take our economic and financial assistance and at the same time are supporting Peiping's and Moscow's policies.

Modern diplomacy, however, has its queer ways. The State Department camouflaged its real thinking and used a silly subterfuge. It declared that we could not go ahead with the proffered help for the Nile dam because Egypt had mortgaged all its future income from cotton and other crops to the U. S. S. R. and her satellites to purchase arms.

It happens that our economic aid is not always predicated on the solvency of a recipient. If it were, very few nations would receive it. We did not look into Britain's ability to repay when in 1946 we advanced the Labor government money for the great socialistic experiment. We did not look into the solvency of Greece and Turkey in 1947 when we rushed not only military but also economic assistance to help them stay out of the Red clutches. And we certainly did not bother about Poland's ability to repay when we loaned that Red satellite in 1946 some $50 million to improve the exploitation of its coal mines. At that time, more than today, coal was an important strategic material and we knew that the USSR had obtained complete control over them.

There are grave doubts, even today, about the solvency—both political and economic—of Yugoslavia. Yet we witnessed this week a spectacular show in the Senate when a sizable number of legislators got up and fought with all the energy at their command the Knowland-Bridges resolution to cut off military aid to President Tito.

President Nasser is only playing footsie with the Kremlin, and according to some diplomatic observers there was a time when he and his people, who are only fanatical nationalists, could have been detached.

President Tito is actually a full-fledged Communist from way back, before the last war. We must give him credit that he has never tried to deceive us in that respect. As soon as his personal quarrel with the Kremlin leadership, after Stalin's death and Beria's execution, was settled he returned to the fold which he never actually quitted.

It was interesting to hear the golden voice of Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, once a confirmed opponent of indiscriminate giveaways, perorating and admonishing his colleagues that unless President Tito receives every cent earmarked for him by the administration in economic and military help "we would throw him into the arms of the Communists."

The ability of India to repay the loans and grants provided in the past and present appropriations of foreign aid is at least as questionable as that of Egypt. And politically Nehru is more damaging to the West's efforts to resist Communist expansion throughout the world than the power-tipsy Egyptian President Nasser. All these facts are well known to the outside world, as well as the facts that hundreds of millions of the American taxpayers' money have gone down the drain in questionable projects.

The State Department could have been outspoken by stating that Egypt's present policies as Russia's pacemaker in the Middle East and in Africa have caused us to turn down its request for a loan for the Aswan Dam. This would have been a strong and frank policy which would not have failed to impress other nations which are playing both ends against the middle about our new stand.

Tribute to Hon. Charles B. Deane, of North Carolina

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as adjournment of the House appears to be imminent, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to our esteemed friend and colleague, Hon. CHARLES B. DEANE, of North Carolina.

In his 10 years here in the House, CHARLIE has given outstanding service to his constituency and has been a selfless, loyal, devoted servant of the people of his district, his State, and the Nation. He has worked diligently and effectively in their interest and has given unstintingly of his time and energies in their behalf. I, personally know that he has been in his office early in the mornings and late at night, giving the very best of his talents and ability.

Those of us who have had the great privilege of knowing and serving with CHARLIE are proud to call him "friend and colleague." His warm and affable nature is a source of great pleasure to all of us and we know him as a fine Christian gentleman of rare courage. He believed in a principle and stood by it, thereby bringing about his defeat in the primary. While I, personally, did not agree with his stand, nevertheless, I admire and respect him for his belief and for sticking by his convictions. As Voltaire said: "I may disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

To CHARLIE DEANE, a true friend, a splendid, loyal citizen of North Carolina, an able legislator, and a great and fearless American, I say: "Good luck in your next endeavor and God bless you always." We all shall miss him sorely.

The Chiropractic Profession Sponsors Chiropractic Day, September 18, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, the general health and welfare of all Americans is a subject of utmost importance to all of us. In that connection, therefore, I want to call the attention of my colleagues here to a special observance that will occur throughout the Nation in September.

During that month, the chiropractic profession—America's second largest profession of healing—will observe its annual chiropractic day.

More than 25,000 chiropractors in the United States, Canada, and many other foreign countries will celebrate on September 18, 1956, the 61st anniversary of the discovery of chiropractic by the late Dr. Daniel David Palmer.

I want to say that members of my own family have unbounded confidence in this profession and so do many thousands of others who have benefited by its services. This tribute to th chiropractic profession calls to mind the memory of an old boyhood friend. An eminent surgeon from New Haven strongly urged his parents to consent to an operation for the removal of the boy's leg. Instead they brought him to a chiropractor who spent several years with him and succeeded in completely healing him. Today my friend is still walking around in healthy condition and with two strong legs.

Since this event is national in scope, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a statement prepared by Dr. F. Lorne Wheaton, of New Haven, Conn., who is publicity chairman of the chiropractic public-relations conference committee. The text follows:

STATEMENT BY DR. F. LORNE WHEATON

Chiropractic is the second largest healing profession in America. It is classified as one

of the four major healing professions, along with medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, by the Executive Office of the President of the United States, Bureau of the Budget, Washington, D. C.

So, on September 18, chiropractors will be looking back to review the 61 years of progress, wherein their profession has been raised to a high level of professional skill and ethical standards, and to the point where chiropractic today enjoys the prestige, the standing, and the material rewards of other professions.

The progress of chiropractic was forcefully illustrated earlier this year when the profession became the subject of an objective fact-finding study conducted by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D. C., a nationally known nonprofit research organization.

This study has been compiled under the title of "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic" and it represents the latest facts of the profession as gathered by the competent institute staff under the direction of Dr. Dewey Anderson (A. B., M. A., Ph. D., Leland Stanford University).

I think that a statement from this scientific study of our profession is particularly pertinent as an explanation of our contribution to the general health and welfare of all Americans. This is the statement from the Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic:

"In these modern days of our high-speed, nerve-exhausting living, chiropractic is fast becoming an indispensable element in helping people maintain good health."

Regarding the scientific study itself, Science Sidelights comments that "since every profession is built upon a body of knowledge which has developed over a period of years, Dr. Anderson correctly appraises chiropractic in the light of certain concepts which are regarded as well accepted by the public at large."

To examine the present-day facts, we find this statement from Glenn E. Long contained in a review of the Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic. Writing in Healthways magazine, Long said:

"From all that is presented in the booklet, it is obvious that the national health level is not as high as it should be." It is equally obvious that there are not enough doctors in the recognized branches of healing, and not enough hospitals and other facilities to provide the required care to maintain national health at a maximum level."

However, we can report this development of recent years which is contributing much to the care of our Nation's physical health:

A well-known national news column, Washington Window, reports that "the fastest growing of the healing arts is the profession of chiropractic which is making a major contribution to the health of a constantly increasing number of patients and their families."

This rapid growth of chiropractic—and its far-reaching effects on our national well-being—is dramatized by Dr. Anderson himself. In one phase of his study of chiropractic, he said:

"From a handful of patients somewhat more than a half a century ago who came to Dr. Daniel David Palmer (chiropractic's discoverer) and got relief, those being cared for by today's chiropractors number many millions. And every year the number swells as chiropractors become more proficient and as their satisfied and healthy patients spread the word. Here is the best and final test of an emerging profession seriously serving the public."

This rapid acceptance of this science of healing in the past 61 years leads us to inquire of the standards in use today. And extremely exacting standards they are found to be.

FOUR-YEAR COURSE IS EDUCATION STANDARD

Chiropractic colleges are required to give 4,000 academic hours in a standard 4-year course to obtain approved ratings from the accrediting committee. Up to 2 years of preprofessional (college) education is required by State chiropractic laws of licensure.

I think that another statement from the Public Affairs Institute study of our profession could well be quoted here, since it deals specifically with the educational standards of chiropractic. The statement follows:

"Remember this—the graduate of an accredited chiropractic college is as well qualified to practice his healing art as the graduate of an accredited medical college is qualified to practice medicine as his form of the healing art. Often, too, they both have to pass the same State board examinations in the basic sciences to obtain a license."

Chiropractic Day—on September 18, 1956—will bring to national attention the present record and the future plans of our profession. In conclusion, a word from The Present Day of Doctor of Chiropractic should be mentioned here:

"The profession itself is so ardent about its future that nothing can stop doctors of chiropratic from being devoted public servants and becoming better ones with the passage of time."

Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a real sense of loss that we realize the service of the Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER in the House of Representatives is drawing to a close. Months ago he announced that he would not be a candidate for reelection from the Third District of Indiana, but would return to the private practice of law. This is a field in which he and other members of his family have made notable records in Indiana through the years.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] brought to the House of Representatives extensive training both in the fields of law and engineering. This, coupled with his wartime service in the Air Force and his actual experience as the operator of an Indiana farm, provided an ideal background for service in this body.

He is by nature quiet, studious, and objective and has a keen sense of right and wrong. Those who knew him were always impressed with the knowledge he had of pending legislation.

His service on the Judiciary Committee was distinguished. He was a hard-working, diligent member of that group and one whose views were respected because they were objective and fair.

Of his patriotism and love of country, there can never be the slightest doubt. He has demonstrated those characteristics in too many ways, both as a member of the armed services and as a civilian. A great advocate of adequate airpower, he never failed to express his views in that respect when proper opportunity offered. The Members of the House of Representatives will miss his steady, inquiring mind and the counsel which he gave, but certainly those of us who count ourselves among his closest friends wish him every success and happiness as he returns to the practice of law in South Bend, Ind.

Territories of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I introduced a joint resolution directing the Interior Committees of both Houses of Congress to evaluate, at least once in every 2 years, the status of all the Territories of the United States, incorporated and unincorporated, and to determine their readiness for additional steps toward self-government.

I did not ask nor expect action on this resolution at this session, but I hope that action will be forthcoming early in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

Such a resolution would proclaim to the world that we abhor colonialism and that we are ready and anxious to grant the fullest self-government possible to our Territories.

Mr. Speaker, we did not grant statehood to Alaska or Hawaii in this Congress, but I believe statehood for those two great Territories is more iminent than many think possible.

While we stopped short of statehood, I think the RECORD should show that the 84th Congress passed more beneficial legislation for the Territories than any Congress in recent times. I am proud that the great Interior Committee of the House, and the subcommittee I have the honor to head, the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, had an important part in considering and acting upon this legislation affecting the well-being of the people in the Territories, but other committees of Congress helped to round out this splendid program. They are to be commended.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii do not have the right to vote in this House or in committee, although they may speak in either place. In view of the limitations placed upon them, I believe they have done a remarkable job for their people. They have been industrious, persuasive, and always courteous.

Their own people know what they have accomplished, but I might note in passing that the legislation they sponsored, or for which they worked, has advanced the economic and social welfare of their Territories to a marked degree. Some of the steps made possible by this legislation will, I am sure, enable them to meet more fully and firmly, in the future,

claims here and elsewhere that these Territories are not ready for statehood.

The delegates from Alaska and Hawaii can speak for themselves about what has been done for their Territories during the last 2 years, and more particularly during the session now ending. I should like to point out, however, that there has been much accomplished for other areas outside the continental United States for which we are responsible and which do not have elected representatives here.

One of the bills, now law, considers residence in American Samoa and/or Trust Territory as residence in the United States for naturalization purposes.

We passed an omnibus bill for Guam, as well as legislation affecting the judiciary and gasoline tax there.

This Congress acted favorably upon legislation creating the Virgin Islands National Park and extending the Social Security Act to the Virgin Islands.

Several measures for the benefit of Puerto Rico, ably represented by Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, their Resident Commissioner, were approved.

In addition, we extended library services to all the Territories and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and we exempted travel to those places from the 10 percent Federal excise tax.

Last September and October members of the Territories Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee held hearings in many communities of Alaska where we met with residents from all walks of life and talked over with them the problems which confront those who live in that vast and vital Territory. It was a wonderfully enlightening experience for me as I know it was for other members who made the trip. I came away more convinced than ever that these fine people are completely justified in seeking to have Alaska admitted as a State and short of that working for social and economic improvements which can come to them only through the legislative processes of the United States Congress.

Those legislative processes, so far as Alaska is concerned, have not come to a halt or a slow walk in the 84th Congress. It is my understanding that close to 50 Alaska bills have become law during the past 2 years or are at the White House awaiting approval. Thirty-five of those measures under the jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were initially considered and approved by the Territories Subcommittee of which I am chairman.

These 35 bills which represent many, many hours of hearings and executive sessions, of course, are only part of the great number of bills which were approved by the full committee, but at this time I thought it would be of interest to concentrate on the accomplishments for Alaska.

If approved by the President, the Alaska Mental Health Act will provide the mechanism by which Alaskans will be able to take care of their own mentally ill in their own Territory under modern and humane procedures. The law permitting the Territory to assume bonded indebtedness, thus lifting a prohibition in force since Alaska's Organic Act was enacted in 1912, will allow the Territory to go ahead on its own in the matter of building public improvements up to the bonded indebtedness limit of $20 million.

A number of bills have been signed into law or are at the White House designed to aid in the settlement on public land in the Territory. I consider one of the most important, that measure which eliminated the requirement that an 80-rod space had to be reserved between public land entries on navigable waters in Alaska. Another measure would authorize the Interior Secretary to dispose of the lands to be restored from highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals, giving any adjoining landowner or claimant a preferred right to acquire the land subject to disposal.

The Interior Department through its Bureau of Land Management will start its program of clearing campsites along Alaska's highway this year through an enabling bill enacted into law.

Another measure is going to make it easier on homestead settlers who enter unsurveyed public lands. From now on they will be required to make only one final proof prior to survey instead of being required to submit proof twice, thus cutting a lot of unneeded redtape and speeding action on final acquisition of the land.

Among the other measures enacted during the past 2 years are bills to permit the Alaska Railroad to enter into 55-year leases on its property; authorize a yearly appropriation of $250,000 for Bureau of Reclamation investigations; extend until December of 1958 the present law allowing the Territory first refusal of surplus personal Federal property in Alaska; raise the annual compensation of the United States Commissioners so that those officials in Alaska may retain up to $12,500 a year from fees collected; establish a commission to study the feasibility of a railroad to the Territory and additional roads to connect the States and Alaska; abolish Old Kasaan National Monument; authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service to regulate the distance between set nets in Alaska waters; permit members of the Territorial legislature to run as candidates for the State constitutional convention which was held last winter at the University of Alaska; authorize the Secretary of the Interior to work out plans for establishment of facilities, such as office space for Customs and Immigration, at the Alaska-Canada border; permit homestead allotments granted to Eskimos, Aleuts and Indians to be alienated after 5 years of occupancy and use; permit the Territory to borrow funds from the Federal Government to supplement Territorial unemployment compensation funds; bring the Eskimos increased incomes by permitting the export of walrus hides from the Territory; and several more.

On the numerous measures now law or soon to be which were handled by committees other than the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, I was especially gratified when Alaska was included in the Highway Act for 1956, thus bringing the Territory within the Federal-aid highway program from which it had been excluded since 1916 when the program was conceived. Definite plans can now be made for a real road-building program because of the certainty of a stable, continuing source through which such roads will be possible. One of the great needs for developing any land is an integrated highway system which will connect communities and open areas to settlers. The application of that theory to Alaska will be a boon in the years ahead to that magnificent Territory of ours which I hope soon will be a State.

Bonus Payments for Cows and Heifers Forced To Slaughter Because of Drought

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Western Livestock Journal, calling upon the Secretary of Agriculture to use his discretion to see to it that cows and heifers are brought up by the Government in the drought area. The Secretary of Agriculture has a fund of $110 million to provide relief in such cases.

I completely endorse the position taken by Mr. Nelson R. Crow in his editorial.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crow's letter to me be also printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With a minimum of expense, the Government could provide a bonus payment on every cow and heifer forced to slaughter because of drought and, at the same time, cut down the Nation's beef breeding herd to a level that would bring beef production more nearly in line with consumer demand. The Secretary of Agriculture has $110 million available immediately for the purpose of supporting the cattle market, when and if necessary. That amount of money could pay a bonus of $20 per head on 5,500,000 cows and heifers marketed from drought areas this late summer and fall.

We are suggesting that such a program be instituted at once, with the provision that the bonus payment be made only on she-stock marketed from counties designated as drought disaster areas, and upon certification that the animals were slaughtered.

Such a program would be far more effective than a renewal of a beef purchase program such as was used by the Secretary of Agriculture 3 years ago, and would be infinitely less costly to the Government. By simply paying a bonus on every female bovine animal moved out from a drought disaster county upon certification that the animal was slaughtered, the Government wouldn't be in the beef business. There would be no stockpile of canned beef that would have to be given away or bartered abroad. There would be no interference with normal marketing functions.

Few people in the cattle business want to see the Government forcing canned beef

from thin cows into the school lunch program. First, because past history shows that the beef is of such pool quality that it turns the youngsters away from beef. Second, because gifts of canned beef offset the normal school purchases of beef.

There's no reason why the Government should get into the beef business as a means of affording relief to the hard-pressed cowmen in the drought disaster areas. There's no reason why these cows shouldn't be slaughtered under normal marketing methods. Actually, there's no place for millions of the cows and heifers to go except for slaughter, due to the scarcity of buyers who have grass onto which to move beef shestock.

The program we suggest would serve two vital functions: 1. Make cash payments to owners of cattle in drought areas. 2. Remove at least five million cattle from inventories and thus relieve the market from the pressure of surplus above normal consumer requirements. Many cowmen say that there's nothing wrong with the cattle market that a 10 percent reduction in cow numbers wouldn't cure.

Such a program would be simple to administer. The Secretary of Agriculture already has certified hundreds of counties as drought disaster areas in the worst drought since 1934. County committees already have been set up in each area, and these committeemen would certify that shestock has been shipped and slaughtered. No payment would be made unless the stock was slaughtered.

For the range cowman beset by drought, it would mean that on any females sold for replacement, if from a drought disaster county, the buyer would have to meet the market price plus the Government payment. It would mean no interference with normal marketing and processing of beef, leaving the slaughter and processing to packers who understand the marketing of beef much better than any Government agency.

If there is not enough money available to the Secretary of Agriculture to fully carry out such a bonus payment program, there is no doubt in anyone's mind but that Congress would quickly appropriate sufficient additional funds to make the program effective. But the Secretary has enough money on hand to start the program at once and take 5½ million cows and heifers out of production.

Details of such a program could be worked out quickly by representatives of the cattlemen, the packers, the Government and marketing agencies. Steers would not be considered. There's a ready market for steers from feedlots. But all female bovine animals should be brought into the program provided they are shipped from a drought disaster county. For example, heifer calves could carry a $10 bonus payment, heifer yearlings a $15 payment and cows 3 years old or older could merit a $25 payment. Then let the normal market set the prices on all animals sold. Perhaps these payments are not high enough. But the plan would reduce our inventory of breeding animals, give owners cash to be held for restocking when the rains come, and would inject strength and stability into the cattle market.

WESTERN LIVESTOCK JOURNAL,
Los Angeles, Calif., July 24, 1956.

The Honorable WAYNE MORRIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We have just completed a survey answered by 160 of the top cattlemen in the 17 western States, and it is apparent that drought conditions are going to force an abnormally heavy movement of cows to market, starting very soon, and continuing into the fall.

The attached editorial will appear in our weekly Western Livestock Journal this week. I hope you will take the time to read it, and I'll appreciate your reaction.

I believe that no one would say that the cow beef buying program 3 years ago served its purpose. It did not encourage marketing of shestock from drought areas; it did not serve to reduce cow population; it left the Government with a huge amount of poor quality canned beef which cost too much money.

This program, if held to a cost of $110 million, could mean extra cash to cattlemen throughout the drought areas. It would not mean a Government stockpile of canned beef. It would reduce the size of our cowherd, relieve necessity of emergency feed payments next year to a large extent, it would help bring beef production more nearly in line with consumer demand.

I will appreciate your comment.

Sincerely,

NELSON R. CROW, *Publisher.*

Amending Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of my friend from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. It is utterly impossible for me and would be for anybody else in the few minutes available to meet fully the arguments that have been presented so ably by the gentleman from Arkansas, my friend, the chairman of the committee. However, I am going to try to hit the high spots.

This is windfall legislation of the worst character. I do not believe it is intended as such by the members of the subcommittee or the full committee. That it is windfall legislation is not my opinion alone; that is the opinion and it is in the record expressed by the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. Everyone could see it who chooses to read it. That is the judgment which was expressed. He was joined by a former colleague of ours, who was then Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Honorable Ross Rizley, now a member of the Federal bench.

It does remain an indisputable fact that the Bureau of the Budget is opposed to this legislation. I took the precaution to ask them after the amendment had been adopted if they were still opposed, and they said they were. That, too, is a matter of public record. The General Accounting Office, through Mr. Campbell, expressed opposition before the committee and went into detail as to why that agency was opposed to it. I took the precaution of asking him, following the action of the committee, if he still remained opposed to the legislation as it was amended. I placed his letter in the RECORD and it is available to all Members. He said flatly he was opposed. The fact remains that there is opposition from every Federal agency involved.

There is support individually by 2 members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I submit that support is heavily outweighed by the compelling reasons for the opposition which has been expressed fully and publicly.

Why is it described as windfall legislation? Well, because the Department of Commerce presented a tabulation as to who would have obtained the benefits of this bill had it been on the books during the last 5 years. That is in the minority report which is available at the desk if anyone is interested. It occupies 1 full page, page 4 of the minority report.

The sheer fact is that four airlines would have received $21,498,000 in unjustified double subsidy out of the $21,900,790. Those are not my words, they are not my figures, but the figures of the Department of Commerce submitted to this Congress.

A great deal of concern has been expressed as to what would happen to the feeder airlines, the smaller airlines. The sheer fact is that these four big airlines, Pan American with $17,288,000; Braniff, with $1,515,000; Delta, with $1,400,000; and the International line of Trans-World, before it went off subsidies, with $1,295,000, would have been the chief beneficiaries. As I recall the figure, 29 other airlines—it is all in the RECORD—would have received nothing under this bill. Some of you are served by airlines which are off subsidies—American, Eastern, National, Capital, Delta, Northwest, TWA, and United, and others. Mr. Chairman, they will not receive 1 penny if we pass this bill. They have had initiative and foresight and ability enough to take themselves off the Federal Treasury, off the taxpayers' shoulders and no specious or fine spun arguments presented by apologists for subsidies can contradict that fact.

Only yesterday afternoon Capital announced that it was purchasing some 14 new modern jet airplanes for $53 million, on top of 15 turbojets for $15,400,000 more not out of the Federal Treasury but out of funds they have earned. You will not find any lobbyists for that line outside this Chamber with cups in their hands crying about their weaknesses. These lines have demonstrated their independence and their success. Some smaller airlines have gone out and borrowed money ranging from $650,000 up to $2, $3, and $4 millions, not out of the Federal Treasury but from the record of their own earnings and their competence in the business world, as examples of those who show what private enterprise can do and do not spend time and money whining about their lot and scheming to get more and more handouts.

The people who have received the benefit of the most subsidy over the years are the people who are insisting most vocally that they should receive this additional benefit, and they are in large measure among the large airlines of this country. The official figures which I have show that as of July 18 of this year 32 airlines have received $502,915,000 of subsidy from the Federal Treasury. Pan American World Airways, Inc., has received $219,768,000. But it wants more and is working desperately to get it.

It has been pointed out by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget that this is depreciation piled on depreciation, that these aircraft have been fully depreciated in many instances. But what they want is double depreciation. That is the sort of thing you are confronted with under the terms of this legislation. Whether it is intended I do not have any idea but you must draw your own conclusions.

The suggestion has been made that safety is involved, the suggestion has been made that these airlines are trying to get rid of old, dilapidated equipment and that somehow or other they are unable to do it. I asked the Vice-Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to tell me what the situation was. On page 12190 of the RECORD of July 18 is a table he furnished. The depreciated cost as of December 31, 1955, of all the aircraft involved was $127,005,000, but the estimated market value was $228,895,000, more than double. Pan American's depreciated loss was $79,147,000; the estimated market value was $130,200,000. No wonder it wants this bill.

The aircraft are being sold all the time. The profits are being realized all the time. Yet they want to go into the Federal Treasury and ask the American taxpayer not just to pay single subsidies but to pay twice, to pay a double subsidy.

If I thought this had any effect whatsoever on the equipment proposition, on the modernizing of equipment, which could not be accomplished without further demands on the overburdened taxpayers. I would not be here before you making this statement.

Some suggestion has been made that there are some airlines interested in opposing this bill because they are in competition. Why should they not be interested? All they want is a decent break without handicaps imposed by unwarranted legislation. That is true.

Who are those airlines who will not receive one single, solitary dollar or penny out of this bill? American, Capital, Caribbean-Atlantic, Delta, Eastern, National, Northwest, Trans World, United, Western, American Air Export & Import, The Flying Tiger Line, Riddle Airlines, and Slick Airways. I submit we should respect them and their interest in free and fair competition.

So you can see that in spite of all the fine and emphatic words presented in favor of this legislation, there is offered a very serious question as to whether we should endorse it at this dying hour of this session. I hope in the very few minutes you have, you can examine the facts. If you can, the decision here tonight will not be in doubt.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, DICK RICHARDS I salute you and wish for you the best than can come to a great American. Our districts, yours in South Carolina and mine in North Carolina adjoin. You have extended me many courtesies. I am grateful. My wife Agnes and our family, Cree, Carol, and Charles join me in expressing to you and your devoted wife Katherine our very sincere good wishes.

Dixon-Yates Contract

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD public statements and communications of the President of the United States with reference to the Dixon-Yates contract, as reported by the press.

There being no objection, the statements and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of July 1, 1954]

From the President's news conference, July 1, 1954:

Question. "Mr. President, could you tell us your reasons for ordering the AEC to make a private-power agreement for getting some additional power put in through the TVA?"

Answer. "Well, it was a rather long and complicated story. He had told you people long ago that the TVA was a historical fact, that it was going to be supported and, particularly supported in the purposes written into the law for which it was established. Now, as time went on, we found that TVA had gone far beyond the establishment of steam plants to firm up maximum water power developed in the waters of that region.

"Now, we found projects for installing, building TVA power plants way out on the periphery of this area, which would mean finally that they could best deliver their power on beyond that, and there was no, he knew of no, way in which this thing would be limited.

"The only thing that he wanted with respect to that was a very good look from every angle, and tell them what was the best future for that region, how far they could continue to build up this area at the expense of others. Maybe they should be building the Missouri River or the Susquehanna or the Penobscot or some other.

"Now, one of the contentions made was that they were under an immediate shortage, something had to be done because of this great portion of the power taken by the AEC. The AEC said that they had the authority to buy their power for a given number of years under private purchase. The comparisons of cost, as based on original layout and the annual cost of this power, were long and involved.

"But it looked like a good thing to buy this power privately so that they could get a really good look as to where they are going into the future in terms of expansion because, you see, he had States, representatives of Massachusetts, New York, Indiana, coming to him and saying: 'You are taking our taxes and building up cheap power some place and taking our industries out.'

"He didn't know exactly where all of the truth lay in this thing, and he was trying to find out—this was just a way to give us a chance to study the thing thoroughly."

[From the New York Times of July 8, 1954]

From unofficial transcript of the President's press conference, July 8, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Gov. Frank Clement, of Tennessee, has sent you a telegram saying that your remarks here last week regarding TVA were deeply disturbing to him and asking a chance to meet with you and state his case regarding this new proposal for private utilities to come into TVA territory. Have you decided to give him that conference?"

Answer: "As a matter of fact, he hadn't actually seen the telegram yet, but Governor Clements, like any other governor in the United States, could come to see him at any time that a convenient time could be arranged."

[From the New York Times of July 22, 1954]

From the President's news conference, July 21, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, the Democrats have used some pretty strong language on the Hill this week in attacking the administration proposal to grant a private power contract in the Tennessee Valley area. Republican Senator Cooper, of Tennessee, has also joined critics of the proposal. Is there any chance, any possibility, of the administration changing its position on this issue?"

Answer: "Well, he constantly had stated in front of them that there were always details of anything he proposed where, if he was shown there was a better way of doing it, why, he was perfectly ready to do it.

"Now, he thought he had explained this situation here a couple of weeks ago. This area said it needed power because industries wanted to come into that region. Long ago, the project of harnessing the streams in the area had been completed, and the Federal Government also had built the steam plants to firm up the waterpower potential.

"Now, in these recent years it had been merely a question of producing steam plants. Well, now the problem in his mind, and he would think in everybody's, was if the Federal Government went into the constant production of steam plants, why didn't we go now to the Missouri Valley or to the Ohio or to the Connecticut or the Sacramento or the Pecos or anywhere else, and produce steam plants in that region before we went putting more here?

"He was trying to find out the facts of this whole situation, what it meant. He was, as he had told them before, he was prepared to support TVA as it now stood, with all the strength he had, and anyone who said this was any attempt to destroy the TVA was, to say it in the mildest way he knew, was in error. There was no such thought at all. There was the thought of providing the power while a new and further look was taken at this whole business because the whole United States was concerned and not simply one little area, and he was working for the United States."

Question: "Mr. President, one of the major points in the debate on the Atomic Energy Commission–TVA contract today arose out of testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that three Commissioners of the Atomic Energy Commission opposed signing the contract. Therefore, the Senators are arguing the question of whether the President has the power to order independent agencies to take action that their Administrators or a Commission majority oppose. Would you discuss your attitude toward that problem?"

Answer: "Well, he was not going to discuss it very greatly, very obviously. He had an Attorney General and, when there was a matter of legality arose, why, he had to be governed by what the legal staff of that office decided was correct because they would remember this: It wasn't always a matter of taking authority in these cases, it was a matter of somebody exercising responsibility, and someone had to do it. And, frequently, he supposed lots of people would like to get

out of exercising responsibility, but you had to do it when the chips were down.

"Now, in this one, she was telling him things and she was giving him a premise that he didn't know existed. But he would say this: The Atomic Energy Commission he did not believe was an independent Commission in the sense that the ICC or FCC was. It was something that he was compelled to take action on and over which to exercise supervision."

[From the New York Times of July 29, 1954]

From the President's news conference of July 28, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, you told Mr. Brandt that you wouldn't want to support someone who had opposed you on a major issue. In the last week Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, has voted twice against the administration—once against the TVA contract, and yesterday or last night, rather, against the entire atomic-energy bill. Would you consider that major opposition, sir?"

Answer: "Well, he thought Senator Cooper was mistaken, but he thought that Senator Cooper's record in the Senate was one that he couldn't possibly criticize in any serious way. Now, he has been perfectly honest, he (Senator Cooper) has come to him every time he had had a difference and he (The President) knew that it did not make either of us happy. He believed there was a legality, a point of legal responsibility and legal authority involved, and he thought he (Senator Cooper) had been perfectly honest in that, and he respects a man's honest opinions. So he—don't try to get him to say he was against Senator Cooper; he was not."

Question: "I am not trying to."

[From the New York Times of July 18, 1954]

From the President's press conference of August 17, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Stephen Mitchell, the Democratic National chairman, said yesterday you personally ordered the Dixon-Yates power contract awarded to a firm in which one of your closest friends has an interest, and at $90 million more than a competitor syndicate. His office later identified the friend as Bobby Jones. Do you care to comment on that matter?"

Answer: "Well, ladies and gentlemen, he knew when he once went into political life that he would be subjected by many types of strange characters to many kinds of innuendo and allegations. In this case, he must say, and he was a little astonished, that any kind of such innuendo should include a private citizen of the character and standing of Bob Jones.

"He thought there was no gentleman that he knew whose integrity and probity he was more certain of than he was of his.

"Now, as to his (the President's) actions, his own actions, he was no going to defend himself, as he had told the reporters time and again he should not. He merely said this: Of course, he approved the recommendations for this action, and every single official action he took involving the contractual relationships of the United States with anybody and except only when the question of national security was directly involved, was open to the public.

"Any one of you here present might singly or in an investigation group go to the Bureau of the Budget, to the chief of the Atomic Energy Commission, and get the complete record from the inception of the idea to this very minute, and it was all yours. Now that was all he had to say about it:"

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1954]

From the President's news conference of October 27, 1954:

Question: "On this secrecy of documents, and so forth——"

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "Why can't we get the Dixon-Yates contract? We got a copy but other people didn't."

Answer: "Well, as a matter of fact, he probably, if he had anything to do with it, would discipline the person that had given them the copy, if he knew them. He didn't know. Here were the facts. He had promised all the documents in the negotiations leading to the making of this contract and, as far as he knew, everybody had been able to see them.

"Next there was a contract made, and the law provided that that contract, when made, was placed before the Congress, and was to remain there until—he believed it was the Joint Committee—the Joint Committee of the Atomic Energy Committee, had the full opportunity to investigate it and go through its details. And when that was done, then it would undoubtedly be made public. But until it had finished its tour in front of the Atomic Energy Commission, he doubted that it would be proper to release it."

Question: "On that point, sir, do you wish the Joint Committee to waive that 30-day period for inspection and have the contract——"

Answer: "No one had asked him to ask them to waive any period. Now, this was what he did know: The Federal Power Commission said this was a proper contract and fair to the Government and all concerned. The TVA authorities had gone over it and said, after incorporation of certain changes they wanted, that it was perfectly satisfactory. The Congress had the last word in the situation, and could go after it if they wanted to, so he felt that the Government was perfectly and splendidly protected."

Question: "The Senate committee has raised some question about the ethics of the actions of some subsidiaries of the Dixon-Yates group. I wonder if that would have any effect upon your thinking on the Dixon-Yates people, and the fact that the contract was left without bid?"

Answer: "Well, he couldn't think of any man in Government whom he trusts more as to his integrity, his commonsense and his business acumen than Lewis Strauss (Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission). Now, he was the one that was at the focal point of making this contract. The Congress—after he (the President) had quoted the Federal Power Commission, he had quoted the TVA—the congressional committee had its right to go over it in detail.

"If they found anything wrong, he was sure there would be someone that would make it public. Now, up until that moment, he had nothing further to do with it; he hadn't seen the contract in its detail, and he hadn't any more comments to make about it."

[From the New York Times of November 11, 1954]

From the President's press conference of November 11, 1954:

Question: "Mr. President, Mr. Thomas Murray, a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, testified before the Joint Committee this week that the top level management of the Atomic Energy Commission was being diverted from its primary mission by what he described as a political controversy over the Dixon-Yates contract. Would you agree with this conclusion and discuss with us, sir, your views on whether the Atomic Energy Commission should be a nonpolitical or a political body?"

Answer: "Well, he thought, of course, that any business organization working for the Government should be nonpolitical, and he deplored any thought that there had been an effort to make this mater political. On the contrary, this contract, to which had been raised some objection, there had been no effort to keep that under cover until after the elections or to keep these—it had been laid out and spread out on the record as fast as it could be, first, the negotiations and, after the contract was once in the hands of Congress, then the country.

"Now, possibly, he had better straighten once again his attitude toward this whole business. It had been represented to him that there was going to be an acute power shortage in the TVA area by 1957.

"Now, there was an area in which the Federal Government had not fully developed the water power, had then built the steam plants to firm up that water power, then had built additional steam plants and was still enlarging some of them. Now, the question became how long did this go along at Federal expense unless it was done in the Smoky Hill Valley, and in the Penobscot Valley, and in the Hudson Valley, and all the rest of the world. It would look ike it was time to take a look at this. So, consequently, he said, 'How can we supply that need without putting the Government in position that in perpetuity it is going to continue to build steam plants anywhere anyone wants them?' Now, one way to do it was to take the needs of the AEC and to see whether they could be supplied and, therefore, provide this extra 600,000 watts it then had been predicted they were going to need in 1957; then it wouldn't damage the people of the area and one would go ahead and give everybody time to take a good look at this and study it out. There was nothing in this contract that could raise by a single cent the prices for—that TVA charged its customers for power, and the contract had been gone over, as he had told the reporters before, by the Federal Power Commission, by TVA, and he believed, the General Accounting Office, all of whom had found it a satisfactory contract. So if there was anything political in it, someone was making it that way, it was nothing political from his viewpoint."

Question: "Mr. President, this week, one of your strong supporters journalistically, one of your strong supporters, the Scripps-Howard papers, called on you to let go of the Dixon-Yates contract. They said it was a dangerous thing politically and would hurt you. Have you changed your mind any on supporting the Dixon-Yates contract from what we understand you said a minute ago, or do we understand that it is going to go through?"

Answer: "Well, he hadn't changed his mind for this simple reason: No better contract had been offered. If the people were going to get power in that region, and if they were going to get it in this amount, he knew of no better way to get it, and no better way had been offered. So, until some better way was offered, he had to stick to this one."

Question: "Mr. President, on that point, why were not the specifications laid down for this, and competitive bids asked?"

Answer: "Well, as far as he knew—now, he didn't want to be quoted here too exactly that he couldn't change his mind—but, as he remembered it, he had been informed that they had put this matter up before a number of utilities, and there had been only two offers received, and one had been, they thought, completely unacceptable, because there had been no risk whatsoever. They remembered, in contracts of the past, where the AEC had made contracts, they had been strictly cost-plus. He rejected those; he thought they weren't good for the Government. He thought it ought to have a contract where there was some risk shared by the building companies, so he had insisted on that. Now, the other one, the other plan, as he understood it, that had been submitted, was again one which the building companies took no risk on."

Question: "As I understand, the specifications were very general and there was only one other company made a bid."

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "And I also understand that TVA was not consulted in the initial steps."

Answer: "Well, that would have to be checked up with AEC and with the Bureau of

the Budget. He couldn't be expected to recall every detail."

Question: "No."

Answer: "But he did know they had come and sat in front of him often enough and he assumed TVA knew about it."

Question: "The previous Chairman of TVA testified that he was not called in on the initial proceedings to give the expert advice."

Answer. "Well, he did believe this: He believed that the prior Chairman's whole attitude toward the matter, toward this particular matter had been well known, but he was not—he didn't recall, and he thought that he (the questioner) had got places to find out that detail."

Question: "May I ask one more question, please?"

Answer: "Yes."

Question: "Are you adamant against TVA expanding further?"

Answer: "Well, he said 'admant.' He hoped that he was old enough that he didn't think there was anything particularly sacrosanct about his decisions and conclusions. But he did believe that if the Government continued to expand there, what was it going to do about the other sections of this country? And he thought there had to be a policy deliberately adopted by the United States before it made these things so lopsided. Because, let him tell those present, for every argument he had had for TVA, he had many, many people, political leaders, come to his office and say: 'Why do you continue to give them cheap power and take away our industries, and then we pay taxes to support them?' Now, he didn't know that there was any justice to that argument and, as he had said again and again, he had put a man down there from whom he believed they could all expect absolutely objective and complete reporting on the thing, and he hoped they got it, because he would like to know what the answer was."

Question: "There are two kinds of expansions, sir; one is geographical and the other one is expanding power production."

Answer: "That is right."

Question: "Inside TVA's area. Now, do you oppose expansion both ways?"

Answer: "Well, again he said, he didn't know too much about it. But if they—look, if they, if the Federal Government was committed just to building power in the TVA and giving them 100 percent of all they would ever want in their estimates for the next 5 years, why didn't he do it in the Mississippi Valley; that was what he wanted to know and no one answered for him. He asked them—the TVA people came in his office and stood around and argued and he said, 'Well, now are you ready to support this kind of development for the Upper Mississippi?' And they just looked at him and said, 'That is outside the question.' But it wasn't to him. He believed that the United States should be treated fairly all the way through."

Question: "Their argument down there was that the Federal Government was their power monopoly in that area. Any expansion they got in that region must come from the Federal Government."

Answer: "Well, to his mind, he would hate to be admitting that he was completely and absolutely dependent upon the vagaries of the Federal Government that might do anything at any moment, and didn't believe any section of this country had to be completely dependent upon the Federal Government unless it was in the District here."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of November 11, 1954]

TEXT OF LETTER BY EISENHOWER ON DIXON-YATES

WASHINGTON, November 11.—The text of a letter from President Eisenhower to Representative W. STERLING COLE, Republican, of New York, chairman of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee, on the controversial Dixon-Yates contract follows:

"DEAR STUB: On several occasions you and I have discussed the administration plan to relieve TVA of part of its obligation to furnish electric power to AEC in order that TVA, without additional steam plants built at taxpayers' expense, may have an adequate supply of electric power for its customers through 1957.

"My general thinking on the subject is this: It seems to me that all arguments for the construction by the Federal Government of the additional steam plants ignore this one and very important truth: If the Federal Government assumes responsibility in perpetuity for providing the TVA area with all the power it can accept, generated by any means whatsoever, it has a similar responsibility with respect to every other area and region and corner of the United States of America.

"Logically, every section of the United States should have the same opportunities, and the Federal Government should not discriminate between the several regions in helping to provide this type of facility. My own conviction is that we have not been alert enough in making certain of this equality of treatment. If this is the case, then it is high time that other regions were getting the same opportunities.

"I cannot believe that Americans, in general, disapprove of attempting to place all regions on a basis of equality in this regard. Consequently, there must either be some reexamination of any plans which would call for the Federal Government to supply all the additional power capacity that might be needed in the future in the Tennessee Valley, or logically we would have to begin plans for a gigantic power delevopment to cover the entire Nation equitably.

"DESIGNED TO GAIN TIME

"The directive to the AEC to make arrangements for the purchase of private power—either directly or by finding a new private source to replace available TVA power—was designed to allow time for a thorough examination of this whole vast field, without hurting the citizens of the valley.

"As a consequence of these facts, I believe that the project for building new plants at Federal expense—implying a purpose of continuing this process indefinitely in the future—is therefore wholly indefensible unless it should become part of a vast national plan. If this is to be national policy, it is most certainly a project that demands earnest and prayerful study. In the meantime, the citizens of that region will not be deprived of the additional power they need for the next several years.

"It seems to me that there has been a very great deal of talk and argument—much of it partisan—about issues that are really clear and simple.

"NO INTENT TO HURT TVA

"No one in this administration has any intention of destroying or damaging TVA or of diminishing its effectiveness in any way. But this is not the same thing as fastening on the Federal Government a continuing and never-ending responsibility which I frankly do not believe is logical nor, in the long run, in the best interests of the country.

"The administration plan, and all facts concerning its development, have been before the public for months. I hope that the Joint Atomic Energy Committee will give the plan, and the proposed contract to carry it into effect, the fullest consideration that the committee deems necessary. If, however, after such consideration, the committee is of the opinion that the final contract terms are completely satisfactory, it would be clearly desirable and in the best interests of the people of the TVA area that any additional waiting periods be waived, so that construction may begin as soon as possible and people in the TVA area may make their plans for the future.

"With warm personal regard,

"Sincerely,

"DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER."

[From the New York Times of March 17, 1955]

From the President's press conference of March 17, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, I have two questions about an oldie. The Dixon-Yates contract is apparently tied up in the courts, and a majority of the TVA Board has lately asked you again for appropriations for the Fulton steam plant. I wonder whether that would prompt you, sir, to reconsider the problem of power in west Tennessee; and, the second question, would the construction of a plant, generating plant, by Memphis itself not fit into your philosophy, sir?"

Answer: "Well, I know of no reason, to take your second question first, I know of no reason whatsoever that Memphis has not a complete right to manufacture or set up any producing plant it wants to. And certainly I would favor it. I have nothing at all against local ownership of power. I think in many cases it is not only a good thing; in some cases it has been proved to be very effective. But there is one thing I always want to point out to you people when I talk about governmental authority, responsibility, and operation. Don't forget this: When the Federal Government does this, they can print money to do the job. Nobody else can, and there is a very great difference; because the second that the Federal Government starts to print money to do these things, they are taking 1 cent, or at least their proportion, out of every dollar that any of you might happen to have in your pockets. Now that has the effect of cheapening money, and I don't think we ought to go into that.

"Now, as to the review of the case, it has not come up to me in any way in that form, and I don't know whether there is any reason for review or not. But I do say what the local governments or anything else that falls within the State or city authorities, I have no objection to it, to their doing it whatsoever."

[From the New York Times of June 30, 1955]

From the President's press conference of June 30, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, one of the justifications for the Dixon-Yates contract was that the Memphis area needed the power, needed the 600,000 kilowatts. Last week, as you probably know, the Memphis City Council voted to build a steam plant of their own of about 600,000 kilowatts. I wonder if, in your opinion, the Government should now proceed with the Dixon-Yates contract or cancel it at the cheapest possible terms."

Answer: "I haven't had this matter brought to my attention by any of my responsible associates since I saw that suggestion in the paper. But I do know this: that when I was first visited by a delegation from Tennessee and I suggested that the city of Memphis go ahead and build their own plant, they said it was an impossibility under the whole TVA system, and the TVA contract was an impossibility; that's all I know about it."

Question: "Senator KEFAUVER charged on the Senate floor yesterday that the Budget Bureau was trying to conceal what he called a scandal in the Dixon-Yates contract negotiations regarding the employment of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corp. Senator KNOWLAND says there is no corruption in it, and that he thinks you were just trying to help the Tennessee Valley get some power. I wondered if Mr. Hughes of the Budget Bureau had cleared with you his

refusal to give Mr. KEFAUVER the information he was asking down there?"

Answer: "Mr. Hughes came to see me, went over the situation, and I repeated to him the general instructions, I think, that I expressed once publicly in front of this body, that every single pertinent paper on the Dixon-Yates contract, from its inception until the final writing of the contract, would be made available, I think I said at that time, to the press, much less to any committee.

"Now, I do stand on this: Nobody has a right to go in and wreck and processes of Government by taking every single file—and some of you have seen our file rooms and know their size—and wreck the entire filing system and paralyze the processes of Government while they are going through them.

"There are—these files are filled with every kind of personal note—I guess my own files are filled with personal notes from my own staff all through, they are honeycombed with them. Well, now, to drag those things out where a man says to me, 'I think so-and-so is a bad person to appoint to so-and-so, and you shouldn't have him,' all he had was his own opinion. You can't drag those things out and put them before the public with justice to anybody and we are not going to do it. But at the time that I gave those instructions, Mr. Hughes, Mr. Strauss, whoever else was involved, got together every single document that was pertinent to this thing and put it out.

"Now, as far as the Wenzell report, Mr. Wenzell was never called in or asked a single thing about the Dixon-Yates contract. He was brought in to—as a technical adviser in the very early days when one of us here knew nothing about the bookkeeping methods of TVA or anything else. He was brought in as a technical adviser and nothing else, and before this contract was ever even proposed."

Question. "Mr. President, a little while ago you stated that Mr. Wenzell was never called in about the Dixon-Yates contract, and there seemed to be some testimony before the SEC and before a committee that he had served as a consultant, I wondered if you were—"

Answer. "He did serve as a consultant at one time."

Question. "Of the Dixon-Yates?"

Answer. "No; I think—now, I will check this up. My understanding is that quickly as the Dixon-Yates thing came up he resigned and we got as our consultant a man named Adams from the Power Commission here itself to come over and be the consultant so as to have him because he (Wenzell) was connected with a great Boston financial company."

Question. "Mr. President, had you been informed that he had no connection at all with the Dixon-Yates?"

Answer. "My understanding of it, and it may have been, that part of it there may have been, an overlap of a week or two, there I am not sure of."

Question. "Would there be any change in your position on that if there was material that he had served as a consultant on that?"

Answer. "If he had served as a consultant on that and brought in a definite recommendation to us I would be very delighted to make that public. But I just don't believe there is a thing in it about it. However, I will have it checked again."

[From the New York Times of July 7, 1955]

From the President's press conference of July 6, 1955:

Question. "Mr. President, many Democrats on Capitol Hill are now claiming that your decision to reopen or to restudy the Dixon-Yates matter is a political victory for their side, and claim that it represents a backing down on your part on this whole matter. Could you discuss that with us, sir?"

Answer. "Well, I hadn't heard this particular point. The first group that ever came to my office to urge upon me the building with Federal funds of a new steam plant in the TVA were very insistent that this be done. It's the only way they could get a plant; and they said the city of Memphis is going to be without power in that whole region; and I recommended to them that the city of Memphis build its plant just like New York City or Abilene, Kans., would if they had to have a plant. And they showed to me or attempted to show to me this was impossible in their area because of the type of contract that TVA had made with all its customers. It is an exclusive sort of contract. If you take any power from TVA then you may not, under your contract, get any power anywhere else.

"Now, that was the situation at that moment. Actually, I am delighted that the city of Memphis or any other local community, when it comes to the simple building of a power station through steam-plants methods and with no flood control or navigation or other factors in it, do it themselves.

"I believe we should do it ourselves. So I am not really concerned as to who is claiming political victories. This is in accordance with the philosophy in which I believe."

Question. "Mr. President, returning to the Dixon-Yates question, have you had a report from Mr. Hughes as yet so that you could tell us whether you will or will not cancel that private agreement?"

Answer. "Well, I had a report just a few minutes ago from Mr. Hughes. But the investigation by the Attorney General and by the Budget Bureau is still going on, because there must be determined the complete feasibility of the city building its own power-plant. Otherwise we might proceed quite a ways on that proposition, and find that it was an impossible thing, due to some kind of legal or other limitations. The TVA has reported to me that there will be no need for this power in TVA and, of course, in that event, if that is substantiated, then there would be no need for building this plant."

Question. "Then you would cancel under such circumstances?"

Answer. "Under—if all of these circumstances meet the standards that we have set up, yes."

Question. "You spoke, sir, of the continuing investigation of the feasibility of the city of Memphis"——

Answer. "Yes; and that will be"——

Question. "Is that likely to take some time, a week or 10 days?"

Answer. "Well, I didn't ask them, but my impression of this was that it might be finished up in a couple of weeks."

Question. "Mr. President, there has arisen between Budget Director Hughes and Senator KEFAUVER relative to the questioning of the five witnesses from the Budget Bureau in the Dixon-Yates controversy, and I wondered if you would care to discuss for us"——

Answer. "Five witnesses, you say?"

Question. "Five witnesses in the Dixon-Yates controversy relative to the part that Mr. Wenzell played in the Dixon-Yates case."

Answer. "Well, Mr. Wenzell was the only one I heard about."

Question. "The thing I wanted to find out was where you thought how much discretion Mr. Hughes had?"

Answer. "I think Mr. Wenzell is entitled to tell the court—I mean to tell the investigating committee exactly what he did. You will remember he was called in to investigate certain accounting and financing systems of power establishments and their tax situation, and that was early in this administration. And he, I believe, submitted on that a fairly formal written report. I have no doubt he will show that written report to the committee if they want to see it, although it has no bearing on the thing they are now talking about. Later he was for a period, I believe of 60 days, in early 1954; he was here as a technical adviser, as they were trying to devise some form of contract that would befit the situation. He, I have no doubt in all matters of fact, will testify freely before this investigating committee."

Question. "Mr. President, I had in mind more the discretion that you felt your agency had had, not necessarily Mr. Wenzell but with regard to other witnesses. There were five other witnesses before in the Budget Bureau that the committee had asked to come down; and Mr. Hughes had informed the committee that they should not—"

Answer. "Mr. Hughes has not talked to me, as I recall it. Now, maybe Mr. Hughes talked to me about it and it slipped my mind. I have explained my attitude here time and again. If anybody in an official position of this Government does anything which is an official act, and submits it either in the form of recommendation or anything else that is properly a matter for investigation if Congress so chooses, provided that national security is not involved.

"But when it comes to the conversations that take place between any responsible official and his advisers or exchange of little, mere little slips, or this or that, expressing personal opinions on the most confidential basis, those are not subject to investigation by anybody, and if they are, will wreck the Government. There is no business that could be run if it—if there would be exposed every angle thought that an adviser might have because in the process of reaching an agreed position there is many, many conflicting opinions to be brought together. And if any commander is going to get the free, unprejudiced opinions of his subordinates he had better protect what they have to say to him on a confidential basis. It is exactly, as I see it, like a lawyer and his client or any other confidential thing of that character."

Question. "Mr. President, on the basis of what you have been told about the role of Adolphe Wenzell in this Dixon-Yates contract, do you regard that role as proper?"

Answer. "Indeed, yes."

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 12, 1955]

July 11, 1955: "On leaving the White House, Mayor Tobey said the cancellation of the contract 'is unquestionably a victory for public power.' Asked what President Eisenhower's reaction was, the mayor smiled and said, 'the President is very happy about it.' The White House issued a statement saying President Eisenhower was 'delighted' to see Mayor Tobey and to learn of Memphis' decision to build its own plant. The President told the mayor, the statement said, that the President long has favored such a plan as an alternative to building another TVA steam plant. The President said he saw no more reason to spend Federal funds on a steam plant to provide power for the Tennessee Valley than one to provide power from the valley of the Kansas River, the statement said. It added that only after the President was informed that Memphis could not build its own plant was the Dixon-Yates plan developed. 'The Dixon-Yates plan was developed as a means of assuring the Memphis area it would not suffer a power shortage as a result of the siphoning off of additional power by the Atomic Energy Commission,' the statement said."

[From the New York Times of July 28, 1955]

From the President's press conference of July 27, 1955:

Question: "Mr. President, there has been testimony of the SEC Chairman that Sherman Adams intervened before the SEC which was a quasi-judicial body. Testimony was given by the Chairman on that score. The Democrats are contending that there was something improper in intervening with any quasi-judicial body. I wondered if you looked into that and you have any comment you would like to make about it."

Answer: "I looked into it only to this extent: I am sure that Mr.—head of the Commission—has given the entire story. I understand he is back before the committee. And certainly if he had omitted any details, he should give them now. And I believe that Governor Adams has informed the Senate committee that he hasn't a single detail to add; that the story has been told and that is all there is to it."

Question: "In connection with the Dixon-Yates matter, and in view of the fact that the Senate investigation subcommittee recently brought out for the first time the part played in initiating the Dixon-Yates contract by Adolphe Wenzell of the First Boston Corp., which corporation later became the financing agent for Dixon-Yates, in view of all of that, do you believe your directions last summer for disclosure of the complete record in the case were carried out by the agencies concerned?"

Answer: "Well, I didn't know that anyone had alleged that he was the initiator, because no such statement has ever been made to me. But what I have done is this: I have gotten back Mr. Dodge who was Director of the Budget when all this was done, when the 1954, I believe, policy on this statement, on this whole proposition was made, and he is going now before one of the committees. Isn't that correct?"

The President's press secretary: "Yes, sir."

Answer: "He is going down before one of the committees with instructions to do this: to tell every possible item that has anything whatsoever to bear on Dixon-Yates and see whether we can get the whole list of information properly coordinated and placed before the people that are investigating it."

Question: "I hate to go back to Dixon-Yates again, but there was one thing I don't think was completely clear. There were some AEC officials, Mr. Fields and Mr. Cook, who testified that Mr. Wenzell's name was knowingly elminated from the Dixon-Yates chronology; and, of course, they stated this was on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget. I wondered if you knew anything about this, and if you did know of it, if you would like to comment on whether you thought it was important."

Answer: "I don't intend to comment on it any more at all. Now, I think I have given to this conference, time and again, the basic elements of this whole development and everything that I could possibly be expected to know about it. I said Mr. Dodge, who initiated this whole thing, is going down before the committee to again begin the process of taking this thing from its inception and following it through until he turned over to Mr. Hughes, and I believe that Mr. Hughes is to be there if they want him again. Now, they can tell the entire story and I don't know exactly such details as that. How could I be expected to know? I never heard of it."

Let Us Stick to Facts—There Is No Spoils System in the Fish and Wildlife Service

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has had quite a bit to say about the spoils system ruining the Fish and Wildlife Service. Let us examine that closely.

In the first instance he says the top 6 jobs in the Service are all political appointments. Auctually, there are only 4 class C—exempt—positions: the Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director for Wildlife, and Assistant Director for Field Operations. The 2 Assistants to the Director, GS–15, are not class C; they are both career appointments.

During the discussions on the floor of the House on July 24, the implication was left that the people who have been appointed to these jobs are "political hacks" with no experience in conservation and without qualifications for the jobs they hold. Nothing could be more inaccurate. Here are the facts.

John L. Farley, the Director, was for 6 years executive officer of the California Fish and Game Commission.

Associate Director Arnie J. Suomela, a graduate of the University of Washington in fisheries, joined the old Bureau of Fisheries back in 1931 and worked in it for 4 years until he went to the State of Oregon Fish Commission, of which he was executive secretary when he came to the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1953.

Incidentally, Milton James, who retired voluntarily in 1952 as Assistant Director for Fisheries, the position to which Mr. Suomela was appointed in 1953, recently was named to Mr. Suomela's old job in Oregon.

Robert H. Johnson, who holds the position of Assistant Director for Wildlife, was director of the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Game, when he was appointed, a post he had held 8 years.

Lester H. Bagley, Assistant Director for Field Operations in the Service, came to Washington from Wyoming where he had been director of the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission for 16 years.

Dr. O. Lloyd Meehean, who is Assistant to the Director for Technical Staff Services, one of the jobs implied to be occupied by a "political hack", has been a member of the staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service for 26 years and was Chief of the Branch of Game Fish and Hatcheries when he was promoted to his present position.

The other Assistant to the Director job in the list discussed by the gentleman from Wisconsin is occupied by Robert A. Wells who, before coming to Washington, had been for 9 years secretary of the New York State Conservation Department, which had an excellent reputation for a progressive conservation program in the administration of Perry B. Duryea. Mr. Duryea was the conservation commissioner who was succeeded by Governor Harriman's appointee, Louis A. Wehle, who resigned recently under fire after making ridiculous charges against civil-service wildlife employees in that department. Incidentally, Governor Harriman is a member of the party of the gentleman from Wisconsin. I might add that Mr. Wells received the Charles Banks Belt award in 1955 for the outstanding contribution to waterfowl restoration in the Atlantic Flyway as a result of the program which he developed in New York. That award was made by a committee of judges which included S. Dillon Ripley, curator of the Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., and Robert Cushman Murphy, formerly curator of the American Museum of Natural History.

Along these same lines, Assistant Director Johnson received the Springfield Daily News Trophy this year for outstanding achievement in New England conservation. The selection was made by the New England Outdoor Writers Association.

Every single one of these men have long professional records in the conservation field. They are anything but "political hacks."

Apparently, if you came into the Service with a Democratic chairman's approval, you are a conscientious public servant; and if you came in at the time of a Republican administration, you are a "political hack."

Now let us turn to the subject of oil leases. We get the impression from the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin and some of his associates that oil leases were never issued before 1953 and that the present administration of the Department of the Interior is responsible for opening all wildlife lands to oil and gas operations. From the way the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin read, you are given the impression that only six oil leases were issued in the 20-year period prior to 1953. This, too, is completely inaccurate.

The wildlife lands involved are in 3 categories—wildlife refuges, game ranges, and cooperative lands. For all 3 groups there have been issued since 1920 to date a total of 612 leases. It may be of interest to the gentleman from Wisconsin to learn that prior to January 20, 1953, there were 277 of those leases issued. The bulk of all the leases were issued on the game ranges, principally Fort Peck. For wildlife refuges alone there have been 37 leases from 1920 to date. Of those 37 leases, 20 were issued prior to January 20, 1953. That certainly does not indicate that the Fish and Wildlife Service has taken a 180° turn, as the gentleman from Wisconsin stated.

The charge also has been made that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been winking at duck-baiting regulations. That, too, is completely untrue, as the facts on prosecutions clearly indicate. An examination of the record leaves you with the inescapable conclusion that, if the present Fish and Wildlife Service administration is winking at duck-baiting regulations, the previous one shut its eyes completely to them. The tabulations submitted to the gentleman from Wisconsin by the Fish and Wildlife Service for a 5-year period through 1953 showed an increasing number of cases in the past 3 years and none in 1951 and 1952 in the States involved.

When these facts were brought to his attention, the gentleman from Wisconsin then tried to emphasize that there were no prosecutions involving shooting of ducks more than 200 yards away from bait. In that respect I note that in his July 24 comments he said that—

California duck-hunting clubs were given the green light and have been merrily shooting ducks from over bait from 200 yards to half a mile from the guns ever since.

I should like to know what kind of firearms they use in California to have a range like that. My duck-hunting friends boast forever when they reach out to get a bird 70 yards away.

This talk about 200 yards is just a smokescreen. Duck baiters actually shoot directly over or at least within shotgun range of the corn when they are taking ducks by this illicit method. That is where the birds are really vulnerable and where the baiters can get the most ducks. That's the real reason why baiting cases involve ranges of less than 200 yards.

I do not intend to discuss charges and countercharges involving Mr. Day which came up on the floor on July 24. I should like to suggest, however, that some of the gentlemen who have been so industriously engaged in whitewashing everything which happened in the Fish and Wildlife Service before 1953 and smearing everything which has happened since should check with the State fish and game administrators and learn what they privately think about previous Fish and Wildlife Service Administration's attitude and actions with respect to cooperative Federal-State effort to improve waterfowl management. Ask them if that administration willingly and freely cooperated in the States' efforts to get coordinators to make possible more efficient State and Federal action in flyway management programs and in developing improved regulations realistically based on waterfowl behavior patterns.

Practically all of these discussions, charges, and countercharges have involved waterfowl. For that reason and not as an intentional disregard of the other important phases of the work of the Fish and Wildlife Service I limit my next observation mostly to the waterfowl program alone. The present administration of the Fish and Wildlife Service is dedicated unequivocably to a cooperative Federal-State fish and game agency approach to the solution of the waterfowl problem. It believes that only by joint consultation and effort through flyway council organizations can the waterfowl management programs which are necessary be developed. This determination to work closely and continuously with the State conservation agencies is in sharp contrast with the record of the past. With respect to fisheries, I should like to add just this: Great advances in the fisheries conservation program have been made these past 3 years in both management and research. Everywhere you hear commendatiton for the Service's activities in this field.

H. R. 8384

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] has correctly stated that while this bill seems quite innocuous, there is a principle involved which could do great harm to the canning industry and to the vegetable growers of the country. The simple fact is that this legislation would make it possible for the creation of a monopoly by those who are producing and processing cranberries.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter involving cranberries alone. It cuts across the whole canning industry. Under existing law, cranberry growers have the right to have a marketing order in the marketing and production of fresh cranberries. This bill would give them control over the processing of cranberries throughout the country. If such a favorable advantage were given to them, this industry would be in a position to dictate the price not only of cranberries under a market order but also for the processing and sale and quantity of fresh cranberries that goes into processing all over the country. I do not believe that we, today, should make such an eventuality possible.

I am informed that if the bill is approved it would, as I have already stated, make a monopoly possible and under existing conditions this monopoly would be controlled by two canners who already have a monopoly of 90 percent of the production of canned cranberries. This body should be fully advised of the possibilities which exist if this bill is written into law. I trust it will be defeated, notwithstanding my very great affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON].

United Nations Theory Falls Flat in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to bring to the attention of the House an excellent editorial in a recent edition of the Jacksonville Journal. I have never understood why the United Nations has not brought Russia to trial for its violations of international law in the aggressions which have added to its colonial empire in Europe and Asia and which resulted in the tragic loss of life for many American heroic defenders of freedom in the late Korean war. To me, it seems absurd that Russia continues to be able to sit down at the conference tables of the United Nations and influence the deliberations of the United Nations while Russia at the same time flagrantly pursues a persistent policy of international banditry. The following editorial states the matter clearly:

UNITED NATIONS THEORY FALLS FLAT IN BROOKLYN

The sudden introduction of "zip" guns into that Brooklyn "peace conference" the other day is a readymade allegory for what could happen any time in the United Nations.

And it points up the apparent futility of trying to deal with gangsters and hoodlums on the level of reason.

The conference was called by the Brooklyn Youth Board Center in an attempt to end teen-age gang wars. That's a pretty noble purpose. But the silly part of the operation was the willingness of the civic-minded citizens behind the youth board to bargain as equals with the cheap young punks who were leaders of the gangs.

They actually sat down at a conference table with 5 members of the Stompers and 5 members of the Chaplains—2 of the principal gangs of warring young criminals—and tried to get them to agree that they wouldn't use guns and knives any more in their gang wars on the streets of Brooklyn. Just beat one another up with fists, the helpful adults suggested.

At that point one of the hoodlums got tired of listening to the soft stuff, pulled a "zip" gun out of his shoe, and started blasting away at the nice people who were trying to help. Another member of the Chaplains pulled a similar homemade gun out of his shirt. All the rest of the gang members started throwing furniture. The peacemakers called the cops.

We don't have any ideas to offer New York City on how to handle its gang-war problem, but it certainly does have one.

But we do hope that retribution will be swift and sure. After all, the United Nations hold their meetings up there, and the United Nations is made up of a lot of decent people trying to talk sense to a lot of crummy gangsters. The U. N. gansters have been able to get enough bad-boy ideas on their own, without any inspiration from their kindred spirits, the Brooklyn young punk element. So it would be a good idea if the allegory were acted out to the final curtain, with a denouement showing clearly that hoodlums can't get away with it forever.

Amending Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard?

Mr. HESELTON. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman. I realize it would be advisable for me to concede the point of order since I have sought the advice of a gentleman whom we all respect, the Parliamentarian of the House. However, I have given him a memorandum in connection with it. I am not going to impose upon the Chair or the House to refer to it in detail. I would like to refer, however, to a ruling of John J. Fitzgerald, which is to be found in Cannon's Precedents, section 2993, which seems to me to go to the heart of the matter. It is as follows:

An amendment to a section which is relevant to the subject matter and which may be said to be properly and logically suggested in the perfecting of the section and the carrying out of the intent of the bill

would be germane to the bill and thus is in order.

There are other precedents. Whether it is in point or not, I would regret that any doubt might not be resolved in favor of the germaneness of the amendment since it does so directly affect the bill and since it is obviously the sort of amendment that may well be considered and is considered by committees and by the other body all the time.

After the Railroads, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, with the ranks of labor closed solidly behind them, steelworkers across the Nation are in their fourth week of their strike for an adequate contract.

The strike began July 1, 1956, when 650,000 United Steelworkers of America members walked out in support of their demands for a substantial wage increase, supplemental unemployment benefits, weekend premium pay, and improved fringe benefits. The company offered a 5-year contract and a package increase which the union termed too little, too long, and too late.

Meanwhile, layoffs continue spreading in allied industries as the shadow of the steel strike lengthens each day. The strike has brought involuntary idleness to more than 800,000 workers in steel and allied industries. However, today there is high optimism that the strike will soon be settled. Exact details of any contract settlement between the steelworkers and the steel industry is not clear, but it is generally felt that the terms will prove to be a major victory for the Union.

I believe the following editorial which appeared in the Malden Evening News of July 20, 1956, and written by David Brickman, the distinguished publisher and editor is very pertinent to the industrial dispute existing between the steel companies and the United Steelworkers of America. I am certain every Member of this House will obtain valuable information from this penetrating editorial:

AFTER THE RAILROADS, WHAT?

The sensitive reaction of the Nation's rail systems, including our own, to the steel strike ought to be an ominous warning about the plight of these carriers. Carloadings in the east are down. Rail shares are generally lagging. Unemployment on the Pennsylvania, the largest in the Nation, soared soon after the steel-production stoppage began. The Baltimore & Ohio looks for a substantial drop in activity this month.

Even the smaller systems, which handle very little steel, face trouble. The $250 million Boston & Maine, which has been doing well under Pat McGinnis' management, is beginning to worry about deliveries of much-needed rolling stock on order for some time.

A prolonged strike could halt installation of the freight cars with which the Boston & Maine hopes to cut down its big per diem rental outlays for equipment from other roads. Also affected are the self-propelled Budd railcars for improvement of commuter and general passenger services.

The situation should impress those regulatory officials who deal with protests from the joy-riding elements of the commuting public. As the military establishment has often pointed out, the Nation's rail systems are the backbone of all mobilization plans and M-day operations. Despite competition from trucks and barge lines, the rails remain indispensable to a thriving economy.

Under the circumstances, railroad management shouldn't be harassed with demands and pressures to continue money-losing passenger services. Current proceedings involving the New York Central and the New Jersey Public Service Commission offer a case in point.

For years, the Central has been taking an annual loss of some $325 per commuter per year for passenger operations on the West Shore line. The commuter has alternative means of getting to work, but perfers the convenience of the railroad to the bus.

Accordingly, the Central is confronted with demands that it prove its freight revenues are insufficient to absorb the deficits produced by the continuation of uneconomic passeger schedules between New York and Albany along the west side of the Hudson.

Few people would dispute that the Central's management is the ablest in the Nation, perhaps in the world. In the past few years phenomenal gains have been made in better freight and passenger service.

The investor has also been given reason for satisfaction, for a change. But in recent months, the net earnings on the Central and most other class I roads have been shrinking in spite of increases in revenues.

The State and Federal regulatory bodies that ride herd on common carriers are required by law to give priority to the public convenience, necessity, and interest. The fact that the rail segment of the economy is being depressed in the current emergency—and is the first to suffer when such major strikes occur—should figure strongly in the thinking of these commissions as to what constitutes the public interest.

Otherwise, nationalization of the rail skeins may prove the only alternative to keep them going.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, on the last day of the session one is especially aware of the value of friends—and the importance of friends. In the case of those retiring from Congress, as is OLIVER BOLTON, we realize all the more how much their friendship has meant to us all.

In the two terms in which he has served his district and his country with distinction. OLLIE has been a devoted public servant—and a real friend. He has been blessed with many talents. We have all benefited from his unfailing good judgment, his understanding of the many problems which we all face, and from his ever-present—and invaluable—sense of humor. He has always been conscientious in discharging his responsibilities and yet he has never let his tireless energy interfere with his real interest in his friends and associates. Although he is retiring, I am confident he will continue to be actively engaged in worthwhile activities. On both sides of the aisle, I am sure, we wish him all kinds of happiness and good fortune.

Shabby Treatment of Our Federal Retirees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the closing hours of this 84th Congress are upon us, and I am compelled to express my indignation at the apathy of this Congress in connection with the shabby treatment accorded our Federal retirees. These former civil servants are entitled to better treatment at the hands of their Government. Some twenty-odd bills were introduced by various Members of this House, including my own H. R. 11334, designed to grant some measure of economic relief to this group. The House committee has failed to consider any of these measures. Anyone who has given this problem even a cursory examination will agree that the present pensions are grossly inadequate and completely out of line with the present cost of living index.

H. R. 11178, introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY], is the bill most frequently mentioned by interested constituents of mine. It is indeed tragic that the distinguished Members of this House were not given the opportunity of acting on this or similar legislation such as S. 3725, the Senate-passed version which rests at this moment on the Speaker's desk. The economic objections raised against this legislation leave me cold. Since when have we placed a price on the welfare of our people? We lavish money all over the world to raise the standard of living of other nations in the interest of making the world safe for democracy. Yet the needs of the Federal retirees of our own land are ignored. What consistency is there in a policy that is parsimonious on the one hand, and profligate on the other? It is not my purpose to quarrel with the principle of fighting the cold war with dollars rather than lives, but it is a sad state of affairs when retired civil servants who have served their government long and well are denied an annuity that will provide something more than a mere existence.

I would like to serve notice here and now that if I am returned as a Member of the 85th Congress it is my intention to reintroduce this legislation and work for its passage with all the resources at my command, in order to bring about fair and equitable annuities for these deserving people.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 31, 1956 No. 132

Daily Digest

RÉSUMÉ OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY OF EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

January 5 through August 2, 1955

	Senate	House	Total
Days in session	105	112	..
Time in session	559 hrs., 41′	471 hrs., 19′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	6,251	5,079	11,330
Appendix	..	..	6,314
Public bills enacted into law	162	228	390
Private bills enacted into law	146	344	490
Bills in conference	..	1	1
Bills through conference	14	44	58
Measures passed, total	1,325	1,597	..
Senate bills	574	361	..
House bills	566	966	..
Senate joint resolutions	22	16	..
House joint resolutions	20	24	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	25	18	..
House concurrent resolutions	21	25	..
Simple resolutions	97	187	284
Measures reported, total	*1,426	*1,528	..
Senate bills	626	215	..
House bills	571	1,099	..
Senate joint resolutions	27	7	..
House joint resolutions	20	33	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	28	9	..
House concurrent resolutions	21	17	..
Simple resolutions	133	148	281
Special reports	28	44	..
Conference reports	..	60	..
Reported measures not acted on	**22	**79	..
Measures introduced, total	3,070	8,844	11,914
Bills	2,759	7,869	10,628
Joint resolutions	104	436	540
Concurrent resolutions	58	196	254
Simple resolutions	149	343	492

SECOND SESSION

January 3 through July 27, 1956

	Senate	House	Total
Days in session	119	118	..
Time in session	801 hrs., 42′	465 hrs., 57′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	8,489	5,471	13,960
Appendix	..	..	6,012
Public bills enacted into law	131	330	461
Private bills enacted into law	76	263	339
Bills in conference	1	1	2
Bills through conference	20	57	77
Measures passed, total	1,555	1,236	..
Senate bills	585	295	..
House bills	685	596	..
Senate joint resolutions	28	24	..
House joint resolutions	70	78	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	21	19	..
House concurrent resolutions	33	33	..
Simple resolutions	133	191	324
Measures reported, total	*1,627	*1,170	..
Senate bills	629	243	..
House bills	680	640	..
Senate joint resolutions	39	12	..
House joint resolutions	59	85	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	19	14	..
House concurrent resolutions	31	24	..
Simple resolutions	170	152	322
Special reports	60	79	..
Conference reports	..	79	..
Reported measures not acted on	**33	**87	..
Measures introduced, total	1,765	5,260	7,025
Bills	1,556	4,598	6,154
Joint resolutions	99	266	365
Concurrent resolutions	30	81	111
Simple resolutions	180	315	495

*These figures on measures reported include all placed on calendar or acted on by Senate even if there was no accompanying report. During the second session, 1,520 reports were filed in the Senate; a total of 1,328 were filed in the House.

**This figure does not agree with the total difference between bills reported and bills passed, because resolutions and bills placed on the House Calendar without having been formally reported were not included in figures of measures reported to the House; the difference in the case of Senate figures is due to uncounted bills "laid on the table" or "indefinitely postponed." These data include bills on calendar and in conference at the end of the first session.

FIRST SESSION

January 5 through August 2, 1955

	Senate	House	Total
Quorum calls	62	74	136
Yea-and-nay votes	88	73	161
Bills vetoed	5	6	11
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 5 through August 2, 1955

Postmaster nominations, totaling 1,490, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,131
Withdrawn	12
Rejected	3
Unconfirmed	344
Army nominations, totaling 5,805, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,804
Unconfirmed	1
Air Force nominations, totaling 3,910, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,594
Unconfirmed	316
Navy nominations, totaling 16,496, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	16,432
Unconfirmed	64
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 11,256, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	11,256
Civilian nominations other than postmasters, totaling 1,729, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,680
Withdrawn	3
Unconfirmed	46

Summary

Total nominations received	40,686
Total withdrawn	15
Total rejected	3
Total unconfirmed	771
Total confirmed	39,897

SECOND SESSION

January 3 through July 27, 1956

	Senate	House	Total
Quorum calls	94	58	..
Yea-and-nay votes	136	74	..
Bills vetoed	2	7	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 3 through July 27, 1956

Postmaster nominations, totaling 1,902, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,252
Withdrawn	22
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	628
Army nominations, totaling 8,425, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	8,425
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Air Force nominations, totaling 6,217, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	6,217
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Navy nominations, totaling 18,471, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	18,437
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	34
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 5,534, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	5,534
Withdrawn	None
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	None
Civilian nominations other than postmasters, totaling 2,938, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	2,932
Withdrawn	1
Rejected	None
Unconfirmed	5

Summary

Total nominations received	43,487
Total withdrawn	23
Total rejected	None
Total unconfirmed	667
Total confirmed	42,797

TABLE OF APPROPRIATION BILLS, EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Public law			Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to date
		Budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	Date approved	Amount as approved	Law No.	
	1956 APPROPRIATIONS														
H. R. 9063	Urgent Deficiency, 1956	$64, 505, 201	Feb. 3	$61. 504, 201	Feb. 7	$64, 670, 201	$64, 505, 201	Feb. 8	$70, 195, 066	Feb. 10	$65, 695, 066	Feb. 14	$65, 695, 066	406	+$1, 189, 865
H. R. 10004	Second Supplemental	835, 902, 923	Mar. 15	795, 743, 823	Mar. 21	795, 768, 823	878, 136, 527	Apr. 11	858, 864, 176	Apr. 12	838, 864, 176	May 19	852, 414, 896	533	−25, 721, 631
H. J. Res. 582	Labor		Mar. 15		Mar. 15			Mar. 15		Mar. 15		Mar. 19		432	
	1957 APPROPRIATIONS														
	SUPPLEMENTAL														
H. R. 12138	First Supplemental	1, 222, 849, 525	July 7	1, 555, 535, 425	July 12	1, 555, 589, 275	1, 254, 364, 525	July 14	1, 722, 089, 675	July 16	1, 724, 639, 675	July 27	1, 691, 341, 875	814	+436, 977, 350
H. R. 12350	Second Supplemental	1, 912, 095, 000	July 20	2, 341, 895, 000	July 24	1, 941, 895, 000	2, 365, 553, 038	July 21	2, 311, 391, 438	July 25	2, 316, 142, 438		2, 257, 729, 438		−107, 823, 600
H. J. Res. 671	Temporary		July 2		July 2					July 2		July 3		658	
	Regular														
H. R. 9064	Treasury, Post Office	3, 649, 872, 000	Feb. 3	3, 618, 699, 000	Feb. 7	3, 618, 699, 000	3, 649, 872, 000	Mar. 6	3, 639, 579, 000	Mar. 7	3, 639, 579, 000	Apr. 2	3, 629, 139, 000	467	−20, 733, 000
H. R. 9390	Interior	426, 748, 200	Feb. 17	415, 963, 200	Feb. 21	415, 963, 200	435, 142, 300	Apr. 17	433, 851, 400	Apr. 23	433, 876, 400	June 13	423, 934, 100	573	−11, 208, 200
H. R. 9536	General Government	15, 014, 475	Feb. 27	14, 849, 275	Mar. 1	14, 849, 275	15, 014, 475	May 24	14, 969, 975	June 6	14, 969, 975	June 13	14, 969, 975	578	−44, 500
H. R. 9720	Labor-HEW	2, 363, 648, 400	Mar. 2	2, 296, 810, 781	Mar. 5	2, 296, 981, 781	2, 363, 885, 400	June 1	2, 372, 023, 281	June 5	2, 372, 523, 281	June 29	2, 366, 380, 781	635	+2, 495, 381
H. R. 9739	Independent Offices	5, 783, 704, 000	Mar. 2	6, 005, 157, 260	Mar. 7	6, 010, 543, 290	5, 783, 704, 000	May 24	5, 916, 997, 258	June 6	5, 925, 187, 646	June 27	5, 966, 517, 826	623	+182, 813, 826
H. R. 10003	District of Columbia	(182, 899, 500)	Mar. 15	(179, 797, 800)	Mar. 19	(179, 797, 800)	(182, 899, 500)	June 1	(181, 682, 050)	June 5	(181, 687, 490)	June 29	(181, 612, 490)	637	(−1, 287, 010)
	Federal Payment	22, 358, 650		22, 358, 650		22, 358, 650	22, 358, 650		22, 708, 650		22, 708, 650		22, 558, 650		+200, 000
H. R. 10721	State, Justice, Judiciary	598, 169, 820	Apr. 20	541, 367, 372	Apr. 25	541, 367, 372	599, 104, 820	May 21	556, 271, 517	May 25	556, 271, 517	June 19	548, 930, 957	603	−50, 173, 863
H. R. 10899	Commerce	1, 522, 673, 000	Apr. 27	1, 382, 003, 000	May 2	1, 382, 003, 000	1, 522, 673, 000	May 23	1, 445, 566, 000	May 31	1, 446, 316, 000	June 19	1, 416, 732, 000	604	−105, 941, 000
H. R. 10986	Defense	34, 147, 850, 000	May 3	33, 635, 066, 000	May 10	33, 635, 066, 000	34, 147, 850, 000	June 18	34, 983, 734, 000	June 26	34, 783, 734, 000	July 2	34, 656, 727, 000	639	+508, 877, 000
H. R. 11177	Agriculture	1, 987, 302, 268	May 11	1, 983, 512, 568	May 14	1, 983, 512, 568	1, 989, 841, 668	May 18	2, 016, 771, 068	May 22	2, 018, 331, 068	June 4	1, 993, 744, 968	554	+3, 903, 300
H. R. 11319	Public Works	818, 501, 000	May 21	787, 453, 000	May 22	790, 758, 000	818, 501, 000	June 8	871, 886, 000	June 13	872, 186, 000	July 2	856, 727, 000	641	+38, 226, 000
H. R. 11473	Legislative	93, 664, 903	May 24	89, 376, 450	May 29	89, 376, 450	122, 496, 933	June 14	117, 804, 058	June 18	117, 804, 058	June 27	117, 804, 058	624	−4, 692, 875
	Total (regular)	51, 429, 506, 716		50, 792, 616, 556		50, 801, 478, 586	51, 470, 444, 246		52, 392, 162, 207		52, 203, 487, 595		52, 014, 166, 315		+543, 722, 069
	FOREIGN AID														
H. R. 12130	Mutual Security	4, 859, 975, 000	July 6	3, 425, 120, 000	July 11	3, 425, 120, 000	4, 859, 975, 000	July 14	4, 105, 420, 000	July 24	4, 110, 920, 000		3, 766, 570, 000		−1, 093, 405, 000
	Total (Regular and Foreign Aid)	56, 289, 481, 716		54, 217, 736, 556		54, 226, 598, 586	56, 330, 419, 246		56, 497, 582, 207		56, 314, 407, 595		55, 780, 736, 315		−549, 682, 931

RECAPITULATION FOR SESSION

	Estimates	Amount appropriated	Increase or decrease
Total 1956 Supplemental	$942, 641, 728	$918, 109, 962	−$24, 531, 766
Total 1957 Supplemental	3, 619, 917, 563	3, 949, 071, 313	+329, 153, 750
Total 1957 Regular and Foreign Aid	56, 330, 419, 246	55, 780, 736, 315	−549, 682, 931
Grand total	60, 892, 978, 537	60, 647, 917, 590	−245, 060, 947

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Monday, August 20, 1956. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

The Battle That Set Us Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Battle That Set Us Free."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE THAT SET US FREE

(By Samuel Eliot Morison)

On a bright September day in 1944, United States Coast Guard Cutter *Campbell* was standing out of Hampton Roads by the swept channel through the minefield. I was on board, a Johnny-come-lately in the Naval Reserve, attached to the staff of Capt. W. A. P. Martin, USN, the escort commander.

As a maritime historian, I am always thrilled at entering or leaving Hampton Roads. There passes through my mind a pageant of sail, from the visit of the first Spaniards to the engagement that marked the finish of the sailing Navy three centuries later. So, when Cape Henry was falling low under the western horizon, I stepped to the starboard side of the bridge and saluted.

"What's this all about?" said Captain Martin.

"I'm saluting the ghosts of Frenchmen."

"What Frenchmen?"

"About 50 sailors in the fleet of the Comte de Grasse, who were killed here in battle and buried at sea—our convoy must be right over their bones now."

"What in heaven's name were they doing here?"

"Fighting for the glory of France and for American independence," said I. "If de Grasse hadn't won that fleet action, Cornwallis would not have surrendered and America would not have won her independence—at least not when she did."

"Well, tell me about it as soon as we are in blue water," said the captain.

And I did.

Here is the story that I told my friend, Captain Martin, at sea, and which I have had 10 years to check upon and correct from innumerable books, old ships' logs, and the naval archives of three countries.

The winter of 1780–81 was the darkest period of the war for the American cause. The British held beachheads at Castine, Maine, New York City, Charleston, S. C., and Savannah, Ga. Washington was stalemated on the Hudson, too weak to attack the British force holding New York City. Army desertions were numerous; the States provided reinforcements solwly and reluctantly. Washington could spare only 1,000 troops to protect the Carolinas, where Lord Cornwallis was marching northward to Virginia, receiving plenty of help from the Carolina loyalists.

Rochambeau's French expeditionary force of 6,700 men, protected by a small French naval squadron, had been at Newport, R. I., since July 1780. But it was accomplishing nothing except to amuse the local damsels and enrich the Rhode Island farmers, because there was nothing it could do while the British fleet had naval superiority off our coast.

"Without a decisive naval force," Washington wrote to Lafayette about this time, "we can do nothing definitive; and with it, everything honorable and glorious."

And where, you will ask, was the United States Navy? Part of our fleet had been sunk or captured when the British took Charleston, the year before. John Paul Jones, John Barry, and a few other intrepid captains were destroying British commerce in European waters. And, of course, there were the privateers. But all that added up to something less, in effectiveness, than the South Korean Navy in the recent Korean war. There was no hope for the United States winning independence unless we obtained the aid of a powerful fleet of capital ships to defeat the British Navy off our coasts. And that we got in 1781, thanks to France, and France alone.

In the spring of 1781 there began a series of military and naval movements which, before the end of the year, resulted in the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown. That decisive event, which caused the fall of George III's ministry and forced him to sue for peace, was brought about almost entirely by seapower.

The capital ship in that era of sailing navies was the line-of-battle ship, or 74, of which the British Navy had 120, the French 42, and the United States none. She was 170 to 190 feet long, mounted on three decks, 74 guns on the average, and carried 600 to 700 officers, sailors, and marines. The battle line was formed by a fleet of these 74's sailing in single file about 500 feet apart. Standard tactics were to sail parallel to the enemy's battleline and pound it to pieces.

Next most powerful ship was the frigate. Around 140 feet long, she mounted 40 to 50 guns on 2 decks. Frigates were used as scouts or to escort a convoy. During a battle between 2 lines of 74's, the frigates hung around to pick on a dismasted enemy ship or lend a hand generally. The sloop of war, smallest of the fighting ships, had only one deck of guns. Like the 74's and frigates, she was ship-rigged—square sails on all three masts.

There was no sense in trying to camouflage the hull of a sailing ship, with its towering masts in plain sight. Topsides were painted gay colors. Green, yellow, or blue stripes accented the gun decks; bulwarks and gun ports were a contrasting color, often bright red. A fleet of these ships sailing offshore, yards braced sharp and heeling to the trade wind, white sails and the nervous tracery of rigging standing out against the sky, presented a noble maritime spectacle that has passed from us forever.

Life on board those ships was tough. Seamen of that day slep in hammocks which were rolled into tight packages every morning and stowed in nettings on the bulwarks, so that they might help to stop a cannon ball. The seaman's food was terrible: Salt beef and pork, dried peas, hardtack, and dumplings boiled in vats with the meat. The sailor got his food in a mess kit, a wooden bowl which he cleaned by polishing off the food with his fingers or his sheath knife. His water was carried in wooden casks, and it often went foul. One cask broached on deck was the "scuttle butt" where he could drink from a tin dipper, favorite skating ground for microbes, so that if one man got influenza, all on board took it. Rum was served out regularly in the diluted form of grog.

After 6 weeks at sea, scurvy was expected to break out, and usually did. An English naval surgeon who made a careful count of the losses in 20 British line-of-battle ships, during 1781, reported that their total complement was 12,109 men. Only 59 were killed in battle or died of wounds, but 1,518 died of disease and 350 more were sent home disabled, mostly by illness.

Conditions were no better in the French Navy, but its ships were newer and better

than the British, and their sailors were better trained. And the French had learned strategy; with their weaker fleet they aimed to be stronger than the enemy at the point of contact.

If you counted up all British and French warships in American waters in the summer of 1781, the British outnumbered the French almost as much as the Japanese outnumbered the Americans at the Battle of Midway. Yet De Grasse won, as Spruance and Fletcher won, because he directed his striking force at the one enemy fleet that really counted.

Rear Adm. François Joseph Paul, Comte de Grasse, came of an ancient Provençal family. He was a natural seaman and a thorough gentleman—"6 feet tall most days, 6 feet 6 on days of battle," his sailors used to say. In 1781, when he got into the campaign for American independence, he was 59 years old and had been 47 years in the navy. Departing Brest on March 22, with 20 line-of-battle ships and a suitable number of frigates, transports, and storeships, De Grasse made Martinique on April 29, a fair passage for those days.

After driving off a blockading squadron under Rear Admiral Sir Samuel Hood, he captured the island of St. Lucia from the British. Then, escorting a convoy of 200 merchantmen, he proceeded to Cap-Haïtien. More 74's awaited him, and there he arranged to take on board the French garrison of the colony of St. Domingue—now the Republic of Haiti—commanded by General the Marquis de Saint Simon.

While the British never had an actual overall war plan to defeat the United States, they did follow a general concept. That was to cut the Colonies in two along the Hudson River line; to occupy strategic places along the coast, but to stay out of the interior, where the redcoats were likely to get clobbered by embattled farmers.

Cornwallis, having reached Virginia, chose Yorktown on the deep, well-sheltered York River as his base. If he could suck Washington's army away from the Hudson and add this base on the Chesapeake to the many already held by Britain, the United States would be cut into three parts and the flow of supplies from France would be choked off. Sea power would stifle the rebellion.

But de Grasse was coming over from France to challenge seagoing Britannia. Well ahead of him, Commodore the Comte Barras de Saint-Laurent arrived at Newport on May 10, 1781, bringing reinforcements for the small French squadron already there. He brought dispatches from France for General Rochambeau, stating that de Grasse had orders to sail north from Haiti that summer with his fleet and 3,000 soldiers, and that the admiral was to decide at what point on the United States coast he would operate.

With that big news under his cocked hat, Rochambeau galloped through Rhode Island and Connecticut to meet Washington at Wethersfield, Conn., and decide what they would do about it. Both generals were keen to use the 10,000 or so troops at their disposal for a combined land and sea attack on New York City. But Washington, who had an amazing grasp of the strategic value of seapower, convinced the Frenchman that de Grasse must make the choice. As he put it, "The navy must have the casting vote. In any operation and under all circumstances a decisive naval superiority is to be considered as a fundamental principle, and the basis upon which every hope of success must ultimately depend."

This was Washington's long-awaited opportunity for a sustained offensive. He was not going to risk spoiling it by failure to concentrate all available forces, military and naval, French and American. There was no time to argue it out with de Grasse; they must accept his choice and cooperate with him.

Rochambeau send word of this decision to de Grasse by frigate *La Concorde*. He urged de Grasse to reply quickly as to where he proposed to strike, and begged him to bring all the French troops he could carry and all the hard money he could raise, as the French troops and Washington's were clamoring for their pay.

In the meantime, Rochambeau's army left Newport, marched across Connecticut, and joined Washington's forces at Dobb's Ferry.

De Grasse decided to make the Chesapeake his target. There was room in Hampton Roads for a fleet to maneuver, while at New York a British fleet was in a position to concentrate fire on his ships one at a time if they tried to pass through the narrows. On July 28 he dispatched La Concorde north with word of his decision and sent a frigate to Havana to obtain the wanted money.

One week later the grand French Fleet sailed from Cap-Haïtien. It carried 4,000 sailors of the St. Domingue garrison, and it was soon joined by the frigate bringing $240,000 in gold from Havana. The Spanish Governor there had collected the war chest—an enormous one for those days—by putting the heat on the merchants of Havana.

La Concorde, bearing de Grasse's message to Rochambeau and Washington, entered Newport Harbor on the 12th of August. From there a courier sped to White Plains headquarters with the news that the French Fleet was coming to the Chesapeake. That decided it; the allies began to ferry troops across the Hudson at King's Ferry.

Gen. Sir Henry Clinton, the British commander at New York, believed that they were aiming to attack that city via Staten Island, and to foster that delusion Washington left 4,000 troops behind, on the Hudson and in New Jersey. De Grasse's fleet was now off the coast of South Carolina, making best speed northward before the summer southwest breeze.

In contrast to this beautiful coordination between 2 French fleets and 3 armies—1 American and 2 French—the enemy was making a mess of his communications.

In the summer of 1781 the British had two fleets in American waters—the North American Fleet of Rear Adm. Thomas Graves, based at New York, and the West Indies Fleet, under the command of Rear Adm. Sir Samuel Hood. Hood sailed north to reinforce Graves, sending the sloop of war *Swallow* ahead to tell Graves that he was coming— and "for heaven's sake, watch out for de Grasse."

H. M. S. *Swallow* arrived in New York July 27 and found Graves gone. He was at sea, trying to intercept a French convoy bringing reinforcements to Rochambeau. *Swallow* put out to sea herself in hope of finding him, but the sloop was intercepted by four American privateers off Long Island, run ashore and burned.

Admiral Graves returned to New York on August 18. As the dispatches brought by the *Swallow* were now lost, he didn't know that de Grasse's fleet was coming north until 10 days later, when Hood arrived from the West Indies. Up to that time Graves foolishly assumed that the French would spend the summer at Havana.

It took Graves about 3 days after Hood's arrival to grasp the situation. Finally, on September 1, the combined British fleet sailed from New York, bound for the Chesapeake. Graves did not know that de Grasse had already entered the capes of the Chesapeake and anchored in Lynnhaven Roads; only that he was coming. But he did know that Barras had sailed from Newport on August 25 and suspected that he was aiming to combine his fleet with that of de Grasse, which was true.

With the British still in command of our coasts and blocking our harbors, the French and American armies had to walk all the way from the Hudson to the Chesapeake. Washington reached Philadelphia on the last day of August, ahead of his army. He knew that everything now depended on whether de Grasse could keep the British fleet out of the Chesapeake long enough to let American and French troops pin down Cornwallis at Yorktown. Very, very anxious, he wrote to Lafayette on September 2, "I am distressed beyond measure to know what has become of the Count de Grasse and for fear that the English fleet by occupying the Chesapeake * * * may frustrate all our flattering prospects in that quarter."

The general had reached Chester, Pa., on September 5, when he received news of de Grasse's arrival within the capes. In view of all we have read about Washington's unbending dignity, it is interesting to note that the French officer who brought the word said that he had never seen such expressive joy. "Washington acted like a child whose every wish had been gratified."

The presence of the French fleet and the troops it carried not only meant that Yorktown could be invested with superior force but that ships and boats would be at hand to float the armies down Chesapeake Bay. All depended, however, on whether the French could beat off the expected attack of the British fleet.

At the very moment that Washington was rejoicing over news that the French had arrived, the naval battle was being fought—the battle off the capes of the Chesapeake—which would decide the question of American independence.

The British fleet, 19 ships of the line, approached the capes at daybreak on September 5, 1781. Rear Adm. Thomas Graves wore his flag in H. M. S. *London* in the center. The rear division was under a flag officer with a great name, Sir Francis Drake. The van division was under Read Adm. Sir Samuel Hood, who became in later days a very distinguished admiral indeed. Graves, a by-the-book naval officer, was the senior, so he had tactical command, which was lucky for us.

At 8 o'clock on the morning of September 5, a French frigate scouting for de Grasse sighted the British Fleet bearing down before a light northeasterly wind. The frigate cracked on all sail to bring the news to de Grasse. The French were nearly caught flat-footed. Almost 2,000 officers and men of the fleet were absent with landing craft, setting ashore General St. Simon's troops, and there was no time to reembark them. The wind was foul and the tide on the flood. The tide was not due to turn until noon—earliest moment that a square rigger with a head wind could hope to clear the capes. Graves, whose foremost ship sighted the French at anchor at 9:30 a. m., let slip a wonderful opportunity to attack while the French were getting underway or beating out of the ship channel, closehauled and more or less in disorder. That is what Nelson would have done, and what Nelson did at the Battle of the Nile in 1798.

The French ships promptly heaved in short on their anchor cables—and what a job that

was with old-fashioned, walk-around capstans. Four seventy-fours and all the French frigates were assigned to stay behind to support Washington and to finish landing the troops. When the tide turned at noon, all the rest were ready to weigh anchor. A signal gun from the admiral's flagship, the Ville de Paris, marked the moment. Within 15 minutes every vessel had her anchors off the ground and her masts and yards clothed with lower courses, topsails, topgallant sails and royals. Superb seamanship, glorious sight.

These Frenchmen must have been fine ship handlers, even to get outside the capes. Full-rigged seventy-fours of that era could not sail nearer the wind than 6 points, 65 to 70 degrees. That meant they had to tack out through the 3-mile-wide channel in very flat zigs and zags, and every time they came about, there was the chance of missing stays, being caught aback and drifting ashore before the crew could get the ship under control.

I recall one ticklish moment "Up the Slot" in World War II, when a Japanese torpedo hit square in the fantail of our cruiser but failed to explode. It hung there for about 10 minutes, and then dropped off. The aviators quartered aft sent a delegation to the bridge to thank the chaplain. I'll bet every padre in the French fleet was thanked that September afternoon of 1781 after Ville de Paris, 11th in the French line, had weathered Cape Henry.

Admiral Hood begged Admiral Graves to attack the French ships while they were beating out, but the senior flag officer declined this opportunity in favor of the old-time parallel action between two battlelines. At 2:11 p. m., when Graves was closing the Middle Ground shoal between Cape Charles and Cape Henry, he ordered his fleet to wear ship and head east in reverse order of battle. The French van, commanded by Rear Admiral Bougainville, 3 miles to leeward, had just passed Cape Henry.

Here was Graves' chance to run down before the wind and beat up Bougainville befor the French center (de Grasse) and rear (de Monteil) could get into position to support him. Instead, the British admiral waited until the French center lay opposite his center. He wanted to attack ship to ship according to naval doctrine that had been laid down in the reign of Charles II.

Now the two fleets were standing out to sea on converging courses. Wind was about NNE and light. The British were sailing with wind abaft the beam, which enabled them to maneuver well. The French, braced sharp up, could not get any nearer the enemy. Each British ship was a cable's length ahead of the other, and in flagship *London* the signal "Line ahead" was flying—a Union Jack at the mainmast head. There was a big gap between Graves' center and Hood's rear division.

The French, too, had been unable as yet to form a perfect line. But the French, having 24 ships to the enemy's 19, were willing to let the British make the first aggressive move.

At 3: 46 Admiral Graves hoisted the signal, "Bear down and engage." If this order had been carried out promptly, Drake's van and Graves' center might have concentrated on Bougainville's van, while Hood bore down and engaged the French center before their rear could come up in support. But Graves' plan of attack was frustrated by two factors.

In the first place, Bougainville fooled the British. Instead of holding his luff and thus offering his 8 ships as target for the 13 under Drake and Graves, the Frenchman sheered off to leeward. Thus he allowed time for de Grasse's center to close him and de Grasse promptly formed a straight line on Bougainville. By the time the British attacked, Bougainville had the support of the whole French center, which included the biggest warship in the world, the *Ville de Paris*.

Secondly, when Admiral Graves bent on the signal, "Bear down and engage!" he kept the former signal "Line ahead" flying; and Hood thought, or pretended to think, that meant him. So Hood's rear division continued straight on its course instead of bearing down, and never got into the action.

Shooting began at 4:15. The 16 ships of Drake's van came down against the French in echelon, one at a time, affording splendid targets for fore and aft taking fire. As each British ship got within range of a Frenchman, she straightened out on a parallel course. For over 2 hours it was fire-away-Flanagan between these portions of the 2 fleets.

Drake's flagship *Princessa* sailed so close to Diamene that she set her on fire with gun wadding, and was about to grapple and board when Admiral Bougainville in Auguste came to Diademe's aid. Now the fire from Auguste and Diademe became so hot that Drake's *Princessa* hauled her wind and pulled out of the ruckus. The French, as was their custom, fired at the enemy's masts and sails with mitraille or langrage—iron bars and bolts chained together. The British concentrated their fire on decks and topsides—"between wind and water," as the old phrase is. They hoped to knock such big holes in the wooden walls that de Grasse, with no dockyard nearby, would lose a number of his ships.

Don't imagine that these old sailing warships didn't throw hardware. We have no statistics for this battle, but in an earlier one off Martinique in 1780, Admiral Rodney's flagship fired 3,288 rounds. Compare the Battle of Manila Bay in 1898, in which our flagship Olympia fired 1,300 rounds; or the action off Casablanca in 1942 when U. S. S. *Massachusetts* fired 788 rounds of 16-inch and U. S. S. *Brooklyn* 2,761 rounds of 6-inch ammunition. And we did not kill nearly so many men with our armor-piercing and high-explosive projects as Rodney and de Grasse did with their cannonballs, grapeshot and langrage.

At 6:30 darkness began to fall and all firing ceased. *Princessa's* mainmast was about to fall, *Terrible* was in a sinking condition, and three other British ships had been heavily damaged. Ninety British tars had been killed and 246 wounded. No French ship was so badly damaged that she could not be repaired at sea, and the total French casualties were 230, of whom about 75 were killed or died of wounds. The critical battle off the Capes of the Chesapeake was over. The French had won supremacy, provided they did not throw away victory by imprudence.

For 4 days de Grasse and Graves steered southeasterly to a position almost off Cape Hatteras, warily watching each other. The French admiral was leading the British away so that Barras' squadron, bringing siege artillery from Newport and making slow time, could slip into Chesapeake Bay. Graves fell for this ruse. He should have doubled back to engage Barras before he got inside the Capes. Apparently the reason he did not do so was an erroneous report from a scouting frigate that Barras was already there.

De Grasse was criticized for not renewing the battle, since his fleet was superior, but he was right not to risk losing the advantage he had won. The French had no dockyard nearer than Fort-de-France, Martinique, while the British had ample repair facilities in New York. There was no sense in de Grasse taking risks when he had the upper hand. He was not of the school of Admiral Halsey—rather, that of Admiral Spruance, who believes that enough is enough; if you have won your objective, why risk losing it by more aggressivness? And it was Spruance who, by following that maxim, won the great Battle of Midway and of the Philippine Sea.

On the evening of September 9, when de Grasse felt sufficient time had elapsed for Barras to arrive in Chesapeake Bay, he broke contact with Graves and squared away for the Capes. Two days later his fleet anchored in Hampton Roads. Barras was there, all right. Now the allies were masters of the bay.

Graves limped back to New York for repairs and upkeep. He lost two frigates en route, captured by two of de Grasse's frigates. In addition, H. M. S. *Terrible*, one of his biggest ships, had to be abandoned on the point of sinking. The top hamper of every vessel that had engaged was so badly cut up and the supply of spars in New York was so short that Graves could not sail again for over a month.

Let us return now to the land forces. Washington heard of the naval victory at Williamsburg, where he met Saint Simon and Lafayette, 10 days after the battle ended. He promptly sent a message to the French admiral by a small sailboat:

"I take particular satisfaction in felicitating your excellency on the glory of having driven the British fleet from the coasts, and taking two of their frigates; these happy events and the decided superiority of your fleet give us the happiest presages of the most compleat success in our combined operations on this bay."

De Grasse replied that he had already sent up the bay to Annapolis 6 ships with a troop capacity of 4,000. And he invited the general and staff to visit him. Washington, with Generals Knox and Lafayette, Governor Nelson, of Virginia, Col. Alexander Hamilton, and others of his staff, embarked at Hampton in the *Queen Charlotte*, a British prize recently taken by the French, and went on board flagship *Ville de Paris* on the 18th, in Lynnhaven Roads.

Fortunately Washington by this time was used to French manners, for he had no sooner climbed the ganway to the quarterdeck than the impetuous admiral embraced him warmly, addressing him as "Mon cher petit général." As Washington stood 6 feet 4 and De Grasse only 6 feet, the assembled officers restrained their laughter with difficulty, and jolly General Knox laughed aloud "till his fat sides shook."

After a dinner with toasts, each accompanied by a salvo of gunfire, some important business was done. De Grasse's orders required him to return to the West Indies not later than October 15. Washington was appalled. He did not see how he and Rochambeau, even with Saint Simon's reinforcements, could force Cornwallis to give up in less than 6 weeks. Siege operations in those days were protracted affairs, with deep trenches to be dug in creeping approach to enemy fortifications, all according to classic rules. If the French fleet left before these labors were over, Graves might return with reinforcements and raise the siege. So Washington begged De Grasse to stay on.

The admiral promised to stay, and to leave Saint Simon's troops ashore, too, until November 1. Washington thanked him warmly and departed the same evening for Williamsburg.

Toward the end of September De Grasse received a disquieting piece of false news, to the effect that Graves was on his way back to the Chesapeake, reinforced by 10 ships. Like all good sailors, De Grasse hated to ride idly at anchor, especially at a time when equinoctial gales were expected and ships might drag ashore. So he proposed to put out to sea and search for Graves, and if he didn't find him, take a crack at New York. Washington wrote him on the 25th, begging him not to do so, pointing out that he would risk all by leaving, but would assure victory over Cornwallis by staying. He sent Lafayette to present this letter in person, together with a plea from General Rochambeau. Again De Grasse agreed, but he begged Rochambeau to urge Washington to get on with the siege.

Washington needed no urging. His engineers had done their stuff, and the big

French siege guns, brought from Newport by Barras, had been sited around Yorktown. On September 28 the American and French troops made the first assault, driving the redcoats back to their inner fortifications. The attack on the inner defenses opened on October 9. The French Fleet lent fire support all the afternoon, and at night too. Their red-hot cannon balls destroyed the last British warships which were anchored on the York River.

On October 17th a British drummer under protection of a white flag appeared on a parapet of the British fortifications and beat a parley. An armistice was concluded, and on the morning of the 19th Lord Cornwallis signed the surrender. De Grasse sent hearty congratulations and was represented at the ceremony by Commodore Barras.

By deliberate tactics Washington had saved many lives. The French lost 60 killed and the Americans only 28 during the siege; the French had 193 wounded and the Americans 107. Cornwallis lost 156 killed and 326 wounded, and he surrendered 7,241 officers and men, 840 sailors of the Royal Navy, 24 colors, 214 pieces of artillery, 7,320 small arms, 457 horses, 40 vessels in good condition, and 11,000 hard dollars.

On the very day of surrender, the repaired British Fleet sailed from New York, escorting transports carrying 7,000 troops to reinforce Cornwallis. En route, Graves heard the bad news from scouting frigates; he turned back to New York.

In his General Orders of October 20th Washington expressed in glowing language his gratitude to the French for their aid on land and sea; especially to the fleet, "the most numerous and powerful that ever appeared in these seas, commanded by an admiral whose fortune and talents ensure great events." And before the end of the month Thomas McKean, president of Congress, wrote to the French admiral: "Your whole conduct justly endears you to us, and entitles you to every mark of honor that we can possibly confer upon you."

Fickle fortune soon reversed the roles of some of the naval contestants. De Grasse lost the next big battle, off Les Saintes in the West Indies, on April 12, 1782. Bougainville on that occasion acted much as Hood had off the capes of the Chesapeake; he failed to support his commander; while Hood, having learned a lesson, followed Admiral Rodney closely. The Ville de Paris was cut off and surrounded, and de Grasse was forced to strike his flag after losing half the crew. He put up such a stout fight that as a prisoner he became quite a hero in England, but after the war was over he was ignored by Louis XVI.

Admiral Graves never recovered from his defeat in 1781, but Admiral Hood went on to a brilliant career in the war of the French Revolution. And Lord Cornwallis became a great Governor-General of India.

Washington, as we know, went from strength to strength. Yet he knew well, and never denied, that without that French naval victory off the capes of the Chesapeake, history would have more probably recorded not a surrender of Cornwallis but a surrender of Washington.

Work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress comes to a close it is well to take stock of its accomplishments. In the field of foreign affairs much has been done by the Congress to enable the United States to give those charged with the responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs the money, the authority, the flexibility, and the tools with which to make progress in the complicated field of international relations. In this legislative process the House Foreign Affairs Committee has played an important part.

I want to pay tribute to the hard-working, conscientious, and able members of the committee who worked tirelessly together in a true spirit of bipartisanship to enable the committee to complete one of the heaviest workloads in its long history. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and as one who is about to depart from this body into private life, I can only look back at my work on the committee with profound satisfaction. Above all, I can say without hesitation that without the hard work and wholehearted cooperation of each and every member of the committee, both on the majority and minority side, the great accomplishments of the committee would never have been achieved. I can truly say that the legislation which emerges from the House Foreign Affairs Committee is legislation which has been very carefully considered and very carefully drafted by the committee, with only one goal in mind, the security and the welfare of our Nation and of our people at a minimum cost to the taxpayer.

I also want to pay tribute to Boyd Crawford, the head of our committee staff, and to the others who have worked so well and faithfully under him—our staff consultants, Roy Bullock, Albert Westphal, and Sheldon Kaplan, and our staff assistants, June Nigh, Winifred Osborne, Helen Mattas, Myrtie Melvin, Helen Hashagen, and Louise O'Brien. They have earned and evoked my admiration and appreciation, as well as my personal friendship, by their consistent and sustained efforts on behalf of the committee. I do not believe there is another committee on Capitol Hill which has a better qualified staff. It has been the constant aim of the committee only to employ people who can deliver the goods. The long tenure of the staff is evidence that our high standards and care in selection have paid off in terms of efficiency and dependable service.

The work of the committee has grown by leaps and bounds. This is apparent from the comparison of funds involved in legislation considered. For example, during the 73d Congress the amount of money involved in public bills before the committee was $102,000, whereas the approximate total authorization considered by the committee, passed by the House, and enacted into law during the 84th Congress alone was $7,222,975,174.

The tremendous workload in the committee is readily obvious from a review of the following statistical record of committee activities during the 84th Congress:

Statistical record, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 84th Cong.

Number of consultative subcommittees	8
Number of special legislative subcommittees	7
Number of conference committees	4
Number of meetings of conference committees	5
Number of bills and joint resolutions referred to the committee	166
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions referred to committee	157
Number of bills and joint resolutions considered by the committee	58
Number of bills and joint resolutions reported favorably	39
Number of bills and joint resolutions favorably reported by committee and passed by House	37
Number of bills and joint resolutions enacted into law	32
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions considered by committee	23
Number of simple and concurrent resolutions reported and acted upon by the House	10
Number of hearings (open and executive)	229
Number of pages of printed hearings	2,282
Number of pages of reports	982
Number of witnesses	348
Number of witness appearances before committee	482
Number of meetings with Rules Committee	13
Number of committee reports:	
Reports on legislation	48
Minority reports on legislation	3
Conference reports	4
Special reports	7
Total	62
Number of messages from the President and executive communications referred to the committee	40
Number of House documents referred to the committee	29
Number of memorials and petitions referred to the committee	104
Number of reports requested from Government departments and agencies on legislation referred to the committee	87
Approximate number of pages in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of House consideration on bills and resolutions reported by committee	480
Number of Members sponsoring measures referred to the committee	169

Time spent in sessions:

By committee: Executive 193 hours, 25 minutes; open 92 hours, 5 minutes.

By subcommittees: Executive, 51 hours, 14 minutes; open, 41 hours, 50 minutes.

Total: 376 hours, 6 minutes.

One point I wish to emphasize is that the committee has been very much aware of the fact that foreign affairs legislation is a matter of deep concern to the American people and that the public is entitled to as much information as can be made available without impairing the security of our country. In this connection, the committee has made a special point of publishing transcripts of executive session meetings after deletion of testimony involving matters relating to national security. It has also been the chairman's practice after executive session meetings to give the press a digest of information received or action taken during the meeting, carefully omitting references involving matters affecting the national security.

Within the next few weeks a detailed survey of the committee's accomplishments and activities during the 84th Congress will be made available to the public in printed form. The idea of compiling a documented survey of the activities of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was

conceived during the 1st session of the 81st Congress. At the close of each Congress since that time the committee has published a survey of its activities.

For the benefit of the Members of the House who may wish to have a ready reference at this time to the committee's activities, there follows a summary of the legislative measures on which the committee completed its action during this Congress:

MEASURES ENACTED INTO LAW

FORMOSA

This act authorizes the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related possessions and territories of that area; approved January 29, 1955, Public Law 4.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mutual Security Act of 1955: This act authorized not to exceed $3,280,800,000 for the mutual security program through fiscal year 1955; approved July 8, 1955, Public Law 138.

Mutual Security Act of 1956: This act extended the mutual security program through fiscal year 1956 and authorized not to exceed $3,927,575,000 for carrying out the program; approved July 18, 1956, Public Law 726.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

This act provides for distribution to American claimants of $41 million available in the United States for payment of claims against Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, the Soviet Union, and Italy. Utilizes existing claims adjudication organization at no cost to American taxpayer. Administrative expenses are to be met from funds available for distribution; approved August 9, 1955, Public Law 285.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Strengthening the State Department: This act increases the number of top-level statutory positions in the Department of State by three officers at the level of Deputy Under Secretary of State; provides for the rank of career ambassador as the highest class of Foreign Service officer; and permits computations for retirement purposes upon the actual salary received by an officer; approved August 5, 1955, Public Law 250.

Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1955: This act enables the Department of State to continue the integration of its personnel into the Foreign Service Officer Corps, as has been recommended by several independent committees appointed to study the State Department personnel and organization.

Establishes a home transfer allowance; permits the Department to defray part of the cost of education of children of Foreign Service officers when living abroad; provides for medical examinations, inoculations, and vaccinations for dependents of Foreign Service officers; makes Foreign Service and Reserve officers eligible to receive hardship post differentials like those paid staff officers and employees and civilian personnel of other Government agencies stationed abroad; approved April 5, 1955, Public Law 22.

Foreign Service Act amendments of 1956: This act, like Public Law 22 and Public Law 250 of the first session, continues the program started in 1954 by the Department of State to strengthen the Foreign Service and to improve its overall administration so that qualified individuals will find career incentives in the Foreign Service; approved July 28, 1956, Public Law 828.

Providing certain basic authority for the Department of State: By this act the Department of State was given basic authority for certain housekeeping activities which, in the main, have heretofore been contained in annual State Department appropriation acts. Waiting signature by the President.

Foreign Service annuities: This law provides for a $324 increase for about 250 retired Foreign Service officers and widows. It also makes an adjustment in some annuities similar to the cost-of-living increase already provided for a comparable group of retired civil service employees. The bill also provides relief through grants, not exceeding $100 a month, to widows living in impoverished circumstances who are not eligible for annuities; approved May 1, 1956, Public Law 503.

Repeal of consular fee stamp requirement: This act repeals the requirement for adhesive official stamps to be affixed by consular officers abroad when any consular or notarial act is performed. Elimination of this stamp dispenses with an obsolete and costly procedure and permits the Department of State to conduct certain of its functions in a more efficient and businesslike manner; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 101.

Service charge: This law repeals service charge for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State. Permits the Department to charge for such services at a rate commensurate with cost; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 102.

Protection of United States officials and distinguished foreign visitors: This act authorizes certain security officers of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms for the protection of United States officials at international conferences and distinguished foreign visitors to the United States; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 104.

AMENDING THE UNITED STATES' INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACT OF 1948

The purpose of this act is to prevent exchange visitors from using the exchange visitors program as an avenue to immigration to the United States. It is designed to prevent these exchange visitors in American institutions and organizations from regarding training experience provided under exchange regulations as preparation for permanent employment in the United States; approved June 4, 1956, Public Law 555.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

This law amends an act of August 5, 1953, to give more flexibility to the Commission in its plans for a suitable memorial in the Philippines to the Filipinos and Americans who fought there during World War II. It permits the Commission to accept public and private gifts and carries an authorization of not more than $100,000 for the expenses of the Commission. Also it permits the Commission to contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment inside and outside the United States and to engage the services of architects and other personnel; approved August 9, 1955, Public Law 298.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF THE AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

This act amends the American Battle Monuments Commission's basic legislation by repealing outmoded provisions, and streamlining and improving the Commission's functions and responsibilities with resepect to military cemeteries in which our American war dead are interred in foreign countries; approved July 25, 1956, Public Law 792.

RELINQUISHMENT OF UNITED STATES CONSULAR JURISDICTION IN MOROCCO

This law authorizes the President, at such time as he considers appropriate, to relinquish the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco. It also repeals various statutes implementing the treaties which have permitted the United States to exercise extraterritorial jurisdiction in Morocco. Waiting signature by the President.

PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN LOSSES AND DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES DURING WORLD WAR II (VATICAN CLAIMS)

This act authorizes the payment of $964,199.35 for damages sustained by the Papal Domain Castel Gandolfo, which was accidentally damaged by bombs dropped from United States planes during attacks upon military targets in close proximity thereto during hostilities against German armed forces in World War II; approved July 3, 1956, Public Law 656.

PASSAMAQUODDY INTERNATIONAL TIDAL POWER PROJECT

This law authorizes not to exceed $3 million for the purpose of making a final survey to determine the feasibility of construction of a tidal power project in Passamaquoddy Bay for the generation of hydroelectric power, its cost, and whether the project is in the interest of national economy and national defense; approved January 31, 1956, Public Law 401.

PASSPORT FEES

This act authorizes an increase from $1 to $3 in the passport fee collected by clerks of State courts when executing passport applications; approved February 10, 1956, Public Law 403.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES ACROSS CANADIAN AND MEXICAN BOUNDARIES

Bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn.; approved June 16, 1955, Public Law 79.

Bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 98.

Bridge across the Rio Grande at Rio Grande City, Tex.; approved June 28, 1955, Public Law 100.

Bridge across the St. Croix River between Calais, Maine, and St. Stephen, New Brunswick, Canada; approved July 28, 1955, Public Law 184.

Bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near city of Ogdensburg, N. Y.; approved May 18, 1956, Public Law 529.

Bridge across the St. Marys River in or near city of Sault St. Marie, Mich.; approved May 18, 1956, Public Law 530.

Bridge between Lubec, Maine, and Campobello Island, New Brunswick, Canada; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 687.

Bridge over Niagara River between Buffalo, N. Y., and Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 824.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

United States participation in Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs: This measure authorizes an increase in the United States contribution for the support of the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs from $2,333 to $8,658 per year. It also authorizes an appropriation of $44,975 to pay the increased contribution for fiscal year 1957 and the increased amount for the period since April 1, 1950; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 680.

Participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization: This act authorizes the continued participation by the United States in the North Atlantic Treaty Parliamentary Conference as well as a continuing appropriation to finance such participation; approved July 11, 1956, Public Law 689.

Participation in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood: This act increases from $10,000 to $25,000 the authorization of the amount which may be appropriated to meet annual contributions of the United States to the regular budget of the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood, a specialized agency of the Organization of American States; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 816.

Invitation to World Health Organization to hold 11th World Health Assembly in the United States: This measure authorizes an appropriation of not to exceed $400,000 in order to defray the expenses incident to organizing and holding the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; approved July 30, 1956, Public Law 832.

INTERNATIONAL GAMES AND FAIRS

Cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals: This act authorizes the United States to continue the program which it has carried on for the past 2 years of participating in foreign trade fairs in various parts of the world and of underwriting certain expenses of sending United States musicians, theatrical performers, and athletes to other countries. The program has been financed for 2 years by the President's Emergency Fund for International Affairs. This measure recognizes the importance and demonstrated success of this program and provides formal authorization for its continuation. Waiting signature by the President.

Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif., 1960: Gives official United States sanction to the extension of an invitation by the United States Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif. No expense to the United States Government is involved. The last games were held in the United States in 1943; approved June 13, 1955, Public Law 69.

Pan-American games, Cleveland, Ohio: Authorizes an appropriation of $5 million to be available for the purposes of promoting and insuring the success of the Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959; approved July 30, 1956, Public Law 833.

United States World Trade Fair and the Oklahoma Semicentennial Celebration: Authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, 1957, and in the Oklahoma Semicentennial Celebration to be held in various communities of Oklahoma, 1957. No expense to the United States Government is involved; approved July 27, 1956, Public Law 815.

AUTHORIZING HON. BARRATT O'HARA, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA

Authorizes the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA, Representative from the State of Illinois, to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fulgencio Batistá y Zaldivar. Waiting signature by the President.

CONCURRENT AND HOUSE RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE AND ADOPTED

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 109

Authorized appointment of seven delegates by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and by the President of the Senate to meet jointly with representative parliamentary groups from other NATO members at a conference in Paris in July 1955.

Passed House under suspension of rules June 20, 1955; passed Senate July 1, 1955.

OPPOSITION TO COLONIALISM AND COMMUNIST IMPERIALISM, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 149

Expresses the sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 23, 1955; passed Senate July 14, 1955.

STRENGTHENING THE PEACE, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 157

Congress hereby expresses the fundamental desire and hopes of the American people for peace and calls upon other nations to renew efforts to strengthen the peace.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, June 14, 1955; passed Senate June 17, 1955.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO PAKISTAN, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 223

Extends the greetings of the United States Congress to the National Assembly and to the people of Pakistan upon the occasion of Pakistan's inauguration as a republic on March 23, 1956.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, March 20, 1956; passed Senate, unanimous-consent proceedings, March 21, 1956.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS ON OCCASION OF ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 232

Extends the greetings and expresses the appreciation of the United States Congress to the American National Red Cross on the occasion of its 75th anniversary.

Passed House, consent calendar proceedings, May 7, 1956; passed Senate June 6, 1956.

OPPOSING ADMISSION OF THE COMMUNIST REGIME IN CHINA IN THE UNITED NATIONS, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 265

Reiterates the opposition of the House of Representatives to the seating of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies and supports the President in his expressed determination to prevent such representation.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1956; passed Senate July 23, 1956.

CONTINUING THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL INJUSTICES IN THE WORLD, HOUSE RESOLUTION 370

Expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that it shall continue to be the policy of our Government to bring about the reunification of the peoples of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam; declares the sense of the House that it shall be the policy of our Government to bring about the entrance of Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Vietnam into the United Nations; and declares that the policy of the United States Government shall continue to be in support of the peaceful achievement of freedom and independence by the peoples now under Soviet and Chinese Communist bondage.

Passed House under suspension of rules, April 16, 1956.

EXTENDING GREETINGS TO THE SUDAN, SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 70

Conveys the greetings of Congress to the Parliament of Sudan on the occasion of the independence of Sudan and the approval of its application by the Security Council for membership in the United Nations. The resolution also reaffirms the friendship of the United States for the people of the Sudan.

Passed Senate March 19, 1956, passed House, Consent Calendar proceedings, May 7, 1956.

MEASURES REPORTED AND PASSED BY HOUSE BUT NOT FINALLY ACTED UPON IN SENATE

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE KINGDOM OF GREECE, H. R. 12358

Authorizes the Honorable WAYNE L. HAYS, Representative from the State of Ohio, the Honorable WALTER H. JUDD, Representative from the State of Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN J. ROONEY, Representative from the State of New York, and the Honorable JOHN TABER, Representative from the State of New York, to accept the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

Passed House July 23, 1956, unanimous-consent proceedings, without committee action.

AUTHORIZING AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE AND CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCEPT AWARD TENDERED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY, H. R. 12408

Authorizes Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the Honorable JAMES G. FULTON, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, to accept and wear the award of the Order Al Merito della Repubblica Itáliana tendered by the Government of the Republic of Italy.

Passed House July 25, 1956, unanimous-consent proceedings, without committee action.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 386

Calls upon the people of the world to join in protecting their continued right to worship and to practice their own spiritual beliefs.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1955.

URGING CREATION OF AN INTERNATIONAL JURIDICAL COMMISSION WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION, HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 668

Urges the President and the Secretary of State to take immediate steps to bring about the establishment of an International Juridical Commission within the framework of NATO. The Commission would fulfill four functions: First, document all available evidence on the crimes against humanity committed by the leaders of the international Communist conspiracy; second, prevent those individuals implicated in such crimes from purging themselves of guilt by passing all responsibility to former leaders of the conspiracy now deceased; third, prevent the conspiracy of communism from cloaking itself with unwarranted respectability; and fourth, reduce the dangers of a third world war.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 18, 1956.

MEMBERSHIP OF SPAIN IN NATO, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 127

Expresses the sense of the Congress that the President should take all proper and necessary steps to bring about an invitation to Spain to become a party to the North Atlantic Treaty and a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Passed House, unanimous-consent proceedings, July 14, 1955.

MEASURES REPORTED BUT NOT FAVORABLY ACTED UPON IN THE HOUSE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMUNIST AGGRESSION, HOUSE RESOLUTION 183

Requests the Secretary of State to take action to carry out certain recommendations of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression, contained in its report made at the close of the 83d Congress.

Reported to House, June 9, 1955.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO, H. R. 5894

Amends Public Law 565, 79th Congress, to permit acceptance by the United States National Commission of gifts or bequests of money, such gifts or bequests to be exempt from District of Columbia as well as Federal income, estate, and gift taxes.

Reported to House July 14, 1955; considered in House July 23, 1956, under suspension of the rules. Motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill defeated by voice vote.

UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP, HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 186

Membership in the United Nations for Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, the Republic of Korea, Laos, Libya, Nepal, Portugal, and Vietnam has been blocked by Soviet veto in the Security Council. It is the sense of this resolution that the United States should "exercise all possible influence in the United Nations to support these free and independent countries for membership in the United Nations."

Reported to House July 12, 1955; considered in House February 6, 1956, consent calendar proceedings. Motion adopted to have resolution laid on the table.

Health Issue an Attempt To Confuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln on the political hay certain Democrats are trying to make out of the health of President Eisenhower. The American people must question the motives of these persons who speak of the Presidents' disservice in seeking reelection and at the same time wax grave concern for his physical well being.

The Janus-like characteristics of Mr. Butler are as clear as the nose on his faces. The overwhelming reelection of President Eisenhower in November will be the answer by the American electorate of Butler's transparent and ill-advised attempts to deceive and confuse.

The article follows:

THE POLITICAL MILL

(By Gould Lincoln)

HEALTH ISSUE AN ATTEMPT TO CONFUSE

Democratic leaders assert with considerable finality that President Eisenhower's health is to be a major issue in the coming political presidential campaign. Democratic National Chairman Paul M. Butler still insists—as he has for 2 years—"there is a great possibility that President Eisenhower will not be on the Republican ticket" in November.

Of course, if this halfway prediction of Butler's should be correct, the President's health would cease to be a campaign issue. On the other hand, if Eisenhower remains on the ticket, as he now expects to do, and his health is good, the health issue is likely to dwindle away. The President has said his recent abdominal operation has done him good—not harm. His physicians say he should be in better shape than before that operation.

Everybody's health a gamble

Democrats argue that the President may become seriously ill again. To reelect him for another 4-year term would be a gamble. To elect any man President for a 4-year term is a gamble—so far as his health is concerned. To take a recent example, had the late Senator Taft of Ohio been elected President in 1952, instead of Eisenhower, the country would have found itself without a President and relying on a Vice President to carry on within the first year of a Taft term. Yet from a health point of view, Senator Taft had appeared indestructible.

In 1944 the country gambled on the health of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and reelected him. Yet within 3 months of the beginning of his new term he was dead. On the other hand, when it was proposed to nominate Roosevelt for President in 1932, there arose a clamor that he could not survive a 4-year term in the White House; that the infantile paralysis with which he suffered would carry him off. Medical experts clashed violently over this suggestion. Yet Roosevelt served three full terms in the White House and was elected for a fourth. In the last century, a tough old warrior, William Henry Harrison, was elected President. He became ill, due to exposure on the day of his inauguration, and died.

Health is a gamble. Woodrow Wilson, who seemed sound enough, was stricken during his second term in the White House and was incapacitated for a considerable period, although he finished out that term.

The other health charge made by the Democrats against President Eisenhower is that he will be only a part-time Chief Executive. That is not the President's conception. He would not seek reelection if he believed he could not serve effectively and fully. He himself believes that he will be able to carry on.

An effort to confuse people

In recent days, it has been charged by Senator MCNAMARA of Michigan, Democrat, that the President has been pushed by Republicans into running again, and that the true state of his health is being concealed from the people. It is a charge, as Senator KNOWLAND, Republican leader of the Senate, has said, against the personal integrity of President Eisenhower. Both during and after the President's heart attack last September the country was kept fully informed about the condition of the President. The President's press secretary, James C. Hagerty, saw to it. Members of the press, assigned to cover the President, knew it. When President Eisenhower, having fully recovered from the heart attack, was stricken with an intestinal illness, there was no hesitancy on the part of the White House and Hagerty to give all the facts regarding the President's condition as they developed. It is so today, as the President has made good progress during his convalescence.

Opponents of the President have charged, too, that his physicians have been motivated by politics in their statements regarding the President's condition. Where the politics has entered, it has come from those who make these charges. Their purpose obviously has been to confuse and to deceive the voters, to convince them that reelection of the President would be a disservice to the President and to the country. The concern for President Eisenhower, expressed at the same time by critics, has a mighty hollow sound.

Report to the People of Fourth Congressional District of Wisconsin—My Record and Votes on Major Issues in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with a policy which I have followed since first elected to the 81st Congress as a Member of the House of Representatives, I submit to the people of the fourth district a report on the major legislative actions of the 84th Congress.

There is no doubt in my mind that my record will not please each and every individual in the fourth district. Nevertheless, I want my constituency to know that I have followed the dictates of my conscience, and tried to represent our people to the best of my ability. The rest is a matter for their judgment.

THE 84TH CONGRESS

The Democrat-controlled 84th Congress—as the record shows—was a hard-working Congress. During the first session, which began on January 5, 1955, and ended August 2, 1955, the 84th Congress put more laws on the statute books than any other Congress in 5 years, and it had done so in less woring days than any recent Congress.

During the second session, which lasted from January 3, 1956, to July 27, 1956, the record was equally imposing. The overall accomplishments of our national legislature during the last 2 years show a keen sense of responsibility and concern for the public welfare.

Even more important than the record 2,878 bills approved by this Congress is the quality of its conduct—and here, the 84th Congress ranks very high. We must note that President Eisenhower's prediction about a cold war of partisan politics—which he said would develop if the Democrats would win the control of the 84th Congress—never materialized. As a matter of fact, the President repeatedly received more support from the Democrats in Congress on issues affecting the security and well-being of our Nation than he did from the members of his own political party.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

It is a matter of record that the Democratic majorities in the 84th Congress have shown a consistent determination to keep our country militarily strong. They opposed the administration's moves to cut back our airpower, to reduce the strength of the Marine Corps, and to curtail our military buildup. The administration claimed that these economy moves would not hamper our military aircraft procurement, but the opposite happened. Aircraft purchases were cut back, a 2-year delay occurred in the Air Force buildup, and the production of B–52 jet bombers fell to alarming levels.

In the meantime, Communist displays in Moscow revealed that the Reds made unsuspected progress in the development and production of jet bombers and fighters, and in other military equipment. In comparison, our airpower and military development were falling behind.

Bearing these facts in mind, the 84th Congress increased the administration's request for Air Force funds by $1.1 billion, expanded research facilities in aeronautics, enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for aircraft control and warning system. It also reorganized our military Reserves, forestalled Marine Corps manpower cuts, raised the officer strength of the Armed Forces by 60,000, and enacted a $1.4 billion naval construction program which included an atom-powered cruiser and a supercarrier.

INTERNAL SECURITY

While the Democrat-controlled 84th Congress was deply aware of its responsibility for the safety of our Nation, it could not condone the many politically motivated frauds perpetrated by the administration in the name of internal security.

A thorough, 14-month study led a congressional committee to conclude that the administration "deliberately compiles figures which are basically dishonest" about its security programs.

The committee showed, for instance, that the list of persons allegedly fired as security risks was replete with duplications, dead people, employees who transferred to other Government agencies, workers who resigned because of illness or to take private jobs, and with other gross errors. As a case in point, the committee reported that 750 alleged security riks could not be identified at all by the Federal agencies which supposedly employed and fired them, and another 646 were actually rehired by the Government.

Through its security program "numbers game," the administration rendered serious injustice to thousands of loyal Government workers whose reputations have been besmirched for the sake of political expediency.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Great changes took place in the world during the last 2 years. Under the impact of the "spirit of Geneva," the trend toward neutralism became apparent in many countries located on the fringe of the Communist empire. Collective security arrangements, embodied in NATO, SEATO, the Balkan Alliance, the Baghdad Pact, and in other defense treaties, began to lose cohesion and strength. At the same time, dissension and conflict flared in North Africa and in the Near East.

The 84th Congress followed the President's recommendations by approving the continuation of the mutual-security program in 1955; by extending for 3 years the President's authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements; by simplifying our customs laws; by approving various treaties, and in other ways. In this field, the Democratic support of President Eisenhower's recommendations consistently exceeded that which he received from his own party.

Unfortunately, these measures were insufficient to stem the apathy toward the Communist danger which was slowly spreading through the free world. New, dynamic programs are needed to meet the challenge of revised Communist tactics. The administration failed to provide this kind of leadership. Instead, it further confused our allies by contradictory positions on the subjects of neutrality, on colonialism, on trading with the Communists, and on other grave issues.

Disturbed by these developments, Congress sharply cut the 1956 mutual-security program funds, initiated a thorough review of our foreign policy, prohibited the administration from sending further military aid to Yugoslavia, and adopted a series of resolutions reaffirming its opposition to colonialism and to the admission of Red China to U. N.; supporting the right to self-determination of other peoples; urging that Spain be admitted to NATO; and stressing our determination to work for reunification of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and for the freedom and independence of the Communist-dominated nations.

GOOD GOVERNMENT

The 84th Congress adhered to the principle that good government requires fair treatment of Government employees. It increased the salaries of postal and other Federal employees to bring them more closely to the levels prevailing in the private sector of our economy, and liberalized retirement and various fringe benefits. Judicial, legislative, and executive salaries were also adjusted.

The administrative machinery of the Federal Government came under careful congressional scrutiny, and many improvements were put into effect. The authority of the President to submit reorganization plans was extended, and various recommendations of the Hoover Commission were implemented.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The long-range, dynamic highway program approved by the 84th Congress will provide our growing Nation with a network of safe, modern highways. In the next 13 years, the Federal Government will finance 90 percent of the cost of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System, at the same time continuing the policy of aiding local and State authorities in the construction of Federal-aid highways outside of that system.

In the field of taxation, the 84th Congress repealed the so-called Humphrey blooper—a provision of the Republican tax law which meant at least a billion dollar windfall profit for corporations; revised the formula for taxing the incomes of insurance companies to yield higher revenues; and extended existing excise tax schedules and the 52 percent corporate income tax.

An earnest attempt was made to lessen the burden of the individual taxpayer by granting a $20 tax credit. Unfortunately, opposed strenuously by the administration which only 2 years earlier pressed for and received tax cuts totaling $7.2 billion, and primarily benefitting large corporations, high-income people, and special cases, the average man's tax bill failed to clear the Senate.

In furthering balanced economic growth of our Nation, the 84th Congress

overrode the administration's opposition and raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour; approved a 4-year program to stimulate airport construction; extended the life of the Small Busuiness Administration and increased the revolving fund for loans to small business; strengthened our antimonopoly law and passed a law to curb the influence of large bank-holding companies.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

One of the most dramatic achievements of the 84th Congress was the enactment of new social-security amendments. These amendments contain the principles which I introduced and sponsored as early as 1953. They reduce the retirement age for women to age 62, and provide benefits to totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50. In addition, coverage was extended to 250,000 self-employed, professional people, and substantial improvements were made in programs aiding dependent children, the blind, the old, and the infirm.

The 84th Congress also enacted improved housing laws, providing special aid in this respect to our elderly citizens; approved dynamic, farsighted programs for medical and dental research, for the training of public health personnel, and for hospital construction; and passed several laws which are specifically designed to benefit our youth.

SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

In an effort to make our Military Establishment as effective as possible, and to remove certain inequities, Congress enacted a law to give our Nation a reserve manpower pool of 2.9 million by 1959; provided incentive pay increases for members of our Armed Forces; liberalized retirement benefits and social-security credits; overhauled the entire structure of survivors' benefits; extended medical care to military dependents, and granted educational assistance to children of World War II and Korean war veterans whose deaths were service-connected.

The veterans in the Milwaukee area should be particularly pleased that steps were taken this year to provide a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Wood, Wis., a project which I sponsored and for which I have been working for 4 years. The preparation of plans for the 1,250-bed, $35 million hospital will begin in the near future.

The space limitations of this report will not permit me to describe in detail the several other measures which will benefit our veterans and servicemen. A summary of veterans legislation which was acted upon by the 84th Congress is available upon request.

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Under the Eisenhower administration, farm operators' net income declined about 30 percent. The depressed conditions in the agricultural segment of our economy began to affect our cities: sales of agricultural implements and of other industrial goods dropped sharply, and employment decreased in those industries.

The Agricultural Act of 1956 and other measures approved by Congress are intended to put our agriculture back on its feet, and to correct the sharp disparity in incomes which prevailed during the last few years.

The 84th Congress also took steps to prevent further raids on our natural resources—such as the Al Sarena Mine case, the sellout at Hells Canyon and at Niagara, the tidelands oil grab, and the raids on our timber resources and on the national grazing lands. It strengthened older statutes and provided new laws aimed at the preservation of our national heritage for future generations.

Voting record, 84th Cong.

Stand	Issue	Status
	NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY	
Voted for	Extension of the selective service program	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization and strengthening of our military Reserves	Became law.
Voted for	Stepped-up production of B–52 jet bombers and fighter planes	Became law.
Voted for	Special funds to prevent 22,000-man cut in the U. S. Marine Corps	Became law.
Voted for	Increased funds for aircraft control and warning system	Became law.
Voted for	$1.4 billion for naval construction, including atom-power ships	Became law.
Voted for	Measures to strengthen our internal security laws	Became law.
	INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen the free world defense	Became law.
Favored	Study and revision of United States foreign policy programs	Initiated.
Voted for	3-year extension of reciprocal trade agreements program	Became law.
Voted for	Simplification of burdensome United States customs procedures	Became law.
Favored	Extension and revision of Refugee Relief Act, more visas for orphans	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Resolution opposing admission of Red China to the United Nations	Approved.
Favored	Aid to workers and industries harmed by foreign competition	Pending.
	GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION	
Voted for	Government Reorganization Act of 1955	Became law.
Voted for	Code of fair practices for congressional committees	Approved.
Voted for	Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska	Pending.
Favored	Home rule for the District of Columbia	Passed Senate.
Voted for	Salary revision for Federal employees, officials, judges, legislators	Became law.
Voted for	Improved benefits under Civil Service Retirement Act	Became law.
Voted for	Improved benefits under Railroad Retirement Act	Became law.
Voted for	Reorganization and improvement of U. S. Foreign Service	Became law.
Voted for	Termination of unnecessary Government competition with private business	Became law.
Voted for	More effective civil rights program	Passed House.
	NATIONAL ECONOMY	
Voted for	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer	Passed House.
Voted for	Plugging up of loopholes in the 1954 GOP tax law	Became law.
Voted for	Increase in minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	$33.4 billion, long-range highway program	Became law.
Sponsored	Equality of opportunity bill to aid small business	Became law.
Opposed	Exemption of natural-gas producers from Federal regulation	Vetoed.
Opposed	Postal rate increases on first-class mail which produces a surplus	Passed House.
	VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN	
Voted for	Incentive pay increases and allowances for Armed Forces personnel	Became law.
Voted for	Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen	Became law.
Voted for	Medical care, improved housing for military dependents	Became law.
Voted for	Revision and improvement of military survivors' benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Improved compensation and pensions for veterans	Passed House.
Proposed	New $35 million, 1,250-bed VA hospital for Wood, Wis	Programed.
	AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES	
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 and the soil bank program	Became law.
Voted for	Increased sales of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies	Became law.
Voted for	Liberalization of farm loan programs, relief for economic disaster	Became law.
Voted for	Improved conservation, research, brucellosis-eradication programs	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded reclamation and irrigation project programs	Became law.
Voted for	Upper Colorado River storage project	Became law.
Voted for	Hells Canyon and Fryingpan-Arkansas projects	Defeated.
	SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH AND WELFARE	
Voted for	Social Security Act Amendments of 1956	Became law.
Voted for	Federal assistance to States for construction of needed schools	Defeated.
Voted for	Federal aid for the Salk vaccine program	Became law.
Voted for	Expanded programs of medical-dental research, hospital construction	Became law.
Voted for	4-year program of aid to States for airport construction	Became law.
Voted for	Strengthened bans on use of mails to transport indecent literature	Became law.
Voted for	Increased penalties for peddling of narcotics, particularly to youth	Became law.
Voted for	Extension of school milk program to child-care centers and camps	Became law.
Voted for	Improved housing program with special aids for elderly citizens	Became law.

Rollcall record	Total roll and quorum calls	Rollcalls	Not voting [1]	Quorum calls	Absent on quorum calls [2]
1st session	147	76	1	71	2
2d session	132	73	4	59	2

[1] Pairs generally arranged.
[2] Absence on quorum calls does not necessarily mean a legislative day's absence.

Fiftieth Anniversary—The Golden Anniversary of the City of Huntington Park, in the Great 23d Congressional District, Los Angeles County, Calif., To Be Observed September 15 to 22—Representative Clyde Doyle Extends Cordial Invitation to All Members of Congress To Travel That Way on Those Days During Congressional Recess and Shows Program To Observe Events of Progress and Prosperity of "City of Perfect Balance" During This Appropriate and Happy Birthday Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore very graciously granted me so to do by the membership of this distinguished legislative body in which I have now had the pleasure and honor of serving for 5 elective terms from my native State of California, I am please to present to you and all the Members of this 84th Congress an invitation to attend the golden anniversary event of the city of Huntington Park, Los Angeles County, Calif. This very appropriate and significant golden anniversary will occur in this very important and significant municipality wherein the Post Office Building in this beautiful and prosperous city is located the official 23d district office of my own congressional duties and responsibilities. Needless to say, I am very happy and proud to have my official congressional office so happily and conveniently located.

And as the 50th anniversary of people happily married for a period of 50 years is always a most significant and honored event, so it is with all the residents of this city of Huntington Park at the time of their 50th anniversary. You will note by the data hereinafter set forth, and it is not only my cordial invitation for you to personally attend, but it is the cordial invitation of every resident of the city of Huntington Park to you to be present from September 15 to September 22, 1956, inclusive, and to there enjoy the very happy and historical occasion during these several days. Needless to say I am very proud too to be the Representative in Congress of this city of Huntington Park, I recognize my inability to speak out with sufficient words of praise and description to make it so that each of you will feel that you are personally present right there in that beautiful city. But, since the following descriptive text of how their golden anniversary is to be observed, will describe the coming event in prepared descriptive language and enumeration of events, I again find pleasure and pride in cordially inviting you in your travels during congressional recess to come to the great 23d Congressional District, which I represent, and in which is located this lovely and also very important city of Huntington Park at least on some of those dates beginning September 15 and including September 22.

In fact, I feel I have such cause to be justly proud of this City of Perfect Balance, as it is very properly and commonly designated, that I take pleasure in adding to the outline of the golden anniversay which is to occur and be celebrated, just a few historical facts of the early days of this city, together with pertinent data furnished me by the chamber of commerce.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I know that each of you also cordially join me in extending congratulations to the city of Huntingon Park with its official family, either elected or appointed, also all of the residents thereof upon their announced planning for this golden anniversary celebration which will be another milestone in the continuous happy and prosperous experience in deserved growth and good will for this city with all of its problems.

Mr. Speaker, the officials and people of this beautiful city are always most gracious to me and my lovely wife, Lydia Doyle, and to my professional staff who render services as need arises to the total 23d Congressional District from my office in the Huntington Park post office. So, again I am pleased to state that the golden anniversary committee has graciously and cordially invited us to personally be present and participate in these events so well planned and prepared. And of course I look forward to the pleasure of doing so at every opportunity.

I thank you for your unanimous consent that I have the pleasure of presenting you this invitation together with my brief statement about it:

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mayor Del Cox, honorary chairman, mayor of the city of Huntington Park.

Dr. George I. Beller, general chairman.

Earl M. Anderson, exhibition committee chairman, Rotary Club.

Kermit Bill, city councilman of Huntington Park.

Peter B. Brustin, advertising and publicity committee chairman, member of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Wanda Cairns, Junior Women's Club.

Miss Alice Carmouche, community calendar committee chairman, Business and Professional Woman's Club.

George T. Cummings, civic banquet chairman, president of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Virginia Everhart, Native Daughters of the Golden West.

Harold Eaves, city councilman.

Wesley J. Gordon, management committee, member of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Robert Grace, member of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Clarence Heublein, city attorney, city of Huntington Park.

Carson Hubbard, member of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Mildred Johnson, musicale chairman, Soroptomist International.

James C. Marshall, parade chairman, member of junior chamber of commerce.

Roger B. McGinnis, management committee, secretary-manager, Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Ivan Nichols, veterans' chairman, Veterans' Coordinating Council.

Miss Agnes Platt, historical documents chairman, city clerk, city of Huntington Park.

N. N. Reeves, Elks Club.

Verne Roberts, barbecue activity chairman, Kiwanis Club.

Douglas Rolph, concessions chairman, Lions Club.

Russell S. Saunders, civic theater president.

Richard Stephens, city councilman of Huntington Park.

James Sterkel, member of Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. Kathyrn Vanderhook, special days chairman, Senior Woman's Club.

Miss Esther Wilson, barbecue committee chairman, Quota Club.

Ralph Wilson, recreation commissioner, city of Huntington Park.

George Willson, management committee, Sertoma, city councilman.

Al H. Wineman, Jr., queen contest chairman, member of senior and junior chambers of commerce.

Rev. Owen R. Zurcher, church participation, president of Ministerial Association.

Mrs. Muriel F. O'Brien, office secretary.

SUMMARY OF EVENTS (SUBJECT TO CHANGE)

Saturday, September 15, 1956

10 a. m.: Golden Anniversary Parade; chairman, James C. Marshall.

Parade theme: Fifty years of progress.

Parade entries to include all types of parade units and floats. Prizes will be awarded.

1 p. m.: Fifty years of progress exhibition; chairman, Earl Anderson.

This exhibition will be open to the public and will feature exhibits by industries, local organizations, utility and transportation companies, and other interested firms. Exhibitors will be invited to interpret from their personal interest what "50 years of progress" means to them. Prizes will be awarded.

Sunday, September 16, 1956

Morning: Church anniversary participation arranged by ministerial association; chairman, Rev. La Vern Freeman.

Afternoon: Barbecue; chairman, Miss Esther Wilson. Barbecue activities; chairman, S. V. Roberts and Ralph Wilson.

2 p. m.: Ban concert, county symphonic band, through the courtesy of the Los Angeles County Music Commission.

Monday, September 17, 1956

Entire day: Open house, Huntington Park Civic Center; chairman, E. H. Bahlmann.

Historical documents exhibition; chairman, Miss Agnes Platt, city clerk.

This exhibition will feature documents, photographs, maps, and items of general interest during the 50 years since the city of Hunting Park was incorporated. Also featured will be scrolls, plaques, birthday messages received from public officials, dignitaries, firms and offices. This program will be held at Civic Center.

Reenactment of first city council meeting; chairman, Mayor Del Cox.

This activity will be held in the city council chambers in the evening, and Mayor Cox has indicated that the council members will be attired in 1906 styles.

"Fifty years of progress exhibition.

This event, described under Sunday heading, will continue throughout the entire celebration period.

Tuesday, September 18, 1956

Civic theater anniversary production; chairman, Russell S. Saunders.

A prize winning melodrama of the early 1900's will be presented in a special tent show atmosphere by members of the Huntington Park Civic Theater. This production will be staged nightly for 5 consecutive evenings.

Musicale; chairman, Mrs. Mildred Johnson.

An anniversary musicale program will be presented for the pleasure of the general public.

Wednesday, September 19, 1956

Golden anniversary tea; chairman, Mrs. Del Cox and city council ladies.

The golden anniversary tea with Mrs. Del Cox and ladies of the city council, is being planned by them to honor pioneer women and civic leaders who have contributed so much to the development of Huntington Park during its 50 years of progress.

Thursday, September 20, 1956

Activities scheduled for the entire week, i. e., 50 years of progress exhibition, civic theater production, etc., will be featured on this date.

Friday, September 21, 1956

Free street dance; chairman, Robert J. Grace.

Sponsored by the merchants committee, the anniversary street dance will be held in the central business district beginning at 8:30 p. m.

Saturday, September 22, 1965

Civil banquet; chairman, George T. Cummings.

The civic banquet will climax the 8-day celebration, and will be sponsored to honor civic leaders, pioneer leaders in civic work, industry, commerce, and the progressions. This will be an invitational affair.

Sunday, September 23, 1965

Conclusion of celebration.

Exhibition 1 to 6 p. m.

Several other organizations' activities will be taking place throughout the golden anniversary celebration period, and will be included in the official schedule of events as they are reported by sponsoring groups.

GENERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

I

A. Divisions shall be as follows:

1. Industrial.
2. Commercial.
3. Organizations:
(a) Fraternal.
(b) Service clubs.
(c) Veterans.
(d). Youth.
(e) Civic.
(f) Educational.
(g) Profesional.

4. Special entries: Entries in this section shall be subject to the approval of the admissions committee.

5. Fine arts: Entries in this section shall be restricted to linens, chinaware, silver, service, silverware, clothing, photography, paintings, sketches, and small antiques (no furniture).

B. All exhibits must portray the theme of the "Golden Anniversary" event. This may be accomplished by displays, comparing "50 Years of Progress" in any selected field of general interest, or exhibitors may select any particular year since 1906 to carry out the theme.

C. Prizes for divisions 1, 2, 3, and 4 shall be as follows:

First prize, trophy.
Second prize, ribbon.
Third prize, ribbon.

Division 5, fine arts, shall be noncompetitive and no prizes shall be awarded, instead, all qualified exhibitors shall be issued a certificate of participation.

D. A trophy will be awarded as Grand Sweepstake winner. The basis for awarding prizes will be originality of design and adherence to theme.

II

1. No entrance fee is required.

2. Exhibit space shall be assigned by the admissions committee.

3. Exhibitors will not be permitted to sell articles or products on the premises, nor shall exhibitors be permitted to display signs advertising costs of articles or products.

4. Exhibitors will be permitted to conduct "prize drawings." No solicitations will be allowed.

5. Double booths granted only upon written statement or sketch showing necessity of added area.

6. Booths are 10 by 12 feet, 3-sided, with electrical outlets. Center exhibits shall be limited to a height of 10 feet.

7. Public address systems and unusual power consumption must be approved by the admissions committee before space is assigned.

8. Signs and decorations to be at exhibitor's expense, decorative material to be of nonflammable type.

9. Booths to be manned during exhibition hours as much as possible.

10. The city of Huntington Park, the golden anniversary committee and the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce will assume no liability for fire or theft or vandalism and injury to persons or property, in connection with the exhibition. However, maximum police and fire protection will be provided.

11. Exhibitors' place of business or headquarters must be located in the southeast area.

12. Organizational entries are limited to Huntington Park and Walnut Park.

13. Individuals may enter exhibits in the special entries division subject to approval of the admissions committee.

14. Entry blanks must be received not later than August 31, 1956.

15. Fine arts display may be located in recreation building.

16. Exhibit hours shall be as follows:
Saturday, September 15: 1 to 10 p. m.
Sunday, September 16: 1 to 10 p. m.
Weekdays: 5 to 10 p. m.

17. Exhibits must be completed by 10 a. m., Saturday, September 15 for judging.

18. Exhibits must be completely removed by 12 noon Monday, September 24.

19. The decisions of the exhibition committee shall be final and it shall reserve the right to refuse or include entrants in the golden anniversary 50 years of progress exhibition.

20. Entry blanks signed by the exhibitor shall be demed acceptance of these rules and regulations.

GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY "MISS HUNTINGTON PARK" $500 FIRST PRIZE PLUS WARDROBE AND OTHER PRIZES

(Please print)

Name _____
Address _____
Telephone number____ Age____ Married____
Children_____ Work_____ School_____
Church _____
Height____ Weight____ Hair____ Eyes____
Bust_____ Waist_____ Hips_____

RULES

1. Must be between the ages 16 and 25.

2. Must live, work, or go to school in Huntington Park or Walnut Partk.

3. Selection will be based entirely on beauty and poise.

4. Each contestant will be interviewed individually prior to the semifinals.

5. Semifinals will be held on Saturday, August 25, 1956, at 9 p. m. at the California Theater, Huntington Park.

6. Finals will be held on Saturday, September 1, 1956 at 9 p. m. at the California Theater, Huntington Park.

7. Winner must be available at all times at the discretion of golden anniversary committee for a period of 3 weeks beginning September 1. During this period satisfactory arrangements will be made with present employer. Her activities will be primarily for pictures, publicity, and appearances.

8. Final winner will be given $500, a wardrobe, a bathing suit, and other prizes.

9. Semifinalists will be given bathing suits.

10. The decisions of the judges will be considered final.

11. All entries are to be sent to: Golden Anniversary Office, 2571 Clarendon Avenue, Huntington Park, Calif. Telephone number, LUdlow 2-1465.

[From the Los Angeles Herald and Express]

HUNTINGTON PARK WAS ONLY L. A. SUBURB WITH 5-CENT FARE

(By Art Hewitt)

A horse watering trough once marked what is now the center of Huntington Park, a city that blossomed as a suburb with a 5-cent streetcar fare to the metropolis and then developed into the hub of a tremendously important industrial area.

The entire area was once part of the 29,500-acre Spanish grant of Don Antonio Maria Lugo in 1809, and the watering trough was about midway on the trail that led from his ranch house in what is now Bell Gardens to the Pueblo of Los Angeles.

But the family of Don Bonito, as was the case with so many other Spanish families, fell into hard times—and high interest rates on loans. In the 1860's a sheriff's sale disposed of the rancho, and from then on it was sold time and again and each time more profitably.

Among the more outstanding owners were John G. Downey, Civil War governor of California; Secondo Guasti, the San Bernardino County winemaker; O. W. Childs, builder of the first Los Angeles opera house; Los Angeles banker Isias Hellman, and Remi Nadeau, California's most famous stagecoach operator.

At the turn of the century two real estate subdividers, A. L. Burbank and E. V. Baker, took over a 100-acre tract south of what is now Randolph Street and began selling lots for from $75 to $350. Payments were low. They had to be.

NAMED AFTER RAIL MAGNATE

The townsite, now the core of Huntington Park, was given a boost in 1903 when the Whittier line of the Pacific Electric came through. Everyone at this wide spot in the road was so jubilant that it was called Huntington Park after railroad magnate Henry E. Huntington. Sometime later there was a post office mixup, and the place, for a while, was known as La Park.

In 1906 the residents of Huntington Park were in open warfare. Most of them wanted to incorporate to gain home control of their community. They carried on a running battle with "the interests" (Subdividers Burbank and Baker) before an election was finally called.

To incorporate a population of 500 was necessary. Huntington Park claimed 526. On August 20, 1906, Huntington Park became a city on a vote of 77 to 17. First mayor was Dr. Louis Weber, also the town's first physician.

In 1910 the Los Angeles Railway extended its Yellow Car "J" line to Huntington Park, and it became the only suburb of Los Angeles served by a 5-cent carline.

It was in this period that William E. Ford began his career as Huntington Park's most illustrious and loved public servant. In 1908 at the age of 45 he became the city's first marshal. Aiding him in his duties was Sam, a retired Los Angeles fire horse bought by Huntington Park at a bargain price.

FORD HELD MANY POSTS

Ford went on to become successively fire chief, street superintendent, park superintendent and tree warden.

Even when he was 82 years old in 1945 he didn't feel ready for retirement. He was named official Huntington Park weather forecaster, a job he held until his death last year at the age of 91.

Huntington Park today, with as many as 1,800 industries in its area, has a population

of 32,000. Not only is it the center of major industry, but its trade area encompasses a population of 350,000, according to President Alton E. Allen of the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce.

It is, Allen said, the city of "perfect balance" and not, as some thought it would be 50 years ago, just a way station between Los Angeles and Long Beach.

WHAT YOU SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HUNTINGTON PARK—THE CITY OF PERFECT BALANCE

Location: Huntington Park is in the center of the most progressive and rapidly growing section in Southern California, close to the city of Los Angeles, and midway between the mountains and the ocean. Only a few minutes to downtown Los Angeles * * * or to Hollywood; and to several of Southern California's famous beach resorts. Huntington Park is surrounded by diversified industry, truck farms, citrus ranches, dairy and poultry farms and is an unusually well balanced community, strategically located to benefit from Southern California's industrial as well as residential expansion.

Climate: Here there are no extremes of heat or cold, and even during the hottest summer months, the nights are delightfully cool. With its clear, sunshiny days, and glorious blue skies Huntington Park has nothing but delights for the dweller within its bounds. Average mean temperature for 6 months of winter, October to April is 60.6 degrees; for 6 months of summer, April to October, 66.8 degrees—only 6 degrees average mean temperature difference between winter and summer temperatures. Average annual rainfall only 15 inches. Elevation 170 feet.

Population: During the past 30 years Huntington Park has grown in population from 4,513 to over 30,000.

Transportation: Three great railway systems—the Union Pacific, Southern Pacific, and the Santa Fe—enter Huntington Park; also the Greyhound, Union Pacific, American-Burlington, Santa Fe Railways and Pacific Overland Buslines. There are 342 street cars and 1,014 motor coaches of the Los Angeles Transit Co. that provide daily transportation, at 10 and 15 minute intervals, to all points in Los Angeles, Hollywood, and other nearby districts, and an intra-city busline serves local traffic. An extensive interurban bus and traction service by the Pacific Electric Railway makes possible many pleasure trips to beach resorts and adjoining cities. Huntington Park has 45 miles of paved streets. Several main highways and boulevards for passenger cars and trucks between Los Angeles and the harbor districts pass through Huntington Park and make direct connections with boat, railway, and airline terminals.

Educational: The public schools of Huntington Park are a part of the Los Angeles School System and rank among the best in the Nation. There is a $2,500,000 high school located on 23 acres of ground, which includes a fine swimming pool. The schools offer additional courses in music, art, drama, and manual arts; an intermediate school with 5 buildings and a shop for manual training, occupies 15 acres of ground, including a park and supervised playground. There are 5 splendid grade schools, all with modern buildings and the adult evening school has an enrollment of 2,500.

Religious and social: Huntington Park is an ideal place for a home, having the religious social, educational, and commercial advantages to be found in but few of our larger cities. Its schools, churches, clubs, libraries, theaters, stores, and residences are as fine as can be found anywhere. There are 20 churches—representing practically all denominations. Clubs include: Woman's Club, Business and Professional Women's Club, Ebell Club, Soroptimist Club, Exchange Club, Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, 20–30 Club, Toastmasters, Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Pythias, Knights of Columbus, B'Nai, B'Rith, veterans groups, Boy Scouts, Camp Fire Girls, YMCA, YWCA, etc. Among the civic organizations are the Huntington Park Chamber of Commerce and the junior chamber of commerce. The Huntington Park Symphony Orchestra, numbering nearly 100 talented musicians who volunteer their services, give free bimonthly concerts which are greatly enjoyed by the public. Other organizations, of which the community is justly proud, are the Huntington Park City Junior Band and the Huntington Park Civic Theater. The city recreation department is fully staffed under an able director. The reception from seven Los Angeles television, and many radio stations is excellent and contributes greatly to family enjoyment.

Commercial: Huntington Park is the trading center for over 250,000 consumers within a radius of 6 miles, with a rapidly expanding program for the acquisition of ample parking facilities. Over 400 stores and specialty shops, in up-to-date buildings and modernly equipped, cater to every imaginable retail buying need. There are 10,000 men's suits, 25,000 ladies' dresses, 100,000 pairs of shoes, etc., to choose from when you shop in Hutington Park. In per capita sales it ranks third in 45 cities in Los Angeles County, and second in its population bracket. Its five banks carry deposits of over $70 million.

Industrial: Huntington Park has 125 industrial plants, large and small, including several nationally known plants whose products are used throughout the world. The city, however, is free from smoke because natural gas and electricity operate the factories, and light and heat the homes. In addition to its own factories, Huntington Park is the hub of a large and growing industrial district. Within a radius of less than 4 miles there are approximately 1,000 industrial plants, employing over 140,000 persons. Notable among the products manufactured are: automobiles and byproducts; springs, batteries, paints, steel, iron smelting, heavy hardware, tools, brass, woodwork, underwear, tires, tubes, rubber products, etc. This area leads the world in the manufacture of oil-well equipment. No other district offers greater opportunities. Annual business volume exceeds $150 million.

Government: The city government of Huntington Park is composed of a mayor, four city councilmen, board of health, police and safety commission, fire commission, recreation commission, and departments of streets. The fire and police departments with modern, fully motorized equipment, are under the direction of capable chiefs and assistants. The city's bonded indebtedness is only 2 percent of its legal bond limit. The new civic center is one of the finest in California. The buildings include the administrative, hall of justice, which houses three municipal courts, library, health center, auditorium, and patriotic hall, with park and playgrounds in the rear.

Hon. Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, CHARLIE DEANE and I came to the Congress together in 1947. Since that time CHARLIE DEANE has made an enviable record. He has been most conscientious in his duties on the floor, in committee and in handling his mail. The main thing I will remember about CHARLIE DEANE's service here and my association with him in his Christian character and adherence to moral principles and ideals. CHARLIE DEANE and his family have contributed to the moral uplifting of the entire free world. I will always be interested in him and his fine family. I wish him well.

Grain Prices in Retrospect

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO KRUEGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like the farmer and businessman to look back over the grain prices for the past 17 year period. The truth of the saying "Hindsight is better than foresight" is borne out. It is interesting to observe when and where the fluctuations occur. Of course, we all realize that available supply plays a part in the price level, as well as the market demand. Other factors enter in beyond the farmer's control; it may be the wind, the rain or the sun—too much or too little; insect or rust infestation. Here is where the Government's role comes in; that of a stabilizing factor.

Farm prosperity reflects on the other segments of our economy by a seven-times ratio. The Republican administration has realized its importance in relation to the general prosperity of our country, and to protect the farm economy in peacetime has devised and utilized various remedial measures; increased import restrictions; increased price supports; eased farm credit restrictions, including refinancing existing indebtedness on long-term real-estate loans through FHA; made available to farmers immediate soil-bank benefits—total number of acres presently enrolled is climbing past the 5 million-acre figure and still mounting—liberalized wheat subsidy exports. It is not resting here. It is also working out feasible means of developing new industrial uses for farm products.

With these stabilizing measures, and the $2 support price for wheat extended to the 1957 crop, I believe that farm prices will continue to rise. The Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago reported that farm prices have risen steadily from the downward drift by 11 percent since last December. During this same period, farmer's operating costs rose only 3 percent. I was glad to see this price squeeze eased, and farm prices maintained at a 96 percent average in mid-June of this year, as compared to 80 percent of parity in December. Farm income right now is running about half a billion dollars higher than during the last half of 1955, and it is still on the upgrade. Prospects for a continuance of this steady rise look favorable.

After analyzing the following table of yearly average grain prices per bushel

at Minneapolis from 1940 to 1956 inclusive, I believe you will come to the conclusion that your party, the Republican Party of peace, progress and prosperity is working toward achieving a genuine prosperity for the farmer and the Nation as a whole. It does not intend to let the farmer down. You can bank on it.

[Average yearly price]

Year	Wheat, No. 1 Dark Northern Spring (ordinary protein)	Wheat, No. 1 Dark Northern Spring (15 percent protein)	Barley, No. 2 Malting	Barley, feed type	Oats, No. 2 White	Flaxseed, No. 1	Rye, No. 2
1939–40	$0.92	$0.95	$0.56	$0.45	$0.35	$1.65	$0.56
1940–41	.86	.89	.53	.43	.32	1 1.64	.50
1941–42	1.12	1.17	.79	.56	.47	2.10	.68
1942–43	1.27	1.34	.96	.64	.53	2.58	.68
1943–44	1.56	1.61	1.33	1.12	.77	3.04	1.15
1944–45	1.62	1.73	1.31	1.05	.69	3.10	1.23
1945–46	1.73	1.81	1.34	1.15	.72	3.14	1.91
1946–47	2.30	2.42	1.83	1.36	.84	4.81	2.76
1947–48	2.70	3.03	2.47	1.76	1.16	6.37	2.63
1948–49	2.26	2.38	1.49	1.09	.72	5.98	1.52
1949–50	2.24	2.38	1.57	1.08	.72	3.92	1.41
1950–51	2.34	2.56	1.63	1.21	.84	3.88	1.65
1951–52	2.42	2.53	1.57	1.22	.84	4.10	1.87
1952–53	2.39	2.51	1.64	1.18	.78	4.07	1.78
1953–54	2.33	2.68	1.54	.99	.74	3.86	1.19
1954–55	2.49	2.83	1.48	1.02	.71	1 3.39	1.30
1955–56	2.35	2.47	1.30	.87	.60	2 3.38	1.13

[1] Average of 6 months, August of 1954 through January of 1955.
[2] Average of 11 months, August of 1955 through June of 1956.

Amending Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I have always understood that we should not refer to actions in the other body. In the course of trying to place facts before the Members of this House I have refrained from doing that and I am not going to violate that rule at this time, even though reference has been made to a vote there and to an alleged attendance of "the entire membership" being present, other than to state flatly that neither assertion is correct.

May I add that there was nothing like unanimity of opinion in the other body on the essential amendment which I hope may be passed upon by the House, an amendment suggested by the Bureau of the Budget, which has the complete and wholehearted endorsement of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General, the Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and also the endorsement of our colleague, the then Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Hon. Ross Rizley. It is true two other members of the Civil Aeronautics Board have supported this bill but, I submit, with very little persuasiveness.

I do not intend to impose on the House here today with any detailed argument pro or con with reference to the bill. It is now 13 minutes past 3 o'clock. We came in this morning at 10 o'clock. Last night I sat on this floor and heard the statement made that this bill would be called up before any other legislative business. You know what the present situation is.

I regret deeply there are not more Members present to express their own convictions in the Committee of the Whole as to this particular measure, because, in my honest judgment, it is a windfall of the worst kind. It is discrimination on discrimination and if it is passed here over the protest of every department in the Government, we will all live to regret that action. Yet, considering the kind of a program we have had to face this week, certainly those who are not here now cannot be criticized fairly.

I am sorry that there are only 30 minutes on each side to debate the complex and difficult issues in this matter, but perhaps that is not unusual, because if you will ask one of the boys to bring you the hearings on this bill you will find at the back end of a hearing labeled "Civil Air Policy" there are a few pages devoted to this bill. If you examine those hearings and ask some questions, I do not think my colleagues on the subcommittee will dispute the fact that they were under certain pressure the morning of the hearing.

I want to pay tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. Yesterday he took this floor and admitted that the membership of this House voted on a bill without knowing what they were doing. He admitted that the amendment he offered had been hastily drawn; that the error had not been discovered at the time, and he said: I regret this mistake exceedingly.

And, this is the significant thing I want to repeat to the few of you who are here at this time:

> And, while it illustrates the difficulty of legislating in this hurried fashion in these dying days of this Congress, I must take full responsibility for the error.

And, that is characteristic of that gentleman. He is willing to stand up and take the responsibility publicly for an unfortunate incident yesterday afternoon. It is in the RECORD of yesterday at page 13136, rollcall 119, 92 for and 299 against. And, he added:

> Therefore, the vote just taken was not a fair test of the sentiments in this House on the public-housing question.

We should, and I know we do, respect and honor that sort of complete honesty which always characterizes the gentleman's conduct here, even when we disagree with him on an issue before us.

I submit to you that on this matter which does not have the support officially of a single agency of the Federal Government but has the active opposition of people who have wide experience, who have established reputations of competency, who know what they are talking about should receive something more than 30 minutes consideration on a side, particularly when I happen to be the only one from the committee, as far as I know, who is going to speak in opposition to this bill and to this rule. I assume my colleagues and my friends on the committee will want all their time, and they should have it. But surely who have a right to know the reasons for opposition.

This is not a pleasant position I have this afternoon. I do not enjoy it. I would infinitely rather prefer to have avoided coming to the floor and taking issue on this matter, but I cannot escape that duty and I will not try to do so. I do not care whether there are 1, 2, 3, 5, 10, or 50 people on this floor who may vote in opposition to this proposal or for the amendment I want to submit to you. Now, if a point of order is made, possibly it will not be before you, but I shall offer it. I think we have as much right to consider a serious suggestion of the Bureau of the Budget as to this kind of a bill, divorced from technicalities, as the other body has.

There are a lot more things I wish I had time to say about this bill. But we are confronted with a strict time limitation. While I think that is most unfortunate, we must do the best we can to understand the issues pro and con and the clear, cold facts. If we can do that, this bill will not pass here.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The 84th Congress Has Accomplished Much in the Public Interest—Obstructions Overcome Means America Will Move Forward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the closing days of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, we arrive at the moment when it is time to evaluate our labors of the past 7 months. It is time to look to the record and do a summing up of the legislative actions and accomplishments of this Congress—a Democratic Congress.

Our opinions, as Members of Congress, will differ and in some instances, will be no doubt in direct conflict. However, I personally feel that a true evaluation of our achievements and ac-

complishments will reflect a good record and portray a picture of great worth and merit—a record that will provide service and assistance to the citizens of this Nation and a record of great credit to the Democratic Party. The legislation which we have enacted during this session of the Congress has assisted this Nation of ours to move decisively in the direction of peace, security and prosperity.

The legislative duties and actions have been many and far-reaching, both on the domestic front and in the field of international relations. A summary review of the legislation enacted in this session will indicate the tremendous task with which this Congress—the 84th Congress—has been confronted and has overcome roadblocks and obstacles to bring about great achievements.

AGRICULTURE

The welfare of the farmers of this Nation and of American agriculture has been one of the most seriously considered problems of this Congress.

During the middle of the session, Congress decisively passed a bill to return farmers' crops to high price supports and to increase cash income of farmers through acreage reduction by authorizing a soil bank program. However, the President vetoed this bill, stating that he objected to the high price supports which the Congress has overwhelmingly approved.

Later, after several weeks of further deliberation, the Congress passed a second major agriculture bill—a watered-down version of the original farm bill. The second farm bill retained the soil bank program but called for flexible and lowered price supports instead of high and firm price supports, consequently, the increased income for American farmers will not be as great under the second bill as under the one previously passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President.

The soil bank provisions of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts with producers for a minimum period of 3 to 10 years under which the producer would devote a designated part of his cropland to conserving uses. It further authorizes the Secretary to pay a fair share of the costs of establishing the conservation use and make an annual payment to the producer which will provide a fair and reasonable return for the land diverted to conservation uses. The cost of the program is limited to $450 million annually.

To further relieve the economic plight now being experienced by the farmers of this country, the Congress enacted legislation which exempts farmers from payment of the Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This legislation is expected to give farmers about $60 million in tax relief annually.

The provisions of this bill extend to gasoline used in connection with cultivation of the soil; raising or harvesting any agricultural or farm commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, poultry, and wildlife.

In the vital field of soil conservation the Congress extended for 2 years the authority of the Federal Government to make soil-conservation payments to our farmers. Individual cash payments are made by means of annual refund checks paid directly by the Federal Government to the farmer. To finance this important program the Congress appropriated $250 million for the next fiscal year and continued the maximum payment which can be made to any individual farmer participant at $2,500.

Two legislative measures pertaining to tobacco enacted by the Congress should give increased benefits to Tennessee tobacco farmers as well as to tobacco farmers of other States during the years ahead. One measure adopted by the Congress rescinded an order by the Secretary of Agriculture which would have reduced tobacco acreage allotments for 1956 by about 10 percent less than the 1955 quotas. This congressional action in effect increased the 1956 quota by about 10 percent and established the 1956 quota on the same basis as the 1955 allotments. Another bill approved by the Congress provided for the establishment of quota allotments for each year on February 1, instead of the previous date of December 1. Through this adjustment the allotment quotas will be based on more accurate and up-to-date information and consequently give farmers some time saving in their acreage allotment calculations.

Another aid to the farmers of this Nation, as well as to other interests, was the allocation of funds to establish research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program. One of these research centers will be established at the University of the South at Sewanee, Franklin County, Tenn., and a substantial appropriation has been allocated for this purpose.

Total overall appropriation provided for all agricultural purposes for the fiscal year 1957—the period of 1 year extending from June 30, 1956, through June 30, 1957—was $1,993,744,968. This is more than $1 billion more than was appropriated for agriculture during the fiscal year 1956. However, $1.2 billion of this year's appropriation is earmarked to finance the soil bank program. The remainder of the funds will go to continue the work of the Agriculture Research Service, Extension Service, Soil Conservation Service, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention, Marketing Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, and the other loan, credit, and assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

The farmers of this Nation would have received greater benefits under the first farm bill passed by the Congress which the President vetoed; however under provisions of the legislation approved, the farmers' plight should be somewhat relieved and American agriculture permitted to prosper.

HIGHWAYS

One of the major accomplishments of this session of the Congress was passage of a record $32.9 billion highway construction program—the biggest road-building program in this Nation's history.

This bill authorizes construction of 41,000 miles of super interstate highways which by 1969 will link most State capitals and other major cities from coast to coast. The total cost of this system will be $27.5 billion, with the Federal Government paying $24.8 billion and the States $2.7 billion. The remaining $5.4 billion will be spent on the primary and secondary highway system and on roads on Federal land.

This omnibus road bill, during the 13-year period, should put this country's roads in first-class condition, not only to facilitate traffic and commerce, but to also speed military communication in case of a national emergency.

Federal funds, under terms of the bill, will be allocated to the States on a matching basis, more liberal than the terms authorized in the 1954 Highway Act under which the Federal-State program formerly operated.

The matching formula for the Interstate System will be 90 percent Federal and 10 percent State. Allocations for primary, rural, and urban roads will be made on a 50–50 matching fund basis.

This giant bill should take care of the great overall need for improvement of the roads of our country, and particularly improvement on rural, farm-to-market routes and city streets as well as interstate highways.

The commerce and population of our country are expanding year after year, and in the main, construction of adequate highways has not kept pace with this rapid expansion. There has been little argument over the need for sound highway legislation.

This big road bill is another of the major accomplishments of this session of the Congress.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Preservation of the defensive strength of our country is the greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression.

With this in mind, Congress approved appropriations of more than $34 billion for the Department of Defense for the next year. This sum represents about $500 million more than was requested for defense purposes by the President. Of the total amount appropriated, more than $16 billion is for the Air Force—almost $1 billion more than the President requested. In recommending the larger amount of money for the Air Force, the Congress made an explicit demand that the extra funds be spent to expedite the production of heavy, long-range bombers for our defense.

There have been serious questions asked concerning this country's bomber construction program and it was the opinion of a majority of the Members of the Congress that acceleration of this program is necessary. This Congress felt that production of the giant B–52 bomber should be stepped up from the present light production schedule and the additional Air Force funds were appropriated for this purpose.

To bolster our national defense, greater emphasis is being placed on the application of atomic power by our

Naval forces. The first nuclear-powered submarine—the *Nautilus*—is already in operation with our Naval Fleet, the second such submarine—the *Sea Wolf*—has been launched, and several others are in the process of construction and are included in the fiscal year 1957 shipbuilding program. Adequate funds were allocated by Congress to the Navy for the continued progress of this important phase of our defense program.

With the money which the Congress has appropriated for construction and research, the intercontinental missiles will be a reality in the near future. A portion of this research work is being accomplished at the guided missile center at Redstone Arsenal near Huntsville, Ala., and also at the great Arnold Engineering Development Center near Tullahoma, Tenn.

To help support our national defense effort and promote international security, the Congress has appropriated a total of $3.8 billion to be expended under provisions of the Mutual Security Act. Under this program, the United States provides economic and military aid and assistance to our overseas allies.

By cooperation with our allies in this mutual effort, the United States can obtain a far better defense program, and, according to many informed authorities, at a considerably lower cost. Military officials state that it costs $6,600 a year for our country to maintain an American soldier abroad, while it costs the United States only $789 to maintain an allied soldier in his own country.

Appropriation of this fund considerably strengthens our national defense network throughout the world. Through the cooperation or other free nations, the threat of war should be lessened and diminished and the goal of a secure peace made a reality.

EDUCATION

In the field of legislation affecting education, one of the most important measures approved by the Congress was enactment of the public library service bill which is primarily designed to assist in bringing books and library services to rural families.

This legislation authorizes the expenditure of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period—the funds to be allocated to States matching the grants for this educational aid and rural library service. The bill specifies that no State will receive less than $40,000 a year for library services. Control over distribution of the funds provided in this bill is left entirely to the States as is the selection of books to be distributed to libraries.

In many of the cities and towns of our Nation, there are in many instances excellent library facilities, making available to the citizens the great wealth of knowledge stored in books. This enactment should serve to improve, if not equalize, educational advantages in this regard for our rural citizens.

The adoption of an undesirable amendment, in effect killed changes during this session of Congress for legislation which would have provided States with Federal funds to aid in constructing school buildings. There is a definite need in our country for better school buildings and other facilities to improve our overall school system. As our population continues to grow, more pupils enter school and many of our institutions are now overcrowded and in need of better schoolrooms.

Notwithstanding this recognized need, there are many who fear the ultimate possibilities of Federal interference or control of our State and local school systems should any improper type of Federal aid to education bill be adopted.

During past years, the Congress has approved legislation which has provided Federal assistance to our school systems, but none of these measures have had racial or religious issues or restrictions included in the provisions.

During the debate on the Federal aid to education bill, one amendment was adopted which would have prohibited grants from the Federal Government to schools which failed to promptly integrate children of all races. Actually, the amendment would have gone further than the Supreme Court decision on the question of segregation. This amendment would have withheld Federal aid to schools unless integration was promptly completed, or within 4 years as a maximum time limitation. The Supreme Court decision placed no such time limit on integration.

Shortly after this amendment was adopted, the House voted to kill the bill—thereby removing any chance for further consideration of the measure during this session of Congress.

Of particular importance to our schools and our school children was the passage by the Congress of a bill which increases the allocation from $60 million annually to $75 million for the school milk and lunch program. This is another important and significant measure approved by this Congress affecting the health and welfare of our schoolchildren.

NATURAL RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT

A future power shortage in the Tennessee Valley area was probably averted through legislation affecting TVA approved by this session of the Congress. It can truly be said that this session of Congress has been a fruitful one for this agency of our Government.

Of major importance was the reaffirming by the Congress of TVA's authority to continue to use its own surplus corporate funds to install additional needed generating units at the John Sevier, New Johnsonville, and other TVA steam plants.

Under this authority, the Board of Directors of TVA can go ahead and use the agency's surplus corporate funds to add additional power capacity to these steam plants and forestall a predicted power shortage for the TVA area.

For the past 3 years there have been no new generating units added to the TVA system which would contribute to the agency's power system—and to complicate this factor, the demand for power is constantly increasing by industry, the REA's, municipalities, Government defense installations, and other consumers.

The TVA Board of Directors, recognizing that a power shortage was imminent, recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that 4 new generating units be started, 1 to be constructed in 1956 and the other 3 to begin in 1957.

The Bureau of the Budget adopted the board's recommendation, but then only recommended that the Congress approve sufficient funds to begin construction in 1956 for the 1 unit, then hinged the beginning of the other 3 units upon enactment of legislation of a complicated self-financing method which would have allowed TVA to issue bonds, but at the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and with other limitations and restrictions.

After many weeks of debate and long hours of hearings, the bond issue proposal was stalled and instead, the Congress reaffirmed TVA's authority to use its own corporate funds for the needed new generating units—thus giving TVA a temporary victory.

With this conclusive congressional authority, the TVA board of directors now have begun to build needed additions to the TVA power supply system.

This action can indeed be termed a signal victory for TVA and was only gained after bitter attacks by its enemies.

The TVA critics are on all sides and continually charge that this great agency of government should stand on its own two feet. But these are empty charges because TVA is standing on its own feet—it is paying its own way and more in the many returns to the people of this Nation. It is also paying big dividends into the Treasury. Annual payments into the Treasury through 1957 will have exceeded $285 million. The navigation and flood-control programs of TVA are also paying dividends—in the form of increased river traffic and commerce and in the saving of human lives and property.

This great agency should be allowed to continue its progress—to serve the giant atomic installation at Oak Ridge and other defense installations—to continue to move forward in its navigation program—to expand its flood-control program—and to continue in every way to serve the people of our Nation.

Also of importance to the people of the Tennessee Valley area was the approval of the Congress of $1.1 million to begin construction of a new big dam on the lower Cumberland River. The lower Cumberland Dam, later renamed Barkley Dam, is one of the major dams needed for the full utilization and development of the Cumberland River. This project will greatly aid commerce and navigation, and improve flood control and also provide some 600 million kilowatts of hydro power annually when completed.

An important feature of the new dam will be the construction of a canal between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers just above the proposed dam, thereby connecting these two important rivers and facilitating river transportation on the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers as well as the Ohio.

Late in this session of the Congress, the House-Senate Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recommended legislation to authorize construction of a large number of large scale and smaller atomic reactors to produce atomic electric power.

These reactors would have been built, owned, and managed by the Federal Government. The purpose of the program was to further development of the art of producing electric energy from the atom and to put America ahead of other countries which are making great progress in this field. The program was to run concurrently with the atomic reactor program now exclusively conducted by private industry—which, according to many observers is bogging down and lagging behind the rest of the world.

This important measure was approved by the Senate but lost in the House by a small margin in the closing days of the Congress.

The measure will be reconsidered at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

Significant of other natural resource projects in our Nation was approval of Congress for the development of the land and water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin. This legislation authorizes a series of storage reservoirs with hydroelectric plants; irrigation projects and a comprehensive plan of development of the water resources of this great river basin.

To further help in the development and conservation of the water resources of this Nation, the Congress has initiated a number of new reclamation and irrigation projects in the West as well as furthering other important conservation projects. There was also approved legislation which authorized $500 million to assist cities and other governmental units to construct waterworks and other utility conservation systems. The Federal Government would contribute 30 percent of the cost of these installations to further control pollution of our rivers and streams.

VETERANS

In an effort to improve the various veterans programs of this grateful Nation, the Congress this year appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans benefits, an increase of $20 million more than was appropriated for the last fiscal year and $8 million more than was recommended by the President. This Nation has the greatest veterans program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents. These programs are being continued by the Congress at a level exceeding the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget.

With respect to funds for the hospital and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration, the Congress increased the appropriation by $21 million bringing the total overall cost to $51,635,000 for the next fiscal year. The veterans hospitals of this Nation represent an investment of more than $2.5 billion. Many of these buildings are the old Army cantonment-type and badly in need of repair and replacement. The additional funds appropriated by the Congress will get this work underway.

Included in this appropriation is $2,261,000 as the first installment toward an overall modernization program at the veterans hospital at Murfreesboro, Tenn. Also included is $1,500,000 for construction of a new general medical veterans hospital for Nashville and middle Tennessee to replace the old and inadequate facility of the Veterans' Administration.

Also of significance to the veterans of this Nation was the passage during this session of the Congress of legislation which will allow about 10,000 more widows of World War I veterans to be eligible for veterans pensions. These widows, because of previous legislation, had been disqualified from receiving pension benefits. This legislation will be of substantial benefit to many of the war widows who had previously been denied pension benefits.

This Congress has also approved legislation which provides educational assistance to children of veterans of World War I, II or Korea who died from service-connected disability. Monthly payments to the children range from $110 for full-time training to $80 for three-quarters and $50 for half-time training. This measure will provide educational benefits to more than 150,000 children of soldiers who died in the service of their country.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Another major accomplishment during this Democratic Congress was approval of major innovations in the social-security program which would give additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers of this Nation.

The two major changes in the Social Security Act would, first, allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on January 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 persons eligible for benefits.

The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

The broadening and liberalizing of this legislation for the benefit of labor and working men and women of this Nation can be considered another major achievement of the 84th Congress.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS

As a member of the Independent Offices and Public Works Subcommittees on Appropriations of the House Appropriations Committee, I could not, with a true sense of value, list the accomplishments of this session of the Congress without stating briefly some of the major provisions of the two appropriations bills which I have been most closely associated.

For the fiscal year of 1957, the Congress appropriated $856,727,000 to carry on the public-works projects of the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior. This was almost $10 million more than was appropriated for fiscal 1956. These projects are in all areas of our country, the New England Basin, the south Atlantic Basin, the upper and lower Mississippi River Basins, the Ohio River Basin, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway Basin, the Missouri Basin, the Rio Grande and Southwest area, the Colorado River Basin, the Columbia River Basin, the Central Valley Basin of California—thus this ball can truly be called an all-American measure.

For Tennessee and adjacent areas, the Congress appropriated $2,900,000 to continue construction of the Cheatham lock and dam; $2,250,000 to continue construction of the Old Hickory lock and dam; and $1,100,000 to begin construction of the Barkley Dam, which I have already discussed.

It was through the work of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittees that adequte appropriations and authority were granted to allow TVA to continue to function and to progress as earlier herein indicated.

The appropriations for the independent agencies of our Government is very important and carries great responsibility when it is considered that the appropriations are for some 18 agencies of our Federal Government.

The regulatory agencies in this group, which serve as arms of the Congress, need close attention by the Congress to assure a vigorous and effective prosecution of the law and programs administered in the public interest, health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of this Nation.

The independent agencies include our important regulatory Commissions and others.

These include the Federal Trade Commission which is an agency whose basic objective is the maintenance of free and fair competitive enterprise as the keystone of the American economic system by preventing monopoly or corrupt or unfair business practices; the General Services Administration, the housekeeping agency of our Government, which supervises Federal buildings, post offices and other building and Federal property management; the Federal Communications System which regulates interstate and foreign commerce in communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and television; the General Accounting Office which performs an independent audit of Government financial transactions and serves as a watchdog on Federal expenditures, the Security and Exchange Commission which protects the interest of the public and investors against malpractices in the sale of securities in the financial markets and the Veterans' Administration which administers the vast veterans hospital program and extensive veterans benefit programs, among other of our important independent agencies of Government.

So Mr. Speaker the scoreboard of the record of this Congress is indeed a good one, much constructive legislation has been passed in the public interest. The Congress has moved decisively in overcoming obstructions and advancing in the direction of peace, security, and prosperity.

Amending Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8902) to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill as reported by the committee has the word "property" in it in line 14. It does not refer to aircraft which have been discussed this afternoon at length.

"Property," I suppose, is anything owned by anybody; in other words, anything to which a person has title.

In the Western Airlines case which has been referred to in the debate, the property included a route that had never been used by the airline which was certificated and was sold at a large profit to another airline. It also involved certain assets and privileges, in fact, it involved coin machine privileges which I understand were quite profitable.

The district court of appeals here in the District unanimously rejected the effort on the part of the Western Airlines to have that excluded as part of their other revenue in determining the amount of subsidies they should receive. The Supreme Court affirmed this decision.

Further than that, of course, if this is a tenabel proposition, the words of the bill as reported by the committee requiring reinvestment should be changed.

The amendment I have suggested, and I certainly will not belabor it, is that we confine ourselves to the sale of aircraft if we are going to pass this bill and that we permit this particular allowance to be made only if there is a reinvestment in new and modern aircraft. In that we do not open the door to the sale of hotels which are held by some airlines and to other classes of property; that we confine ourselves exclusively to the sale of these so-called dilapidated aircraft which have increasced in value over a hundred percent in the last few years according to the CAB. If that is what we want then I submit the amendment is in order and without this amendment the bill could increase the subsidy without justification and should be rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman, Is this language similar, or the effect of it similar, to the provisions of the bill that passed the Senate?

Mr. HESELTON. I do not know. I developed the amendment independently because I wanted to confine this. I do not know what the Senate did.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask the gentleman another question, and it might be pertinent. Would the gentleman support the bill if his amendment is adopted?

Mr. HESELTON. Absolutely not.

Mr. HARRIS. May I say to my friend that it was not my intention to embarrass him. I asked the question not to be facetious. I was honest and sincere in my question.

Mr. HESELTON. I know that and I never meant any suggestion otherwise. The gentleman is one of my finest friends, I hope and believe. I honor and respect him. But I do want to perfect bad legislation even if I cannot vote for the revised version.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I can assure my good and warm friend the feeling of friendship he expressed is mutual. I will have to oppose the amendment under the circumstances because, as an example, every airline in the country that operates has to have not only aircraft but they have to maintain hangars, they have to have some place of operation, they have to have a place for maintenance. In many instances it is necessary to make changes and improvements. In instances they may sell old equipment of that kind and of that nature. If that is true, I do not see why there would be any difference in the treatment of an air company that owns a rather extensive hangar and equipment. It is necessary to maintain the new type of aircraft coming in. In 1959 and 1960 we are going to have these new aircraft coming in, different from all aircraft we have today. They are going to be the jets that cost $5 or $6 million and they are going to have to have new equipment, new ways and methods of maintaining and taking care of them, just as essential as the aircraft itself.

I am not for the application of this to hotels that the gentleman mentioned before. That is the reason we amended the bill after we received the alternate recommendation of the Budget Bureau. We used the term in the bill, that is "used and useful in aircraft service." That is what our bill contains. We had our staff to work it out. We wanted to eliminate this questions of hotels, restaurants, and other properties that might become involved. What we are interested in here is permitting the aircraft companies to use the sale of their old equipment as in use now and when they have capital gains therefrom, to apply on the purchase of new equipment and those things necessary for the operation of that new equipment.

Mr. Chairman, from this viewpoint the gentleman's amendment is unsound and I would ask that it be defeated.

Eleventh Annual National Conference on Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following news release of the Honorable Justin Miller, president of the National Conference on Citizenship, and former judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, with respect to the 11th annual national conference on citizenship:

ELEVENTH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON CITIZENSHIP

Justin Miller, president of the National Conference on Citizenship and former associate justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia judicial circuit, has announced the major events planned for the 11th Annual Conference on Citizenship which will be held September 17–19, 1956, at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.

The Voting Citizen is, appropriately, the theme for this year's conference.

Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, past president of the American Heritage Foundation, has been selected to deliver the keynote address on this challenging theme at the opening general session Monday morning, September 17, Citizenship Day. His address will lay the groundwork for full exploration and consideration of the theme by the delegates in their group discussions.

George V. Allen, Ambassador to Greece and former Assistant Secretary of State, will be the guest participant at a youth panel session on the evening of September 17. The topic of the panel discussion will be The Responsibilities of Citizenship. Mr. Allen will answer the youths' questions, many of which may be expected to deal with our foreign policy.

Formerly cosponsored by the Department of Justice and the National Education Association, the Conference now operates as an independent entity under a charter unanimously granted by the 83d Congress. Since its inception the Conference has stressed the need for reaffirming and upholding the principles set forth in the Constitution—principles that are vital to the maintenance of our American way of life.

Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, is the honorary chairman of the Conference.

About 1,000 men, women, and youth from all of the 48 States and Territories will attend. Approximately 800 public and private organizations and agencies with widely varied interests will be represented.

Justin Miller will formerly open the conference with a welcoming message. Members of the United States Marine Corps will advance the State and Territorial flags. The American Legion National Guard of Honor will advance the Colors. The National Anthem will be rendered by one of the United States Service bands, followed by the pledge to the flag. Tom C. Clark, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and Willard E. Givens—who were the heads of the sponsoring agencies, the United States Department of Justice and the National Education Association, respectively, when the Conference was initiated—will greet the delegates. Robert N. Anderson, a member of the board of directors of the conference, will introduce representatives of the Governors of the original 13 States. The address on The Voting Citizen by the keynoter, Thomas D'Arcy Brophy, will close the meeting.

John R. Miles, manager of education department, United States Chamber of Commerce, will preside at the luncheon meeting on September 17. Gabriel Kajeckas, Gonzaga High School, Washington, D. C., a national youth winner of the 1955–56 "Voice of Democracy Contest" will give his winning oration, "I Speak for Democracy." Glenn E. Jackson, Executive Director, American Board for Certification, Prosphetic and Orthopedic Appliance Industry, who is well known as a leader in audience participation, will then lead a general discussion by the delegates on ways of improving the quality of citizenship. The conduct of this discussion will be

such as to encourage and give opportunity to every delegate to participate.

A "Citizenship Day" ceremony will be held on the Washington Monument Grounds in the afternoon of September 17. This ceremony is jointly sponsored by the District of Columbia Citizenship Day Committee and the National Conference on Citizenship. A feature of the program will be the honoring of the signers of the Constitution from the 13 Original States. The representatives of the Governors of these States will lay wreaths at the base of the Monument.

Charles E. Bish, Principal of McKinley High School, Washington, D. C., a member of the Conference Planning Committee, will preside at the evening session of September 17.

The United States Army Band will give a "Musical Americana"—period music that has enriched America from the birth of our Nation to the present. This will follow immediately the youth panel at which George V. Allen will be the guest participant. The public is invited to this evening session.

The first and second group discussion sessions will be held in the morning and afternoon of September 18. The 1,000 delegates will be divided into 30 member groups in which every one will have an opportunity to express his viewpoint. The first group session will discuss the conference theme—The Voting Citizen. The second group session will discuss topicsrelated to citizenship of specific interest to the delegates.

ALVIN M. BENTLEY, a Member of the United States Congress who was seriously injured in a misguided attack on the Congress in the spring of 1954, one of the directors of the National Conference on Citizenship, will preside at the annual dinner meeting September 18.

Charles P. Taft, mayor of Cincinnati and past president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and Philip Klutznik, national president of the B'nai B'rith, will speak on the ideals and practices of United States citizenship.

Justice M. Chambers, Congressional Medal of Honor recipient of World War II, will introduce Purple Heart veterans from Walter Reed General Hospital, and the Naval Medical Center in Bethesda, Md. Purple Heart veterans from these hospitals are always honored guests at the annual dinner.

Arthur P. Crabtree, head of citizenship education, State department of education, University of the State of New York, will summarize the group discussions at the closing session on September 19. It is hoped to have the winner of the first prize in the 21st annual national essay contest, 1955–56, sponsored by the Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, read his winning essay.

An impressive naturalization ceremony will follow wherein a large class of foreign-born persons will become United States citizens. A judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia will preside over the naturalization hearing and address the new citizens. The Presidential Auditorium of the Statler Hotel will be transformed into a courtroom for the occasion. The chairman of the Citizenship Committee of the District of Columbia Bar Association, Richard L. Walsh, will have charge of the ceremonial part of the program. Mrs. Frederick Groves, president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, will extend greetings. Marie de la Huil, soloist of the Columbia Opera Company, a naturalized citizen, will sing the National Anthem.

The American Legion National guard of honor will retire the colors, closing the conference.

The purposes of the National Conference on Citizenship as set forth in its constitution and bylaws are:

"To support and strengthen the efforts of the people in maintaining the blessings of freedom and justice and in protecting and perpetuating the principles and ideals upon which this Nation is founded; to develop a more thorough knowledge of citizenship rights and responsibilities; to inspire a deeper devotion to citizenship obligations; to encourage ever more effective participation in citizenship activities and to promote a spirit of cooperation on the part of all citizens—to these high purposes, the National Conference on Citizenship is dedicated."

The conference was founded in 1946, when a small group of men and women met in Philadelphia to consider how the spirit of cooperation that had bound together all citizens of the United States during World War II could be conserved for the future. They sought a means to maintain this spirit so that, in peacetime as in wartime, all citizens might dedicate themselves to upholding continuously our concept of government and the democratic way of life.

From 1946 to 1954, the United States Department of Justice and the National Educational Association sponsored the conference. The two agencies lent their support until the conference could function as an independent entity. A bill to incorporate the National Conference on Citizenship passed both Houses of the Congress unanimously and was signed by President Eisenhower, at the summer White House, Denver, Colo., on August 13, 1953.

The conference is unique in that it brings together the most comprehensive cross section of organizations and agencies to be found in any single national meeting. Speaking to the Eighth National Conference on Citizenship, John J. Parker, chief judge, United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Judicial Circuit, said: "The conference has been growing in power and influence from year to year and is undoubtedly the greatest mobilization of the forces for good citizenship that has ever existed in this country."

Since 1946, more than 1,200 organizations and agencies have participated. Through their memberships and activities these touch nearly every wholesome aspect of our life and reach most of our 165 million population.

Included are all levels of government—National, State, and local; schools, colleges, colleges, and universities; major religious faiths; professional associations; veterans' and related organizations; labor, business, industry, and finance; farm and civic groups; and youth organizations.

The conference has had four honorarry chairmen. The late Chief Justices of the United States, Harlan F. Stone and Charles Evans Hughes, were the first two, and former Vice President, the late Alben W. Barkley, the third. The present honorary chairman is the Chief Justice, Earl Warren.

The present officers and board of directors of the National Conference on Citizenship, most of whom have been closely identified with it since its beginning, are:

Justin Miller, president; former associate justice, United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Judicial Circuit.

Emma Mae Brotze, first vice president; principal, Marshall Junior High School, Marshall, Tex.; and past chairman, National Education Association citizenship committee.

Leo M. Cadison, second vice president; former Assistant Director of Public Information, United States Department of Justice.

Earle T. Hawkins, third vice president; president, Maryland State Teachers College.

Lee R. Pennington, Jr., treasurer; approximately 25 years with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, retiring in 1953 to become Director, National Americanism Commission of the American Legion.

Carl B. Hyatt, executive director; former Assistant Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice.

Robert N. Anderson, general counsel; past president, Federal Bar Association.

Alvin M. Bentley, Member, United States Congress since 1953.

Maurice Bisgyer, executive vice president, B'nai B'rith.

Boyd Campbell, immediate past president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

Thomas F. Clear, principal, Katherine T. Murphy School, Stamford, Conn.

Willard E. Givens, former executive secretary, National Education Association.

Ralph W. Hardy, vice president, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.

Mrs. J. Borden Harriman, former United States Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Norway.

Richard B. Kennan, secretary, commission for the defense of democracy through education, National Education Association.

Lawrence A. Oxley, organization and methods examiner, Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor.

J. Albert Woll, general counsel, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Distinguished Americans have participated in each of the 10 annual meetings. President Eisenhower and former President Truman have sent greetings to the conference on each occasion. Mr. Truman has spoken to the delegates six times. Speakers at previous conferences have included:

Henning W. Prentis, past president, National Association of Manufacturers; Ellis Arnall, former Governor of Georgia; Daniel A. Poling, churchman and editor; Joseph H. Ball, former United States Senator from Minnesota; the late Ernest J. King, fleet admiral, former commander in chief and chief of naval operations; the late Robert A. Taft, United States Senator from Ohio; Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; William G. Carr, secretary, National Education Association; Robert G. Simmons, chief justice, Supreme Court of Nebraska; the late Willis Smith, past president, American Bar Association and United States Senator from North Carolina; Tom C. Clark, former Attorney General of the United States; Donald R. Richberg, author and attorney; George D. Aiken, United States Senator from Vermont; Watson B. Miller, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization; Anna Lord Strauss, past president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Justin Miller, former judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Judicial Circuit; Robert B. House, chancellor and vice president of the University of North Carolina; Mabel Studebaker, past president, National Educational Association; Hubert H. Humphrey, United States Senator from Minnesota; the late Alben W. Barkley, former Vice President of the United States; Andrew D. Holt, past president, National Education Association; Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; J. Howard McGrath, former Attorney General of the United States; Irving M. Ives, United States Senator from New York; the late George Maurice Morris, past president, American Bar Association; Agnes E. Meyer, author and lecturer; Estes Kefauver, United States Senator from Tennessee; Wayne L. Morse, United States Sentor from Oregon; Florence E. Allen, judge, United States Court of Appeals, Sixth Circuit; James P. McGranery, former Attorney General of the United States; Sarah G. Caldwell, past president, National Education Association; Mrs. James B. Patton, past president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Eleanor Roosevelt, former member, Commission on Human Rights, United Nations; Corma A. Mowrey, past president, National Education Association; John C. Bell, Jr., justice, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania;

Luther W. Youngdahl, judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia; William A. Early, past president, National Education Association; Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General of the United States; John J. Parker, chief judge, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit; Gertrude S. Carraway, past president general, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; Waurine Walker, past president, National Education Association; Simon E. Sobeloff, former Solicitor General of the United States and judge, United States Court of Appeals, Fourth Circuit; Alvin M. Bentley, Congressman from Michigan; Kenneth A. Roberts, Congressman from Alabama; W. Cameron Burton, past president, Bar Association of the District of Columbia; F. Dickinson Letts, judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia; Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia; Harry P. Cain, member, Subversive Activities Control Board; Walter V. Mason, national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor; Boyd Campbell, past president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

The future of the National Conference on Citizenship is challenging. The congressional charter empowers the conference to translate its ideals and objectives into realities. Plans for the future include both long-range and immediate projects and activities. The conference will initiate and conduct some of these activities directly. Others, it will encourage and assist organizations and agencies in States and communities to initiate and carry on. Proposed projects and activities include the following:

1. Annual meetings of the National Conference at which participants will consider the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, discuss major problems facing the Nation, and ways in which the ideas inspired by the national meeting can be carried out in their home States and communities.

2. Regional, State, and local conferences on citizenship which will have purposes similar to those of the national conference, with organization and procedures adapted to State and community situations.

3. Citizenship Day observances which will commemorate the signing of the Constitution, recognize the native youth reaching voting age and the foreign-born receiving citizenship through naturalization, and afford all citizens opportunity for rededication to the ideals and principles of the Constitution.

4. A "new voter" program which, carried on through cooperating groups and other organizations and agencies, will stress responsible exercise of suffrage by all, and emphasize greater recognition of youth in civic affairs and their better preparation for the assumption of citizenship responsibilities.

5. Naturalization ceremonies in which the conference, through its participating organizations and agencies, will assist Federal and State courts with inspirational court induction ceremonies that stimulate in new citizens appreciation of American traditions and ways of living.

6. Integration of foreign-born citizens through State and local programs in which the native and foreign-born may achieve mutual understanding by working together and those of foreign birth may become more effective citizens.

7. A magazine and other publicity materials which will provide current, pertinent information for the press, radio, and television, for those carrying on projects and programs to promote good citizenship, and for those planning conferences and patriotic observances.

8. Citizenship programs in schools and colleges for which the conference, in cooperation with educational authorities, will assemble and make available information about significant developments in methods and materials for citizenship education.

9. Information on legal aspects of citizenship which will be assembled and made available to conference members and other participating organizations and agencies.

10. A clearinghouse which will collect, compile, catalog, exchange, and disseminate information and materials on matters relating to citizenship.

Nixon Support Proved Strong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the San Diego Union, Wednesday, July 25, 1956, which provides additional evidence of the strong popularity of Vice President RICHARD NIXON, The editorial follows:

STASSEN OUT OF LINE—NIXON SUPPORT PROVED STRONG

Harold Stassen has proved one thing: There is no substantial support for an anti-Nixon campaign.

The former Governor of Minnesota is leading a one-man parade going the wrong direction. Few campaigns have fallen so flat so fast as has Mr. Stassen's self-assumed effort in behalf of Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts.

Mr. Stassen's proposal to drop RICHARD NIXON from the 1956 Republican ticket had developments contrary to his intentions. It resulted in further preconvention crystallization of support for the Vice President.

There can be no doubt now but that Republican leaders, headed by President Eisenhower, consider Mr. NIXON to be the logical and the most powerful candidate for Vice President.

Governor Herter unquestionably has an outstanding record as a Congressman and as a governor. The fact is he and the Vice President are long-time friends. Mr. Stassen's efforts lost all substance with the climactic announcement that Governor Herter personally would place Mr. NIXON name in nomination.

Mr. Stassen failed to substantiate his argument that Governor Herter should replace Mr. NIXON on the GOP ticket. The Californian is one of the outstanding Vice Presidents of all time. Even Mr. Stassen can offer no criticism of his ability and his service. Any concerted effort to drop Mr. NIXON from the GOP ticket would damage Republican election prospects. The strong popular support for Mr. NIXON was shown in the tremendous write-in vote given him in primaries such as in Oregon and New Hampshire.

Mr. Stassen often has referred but vaguely to some kind of a poll he has conducted. A recent Gallup Poll showed the following Republican preferences for Vice President: NIXON, 66 percent; Stassen, 7 percent; Herter, 2 percent. Among independents, the figures were: NIXON, 48 percent; Stassen, 8 percent; Herter, 3 percent.

With the choice limited to Mr. NIXON or Mr. Herter, the replies favored the Vice President 8 to 1.

The politically ambitious Mr. Stassen has decreased his usefulness to the President. He no longer can be considered a spokesman for a unified administration team, or even a member of it.

Mr. Stassen would do well to weigh seriouly the suggestion made by Members of the House that he resign from his White House post.

Since being elected governor of Minnesota in 1938 at the age of 31, Mr. Stassen never has lost his appetite for the limelight. As recently as July 9, he said he would be available for the presidency if Mr. Eisenhower did not run.

One can only wonder if Mr. Stassen's first concern is for Governor Herter or for his own ambitions. After all, 1960 is only 4 years hence.

Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, as we reach the conclusion of the 84th Congress, it seems to me worthwhile to make a brief and informal report to my constituents on the state of the Union.

The most important thing to all of us is that America is at peace. Since the President concluded the tragic war in Korea, there have been no Americans in combat anywhere in the world. Moreover, while it must be said that there are lots of trouble spots, I am very optimistic about the maintenance of the peace. While the President's conference at Geneva may not have achieved concrete agreements, it has been increasingly obvious that there has been a greatly improved climate in our international affairs since that time. The change in the attitude of Soviet Russia is more than superficial. They may not have had a change of heart, but they are certainly changing policies, both by reason of difficulties in their own country, and also because of the firm policies and tremendous striking power of the United States. I have talked to Secretary Dulles, General Gruenther, and many other leaders on this point, and they are all convinced that Russia does not plan, nor does she dare to plan, aggressive war against us. If war should come, it would be the result of accidents, which we will certainly avoid if humanly possible.

Along with the peace has come the greatest prosperity in our national history. Inflation has been stopped, average pay and employment is at an all-time high, Federal taxes were cut $8 billion dollars, many nuisance taxes have either been abolished or reduced, and despite our enormous expenditures for defense and other necessary purposes, the budget has been balanced with a surplus of nearly $2 billion cash at the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1956.

The American people have more houses, more automobiles, and more comforts than ever before, and this happy situation has been achieved without the false inflation and stimulation of a war economy.

At the same time, we continue to make giant steps in social progress. Our social-security system has been improved and strengthened, and we are making

dramatic improvements in the public health.

The American society is the envy of the world, and is an example to the world of what can be accomplished under a system of full liberty and free enterprise.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

In the general field of national economy, we:

Authorized $33 billion for a 13-year highway-construction program, which when completed will completely rebuild and modernize our system of interstate highways.

Provided for substantial pay increase for all postal workers.

Increased minimum wage under Federal Labor Standards Act to $1 per hour.

Authorized 4-year program of airport construction with grants to States to implement program.

Increased criminal penalties under Antitrust Act.

Increased from 25 million to 125 million authorization to Small Business Administration to make disaster loans.

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Passed improved social-security bill commencing benefits to widows and surviving dependent mothers at age 62 instead of 65, and provided certain disability benefits at age 50, and further extended coverage of law, and increased grants to States for aid to needy, blind, and dependent children.

Passed Federal flood insurance program, and in addition act permits FHA loans for homes damaged in floods and other major disasters.

Extended Salk polio vaccination program to July 1, 1957.

Extended school milk program.

Authorized Federal aid of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases.

Extended modified version of housing bill.

SPECIAL NOTES

A special note should perhaps be made concerning the so-called Federal aid to education bill. As nearly everyone is aware, this was defeated since it included the Powell amendment preventing the expenditure of Federal funds to Southern schools which discriminated against Negroes. Its passage was inevitably blocked largely but not entirely because of solid opposition by Southern Democrats. The same thing can be said about the civil-rights bill which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives, but did not have a chance of passing the Senate this late in the session.

Now, I want to refer particularly to a program which is very close to me, the appropriations for which are the concern of my subcommittee.

HEALTH RESEARCH

The National Institutes of Health, located at Bethesda, Md., close to Washington, are doing dramatic work in the field of research against the major diseases afflicting the people of this country. An enormous effort is being made in the field of cancer research, although with results that are not so far immediately encouraging. In the field of mental health activities, study of the heart, arthritis and related diseases, neurology and blindness, very substantial progress is being made. It is not too much to hope that within the next 5 years or less, assuming the continuance of a well-supported program of research, that major results will be accomplished. We must continue that support.

The Congress this year has been extremely generous and has, in the case of all the National Institutes, greatly exceeded the requests of the Bureau of the Budget.

I think it is interesting to look at the following tables showing how much more money Congress has appropriated than was requested, or than was appropriated last year:

National Cancer Institute

1956 appropriation	$24,978,000
1957 budget estimate	32,437,000
House allowance	34,437,000
Committee recommendation	48,432,000

Mental health activities

1956 appropriation	$18,001,000
1957 budget estimate	21,749,000
House allowance	23,749,000
Committee recommendation	35,197,000

National Heart Institute

1956 appropriation	$18,898,000
1957 budget estimate	22,106,000
House allowance	25,106,000
Committee recommendation	33,396,000

Arthritis and metabolic disease activities

1956 appropriation	$10,840,000
1957 budget estimate	13,345,000
House allowance	13,845,000
Committee recommendation	15,885,000

Dental health activities

1956 appropriation	$2,176,000
1957 budget estimate	2,971,000
House allowance	3,471,000
Committee recommendation	6,026,000

Microbiology activities

1956 appropriation	$7,775,000
1957 budget estimate	9,799,000
House allowance	8,799,000
Committee recommendation	13,299,000

Neurology and blindness activities

1956 appropriation	$9,861,000
1957 budget estimate	12,196,000
House allowance	14,196,000
Committee recommendation	18,650,000

This is one of the most interesting fields in which I have been active, and one which gives the greatest promise of future welfare of all Americans.

It has not been possible, in a brief report, to cover fields relating to special groups.

In conclusion, it is proper to say that in my judgment many laws have been passed which ought not to have been passed, and many have failed to pass which should have been favorably considered. The net result, however, is most encouraging progress for the state of the Union, which is already in a most highly satisfactory condition.

The Honorable James P. Richards

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I, too, desire to pay tribute to one of the great personalities in the House of Representatives, the chairman of my committee, the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS.

It has been my very great privilege to have served on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs of which Mr. RICHARDS has recently been the chairman.

Words cannot express my great respect and admiration for him. He has conducted the affairs of our committee diligently, fairly, and without political consideration. I know of no committee in this House which has functioned with so little political bias as our committee.

JIM RICHARDS, as we refer to him so affectionately, is a man who typifies the American boy of humble parentage who has risen to great stature in his State and more recently in the Nation. He has made an impact on this body. We shall long remember his devoted service and his kindly attitude toward all of us.

As he takes leave of us, I join with my colleagues in wishing him Godspeed and good health. Here is a man.

Sources of Energy for Electrical Generation in the Two Decades Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. M. G. BURNSIDE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, in my estimation one of the greatest engineering minds in the Nation today is Mr. Philip Sporn, who is president of the American Gas & Electric Co. He has pioneered in new methods in the field of electrical generation. It has been my privilege recently to read an address which Mr. Sporn made on May 11 to the American Mining Congress at Cincinnati, Ohio. I feel that this discussion is so impressive that it should be read by each Member of the House; and I, therefore, want to take this opoprtunity to include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The address follows:

SOURCES OF ENERGY FOR ELECTRIC GENERATION IN THE TWO DECADES AHEAD

In order to arrive at a reasonably reliable projection of sources of energy for the somewhat distant future, it is necessary first to make a good estimate of total energy requirements for the period in question. Such an estimate in turn depends upon the view taken of overall anticipated economic development.

I begin, therefore, with certain conclusions about the level of economic activity which I believe is to be expected in the United States during the next two decades, the period I have elected to examine. A number of factors impress me as especially relevant in arriving at these conclusions. We are experiencing a population boom which gives every indication of continuing for some time to come. We have achieved a high level of material welfare with a relatively steady but increasing trend over the past several decades. We have good reason to hope that that trend will continue. The very fact that we are engaged in a worldwide struggle between the free and the Communist world that seems destined to go on for a long time

to come makes it essential that we maintain and increase our economic strength.

We must be economically strong in order to support an adequate system of armament; we must also produce enough goods and services to take care of the peacetime requirements of our growing population at ever higher standards of welfare; we need to produce enough in addition to help strengthen our allies and potential allies who are less fortunately situated than we are.

Now, among other things, what all this means is that our energy requirements will have to increase very substantially year by year. Ours is a technically advanced economy, which is another way of saying that it is a high-energy economy. This view of our present situation and future needs sets the base for a quantitative projection of how much energy we will have to make available in the future.

ENERGY REQUIREMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE NEXT TWO DECADES

Today the United States fulfills its energy requirements by bituminous and anthracite coal, oil, natural gas, and waterpower. Total current use represents 1,480 million tons of bituminous coal-equivalent annually. Recent predictions about the country's requirements 20 years hence place the figure at approximately 2,750 million tons of bituminous-coal equivalent annually. The distribution of this future supply among coal, oil, and so on, is in itself a very complicated problem. Study of the subject, taking into account the availability of various classes of fuel and the prices at which they will be available, is among the most important resource problems that warrant attention. But the question of sources of energy for overall requirements of the long-term future is hardly a manageable subject for an occasion of this kind. I want to address myself to more limited questions—energy requirements for electric power and the sources of such energy. Even such a subject may seem overly ambitious. But if, as I have done, we consider not the remote future but only the next two decades, I think it possible to make reasonably reliable projections.

A look 20 years ahead is commended by a number of considerations:

Two decades are definitely within the range of interest of almost all people now engaged on the problem.

The trend in availability of competitive fuels for this period can be gaged with reasonable accuracy.

The effect of atomic energy in particular can be gauged for this period—for whether one is inclined to be optimistic or pessimistic in his outlook about nuclear power, the chances are that an examination of the problems involved in developing competitive atomic plants in the next 20 years will yield projections that lie within a relatively narrow range.

Finally, the next two decades may witness a focusing of worldwide forces affecting us, which may be the most critical that will confront this country for perhaps several hundred years ahead. Energy policies will play an important role in the working out of these forces. This is particularly true from the standpoint that, if any action needs to be taken looking toward a change in policy or the projection of a new program to make new sources of energy available, there is not very much time to loose if effective help is to be obtained prior to the critical conjuncture of turning points in our history of the next several decades which may affect us for centuries.

We begin with total generation by utilities in the United States of nearly 550 billion kilowatt-hours in 1955. Using the techniques that we are accustomed to apply in projecting growth in my own company, which, of course, take into account our expectations concerning the national economy, I believe the corresponding figure for 1975 will be close to 2,000 billion kilowatt-hours. A reasonable breakdown of this load would show the several classes of use as follows:

Projected total electric power generation by electric utilities in the United States in 1975

Class of consumer:	*Billions of kilowatt-hours*
Residential	545
Commercial	250
Industrial	900
Miscellaneous	55
Total consumption	1,750
Losses	250
Total utility generation	2,000

Residential consumption is estimated on the basis of 54.5 million customers in 1975 with an average annual consumption per customer of 10,000 kilowatt-hours, as compared with 44.5 million customers today and slightly over 2,750 kilowatt-hours average use. Industrial consumption results from an estimate of 245 for the FRB Index of Industrial Production in 1975 and industrial consumption of 3,675 million kilowatt-hours per point of the index, or 900 billion kilowatt-hours. (It excludes generation for self-use, which we estimate at about 250 billion kilowatt-hours.) Commercial and miscellaneous consumption represent extrapolations of present trends related to projected growth in population and income. The important figure here is the 900 billion kilowatt-hours for industry.

The estimate of 245 for the FRB Index of Industrial Production for 1975 requires explanation. It is nearly twice the 1953 figure of 134, but I do not regard it as overly optimistic. In the same period, 1953–1975, the number of production workers in the country, which in 1953 was close to 14 million, is expected to increase to nearly 17 million. Taking account of the fairly well established trend in working time, man-hours worked may be expected to rise in the same interval by a much smaller amount—my estimate is a modest 8 percent. Obviously then, the bulk of this large increase in the FRB index has to come about as a result of the continuation of the rising long-term trend in the output of the average worker.

The measure of this is seen in the nearly trebling of large power sales per point of FRB index which I have assumed. And the nub of the increase is that the 1975 worker, with fewer hours on the job than his counterpart in 1953, will be much more productive and that the increased productivity will require tremendously more electric energy per hour of work. The 1953 figure of 9 kilowatt-hours per man-hour will, in my opinion, be nearly 19 kilowatt-hours per man-hour by 1975.

With industrial energy requirements of 900 billion kilowatt-hours and the residential, commercial, and other uses of power that we believe are clearly in the offing, you end up with the total energy requirement of 2,000 billion kilowatt-hours.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THE HYDRO PORTION

The installed hydroelectric generating capacity in the United States in 1955 was not quite 25 million kilowatts, or approximately 21 percent of a total generating capacity for the utilities of 114,550,000 kilowatts. But the percentage of hydro power in the total of electric energy is on a declining trend; hydro is bound to play a consistently diminishing role as our economy expands and the expansion in total power requirements continues to exceed the growth potential of our hydro reserves. By 1975 the Department of the Interior expects that 14 million kilowatts of hydro will have been added to the existing 25 million kilowatts of hydro installations. The Federal Power Commission estimates as much as 30 million kilowatts of additional hydro between now and 1975, or a total of 55 million kilowatts by that date.

My own projections make me think that we shall have about 48 million kilowatts installed hydro by 1975 and total capacity of all kinds of 382 million kilowatts. This would mean that 2 decades from now slightly over one-eighth will be hydro and that this capacity will account for 250 billion kilowatt-hours, or one-eighth of all generation. The balance, or 1,750 billion kilowatt-hours, will be thermally generated. Solar, tidal, and wind energy in the United States can be disregarded for the period in question. Despite the attempted revival of Passamaquoddy and the growing interest in solar energy, it does not look as if such sources will count for much between now and 1975.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THERMONUCLEARLY

The balance of 1,750 billion kilowatt-hours to be generated by thermal power will either employ nuclear or fossil fuels. I would like to give you my estimates for nuclear fuel and then, having determined how much will have to be supplied by fossil fuels, go on to estimates of the respective parts that will be supplied by oil, gas, and coal.

The large experimental nuclear power projects which are now well beyond the early planning stage total altogether about 1 million kilowatts. These reactors are either owned outright by the Atomic Energy Commission or are being installed under the reactor demonstration program of the Commission, or in some cases are to be owned and paid for entirely by private companies without governmental aid.

This is a substantial program. A million kilowatts is a sizable amount of capacity from any point of view. Nevertheless, the effect of nuclear fuel and its impact on the energy picture of 1975 in the United States, although not insignificant, is likely to be relatively small. One of the important things to remember is that, while all the promising types of reactors are being undertaken on a large developmental scale, we should not be surprised by a period of slowdown between the completion of each of the prototypes and the inception of additional reactors of similar species. Each experimental reactor must be built and operated to obtain the first test results and operational verifications of engineering projections. These reactors will then have to undergo a phase of further experimentation and development before the design and construction of more advanced additional projects in the same family is decided upon or before wholly new types evolve.

A substantial period of technical development and adaptation precedes the perfection of major scientific discoveries. We are now witnessing this process in the development of nuclear powerplants. In view of the formidable technical-economic obstacles to be overcome, progress in making economically competitive nuclear installations is not going to be as dramatic as has generally been assumed. I am confident that the obstacles will be overcome and nuclear power costs will be reduced to competitive levels, but only after some years of painstaking engineering development and experience with a wide variety of large experimental operating units.

Hence, I do not believe that the total installed nuclear generating capacity by 1975 will reach a level much above 20 million kilowatts in the United States. This will then represent some 5.2 percent of the total generating capacity at that time, but, owing to the higher load factor that is likely to be available to the nuclear plants, this capacity should account for approximately 150 billion kilowatt-hours, or 7.5 percent of the total 1975 utility generated energy. Of course, if the fossil fuels should for any reason fail to meet the requirements adequately, nuclear plants

will be installed more rapidly. On the other hand, there is the possibility that even the estimate of 20 million kilowatts in atomic plants by 1975 may be too optimistic, because the time that it will take to solve some of the technical and economic problems may be greater than any of us now realize. Some notion of the time span which may be involved in the development of competitive nuclear power may be obtained from the recent estimates of Admiral Rickover with regard to the Shippingport plant scheduled for operation next year. Admiral Rickover has estimated that the cost of power from the operation of the first core in the Shippingport reactor will be some 52 mills per kilowatt-hour. The second core, he estimates, should produce power at 39 mills per kilowatt-hour, and the third core, which may be ready for operation in 10 years, may reduce the cost of power to 14 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is still well above a realistically competitive cost level.

While there can certainly be differences of judgment with respect to the speed with which competitive atomic power will take its place in our economy, the estimates presented herein represent I believe a reasonably well-founded judgment of the probable order of magnitude of atomic energy that will be produced in the United States in 1975.

I would not want to leave the impression that Admiral Rickover's account of what is to be expected on costs from our first commercial-sized experimental power reactor illustrates anything more than the point that the first prototype of any reactor will represent the first step in a relatively long progression of steps from higher to lower costs. I say this because even now I think we know how to build reactors which will produce power at a cost reasonably close to that which the Shippingport reactor will not approach until 10 years after initial operations; the reason, of course, that we are that confident today is because of all the experimental work which has gone on in the last 10 years.

HOW THIS ENERGY WILL BE SUPPLIED—THERMAL PORTION: FOSSIL FUELS

The picture with regard to the fossil fuels it seems to me is susceptible of fairly accurate analysis. Let us start with natural gas.

Gas

In 1955 natural gas supplied some 96 million kilowatt-hours, or 17.5 percent of the total electric energy, and 22 percent of the thermally generated energy of the United States. The figures, going back to 1950, of percentage of thermal energy generated with natural gas are:

Portion of total electric utility thermal electric energy generated by gas

Year:	Percentage
1950	19.1
1951	20.9
1952	23.3
1953	23.6
1954	25.7
1955	22.0

The conditions which have resulted in the continual rise, until reversed in 1955, in the proportion of total electric energy generation accounted for by natural gas in the past 2 decades, and particularly since the end of World War II, are not likely to prevail over the next 2 decades. The rapid extension of the gas pipeline networks is nearing completion and the emphasis now is being directed to gas storage facilities in order to avoid the need for selling large quantities off-peak at extremely low prices. The very rapid rise in gas demand for premium uses at higher prices has made such storage attractive and has stimulated construction of more storage facilities.

The rapid expansion of demand has, in turn, intensified the upward pressure on gas prices in recent years. The same process is likely to continue and exert increasing pressure on natural gas reserves. This pressure is reversing the price advantage that natural gas has enjoyed over alternative fuels until now.

As demand expands and strains natural gas reserves and as prices rise, it will become less economical to burn off-peak gas under boilers. Available supplies are likely to be assigned to those electric utilities located close to the sources of gas supply and to an even greater extent to those special high value uses in which natural gas is especially suitable and in which for one reason or another price is not the important factor.

Appraisals of the role of natural gas in supplying 1975 energy requirements vary considerably in large part because of uncertainty as to recoverable reserves. Some of the leading estimates of the total marketed producton two decades hence, are:

Projected marketed production of natural gas in the United States in 1975

Authority:	Trillion cubic-feet
AGA	22
Department of Interior	19
Wallace E. Pratt	15
Paley Commission	15.2

Adopting from this range of figures 19 trillion cubic-feet as a likely estimate for marketed production, it is possible to make a fairly reliable estimate of the amount of power that will be generated with natural gas. The maintenance of natural gas's present share of the electric utility generating market would imply the consumption of about 3 trillion cubic feet or almost 16 percent of all gas production in 1975, compared to 1955 when use for power accounted for only about 12 percent of total marketed production. An expansion of this magnitude in the utility market does not appear feasible when reviewed against the expected expansion in demand for the higher value uses and estimates of ultimate reserves. My own judgment is that gas for utility generation in 1975 will be approximately 1.7 trillion cubic-feet, which will represent expansion of close to 50 percent in gas consumption by electric utilities. (Mr. Pratt has ventured a somewhat higher estimate of 2.4 trillion cubic-feet.) With the B. t. u. figure at 1,050 per cubic foot and an average performance of 9,000 B. t. u. per kilowatt-hour, this represents 200 billion kilowatt-hours or 10 percent of total 1975 generation.

Oil

In 1955 oil accounted for 36 billion kilowatt-hours, or 6.68 percent of the total generation and 8.3 percent of thermal generation. The figures going back to 1950 are as follows:

Portion of total electric utility thermal electric energy generated by oil

Year:	Percentage
1950	10.2
1951	7.7
1952	7.4
1953	8.7
1954	6.67
1955	8.3

As in the case of natural gas, projections of petroleum's role in the energy economy in 1975 are highly dependent upon estimates of total recoverable reserves. While these vary over a considerable range, nevertheless leading estimates of total oil use in 1975 are quite close to one another:

Estimated total oil use in the United States in 1975

Authority:	Billions of barrels
Bureau of Mines	5.0
Wallace E. Pratt	4.9
Paley Commission	5.0

As in the case of natural gas, oil is being diverted to higher value uses, such as motive power, for which economic or convenient substitutes are not available. There has been a rapid growth in demand for the lighter petroleum fractions which is expected to continue. This shift in the composition of petroleum demand has led to changes in the petroleum refining process to diminish the portion of the barrel of oil which remains as residual oil, the oil used for power generation; even residual oil itself is finding higher value uses in the making of petroleum coke, asphalt, and other materials. In the international sphere the United States may expect to meet increasing competition for the world's petroleum resources so that imports are less likely to be available in the necessary quantities at favorable prices for utility generation. Western Europe is straining its coal reserves and looking toward oil to fill the gap in its energy supply. Accentuating this, growth in the underdeveloped countries of the world is likely to result in a very rapid rise in their petroleum demand.

These factors will increase the competitive pressures on world petroleum markets.

It appears unlikely that, in the face of the anticipated expansion in demand for the lighter fuel oils in their many specialized uses, the prospective diminution of our petroleum reserves and the rising prices likely to result from the growing demand and rising costs of petroleum exploration and development, the quantity of petroleum burned under utility boilers could expand the almost 300 percent necessary to maintain its present share of the market.

Based upon the accepted conversion figures, my own estimate of use of oil for power production is 143 million barrels, a 90 percent expansion over 1955 consumption. (Here again Mr. Pratt believes a somewhat higher figure—182.5 million barrels—is justified.) My estimate of a 90 percent expansion over 1955 would mean oil-fired power production equivalent to over 91 billion kilowatt-hours, or roughly 5 percent of the total.

Coal

In this country we are extremely fortunate in our coal reserves. To arrive at the portion of the electric energy to be generated by coal we are, therefore, able to simply subtract the percentages of the total requirements that will be supplied by hydro, nuclear, fuel, gas, and oil. It will be recalled that there are 12.5 percent, 7.5 percent, 10 percent, and 5 percent, respectively. Thus the total amount to be taken care of by coal is 65 percent, or 1,300 billion kilowatt-hours. Again using an average performance of 9,000 British thermal units and assuming coal at 12,000 British thermal units average heat content, this results in a 1975 coal utilization of 488 million tons.

In a previous study that I made of this subject, I had come to the conclusion that the amount of coal, based upon a similar assumption of the proportions to be supplied by nuclear energy, was 463 million tons. This lower figure resulted from using a conversion ratio to go from British thermal units to tons of coal on the basis of 13,100 British thermal units per pound as against the 12,000 utilized here. However, the latter figure is the more realistic for average utility coal.

I have a few remaining observations. I am confident that our industrial system will be able to provide the country with the additional 275 million kilowatts of capacity that will have to be built by 1975. I have equal confidence that we can make the fuel available to the extent required by the new capacity. As to that, the most important observation is that the role of coal will with the years become increasingly prominent.

This country is in an especially favored position in that we have the necessary coal reserves.

Parenthetically, the favorable situation of the United States in respect to coal must be contrasted with the situation of many areas abroad in which fossil fuels are even now available only at high cost or where the areas are rapidly approaching such a condition. In such areas the rate at which nuclear power plants will be built to supplement and even replace plants using fossil fuel is likely to occur more rapidly than in this country. The present British program is a good illustration of the point. And I think it is also very probable that our interest in strengthening our friends abroad in relation to their energy program will be a stimulant to our own experimental work on nuclear reactors and that our manufacturers are likely to play an important part in supplying equipment for reactors abroad under conditions that make their work in that field more attractive economically at an earlier date than in the United States where the situation with regard to coal and coal reserves is so favorable.

But coal in the ground is not available until it is mined; in that process there will be required vast increases in capital facilities and, therefore, in capital expenditures and considerable development in all phases of coal mining: technological, management, and operational. It is true that there is on the horizon a young, vigorous, and serious competitor in the form of nuclear fuel but, considering the opportunities that are presented to coal and to the coal industry, I will not believe that the effect of the impending challenge of nuclear fuel will be anything but a stimulant to the industry—to its owners, managers, technicians, and to the people engaged in the actual mining. In responding to that challenge all of them will enhance their own welfare. That is important but, what is more important, they will make an immeasurable contribution to the welfare and safety of the people of the United States, and indeed of the whole western world.

Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott, Soldier and Statesman

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with many other colleagues to express regret that JESSE WOLCOTT is leaving Congress. He has been an outstanding personality in the years that I have been a Member of this distinguished body. Rarely have I disagreed with his position on matters that came within the jurisdiction of the great Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. WOLCOTT had the unusual ability to analyze a legislative problem and then to set forth his views in clearly understandable language. There was never any doubt when he completed an argument that the membership of the House understood his position.

His leadership will be missed. The people of the State of Michigan will perhaps miss him more than we do because he was an outstanding legislator. On the other hand, he has today established himself as a national personality by virtue of his grasp of banking and currency problems as they affect the welfare of the Nation. So his departure from this body creates a void not only in the Michigan delegation but truely it is a national loss. Men of his ability and stature are not numerous in public life. He has given of the best years of his life to public service and he has earned a very deserved respite from legislative responsibilities.

JESSE WOLCOTT, Mr. Speaker, also served with honor and valor as a soldier in World War I. It was my privilege to have been a member, along with him, of the first officers training camp at Fort Sheridan, Ill., established in 1917. For 90 days we trained intensively to become second lieutenants in Uncle Sam's Army in a war that was to save the world for democracy. Here, also, JESSE WOLCOTT made an outstanding record as a soldier. So we have in this man a personification of soldier and statesman.

We shall miss you, JESSE, but our prayers and good wishes go with you for continued health and happiness in the days ahead.

Real Issue as Congress Quits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by David Lawrence:

REAL ISSUE AS CONGRESS QUITS—ADJOURNMENT IS VIEWED AS PAUSE IN BATTLE OF STATE SOCIALISM VERSUS PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

(By David Lawrence)

This was not a "do nothing" Congress. Nor was it a Congress that did a little about everything. It was a Congress in which what failed to be passed was as important an indicator of the real battle going on in America as the measures that did become law.

The real story centers on the four-way split in the political parties of today. It reflects a big tug of war between state socialism and the private-enterprise system.

The pressure in the present Congress toward Government ownership, Government control, Government subsidy, and big-government domination of everything has been revealed as unremitting. Congress will be in adjournment only about 5 months, and the warfare will then be resumed.

Meanwhile, all the defeats and all the victories are temporary. The advocates of public power who really want to wipe out private utilities in America by extending the TVA scheme to other regions of the country were halted but not beaten. They were balked in their effort to see atomic power for plant use put completely into Government hands. They lost out on a public-power project known as Hells Canyon on the Snake River in Idaho, but they found administration support for construction of public dams on the upper Colorado River.

The administration's position is that Government should do what private capital cannot and will not undertake. A Republican bloc considers this an opening wedge for socialism. Another bloc—mostly Democrats—is anxious to push Government ownership on every side. They will not be happy until all food stores, all department stores, all retail stores, all steel plants, all factories are owned by the Government. A minority bloc of Democrats is opposed. Most of the Democrats, however, are making the same steady drive toward nationalization of industries as the Socialist Party has espoused in Britain, and which now is being repelled by the Conservatives in Parliament.

There are other major issues, of course, on which the division in the parties in Congress is not just between nonradical and radical but, for example, between those who differed on foreign aid. In the vote on the $4.1 billion appropriation bill in the Senate this week, 30 Democrats voted for it and 15 against it, while 30 Republicans voted for it and 15 against it. If it hadn't been for President Eisenhower's pressure on the Republicans who held the line for him, the measure surely would have been cut further. This was an acid test.

So it isn't accurate to blame those divisions on an alleged lack of leadership by the President. These are the familiar criticisms leveled at him in the propaganda of the Democratic National Commmittee and its allies. The truth is, a bloc in the Democratic Party has held the balance of power on many measures. Likewise, a bloc in the Democratic Party has kept up a drumfire of criticism at Secretary Dulles as well as at the President. This partisan sabotage has been unduly publicized abroad and has encouraged there a defiance of some of the American Government's policies.

A careful examination of the steady stream of speeches—some of them prepared at Democratic campaign headquarters—shows the Democrats as a party have not made good on their pledge to the people to cooperate with the President on foreign policy, though a few like Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, did go along with the Executive.

In the House Appropriations Committee, the Democrats recently lined up solidly against acceptance of the Eisenhower administration's foreign-aid proposals. The Republicans in the committee stood solidly by the President. Yet, in the months to come, much will be heard on the stump to the effect that a Democratic Congress has cooperated with the Executive on foreign policy and that the Republicans have not.

So, looking back on the record of the Congress, the only satisfaction that can be derived is that it was not worse and that the nonradical forces did hold the radicals at bay on some important measures. The school construction bill failure has to be charged to the radical bloc of the Democratic Party and the southern bloc who didn't want Federal control of education. The agricultural program was adopted because the soil bank idea of the administration—a socialistic experiment—was too popular to be blocked by the Democrats.

The Democrats succeeded, however, in pushing through the unsound expansion of the social security system over the protest of the administration. The socialistic features of the public-housing bill were successfully fought by a bloc of Democrats allied with a bloc of Republicans.

There can be no dispute about the remarkable type of leadership in Congress today—Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Representative JOE MARTIN in the House, and WILLIAM KNOWLAND and LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate.

Senator KNOWLAND, the Republican leader, is one of the outstanding personalities of this era in public life. He handled with finesse and good judgment the many complicated tasks entrusted to him by the White House. Senator JOHNSON was masterful in handling his side.

The two Senate leaders worked together harmoniously, respecting each other's differences but operating the whole legislative program as efficiently as possible, considering the handicap of the four-bloc party system with its temporary coalitions and alliances.

Five months hence the battle resumes. Even if one party controls both Congress and

White House, the four-bloc system will remain. It's an ideological cleavage. It will not end till the forces seeking confiscation of incomes and property, as well as Government mastery of the lives of all citizens, are decisively beaten in an election by the forces that really believe in the basic principles of the Constitution. This means respect for the functions of a Federal Government as defined in the 10th article of the Bill of Rights—namely, that all powers not specifically enumerated in the Constitution itself are reserved to the people and not to Congress or to the Supreme Court or to the Executive.

Lebanon Celebrates Its 13th Anniversary of Independence November 22, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of one of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend my sincere felicitations to the people of Lebanon, President Camille Shamun, and His Excellency, Dr. Charles Malik, Ambassador of Lebanon, on the occasion of the 13th anniversary of independence of Lebanon, November 22, 1956.

After having heroically cpposed in different epochs numerous invasions, the Lebanese still stand firm for their freedom and independence. With varying fortunes they maintained the high spirit of liberty. Like some of its neighbors, according to the peace settlements of the First World War, Lebanon was incorporated into the mandate system. The ensuing years until 1943 witnessed many attempts on the part of Lebanon to wrest itself from the jaws of quasi-colonialism. When the British and Free French drove out the Vichy French Government in 1941 they both declared the independence of Lebanon. In the summer of 1943 free popular elections were held resulting in a constitutional parliament, which elected His Excellency Bechara El-Khoury President of the Republic of Lebanon.

In 1944 and 1945 a score of powers recognized Lebanon's independence. In February 1945, Lebanon declared war on Germany and Japan, and on April 12 of the same year she signed the United Nations Declaration in Washington. Two final acts completed Lebanon's launching into international life; the signing of the Pact of the League of Arab States in Cairo in March 1945 and Lebanon's full participation as a sovereign and independent state in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco. Lebanon has openly avowed that she intends to play her full part in the international field as a free and independent member of the Arab League.

Grave crises have arisen to plague the new government, but these occasions of friction have had the effect of strengthening rather than weakening Lebanon's independence, thanks primarily to the remarkable national unity which the diverse elements of her population were able to achieve.

Although Lebanon is primarily an agricultural country, the era since the end of the war has witnessed a remarkable development of her industries. In trade and commerce, Beirut is certainly one of the main centers of the Near East. The economic importance of Tripoli is growing, owing to the fact that it is 1 of the 2 termini of the oil pipeline from Iraq.

In the words of the Lebanese Ambassador, His Excellency Charles Malik:

> The significance of Lebanon should not be sought in the material sphere. Her significance is entirely intellectual and spiritual. She is the home par excellence in the Near East of freedom of thought and conscience. The country is above 80 percent literate, and it is estimated that every year more than a quarter of her population go to school. Thousands of students flock into her institutions from all over the Near East. The influence of Lebanese thought and life and traditions and outlook upon this army of students is incalculable. It was in Lebanon that the Arabic version of the Bible was made and the Summa of Saint Thomas translated into Arabic. The modern Arab literary, social and political awakening owes its original impetus and direction to Lebanese thought. The entire moral, esthetic, and intellectual climate of the Near East is unthinkable without the agency of the Lebanese. About 1 million Lebanese live in Lebanon, 1 million in North, Central, and South America, and another million spread over the rest of the world; and wherever they go, the children of Lebanon carry with them their characteristic industry, their traditional tolerance, their spirit of adventure, their readiness to learn, and, above all, a genuine thirst for and respect for the truth.

No finer tribute could be paid to the stalwart people of Lebanon on this momentous occasion.

Quadrennial Convention of the First Slovak Wreath of the Free Eagle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, during the week of August 13, 1956, in my home city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., there will be held the quadrennial convention of an outstanding American fraternal society, the First Slovak Wreath of the Free Eagle. Though not the largest, it is among the strongest fraternal groups composed of Americans of Slovak descent in the country. Under the magnificent leadership of an outstanding fraternalist, Matthew Cintula of Staten Island, N. Y., this organization now boasts a mmebership of over 8,000 and total aggregate assets of more than $2½ million. It is justly proud of its solvency of 119.08 percent or $391,346.13 above its margin of safety as prescribed by law.

Founded on September 24, 1896, in Bridgeport, Conn., where its home office is located at 650 Arctic Street, the organization was chartered by the Connecticut General Assembly on May 24, 1901, and was authorized to transact business as a fraternal society by the insurance commissioner of that State on October 5, 1914.

Among the several laudable objects for which this society was founded was the intent to "aid and assist each other in sickness or misfortune and to provide funeral expenses for deceased members."

Since January 1, 1918, the method of conducting business was changed to the level premium system, and the society is still operating on this plan. Policies for adults are issued on any of the following 4 plans: Ordinary life, 20-payment life, 20-year endowment, and endowment at age 65.

From January 1, 1938, the insurance certificates were based on the American Experience Table at 3½ percent interest, and from 1949 the interest was set at 3 percent.

Certificates of the organization based on the assessment rates of the American Experience Table grant cash surrender values, paid-up insurance, loans and automatic payment of dues after 36 monthly assessments. The maximum insurance benefit available is $2,500 in any 1 class, or $5,000 in all classes.

Nonmedical benefit certificates are now issued on any 1 of the 4 plans. For applicants from age 16 to 40 the limit is not over $1,000, while from age 41 to 45, the insurance limit is $500. I am informed that the society accepts members up to 55 years of age with a medical examination.

Reflecting its interest in young people, the organization has a juvenile branch which issues the following plans: Term to age 18, 20-year payment and 20-year endowment. All juvenile policies, except the term to age 18, have the same comparative values and advantages as adult policies, including cash surrender, loan or paid-up insurance.

At age 16, the member who has a term to 18 policy, may joint the adult department, and when he reaches 18 and is in good health, transfer to the adult branch is mandatory.

The Slovak Eagles, as they are informally called, have a very fine record for progress and fraternal spirit and I am proud to learn that many hundreds of this organization hail from the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. The organization is set up on the subordinate lodge system and is licensed to do business in the States of Connecticut, New Jersey, Ohio, New York, and Pennsylvania. Branches are also maintained in Colorado, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, and West Virginia.

The first Slovak wreath of the Free Eagle has always been fortunate in the high quality of its officers and official staff. Among the leading figures in the society there are and have been, some of the most outstanding American fraternal

leaders in America. Assisting President Cintula and the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J. Carnicke, spiritual director, are the following officers: Stephen Gombar, vice president; Stephen Swartz, secretary; John V. Hudak, treasurer, who resides in Exeter, in my congressional district; Paul ine Bayan, Michael Soyka, Michael Chabak, Barbara Hojdic, and Michael Simko, supreme tribunal; John S. Nemergut, Emma Mack, Andrew Maczko, and Frank Benik, auditors; Matthew Cintula, John V. Hudak, Stephen Swarts, Andrew Kaza, and John Rusnak, finance committee; Anna Katusak, president of the juvenile order; Atty. John J. Vavrence, general counsel, and Dr. Arthur Sekerak, medical examiner.

Wilkes-Barre and Wyoming Valley have felt the beneficient influence of immigrants from Slovakia for more than 90 years. As my home city of Wilkes-Barre this year celebrates the 150th anniversary of its incorporation, it is a pleasure to welcome the Slovak Eagles on the occasion of their quadrennial convention during the week of August 13, and to wish them deserved success in their commendable fraternal endeavors.

Commencement Exercises, Georgetown University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the 157th annual commencement exercises at Georgetown University here in Washington, D. C., at which three honorary degrees and 1,062 degrees in course were awarded took place on Monday, June 11.

On Sunday morning, June 10, the graduating students were exhorted to greatness of soul by the Reverend Dominic Rover, O. P., the baccalaureate speaker. Father Rover, of the Black-Friars Guild, New York City, is a 1941 college alumnus, and is the son of Judge and Mrs. Leo A. Rover of Washington.

The Baccalaureate Mass was celebrated on the Healy lawn by the Reverend John E. Wise, S. J., 1926, of Loyola College. The deacon was the Reverend Thomas L. Farrell, 1931, of Catonsville, Md., and the subdeacon was the Reverend Edward J. Snyder, S. J., 1941, of St. Peter's Preparatory School, Jersey City.

Because it was such an outstanding and timely address, I am pleased to include it in its entirety, under permission to extend my remarks.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, that it was for me a genuine pleasure to attend the baccalaureate mass and the commencement exercises to which I was designated by the Very Reverend Edward B. Bunn, S. J., the university president, as the chief marshal, an honor that comes to a silver jubilarian of the university, and I am very proud of my L. L. B. in the class of 1931.

Father Rover's address follows:

BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS BY THE REVEREND DOMINIC ROVER, O. P., AT GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, JUNE 10, 1956

My dear graduates, on this day, before the great day of your graduation, we gather here to put a sacred seal upon that event, to attend Mass together, to give thanks to God, to make formal recognition of the spiritual (indeed, the supernatural) character of your education. On this, the 400th anniversary of the death of the founder of the Society of Jesus, our prayers ought to be that much more fervent, our Mass more recollected, our dedication to the Ignatian ideal of Christian education more complete. Then tomorrow, with his heavenly benediction upon you, and that of his loyal sons who have been your teachers and Fathers in Christ, you graduate, you leave Georgetown, you take up your place in the world, each one of you, as a graduate of a Christian college and university, with all that this implies of a manner of life which we can call Christian.

What does it imply? Certainly not a rejection of the world, nor a hostility toward its temporal destiny. It is too late for that; the Incarnation has put the blessed weight of gravity even upon our supernatural activity. The footprints of Christ were pressed down into the sands of Palestine. He appeared in the habit of a man and walked among men, and in His prayer for the Apostles near the end of His life cried out to the Father: "I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world but that thou shouldst keep them from evil." (John 17: 15.) Whatever may be your work or your calling, it wil be accomplished not in the some ideal universe but in the world as you and I find it. Yet my dear young men and women your Christian education would be a failure if you were suddenly dissolved into the world like salt into water, that leaves no trace of its savor but only the bitterness of a compromise or the flatness of an evasion. You are in the world but you are Christians and your Christian formation bespeaks a commitment.

This is the first component of a Christian style, of a Christian manner of life in the world—a commitment, to a gospel, to a creed, to a morality, to a divine secret, a mystery. Even in the quiet acceptances of our pluralistic society you will be known as those who share this secret. How foolish it would be, then, to blunt the edges, to plane down the rough tractable material of this commitment and offer to others only the smooth and slippery surface of an easy ethics so much like their own! You must realize that they are dissatisfied with their own. They look to you for a few hardy "yeas" and "nays" in a world of puzzled "maybes". And they are disappointed when you blend too easily into your environment, like those passive creatures of the wood who have no defense except their own invisibility.

Affirmations—yes; the crudity of mere blind repetition—no. It will do no good to make your commitment a substitute for thinking, or a mask for an irascibility that delights in making infallible judgments about trivialities. The Christian commitment is more dignified than that; it is part of the corpus of Christian wisdom "which reacheth from end to end mightily and ordereth all things sweetly".

This manly objectivity which strengthens and yet sweetens your affirmations reveals another feature of the Christian manner of life for which your education has been preparing you, namely, a love for knowledge. What a cheapening it would be of the noble ends of Christian education to look upon it as a set of intellectual hand-me-downs, a one-volume digest of answers and insights and selected animosities.

It is so much more than that; it is a wisdom, an introduction (at least) to what is best in human knowledge and divine, noble beginnings to be tempered by experience and enlarged by a sane and liberal curiosity. Very few of you will ever become professional scholars but you might become something better than that—amateurs, those who love knowledge, not for profit or for use, but for its own sake, who beside their chosen field of work retain a healthy interest in history and literature, yes, in philosophy and theology, too, and thus give witness to the faith always by the vigor of their minds, by their keenness and taste and tact. Nothing is more useful to our holy faith than that the educated Catholic should by the breadth and refinement of his interests give the lie once and for all to the shoddy myth that the Christian commitment closes the door to intellectual progress and creates an iron cage for the spirit. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Strength and candor of assent to a spiritual commitment, breadth of intelligence—these establish the first strong lines and features of an authentic Christian manner-of-life. Together with these we would be happy to see a spirit of Christian humor and Christian joy. Sometimes, indeed, we count too much on a righteous judgment of the world. Our Lord said of His own divine mission: "I come not to judge but to save." Yet it calls for a happy man, even a humorous man, to bring a saving spirit to a generation that takes work and success so seriously. This humor, remember, is the fruit of knowledge; for the higher a man stands by wisdom above the frowning practicalities of life, the better he can smile that smile of compassion, the more truly can he sound the uncomplicated sources of human joy.

Wisdom and humor and joy—all set around the strong center of the Christian commitment, all of them together signifying nothing less than greatness of soul. My dear graduates, in your desire for a fitting manner of life in the world, do not be put off by a fear of human greatness. Life will reduce you to size if you reach too high, or too soon, or if you aim in the wrong direction. But your Christian education has in fact been working from the beginning toward the creation of a spiritual and intellectual aristocracy. The church has never believed that a sound democracy was possible (or even desirable) without the elevating influence of its own nobler parts. Greatness of soul—your education moves toward it, the common good demands it, and a Christian manner of life is inconceivable without it, without that growth in wisdom and virtue which constitutes a true peerage, a nobility of the spirit. It is not really a matter of money, or of a class, or of belonging to a gentility of believers who are, perhaps, mostly indistinguishable from the agnostic gentility among whom they live. It is, above all, a matter of taste, a matter of retaining in the midst of the vulgar pretensions of our society a taste, an instinct, for the divine, and for the ideally human. In the last analysis this will describe your vocation in the world—to radiate from below the law and light of the Incarnation, God becoming man in order that men might become like unto God.

My dear graduates, what more could we wish for you than that you should reveal in your whole manner of life the simple and yet subtle depths of this mystery. In its light your Christian commitment becomes suddenly a royal privilege, your wisdom a reflection of the wisdom of the God-Man, your joy the gayety and gratitude of undeserving children for the most bountiful of gifts.

You have nothing to fear from the world except that you may not bring to it love enough or joy enough; the world, on the other hand, has much to fear that your Christian formation might fail of its purpose, after such hopeful beginnings here. And what a great purpose it has been—to bend you to a pleasing shape before God and

man and thus help to fashion a nobility with redemptive power. May the salt and wit and wisdom of the Gospel be ever on your tongue and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ in your hearts, now and forever.

Hon. George A. Dondero, Statesman and Patriot

SPEECH
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have come to know GEORGE DONDERO quite intimately. For the past 4 years it has been my privilege along with other Members of this body to meet in the House Cafeteria at 8 o'clock each morning for breakfast. There we settled many problems of the day. There it was that we contended for certain points of view on certain issues that were about to be considered. There it was in friendly fashion we needled each other about votes cast the previous day on a certain bill.

Mr. Speaker, right now I can see GEORGE DONDERO approaching the breakfast table with his tray of food. His first question to us always was "Well, gentlemen, who is abusing us today?" GEORGE was expressing a question that Abraham Lincoln always addressed to his cabinet whenever they met. So I shall always remember that question and the pleasant association with this man, not only at the breakfast table, or around the round table in the House Restaurant but as an outstanding legislator on the floor of this House.

As chairman during the 83d Congress of that great Committee on Public Works, he assumed tremendous responsibilities but he met them without flinching. Many times he was compelled to vote his convictions rather than vote for specific legislation. He was always in the forefront to consider the effects of every bill upon the welfare of our Nation. His has never been a narrow provincial attitude but rather one of broad outline.

Then, too, Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget him as he would go down into the well of the House at least once a year and admonish us regarding the rules of the House, especially as they related to our conduct while on the floor. No man, in my opinion, knew and understood the rules of the House in this regard as well as my dear friend from Michigan. No Member of this House ever took offense at the manner of his "preaching" to us on the rules. He was always dignified, kindly, yet deadly earnest as he pled with us to obey so that the visitors in the gallery would go away with a good impression of the House of Representatives. We confess today, Mr. Speaker, that many of us have failed to follow GEORGE but we admit the wisdom of his advice.

Mr. Speaker, GEORGE DONDERO is also an intense patriot. I dare say that no man in this body is more devoted to the ideals which undergirded our great Nation than he. Certainly, no one is better informed about the causes for the great Civil War between the States and the war itself than Mr. DONDERO. He is a national authority on Abraham Lincoln and is greatly sought after as a speaker from many points throughout the Nation.

Shortly after coming to Congress, in 1941, my very good friend drove Mrs. Smith and myself to Gettysburg, where, on a personally conducted tour, he pointed out the interesting historic spots in the great battle of the Civil War. A battle which perhaps turned the tide of victory for the Union forces. Mr. DONDERO is recognized by the guides in Gettysburg as being better informed than they, and they all know him and speak affectionately of his very great knowledge concerning the Gettysburg battlefield. It was a rare opportunitay for us to have accompanied him on that trip.

We will miss GEORGE DONDERO in this body. His departure means a personal loss to me, but, more important than that, the great State of Michigan will miss him also, as will the Nation.

I can only wish him godspeed and a pleasant respite from the arduous duties of a congressional Representative. May God be with him always.

Altar of the Nation: Rindge, N. H.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the altar of the Nation at Rindge, N. H., is hallowed ground to the tens of thousands who have visited and worshiped there. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the July 21 edition of the Concord (N. H.) Daily Monitor. The editorial mentions some of the difficulties we face in gaining support for legislation which Senator BRIDGES and I have introduced to recognize this dedicated altar as a national shine.

The editorial follows:

ALTAR OF THE NATION

The National Park Service, the Bureau of the Budget and the American Battle Monuments Commission have been ponderously throwing their weight around in an effort to block Congresional approval of the Altar of the Nation at Rindge as a national shrine. The citizens of New Hampshire and of the Nation, who have seen in the Altar of the Nation a spot where the honored American dead of all services and faiths may live in reverent memory, are callously informed by the American Battle Monuments Commission, as though it were the keeper of the American heart, that "the Cathedral of the Pines is not of such national interest or significance as to distinguish it over and above other memorials * * *" and that the designation thereof as a national shrine would be "undesirable."

Not only is this an affront to the people of New Hampshire and of the Nation who have been pleased to think otherwise; it is an affront to Congress which is fully qualified to decide concerning the dignity it shall choose to bestow upon places enshrined in the national memory. More than this, it reveals a total failure to understand the proper relationship between the States and the Federal Government, the limitations placed upon the Federal Government, and the rights reserved to the States in that grant of powers of which the States are the authors and which is known as the United States Constitution. Not the Federal Government, and much less one of its administrative agencies, has even been granted power to decide in what manner the Nation's people shall honor their dead.

In the last analysis no such power, as such, has even been granted to Congress, except where there is question of providing for the administering of public buildings and lands. Congress does, however, have the prerogative of lending prestige and dignity of its approval to such institutions as shrines which have become dear to the hearts of the people, and it is the exercise of this prerogative, nothing more, that is asked in the prospective levislation sponsored by Senator BRIDGES and Congressman BASS.

The question is not whether the National Park Service, which will have no administrative duties or the American Battle Monuments Commission, which in this case shall have no supervisorial functions, or the Bureau of the Budget which shall have no public funds to control, shall or shall not recognize the Altar of the Nation at Rindge as a national shrine.

There are no federally owned lands or buildings to care for. There is absolutely nothing for these agencies to do about it but to smile—which would be gratifying—or to frown as they presently do—which is of no importance whatever.

It is impertinent and impudent for the National Park Service and the other two agencies to presume to tell the citizens of New Hampshire and those of the Nation at large what they shall or shall not invest with the dignity of a national sanctuary. It is an impertinent and impudent invasion of the congressional prerogative for those same agencies to try to place limitations on Congress in that prerogative's exercise.

Because of the obstacles interposed by these agencies, and of their bullying of the overworked House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the proposed resolution of Congress has been blocked for this session, as it was blocked in the previous Congress. So far as concerns Congress, it is time for that body as assert its own dignity and tell these presumptuous agencies where to head in at. Here is a task ready made—the importance whereof transcends the particular problem of Rindge—for Senator BRIDGES and Congressman BASS, and, indeed, the entire New Hampshire delegation, to push to conclusion in the next Congress.

But the greater task, it seems to this writer, is for the General Court of the State of New Hampshire to assert its right and prerogative of itself placing the stamp of national shrine on the altar at Rindge. Let the people of New Hampshire, in the exercise of their sovereignty and dignity, decide what place in New Hampshire they shall so dedicate. Let them bluntly inform these presumptuous governmental agencies that no power has ever been confided to them of making decisions like that, and that the people of New Hampshire are not of the caliber of men who go, hat in hand, to Government agencies begging for crumbs which, moreover, are not those governmental agencies' to give.

It would be well if the legislative bodies of the State and of the Nation could work cordially, hand in hand, in bringing about such a devoutly to be wished consummation.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is my fourth annual report to the people. A Congressman is an employee; thus in our first congressional district there are approximately 700,000 bosses. Each and every one, regardless of political party, race, creed, or color is entitled to receive this accounting. In reality my report is a summary, because each week I have written a column for your weekly newspaper. Every Sunday I have presented a 15-minute broadcast over Suffolk County's 4 radio stations. During the 4 years I have served you over 500 regular or special reports have been submitted on current topics so that you may have the up-to-date facts. I should like to express my appreciation for the wonderful cooperation received from the many weekly newspapers which published my weekly report as a regular feature; also to the radio stations for broadcasting my Sunday radio reports.

The 84th Congress has passed into history. What has it done for the people? Is it true that this Democratic Congress has destroyed the Eisenhower program? Is it true that our constitutional system shows its skirts when you have a chief executive from the Republican Party and a Congress controlled by the Democratic Party? I think the best answer is for you to look, impartially, at the record and make up your own mind. There is no doubt that the executive branch has done much. We are at peace for the fourth straight year. Yet our national prosperity is at an all-time high. Employment for June reached an alltime high of 66½ million. Conversely, unemployment was lower. The national income is more widely and fairly distributed than ever before. Still there was much for this Congress to do. Ten of the President's 1956 requests are set forth in the order in which they were presented in his State of the Union Message of January 5:

First:

I most earnestly request that the Congress approve our membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, which would assist the carrying out of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to which we have been a party since 1948. Our membership in the OTC will provide the most effective and expeditious means for removing discriminations and restrictions against American exports and in making our trade agreements truly reciprocal.

The Ways and Means Committee—do not forget that all committees of Congress are controlled by the Democratic Party—pigeon-holed this proposal indefinitely.

Second:

In order that our friends may better achieve the greater strength that is our common goal, they need assurance of continuity in economic assistance for development projects and programs which we approve and which require a period of years for planning and completion. Accordingly, I ask Congress to grant limited authority to make longer-term commitments for assistance to such projects, to be fulfilled from appropriations to be made in future fiscal years.

The Congress turned down this Eisenhower request for authority to plan the cold war on a long-term basis. They cut beyond reason the military aid to our foreign friends and allies.

Third:

I expect the budget to be in balance during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

I shall propose a balanced budget for the next fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

These statements became a reality despite the moneys given away by Congress for political purposes—as for example the Wilson-Symington Air Force battles. The Executive cut its expenditures to the bone.

Fourth:

I shall lay before the Congress my detailed recommendations for new steps that should be taken promptly to speed the transition in agriculture and thus assist our farmers to achieve their fair share of the national income.

Congress, at first, passed a political farm bill on a party basis. The President vetoed the bill. With obvious reluctance the Democratic leadership gave the President most of what he needed.

Fifth:

Disaster-assistance legislation requires overhauling, and an experimental program of flood-damage indemnities should be undertaken.

Public pressure caused by the floods and hurricanes of last year forced Congress to approve this legislation.

Sixth:

In my message of February 22, 1955, I urged that measures be taken to complete the vital 40,000-mile Interstate System over a period of 10 years at an estimated Federal cost of approximately $25 billion. No program was adopted.

This session passed a highway bill after public reaction to Congress having turned down the President's 1955 request.

Seventh:

The Post Office Department faces two serious problems: First, much of its physical plant—post offices and other buildings—is obsolete and inadequate. Many new buildings and the modernization of present ones are esesntial if we are to have improved mail service. The second problem is the Department's fiscal plight. It now faces an annual deficit of one-half billion dollars.

The administration recommended increasing the postal rates in an effort to correct the problem. The proposal although it passed the House was pigeonholed by the Democratic leadership in the Senate.

Eighth:

In the field of human needs, we must carry forward the housing program, which is contributing so greatly to the well-being of our people and the prosperity of our economy. Home ownership is now advanced to the point where almost 3 of every 5 families in our cities, towns, and suburbs own the houses they live in.

It was felt by most responsible people that the Federal Government should not dominate this field, but that free enterprise should be allowed to operate.

Ninth:

It is disturbing that in some localities allegations persist that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subjected to unwarranted economic pressures. I recommend that the substance of these charges be thoroughly examined by a bipartisan commission created by the Congress.

All civil rights proposals submitted to Congress were defeated by members of the Democratic Party in the Senate residing in a specific section of our country. They had threatened filibuster.

Tenth:

One particular challenge confronts us. In the Hawaiian Islands, east meets west.

Statehood, supported by the repeatedly expressed desire of the islands' people and by our traditions, would be a shining example of the American way to the entire earth. Consequently, I urgently request this Congress to grant statehood for Hawaii. Also, in harmony with the provisions I last year communicated to the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, I trust that progress toward statehood for Alaska can be made in this session.

The people's representatives have not been allowed to debate separately this key subject in the 84th Congress. It has been permanently bottled up in committee.

As you can see, of the President's 10 basic requests only 3 were granted outright by the Congress, 3 were granted in part, and 4 were turned down completely. You have the facts. Now you can decide if it is wise to elect a President from one party and Congress from another. This Congress has been labeled "the worst in history" because it passed such an insignificant amount of constructive legislation. This criticism is probably too harsh and partisan, yet it is true that the record is most uninspiring.

CONTINUED LOCAL PROSPERITY

In my 1955 report I stated:

For the next 12 months, I predict a continuation (of) prosperity for Long Island with the exception of the potato farmer.

It is gratifying that I can now make the identical prediction for the forthcoming year without excluding the potato farmer. The district continues to grow in population. We have increased by approximately 100,000 within the past year for a total of 700,000. Contrast this with somewhere in the neighborhood of 300,000 5 years ago. This has meant continued home building. New small businesses have blossomed overnight. I have urged the increased allocation of defense contracts to our industries. Hardly a week goes by without our office aiding some business concern seeking its fair share of Government contracts.

Despite self-evident expansion, our local government has been unable to keep pace with the times. A proposed change of county governmental structure was vetoed by Governor Averell Harriman. Consequently, it is extremely difficulty to coordinate proper planning. Let me emphasize that point. Planning is the key to our future. Roads, industry, inlets, erosion control, all have a Federal

interest. Yet I know of no comprehensive policy discussions between Federal, State, and local officials in this field. If the State leadership would reduce its emphasis on politics and pay some heed to our great needs, it would be most beneficial to all our citizens.

A NATIONAL PARK

The National Park Service compiled one of the most remarkable studies in recent years. It was discovered that of the 3,700 miles of general shoreline constituting the Atlantic and Gulf coast, only a small fraction is in the Federal and State ownership for public recreation uses. The seashore is a priceless scenic and scientific resource for which there is no substitute. Yet all we see along the beach today is no trespassing, private property, subdivision: lots for sale. A segment of this natural heritage—the salt marsh, the sand dune, the shrub, and the forest's evergreen community must be saved for the benefit of the people.

The Department of the Interior determined that the undeveloped Fire Island area of Long Island is the ideal seashore recreation area for the largest population center of the United States. The Department's position was arrived at in the closing days of this session; consequently, it was impossible to obtain legislation to acquire and protect this priceless heritage for the people. However, the necessary bill is being prepared for immediate introduction at the opening of the next Congress in January. This has the unqualified support of Hon. Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior. He will join me in my fight against the special interests and real-estate lobby who seek to deprive the people of this heritage.

HOUSING INVESTIGATION

Long Island's housing industry has done an excellent job. However, certain greedy and unscrupulous developers and builders have robbed and swindled the people. While most of these homes have VA and FHA mortgages, there is no machinery for Federal enforcement where a builder fails to comply. He can be blacklisted, but the damage has already been done. Conferences were held with the FHA and VA officials in an effort to improve the inspection services. Also compliance requirements were tightened. Public meetings have been conducted so that these problems could be explained and thoroughly aired. Two members of my staff have devoted most of their time to these cases.

The worst situations were turned over to the deputy United States attorney for our district. He states:

> The United States attorney's office has arranged for a complete investigation from attic to cellar of those developments which have produced the most serious and numerous complaints. The object of this investigation is to discover whether there were any violations of the Federal criminal statutes. This investigation is presently being conducted by a group of nonresident investigators and architects of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

In a recent report received by me from the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, Mr. Lester P. Condon, Director of the Compliance Division, stated:

> As a byproduct of the investigation there will be an improvement of inspection procedures and such disciplinary action as is warranted will be taken against any builder who has been negligent or who has not built in conformity with plans and specifications.

Thus you can see that these measures of themselves have forced the builders to more generally meet the requirements and specifications called for in their plans and advertisements.

EROSION, HURRICANE INSURANCE, AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Fire Island Inlet controversy is too well known to require expansion. In essence, I have attempted to have a study made to determine the best way in which the inlet problem should be handled. We on Long Island must guard our great natural heritage, the Great South Bay. It must at all times have an adequate exit to the sea. For several centuries we have been troubled with the inlet becoming shallow. It became obvious several years ago that a long-range approach should be made. I approached the Long Island Park Commission, informally, to seek their support. They claimed they were working on their plan, but it soon was apparent that this plan was designed solely to help protect the park commission's Jones Beach parkway. It is a temporary makeshift. The senior member of the Park Commission, Mr. Robert Moses, used every possible device of public pressure to pass his own measure and to defeat my proposed study. So far he has succeeded. Fortunately, the sands of time are endless. The people of Long Island will one day be provided with a permanent inlet into the Great South Bay.

In a related field, the beach erosion study of the south shore is almost complete. However, no Federal funds have yet been appropriated to carry out the authorization granted in the Auchincloss bill (similar to the Wainwright bill). This provides for the division of cost of beach erosion in front of privately owned property between the Federal, State, and local governments on an equal basis.

Not only have our Long Island shores been badly injured by recent hurricanes, but our homes as well. Consequently, I have fought for the hurricane and flood insurance legislation. The bill received House action in the closing hours of Congress after inadequate debate. The bill sets up a program of Federal flood insurance and authorizes Federal aid for reinsurance on policies issued by private insurance companies against floods. The Government's portion of the total insurance is set at $5 billion with the approval of the President. As far as individual amounts are concerned: a limit of $250,000 a person or corporation with a proviso that not more than $10,000 can be written on any one home.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to these major projects, a number of local and miscellaneous items should be called to your attention.

First. Office hours are held periodically in Huntington and Wainscott. In addition, the Washington office will provide daily service, 52 weeks a year. Members of my staff are available on Long Island at all times.

Second. Appointed three young men to the service academies—West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy. These appointments were based on civil service examinations, plus a personal, impartial interview conducted as a public service by a distinguished newspaperman, Mr. C. H. MacLachlan, of Huntington.

Third. Sponsored legislation to provide a residence for the Vice President of the United States and to modernize that important office. The use made of the Vice President has increased tremendously in importance, but the tools with which he must work are antiquated.

Fourth. Sponsored legislation to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries. I am pleased to say this became law.

Fifth. Introduced at the request of the administration legislation to carry out the President's request for a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. This was defeated by pressure groups. I am writing an article next month for a Sunday magazine section of a daily newspaper on this shameful action.

Sixth. Sponsored and followed through numerous private immigration bills. Only in this way can relief be granted in cases of extreme hardship.

Seventh. Our office has handled hundreds of visa and passport cases. In several instances we have been called on to obtain action from the State Department in a matter of hours, while the person was waiting at the pier or airdrome.

Eighth. Polled, at my own expense, a cross section of the citizens of the district on the issues of the day. Only by sampling your opinion can I be kept constantly aware of your views.

Ninth. Eliminated the dangerous AA firing at Montauk Point during those months when commercial and private fishing craft abound in the area.

Tenth. Sponsored the first official visit of a Cabinet Member to Suffolk County within the memory of man. Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson spoke to an enthusiastic crowd of more than 1,000 people on May 15, 1956, in Riverhead. This was clarion proof of the Eisenhower administration's interest in the Long Island farmer.

Eleventh. Obtained special services for the various communities, such as a naval vessel for Port Jefferson's Fourth of July ceremonies, as well as soldiers to march in patriotic parades.

Twelfth. Insured a competent and proper investigation of the Coast Guard's participation in a tragic mishap in the Great South Bay. By forcing this investigation it brought to light certain deficiencies in operations with respect to Coast Guard communications and station equipment. Steps have been taken to make more effective the work of all lifeboat stations.

Thirteenth. Obtained for the Fishers Island School, 3.82 acres of land and 5 buildings that will be used to alleviate the housing shortage needed to care for

the teachers in Public School District No. 4.

Fourteenth. The Department of Agriculture has assured me that they will be equipped to transport schoolchildren from Plum Island over to the Orient Point School at the commencement of the next school term.

Fifteenth. Continued to support and sponsor legislation to aid in both school maintenance and construction where, and only where, the Federal Government is responsible—such as empacted school districts caused by workers moving in on defense contracts.

Sixteenth. Post office matters. In the past 8 months, my office has:

A. Arranged for the construction of a new post office in Babylon.

B. Extended city delivery in Bellport, Bethpage, Deer Park, Farmingdale, and Sayville.

C. Been given assurance by the Post Office Department that West Islip will be given its own post office in the near future.

My task, beyond the normal services described in this report, is a position of trust to protect your rights, freedoms, and privileges. Your tolerance and support has been an inspiration.

As usual, it is an honor and a pleasure to be of service to my country and to the people of the First District. Your comments, advice, and suggestions are always welcome.

Condition of Small Business Throughout the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Denver Post on the condition in general of small business throughout the country.

The source of the information is Dun & Bradstreet:

According to this survey, there were 4,225,000 small businesses in the country in 1955, the highest number in history. That meant there was one small business for every 39 persons in the country, a slightly higher figure than the average for the last 30 years of one business for every 41 persons.

The number of small businesses has increased each year since the end of World War II, except in 1954 when there was a net decline of 15,700. That was the first full year following the end of the Korean war.

Last year the number of small businesses increased 28,300, only about half the increase of 58,900 in 1952, which was the peak year of the Korean war boom.

Last year 42 small businesses out of every 10,000 suffered failure. In 1952 the number of failures was 29 per 10,000 and in 1947 there were only 14 failures for each 10,000 establishments.

However, since 1900 the average number of failures per 10,000 businesses has been 70 per year. Thus, it appears that while the number of failures has been increasing since the end of World War II, the 1955 rate of failure was only 60 percent of the long-term average.

Solicitude for their welfare should be mightily pleasing to the 4,225,000 small businesses in the country, whether it comes from Democratic or Republican sources. Still more pleasing would be solicitude shown in off-years as well as election years.—Denver Post.

How Long?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in Bucyrus (Ohio) Telegraph-Forum on July 24, 1956. It is a down-to-earth appraisal of a situation which I think should be considered by every thinking American interested in the solvency of his country. In the midst of a mad rush of Federal spending, this article should have a sobering influence.

HOW LONG?

Credit is a device which permits the exchange of goods and services at a fixed figure extended through time. The use of credit has undoubtedly speeded up our commercial processes. But there is another word which must be used in conjunction with credit. And while credit has a pleasant connotation, its companion has an unpleasant one. The word is debt. Debt and credit go hand in hand. You do not have one without the other.

We do not know what the world would be like if there were neither credit nor debt. But we can imagine. First, after an initial inertia which might take years to overcome, business would probably go on about as usual. The difference would be that all transactions would have to be completed on the spot. There would be no extension of either credit or debt through time.

Consequently, there would be no possibility of phony boom and an ultimate bust. The law of supply and demand would work absolutely. There could not be a depression, that dreadful miasma which arrives when a person's or a nation's credit has been overextended and retrenchment must occur.

The operation of business on a strictly cash basis has been recommended by certain brilliant philosophers and economists. And, indeed, if a cure for depression were seriously desired, the cash-on-the-spot system would provide that cure. You cannot have a collapse of credit if you have no credit. You cannot be burdened with debt, if you have never borrowed.

The travesty of our times is found in a widespread belief, encouraged officially in high places, that the Government can prevent a depression.

Iot long ago President Eihenhower applauded an article which appeared in the Reader's Digest for the simple reason that this article expounded the completely false theme that never again could a depression occur in this country, since the Government was now organized to prevent it.

Let credit become too loose—in the minds of the bureaucrats—and the Government has the power to tighten the strands. Let credit become too tight—the bureaucrats are the ones who deside—and the Government has the power to untie the knots and let the goods flow. Social security is tabbed as a neat little trick whereby the Government can keep the precarious balance. And, according to this article, the problem is solved for all time.

We are reminded somewhat of the diorite tablet engraved by the great lawgiver Hammurabi in the 3400 century before Christ. This ancient Babylonian politician let it be known that he had solved the problem of war, peace, and prosperity for his people for all time to come. Hammurabi's conceit is readily apparent. His great nation is no more. It had its wars and its depressions and vanished, swallowed up the sands of the Middle East.

In truth, government meddling cannot solve the problem of either war, peace, or depression. Government can only upset the trend. It cannot repeal the laws of arithmetic. And any upsetting of a trend is fraught with peril, as reactions are swift and often rise from unpredictable sources.

This Nation right now ought to be very much concerned with its debt structure. Of all the people in the world, we have extended our credit more and occupy the most precarious position. Further, the whole world is going into debt on a vast extension of credit, most of which is supplied by the American taxpayers.

Hasten National Physical Fitness Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in a recent editorial the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call urges speed on a national physical fitness program and describes the pioneering efforts of Paterson's physical culturalist, Dr. Jesse Mercer Gehman, in this field. The editorial follows:

HASTEN NATIONAL PHYSICAL FITNESS PROGRAM

The recent announcement from Washington, that to follow up the findings growing out of the physical fitness conference presided over by Vice President RICHARD NIXON last fall, President Eisenhower will appoint a national advisory council to formulate a nationwide physical training program, recalls to our mind the pioneering efforts of our own Paterson physical culturalist, Dr. Jesse Mercer Gehman, to revive physical education for the youth of the Nation. This was way back before our entry into World War II, which clearly proved the correctness of his contention of physical decadence affecting so large a percentage of our teenagers as draft rejections revealed.

Reared to the health life, of which he is a model living exhibit, he has spent a lifetime to the cause of a stronger America through universal physical training. Seeing the youth of our Nation changing from active sports participants to inactive sports watchers, and being diverted to more softening diversions, he made a survey of the situation back in the 1930's. It revealed an ever-increasing neglect of our children's physical development. This prompted him to appeal for action to President Franklin D. Roosevelt immediately following his election for a third term.

In a letter to the President dated November 15, 1940, our far-sighted fellow Patersonian, known far and wide in the world of sports as Dr. Gehman, said: "Now that the American people have spoken and by their choice you have been selected to head our Government for another 4 years, I should like to point out to you the necessity of a

definite health program for the well-being of all our people, which I believe you will agree is of paramount importance, either in peace or war.

"Our first line of defense is the well-being, the health, and strength of our people. In referring to a health program, I do not mean socialized medicine or the like, but rather a system of health-building procedures designed to include every man, woman, and child in America. * * * If I may, I should like to suggest the most capable men to serve as advisers, directors, and coordinators of an all-American systematic program of physical culture and education to meet our crucial need. * * *

"That you may give the foregoing proposal for a national program of physical training under capable direction and leadership your immediate consideration, is earnestly requested."

This physical softening of our youth has become even more pronounced since World War II than before. Only this past winter Gen. Robert Stillman, United States Air Force Academy Commandant, found the average young man entering there to be physically soft. European boys, he added at the time, are "three times as strong as the average American boy." And all for lack of physical training.

Surely then the need for President Eisenhower's physical fitness program is greater than ever, and no more time should be lost in getting it started.

We have known and been associated with Dr. Gehman in sports and physical culture projects for over 30 years, and knowing of his experienced and conscientious devotion to the cause of physical training the call highly recommends him to the President as a proposed member of the National Physical Fitness Advisory Council soon to be named.

The American Way of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, one of my friends in Banning, Calif., my hometown, Mrs. Patty H. Gandy, wrote the words to a very interesting song, several years ago, which might well be called the song of 1956. She calls it The American Way of Living, and I have asked permission to include the words of this song, as part of my comments here today. The words would fit the music of a march.

Oh, the talk is cheap, but give me action, acts of honesty.
It's easy to do, as the others do
But give me liberty
To speak my mind and help mankind
For individuality
The kind, we used to have and love,
T'was a gift to us, from God above.

(Chorus)

The American way of living has been good enough for me
That's what I'd like to be giving, to all humanity
Sure, God would truly bless our land
If all united we would stand
For justice and for liberty,
Then the world might live
In harmony.

In Favor of S. 4112, Sections 2 and 3

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of sections 2 and 3 of H. R. 12215, now under consideration.

As you will note, these sections amend the existing section 31 a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, which authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to "exercise its powers in such manner as to insure the continued conduct of research and development activities in the fields specified below, by private or public institutions or persons, and to assist in the acquisition of an ever-expanding fund of theoretical and practical knowledge in such fields. To this end the Commission is authorized and directed to make arrangements (including contracts, agreements, and loans) for the conduct of research and development activities relating to." The act then continues to outline the areas in which authority in this section is to be exercised.

As you know, one of the pioneers among the educational institutions of the United States in perceiving the great necessity to train engineers in the field of nuclear physics was the Penn State University. Realizing this obligation on the part of educational institutions, the Penn State University on its own arranged for the financing and construction of a research reactor which is now in operation on its campus at State University.

Likewise, the University of North Carolina at about the same time undertook on its own a similar project. The foresight and initiative of these institutions deserve the highest commendation.

The Atomic Energy Commission has felt for some time that the existing language of the Atomic Energy Act was not sufficiently clear and, therefore, it has been understandably hesitant to enter into all the various types of arrangements which is felt were necessary to assist universities and other non-profit institutions in providing them with the facilities to carry forth this important training and research work. For this reason they have requested the clarifying language which appears in section 2 and 3 of S. 4112.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. Based upon the information I have accumulated as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I realize full well that an ever-expanding program for the construction of training facilities at universities and nonprofit institutions must be undertaken. I am sure the Commission is in favor of such a program and it should be given this clarifying language to permit it to proceed without delay.

As the amendment is now drafted it would permit the Commission to assist not only in the initial setting up of facilities, but also to assist in the continued operation thereafter. It is heartening to note that it is the clear intent of this amendment to permit the Commission to assist the early pioneers in this field in the continued operation of facilities already constructed by their own initiative. I, therefore, urge each and every member to lend his support to the adoption of this amendment.

H. R. 10237, the Government Employees Union Recognition Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will not be meeting again this session, the members of the subcommittee which studied H. R. 10237, the Government employees union recognition bill, wish to have their report on the legislation made known to the Members of the House. We feel that this was vitally needed legislation and regret exceedingly that it was not acted upon in this session.

The members of the subcommittee, all of whom have approved the report, are as follows: J. LESINSKI, chairman, G. RHODES, J. MOSS, R. CORBETT, and H. GROSS.

The report is as follows:

RECOGNITION OF ORGANIZATIONS OF POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 10237

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10237) to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, pass.

AMENDMENTS

The amendments are as follows:

(1) Page 1, and lines 3 and 4, strike out symbols "(U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 5, sec. 652)," and insert in lieu thereof "(5 U. S. C., sec. 652),";

(2) Page 2, line 4, strike out the symbol "(A)."

(3) Page 2, line 15, strike out words "rates of pay."

(4) Page 2, line 18, strike out period after "reprisal" and insert in lieu thereof a colon and add the following words:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall nullify any provision of any contract, agreement, or regulation reached by mutual agreement between a department or agency and an employee organization except as may hereafter be agreed to by the parties thereto."

(5) Page 2, lines 19 through 25, and page 3, lines 1 and 2, strike out all of subsection "(e) (2) (B)."

(6) Page 3, lines 3 through 14, strike out all of subsection "(e) (3)."

(7) Page 3, line 15, strike out symbol "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof the symbol "(3)."

(8) Page 3, line 16, strike out the words "or the Federal Bureau of Investigation." and insert in lieu thereof the following: ", the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or the National Security Agency."

PURPOSE OF AMENDMENTS

The first and second amendments are technical amendments.

The third amendment is designed to clarify the intent of the legislation, leaving the question of rates of pay to be determined by congressional action.

The fourth amendment is added to assure that nothing in the bill will nullify any provision of any existing contract, agreement, or regulation without the consent of the parties thereto.

The fifth amendment strikes from the bill a provision that would set up an impartial board of arbitration to resolve disputes arising from disagreements between the employee organizations and the departments or agencies on the policies enumerated in the bill. The subcommittee felt that in spite of the merits of that provision, such elimination was necessary to maintain a proper relationship between employee and employer. It was felt that the bill, as amended, would supply an effective means by which an employee or his representative could take to the agency head any grievance.

Amendment 6 strikes from the bill a provision which the agency heads feel would empower the board of arbitration to remove an official and thus would conflict with established removal procedures. They argue that agency heads now have the authority to remove or otherwise discipline officials who do not observe laws or regulations.

The seventh amendment is a technical amendment.

The last amendment excludes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the National Security Agency from the provisions of the bill.

JUSTIFICATION

This legislation, by amending the act of August 24, 1912, provides statutory recognition of employee organizations and of the rights of officers and employees or representatives of such organizations to present grievances in behalf of their members without restraint, coercion, interference, intimidation, or reprisal. No new or revolutionary proposal is advanced in the measure. Its enactment would provide for postal and Federal employees the same elementary rights that Congress has decreed should be given to employees in private industry by providing the means whereby their representatives can confer with administrative officials on matters of policy affecting working conditions and grievances. It is in keeping with modern advanced theories of sound personnel management.

Under this legislation, the Federal Government would not lose any of the final authority it now has in employee-employer relations; nor would the Government be a party to collective bargaining such as prevails in private industry. Federal employees would not be given any right to strike against the Government for settlement of grievances.

Extensive hearings on this legislation have been held and all sides of the issue have been thoroughly explored.

Need for this legislation has been recognized by all, it seems, except the Civil Service Commission. Employees and their organizations have for many years been urging its enactment. Surely, if adequate means for settling grievances of employees do exist, as claimed by Chairman Young of the Civil Service Commission, there would not be such a hue and cry raised by the employees and their representatives for statutory safeguards. Recognizing that regulations of the Civil Service Commission do exist which provide certain guidelines for agencies in matters of employee-employer relations, the committee wishes to emphasize that such regulations are not mandatory and that agencies have an extremely wide latitude within which they may, in their own discretion, operate. That the agencies often ignore or pay little heed to the regulations is evidenced by the numerous petitions and grievances of postal and civil-service employees on personnel matters, which are constantly being presented to Members of Congress and also by testimony before the subcommittee.

Not only have the employees and their organizations been most insistent in pointing up the necessity of this legislation, but so also have the American Bar Association and the Commission on the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) emphasized its value.

In a report in August of 1955, the labor relations law section of the American Bar Association approved a report which stated:

"Government as an employer has failed in many instances to practice what it compels industry to do. Legislatures which deny to Government agencies the use of some proper form of collective bargaining procedures so familiar in industry (at least in terms of collective negotiation), which attempt to restrict unduly the right of employees to organize and to petition the Government for redress of their grievances, need to review the problem more realistically."

The report further stated that—

"The progress made in recent years by labor organizations, the development of a more responsible labor leadership, the benefits secured by organized labor, have brought public employees to a recognition of the advantages to them which might result from more effective organization and more aggressive negotiation with governmental agencies. A government which imposes upon other employers certain obligations in dealing with their employees may not in good faith refuse to deal with its own public servants on a reasonably similar favorable basis, modified, of course, to meet the exigencies of the public service. It should set the example for industry by being perhaps more considerate than the law required of private enterprise."

The Hoover Commission in its report to the 81st Congress (H. Doc. 63, February 10, 1949), expressed the finding that:

"Federal employees while given some degree of protection against abuse, discrimination, and unjust treatment, are not provided a positive opportunity to participate in the formulation of policies and practices which affect their welfare."

The Commission recommended that—

"The heads of departments and agencies should be required to provide for the positive participation of employees in the formulation and improvement of the Federal personnel policies and practices."

Additionally, according to information recently made available, the Secretary of Labor at a Cabinet meeting in October of 1955, brought up the subject of extending greater recognition to unions of Government employees. Because of the objections of another Cabinet member, no further developments occurred on the proposal. It should also be pointed out that, in spite of the expressed adverse opinion of the Civil Service Commission on this legislation, the Commission over a year ago circulated, or caused to be circulated, a proposed executive order on recognition of Federal employee organizations. That proposed order was in many respects identical to the language and purpose of H. R. 10237. If that Executive order had been implemented, there might have been no need for the present legislation. Since it appears that no administrative action along those lines will be taken, your subcommittee highly recommends enactment of H. R. 10237.

Recognition must be given to the human element in all relationships where people must cooperate and work efficiently and under humane conditions. Enlightened personnel management experts have determined that good morale and efficiency are enhanced whenever employees are given an opportunity to have a say in matters which affect them.

Conversely, poor morale and lack of interest in the job are to be expected when arbitrary and unexplained personnel policies and procedures are formulated among the top echelon and then sifted down through the subordinate levels of management to the employees.

The Federal Government, having provided under the National Labor Relations Act and other legislation means by which employees in private industry can make proper approaches to management, would provide similar treatment, within reason, for its own employees. Such is the purpose of H. R. 10237. Your subcommittee strongly recommends immediate enactment of the bill.

If They Don't Like It Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

IF THEY DON'T LIKE IT HERE

I received a circular letter from Prof Louise Pettibone Smith, whom I do not know and never heard of before. What the lady is a professor of, I also do not know, but it so appears on her letterhead. She addresses me as "Dear friend," but how it comes about that she and I are friends, I also do not know.

What she wants me to do is to send $2 during July and August, making a total of $4, to the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, which I suspect is not a good thing to do. My father and mother were foreign born, but they needed no protection because they were happy to be here and away from the pogroms of old Russia and Poland. In fact, all my relations of the older generation were foreign born and none of them needed protection.

Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith wants the $4 because she says the Attorney General plans to denaturalize 10,000 citizens and to deport 15,000 noncitizens solely because of their political beliefs. The figures look a little high to me, but it would seem that what Mr. Brownell proposes is to give those who love Soviet Russia or some satellite more than the United States an opportunity to go to the land of their affection after due process of the law here. It would seem that the way the Supreme Court has been behaving, there is a possibility that these people will be deprived of going to the lands they love. It is too bad.

In a circular attached to Professor Smith's letter appears the following:

"During July as many families are just beginning to get away from the cities, 14 New York noncitizens will be challenging the supervisory parole provisions of the Walter-McCarran law.

"The 14 have been ordered deported because of past or present political beliefs. The Justice Department, unable to effect their deportation, has placed them on supervisory parole which means: remaining within 50 miles of Times Square; periodic reporting to

a Justice Department agent; when reporting being forced to answer questions relative to friends, associates, habits and work; submitting to medical and psychiatric examination."

For this, shall I send $4? Why does she not appeal to Comrade Khrushchev to pay these expenses? These guys were working for him or for his predecessor, Stalin, or they would not have got into this particular trouble.

This country is full of foreign born who are happy to be here and who never get into trouble with Attorney General Brownell. Of course, if a fellow who was graciously permitted by our laws to settle in this country, to raise a family here and to live under the advantages of our liberties and our laws, wants to upset the country, to change its form of Government, to make it conform to patterns arranged in the Kremlin, he is bound to get into trouble, not because he exercises freedom of speech but because he is working for an enemy state and an enemy civilization that seeks to destroy us.

There are those who believe that now that Stalin is dead and that Khrushchev has called him all sorts of names, the world has changed and that we should hereafter smile at those who spit upon us. Such are bound to suffer a rude repulse from the American people as they have been encountering for some time such rejections.

Saudi Arabia Celebrates King Saud's 24th Anniversary of Accession to the Throne, November 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of 1 of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend felicitations to the people of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman al Faisal al Saud, and His Excellency Sheikh Abdullah Al-Khayyal, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, upon the occasion of the celebration of the 24th anniversary of His Majesty King Saud's accession to the throne of Saudi Arabia, November 12, 1956.

The herculean efforts of King Ibn Saud to weld his country into an independent entity and break the bonds of the post-World War I mandate system are too well known to warrant detailed recounting here. Perhaps nowhere else in the annals of modern history could be found a state which owed more of its existence to the efforts of a single man. It suffices to say that King Saud's valiant struggles to regain for his family its lost authority and past glory began many years before he acceded to the throne of his country. Despite numerous obstacles created by man and nature which confronted him, nullifying his initial successes, King Saud forged ahead, achieving remarkable victories over the enemies of his people. Personal courage, faith, and determination undergirded the young prince for his tasks. Indeed the determination of King Saud to carry on many of his early encounters single-handed in the face of numerous odds was the source of grave concern to his family and faithful friends.

With the advent of the First World War King Saud's plans for independence of his country suffered a setback. Upon the termination of the war, the Arab countries which revolted against colonialism, and which were promised their independence by the Allies, were placed instead under the mandate system of the League of Nations.

In 1924 the forces of King Ibn Saud captured Taif and Mecca followed the next year by similar victories over Medina and Jedda. In January 1926, King Saud was proclaimed King of the Hejaz. When Nejd was proclaimed a Kingdom in 1927, His Majesty's title became King of the Hejaz and of Nejd and its Dependencies. In September 1932, King Ibn Saud proclaimed the union of the Hejaz and Nejd into the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with himself as monarch.

During the early years of World War II Saudi Arabia remained neutral. Its contribution to the war effort is described in the citation of the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander, presented in 1947 to King Ibn Saud by President Truman. The citation reads in part:

His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman Al Faisal Al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, rendered exceptionally meritorious service to the war effort of the United Nations. He led his country in an unwavering course of support and encouragement to the cause of the Allies * * * As Commander in Chief of Saudi Arabia he kept the land, sea and air routes under his control open for use, and by his attitude of wholehearted cooperation, he enable American forces to accomplish a program of construction and resource development in the country that derived benefits of major proportions for the prosecution of the war. Through his unswerving loyalty, and his dynamic leadership at the head of his nation in the support of the cause, King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud made a notable contribution to the successful war effort of the United Nations.

Saudi Arabia is a member of the United Nations, having sent a delegation to the San Francisco Conference in 1945 when it was a signatory of the United Nations Charter. It is also a member of many specialized agencies of the United Nations.

In describing King Ibn Saud, H. C. Armstrong wrote in his Lord of Arabia:

Ibn Saud is Lord of Arabia ruling by force of his personality and the strength of his own right arm. An immense man, tremendous, vital, dominant. A giant thrown up out of the chaos and agony of the desert—to rule.

The success which King Ibn Saud has achieved through his efforts and with the minimum of external support have gained for him universal esteem and affection of Arabs. No more outstanding figures has appeared in the Arab world for many years. We trust that his business in his own country will be expanded; that his conscience and regard for the prestige of Saudi Arabia in the free world will lead to an expression of that same greatness in all relations with all people; that nothing be permitted to cast a shadow over a shiny career.

The Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently contained a considerable amount of discussion questioning the findings of the Office of Defense Mobilization in 1954 that the domestic watch industry was essential to the national defense. One must recall that the alleged essentiality of the domestic watch industry was one of the principal considerations which, I understand, was supposed to have led the President to decide to increase the tariff on watches 2 years ago. Now the finding of defense essentiality is being reviewed by the Office of Defense Mobilization, which will ultimately hold public hearings on the subject sometime this fall.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting that this same question has recently been examined by the distinguished Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy which held hearings on the subject for 4 days in June. Its findings have just been published by the Joint Economic Committee in its report on the subject of the relationship between defense essentiality and foreign economic policy, with particular reference to the watch industry as a case in point. The unanimous report of the subcommittee, which I have read with interest, is to be commended to the Members of this House as a most constructive and thoughtful document contributing to the development of sound foreign economic policy. I might add what I am sure Members of this House need hardly be reminded of—that the subcommittee which carried out this excellent work was chaired by our distinguished colleague, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, of Missouri.

I want to draw particular attention to one of the recommendations contained in the report which is especially pertinent to the 1954 watch decision. I quote:

The 1954 decisions on watches by the Department of Commerce, the Interdepartmental Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and of the President were not accompanied by completely developed analysis of defense essentiality. The industry appears to have been studied in isolation from other industries and any set of recognizable criteria. We urge that new decisions taken this year be supported in the public record with a full analysis of why the decision is taken, regardless of whether that decision is to call for more or less restriction of the watch imports.

Recent articles in the press have almost uniformly echoed this observation

and have further indicated widespread agreement that, as the report states:

Attempts to restrict watch imports * * * are likely to have undesirable side effects on our worldwide trade relations and hence on national security far beyond any narrow gain in domestic watch production.

As a good example of the newspaper reports on this well-reasoned subcommittee report, I ask that the text of a column which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and Sun on July 23, 1956, be reprinted in the RECORD. It was ably written by Scripps-Howard staff writer Douglas Smith:

CONGRESS UNIT WOULD EASE WATCH TARIFFS

(By Douglas Smith)

WASHINGTON, July 23.—There should be no more barriers against the importation of watches, a congressional committee has declared.

The Joint Economic Committee, of which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois) is chairman, says the tariff increase on watches 2 years ago did not improve the relative position of American watchmakers.

The committee's report is based on an investigation conducted by a subcommittee headed by Representative RICHARD BOLLING (Democrat, Missouri).

But this is only one more round in the perennial battle over watch tariffs.

The President can restrict watch imports without the approval of Congress if he considers it necessary to advance the national defense. The Office of Defense Mobilization now has a committee studying whether to recommend such action to the White House.

An ODM committee recommendation caused the President to increase the tariff on jeweled watches by 50 percent in 1954. The new congressional committee report suggests that recommendation was "dominated by domestic commercial considerations rather than either defense needs or foreign policy effects."

American jeweled watch manufacturers would prefer import quotas on their foreign (Swiss) competition, because even a substantial tariff increase might not do them much good. The one of 2 years ago helped them little, because the Swiss are able to make fine watches much more cheaply than American firms.

The American companies also are engaged in high-precision defense work for which they claim their watchmakers are a unique and highly essential pool of skills.

The congressional committee considered the plant-conversion idea old-fashioned, however. It said "it is safest to assume that never again will we have time to convert our industry over a period of years from a peaceful orientation to a military one."

Congressman Nicholson's Cranberry Day at the House Restaurant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from an article in the Washington Evening Star by Betty Beale:

When we got off the elevator and walked past the House dining room, there was Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, arriving to meet Miss Cranberries, who was posing with a crate of cranberry jelly.

Miss Cranberries had a natural straw ladies' hand basket ornamented with a bunch of cranberries for both Mrs. ROGERS and Mrs. Donald Nicholson, wife of the Congressman from Wareham, Mass., where the biggest cranberry producers come from. EDITH ROGERS was so delighted with her basket, she promised to wave it on the floor of the House, but I couldn't wait to see what interesting effect this gesture might have on her colleagues.

Inside the dining room cranberry sauce reposed on every table, together with a ditty intended to overcome that American conviction that cranberry sauce was meant for Thanksgiving turkey and nothing else.

The ditty read:

"It's the berries, and there's a reason.
For cranberry sauce knows no season," etc.

"It's yours in winter, yours in spring;
It's sauce for a goose or sauce for a king."

That last line was so flattering House Members got into the spirit of things and helped reduce the cranberry sauce surplus for 1956. Besides, it was free.

Mrs. Christine Stevens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to insert an article by Ann Cottrell Free of the North American Newspaper Alliance on Mrs. Christine Stevens:

(By Ann Cottrell Free)

WASHINGTON.—A most extraordinary woman, whose pursuits could be those of the idle rich, is here—pursuing, instead, passage of a law to banish pain and terror from the last moments of millions of animals annually.

Christine Stevens is that woman.

She is tall, slender, and young—only 38 years old. An artist herself, she has the delicate features of a renaissance madonna. So profound is her reverence for life that famed philosopher Dr. Albert Schweitzer calls her "my companion in battle."

These attributes of fact and heart prompt some Congressmen to stop and listen. All she asks is legislation compelling meat packers to make animals insensible to pain—as most are not—before death.

Other Congressmen listen for another reason. They know she is the wife of one of the Nation's most powerful financial wizards—Roger Stevens. He headed the group that bought the Empire State Building a few years ago for a record $51.5 million. Real-estate interests of this Michigan-born tycoon are tremendous in such cities as Seattle, Cleveland, Boston, and Washington, D. C. The 45-year-old Stevens also is backer and producer of dozens of Broadway hits, including Tea and Sympathy and Cat on the Hot Tin Roof. In addition, he may be a rising political figure. He is campaign finance chairman for presidential aspirant Adlai Stevenson.

Mr. Stevens also is treasurer of the Animal Welfare Institute, 270 Park Avenue, New York City, headed by his wife.

Christine Stevens controls well the flame of indignation under a cool exterior. She has a clear, factual, and persistent, approach to the problem of humane slaughter.

Though she heads the Animal Welfare Institute, dedicated to various phases of animal care, she established last year the Society for Animal Protective Legislation. Its primary purpose is to support—along with the larger humane organizations—the proposed humane slaughter legislation. It is a registered lobby. Mrs. Ludwig Bemelmans, wife of the author-illustrator, is president.

How does one go about arousing interest in a subject that is not only indelicate but so unspeakable that few speak of it?

Christine Stevens believes that the answer is in facts, not tears and sympathy. To this end she has visited slaughterhouses here and abroad to familiarize herself with conditions. She has written and distributed thousands of leaflets, Facts on Humane Slaughter. She testified in May before a Senate subcommittee in favor of the bill sponsored by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota. And she and her associates have asked every Member of Congress to support the legislation.

"What we must remember," Mrs. Stevens says, "is that 12 other countries have passed humane slaughter laws. Why do we stall while this debasing brutality continues?"

She then told about seeing beef cattle bludgeoned repeatedly before falling as she gave her answer to that question.

"Special stunning weapons to avoid this barbaric and terrifying practice are available, but there is no law requiring their use."

She told of seeing smaller animals—hogs, calves, and lambs—being strung up by a hind leg and their throats cut while alive and terrified.

"This is needless torture," she said, "when carbon dioxide gas chambers can be used safely and economically. The Hormel Co. has installed one and finds its hams less bruised," she added.

What will happen to the proposed legislation (there are three bills) to outlaw these age-old killing methods during the last days of this Congress is anybody's guess. Representative MARTHA GRIFFITHS, Democrat, Michigan, author of a House version, reports that support mail continues to pour in. Much of it comes from housewives.

If the bills don't come to a vote this session, Christine Stevens will not rest until a law is passed. She puts in more than 40 hours weekly on this nonpaying job. Yet she is able to live a full family life, too. The Stevens, unlike many who deal in the millions of dollars, live in a modest New York apartment and she does the cooking. She helps her husband read manuscripts and, of course, goes to all the first nights.

They were in Europe three times last year. Their 17-year-old daughter, Christabel (called Kittybel), has been studying at the Sorbonne in Paris. This fall she enrolls at Cambridge in England.

Mrs. Stevens meets with European humane groups frequently and this fall will attend a meeting of the World Federation of Animal Protection in Orleans, France. She keeps up, however, with her hometown humane society in Ann Arbor, Mich.—even writes a weekly radio program for it.

Her concern for animals, especially those used for experimental laboratories, was created by her father the late Dr. Robert Gesell. He was chief of the Department of Physiology at the University of Michigan.

She is the niece, incidentally, of the famed child psychologist, Dr. Arnold Gesell, founder of the Gesell Institute for Child Development at Yale University.

Whether the efforts of Mrs. Stevens, and others equally dedicated, will succeed this year nobody knows. But they may have convinced many Congressmen that a nation so advanced as this also needs:

"A boundless ethics which will include the animals also."

Those words by Dr. Schweitzer are inscribed on a medal in his honor that Christine Stevens awards annually to the person who does the most for animals.

Haiti Celebrates 153d Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to send sincere greetings and best wishes to the Haitian people, President Paul E. Magloire, and His Excellency, Mauclair Zepherin, Ambassador of Haiti, on the occasion of the celebration of the 153d anniversary of the independence of Haiti, January 1, 1957.

Haiti, first of the Latin American nations to proclaim its freedom from colonial rule is the only Negro republic in the New World. Dissatisfaction with colonialism grew apace in America during the last years of the 18th and early years of the 19th centuries. St. Domingue was no exception, and on July 1, 1801, the great Haitian patriot Toussaint L'Ouverture declared the independence of the island from France. This independence was reaffirmed by Jean Jacques Dessalines on January 1, 1804, when the new republic was given the island's aboriginal name—Haiti—meaning land of mountains.

For a long time after separation from France, Haiti, like other countries of Latin America, suffered from political chaos. It is to the country's everlasting credit that, having so many obstacles to overcome, it has gone far on the road of self-development. Fundamentally, that road has been one of agricultural progress.

Agriculture is the basis of the Nation's economy. There has been no lack of awareness of the problems of Haitian agriculture or of devotion to the cause of improving it. President Paul E. Magloire upon the assumption of office embarked upon a plan of economic development for Haiti the scope of which has never before been undertaken in the history of the country. The aim of the Magliore program is to ameliorate all economic life, but in Haiti this means basically agricultural development. Haiti envisages a series of economic measures of which the most important, actually in execution, is the development of irrigation and hydroelectric power in the Artibonite Valley. In addition, the program of economic development embraces measures for the promotion of increased production of the chief exportation crops, intensified production and cultivation of foodstuffs, irrigation, drainage and river control, conservation and reforestation, development of animal husbandry, and the establishment of demonstration and experiment farms. The government of President Magloire has seriously adapted itself to the fulfillment and implementation of this program, which if successful will accrue many benefits for Haiti.

The government has dedicated itself to resort to all available means to improve the health, security, and standard of living among the people at large without undue delay. The entire education system of the Republic reflects this objective.

There exists a close rapprochement between our country and Haiti. The Haitian Government has repeatedly declared its solidarity with the United States and the other republics of the Western Hemisphere. Haiti is no newcomer to the practice of genuine inter-American cooperation. Haitian soldiers fought at the battle of Savannah in the American Revolution. Haiti sent help to Simon Bolivar in his struggle for independence in South America. Haiti's valuable contributions to World War II and western hemispheric defense efforts are well known. Hence, in contributing her efforts to the common cause of democracy, Haiti is carrying out a well-established historical tradition for which other American nations are deeply grateful.

Haiti is made up of a great and proud people; it is an important democracy toward which we feel friendly and we believe its people feel friendly toward us. I trust that throughout the years this good feeling, this friendship, and this cooperation may abide.

Refugee Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Post of Thursday, July 26, 1956, urging amendment of the Refugee Relief Act.

In this connection I call the Members' attention to the President's letter referred to in the editorial which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18, 1956, at page 12119.

I certainly hope that even at this late date, the Congress can take much-needed action on this subject.

The editorial follows:

UNUSED VISAS

The President, in a strong letter to Senator WATKINS that has been virtually overlooked in Congress' rush to adjourn, has urged once again the prompt amendment of the immigration laws to permit reallocation of unused refugee relief visas. "Unless action is taken in this session," Mr. Eisenhower declared, "immigration from a number of friendly nations such as Greece and Italy will be drastically reduced when the visas which have been available to those countries under the Refugee Relief Act are exhausted this summer."

Thousands of visas available to escapees from Communist countries now living in Germany and Austria have not been applied for, but under present law these quotas cannot be shifted to other countries where many refugees are stranded. Senator WATKINS hopes to tack the necessary amendments on the so-called sheepherders' bill—the only House-passed immigration bill on the Senate calendar, if and when it is called up by the Senate leadership. Full hearings have been held on the Watkins proposals, and Congress ought to heed without fail the President's renewed plea for this humanitarian and long overdue legislation.

Tribute to Congressmen Cannon, Thomas, and Patman, Committee Chairmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress approaches adjournment and we reflect upon our work and service and accomplishments, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to pay my own special tribute of regard and appreciation for the three chairmen and subcommittee chairmen of committees on which I am privileged to serve in the Congress.

It has been my good fortune and pleasure and certainly distinct privilege to be able to work with the members of the Committee on Appropriations and especially my colleagues of the two appropriation subcommittees on which I serve—namely, the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. My other committee assignment is represented by membership on the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. My three committee chairmen are the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, who also serves as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations; the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, and the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. All of these gentlemen, my chairmen, are outstanding chairmen.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as we all know and recognize, is one of the most distinguished Members of this body. He is an able and skilled parliamentarian. He is equally outstanding as chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations. This year the appropriation bills have reached the floor of the House in advance of an earlier announced schedule. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, Mr. CANNON has worked diligently and devotedly on great public works projects for all sections of our common country, analyzing budget requests and evaluating the projects commensurate with the needs of the citizens of this Nation. Chairman CANNON'S

years of experience and keen understanding of government and the needs of our Nation has resulted in the outstanding work of the Appropriations Committee which has been achieved this year under his leadership. He deserves the praise and thanks and gratitude of all of the citizens of this country for the valuable and exacting service which he has rendered.

Further, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my compliments and well-deserved tribute to my esteemed friend, Hon. ALBERT THOMAS, the distinguished Texas gentleman, chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations. All Members of this body recognize Congressman THOMAS as one of the most outstanding Members of Congress. He is esteemed, beloved, and respected. Esteemed and respected because of his fine abilities and beloved because of his genial, personable qualities—to be closely associated with and to work with AL THOMAS is a privilege and distinct honor. He has a penetrating and probing mind and devotes himself tirelessly to his duties and responsibilities. Congressman THOMAS is a leader and an able committee chairman. He knows and understands the issues thoroughly and has the ability to sift the chaff from the wheat and to achieve results. We respect and admire AL THOMAS immensely. He is deserving of the thanks of a grateful nation for his valuable public service.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, another distinguished Congressman from Texas, who is chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. In the person of Congressman PATMAN, the people of his district, Texas, and the Nation have an outstanding representative. As a member of the committee of which he serves as chairman, I am privileged to serve under and work with another great committee chairman, whom I am pleased to call my friend. Congressman PATMAN has rendered an outstanding service in guiding and correlating the work of this committee which has a wide jurisdiction and a multiplicity and variety of programs of public service. The diligence and zeal with which WRIGHT PATMAN has pursued his duties as chairman of this committee to fulfill the objectives of the committee should not go by this session without public recognition. WRIGHT PATMAN has a big heart and generous nature and his impulses are motivated by the highest principles of dedicated public service. The energy and drive and untiring efforts of Congressman PATMAN are admired by all. I know he is not opposed to big business but, certainly, he is devoted to small business—to serving the independent merchant and the small-business men of this Nation, whom he considers, vital and essential to the well-being and progress of our free-enterprise system. Moreover, WRIGHT PATMAN is beloved because of his fine personal qualities. He is not only a great chairman, he is also a fine friend and Christian gentleman.

So, Mr. Speaker, these men, my committee chairmen, are all outstanding Members of Congress and I do not want this session to end without paying my personal respects to them. They deserve this tribute and more for the important public service which they have rendered our country.

Fluoridation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement, which I include under leave to extend my remarks, was given before the 20th annual convention of the American Academy of Nutrition in Los Angeles on May 18, 1956, by the president of the academy, Dr. Granville F. Knight.

Membership in the American Academy of Nutrition is limited to physicians with a doctor of medicine degree, dentists, veterinarians, agronomists, biochemists, and other with the degree of doctor of science, doctor of philosophy, or the equivalent thereof, and the membership is countrywide.

The objects and purposes of the academy, as given in its constitution, are "to promote and advance the science and art of nutrition especially as it pertains to the prevention and treatment of disease; to establish nutrition as a speciality of medicine and dentistry; to provide for the dissemination of knowledge concerning nutrition and related sciences."

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT ON FLUORIDATION

(By Granville F. Knight, M. D., F. A. C. A., F. I. A. A., Santa Barbara, Calif.)

Although those living in large metropolitan areas are often exposed to toxic amounts of fluorides in the air (in the form of byproducts from steel, aluminum, and fertilizer plants), the United States Public Health Service is strongly advocating the addition of sodium fluoride, or similar compounds, in a dilution of one part per million, to domestic water supplies. This campaign is based on the questionable premise that the result will be less tooth decay in children without harm to consumers.

In my opinion—and I want it clearly understood that I am not reflecting the views of any medical or dental organization, but the ideas of an increasing number of thoughtful citizens and professional men (of whom only a few are willing to express themselves)—such fluoridation is not only illogical, but is an invasion of personal rights and is fraught with grave danger to the health of the whole population. Let me enumerate some objections:

1. It is mass medication without precedent.

2. Sodium fluoride is a very toxic chemical acting as an enzyme poison, direct irritant and calcium inactivator. In a dilution of 1 to 15 million it reduces the activity of pancreatic lipase by 50 percent. It is also an inhibitor of cytochrome oxidase, catalase, alkaline phosphatase, and others. It reacts with growing tooth enamel and with bones to produce irreversible damage. It may injure the nervous system, kidneys and other tissues of susceptible individuals.

3. Fluoride is not a necessary trace element even for dental health.

4. The thereapeutic dose (arbitrarily set at one part per million in drinking water) is equivalent to the toxic dose and yet the public is expected to consume this dangerous drug in uncontrolled quantities as a humanitarian gesture. Even proponents admit that 15 to 20 percent of children drinking such water will show chalk patches in their teeth. Drugs of such potency, in the past, have only been administered individually and under close supervision. There is no reason to abandon these safeguards.

5. Uniform dosage of any drug dissolved in the water supply is obviously impossible. Some individuals may drink 10 times as much as others. Thirst has many variables.

6. Fluoridation is completely illogical and expensive to boot. Why treat all users of a domestic water supply when only one-tenth of 1 percent of the water will be consumed by the 12 percent who might possibly benefit? And why expose all citizens to a potentially serious hazard by obliging them to drink medicated water or to purchase bottled water at considerable expense? In addition, it is admitted that children in rural areas will not receive the doubtful benefits. How much more logical it would be for those wishing to use this toxic chemical to add a known daily dose of chemically pure sodium fluoride to milk or water by means of a tablet or drops on the prescription of a physician or dentist—and how much cheaper.

7. Moreover, statistics cited to prove a marked reduction in dental caries in those children consuming artifically fluoridated water are both contradictory and unconvincing.

8. No satisfactory studies are available to prove lack of toxicity for the aged, the chronically ill, the malnourished, and the allergic members of the population.

9. Cases of serious illness resulting from the consumption of water fluoridated at the recommended concentration are now being reported. Allergic individuals, as might be expected, seem particularly susceptible. Two fatal cases exhibiting marked generalized fluorosis have been carefully studied and reported. They drank naturally fluoridated water not far above the advocated level (about two parts per million. See references 12 and 13).

10. The fact that those opposed to fluoridation not only have great difficulty in reporting their observations, but in addition are subjected to unfair assaults upon their personal integrity and professional standing, should be enough to make every physician and dentist resolve to learn all the facts and to question the motives and tactics of those advocating fluoridation.

Finally, citizens of every community should seriously question the advisability of permitting themselves and their children to serve as human guinea pigs for an experiment of dubious value and safety—particularly when avoidance of sugar and highly processed bread and cerals plus the consumption of an optimum diet will control dental carries in most instances and vastly improve the general health as well.

REFERENCES

1. American Dental Association, May 1954. Pamphlet (G20–10M).

2. American Association for the Advancement of Science: Fluoridation as a Public Health Measure, 1515 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1954).

3. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons: Resolution Opposing Compulsory Mass Medication, Chicago, Ill., October 8 (1955).

4. Dean, H. T.; Jay, P.; Arnold, F. A., Jr.; Elrove, E.: Domestic Water and Dental Caries II. Public Health Reports, 56: 761–92 (1941).

5. Exner, F. B.: Fluoridation. Northwest Medicine (1955).

6. Fluoridation of Water. Hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign

Commerce, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, May 25, 26, and 27 (1954).

7. Fluoridation of Public Drinking Water. Delaney Report (Select Committee To Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Foods and Cosmetics), 82d Congress, 2d session, Union Calendar No. 787, Report No. 2500, July 10 (1952).

8. Forman, J.: Fluorine on Tap: The Case Against It. The Land 12: 1 (spring 1953).

9. Kandy, J. C.; Bingham, F. T.; McColloch, R. C.; Liebig, G. F.; and Naueslow, A. O.: Fluorine Content of Citrus Leaves in the Major Citrus Areas of California. Citrus Leaves, June (1954).

10. Klerer, M.: The Fluoridation Experiment. Contemporary Issues, 7: 26, February-March (1956). Contemporary Press, 545 Fifth Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

11. Khutson, J. W.: Medical Progress, the Case for Water Fluoridation, N. E. Journal of Medicine, 246: 737 (1952).

12. Linsman, J. F.; and McMurray, C. H.: Fluoride Osteosclerosis From Drinking Water. Radiology, 40: 474–84 (1943).[1]

13. Mascheroni, H. A.; Munoz, J. M.; and Reussi, C.: Bone Manifestations of Endemic Fluorosis, Rev. Soc. Argent de Bilo., 15: 417–419 (1939).

14. A Manual of Pharmacology. Sollmann, W. B., Saunders, Philadelphia, fifth edition (1940).

15. McClure, F. J.: Fluorine and Other Trace Elements in Nutrition. J. A. M. A., 139: 11, 711–714, March 12 (1949).

16. National Fluoridation News, 2930 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich. January (1955).

17. National Research Council: Publication 294, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, D. C. November (1953).

18. The Problem of Providing Optimum Fluoride Intake for Prevention of Dental Caries. National Res. Council Publication 294, November (1953).

19. Roholn, K.: Fluorine Intoxication, London, H. K., Lewis & Co., Ltd. (1937).

20. Rupp, G. W.: The Pharmacology of Fluoride. The Bur., April (1950).

21. Transcript of the Minutes of the Fourth Annual Conference, State Dental Directors With the Public Health Service and the Children's Bureau. Federal Security Building, Washington, D. C. June 6–8 (1951).

22. Waldbott, G. L.: Chronic Fluorine Intoxication From Drinking Water at the 1 Part per Million Concentration; An Epidemic in Saginaw, Mich. Folia Clinica Internacional, April (1955).

23. Waldbott, G. L.: Chronic Fluorine Intoxication From Dinking Water at the 1 Part per Million Concentration: A Case Report. Int. Arch. Allergy and Immunology 7, 70–74 (1955).

24. Waldbott, G. L.: Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies, II, Promotional Aspect, 2930 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit 2, Mich.

25. Waldbott, G. L.: Medical Evidence Against Fluoridation of Public Water Supplies. Australian Journal of Dentistry, 59: 13, February (1955).

Mr. Speaker, since making this statement, Dr. Knight has been the subject of vicious attacks by proponents of fluoridation. Admittedly, the subject is controversial, but it is unfortunate that when a prominent physician comes out in opposition, attempts should be made to undermine his professional standing. This has happened in a number of cases, and one result is that many qualified authorities who oppose fluoridation keep silent rather than open themselves to such attacks.

[1] Misprint corrected in 41: 497 (1943).

It is my opinion that the case for fluoridation has not yet been satisfactorily proved, and I believe that such men as Dr. Knight are performing a public service.

Low Mentality Groups Damage United States Abroad, But Race Can't Be Named

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an article from the Charleston News and Courier under date of July 20, 1956, and an editorial of July 21, 1956. These relate to the almost insuperable problem placed on the shoulders of one of America's great military heroes, Gen. Henry I. Hodes, commander, United States Army, Europe. It is a tragedy that such a great soldier has to put with a certain segment of troops being sent to him in Germany.

The editorial and article follow:

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of July 21, 1956]

LOW MENTALITY GROUPS DAMAGE UNITED STATES ABROAD, BUT RACE CAN'T BE NAMED

The protest of General Hodges, European commander of the United States Army, against sending low mentality groups to foreign military service is national news of first importance. It is news that we fear will not reach, with its full implications, the bulk of the American people. The facts, however, will be exploited to their full worth by the enemies of our country. For the truth is that in many parts of the world the people mean it when they say, "Yankee, go home."

One of the reasons why our country is earning more hatred than love is that foreign troops are never welcome indefinitely. Whether they are occupying armies among conquered peoples, as in Japan and Germany, or police garrisons as in Iceland and scores of other places in the world, sooner or later they are intensely unwelcome.

This historic distaste for foreign troops is even more accurate when racial differences are added.

General Hodes' protest that some of the men assigned overseas are unfit to represent their country apparently made no reference to race. In view of the integration orders from the Supreme Commander in the White House, he hardly could have mentioned it.

The subject is in the spotlight as a result of indignation over a gang-rape in Bamberg, Germany. Seven American soldiers are charged with assaulting a girl of 15. All seven are Negroes.

Reports have been current for some time that American troops have behaved badly in foreign places. Not all of the crimes, of course, are committed by Negro troops. The Army does not keep statistics by race and therefore it is not possible to get an official statement. Statistics on crime by race are available in the United States, however. They show plainly that Negroes commit far more than their share.

Would it be surprising if Negro troops have a similar record overseas?

The United States should not permit Negro troops to be billeted in all-white countries. But national policy forbids segregation in the Armed Forces. Segregation, we have been told, supplies bad propaganda. Yet the American commander in Europe calls for segregation of his troops from "low mentality groups." Juggling of words to avoid reference to race can't hide the truth forever.

[From the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of July 20, 1956]

GENERAL HODES PROTESTS SENDING STUPID GIS TO EUROPE

WASHINGTON, July 19.—Gen. Henry I. Hodes, commander of the United States Army in Europe, has protested to the Pentagon against shipment overseas of what he calls low-mentality groups, which he blames for troubles with German civilians, it was learned today.

(While General Hodes did not mention specifically Negro troops, the News and Courier recently elicited, by insistent questioning, the information from the Associated Press that the seven United States soldiers involved in an alleged mass rape of a 15-year-old German girl at Bamberg, Germany, all were Negroes.)

Hodes was reported by reliable sources at army headquarters here to have complained that some of the men being assigned to his overseas command are so obviously unfit to represent this country as ambassadors abroad that they should have been dismissed from service at home.

West German newspapers have complained bitterly recently about a rising number of violent incidents involving American soldiers, and at least one German community has demanded that American garrisons there be withdrawn forthwith.

The state government of Bavaria, because of violence, has mobilized its riot police, and General Hodes himself has directed rigid enforcement of a previously ordered midnight troop curfew.

The degree to which Negro soldiers are responsible for the outbreak of violent incidents in Germany cannot be determined at the Pentagon, where information officers say that, because of rigid integration orders from President Eisenhower, as commander-in-chief, racial breakdowns on military crime are not available.

The Army said it keeps only two sets of statistics on its crime incidence in Germany, one showing the overall total and the other recording those involving Americans and Germans. But it insists that neither set shows any data to support reports that crime is on the increase among American troops or against German civilians.

Nevertheless, General Hodes has told the Pentagon, as a Washington newspaper put it today, to "quit sending me stupid GIs—they are the cause of crime and trouble in Germany."

The Iowa Rose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an article from the New York Journal-American of July 23 entitled "The Iowa Rose." The subject referred to is not the Iowa State flower, as you might suppose, but Miss Carol Morris, of Ottumwa, wro recently was crowned Miss Universe:

THE IOWA ROSE

It is not alone the corn that grows tall and beautiful in Iowa. It has another product

worthy of world glory, namely Carol Morris, 20, a minister's daughter of Ottumwa, who has been acclaimed Miss Universe over 29 of the fairest feminine flowers in all the world. Speaking of flowers, the State flower of Iowa is the wild rose. Miss Morris emphatically is not wild, but she indisputably is a lovely Iowa rose. We wish her the rosiest possible future.

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEO W. O'BRIEN

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call the attention of our colleagues to the statement issued by the Honorable Delmas H. Nucker, Acting High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, at the conclusion of the hearings before the United Nations Trusteeship Council on June 27, 1956.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I had the good fortune to attend a portion of the hearings as an official representative of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am genuinely impressed by the efficiency and sincerity with which Commissioner Nucker and his staff are administering the trust territory and am taking this opportunity to express publicly my appreciation to them.

Mr. Nucker's closing statement follows:

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS—STATEMENT BY DELMAS H. NUCKER, UNITED STATES SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE IN THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

My appearance before the Trusteeship Council this year has been a stimulating experience. A variety of ideas—some of which involve very fundamental policies—have been propounded by various members of the council. Such an exchange of ideas is a useful and interesting experience.

I believe it is fair to say that many of the suggestions that have been made by members of the council have stemmed from the report of the visiting mission. In my opening statement I commented upon our pleasure at having the mission visit with us in the trust territory and being able to discuss our problems and policies with its members. Because of the very short time between our receipt of the mission's report and my appearance here, I did not undertake to make detailed comments upon the mission's recommendations. I believe, however, that during the questioning period I have been asked to comment upon virtually all of the recommendations.

In answering questions that have been based upon the mission's report, as well as in the remarks of the members of the Council during the general debate, I think there have been clearly brought forth some honest differences of opinion regarding the philosophies that guide our administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. I appreciate the opportunity now to comment upon these issues and upon some specific points of our various programs.

PROBLEMS OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

I am pleased that almost all members of the council and the visiting mission have stated their recognition of the difficulty of creating in the whole of the trust territory a common territorial awareness of unity—or a feeling of need to join together to solve certain problems. We have, nevertheless, been urged to take measures to more rapidly educate the people in this direction. The visiting mission has noted that various factors, such as education at the Pacific Island Central School, will accelerate the feeling of unity.

I would also reiterate that the proposed conference of Micronesian leaders to be held in August in Guam is one of the steps we are taking to create among the people of the various parts of the territory a realization of some of the common problems facing the different districts and the common approaches being taken by our staff in the solution of those problems.

While we are thoroughly appreciative of the feelings that have been expressed for the rapid creation of a feeling of unity and then a central political body for all of the territory, I feel that I should reemphasize that the administration is still firmly of the opinion that the soundest political growth for the people is through the municipalities and the districts. Moreover, the rate of progress must, in our view, be geared to the pace at which the people themselves are prepared and willing to accept new institutions and to adjust their customs and traditions to them without creating voids and unbalances in the way of life that has become admirably adjusted to life on these small and relatively isolated islands.

Lack of uniformity comes from the wishes of the people and is no detriment to any future central government. The States of the United States, for instance, vary—some have single-house legislatures, some have 2 houses. The of terms members differ—salaries differ widely. Yet the United States is unified.

It has been stated that it would be wise to greatly speed up a centralized political development in Micronesia. This implies the wisdom of an imposition of Western techniques and uniformity of methods in such development.

Few individuals in this world enjoy being subjected to imposition. Most individuals enjoy and appreciate participation, particularly in matters affecting their political, social, and economic lives, not only today but in the years to come.

I am pleased that within the framework of this policy it appears that the people and leaders in the Truk district are now rapidly approaching the point where they will desire the establishment of a district congress. This situation contrasts sharply with that of a few years ago when such a district congress failed because of a lack of desire for it.

The representative of Guatemala commented upon the shortness of the meetings of certain of the existing district congresses. In partial explanation of this situation I would like to point out that the problem of travel by the members of these bodies in an important factor. Many of the members must spend considerable time in travel to and from the meetings and hence are sometimes reluctant to meet or are anxious to begin the return trip. The congresses can themselves, of course, determine the length of their meetings. Although I did agree to a request from the Marshallese congress that they be excused from meeting this past year, we do intend, as a matter of policy, to encourage meetings of the congresses at the intervals stated in the charters granted to them.

The distinguished representative of India mentioned the desirability of electing magistrates on a biannual basis. I agree and am sorry that my replies to questions created a wrong impression. We elect on an annual and a biannual basis—not a 6 months' basis.

Insofar as the move of the trust territory headquarters from Guam to a site within the trust territory, which the representative of New Zealand and others have urged, we are thoroughly appreciative of the reasons for the proposal but, when we take into account all of the factors involved, we do not feel that the time for such a move has yet arrived.

Several members of the Council have also urged that the Saipan district of the territory be brought back under the civilian administration of the rest of the territory. Here again the proposal is one that we can readily appreciate and understand. The transfer to Navy administration, however, was made after due consideration, and the Council may be sure that the administering authority will do its utmost to insure that the principles and purposes of the trusteeship agreement are carried out in the Saipan district. Coordination between my office and staff and the Navy staff will continue and will be made as effective as possible.

QUESTION OF UNITED STATES APPROPRIATIONS

One fundamental issue on which we have differed with the visiting mission, and on which various members of this Council obviously have different opinions, has arisen from the statement of the mission that the administering authority should increase its appropriations so that the development of the territory is not hampered. I think one of the difficulties in this statement arises from the use of the word "hampered." To anyone who has followed the administration of the territory over the past 10 years, I believe the word would appear ill chosen. The Council has itself noted annually in its review of conditions in the territory a steady progress in political, economic, educational, and medical fields.

It is true that, if larger appropriations had been made available, we could have substantially increased our staff, could have built many buildings, could have embarked upon numerous additional economic experiments, and could so have overadministered the territory as to have created a facade of various programs, structures, and enterprises that had no real foundation other than the subsidies paid into them. I cannot believe that this type of false economy and overadministration would have been in the best interests of the Micronesian people. Unless the size of the administration is in proportion to the need and the economic life of the territory is firmly founded on productivity, the dependency of the area is increased because it will never be able to support the artificially high standards created by oversubsidization.

The level of appropriation is, to my mind, one of judgment and balance. Opinions on the subject obviously differ. I do not, however, believe that the past level of appropriations has hampered the development of the territory. Furthermore, I firmly believe that the amount of subsidization should and must be related to the needs of Micronesia—not to the administering authority's appraisal of the security value of the area. While recognizing the security significance of Micronesia, Congress has approved the administering authority's appropriation requests on the basis of helping Micronesia, not on the basis of buying security insurance for the United States.

TRANSPORTATION DIFFICULTIES

Most members of the Council have commented upon the need to improve the transportation in the area. This has long been a problem of major concern to us and one in which we feel we have been making substantial progress. Our improvement program is, of course, not completed. We have entered upon the phase in which we are promoting and encouraging the trading companies and others to take over the transportation within the various districts. The Marshall Islands Import-Export Co. has just taken delivery of a vessel which it was able to have constructed as a result of a loan made to it by the trust territory govern-

ment. This same company is already operating two other vessels that it has chartered from the Government. Similar developments are anticipated in other districts, and substantial improvement in transportation services will result.

Also in the field of transportation, attention has been drawn to the condition of our roads in the territory. I might say parenthetically that the greatest use of these roads is by the administration itself in the area of the district centers. The trust territory government recognizes its responsibility for these roads that are of primary commercial use and is working to improve them.

AVAILABILITY OF CAPITAL

In connection with the mining of bauxite on Babeldaup and the development of small industries, the representative of Haiti raised a point regarding the introduction of foreign capital, the availability of local capital, and the nature of the economy in the territory. During the questioning period I believe I said in response to an inquiry that the economy of Yap is not essentially a money economy. I believe that the distinguished representative of Haiti misinterpreted that reply as applying to the entire territory. Taking the territory as a whole there is a reliance on a money economy along with subsistence agriculture. There is, therefore, available capital in the territory for small undertakings. The local trading companies, for instance, have been financed by small purchases of stock by many people. As a matter of preference we would rather take a little longer to launch an enterprise if it can be done with Micronesian money than to bring in outside investors with the result that the Micronesians benefit only from the creation of jobs and wage income, for which there is no great need at this point. We agree that various economic enterprises will be needed to further increase the monetary income of the people and the territory. The difference arises, I believe, in whether we should plunge ahead rapidly to create subsidized economic activity for its own sake or relate new economic enterprises to the needs of the area and create them by, for, and with the Micronesians. Our preference is definitely the latter course, and it is against this approach that we are assessing and exploring new economic enterprises.

It is my hope that our new fisheries biologist will enable us to improve and increase the productivity of the territory in marine resources. Initial attention is being given to trochus and other shellfish of possible economic import. Subsequently, studies will be made in the fields of reef fishing and deep-sea fishing.

The visiting mission and various members of the council have commented upon the need for additional effort in the agricultural field. As I mentioned in response to questions on this point, our agricultural staff has been doubled within the past 18 months because we had recognized that increased emphasis on both subsistence and export agriculture was needed. I believe that, as this expanded agricultural team draws up its program and begins its coordinated efforts in execution of the program, the agricultural situation will be much improved.

Attention has been directed to the statistics in regard to land holdings in the territory as a result of the repetition in the visiting mission's report of the same figure for public-domain holdings as had been used by the administration 2 years ago. This would seem to indicate that no progress has been made in returning the lands to the Micronesians. In reviewing the problem, however, I believe it is fair to say that since the 1954 report to the United Nations more than 10 square miles of public-domain lands have been returned or made available to the Micronesians. Moreover, a sizable portion of the public-domain lands is nonarable. Such of the public domain as is arable will be made available to the Micronesians through our homesteading program or otherwise.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

I have followed closely and with much interest the comments made by the various representatives of the council with respect to our educational program. I am in full agreement with the oft-repeated comment that, undess a sound education system is developed, other programs of the territory cannot rest on a solid foundation.

It has been suggested by the visiting mission that perhaps too heavy a burden has been placed in too short a time on the local municipalities by making them responsible for all elementary education. The representative from Guatemala has recommended that more aid should be given in the form of American schoolteachers as well as financial subsidies for school buildings and equipment. It has been our firm belief that any worthwhile program of elementary education must stem from the local community itself. The limited potentials of the territory to develop economically would, it seems to me, make mandatory the development of a pattern of local education which can be correlated into the existing social and economic structure of the area. With this as a guideline, we are aiding and encouraging the Micronesians to develop a local system of education within their own means of support. I would like to point out though that we are supporting and encouraging this local elementary school system in larger measure than might appear from reading a general account of our educational program. We are concentrating on using our American teachers as teacher-trainers for local elementary teachers; this program will be greatly expanded during the coming year. Production of text material suitable for local use is being accelerated; financial subsidy for school buildings can now be secured through a matching-fund arrangement. In short, in many indirect ways we are providing major support to the local elementary school program.

Vocational education is receiving additional support by strengthening our inservice work program. Trained vocational experts have and will continue to be recruited to push this program forward. Our new Pacific Islands Central School also will have a strong vocational training program as part of its new curriculum.

In appreciate the report made by the UNESCO and the amplifying comments made by the UNESCO representative. I would like to assure the Council that the reports of the UNESCO will be studied carefully by our educators.

The representative of Burma has noted that birth and mortality rates were not highlighted in our annual report. In this connection, I would like to point out a résumé of birth and death statistics has been included on page 135 of the 1955 annual report. This past year our health statistician has developed a systematic reporting system for vital statistics throughout the territory, and I can assure the members of the Council that next year's report will have greater detail on this aspect. I might also mention that at the present time plans are being formulated for the conducting of a territorywide census early in 1957, a census in which international standards will be closely adhered to so as to make our statistics more readily usable for comparative purposes.

I was pleased to note the favorable comments made by the various representatives on our overall health and medical program for this is one in which I feel the trust territory has made significant progress. This coming year we are planning to expand our program of improving the out-island health-aid system so as to bring more of the benefits of the district health pattern into the more demote areas. This will be done by a program of training and refresher courses at our hospitals for health aids as well as expanding our medical field-trip programs. The implementation of a territorywide BCG vaccination program will, we hope, enable us to gain even better control over tuberculosis.

Additional medical practitioners are being trained. Three new candidates are ready for the Suva school this year, and our medical director has hopes that he may expand the number to five. Our postgraduate medical-training program at hospitals in Hawaii will continue. The visiting mission report commented that the next step should be full-fledged medical university training. As members of this Council know, to qualify for such training a university degree is a prerequisite. I assure the Council that we are looking forward to the day when enough young Micronesians will have reached this goal to allow us to launch such a program.

LAND CLAIMS

While I have desired to report fully in answer to your questions on our plans for the displaced persons within our areas, I would like to reassure the Council again that all possible steps are being taken to remedy problems that have arisen. The logistic situation of Ujelang will be measurably improved with the operation of a new intra-district boat in the Marshalls. The Ujelangese land claims to Eniwetok will, I hope, be satisfactorily met within the next few months.

Similar land claims of the ex-Bikinians now on Kili also should be satisfactorily met within the space of the next 2 months. While the Kili boat and Jabwor project has been slow in progress, it now has been activated and will, I feel, immeasurably add to the Kilians' welfare. The representative of Guatemala has commented that his delegation has noted that plans for the Jaluit project for Kili appear to have shifted somewhat and that this perhaps might add a disquieting factor to the program. I would like to point out that the plans for the Kili-Jaluit project are formulated in cooperation with the Marshallese-Kili project manager and the Kili Council and reflect the desires of the Kili people. I feel a project of this nature to succeed must have the full cooperation of the people themselves, and I fully hope that the administering authority will at all times maintain a flexible attitude so it can meet the needs and desires of the Kilians in solving problems that may arise in their readjustment.

We are looking forward to the early return of the Rongelap people to their home atoll. I assure the Council that this move from Ejit to Rongelap will be carefully planned and that all steps will be taken to make the resettlement and adjustment as smooth as possible.

Mr. President, in conclusion may I thank the members of the Council for their courtesy and the generous and kind personal comments that have been made to me. As I previously said, the ability to exchange views in this atmosphere is of tremendous value. I feel that each of the distinguished representatives is motivated by a desire to help the Micronesians and to improve their self-sufficiency. May I assure the Council that this, too, is the aim of the administering authority.

Red Jim Crowism: A Weapon for the West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most neglected areas in the American

campaign of truth and factual information regarding the Soviet Union is the colonialism and Red Jim Crowism that thrive in this basic empire. While Moscow exploits in twisted version the segregation problem in the United States, we, unfortunately, appear to overlook the genocide, persecutions, discriminations, and colonial exploitation promoted by imperialist Moscow against the many captive non-Russian nations and peoples in the Soviet Union.

A very illuminating article written on this vital subject has recently appeared in the June issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Authored by Edith Kermit Roosevelt, the article on Red Jim Crowism—A Weapon for the West, amply shows the sins of our omissions in the informational field. The Ukrainian Quarterly is the authoritative organ of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America which, led by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor at Georgetown University, is dedicated to the propagation of true information regarding the Soviet Union.

Because of its striking importance to our informational services, I request that this article by Miss Roosevelt be printed in full text in the RECORD:

(By Edith Kermit Roosevelt)

While the Communist press in this country attacks attempts by Southern States to evade the Supreme Court decision eliminating racial segregation in the schools, inside the Soviet Union itself the Reds are waging the world's most vicious campaign against this basic principle of democracy.

Russian segregation is not limited to racial separation in schools but includes wholesale extermination of non-Russian peoples. Because of this bloody persecution, the several nations and over 100 smaller racial groups who are victims of Red Jim Crowism constitute the greatest single revolutionary force inside the Soviet Union. The derailment of a Soviet troop train by Ukrainian rebels on May 20 near Shepetivka and the student demonstrations in Tiflis, capital of Georgia, are the most recent evidence of Russian failure to solve her racial and colonial questions. The destruction of the Stalin myth by the Soviet Government gave Ukraine, Georgia, and other once independent areas a pretext to express again their smoldering nationalism.

What should be the attitude of the United States toward the oppressed nationalities with the Soviet Borders? To date, while the United States has opposed colonialism by Allies—Great Britain and in the case of the Dutch and Indonesia, this Government has ignored the colonialism practiced by the Soviet Union, her enemy in the cold war. In view of the political unrest inside the Soviet Union, some politicians and Western intelligence officers are calling for a more consistent policy. Plans have long been under wraps to champion the cause of the non-Russian peoples who compose about 50 percent of the population of the U. S. S. R. Some strategists even urge a scrapping of the traditional United States policy of nonintervention in Soviet internal affairs in order to effectively counter Russian subversion in the West.

Who are these oppressed peoples and what do they seek from the West? One of the many Soviet colonials agitating for independence is the Ukrainian, Mikola Lebed. His picture was plastered by the Nazis on trees and bulletin boards throughout the Ukraine as one of Ukraine's most wanted "criminals." After the defeat of the Nazis he turned against the Red Russians. Now Secretary of Foreign Affairs of the Supreme Ukrainian Liberation Council, the stocky, blue-eyed Lebed was a leader in the Ukrainian Nationalist Army that fought both Germans and Russians in World War II. As a leader of nationalist resistance, the now balding guerrilla leader still remains a headache to the Reds. The East German Communists placed a price on his head. For within the Soviet borders these colonial peoples stall the Red plans for world conquest by continual revolts and unrest, while outside the Iron Curtain their documented testimony disproves Communist claims to racial equality and leadership of the anticolonial front.

At his Riverside Drive office in New York City Lebed recently raised a question frequently voiced by escapees.

"Why is it that millions of us, anti-Communist patriots, many of us shoveling the tundra in remote Arctic slave camps, remain the world's forgotten people?"

Lebed pointed out that while Communists attack Western colonialism—a relatively benign and vanishing form of world imperialism—the West is "strangely silent" about Russian colonialism.

"Never forget," he insists, "that we colonials have been waging a fight against Soviet imperialism for 39 years. You Americans would be smart if you would keep Russia busy at home. Then she wouldn't be able to pick a fight."

And how can Russia be kept busy at home?

"By an aggressive propaganda campaign of liberation by the West and funds to the people who want 'home rule' just as American colonials of Great Britain did less than 200 years ago."

Lebed's cause and that of other "forgotten peoples" of the U. S. S. R. are at last beginning to get a public hearing. Robert F. Kennedy became an ardent champion of Russian colonials after his trip last year to Soviet Central Asia. Kennedy, Chief Counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said he believes it is "high time that we in the West understood and spotlighted in the United Nations and in our own propaganda throughout the world this Russian aggression against human freedom."

Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, Ohio, has introduced congressional resolutions calling for recognition of the non-Russian republics of the U. S. S. R.

"Communists realize," FEIGHAN said, "that nationalism is the most effective weapon if not the ultimate weapon in the 20th century arsenal. The Reds are using this emotion to create antiwestern attitudes. They declare the United States is supporting British suppression in Cyprus and Kenya and French slaughter in north Africa in order to draw politically naive areas into their orbit. To offset this Soviet policy," he maintained, "the West must show these countries what happens to non-Russian peoples under Russian Communist rule."

However, the State Department has been cool to the idea of exploiting Soviet Russia's nationality problem. Recently the Voice of America dropped two of its nationality language broadcasts while the United States refused to ratify the United Nations genocide convention which opposes racial murder.

The American press, traditionally the protagonist of the underdog, has largely ignored the fate of the Soviet nationalities and racial groups. Mr. Kennedy, in a letter to the New York Times January 2, protested its December 23 editorial which singled out Russian imperialism in the Baltic States and central eastern Europe, but skipped Soviet liquidation of four nationalities after World War II, the Chechen Ingush, the Volga Germans, the Crimean Tatars, and the Kalmuks. The Communists disposed of these peoples over the vast expanses of Soviet Asia. Some were sent to develop virgin territory in slave camps in the far north—many thousands perished in cattle cars en route.

Kennedy chided the Times for not mentioning the brutal Communist imperialism practiced in the 1,500,000 square miles which comprise the 5 republics of Soviet Central Asia. He wrote:

"The peoples of Soviet Central Asia are denied local autonomy, for all sources of income, all means of livelihood, all social and political activity are controlled by Moscow."

In short, the Russian is lording it over the brown- and yellow-skinned people—the slant-eyed Turk, Persian, and Mongol; he is also domineering over the old civilized peoples of Ukraine, Caucasus, and others. And it is logical that the colonial subjects hate their Russian Communist oppressors.

To take advantage of Russia's inept colonial policy, Representative Charles Kersten, Republican, of Wisconsin, has called for not only extension of diplomatic relations with these colonies apparently independent nations, but for "material aid and moral support to active fighters now struggling for the liberation of the peoples of the Soviet Union * * * including nationality organizations and groups whose members have an origin or particular interest in the Soviet Union."

During the 83d Congress, Representative Kersten headed a committee which investigated Russian acquisition of non-Russian nations.

Prof Clarence A. Manning, of Columbia University, in a magazine article last spring, wrote that Soviet imperialism can be blocked only by "a policy of liberation of the oppressed peoples and the seating of their freely elected representatives in a revamped United Nations."

Under such a plan, the answer to the Soviet request for a U. N. seat for Outer Mongolia or its other colonies would be then "centainly, if your representatives are freely elected by the colonials themselves—not their Russian Soviet rulers in Moscow."

Rear Adm. George E. Mentz, for many years a teacher of naval strategy at Annapolis, stresses the strategic importance of Russia's colonies. He said recently "we must never lose sight of the fact that the Moslem countries of the Soviet Union border on the Middle East. These people are loyal to Islam, not Russian communism. This would be Russia's weak underbelly if war should come."

The Central Intelligence Agency and the Pentagon's psychological warfare branch should have plans for knifing into this underbelly to prevent an attack on the West. Spokesmen who necessarily must remain annoymous say these include autonomy for the Ukraine, the peoples of the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Far East. Also in the cards is an announcement by the West of the return of land to farmer ownership and a transfer of wealth from the Russian ruling clique to the natives. With such a platform, it is expected the oppressed nationalities would fight for independence. Russian commissars look back in horror to the disintegration of the Russian empire of 1917. During the revolutionary years, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia and other areas of the U. S. S. R. set up their own governments.

The ever-present possibility of revolt is a nightmare to Red rulers. Even in official Communist newspapers, Soviet leaders continually express concern over their discontented subjects. A. I. Niyazov, head of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, complained recently in Pravda that among Uzbek writers and scholars "nationalist survivals were reflected in idealization of the Uzbek people's feudal past * * * in the desire to overlook and underestimate the great role of the Russian people * * * and in the attempt at any cost to weaken the inviolable friendship of the peoples of our country."

Only a year ago, Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan admitted love of nationalism in,

Armenia was as strong as ever and as recently as October 20, 1951, the State Department radio reported that a revolt in the Soviet Central Asian republic of Kazakhstan was probably the most serious outbreak in a decade.

Continuing reports of "voluntary" deportations of Ukrainians to other regions of the U. S. S. R. show that decades of oppression have not broken the spirit of this proud people. On April 8, 1954, the central migration administration of the Ukrainian Ministry of Agriculture announced a "voluntary" migration of the Ukrainians to the Maritime and Khabarovsk territories. The Soviet Government hopes deported Ukrainians will mingle with other deportees and there share an interest in developing virgin lands for the benefit of Great Russia.

Unceasing resistance by the Ukrainian underground was revealed when Red Star, a Soviet army newspaper, announced May 20, 1954, the arrest and shooting of the agent, Vasily Okhrymovich, identified as "one of the chiefs of the so-called Organization of the Ukrainian Nationalists."

Soviet Arctic expert M. A. Sergeev admits in his book on the Soviet islands and the Pacific that occupying Russian soldiers get Roosky (Russian) go home treatment. Primitive Koryak tribesmen, he reports, pigheadedly refuse to develop proper class feeling against wealthier reindeer breeders. They counter Communist class war slogans with shrewd phrases as "rich and poor live together" or "rich are feeding the poor." Yet the Koryak national areas of the Arctic have political importance because they are near both the United States and Japan.

And no wonder Russian Communists are so despised. For outside of Moscow, in the hinterlands, the most ignorant Ivan as a member of the new Russian master race, is entitled to special privileges denied the natives. Mr. Kennedy told newsmen in October after his visit to Soviet Central Asia that the Russians treated the yellow and brown skinned peoples of Central Asia as inferiors.

"In every city we visited in Central Asia, the schools were segregated," he said. "The Russian schoolchildren in one school, the local children in another."

And according to Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, who accompanied Kennedy on his trip, in the Communist Party ranks and in the professions, Russians get the best jobs.

Harrison Salisbury, former Moscow correspondent for the New York Times, described Soviet Russia's contempt for non-Russian races in an article September 29, 1954:

"They always have a laugh or a sneer for Georgians and Armenians. They have special Armenian and Georgian jokes. * * * How deep racial pride goes you can easily see if you listen to the derogatory remarks of a Russian woman about a friend who has married, for example, an Asiatic Uzbek or a citizen of Azerbaijan."

Testimony of emigre leaders before the Kersten committee shows the Jews are the special whipping boys of Homo Sovieticus, this new master race. Mikola Abramchik, president of the Rada of the Byelorussian democratic government in exile, made available to the committee an MVD document which revealed the murder by the Soviet Government of 13,325 persons, mostly Byelorussians. The document showed, however, that the Soviet Government was still dissatisfied with the work of its diligent gauleiter, Brig. Military Jurist A. Kiselev. A report signed by the assistant military prosecutor of the Leningrad military district charged the luckless Kiselev with a "criminally irresponsible attitude toward the important work entrusted to him" because he had failed to prosecute six Jews who were allegedly "members of an espionage organization existing in Minsk among Jewish clerics."

The American Jewish League Against Communism has completed research exposing the mass murder of thousands of Jews during World War II. According to the league, at least 78,000 Jews vanished in Vitebsk alone in 1942 before the Nazis entered the city.

Communist suspicion of Jewish disloyalty is apparent by their barring Jewish technicians from strategic plants in border areas of the U. S. S. R.

The Ukraine, particularly western Ukraine with its strong separatist tradition, has been also a special target for Russianization by murder. A House select committee on Communist aggression in its report H. R. 2684, reported that at Vinnitsya alone, 10,000 persons were put to death and buried in mass graves in a single year (1937–38). An eyewitness, Zenon Pelenskyj, produced atrocity photographs for the committee record.

One of these showed the remnants of a merry-go-round and park atop the graves. Pelenskyj testified:

"The Soviet Government had a 'people's recreation park' or 'laughing cabinet' consisting of convex and concave mirrors over these graves. Over every one of these graves was constructed a laughing cabinet and over every two graves a platform for dancing and people danced there, not knowing there were corpses underneath."

Naturally, the Ukrainians don't join in macabre Communist humor at their expense. Its testimony like this that explains the Soviet Union's drive to get its emigres to return home. This explains the recent kidnaping in West Germany of Dr. Alexander Trushnovich and the murder of "Fatilibey," an employee of Radio Liberation. For the Soviet Government is so terrified the West will learn the real truth about this system that it does not stop short of murder, blackmail, and kidnaping to silence witnesses of its crimes. But although the Red bosses have stamped it top secret the truth about race discrimination is gradually leaking out to the world at large.

Even Red China is viewing with jaundiced eye Russian treatment of Mongols and Chinese nationals within the U. S. S. R. In the light of Mongol unrest reported in Pravda it should be remembered that in 1936 Mao Tse Tung promised after the Chinese revolution "the Outer Mongolian Republic will automatically become a part of the Chinese federation." Yet today it is a Soviet colony and as such a bone of contention between Russians and Chinese. C. L. Sulzberger wrote in the New York Times, February 15, that the Chinese people still hope to get Outer Mongolia back.

Despite police controls and censorship they (the Chinese people) still disseminate strange rumors. They even spread the crazy tale last year that Moscow planned to retrocede its maritime provinces." It is Peiping, the Times correspondent noted, that has kept Kremlin out of the "Bandung bloc" of Afro-Asian nations, evidence of Chinese distrust of Russian imperialism.

The United States could have used the day designated by Communists as "anti-colonialism day" to bring up in the United Nations the question of Russian enslavement also of Outer Mongolia. Instead, this country waited for the Communists to denounce United States support of Goa pictured as belonging to India and Macao presented as belonging to China. At present neutralist nations are shocked by headlines about the young Negro woman, Miss Lucy, and her gallant fight to remain at the University of Alabama. Would not United States diplomats do well at this time to publicize the Russian drive to create white Soviet Far East? For Russia not only bars Asiatics from her Pacific coastline under her restrictive immigration policy but is even eliminating the Far Eastern races already there.

Victims of Soviet racism include the Koreans concentrated in the Vladivostok area, the Japanese of Kamchatka, Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands and the Chinese of the Amur and Ussuri regions. Chinese who have been Soviet colonials relate how abusive terms are used against them such as Kitayeza and Chan-Kai-Shi (the Russian version of Chiang Kai-shek). With official connivance Russians have lynched Chinese workmen in the agricultural machinery plants at Khabarovsk and the shipbuilding yards of Vladivostok. Soviet administration in the Far East as elsewhere in the U. S. S. R. wages a ruthless war against native culture, religion, and traditions. Soviet author I. M. Suslov in his book Shamanism and the Fight Against It writes how the Shamans or native priests in Siberia are forced to register and answer such questions as: What sort of cult objects do you possess? Drums? Costumes? Are you a tamer of snowstorms? Do you hold collective seances? What is your social origin? Detailed dossiers on these wreckers are sent at least twice a year to the Central Council of Militant Godless, Moscow.

In order that United States propaganda can give wide publicity to such facts, six House Members urged February 21 that the United States information program be expanded to provide a more dynamic answer to Communist propaganda. Signing the statement were Representatives ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Republican, of Michigan; THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democract, of Ohio; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Republican, of California; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Democrat, of Michigan; and RAY J. MADDEN, Democrat, of Indiana.

Several high State Department specialists believe that the Voice of America should expand its language broadcasts to the U. S. S. R. They urge the resumption of broadcasts in Tatar and Azerbaijani and the scheduling of additional broadcasts in the Kazak, Tadzhik, Turkmen, Circasian, and Kurdish languages.

Recently VOA initiated a 15-minute broadcast in Uzbek from Munich. But some officials believe the Soviet Union's 5 million Uzbeks should receive more attention in the information program. Said one official:

"The Uzbeks represent the largest non-Slav group in Soviet Russia. They have a strong separate state tradition. After their independent government collapsed in 1918, they formed the Basmachi movement, an organized bandit resistance which lasted for several years. Broadcasts to these people, should therefore receive equal priority with Russian languages from the Soviet radio."

Another official stressed the importance of these nationality groups to the political picture in the Middle East, the area where oil-rich Moslem countries are presently cool to the West. This official pointed out that the Kurds and the Circassians, two nationalities present in both the Middle East and the U. S. S. R. can now receive only broadcasts in their languages from the Soviet radio.

Representative Kersten has said repeatedly that the countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East will be strongly influenced by Soviet Russia's treatment of her colonies.

He insists it is up to the Voice and other United States of America agencies, private as well as public, to tell the world that communism is in effect a twisted form of Russian chauvinism. In a speech at Georgetown University where he devotes full time to research on Soviet colonialism Kersten said:

"We must support the desire of Soviet colonials for self-rule and freedom if we wish to avoid a third world war."

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, United States Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include an article from the February issue of Armed Forces Management on the management of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, United States Navy.

I am especially interested in the article because Rear Adm. Ralph J. Arnold, who on October 4, 1954, was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and Paymaster General of the Navy, was born in Garden Grove, Iowa, in my congressional district, and still calls Garden Grove his home. He was born on July 6, 1902, son of Harry Guy and Mrs. Mable Arnold. He attended Garden Grove High School before entering the United States Naval Academy, and was graduated and commissioned ensign on June 8, 1923. He advanced to the rank of lieutenant, and on September 20, 1935, was transferred to the supply corps of the United States Navy in the grade of passed assistant paymaster with the accompanying rank of lieutenant, and thereafter progressed in grade to that of rear admiral.

The article follows:

MANAGEMENT OF THE BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, UNITED STATES NAVY

The time was that period historians have since labeled "the darkest days of the war." The place, the deck of the valiant aircraft carrier *Yorktown* for whom the curtain was rapidly descending as the result of a suicidal enemy hammering. This was the Battle of Midway.

Every man was a hero that day, but a few stood out. One was a young commander who wore the emblem of the Supply Corps but who had volunteered for a hazardous post in the ammunition supply of a 5-inch gun. For extraordinary heroism that day and for a subsequent rescue from the sea of two men, Ralph Judd Arnold was awarded the Navy Cross, highest military honor the Navy can bestow.

Today that same Ralph Judd Arnold, now a rear admiral, sits at the control value of one of the world's mightiest supply lines—the line that ends with the armed strength of the United States Navy and which has its beginning in Washington, D. C., in the office of the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, Rear Adm. R. J. Arnold, Supply Corps, United States Navy.

Never before—not during those hours aboard the sinking *Yorktown;* not during his 4 years at the United States Naval Academy; not as a Bronze Star Medal winner during the latter days of the war—has the deadweight of responsibility pressed as heavily upon the admiral's shoulders as today. For that responsibility is not to individual, nor to a ship, nor even to an area of military operations, but to every man and woman who wears the Navy blue anywhere in the world.

As a matter of fact, those Navy blue uniforms are just one item of supply to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts (known within the Navy as BuSandA or merely S. & A). Out of this supply line flows not only the clothes they wear, but the food they eat, the money they spend, the things they buy, the tools with which they work, and the fuel with which they sail the ships and fly the planes.

In short, what the Navy and its fleet needs—when and where it is needed—BuSandA has a hand in supplying. That, of course, is an extremely simplified description of the operation of the Navy supply system, but in its effect this is its basic responsibility.

Now, having conjured up the picture of one man shoveling supplies into a coal chute, it is important to point out that neither Admiral Arnold nor any of the fourteen-hundred-odd military and civilian personnel who comprise the BuSandA staff, actually handle the supplies with which they are so concerned any more than Henry Ford II places the hub caps on the new Thunderbirds. His is a management function.

The parallel is even more exact within the respective organizations. Just as Ford has separate divisions within the company to exercise coordination for the various facets of automobile production, so does BSA with respect to Navy supplies and accounts. These divisions establish the policy and regulate the flow of supplies through the system. Physical operation of the supply system takes place within the worldwide network of supply demand control points, naval supply centers, depots, and supply departments.

Each center, depot, and department—the particular designation depends to a great extent on its size—has a like mission—that of supplying, in a physical sense, the needs of the fleet and naval activities. It is at these activities that the flour and shoes and aviation gas and electronics spare parts can be found, ready for shipment or distribution where they are required in the needed quantities.

The supply demand control points—Admiral Arnold has called them the fellows who do the work—can be likened to a central control agency for a particular type commodity. There is, among others, an aviation supply office, a provisions supply office, a fuel supply office, and offices for electronics, general stores, submarine, ordnance, clothing, ships parts, and yards and docks supply.

The SDCP's, though under the direct management control of BSA, are also under the "technical" direction of the Navy bureau which has the major interest in the material controlled—aviation supply and the Bureau of Aeronautics, ships parts, and the Bureau of Ships, etc. Their expressed missions are long and in much detail, but, in brief, they determine requirements, procure, determine excess, redistribute to the centers and depots, and budget for the future in terms of supplies, supply lines, and storage space—these, navywide, and not just for a particular locality.

Braced with years of experience as head of the Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, as well as Navy service in both shipboard and shore station supply capacities, Admiral Arnold came to BSA as Chief in October 1954. He brought with him particular qualifications for a job the success of which depends to such a large measure on the individual SDCP.

But the admiral makes no pretense at going it alone. He relies for advice and assistance on a deputy and assistant chief of bureau, on four assistant chiefs, each charged with responsibility for a specific but broad area of Navy supply. And on the guidance of a weekly policy council meeting with his assistants, the BuSandA comptroller, inspector general, and staff directors.

The deputy, Rear Adm. Thomas L. Becknell, SC, USN, serves in the important post of acting bureau chief when Admiral Arnold is away from Washington taking a first-hand check on the business end of the supply line. He otherwise relieves the chief of a great many administrative chores.

Supply management, purchasing, transportation, and accounting and disbursing are the four fields for which Admiral Arnold was named an assistant chief. And within themselves, they embrace the missions of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Largest of the four, in terms of broadness of field, is supply management. As with the other three, the individual mission parallels that of the Bureau as a whole, but on a limited scale. The assistant chief for supply management, Capt. Lamar Lee, SC, USN, carries out the direction, planning, implementation of policy and coordination of the bureau's navywide responsibilities in fields such as inventory control, subsistence, fuel and clothing; storage, cataloging, and stock finance and coordination.

Supply management is concerned also with the operation of Navy ships' stores and with the program for the redistribution and disposal of salvage and surplus material. It is vitally concerned with the program for industrial mobilization.

Within those areas with which the assistant chief for supply management is concerned falls practically every material need of the Naval Establishment as well as policies for storage, stock, and inventory control of that material.

That material is and would remain manufacture's stock were it not for the efforts of the assistant chief of purchasing and his staff. Capt. D. C. MacKenzie, SC, USN, is Rear Admiral Arnold's agent in matters of field purchase functions and Navy purchasing offices, and is the man behind the policy planning of the purchase operations of BuSandA. In addition, Captain MacKenzie's divisions are concerned with the review of purchase contracts and the analysis of requests and suggestions for changes in purchase procedures.

Charged with moving the goods in the Navy supply setup is the assistant chief for transportation. Currently he is Capt. Fred L. Haerlin, SC, USN, under whom policies are set which affect air and surface traffic, freight rate and classification, cargo and terminal operation, and even the movement of household goods for naval personnel and their families.

Another assistant chief is the key to the accounts in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. He is Capt. John F. Castree, SC, USN, assistant chief for accounting and distributing.

An elaboration of the mission of Captain Castree's group would, in several additional sentences and 100 additional words, boil down to this: Responsibility for the administration of the naval working fund for the United States Navy; management control over the Navy regional accounts offices, the Navy accounts disbursing offices and the Navy Finance Center. And for guiding the fiscal policies of all naval activities assigned to BuSandA's control.

Those duties, of course, are in addition to the policy determination requirements which fall to Admiral Arnold as BuSanA chief and which he entrusts to his assistant chief for accounting and disbursing.

The areas covered by the offices of the assistant chiefs, then, embrace most, but not all, of BuSandA's contribution to the Navy's operating forces. There is, as a good example, the officer personnel division which is a supply demand control point for Supply Corps personnel—those men who are responsible for making work all the plans and policies established by the parent bureau.

Within that division, headed by Capt. E. W. Sutherling, SC, USN, are branches devoted to the assignment of qualified Supply Corps officers to duty stations at sea, on foreign shore, and in the United States. Others are concerned with the training of Reserve

officers not now on active duty as well as the further training of active duty officers.

So it is more than true that the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has a hand in virtually every phase of supply, even including the flow of trained officer personnel to supply billets throughout the world.

There are at least two other operations with which BuSandA concerns itself which are so important in this time of progress and everchanging conditions. One is represented by the Bureau's Research and Development division. This office coordinates BuSandA's continuing effort to find better ways and better things in the fields of food, clothing, and logistics research. And also atomic, radiological and chemical warfare as pertaining to food and clothing.

The Navy Supply Research and Development Facility at Bayonne, N. J., is a responsibility of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and it is significant that out of NSR & DF Bayonne have come such things as a simplified cargo handling device and methods to increase the storage life of fresh vegetables aboard ship.

Along the lines of better ways and things is the Bureau's Management Engineering division. Although not involved directly in service to the fleet—a phrase which became a Navy by-word last February when the Navy Supply Corps celebrated 160 years of service to the fleet—the management engineers dig deeply into matters of efficiency, economy, and labor saving—all with the ultimate goal a more efficient operation, better able to serve the Navy's needs.

It never has been, nor will anyone ever pretend that it is a one-man job, this job that Admiral Arnold fills. But it would be equally short-sighted to pretend that the caliber of the man who fills that job is unimportant to the over-all success of the Bureau and the Navy it serves.

The current Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts has demonstrated in a manner unostentatious but convincing that his is the character that fosters the motivating power behind an organization the size and importance of BuSandA.

And where was that character developed and strengthened? It was at the Naval Academy. It was on a farm near his boyhood town of Garden Grove, Iowa. It was on the battle-torn deck of a sinking carrier.

How the Encyclopedia Britannica Was Gobbled Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. CARROLL REECE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the present study of the Ford Foundation-sponsored Fund for the Republic again points to the existence in the field of tax-exempt foundations of a number of serious problems.

The example of this fund under the management of Mr. Paul Hoffman and Mr. Robert M. Hutchins demonstrates the existence of a network of power and patronage of greatest concern to our Republic. Economic power and the power to mold public opinion rests in the hands of tax-privileged foundation managers. This power is not subject to any checks and balances.

In the American tradition of opposing concentration of power the TNEC, and before and after it, many congenial investigations and subsequent legislation have attempted to protect the public against the abuse of private control of our public life.

There has not been a comparable awareness of the dangers for our welfare that come from the concentration and the possible abuse of power in our multibillion-dollar tax-exempt organizations. Because of the complete absence of public controls these privileged organizations can be used and have been used for political ends and as tools for the promotion of the private interests of some of their managers and their cohorts.

The purpose of a study of tax-exempt foundations is not to conduct a court trial by congressional investigation. Its objective is to explore free from any preconceived bias an existing social and economic condition. It should attempt to examine data that will give us a better understanding of the history and of the effect of tax exemption and of possible improvemens of our law in the public interest. The hearings of such a congressional investigation serve the purpose of giving the parties an opportunity to present their facts, figures, and ideas. They are not mean to degenerate into a free for all of incriminations and offensive behavior. I had the intention of conducting the hearings of the House committee of which I was the chairman in such an impartial manner. Unfortunately, the sabotage of the committee hearings by a member of the committee minority prevented a collective and conclusive study of the subject in view of the time and available funds.

The reactions of the committee minority and of parts of a partisan effort were in themselves indications of the power of some of the tax-exempt foundations that we intended to study. If any confirmation of this power had been needed, its manifestations in connection with the history of this House Committee have certainly convinced every fair minded person.

An objective and continued study of tax-exempt organizations, of their fiscal and social, their legal and economic, as well as their subversive aspects, is as necessary today—even more so—as it was 2 years ago. We did never get around to study and to present to Congress a complete report on the concentration of economic, ideological, and political power in the hands of foundation managers.

Foundation spokesmen themselves have reportedly pointed to weakening in current foundation practices. They have criticized the practice of many foundations not to inform the public in understandable published reports about the way the practice of disguising business operations and fraudlent fund raising schemes as tax-exempt institutions. Their complaints alone justify a further investigation of tax-exempt activities by Congress.

No doubt, the foundations recommending, and the ones adopting the policy of publishing detailed activity and financial reports, agree with me that tax exemption entitles the public to know what tax-exempt organizations do. All are aware of the fact that publicity of foundation tax reports is still very much a theory and that the practice of the United States Treasury does not facilitate the examination of allegedly public foundation tax returns. Even congressional committees find it most difficult to gather such data from Treasury offices.

An examination of these data is essential if we want an objective appraisal of promise or menace of tax exemption for American's future. All through history governments have fought the growing power and wealth of tax-exempt organizations in the interest of the public. Growth of tax-exempt institutions always went hand in hand with a growiing burden on the remaining taxable pursuits. The dissolution of the Order of the Templars, the secularization of church property in many countries, the Reformation itself were due mainly to the withdrawal of so much taxable property from taxation, that the economy could no more support the burden of reasonable public spending.

The return from tax-exempt funds quite obviously multiplies foundation capital much faster than corporate or other taxed funds will grow. The temptation to use these ever-growing funds for the political ends favored by foundation managers is ever present. Essentially under our system, they may use these funds for all, except political and nonpolitical educational activities is very difficult to define.

The Fund for the Republic is a good example of the tendency to take an active part in political propaganda and in partisan pursuits. Another well-known example is the involvement of the Carnegie endowment for peace in a most active and successful promotion of its peculiar type of foreign policy. The operation the Ford Foundation in Indonesia at the present time may also constitute another example.

There are all indications of the existence of a patronage network operated by foundation managers. This network influences and sometimes controls our media of information, our schools and powerful cliques in both political parties. By strategically locating its men and by wisely using tax-exempt funds for favoring its friends it has gained a hold on many important positions, that deserves to be studied. The current concern with the Fund for the Republic and its president, Mr. Hutchins, suggests that we may look into Mr. Hutchins' activities as an example of the power structure that grows out of the control of tax-exempt organizations and results from their consistent political use.

The picture that presents itself from bits and pieces of available information is far from complete. It poses more questions than it answers. And it makes quite obvious that control of tax-exempt operations in the hands of skilled manipulators becomes control of our political and intellectual life.

The Encyclopedia Britannica lists Robert Maynard Hutchins as chairman of its board of editors. In the Britannica Yearbook for 1955 it says that in 1950 he resigned from the presidency of the University of Chicago but continued as

chairman of the editorial board after joining the Ford Foundation.

Mr. Hutchins then holds in addition to his job in the Fund for the Republic a second job equally important and spectacular, a second job that gives him a control position in American public life and public opinion. He certainly has succeeded in turning his university presidency into a steppingstone to prestige, to power, and to economic advantage.

As president of the University of Chicago, he had many opportunities for self-aggrandizement. Such is the power given to the presidency in such a major tax-exempt institution that under the guise of promoting the institution a shrewd operator can promote himself into commanding positions far beyond the objectives of the university.

Dr. Hutchins promoted himself into the control of the policies of the billion-dollar Ford Foundation. He selected many of its early personnel and beneficiaries and now, after having exhausted even the seemingly endless patience of its trustees, holds a sinecure paying an astonishingly big salary from the Fund for the Republic.

From his office as a university president, using funds of the Britanica, he launched an investigation of the American press. The Hutchins-Luce Commission on Freedom of the Press held American newspaper editors accountable—probably to the liberal friends of Mr. Hutchins—and it was therefore aptly called the Commission Against Freedom of the Press.

Mr. Hutchins, probably seeing himself a Thomas Jefferson of a future world state, launched the Committee To Frame a World Constitution. Under his direction, a preliminary draft for a world constitution was drafted. He signed that constitution. Did the trustees of the Ford Foundation and of the Fund for the Republic know that? Is it not a mockery of America if a man can become president of a fund for our Republic who, previously in a world constitution proposed by him, has ventured to abandon the Constitution of our Republic?

In a recent book on the Ford Foundation, the author, Dwight MacDonald, a man not unfriendly to the Ford Foundation respects the well known refusal of Hutchings to take the Communist Party as a serious menace. In earlier investigations Hutchings was asked to declare himself on communism. His answer was: "I am not instructed on this subject" is characteristic of his shrewdness. The above mentioned book attributes to Hutchins "a combination, not unusual with him of logic and ignorance." It has been said that if Hutchins had ever studied a subject thoroughly instead of devoting his energy to the manipulation of men and of funds, he may have become a scholar; but then he would never have reached the positions of power, first in the tax-exempt university, then in the tax-exempt Ford Foundation and finally in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

As a manipulator of men and organizations, Hutchings has refused the Machiavellian technique of using others as fronts to reach his goals.

The history of the Encyclopedia Britannica is an excellent example of this technique of using power to get more power. The importance of the job of a chairman of the editorial board of the encyclopedia is illustrated by the policy of constant revision established in 1932. Since 1938, there have been more than 15 revised printings. In each of these more than 2 million words were changed. What an opportunity to indoctrinate the American people with one's idea on world government, freedom, the United Nations, Foreign policy concepts, socialism, and so forth.

The place of the dictionary and of the encyclopedia in America is a unique one. In no other culture do dictionaries and similar reference books have such an importance in the life and learning of the people. The prestige of encyclopedias and dictionaries makes them unquestioned sources of authoritative information. The passion of the American for facts as documented by popular games and quiz programs is indicative of the nationwide occupation with the type of information offered by encyclopedic publications. The average American believes to have in his encyclopedia an arsenal for the searching mind, an objective source of reliable information, and a tool for intelligent participation in public affairs.

Because of their prestige and their impact on public opinion, encyclopedic books are a favorite target of the propagandist. Any distorted presentation of ideas and facts carried in a reference book promises to influence readers for a long time to come. Unlike the ephemeral impact of periodical and pamphlet literature, an article in an encylopedia will mold the minds of generations of students, of teachers, and of opinion leaders, the type of literate citizens who consult a reference book before making up their minds.

The propaganda experts of the Soviet Union have long ago recognized this for a fact. They have written and are rewriting history to suit their politics. At times their encyclopedia editors may find it hard to keep up with the fast changes of their official versions and interpretations of events. Similarly, when Hitler came into power, many of the German lexicons were edited, cut, rewritten to suit the new propaganda line.

The editor of an encyclopedia very often reflects the fashionable thought of its time. Sometimes as in the often investigated case of the Encylcopedia of Social Sciences—financed by foundation funds—he becomes an instrument of factional pressure groups who exploit the grand opportunity for long-lasting propaganda, to impose their philosophies and social and political theories on the learning American public. In doing so they follow more the traditions of the French encyclopedists who were in business for propaganda, than that of the Royal Society that aimed for classification of factual controversy.

There has yet to be published a reference book that will point out to its readers the controversy in all the issues and facts presented. Such an ideal reference book will present the two or several opinions on the subjects covered. It will warn its readers of ideological traps and give them encouragement and opportunity to make up their minds for themselves. As it stands today, however, the very magnitude of the editorial job makes it possible for men with axes to grind to infiltrate the encyclopedia writting staff and to supplement the miserable word rates of 1 or 2 cents per word that they receive for their research and writing with the substantial satisfaction of imposing their partisan thought on millions and generations of more or less intelligent readers.

The importance of authorship by men with an ax to grind is not alone the impact of partisan subject matter on the reader. Because many of these articles carry the author's signature in a respected encyclopedia gives the author added prestige, he becomes under sponsorship of his publisher an authority.

Consequently, control of a respected encyclopedia means power in the world of ideas and of the intellect. It means power over the readers and the teachers and students who turn to it for the truth. It means power over the minds of the writers who in their livelihood or in their professional prestige depend on the appearance of their contributions. It means beyond this power over the minds of those who prepare themselves to contribute and who will act and write so that they may remain acceptable to the mighty publisher and his editorial organs.

Unfortunately, for at least one writing generation now, this magic prestige giving effect of encyclopedia writing has been exploited nearly exclusively for the benefit of the Socialists of all hues. Consequently, the taint of interventionism and reformism in all shades and forms is prevalent in these books. The infiltration of the American mind with intellectual and political concepts of such bias is nearly complete. A whole generation of teachers, textbook authors, ministers, journalists, labor leaders, and other opinion operators has never had a chance to become acquainted with ideas and arguments other than materialistic, anticonservative, and utopian. For more than three decades now our legislation and our foreign policy and the public opinion behind them have reflected this distorted and one-sided presentation of public problems.

The great expense connected with the creation of an encyclopedia accounts for a similarity between most reference books. Ideas and factual data in one such work are often lifted from another. For instance, the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, published in the thirties, was freely used by later reference books. In this manner ideas of Alvin Johnson, Harold Laski, Max Lerner, Bernard J. Stearn, Oskar Jaszi, Lewis Lorwin, and similar authors are reflected in other encyclopedic books. The resulting prestige produced in addition to profitable lecture invitations, teaching and Government jobs, book articles, and textbook assignments, broadcasting programs, and so forth. The core group of editors and contributors became a powerful faction by mutual endorsement. It found easy acceptance by learned journals, professional organizations, book review sections and in the resulting mushroom

growth of influence gained decisive influence on public thought.

If this can happen in a surreptitious way by mutual support of the professional writers employed to produce the text—how much more influence can result from a well-conceived strategy of a publisher using his encyclopedic publication consciously to influence public opinion?

This brings us to the main problem of the Encyclopedia Britannica and its influence on American thought. Today, the Encyclopedia Britannica and its affiliated and associated activities have become such a major factor in our public and intellectual life that it overshadows in importance and impact all other book publishing ventures.

In May 1942, William Lygate in the Saturday Review of Literature surveyed the history of the Encyclopedia Britannica from its beginning in 1768 to its ownership by the house of Sears, Roebuck & Co. By 1942, this classic reference book had developed into a 32-million-word giant. Its 14th edition had cost $2 million to prepare and appeared 6 weeks before the stock market crash of 1929. In spite of losses in the publishing of the encyclopedia during the depression, Sears, Roebuck & Co., kept the famous old publication alive and in 1932 so reorganized its operations that revisions became a continuous activity. The resulting economies eliminated losses within 2 years. Three years after the editorial reorganization the publication began to make money again. The addition of the Britannica yearbooks and the establishment of a service offering answers to 50 questions free of charge to subscribers added to the popularity of the book. In 1939 as a result of radio promotion, sales and popularity of the encyclopedia continued to grow. In 1942 domestic sales alone reached $4 million. Considering this the encyclopedia was certainly one of the most important if not the most valuable reference-book publishers' property in the United States. It appeared somewhat misplaced under an ownership best known at that time for a successful operation of mail order merchandising and a growing chain of department stores, but not identified as a purveyor of scholarly publications.

The further fate of the encyclopedia may be best described by its reflections in the press. Thanks to the activities of several press agents, we have a play-by-play description of what the parties involved wanted the public to know. On January 30, 1943, Publishers Weekly blandly reported: "By outright gift from Sears, Roebuck & Co. the University of Chicago has acquired full property rights in the Encyclopedia Britannica." The president of Sears, Roebuck in making the gift had declared: "As one of the great universities of the world, the University of Chicago is best equipped to conduct an enterprise of such educational importance as the Britannica." After acquisition of the enterprise Sears had successfully operated the publication for over 20 years. It was carried in its book at $1. The gift was in the traditions of the philanthropic Rosenwald family, a benefactor of Chicago University for many years.

As Publishers Weekly reports at the time of the donation, sales were good for the 24-volume sets and the annual supplements. At the same time Newsweek reported the gift and explained that Sears had decided that publication of the encyclopedia was scarcely a proper part of its retail business. "Had it not been for the generosity of Sears," the Britannica would have gone out of existence during the depression. It had been saved by the philanthropic efforts of Sears, Roebuck and was given to the university, a result of old cordial relationships between Sears and the institution of learning, the gift included the Junior Britannica and other connected minor publications.

The University of Chicago magazine about the same time published a version of the story accompanied with a photograph of smiling William B. Benton, then the university's part-time vice chancellor, and reported:

> There were 35 million words in the mouth of the gift horse which came to Chicago last month from Sears, Roebuck & Co.

Sears had long felt that the encyclopedia, a corporate entity, was an anomalous item on its books, and arrangements by which it was given to the university were completed in January. Gen. Robert E. Wood, the chairman of Sears, was instrumental in deciding on this donation. Vice Chancellor William Benton, instrumental in the arrangements, took over the chairmanship of the board of the Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., and President Hutchins also became a member of the still not completed organization. The university magazine explained:

> The encyclopedia is also anomalous as a university possession, although to a smaller extent than as the possession of a mail-order house. Only rarely have universities owned going businesses, their mangements usually preferring the smaller but surer income from security holdings. The Britannica setup, however, is so arranged that the university will profit as the corporation profits but will not lose if the corporation loses.

The value of this gift was emphasized in this university publication by referring to the encyclopedia as the "oldest and most famous continuing publication in the world." However, in the university magazine, at this occasion no specific information about the legal provisions of the gift and of the succeeding arrangements between the university and any third parties was offered.

Time magazine, on February 1, 1943, apparently after interviewing officials of Chicago University, shed some light on the further development after the donation had been made by Sears. It reported:

> Sears' gift to the university was engineered by University of Chicago's kinetic vice president, William Benton. * * * He sees the Britannica as a logical adjunct to University of Chicago, which has always had a flair for combining scholarship with good publicity.

The story carries a picture of Benton captioned "He Took Stock in a Name," and explains that since the gift did not include the Britannica's—that is, Sears'—working capital and the university trustees did not want to risk endowment capital—why?—what were they told?—

> Result: Bill Benton himself agreed to put up whatever might be needed to keep it going, took an unnamed percentage of the stock from University of Chicago to back his investment. The university has an option to buy his stock (for the sum he put into it plus no interest) if the going is good, a further option on the whole works at 42-year-old Bill Benton's death. Meanwhile, Benton will devote at least part of his ample talents to making the university's gift pay.

Whatsoever the motives of the university trustees may have been, Sears, Roebuck & Co. knew nothing about this arrangement before its generous gift of an asset worth many million dollars was made. After the gift was made, Sears had no more right to interfere with university arrangements. Presumably they had meant to donate the publication to the educational nonprofit tax-exempt institution in the intention to have all its benefits accrue to the university.

In October 1955 Gen. Robert E. Wood was asked the following questions:

> 1. Did Mr. Benton who, according to Hutchins, conducted the negotiations with you, indicate that he was to become personally the owner of two-thirds of the common stock of the enterprise donated to Chicago University?
>
> 2. Did you intend to donate this asset to the university as a charitable gift?
>
> 3. Mr. Hutchins in his report on the state of the university implied that Sears approved of the arrangement with Benton personally (not in his capacity of vice president of the university). Is he correct?

General Wood answered on November 9, 1955:

> 1. I was not advised that Mr. Benton was to become the owner of some of their common stock prior to the gift to the university. After the gift was made I was advised of this.
>
> 2. The intention was to donate this asset to the university as a charitable gift.
>
> 3. I am not familiar with Mr. Hutchins' report. However, as the arrangement with Mr. Benton was made after Sears made the contribution to the university, Sears had no authority to either approve or disapprove the arrangement with Mr. Benton.

Chicago University under Hutchins adopted a code of educational ethics that would exclude its staff from benefits in excess of their salaries resulting from their academic office. Robert M. Hutchins himself had repeatedly made the statement "education asks no profit." In an article in the Chicago Daily News, as president of Chicago University—February 17, 1944—he announced the formal adoption in 1943 of the principle previously advocated by him that neither the university nor faculty should profit financially from research conducted at the university. All earnings of faculty members from work done outside the university, including royalties on books, lecture and consultants' fees, and similar activities should be turned back to the university. The articles of the encyclopedia at least partly written by university staff members must have been subject to this strict rule and one can only wonder how the acquisition of substantial rights in the encyclopedia property by university officials, if not in conflict with the purpose of the donation can be recon-

ciled with Mr. Hutchins' article "Education Asks No Profit." He says about books of professors:

> The board of trustees agrees that the only practical way in which you can make sure that professors are doing the work, making the speech, or writing the book, solely for the usefulness of the outside activity and not for the money that is in it, is to take the money away and use it for the university.

The terms of investment most likely but certainly in terms of power, William B. Benton has done well by his transaction with Chicago University. Some light on the further development of his strange partnership with this institution of learning is shed by successive presidents' reports on the state of the university.

In his annual report after acquisition of the encyclopedia, Mr. Hutchins gave only a very hazy picture of the deal with Benton. The generosity of Gen. Robert E. Wood, of the board of Sears, Roebuck & Co., was praised and correctly stated that General Wood had decided that the encyclopedia should be owned by some university and that he had finally after previous negotiations for a sale of the assets of the encyclopedia, made a still more generous offer to give it to the University of Chicago. The report goes on to say:

> Mr. Benton, vice president of the university, was very active in the negotiations with Sears and in seeking for sources of working capital, and finally became so much interested that to make it possible for the university to accept the gift he offered to provide the working capital himself. The university thereupon accepted General Wood's proposal. Mr. Benton was given two-thirds of the common stock of the corporation, the university retaining the preferred stock. Mr. Benton gave the university an option to buy half his stock at cost after 18 months and a further option on the balance of his stock at his death.

Mr. Hutchins in his report claims that "that arrangement was accepted by the board of trustees and by General Wood." In no place could there be found a published record on the following obvious questions. Who owns or did own the last third of the corporate stock? What if any, compensation did R. M. Hutchins and other university officials including Benton, receive from the encyclopedia since the year 1943? Why does Chicago University not exercise the option mentioned in Time magazine of February 1, 1943?

The encyclopedia was at the time of the donation not a broken-down corporation. Hutchins expected for the first year, $150,000; royalties to be paid to the university and $45,000 in the form of fellowships, and support of the university radio program Human Action. Mr. Hutchins expressed his thanks for the donation in the following words:

> The university records its gratitude to General Wood and the board of directors of Sears, Roebuck & Co. for their contribution to the university's welfare and to the cause of scholarship and popular education.

In 1944 Mr. Hutchins reported that the university had received $159,141 for the editorial advice of the faculty for the year ending January 31, 1944, and $25,780 for the support of the radio program Human Events. In addition, the Britannica supported 18 fellows with an average annual stipend of $1,500 each, a total of $27,000.

In November 1943 the Encyclopedia Britannica Corp. acquired from Western Electric Corp., the ERPI classrooms films and changed their name to Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc. This placed the university, through its affiliate corporation, the Britannica, in leading position for the distribution and production of sound films. Thus, the Encyclopedia Britannica Corp. became the preeminent producer and distributor of educational films in the United States. Shortly thereafter, the university received from Eastman Kodak the donation of its huge library of educational silent films. The Eastman Kodak Co. was led in this donation by the same philanthropic considerations as the Sears, Roebuck Co. in its gift to the university. Mr. Hutchins was already chairman of the board of the Britannica committee and also chairman of the executive committee of the film corporation. The films donated by Eastman Kodak became part of the Britannica program.

Mr. Hutchins in 1947 reported that though the university then still owned only the preferred stock of this corporation it had received in the years 1946-47 royalties of $400,000. Britannica, Inc., has rapidly expanded since its affiliation with the university. One of the projects which it undertook was the publication of a set of Great Books of the Western World which appeared in June 1948. The university had spent $10,000 for furthering the Great Book program. Then the Britannica began its publishing project and Mr. Hutchins became editor in chief of this series. For this purpose Hutchins took leave of absence from the university for 9 months from October 1, 1946.

In 1949, Hutchins reported that the university had received in cash $1,774,343 from Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. Britannica's sales had increased approximately fivefold from the acquisition of the property by the university. This increase created a shortage of working capital that caused the university to accept a million dollars in notes of the company in lieu of current royalties. These notes were in addition to the cash payments of $1,774,343.

In January 1951 Time magazine called the Encyclopedia Britannica one of the most prosperous properties of the University of Chicago. William Benton had then already become Senator of Connecticut but still headed the Encyclopedia Britannica's board of directors. Robert Hutchins, after his retirement as chancellor of the university, still presided over the encyclopedia's board of editors.

The boom in the sales of the encyclopedia succeeding the gift to Chicago University has never stopped. In 1944, Business Week pointed to the fact that wartime sales were limited only by reduced paper quotas and printing facilities. The Britannica claimed that since 1939 it had experienced an annual sales increase of nearly 35 percent.

In November 1944, reported that William Benton really considered himself a fiduciary for the university and that the protective restrictions contained in his agreement with the university had given him full management responsibility without hope of dividends. But the fact remains that Benton and Hutchins both now separated from Chicago University—continue to control an instrument of power by reason of their previous functions as officers of a nonprofit tax-exempt organization.

Future investigations may disclose the answers to the following questions:

What, if any, are the financial rewards collected by Hutchins, Benton, and their clique from the encyclopedia?

Who owns the third common stock not given to Benton originally?

Why does Chicago University leave control of this enterprise to Hutchins and Benton instead of making use of its option to repurchase the common stock held by Benton?

This example of the mixing of power politics and of private gains with the management of a tax-exempt university operation would be incompletely presented, if I did not offer you additional bits and pieces of illustrative information. Though only incidental and incomplete fragments of a larger picture, they demonstrate the degree of interrelationship of business and charity in the Hutchins network of economic and intellectual patronage.

Here are some of the highlights:

Hutchins promoted the Great Book program of adult education. The Encyclopedia published a high-priced edition of the great books under Hutchins as editor. Hutchins took 9 months' leave of absence from the university to edit the Great Books for the Encyclopedia Britannica Corp.

There exists for the promotion of these great books a nonprofit, tax-exempt Great Book Foundation created by the university and the Britannica in 1943. Will you be surprised if I tell you that this Great Book Foundation received many hundred thousand dollars from one of the Ford funds? The Great Book Foundation in 1955, operated on a two million annual budget. Contributions came in 1955 from the University of Chicago, $131,000; from the Ford Fund for Adult Education, $775,000; from the Old Dominion Fund, $50,000; from Paul Hoffman—royalty of his book, Peace Can Be Won, $23,000; from the Encyclopedia Britannica, $81,000; and from six other tax-exempt foundations, $63,000.

These funds undoubtedly helped promote the publication sales of the Great Books of the Western World and the Great Ideas—of a business venture under the editorial direction of Hutchins and under the management of Benton, a venture in which the Britannica Corp. had invested $1 million.

Another Ford Fund donation of $220,000 was given to the Film Council of America. We have seen how the Encyclopedia Britannica, a profit-making corporation, became the dominating distributor of classroom films. It gained its leading position in this field by benefiting from donations of films to the tax-free university, by the Eastman Kodak Co., in 1943.

Will it surprise you that Hutchins made the head of the Britannica Films,

Inc., Mr. Scott Fletcher, in 1951, head of the same Ford Fund for Adult Education in 1955 so generously and donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the Film Council of America?

Among the directors of the Encyclopedia Britannica listed in Poor's Register for 1956, we find the following names in addition to Hutchins and Benton.

Beardsley Ruml, another former officer of the University of Chicago, a former executive of the tax-exempt Laura Stillman-Rockefeller Foundation—a professional executive of nonprofit tax-exempt operations and now also a director of the Ford Fund Resources for the Future, Inc., thanks to Hutchins.

Walter Paepcke of the Container Corporation of America is also due to Hutchins a director of the Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education.

Paul Hoffman of the Studebaker Co., of the Committee for Economic Development of the Economic Cooperation Administration, etc., became with Hutchins' help first president of the Ford Foundation and is now chairman of the board of the Fund for the Republic.

Among the other directors:

Curtis H. Gager of General Foods and of the Committee for Economic Development and Robert C. Praeble with a background in Marshall Fields empire of publishing Encyclopedia books competing with Britannica.

Of the directors of the Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc.:

George M. Shuster of Hunter College, New York City, made the grade as a director of the Fund for the Republic. Another director is Adlai Stevenson. The circle of influential members of the Hutchins-Benton-Hoffman network of patronage is great; it reaches into politics, into business, into foundation.

In view of the power of this network around the Encyclopedia Britannica you can well understand the pressure in defense of R. M. Hutchins. You may have heard of a treasury investigation of the tax-exempt status of the Fund for the Republic. The obvious political bias of the management of this fund marks it clearly as a political pressure institution for which tax exemption may not be granted. Yet it looks as if the powers supporting Hutchins and benefiting from his past and present power positions may be stronger than the law. Quite recently Victor Riesel, the labor columnist who has lost his eyesight as a result of his attacks on labor racketeers has asked: "Why does the Fund for the Republic not study the injustices and the restraints of freedom in our labor unions?" I presume this and many other questions will have to wait for a new study of tax-exempt acivities. In the meantime, all we can do is point to the existing and unexplored dangers for one republic, that rest in an unchecked and uncontrolled—if not uncontrollable—power of foundation and tax-free institutions, managements. If we have found a need for protecting the public through SEC legislation against business management conflicting with the public interest, should we not find ways to protect the public against the unbridled growth of power in the hands of the managers of tax-free funds who seek to subvert the public welfare?

Address of the Honorable W. M. Abbitt at the Virginia Democratic Convention in Richmond, Va., July 27, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE W. M. ABBITT AT THE VIRGINIA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION IN RICHMOND, VA., JULY 27, 1956

I count it a high honor and a great privilege, as well as a real pleasure, for me to be here today to talk briefly to the Democrats of Virginia. It is always a pleasure to meet with real Virginia Democrats. Here in Virginia the Democratic Party was bred and nurtured. Virginia is the cradle of democracy. In my opinion, the Democrats of Virginia have kept the faith of our Founding Fathers. I am proud of the great heritage that we in Virginia have. Virginians can be proud of the record of our Democratic Party, its accomplishments as well as the aims and ideals that have been our guiding light down through the years. Our State government has been a model for other States. We have had clean, honest, efficient government, whose officials have been untarnished and unblemished by corruption or fraud.

In these trying times, and believe you me these are trying times, it is well that we think back and review the principles of democracy so that we might be guided in the future by the light of the experiences of the past. The Democratic Party was founded for the purpose of protecting the rights and privileges of the people as well as the sovereignty of the individual States. It was founded by that great Virginian, Thomas Jefferson, who realized the evils thereof and the danger of creating a strong centralized governmental monstrosity if the rights of the people were to be preserved. He realized that the best governed were the least governed. He knew, as we know today, that any centralized government is constantly grasping and seeking power, constantly trying to take from the individual citizens their rights and privileges in an endeavor to secure power for the Government. He realized, as we realize, that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. He knew, as we know, that there is no such thing as something for nothing; that no money is handed out from the Federal Treasury except and until it has been first extracted from the individuals who make up this great country of ours of some one hundred sixty-odd million souls.

The Democratic Party has been the party of the masses, the party of the common people and every-day citizens as opposed to the party of big business. I hope and trust that we can keep the Democratic Party on the right track and headed in the right direction maintaining the principles upon which it was founded.

In the past few years, we have seen many people, would-be political leaders, endeavoring to chart a new course for our Nation; endeavoring to build up a strong all-powerful centralized government; endeavoring to take away the rights, privileges, and liberties of our people and to strike down the sovereignty of the individual States. Yes, endeavoring to federalize and socialize whenever possible.

There are and have been political hacks who, in their desire and greed to obtain political preferment, are willing to change the entire philosophy of our Government, to make the people the vassals of the Government, the servant of the Government rather than the Government the servant of the people. In the very recent past, we have seen the judicial arm of the Federal Government attempt to strike down the customs, habits, mores, and traditions of our people by usurpation of authority that they never had, authority that was specifically retained by our Founding Fathers for the people themselves and the individual sovereign States.

According to the Vice President of these United States of America, the Court that rendered that decision was headed by a "great Republican Chief Justice." I am sure that no one in the sound of my voice would want to dispute the claim of the Vice President as to the political affiliation of the head of that Court. Only recently in Virginia, we have seen in the press where another Republican judge entered an order on the same subject which was equally as obnoxious.

My friends, we cannot afford to sit idly by and see the rights and privileges of our people gradually taken from them by an octopuslike arm of our Government which is attempting by judicial decree to amend the Constitution and thus strike down constitutional government. Now is the time for men and women to stand upon principles that we know are right and just. I call upon the Democrats of Virginia to stand steadfast upon the principles of the founding fathers of this great party of ours; to exert every effort possible in these perilous days to preserve for posterity and to hand down to oncoming generations this civilization of ours as it was wrought out for us by the Founding Fathers.

I think it is fitting that we review for a moment one of the great principles of our party and its patron saint, Thomas Jefferson. He believed in strong, local, self-government, and the dignity of the individual. That has been one of the main tenets of the Democratic Party. I want to see our people cling to this ideal and demand that this country of ours get back on the right track and continue to recognize constitutional government, the sovereignty of our States and the freedoms, the privileges and the dignity of the individual.

It is discouraging to observe that the spirit of self-reliance so dominant among our early leaders is becoming more difficult to find today. It is alarming to note that principle is being sacrificed too often for the sake of political expediency. The lure of a welfare state has caused many to surrender their liberties. When a sovereign State permits or invites the Federal Government to perform any of its functions, the moral fiber is weakened and we rapidly approach a state of dependency. Such a condition is foreign to our teachings and should be distasteful to every Virginian.

So many of our people forget the duties and obligations they owe as citizens of this great country of ours. It is so easy to look for security rather than to stand upon principles. I think we as Virginia Democrats must rededicate ourselves to the principles upon which our great party was founded and to let the world know we intend to stand on those principles and the things we know and believe to be right.

I say to you when there are principles involved, such as we face today, if we are to maintain our way of life, if we are to continue constitutional government, if we are to retain for our children and our children's children their liberties and freedoms then we must stand up like men and women and fight for those principles.

I realize it is very popular today to run with the crowd, to put up token resistance to things we don't believe in but to finally succumb to the majority and go along with the crowd. The continuance of this action could well mean the annihilation of our way of life as well as the wrecking of the Democratic Party as we know it and which we love so much.

The need of the time is for a leadership willing to face the facts. Complacency to-

ward what is happening is a betrayal of the America we have inherited. The kind of leader that people are willing to stay with, and to sacrifice personally for, is the kind that says, "I'm going to fight it out on this line if it takes until eternity."

Wavering and self-interest through compromise where vital points are at stake never yet held a following. To win this struggle we have got to get on the right side of the road and keep it with resolution.

Here in Virginia, yes; and in all the Southland, we are facing today a great crisis. There are those who would have us to yield and to sacrifice the principles upon which this great country was founded because, as it appears now, we are faced with superior forces. There are those who would have us sublimely submit to the illegal, unauthorized, unwarranted and iniquitous decision of May 17, 1954, of the Supreme Court of the United States of America. This decision, as we all know, was based not upon legal precedent, the pole star of legal jurisprudence in Virginia and all English-speaking countries, but rather upon the sociological philosophy of a foreign-born sociologist whose name is mentioned prominently in the records of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives.

If we in Virginia sublimely submit then we have lost all hope of retaining constitutional government in this country of ours. To combat this decision will require sacrifice; it will mean hardship, yes; and more, but to me the privilege of being and remaining an American, the privilege of retaining for my children and my children's children the rights, privileges, and freedoms that have been carved out of this wilderness by our forefathers is worth all of the sacrifice necessary, all of the hardship that is forthcoming and all of the wealth we possess that men might continue to walk upon the face of this good earth with dignity and the retention of their self-respect.

I have faith in the people of Virginia. I believe they have the intestinal fortitude, the love for freedom, the burning desire to maintain our way of life to such an extent that they will do whatever is necessary to maintain our rights and freedoms. Yes; our very way of life.

I do not know what sacrifices will be necessary or what hardships we will have to overcome, but whatever is necessary that we will do or we will forever and a day lose our way of life as we know it together with all the freedoms and privileges that have meant so much to the people of this great country.

I hope, believe, and trust that the Democrats of Virginia will stand together on this great issue, it being the issue upon which our party was founded.

What can we do to maintain as well as preserve our way of life? I say to you in all candor, there is no hope in the National Republican Party or those who are running the present administration. In 1952, we were led to believe that the present administration, if they were elected, would stand firm for States rights. Apparently, since the election of 1952, not a thought has been given to that campaign promise. The present Attorney General, upon the bidding of the Chief Executive, has done more, in my opinion, than any one man to bring about the crisis we are now facing. He intervened in the famous school case, insisting and demanding that all of the past legal precedent be ignored and that the Supreme Court, in effect, amend the Constitution. It was he who appeared before the appropriate committees of the Congress urging those committees to report out legislation known as the so-called civil rights bill. The name, of course, is a misnomer. It is anything but a civil-rights bill unless the depriving of individuals of their liberties and the States of their sovereignty is civil rights. This legislation, if enacted into law, strikes at the very heart of the liberties and freedoms of our people. The Republican leaders in the House who had charge of the civil-rights legislation boldly shouted at the tops of their voices that the legislation not only had the blessings of the Chief Executive but was introduced at his bidding and upon his urging. In my opinion, it is an effort on their part to influence certain minority segments of our society in utter disregard of the welfare of our people, regardless of the consequences to the liberties and freedoms that were wrought out for us by the sweat, blood, and tears of those great patriots who have gone on before. It is an attempt to strike down with one stroke of the legislative pen the theory of our very form of government itself. This legislation strikes down the right of trial by jury. It does away with the sovereignty of our States. It takes from our individuals their right to be tried in the local courts. It sets up a small gestapo under the direction of an Assistant Attorney General who will be the political hatchet man of the administration in power. It allows our people to be dragged from the four corners of our country and brought before an agent of the Federal Government without a charge being brought against them and without knowing who instigated the investigation. It is an iniquitous piece of legislation. It is one we would expect in a totalitarian government. It could well be the beginning of the end of our very way of life and of democracy itself in this great country of ours if it ever becomes the law of the land. I say to you its main sponsor as of this moment is the present administration that told us in 1952 that they were running on a great platform of States rights.

I say frankly to you Democratic men and women of Virginia, there is no hope for us in the Republican Party. They will never aid or assist us in retaining our way of life nor in preserving for us the precious heritage that is rightfully ours. They would sell our very birthright for a mess of political porridge. I tell you that the record of the Republican administration in Washington has been a disappointment to those Virginia Democrats who believed in 1952 that the cause of sound government demanded that they leave the ranks of the National Democratic Party. The discrepancy between Republican promise and performance in Federan finances, resistance to socialistic experimentation, and defense of the integrity of local governments makes it plain to us that the present administration has been one of broken promises and an attempt to outdeal the New Deal.

Those Democrats who supported the Republican Party in 1952 could not have foreseen the rapidity with which the promises that attracted them were to be shelved after inauguration day.

For instance, we can recall in the campaign speech in New York in October 1952 the Republican candidate for President promised, and I quote, "We are dedicated to better education without letting the Federal Government stick its long nose into local business." Almost one of the first acts of the present administration was to have the chief law-enforcement officer, the Attorney General of the United States, stick the long hose of the Federal Government into a lawsuit pending between the Commonwealth of Virginia and certain pupils in the public schools of Prince Edward County. Contrary to that solemn Republican promise to respect the right of the States to order and control domestic institutions, the Supreme Court was told by the mouthpiece of the Chief Executive that peace in the world required the decision of the case in Virginia.

Then, too, it was impossible for us to foresee in 1952 that a Republican Vice President would be able to brag that these domestic institutions were being uprooted under the leadership of a great Republican Chief Justice, nor that Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN of Massachusetts, Republican leader of the House, would join hands with Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York City's Harlem, in support of a law to tax the citizens of Virginia for Federal aid to education but deny them the financial benefits of this taxation.

The Republicans in 1952 promised debt reduction, and almost as soon as they took office the Chief Executive demanded that Congress increase the national debt limit. He promised fiscal sanity. Then he tried to win congressional approval of an irresponsible bond-selling scheme for highway construction with the added audacity of demanding that the bonds not be counted as a part of the debt of the United States of America. But for the valiant efforts of stalwart Democrats, the bond scheme would have been perpetrated upon the American people and the Eisenhower administration could still claim a balanced budget. The economy promises of the present administration have been followed by substantial increases in nondefense spending and their farm policies have aided neither farmer nor consumer.

In 1952, the national Democratic candidate advocated enactment of the Compulsory Fair Employment Practice Act while the Republican candidate opposed it; but, suffice it to say, it was impossible for us to see in 1952 that within 2 years the Republican Vice President would boast truthfully that the major civil-rights aims of the FEPC had been accomplished by the administration without even submitting FEPC to a vote of the people's elective representatives in the Congress.

In 1952 we were afraid of creeping socialism, and I say to you this day in 1956 the Socialistic trend, if anything, has been accelerated by the present administration. The Democrats were not outvoted in 1952—they were outpromised. Today, however, fellow Democrats, we in Virginia and the Nation have the Eisenhower record of 3½ years in office on which to base our judgment next November.

In my opinion, it is a record of broken promises. Let's take the promise to the farmers, for an example. To a lot of farmers today, Benson is a fighting word, with the polls showing that the Secretary of Agriculture is about as popular with feed growers as an invasion of locusts, about as popular with cattlemen as Bang's disease, about as popular with the tobacco people as the blue mold, and as popular with the peanut producers as the lifting of import quotas; and discerning voters are not going to buy this Eisenhower farm program as a Benson program.

It was President Eisenhower, not Secretary Benson, who pledged 100 percent of parity, and officially broke that campaign promise to the farmers early in 1954. I am beginning to wonder if the Eisenhower farm program is what the President is talking about when he describes his program as one of "dynamic conservatism." To the Virginia farmers and to the Nation, it has meant a dynamic cut in prices that is doing little to conserve the farmer's income. I don't think Virginia's farmers are being sold on another term of Eisenhower government.

But what about the Eisenhower program of progressive moderation? This might well be used to describe small business under this Republican administration since small business is being progressively moderated right out of existence.

During the 1952 campaign, the candidate in a nationwide telecast expressed a deep concern for small business. "I must say," he told his television audience, "I think in the long run we should be even more concerned about small business than big business, because big businesses were all small businesses at one time, that is certain."

Now, today it is also certain that big business has taken over this administration and left small business out in the cold. Official statistics of the Department of Commerce reveal the fact that small business profits are down to one-third of what they were under the Democrats, while the rate of business failures has doubled under the Eisenhower administration.

Earlier this year, we had the frank admission from the Department of Commerce that a man starting his own business today has anly a 50–50 chance of lasting 2 years.

Of course, no one expected Secretary of Commerce Weeks to do anything about this, since he has clearly indicated that his role in the Cabinet post is to help big business, which put him there in the first place.

The Republican candidate in 1952 talked repeatedly about the high cost of living and how he would bring it down if elected. Yet, during the present administration's first year in office in 1953, the cost of living hit its record peak in our history and it stayed right up there too, until June of 1956. Then came the new record peak in our history, when the Eisenhower administration broke its own previous record high in the cost of living, setting a new all-time high.

We were promised a balanced budget and we hear the budget balancers boasting of a $2 billion surplus in the Treasury. At one and the same time, we see an alarmed group of Senators on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate listen to one Air Force general after another testify about the big cuts in the necessary fund for the proper protection and defense of our country. What they said, in effect, was that they had been denied the money which meant that the world's most powerful Nation would soon have the world's second best Air Force. This came as quite a shock to those of us who had been assured by the present administration that the drastic cuts in our Armed Forces personnel would more than be made up by our overwhelmingly superior Air Force.

I say to you that the budget has been balanced in spite of the administration. It was balanced because of (1) drastic cuts in defense appropriations; (2) the rapidly expanding economy of the country; and (3) a cut of over $2 billion made by the Democratic Congress in the budget request of Eisenhower. In other words, the present administration backed into a balanced budget for the time being, through no efforts of its own.

We come now to the question—wherein lies the hope of the South? The South is and always has been the backbone of the Democratic Party. And in turn, the Democratic Party has always been the home, the hope, and the sanctuary of the South. It is true that not all Democrats agreed on all the issues within our party. In that respect, our political party differs from the British. In Britain, most issues are fought out between the 2 major parties but here in the United States, we debate isues within parties as well as between parties. I think that is helpful.

It is true there are wide areas of disagreement between Democrats in the North and South. Southern statesmen are leaders in the Congress and leaders of important committees in the House and Senate. Upon the record of the parties as of today, I say to you in all candor and frankness that I believe it best to fight in the party caucuses for the principles that we believe in and know to be right whenever possible.

In the coming months, we will hear a great deal about the necessity of a Republican Congress in order to carry out Ike's great program of progress.

In 1952, the people gave to Ike all that he asked in the shape of the Republican 83rd Congress. Recently, we were given the benefit of the inside story as to how that worked. The palace guard that surrounds President Eisenhower and that makes the decisions during the prolonged interregnums of his illnesses, decided that there should be an official biography to present Ike to the American people during the fall election in the most favorable light possible. After careful deliberation, the biographer was selected. He was given access to all secret files, including top secret minutes of Cabinet meetings and those denied not only to the public but to committees of the Congress.

The book has recently been published. It tells from the inside how Ike liked the doings of the Republican 83rd Congress. He was so disgusted with its performance, says his official biographer, that he gave serious consideration to the formation of a third party and even went so far as to select the name of that party.

But Republican orators will say that that won't happen anymore. The elephant has been made over into Ike's liberal image, and if Ike is again elected with a Republican Congress, we need not again fear that its conduct will cause a flare-up of ileitis.

Do I understand, therefore, that the good people of Southside should return big BILL TUCK to South Boston in order that they may send a Republican Congressman to Washington to help Ike integrate the schools and carry out his civil rights program?

Do I understand that the good people of the Richmond area should retire VAUGHAN GARY from his important position on the Committee on Appropriations in order that Ike might raise our contribution to Marshal Tito and put all such programs on a permanent basis?

Am I to understand that the people of Tidewater are to retire ED ROBESON to the shipping yards in order that we might carry out Ike's program to emasculate the Taft-Hartley Law?

Is BURR HARRISON to be returned to the valley from his vital position on Ways and Means in order that we might carry out Ike's program of a permanent increase in the national debt by $15 billion, or applaud such new juggling acts with the Nation's finances as setting up Government corporations to issue bonds which would not be counted as part of the national debt, as was attempted in the $30 billion highway bond scheme?

Is PAT JENNINGS to be returned to southwest Virginia so Benson will be allowed to ride herd on the American farmer?

Are the people of Piedmont and the northern neck to retire to pasture that most beloved and most respected of Congressmen in the United States, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, in order that Ike may clear through the Rules Committee his program for socialized housing?

I read in the press of the nomination for Congress in the Norfolk area of a recent arrival of a new citizen whose total claim to fame seems to be that on some occasion he gave up his home to Ike for a weekend of golfing. Are the good people of Norfolk and the second district to be asked to retire Congressman HARDY who is doing such a great job in order that he may be succeeded by one who is so slavishly devoted to Ike that he will give up his home, our traditions and our principles to carry out his program?

The simple truth is, and the record proves it, that the hope of good government lies in the election of a Democratic administration with a Democratic Congress dominated by men from the Southern States, men like JOHNSON and RAYBURN as majority leaders; like BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the vital Committee on Finance; and RUSSELL and VINSON, of Georgia, and HARDY, of Virginia, on Armed Services; ELLENDER, of Louisiana, and PAT JENNINGS, of Virginia, on Agriculture; FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and ROBERTSON, of Virginia, on Banking and Currency; GEORGE, of Georgia, and RICHARDS, of South Carolina, on Foreign Relations; MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, rather than MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, as chairman of the Committee on Government Operations; EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and TUCK, of Virginia, on Judiciary; that great southern statesman, GRAHAM BARDEN, of North Carolina, on Education and Labor, MURRAY, of Tennessee, and ROBESON, of Virginia, on Post Office and Civil Service.

These men will take what is good in any President's program. They have the capacity, the intelligence and the vision to enact it into law, but regardless of what President may recommend programs to destroy the solvency of the Nation or to bring its agriculture to its knees or to emasculate its constitution, these great southerners will stand as a stone wall as did Jackson and his men at Manassas and will again inspire the battle cry to "rally behind the Virginians."

Ike's Real Scorecard Impressive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave for adjournment without saying that the Eisenhower administration has made great strides and another 4 years of leadership will put us well back on the firm ground of constitutional government from which we had strayed in the 20 years preceding his election.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a column by E. F. Tompkins:

IKE'S REAL SCORECARD IMPRESSIVE

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Appraisal of the Eisenhower administration, as Congress adjourns for the national campaigns, makes quite a catalogue.

Two outstanding factors will have much attention in the coming debates—the two being foreign policy and national defense. Less spectacular, but of great importance, are these:

Merchant marine: The administration has put in motion the largest peacetime program in our history to keep the flag on the seven seas, to maintain our shipyards in readiness, and to assure that, in case of war, we will not again have to improvise a naval auxiliary and military transport system at a cost—and a loss—of billions of dollars.

Electric power—with the deserved defeat in Congress of the Hells Canyon scheme, the administration saw its partnership program for hydroelectric projects legally established. Under this program, the Federal Government will do whatever is required on the rivers for flood control, navigation, and irrigation of arid areas. Riparian law and constitutional States' rights will take care of local problems which taxpaying private enterprise will be encouraged to produce and sell the commodity called electricity.

BAD BILL VETOED

Agriculture—President Eisenhower's veto of a bad farm bill was both sound economics and good politics. It is no secret that, with vast surpluses on hand and accumulating under the rigid price-support system, the Democrats hoped to win votes in November by rejecting the administration's flexible price-support policy. The President eliminated this political factor from the coming campaign by simply spurning the defective bill offered to him and getting the kind of legislation he wanted.

Finance: Especially significant was the joint announcement by the Treasury Department and the Budget Bureau that fiscal

year 1956 ended on June 30 with an actual surplus of $1,754 million—the first Federal surplus since 1951—and that the available funds would be applied to start reducing the national debt.

Technically, this signalized an end of deficit financing. And the estoppel of deficit financing means that the inflation has been brought under control.

The administration has discarded the Keynesian fantasy that expanding industry and full employment can be engendered by multiplying liabilities.

In rejecting Keynesianism, the Eisenhower administration has made prosperity a major campaign issue.

Antarctica

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the great continent of Antarctica was discovered and explored in large measure by American citizens. It has great potentials in this age of air and atomic power.

On July 26 seven other members of the Interior Committee joined me in introducing identical bills to establish a commission for the purpose of correlating our knowledge of the Antarctic and for the purpose of examining all factors necessary to validate the claims of the United States in this important area.

I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an article from Miss E. A. Kendall, of Washington, D. C., who has been most helpful in supplying me with information based upon her research on the subject of the rights of the United States to vast areas in the Antarctic:

HEROES OF THE ANTARCTIC

Many an Antarctic hero has lived and died unsung. Today in press and radio and television we hail the men returning from the latest expedition to the South Polar continent, but sometimes we forget after the hurrah of the welcome, and we fail to realize how much these men have been through and how much it can mean to this country, perhaps.

It may be that today we, as a Nation, are more alert than formerly to the potential importance of the Antarctic Continent and to the fact that we have never made claim to any of the territory that our men have explored. In spite of the fact that we are going down there during 1955–59 in regard to our participation in the International Geophysical Year and that our flag will be brought home again in 1959, according to present plans—in spite of this, it may be that we are beginning to question the wisdom of continued indifference to making concrete territorial claims.

Other countries have been looking the continent over with eyes wide open and vision expanding. Seven other countries have made formal claims to certain tracts (through their parliaments, in most instances). The Halls of our Congress are beginning to echo with grassroot queries regarding our failure as a Nation to make formal claims to the areas of the Antarctic that we have explored.

Today we do not own any square foot of the continent and yet we have discovered and explored and mapped more than any other nation has.

Moreover, there is just now a little book that seems well documented and that tells of the first landing by human beings on the Antarctic Continent—and these human beings were American sealers. That is a thrilling discovery. Also in the book are quotations from the logs of the *Huron* and the *Huntress* and other vessels, indicating that Captains Palmer, Burdick and Davis may all be equally important in Antarctic history as early sighters of the continent proper. Dr. Edouard A. Stackpole of Mystic, Conn., has compiled the book with the cooperation of Curator Vietor, of Yale, and the volume will prove of much interest and satisfaction to Antarctic amateur enthusiasts as well as experts.

E. A. KENDALL.

WASHINGTON.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the position of small business in our country today and there are among us the conjurers of gloom who, in their frenzied search for political issues, have hit upon the idea that they can sell the American people the bill of goods that the present administration in Washington is not interested in the fate of the small businesses of our country. This is plain balderdash.

Today small-business concerns, in general, are much better off than they were in the early part of 1953 when President Eisenhower took office. This improvement has been accomplished despite the more highly competitive civilian markets of the past 2 years. In addition, much progress has been made in solving the problems encountered by small business in particular areas such as financing, Government procurement, protection from monopolies and discriminatory practices in the market place.

OUR RECORD ECONOMY

Our economy is currently operating at record levels, far above anything contemplated by even the most optimistic persons 10 or even 5 years ago. The first 3 months of 1956 show total goods and services—the gross national product—produced in the United States as reaching an annual rate of $403.4 billion, an all-time high. A record number of business concerns participated in supplying this amount of goods and services—they now number more than 4,252,000. Our total labor force is at a new high of 67,846,000, while average weekly earnings for workers in manufacturing concerns reached $78.40 in May of this year. A new high in average weekly earnings of $79.52 was reached in November of last year.

Our economy, therefore, is in a period of prosperity with the people of the United States enjoying the highest standard of living ever experienced in our history or anywhere in the world. We Republicans are proud of this record, particularly when the goods and services produced by our economy may be enjoyed during a time of peace.

Small business concerns have participated in and have contributed to this prosperous economy. While small firms suffered a decline in sales and profits during the Korean war period, the trend was reversed within a few months after the end of hostilities in 1953. Since that time there has been a steady increase in both the sales and profits of small business. The conversion from the Korean period to an essentially peacetime economy was accomplished with a minimum disturbance to our economy.

Small business concerns depend upon a high level of economic activity and upon a large demand for civilian goods and services. It may be noted that from 1952 to the first quarter of 1956, Federal purchasing of goods and services was reduced from $54.3 billion to $45.7 billion. During this same period, personal consumption expenditures—the things we all buy in our daily living—increased from $218.3 billion to $258.8 billion. This means that small businesses are currently better able to participate and to prosper in the markets of today.

We recognize that while small business in general is better off today than it was in 1953, individual firms do still experience difficulties in their efforts to secure long-term credit, to compete against monopolistic or discriminatory practices in the civilian market and in some other areas. These are not new problems. They were certainly not created by the Republican administration. What is important is that under the direction of President Eisenhower, the several agencies of the Federal Government are making strong and conscientious efforts to remove these obstacles to effective competition by small business concerns.

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MERGERS

Much has been said by our New Deal and Fair Deal critics about the high rate of business mergers with increased concentration in big business and about the high rate of busines failures. Two things should be pointed out about the concentration of economic power and business mergers. The first is that big business normally benefits far more during periods of wartime or defense production than does the small business. We all remember the thousands of small businesses that have been casualties in our last two wars. We also remember the controls which brought on this economic strangulation during our recent war years. Big business received a tremendous impetus during World War II and the Korean period. The factors which brought this about may be an unavoidable adjunct of war, but I suggest that the other party remember its share in the responsibility for the administration of controls during this period.

For many years, New Dealers have vilified our larger business enterprises and wept alligator tears for our small concerns. "Robber Barons," "Economic Royalists" are all part of the New Deal's colorful language contrived to get votes. I believe the American people are tired of such baseless foolishness. Bigness is not bad per se. It is bad if it causes un-

fair competition or is used to foster monopolies. In this event, we are protected by our antitrust enforcement agencies which under the Eisenhower administration have been vigorous in protecting our free enterprise system from monopolistic encroachment. From the number of actions by the antitrust enforcement agencies in this administration, we soon see that the Republican administration has been far more vigilant in policing our economy than were its predecessors.

I believe it is important that we understand the true picture of business failures. The New Dealers have looked long and hard for campaign issues—it appears that the best they can come up with is the fact that some small businesses fail to make the grade. I am as much concerned as the next man when the local tailor, hardware store or shoe store has to close its doors. We hope that every man can succeed in his endeavor. However, the business failure rate today is not high. Let us not forget that during 1955 there were 374,000 new businesses started, or over 1,000 a day. This tremendous incentive to compete in today's market resulted in a record number of business firms in our economy totaling 4,252,000.

I wish to state most emphatically that trying to compare what happens during a peacetime economy, such as we have at present, with the experience of an economy geared to war is sheer nonsense. As a matter of fact, since 1940 we cannot find any normal year for the purpose of comparison. From 1941 to 1945 we had World War II; from 1946 to 1948 we had a reconversion period with all sorts of economic shocks as a tremendous backlog of demand on the part of consumers developed. From 1950 to 1952 we had the Korean emergency and finally in 1953 we had a short period of relatively stable reconversion and the demand for new products to satisfy the wants of consumers. We find, therefore, that 1954 and 1955 are actually the only normal peacetime years in the last decade and a half.

In 1954 we find that there were slightly over 11,000 business failures or at the rate of 42 per 10,000 business enterprises. In 1955 there were slightly under 11,000 business failures or at the rate of 41.6 per 10,000 business enterprises. This rate is considerably less than three New Deal years, 1939–41, which were normal years and which experienced a failure rate of 63 per 10,000 firms. It is also much less than the long-run average of 70 per 10,000 firms for the period 1900 to 1955. This rate is more characteristic of our business experience during this century. On this basis I certainly do not feel that the current business failure rate is out of proportion with our historical experience.

While I am, of course, concerned over the failure of any business enterprise, I firmly believe that we may have confidence in our competitive system when so many thousands of new businesses are being started each year. Certainly, this best illustrates that the citizens of our country have not lost faith in the opportunities which exist today or in their ability to compete with firms which are not only large but which have had many years of successful operation.

PROFITS OF SMALL FIRMS

Using all of the figures available to us, we find that as far as small manufacturing corporations are concerned, there was a significant loss in their financial position during the period 1947–52. Earnings before taxes declined from $1,885 million to $1,347 million or 28.5 percent. Similarly, earnings after taxes declined from $1,096 million to $610 million or 44.3 percent.

During this same period, 1947–52, sales of the large corporations increased from $144,290 million to $219,758 million, or 52.3 percent. Earnings before taxes of this group increased from $14,589 million to $18,877 million or 29.4 percent. Their earnings after taxes decreased 9.5 percent. Compare this to the 44 percent decline of small corporations.

Now what has happened during the Republican administration? For nearly 2 years there has been an improvement in the financial position of small manufacturing corporations as well as the large.

In the years 1954 and 1955, earnings before taxes of the small corporations increased 31.8 percent compared with 36.7 percent for the large corporations, but the percentage of increase of earnings after taxes of the smaller corporations was greater, 39.8, compared with 34.2 percent for the large firms.

WHAT THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION HAS DONE

Now, what efforts has the Eisenhower administration put forth to help create a climate in which small business can prosper? Let us look briefly at the work of various Federal agencies whose programs have assisted the small-business concerns in our economy.

The Small Business Administration was established by the Republican 83d Congress, as the first independent, peacetime agency to render assistance to small firms. This agency actually serves as the chief proponent of small business in the executive branch of the Government and has programs in operation which are designed to help small business. Each year since 1953 has seen increasing activity in these fields. Since the inception of the agency and through June of this year, the Small Business Administration had approved 3,560 loans to business concerns for a total of $165,691,000. These loans have gone to virtually every type of legitimate enterprise, local drug and hardware stores, feed and implement dealers, small machine shops, taxicab and bus companies, and others. The SBA also has approved some 4,552 disaster loans to businessmen and homeowners who suffered damage because of hurricanes, floods, and other catastrophes. As a matter of fact, the loans made during the past fiscal year more than doubled those of the previous fiscal year.

This was the Republican answer—legitimate credit for small business, replacing the scandal-ridden Reconstruction Finance Corporation which spread loans to huge corporations and was so subject to political influence in the previous administration. Let me also say here that the SBA does not seek to compete with private lending institutions. It is not a Government superbank. It does, however, provide sound loans, often in participation with private lenders, when banks cannot make the loan on sufficiently long terms or for other legitimate reasons which would deny credit to small businesses.

Not all the agency's efforts in rendering financial assistance, however, are resolved by the making of a loan. Frequently SBA financial specialists can advise an individual as to changes of operation so that a loan is no longer necessary or so the businessman can secure the credit he needs from his local bank.

The Small Business Administration has agreements with other Government agencies which buy goods and services such as the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and the Department of Agriculture whereby all or certain portions of particular Government purchase contracts will be set aside for exclusive bidding by small firms. This means that on Government contracts suitable for performance by small business, small firms will be assured of an opportunity to compete. As of June 30, 1956, $1,112 million in set-asides for small business had been agreed to by procurement agencies. Here, again, the SBA has been increasing its efforts to assist small business. Each fiscal year finds many more millions of dollars in Government purchases reserved for exclusive award to small firms.

Other Small Business Administration programs in operation assist small firms to place their names on Government bidders' lists, to obtain specifications and bid sets; to learn of prime and subcontracting opportunities; and to acquire the latest information on managerial and technical subjects.

The administrator of SBA recently disclosed that Small Business Administration field office reports during fiscal year 1956 showed that prime contract opportunities referred to small firms resulted in contract awards totaling $332,567,000; counseling on selling to the Government and related problems was provided to 30,139 small companies; 88,857 prime and subcontract opportunity referrals were made to small firms; and Government contracting officers were furnished names and addresses of 7,265 small firms which could supply items for which additional small business competition for Government contracts was needed to obtain more suitable prices.

The Republican founders of the Small Business Administration envisioned it as a one-stop agency to which firms could turn, particularly in their dealings with the Government without encountering the red-tape, brush-off, and run-around which had so long been associated with the attitude of the Federal Government from 1933 to 1953.

I believe that the several programs of the Small Business Administration have been of material assistance to the small business concerns of his Nation. Because I believe that such valuable assistance has been rendered, I have, during this Congress, supported all legislative

proposals and requests for appropriations dealing with the Small Business Administration. I have also noted a tendency on the part of the other party to discredit and belittle this agency.

Other agencies in the Federal Government have during the past 3 years given increased recognition to the needs of small business in their own particular programs.

As I have said, the economic welfare of the small-business concern is, to a large extent, dependent upon the vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws—for with free, open, and fair competition the small firm may successfully compete against his large competitors. The record of antitrust enforcement under the Eisenhower administration is a commendable record. New vigor and insight on the part of the enforcement agencies has created a record of accomplishment superior to that of either of the two previous administrations.

The efforts of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission have been directed toward the speedier handling of cases and the prosecution of hard-core violations. I am informed that during the 10 years from 1944 through 1953, the FTC brought an average of only 111 complaints each year. In fiscal 1954, this jumped to 123, in fiscal 1955 to 161, and at the present rate, fiscal 1956 will see more than 170 complaints issued. In final orders by the Commission, the same stepped-up action is revealed. From an average of 96 orders for companies to cease unfair trade practices each year between 1944–53, 104 were issued in 1954, and 1955 produced 112. Fiscal 1956, with 94 orders already issued, is certain to surpass last year's record.

The Eisenhower administration has a much better record of antitrust enforcement than its New Deal predecessors despite all of the lip service to the contrary. The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department under our administration has instituted well over 100 suits against antitrust violators; whereas, in 1952 under a Democrat administration, 30 new antitrust cases were filed; in 1953 under the Republican Administration, 33 new proceedings were brought; and in 1955, a total of 54 new cases were begun.

In the 62 years since the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act by a Republican controlled Congress, 26 contempt proceedings have been brought for violation of outstanding decrees—one-third of these were brought in the 3 years since the present Republican administration took office. In all areas of antitrust law enforcement, strengthened and more expeditious treatment of cases has resulted. Every means is being used to assure small firms the full protection under the law.

Many small firms sell to the Federal Government and do so in direct competition with the largest business concerns in the country. When so many billions of dollars of goods and services are being purchased each year it is most important that small firms are accorded every opportunity to compete. It has long been the expressed intent of Congress that small business should receive a fair share of Government purchases and in the past 3 years every effort has been made by the procuring agencies to see that the will of Congress is carried out.

I have already mentioned the beneficial results derived from agreements between the Small Business Administration and Government procurement agencies. Additionally, these agencies themselves have small-business specialists and small-business programs. The figures show that small firms have received a larger share of military procurement in the past 2 years than in previous years under the so-called Fair Deal administration.

For fiscal years 1954 and 1955 small business received an average of almost 24 percent while in the 3 most recent Democrat fiscal years they received an average of 18 percent. Similarly, the percentage of contracts awarded through secret negotiation by the Government has decreased during the past 2 fiscal years. In other words, Government buying is being brought out in the open where all business firms can compete fairly.

I believe that the agencies responsible for procurement activities will increase their efforts to assure small business a larger share of Government purchases and will eliminate obstacles to providing small firms full information on proposed purchases, contract administration, and other areas in which small business has a vital interest.

For 20 years, the Federal Government proceeded unimpeded toward becoming a bureaucratic colossus. Empires were built within the Federal structure. The Government arrogantly embarked on all sorts of business-type ventures in competition with the legitimate pursuits of private enterprise. Thus, the Government became a high-cost producer of many items, insensitive to the competitive forces which operate in the American economy to keep prices low. The American taxpayer not only paid the difference, but also suffered increased taxes since the Government was denied the corporate tax revenues which the companies holding Government contracts for such work would pay. This is certainly a form of socialism which often damaged small businesses because of the type of functions that would have been undertaken had this work been contracted for with private industry.

The Republican administration has been quick to disband these schemes. Scores of such activities have been abandoned since 1953, although the opposition Congress of the past 2 years has erected roadblocks in this Republican program.

I have mentioned Socialist tendencies, and I wish to add that a fully socialized economy is far easier to accomplish if production is concentrated in the hands of a relatively few large enterprises. As in great Britain several years ago, a socialistic government can assume control of private industry more easily when the assumption of control results from taking over a few large industrial organizations. This is why anyone who opposes Socialist ideology must believe strongly that small business must be preserved and fostered in a free-enterprise system.

The Eisenhower administration knows that small business is the blood and nerve system of our economic body if free enterprise is to be a vital, dynamic force. It knows that avenues of opportunity for small business to grow are essential to the functioning of free enterprise. It knows and has demonstrated through its intelligently conceived policies that both large and small business are necessary and must be balanced carefully in Government policies so that both can be stimulated.

In order to assure that the small business segment of our economy receives the most assistance possible within the proper sphere of Federal Government activities, and as further evidence of his concern for small business, President Eisenhower recently established a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. This Committee will, in the words of the President:

> Make specific recommendations for administrative action, and, where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen economic position of small business and to foster their sound development.

Through vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws the Republican administration has endeavored to assure small firms an opportunity to compete with all businesses adhering to the rules of the game. In particular areas where small firms habitually encounted more difficulty than larger businesses, the Eisenhower administration has made every effort to strengthen its programs which can provide assistance to individual small business concerns.

But, above all, I believe that the greatest service has been rendered small firms by respecting individual initiative and resourcefulness and by making every effort to maintain a flourishing and prosperous economy in which all businessmen may participate. I believe we can all have faith in the strength of the thousands of small business concerns throughout the country. We also can be assured that President Eisenhower and his administration will continue to render all assistance necessary.

I personally pledge myself to continue to support in Congress every legislative measure which will honestly serve to benefit small business and assure that it continues to provide the vital and driving force in our economy. Then, I believe, all of our people will reap the benefits from a sound, flourishing free Nation.

Pharmacists in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, for many months past I have served as a member of the Subcommittee on Manpower of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This subcommittee has continued the work of a predecessor subcommittee in the 83d Congress to assist in the prevention of duplicated effort and to work toward the most effec-

tive and economical utilization of manpower in the Federal Government. I believe the subcommittee has rendered an excellent service to the Nation.

My comments at this time, however, are directed to use of manpower in the Armed Forces rather than toward civilian personnel.

The armed services must constantly guard against the shortsighted practices in the assignment of personnel. We all know that the use of manpower in our military services is of vital importance to their operating efficiency in the defense of our Nation. I am concerned that the classification of personnel for military duties often leaves much to be desired.

For the past year, I have been particularly concerned with the policies relating to the assignment of servicemen who are registered civilian pharmacists and have made some initial investigation of this question. It is learned that in many cases men who are registered pharmacists serve in other capacities while untrained men are given special training at Government expense upon their entry into the service to assume duties in military pharmacies. I have received letters from constituents bringing this to my attention.

Last year, when I took up this question with the Army, I received the following reply which read in part concerning first, the commissioning of pharmacists and secondly, of the assignment of registered pharmacists as enlisted men:

Recent reductions in the overall strength of the Army have necessitated the suspension of our program of appointing and calling to active duty pharmacists and other individuals who meet the criteria for appointment in the Pharmacy, Supply and Administration Section, of the Medical Service Corps, for fiscal year 1956. In view of the fact that the Medical Service Corps is at the present time approximately 16 percent overstrength, it is not anticipated that vacancies will occur in the very near future.

The enlisted military occupational specialty job description for pharmacy specialists (932) is below the level of the registered pharmacist, and during periods when personnel are not being inducted into the Army, positions classified in this specialty would be filled primarily by service school-trained enlisted personnel with no professional training and experience prior to entry into military service. Because of the large numbers of registered pharmacists who have been inducted, no service school training has been conducted in this enlisted specialty since May 1953. Vacancies through attrition have been filled to the maximum extent possible by inducted registered pharmacists. No attempt was made, however, to eliminate career enlisted specialists already trained and being utilized in the field. It is estimated that 25 percent of the present enlisted strength in military occupational speciality 932 falls in this category. Many enlisted registered pharmacists for whom pharmacy vacancies did not exist have been effectively utilized, during their period of obligated service, after short periods of on-the-job training, in allied enlisted specialists such as medical laboratory and medical aid man.

I have now received the following letter from the Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association informing me of a practice within the Air Force which seems very questionable indeed. The letter is as follows:

OHIO STATE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSOCIATION,
Columbus, Ohio.

Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The past few weeks, Congressman HENDERSON, there have been news stories concerning the need for increased appropriations for the Air Force, and lots of debate back and forth about the justification for the additional appropriations.

At the present time, only a fraction of the pharmacists entering our Armed Forces are given the opportunity to practice pharmacy while serving the term for which they were either drafted or enlisted. Most of them, from reports which regularly come to my desk end up as first-aid men, ambulance drivers, lab assistants, or any one of the myriad of duties related to one degree or another to the medical field.

In our appearances before the various student bodies of Ohio's four colleges of pharmacy we have been rather successful in convincing these pharmacists and pharmacists to be there will be enough pharmacy vacancies to permit each pharmacist to serve in his profession while in the Armed Services.

However, I'm through trying to defend the Armed Forces against the treatment about which these young pharmacists complain. Here's the reason why.

This past week I received a copy of the apprentice pharmacy specialist curriculum prepared for and being used by the United States Air Force School of Aviation Medicine, Gunter Air Force Base, Ala. On page 1, the text outline says, "This course is 18 weeks * * *and 702 curriculum hours. Two of these weeks are devoted to basic medical subjects such as first aid, anatomy, physiology, and preventive medicine."

It goes on to outline the apprentice pharmacist specialist course objectives as follows: "To train students to operate an Air Force pharmacy; to perform the administrative duties necessary for the operation of an Air Force pharmacy; to compound and dispense drugs; to utilize the drugs, chemicals, and biologicals in the Federal Catalog of Medical Material."

Students at Ohio's four colleges of pharmacy spend many times the 702 hours required to complete this course in qualifying for their pharmacy degrees. In addition, they spend 1 year's apprenticeship in a retail or hospital pharmacy, against several times the number of hours necessary to pass the Gunter course.

The young men entering our Armed Forces, Congressman HENDERSON, are entitled to the same high grade of health care they can obtain as civilians. Their lives should not be risked at the hands of untrained apprentice pharmacist specialists whose training does not deserve to be mentioned in the same breath as university graduate registered pharmacist.

The Air Force, if top brass so desires, can eliminate this waste of already-learned skills and money by simply abolishing the Gunter apprentice pharmacist school and utilizing the training of pharmacists who already know their profession and who are eager to practice it while required to serve in the Armed Forces. This whole situation appears to be a gross mismanagement of the use of available manpower by the United States Air Force.

What actions can you take, Congressman HENDERSON, to see that young men and women in our Armed Forces, and the Air Force in particular, get the same high standards of pharmacy treatment as they get as civilians?

Cordially yours,

JAMES H. MERRITT,
Executive Secretary.

JULY 6, 1956.

Amalgamated Clothing Workers—Transcript of Address by Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell at the 20th Biennial Convention, Washington, D. C., May 23, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I append here a recent address by our Secretary of Labor to the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, one of our finest labor unions:

AMALGAMATED CLOTHING WORKERS—TRANSCRIPT OF ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR JAMES P. MITCHELL AT THE 20TH BIENNIAL CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D. C., MAY 23, 1956

Thank you, Mr. Potofsky. Officers, delegates, friends of this convention, I am very happy to be here. I am very sorry that, at your convention in 1954, I was unable to be present, because I look upon the Amalgamated Clothing Workers as friends of mine, and I want to assure you that I am a friend of yours. [Applause.]

Incidentally, I must say, I had the opportunity, together with Mrs. Mitchell, of having brunch with the members of your board and your president and their charming wives, at Arthur Goldberg's house on Sunday, and, in order to set the record straight, one of your board members, immediately upon my arrival, looked to see if I had an amalgamated label in the pocket of my suit. [Laughter.] There was such a label in it. [Laughter.] Today, I have on my other suit and I can assure you that it has an amalgamated label in it too. [Laughter and applause.]

This union is particularly to be held up by all of us who prize and treasure trade unionism in this country as a model of industrial democracy.

It has been an outstanding union in that you have translated the sweat shop—the sweat shop of not so many years ago, the sweat shop which I am sure still lives in the memory of some of those present—you have translated the sweat shop into a high standard of living for your members, and you have done it in an era of mutual trust and mutual aid, and you have built a model of labor-management relations upon which you are to be congratulated.

It seems to me that the present welfare of your members stands in sharp contrast to the period when sweat shops were common and workers, many of them immigrants, were exploited; and your union has been a moving force in that change in the American scene.

I was glad to note that your executive board reports that in the past 2 years you have gained 19,000 members and organized 300 shops, bringing your total membership to over 400,000, and that is a long way, a long, long way from the 70,000 members in 1932.

I am also glad to note that you have wage increases and that you have otained improved insurance benefits for over 150,000 clothing workers.

I understand that one of your objectives is so fittingly and appropriately called Bread and Roses, and I would say that your achievements in attaining the bread and roses in the last several years have been remarkable.

You have opened two new health centers, the Laundry Workers in New York and the Sidney Hillman Center in Chicago, and so you have doubled your service to your membership, and someday I hope that as an honorary, or, shall I say, an affiliated member, of amalgamated, I might be invited to that workers' paradise as Cornwell, Pa., which you have just acquired.

I understand from those who know about it that it is well worth visiting.

I think that the history of this union will stand as a monument to the progress of American trade unionism, and I join with you in your efforts to achieve what Sidney Hillman well described as a future when men and women will be economically secure and politically free.

Now I would like to talk, if I may, about some facts because, as your President has said, my job in the Labor Department, is to promote and develop the welfare of the wage earners of this country, and I assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that so long as I am in that job that will be my sole objective. [Applause.]

So let's take a look at the record, the record of the activities of the Labor Department and the record of the legislative problems and activities of the Labor Department because in that record lies a story. In that record lies a story that I think you and I have to be cognizant of. In that record lies a clear-cut story as to what the workers of this country have to do to make sure that the gains that they are entitled to are secure.

In April of this year, the average weekly wage of the worker in industry in this country was $78.39 a week, which was an all-time record for the month of April. But the really important question is income in terms of purchasing power.

If you have got a lot of money and you can't buy anything with it, it is just the same as though you had none. We compile a statistic in the Labor Department called The Average Net Spendable Weekly Earning. It is the expendable aspect that I think should be of interest. We arrive at the figure by taking the actual average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. We subtract from that all of the deduction, like taxes and social security that come out of the weekly wage, and then we adjust the figure for changes in the cost of living.

And the result gives us an indication of the real value of a worker's wage. Now, between 1944 and 1952, the workers of this country received wage increases amounting to $21.69 per week. The gain, however, was an illusion, because inflation and taxes not only cut the increase down; the real spendable earnings of a single man actually dropped by $1.88 a week. Between 1952 and 1955, however, the average worker had received a clear-cut gain in net spendable earnings of about $6 a week. It seems to me that in an attempt to achieve a higher and higher standard of living we must be continually conscious not only of the wage level but of the level of the cost of living, which in the last 2 years has remained virtually steady, making the money that you receive, money your members receive, of more value in terms of purchasing power.

Now, I note from this morning's paper, as another part of the record, that my good friend Louis Hollander, your vice president, says that the same people who are anti-Negro, anti-Jew, and anti-Catholic, are anti-labor and antisocial, and I want you to know that I agree with him 100 percent. [Applause.] And I want to tell you what we are trying to do in this field of minority discrimination.

In the last several years much has been done, and I am going to use as an example right here in the District of Columbia. Two years ago I recommended, and the President appointed, Mr. J. Ernest Wilkins as Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of international affairs. Mr. Wilkins is a Negro from Chicago, and he was asked at the first press conference he held, "How is it, Mr. Wilkins, that you feel free to come to Washington when a man like Ralph Bunche not so many years ago said that he could not bring his family to Washington because of discriminatory practices?"

And Mr. Wilkins truthfully replied, "I can come to Washington now because things have changed."

Things have changed in this respect: There is no longer discrimination in the District of Columbia eating establishments. Segregation has been abolished in the District of Columbia recreational facilities, in swimming pools, in parks, and in other facilities. Segregation has been done away with in movie houses and in theaters in the District, and racial discrimination has been effectively banned on Federal contract jobs by the President's Committee on Government Contracts. I worked with the President's Committee, and through that Committee we have brought about not only these changes in the District of Columbia but also the abolition of certain discriminatory practices by employers in the District of Columbia.

We have not achieved our goal. We have a long way to go, not only here but throughout the country. But I say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the objective of the President's Committee, the objective of the Labor Department, is to continually and effectively move ahead so that every single American, regardless of his race or his color or his creed, will have equal opportunity for jobs and will have equal opportunity for education and will have equal opportunity as a citizen of these United States. [Applause.]

Now, your president and officers and your membership have always supported the Department of Labor programs which are designed for the welfare of the wage earners of this country, and I would like to mention a few recent happenings which I am sure are of particular interest to you.

The effectiveness of the Walsh-Healey Act which, as you know, permits the Secretary of Labor to determine minimum wages for work performed on Government contracts, has been threatened by the Fulbright amendment which subjects such wage-finding decisions of the Secretary of Labor to judicial review. We are determined to make the law work and have therefore fought hard to establish sensible and practical administrative procedures to help us enforce this law. And the result has been that, within the last month, we have won in the Supreme Court the right to determine a nationwide minimum in the cotton-textile industry and in the woolen and worsted industry. As you know, these determinations have been enjoined by employers for some years. We have successfully defeated the efforts of the employers to make the act inoperative; and, as a result, we have brought $2½ million in back wages to nearly 100,000 workers in these industries. [Applause.]

Now, I'd like to talk also about some of the other problems of the Department of Labor. Each year since 1953, we have been successful, with your help, in increasing the budget of the Department of Labor so that we might be more effective in the doing of our job for the working people of this country. For example, in 1950 the grand total appropriation in the Department of Labor was $223 million. In 1956, it is $468 million. And with this money, the Department of Labor has increased effectively its enforcement operations in Walsh-Healey, in the Fair Labor, and in the Davis-Bacon Acts.

As an example of the tightness of our enforcement, when the minimum-wage law was passed and made effective in March of 1956, in the men's cotton-garment industry, we refused to go along with the precedent that had been established in 1950 for an extended learning period, and we cut the learning period by 160 hours, because we felt that was a fair thing to do. [Applause.]

You may recall that in 1950, learners' certificates were granted in many industries, and through June 30, 1950 (you may remember, the law became effective in January), in the men-boys suit-coat industry, the Department of Labor granted 205 learners' certificates.

So far this year, we have granted, in the Department of Labor, in the same industry, only 82 learners' certificates, and the reason that number is low, possibly, is because we insist that no learners' certificates be granted, unless there is definite proof that no skilled workers are available. [Applause.] And I hope that any of you who know of the existence of skilled workers in an area where learners' certificates have been granted, will let me know.

Now, with relation to this law enforcement, and the additional funds that we have requested and secured from Congress, we propose to continue actively and strenuously our law enforcement in the interests of the workers of this country. We propose to see to it that any employer, who is violating the law, shall be punished, in accordance with the statute. And we propose to continue our enforcement of the laws, so that the fair employer is not subject to the chiseling competition of a law violator. [Applause.]

Just as an example of the difference in the tempo of the law enforcement of the Labor Department, I want to cite you just one figure:

Under the Davis-Bacon Act (an act which as you know, provides that the Secretary of Labor shall find the prevailing wages in Federal construction projects) from 1935 until 1952, 4 contractors were blacklisted by the Department of Labor, for violating the Davis-Bacon Act, this at a time, remember, when we had the largest construction program in the history of our country.

Since I have been in office, we have blacklisted 46, or nearly 10 times as mnay, because, we propose that the workers of this country shall be protected and that the fair employer shall be protected. [Applause.]

Now, I want to tell you about some of our projects:

We have before Congress a number of legislative proposals, and I have brought them with me, because I thought you might be interested in my scanning them for you.

In November 1953, 1 month after I got this job, before the CIO convention in Cleveland, I said, and I think it was the first time that anyone had said it from a national platform, that I thought the minimum wage should be increased. I said that I thought the coverage of the minimum wage should be expanded. [Applause.]

And I want you to know, ladies and gentlemen, that I have not receded 1 inch from that position, and I am prepared, when the Senate Labor Committee calls hearings, to testify with specific recommendations, for the increase and the coverage of the minimum wage. [Applause.]

Now we have a number of other proposals in the Congress, and I won't recite them in detail. We have a proposal to revise the 8-hour laws which would provide for overtime after 40 hours on Federal construction projects because, do you know (while it may not be of particular news to your members), do you know that under the present law, archaic as it is, that in some sections of this country construction workers working on Federal programs are working 56 hours a week at straight time because the law provides only for overtime after 8 hours.

In these nonunion areas in the South and Southwest, construction workers are working 56 hours a week at straight time—8 hours a day, 7 days a week, and we proposed last year, on February 25, 1955, and on April 20, 1955, we introduced legislation in the Congress to correct this abominable situation, and we have had no action.

Last year in this country, 14,000 people were killed on their jobs, and over 2 million, or nearly 2 million injured—injured to the extent that they lost time. And we proposed legislation last year to promote occupational safety programs in the States by providing grants-in-aid to the States so that a better protection job could be done, more factory inspectors, better laws, better codes.

We introduced that legislation on February 18, 1955, in the Senate, and on April 20, 1955, in the House, and we have had no action.

We have legislation to amend the Workmen's Compensation laws that affect longshore and harbor workers and the private employees of the District of Columbia. This legislation was introduced in 1955. It affects some 650,000 workers in this country, and so far we have had hearings, just hearings, no action.

The President of the United States in his state of the Union message this year said that he would introduce legislation, and he has, to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex in the payment of wages, and we have had no action.

We have legislation to provide a nonoccupational disability benefit to the District of Columbia employees because that is the only area that Congress can legislate in this field. This legislation was introduced last year, and there is no action.

We have legislation to improve the unemployment compensation programs of the District of Columbia, and we have no action.

We have legislation which is designed to protect the migrant workers of this country from many bad practices that exist in transporting them from place to place of work. So far we have had no legislation.

We have many other bills which are somewhat technical in nature, and I am not going to talk about them. But when you add up the number of workers that these bills affect on our best estimate—just let me run them down:

One bill, at least 12 million. At least a million on another. The safety bill, 39 million. Six hundred and fifty thousand. Two hundred and fifty thousand. Six hundred and fifty thousand again. One and a half million. Two million. One million.

Those are the workers that would be affected by this legislation which we proposed.

Now why aren't we getting any action? I will tell you why: I see before me a sign which says: "Organizing Is Everybody's Job. Abolish Taft-Hartley and Right-To-Work Laws."

In 1954 the President of the United States suggested, recommended to Congress, presented a bill to Congress, to make certain changes in the Taft-Hartley law. That request was reiterated in 1955, in 1956, and nothing has happened.

My position on the right-to-work laws is well known. But I think to get this picture of why, why nothing is happening on this proper labor legislation which we have in the House and Senate, I think we ought to talk a little bit about the right to work.

Where do these right-to-work laws exist, and how do they affect—and how do they affect—congressional thinking on other types of labor legislation?

Let me run down—it won't take a minute—the list of the political composition of the legislatures in the States with the right-to-work laws in alphabetical order:

Alabama, Democrat; Arizona, Democrat; Arkansas, Democrat; Florida, Democrat; Georgia, Democrat; Iowa, Republican; Louisiana, Democrat; Mississippi, Democrat; Nebraska, Republican; Nevada, Democrat; North Carolina, Democrat; North Dakota, nonpartisan; South Carolina, Democrat; South Dakota, Republican; Tennessee, Democrat; Texas, Democrat; Utah, Republican; Virginia, Democrat.

Thirteen legislatures Democrat, four Republican, one nonpartisan.

Now let's take a look at the congressional composition, the present composition of the congressional delegation from these 18 States with right-to-work laws: The total Democratic Congressmen and Senators, 114. The total Republican Congressmen and Senators, 37.

Now, how can you and I expect reasonably sympathetic approach to legislation which benefits the workingmen and women of this country with that record? How can we expect it? I tell you, ladies and gentlemen, that I say that your job and mine in terms of those elements in this country which are antilabor is to exercise what Sidney Hillman called our political freedom. [Applause.] So I ask with all of the force that I can: How can one say that this administration is not in favor of the workingman, with this record of accomplishment, this record of legislation which is blocked in the House and the Senate by the Democratic leadership? And all you have to do to document it is to look at the right-to-work States and where they are.

I want to thank you for listening to me. I appreciate very much the cordiality and the interest that you have shown. I want to say again that so long as I am in office—and I know I will have the opportunity of being in office for another 4 years [laughter]—so long as I am here, you will find me on your side. [Applause.] You will find me fighting for your legitimate rights, and you will find me working as closely as they will allow me—and they do—with your national officers. You will find me fighting every inch of the way for the thing that you and I are primarily interested in, which is the welfare of the workers of the United States. [Applause.]

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce Activity Report for 2d Session, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 105, 84th Congress, I should like to submit a statement of the activity of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 84th Congress, 2d session.

The activity report for the first session of this Congress was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 16, 1955, at pages A6038 to A6039. A more detailed report, combining both sessions, will be filed later.

Among the important measures cleared by the committee during the second session were the following items of legislation:

On the subject of health, the committee promptly reported a bill to extend the Polio Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955 through June 30, 1957, which became law. The committee also took action on bills authorizing mental health study grants, a national health survey, increasing authorization for construction at National Institute of Dental Research, health research facilities, increasing the number of specially trained professional nurses and of practical nurses and professional public-health personnel, extension for 2 years of the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act, and establishing a national library of medicine.

In connection with its study of the Salk polio vaccine, the committee visited the Eli Lilly & Co. laboratories and acquired much valuable information about the problems involved in the production of the vaccine.

Legislation was enacted, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, to provide, generally, for a 10-percent increase in benefits to a large number of beneficiaries under that act.

On the subject of aviation, the committee reported legislation making it possible for airlines operating in Hawaii and Alaska to obtain permanent certificates; to prohibit serving alcoholic beverages on airlines; to permit reduced-rate air transportation to ministers of religion; extension of aviation war risk insurance; extension for 5 years of Prototype Aircraft Act; to punish sabotage of aircraft; and to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 relating to capital gains of air carriers.

Following the tragic airplane accident over the Grand Canyon, a special subcommittee was appointed to investigate immediately the problems of airspace use, including air traffic regulations and control, in an effort to find ways to avoid recurrence of such air disasters. The subcommittee immediately held hearings in Las Vegas and visited the scene of the accident.

In the field of transportation, the committee held extensive hearings on the legislative recommendations of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Transport Policy and Organization. It reported out a bill to improve the transportation system in the District of Columbia and its environs, which became law. The so-called trip leasing bill was enacted. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act to prohibit common carriers by railroad, motor vehicle, water, or freight forwarders from granting reduced rates—that is, less than published tariff rates—for the transportation of Government property or personnel, except in certain minor respects, was reported to the House. Also reported, was a bill designed to change requirements for obtaining freight forwarder permits. Bills to grant reduced fares for disabled persons requiring an attendant and to regulate transportation of migrant farm workers were reported favorably.

Under authority of House Resolution 357, a special subcommittee was appointed to study traffic safety, which has already made plans for an extensive study of this problem.

The committee reported legislation to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act with regard to attorney fees and disposal of World War I assets; and to amend the War Claims Act relative to claims of certain religious organizations

in the Philippines, and determination of date of death of certain prisoners of war.

In the field of securities, extensive hearings were held on promotional securities, and legislation was reported to establish liability of officers and other persons making false statements under subsection 3 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933.

A report was filed on newsprint, reflecting the newsprint outlook for 1956, House Report 1953.

The detailed activity report follows:

ACTIVITY REPORT OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

BILLS REPORTED

The committee has considered and reported favorably the following bills:

H. R. 8704: Extension of Polio Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955. Report 1697, by Mr. PRIEST, January 30, 1956. S. 2990 passed House, in lieu, February 6, 1956. Approved February 15, 1956, Public Law 411.

H. R. 7732: Artificial coloring of oranges. Report 1982, by Mr. DIES, March 29, 1956. Approved July 9, 1956, Public Law 672.

S. 2587: Commissioned Corps of Public Health Service. Report 1987, by Mr. ROBERTS, April 9, 1956. Approved April 27, 1956, Public Law 492.

S. 2972: Antisabotage of aircraft. Report 1979, by Mr. HARRIS, March 29, 1956. Approved July 14, 1956, Public Law 709.

H. R. 8901: District of Columbia transit bill. Report 2034, by Mr. HARRIS, April 24, 1956. S. 3093 passed House, amended, in lieu, May 17, 1956. Approved July 24, 1956, Public Law 757.

H. R. 9048: Mental health study grants. Report 2086, by Mr. PRIEST, May 2, 1956. Provisions of this bill contained in S. 3958. S. 3958 passed House, amended, in lieu, July 23, 1956.

S. 3958: Health Amendments Acts of 1956. Report 2569, by Mr. PRIEST, July 2, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 24, 1956.

S. 3076: National Health Survey Act. Report 2108, by Mr. DIES, May 3, 1956. Approved July 3, 1956, Public Law 652.

S. 3246: Increasing authorization for construction at National Institute of Dental Research. Report 2144, by Mr. PRIEST, May 10, 1956. Approved July 19, 1956, Public Law 732.

S. 849: Health Research Facilities Act of 1956. Report 2184, by Mr. PRIEST, May 21, 1956. Passed House, as amended, July 13, 1956. House adopts conference report, July 19, 1956. Senate adopts conference report, July 20, 1956.

H. R. 9592: To permit reduced air rates for ministers of religion. Report 2183, by Mr. CARLYLE, May 21, 1956. S. 3149 passed House in lieu, June 18, 1956 (text of H. R. 9592 substituted). House adopts conference report on S. 3149, July 19, 1956. Senate adopts conference report on S. 3149, July 23, 1956.

H. R. 5257: Definition of dry-milk solids. Report 2176, by Mr. ROBERTS, May 17, 1956. S 1614 passed House in lieu, June 18, 1956 (text of H. R. 5257 substituted). Approved July 2, 1956, Public Law 646.

H. R. 8000: Prohibit serving alcoholic beverages on airlines. Report 2399, by Mr. WILLIAMS, June 20, 1956. Passed House, July 25, 1956.

S. 1146: Amend Trading With Enemy Act re attorney fees. Report 2332, by Mr. KLEIN, June 12, 1956. Approved June 25, 1956, Public Law 611.

S. 898: Trip leasing. Report 2425, by Mr. HARRIS, June 25, 1956. Passed House, as amended, July 13, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

H. R. 9065: Amend Railroad Retirement Act to provide increased benefits. Report 2418, by Mr. HARRIS, June 25, 1956. S. 3616 passed House in lieu, July 23, 1956.

H. R. 7536: Require radiotelephones on certain vessels. Report 2387, by Mr. MACDONALD, June 19, 1956. Passed House, July 2, 1956. Passed Senate, amended, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 8902: Determination of airline revenue. Report 2530, by Mr. MACK, June 29, 1956 (pt. 2, minority views, by Mr. HESELTON). Recommitted, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 9319: Liability of officers making false statements in securities. Report 2513, by Mr. PRIEST, June 28, 1956.

H. R. 10624: General Public Utilities Corp. in Philippines. Report 2477, by Mr. KLEIN, June 26, 1956.

S. 2913: Extend for 2 years Advisory Committee on Weather Control. Report 2424, by Mr. ROGERS, June 25, 1956. Approved July 9, 1956, Public Law 664.

S. 3163: Permanent certification for airlines in Hawaii and Alaska. Report 2462, by Mr. PRIEST, June 26, 1956. Approved July 20, 1956, Public Law 741.

H. R. 525: Amend section 22 of Interstate Commerce Act re Government traffic. Report 2633, by Mr. HARRIS, July 6, 1956. Rules Committee deferred action, July 12, 1956.

S. 1456: Amend Communications Act re interlocking directorates. Report 2540, by Mr. HARRIS, June 29, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 16, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

S. 3412: Extend war-risk insurance (aviation) for 5 years. Report 2510, by Mr. PRIEST, June 28, 1956. Approved July 20, 1956, Public Law 746.

H. R. 11969: Require safety devices on household refrigerators. Report 2634, by Mr. ROBERTS, July 6, 1956. Passed House, July 19, 1956. Passed Senate, amended, July 26, 1956.

H. R. 9547: Amend Food and Drug Act to simplify procedures. Report 2623, by Mr. PRIEST, July 5, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 16, 1956. Passed Senate, July 23, 1956.

S. 3365: Change requirements for obtaining freight-forwarder permit. Report 2778, by Mr. HARRIS, July 18, 1956.

S. 1777: Reduced or free fares for disabled persons requiring attendant. Report 2745, by Mr. WILLIAMS, July 17, 1956. Passed House, July 19, 1956.

S. 3363: Private bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak (pilot's radio license). Report 2783, by Mr. HARRIS, July 18, 1956. Passed House, July 26, 1956.

S. 2060.: Working capital fund for Bureau of Standards. Report 2809, by Mr. ROBERTS, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

S. 3391: Regulation of transportation of migrant farm workers. Report 2810, by Mr. HARRIS, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 25, 1956.

H. R. 12144: Amend War Claims Act (determination of death date of POW's). Report 2824, by Mr. KLEIN, July 19, 1956. Passed House, July 23, 1956.

S. 2226: Disposal of World War I assets. Report 2777, by Mr. KLEIN, July 18, 1956.

S. 3430: Establish medical library. Report 2826, by Mr. DIES, July 19, 1956. Passed House, amended, July 23, 1956. Senate concurs in House amendments, July 24, 1956.

S. 2074: Extend for 5 years Prototype Aircraft Act. Report 2816, by Mr. HINSHAW, July 19, 1956.

H. R. 6586: War claims of religious organizations in the Philippines. Report 2825, by Mr. KLEIN, July 19, 1956. Passed House, July 23, 1956.

NUMBER OF PUBLIC HEARINGS

The committee held public hearings as follows: Entire committee, 5; subcommittees, 146.

Hours of sitting (public and executive), entire committee, 44; subcommittees, 328.

Printed pages of public hearings, 6,230.

Unprinted pages of public hearings, 140.

Why Johnny Can't Go to the Circus Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of Congress an excellent editorial in a recent edition of the Florida Times-Union. Like most Americans, I sincerely hope that the circus is not a thing of the past. This editorial points out where a great deal of the blame lies if the circus does become only a memory:

WHY JOHNNY CAN'T GO TO THE CIRCUS TODAY

They didn't ask the right people about the decision to take the Ringling Bros. Circus off the road. The story made a big splash and all sorts of old circus performers gave their views to the papers. Executives spoke and officials, but the press didn't print any comments from the right people. These are the little people, aged 3 to 10.

These, along with a few circus buffs, are the only people who really care whether a circus is in a tent. But, to them, it makes all the difference. It's part of the magic of circus time.

Sure, a circus in an air-conditioned, ventilated, roofed hall is fun. So are the movies; so is television. There's little difference, and when you come right down to it, little point in going. What makes a circus different is the transformation of an open, vacant lot into fairyland for an afternoon. And the process of transforming it.

Anything in a tent is fun for a youngster. When that tent is the biggest in the world and contains animals, machines, shiny spangles and clowns—especially clowns—it becomes something worth waiting for, from one year to the next.

A tent circus is a show for children. The trouble is, it has to be run by adults and supported by adults. Youngsters haven't much say in the matter if dad won't buy tickets, if mother objects to going, or if labor troubles or management difficulties prevent the circus from showing. They can't form a pressure group and petition for the redress of grievances. They may not even know what it's all about, or why the circus hasn't come to town this year.

Then, in a few years, a tent circus won't mean anything to another generation of children. They'll be content with TV and the movies, because they won't know the thrill they're missing. And there will be a ready excuse for all the adults who sunk the circus. They will argue that today's children are blasé, they've seen everything. They are used to getting their shows in the living room and they don't want to sit in a hot tent, and be dragged through mud and dust, and be exposed to crowds and all the other discomforts which go with a tent circus.

The trouble with that argument is that it's an adult's argument, not a child's. Let's put the blame for the end of tent circuses where it belongs. Sure, maybe teen-agers have grown sophisticated, and enjoy watching their circuses in air-conditioned halls. But the memory of a 5-year-old's afternoon excitement at the circus grounds will remain as an everlasting reproach to the adults whose indifference killed the Big Top.

Information Fact Sheet on the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, any legislation which comes before the House must finally be decided on its own merits alone. To merit our approval a bill must be sound in purpose. Its results must be necessary as well as worthwhile.

Normally I would be content to address myself only to the provisions of a bill. I would rest my case solely on the merits of the proposed legislation.

In the recent debate on the veterans security bill it was necessary to consider the character and integrity and history of service of its sponsor and principal supporter—the American Legion.

The American Legion's proud record of service for God and country has been ignored by those who charge the Legion with being a "Treasury-raiding" organization.

There is room for honest differences of opinion as to the relative importance of the various provisions of this bill to liberalize existing veteran compensation and pension benefits. I, for one, believe that the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that disabled and aging veterans who are unable to work because of their disabilities or unable to obtain a job because of their age, and who have little or no income, should not be left destitute. I believe, too, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to insure that those who were disabled in the service of our Nation, their dependents and the survivors of deceased veterans are adequately cared for. Most important, I believe that our Nation and our economy will continue to grow and prosper so that this obligation can be met in the future as well as it is being met today.

This belief, which is shared by the American Legion, scarcely warrants the charge of "Treasury Raider." Yet, nearly three million American Legionnaires have been so branded by some opposed to this bill.

Such a charge is unjustified both in terms of the legislation now being considered and in terms of the American Legion's unequalled record of service for others.

I challenge anyone to show me an organization that has done more for the welfare of all of our people and of our entire Nation than the American Legion.

There is none.

In whatever field of service one may choose, the American Legion is in the forefront.

Consider for a moment the veterans' legislation enacted by the United States Congress since the American Legion was chartered by an act of Congress on September 16, 1919; the American Legion has been in the thick of every legislative battle for the improvement of conditions for disabled veterans and their dependents.

As recently as 37 years ago there was no Veterans' Administration. The American Legion led the fight for creation of this agency. It has been the watchdog of its operations. It has been its most constructive critic. There are few who do not recognize that the establishment and improvement of VA have resulted in a much more efficient and much more economical administration of veterans benefits enacted by Congress.

Is this Treasury-raiding?

After World War I there was no hospital and medical program for disabled veterans. The American Legion fought to make this program the finest of its kind in the world today. Is this Treasury-raiding?

I am confident that future historians will someday credit Congress with writing one of the most beneficial, constructive, far-sighted laws in the history of America or any other nation when it enacted the GI bill of rights in June 1944. The American Legion was the architect of this legislation. Was the American Legion raiding the Treasury when it helped write into law a program whose ultimate value to our Nation and to our people no one can now measure?

Going beyond the field of legislation into the area of direct service to the Nation and to our people, we come to the American Legion's programs of Veterans Rehabilitation, Child Welfare, National Security, and Americanism.

Veterans rehabilitation to the American Legion means more than sponsoring and supporting legislation of needed benefit for veterans. It means helping veterans obtain these available benefits which they need and to which they are entitled.

Each year the American Legion spends millions of dollars on the National, State, and local level processing veterans' claims, helping sick and disabled veterans obtain the hospital and medical care they need, assisting veterans with insurance, disability, housing, education, and other matters, and doing the other things which must be done before a veteran can receive authorized benefits.

Nearly a million dollars are spent by the Legion each year to operate its national rehabilitation service alone. In addition, there are more than 1,100 accredited Legion representatives in VA regional offices, hospitals, clinics, and other installations throughout the country; a service officer in each of the American Legion's more than 17,000 posts is ready and willing to help any veteran with any problem he may have.

Let me emphasize that this service is available to any veteran, regardless of whether he is a member of the American Legion or even eligible for membership in the Legion.

The American Legion, through its veterans' rehabilitation program, has contributed $50,000 to the Heart Fund, an equal amount for NP research, and additional funds for other medical purposes. It has made available to the Government the advice and services of its expert medical, insurance, and claims advisory personnel.

These are but a few of the positive ways in which the American Legion is serving others without recourse to the Federal Government or any other agency, which means, of course, that this is being done with Legion dues and contributions, not Federal or State funds.

In the field of child welfare, the American Legion has during the past 31 years spent more than $125 million to provide direct aid for children in need. In 1955 the Legion's child-welfare program cost that organization more than $7,300,000.

The money spent by the Legion has bought everything from food, clothes, and shelter to iron lungs, prosthetic appliances, and miracle drugs. But the story of this child-welfare program cannot be told in terms of money alone. It must be told, too, in terms of the hundreds of thousands of hours devoted to the care of children each year by the more than 50,000 trained workers in this field in the American Legion and its auxiliary. And it must be told in terms of the children made healthy, the families kept together, and the constructive, farsighted child laws on the statute books today because of the determination and support of the American Legion.

The American Legion's record in the field of national security further refutes the baseless charge of "Treasury-Raider." It is only necessary to review the history of our Nation since World War I to realize that up until very recently, the American Legion was one of the few organizations in the country which steadfastly opposed our lack of military preparedness.

Is there anyone today who would question that the American Legion has been interested only in the welfare and security of our country in urging a strong program of military preparedness? Is there anyone who would question that such American Legion sponsored and supported laws as the Uniform Code of Military Justice, the Federal Civil Defense Act, the various National Security Acts, and other defense measures are in the best interests of our country?

Individual Legionnaires have given freely of their time and effort to serve on Selective Service boards, with Civil defense units, and other defense agencies.

A few days ago on Flag Day, June 14, the American Legion demonstrated another facet of its positive, constructive programs for the good of America. In front of the east entrance to the United States Capitol, the American Legion conducted an inspiring Flag-Day program. Some of our colleagues in the Senate and House were privileged to represent the Congress on this program. They can tell you what this patriotic observance of the birthday of our flag meant to them and to the millions of our fellow citizens who watched it on a national television program that morning.

Americanism is one of the American Legion's most important and most comprehensive programs. If it is a Treasury-Raiding program, it is only because the American Legion drains its own treasury to finance such magnificent activities as Boys State and Boys Nation, the annual, nationwide oratorical con-

test, the sponsorship of Boy Scout troops, and American Legion junior baseball.

Each year the American Legion spends approximately $1 million to teach young men of America about the functions of their State and Federal Governments through Boys State and Boys Nation. Some 20,000 boys participate in this program annually.

The oratorical contest gives more than 350,000 high school boys each year an opportunity to learn about our Constitution and Bill of Rights. Essays are written on these precious documents by the contestants. Many youngsters, who otherwise could not have gone to college, have had a college education because of the scholarships they won in the American Legion's oratorical contest. And every participant has gained a greater understanding and appreciation of those documents that are the foundation of our democratic form of government.

Is this the kind of activity which merits unthinking, caustic criticism?

Currently, more than 175,000 future leaders of our Nation are members of the 4,128 Boy Scout Troops sponsored by the American Legion. Since the Legion began sponsoring these troops, more than one million Boy Scouts have benefited from the wonderful moral and physical training which scouting gave them.

If baseball is America's national pastime, then the American Legion is one of the cornerstones of the country through its unequaled junior baseball program.

This largest, organized, teen-age activity in the Nation started in Milbank, S. Dak., in 1925. It became a national program in 1926. During the past 30 years, at least 20 million boys have played American Legion junior baseball.

Nearly 20,000 league teams take part annually in this program. More than 1 million boys play American Legion junior baseball each year. In addition to the 20,000 teams playing in league competition, other teams are sponsored by Legion Posts to give more boys a chance to play junior baseball. This accounts for the total of 1 million boys.

American Legion junior baseball has been the proving grounds for the major and minor leagues. Since World War II it has given the major leagues 60 percent of their players. Last year alone, 264 players on the 16 major league teams were graduates of American Legion junior baseball.

But this is an incidental benefit of the program. The real value of American Legion junior baseball and the reason the Legion spends upward of $1,200,000 each year on this activity is that it teaches young Americans the importance of teamwork and of sportsmanship as one of the cornerstones of good citizenship.

These are but some of the unpublicized, unselfish, day-to-day programs of the American Legion.

They do not rate headlines. But they do prove that the American Legion, far from being a Treasury-raiding organization, is one of the greatest forces for good our Nation has ever known.

The American Legion fights hard for what it believes in. But it fights fairly. And win, lose or draw, it continues to carry out its many programs of service for God and country.

So the next time somebody accuses the American Legion of being a Treasury-raiding organization because he disagrees with a Legion-sponsored bill for the benefit of veterans, remember what the Legion is doing for the welfare of others.

If every organization which comes before the Congress in support of or opposition to one bill or another were doing as much, you and I could rest easy about the future security and welfare of our Nation.

Laying It on the Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President's address at Manila on July 4 has received widespread commendation for its moral strength and forthrightness. On of the finest editorial comments on this speech is from the Tablet. Under leave to extend my remarks, it follows:

LAYING IT ON THE LINE

The highlight of Vice President NIXON'S recent visits to Pacific and Asian nations was his Fourth of July Address at Manila on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the independence of the Philippines. In that speech the Vice President really laid it on the line when he said that any neutralist morality on the question of communism is wrong.

His carefully thought-out talk had many quotable passages. The part on the immorality of ignoring the basic evil of communism deserves, however, special emphasis.

"There is still another brand of neutralism," he said, "that makes no moral distinction between the Communist world and the free world. With this viewpoint we have no sympathy. How can we feel toward those who treat alike nations that believe in God and honor religion and morality, and nations that boast of atheism and the rule of force and terror alone? How can anyone treat as equals those who believe in the dignity of man and the basic rights of all men, and those who treat their subjects as mere machines? Is democracy to be equated with dictatorship? Is freedom the same as tyranny?"

Those words are reminiscent of the statement of Pope Pius XI: "Communism is intrinsically wrong." They parallel the same Pope's further warning that no one who would save Christian civilization may collaborate with communism in any undertaking whatsoever.

The plain fact is that communism is immoral. To ignore that fact by a moral neutralism of thought, word, or act is consequently likewise immoral.

It is wholesome and encouraging to find the Vice President of the United States putting straight the morality or, rather, the immorality of stradding the fence on the issue of communism. By laying it on the line, he has shown the tragic error of any neutralism which claims that it is possible to be "pals" with Communist countries and the free nations of the world at the same time.

We pray that his words are taken seriously abroad. We pray, also, that they will be remembered at home when our own government reconsiders this country's relations with Tito, of Yugoslavia, who, let us never forget it, is a Communist.

Loyalty Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, May 1 is a day customarily set aside by the Communists to celebrate and glorify the expansion of the Communist ideology. It is a day to sing praises to its depraved principles and to pay tribute to its barbaric aim of world conquest.

On the eve of this infamous spectacle, the Veterans of Foreign Wars in my home State of Georgia observed Loyalty Day. Annually the Veterans of Foreign Wars stage these patriotic ceremonies as a brief reminder of the matchless blessings enjoyed by everyone in our land of freedom and liberty.

There are many fine patriotic celebrations each year in our country, but only VFW Loyalty Day is dedicated specifically to the reaffirmation of faith and belief in our Flag and to the Constitution.

VFW Loyalty Day was conceived in a fighting spirit. It was originated as a weapon to combat the sinister effects of Communist-celebrated May Day and to arm our citizens against the penetration of Communist propaganda.

In Georgia, VFW Loyalty Day was directed by State Commander Randolph Medlock of Stone Mountain and State Loyalty Day Chairman Charles A. Moran of Atlanta. Under the inspirational leadership of these two patriotic Americans, many fine programs were sponsored by VFW posts throughout the State.

At the VFW Georgia Department encampment last month, Chairman Moran summed up Loyalty Day with these words: "Loyalty Day contributes to a great campaign of truth by informing our people and urging them to rekindle that flame of love for God and country which awakens them from apathy and indifference."

The world was slow to recognize the menace of communism. Freedom-loving people of every nation for many years were unprepared to believe the horrors which communism held for the millions living under its scorn. With the high sense of morality associated with Christianity, we could not conceive of the criminal character and the pagan conscience of this heathen philosophy.

At last the world has come to recognize the evils inherent in this ungodly ideology which enslaves the mind and molds the body as serfs of the all-powerful state.

The observance of Loyalty Day stands like a sentry over our freedom and reminds us that our heritage, like all things precious, must be eternally defended.

It was an honor for me to serve as honorary vice chairman of the Georgia Loyalty Day Committee. The Veterans of Foreign Wars have made, and are continuing to make, real and significant contributions to the vital cause of loyalty through the annual observance of Loyalty Day.

A Fair Deal for the Small-Family Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a disappointment to me that this Congress did not bring about a happier solution to the serious farm problem. It is tragic that politics entered into our deliberations.

It is too bad that the Senate delayed until a political year to approach the problem. The House approached it in 1955, a nonpolitical year. If the Senate had followed suit, I believe we could have accomplished more.

I want the record to show that politics never entered my mind in legislating for the farmer. If a bill was good for the small-family farmer, I did not care whether it was a Democratic or a Republican bill. If it was good for the small-family farmer, it got my support and vote.

If a bill was bad for the small-family farmer, I did not care whether it was a Republican or Democratic bill—I worked against it and voted against it. The farm problem is not a political problem with me. It is a serious national problem, and politics should be omitted.

In all my years here I am proud of the fact that I never played politics with the farmers misery. Whether it was Democratic or Republican did not enter my thinking. What effect it would have on the farmers' welfare was my only consideration.

I know from what is going on that the farmers' problems are not going to be solved by politics. The Democratic South in control under Democrats never did give the dairy farmer much of a break. They gave as little as possible—and just enough to get their program through. Their concern is oleo—not dairying.

The Eastern Republicans believe in subsidies for everyone but the farmer. The combination of these two is responsible for the breakdown of dairy farm legislation. For any farmer to blindly follow party is defeating his own cause. The farmer should vote for men—not politics. It's the type of men you send to Congress, and not the party in control, that is going to solve the farm problem.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS FOOD PRODUCTS

I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill, away back in 1945, to set up a plan of disposition of surplus dairy and other food products. That was when the war ended. That was the time to solve the surplus problem. It was folly to wait until the surplus ran out of our ears.

This bill set up a plan for the school-lunch program, school-milk program, food for the aged, the disabled, the veterans, and needy countries of the world.

Progress on this bill has been slow, but little by little it is being adopted. For instance, last year Wisconsin got the following from the Federal Government:

School-lunch program: In 1,696 schools with 157,704 children participating (22 percent of 717,836 schoolchildren—Federal funds allocated to Wisconsin were $1,375,046. Most meals served were complete lunches; children pay part.

School-milk program: In 2,468 schools; Federal expenditure in Wisconsin was $968,000 last year.

Direct distribution program: Foods donated to schoolchildren and needy persons in institutions and family units totaled 3,760,000 pounds at a cost of $1,545,000 in Wisconsin last year.

Foreign nations: The amount of food the Federal Government disposed of to needy people in other nations amounted to over a billion dollars last year.

As a result of my efforts and the efforts of others like me, the school-lunch program, the school-milk program, the food to the needy in our Nation and the foreign-aid food program will be greatly increased in the coming year.

Slow but sure, the bill I introduced away back in 1945 is being adopted. If this bill had been adopted in 1945, the surplus-food problem would not be with us today.

SOCIAL SECURITY

When I addressed the farmers at hundreds of meetings 2 years ago, I told them that I introduced bills to reduce the social-security eligibility age for women to 62 years, and to pay social security to the disabled, regardless of age.

I am happy to report that progress has been made on these bills. The bill to reduce the eligibility age for women to 62 passed both Houses. The disabled will be able to draw social security at age 50, in a bill passed by both Houses.

It may interest you to know that I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill—in 1943—to make farmers eligible for coverage under the social-security program. What a break the farmers would have gotten if the bill had been adopted in 1943, when I first introduced it so that the farm income during war years could have been used as a basis for social-security payments.

WHY I SUPPORT 90 PERCENT OF PARITY FOR DAIRY FARMERS

I have always supported 90 percent of parity for dairy farmers because I believe that the way to reduce production is to guarantee a dairy farmer a good income. A dairy farmer's costs are fixed. He has expenses that are inescapable. If he cannot pay his bills with 20 milk cows he will milk 25 or 30.

If he wants to stay in business his income will determine how many cows he will milk. Lowering his income below 90 percent of parity will force him to milk more cows to get the needed income. That is the mistake in Benson's thinking.

This is why I felt it was a mistake to drop 90 percent of parity for dairying. This is why I introduced an amendment to keep 90 percent of parity for dairy products. But the Democrats of the South and Benson supporters licked my amendment. Notice it was a combination of southern Democrats and Benson supporters who defeated it.

WHY I SUPPORTED 90 PERCENT OF PARITY INSTEAD OF THE SOIL-BANK PROGRAM

The soil-bank program will not noticeably help the Wisconsin dairy farmer. It is a shame that this $1,200,000,000 expenditure will not noticeably help Wisconsin. Wisconsin dairy farmers cannot afford to take land out of production. To pasture and feed the increased number of cows they must milk to make ends meet, they cannot qualify for any real part of the $1,200,000,000 program.

The soil-bank program will enrich the large corporation farms that have thousands of acres. It will not help small Wisconsin dairy farmers. While Wisconsin farmers will get pennies, the large corporation farms will get thousands of dollars.

The 90-percent parity program would help all Wisconsin dairy farms—and particularly the small family farms. And the 90-percent parity program would cost the taxpayers less than the $1,200,000,000 soil-bank program.

That is why I voted for the 90-percent parity program. A good soil conservation program with 90 percent of parity on limited production is the best answer to the problems of the small family farmer. As it now stands, the small family farmer is still in desperate circumstances. The farmer who needs help the cost gets the least.

YOU HELP THE NATION WHEN YOU HELP THE DAIRY FARMER

Dairying accounts for more farm income than any other farm crop. In 1954, total dairy income was $5½ billion. In the same year, income from wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts altogether was only $7½ billion. Every crop is important, but only dairying is a crop in every State in the Union.

Since dairy farmers are everywhere, we help the whole Nation and every State in the Union when we help the dairy farmer. This cannot be said for any other farm crop. We would do the whole Nation a great service if we consider the welfare of dairying first above any other crop.

No farm crop deserves to be considered basic before dairying. What affects dairying affects the Nation. Yet the southern Democrats and eastern Republicans never permitted dairying to be classed as a basic industry. The most extensive farm industry is cast aside for peanuts and rice. It would be a great Congress except for southern Democrats and eastern Republicans.

MY ATTENDANCE RECORD

Largely because of the lack of balance between city and farm income, I saw to it that I was present each day Congress met in the past session. It is difficult to achieve, but the record shows I did not miss a single day that Congress was in session.

I was hopeful that more could be done to up farm income to balance it with city income. I am recorded as voting on every bill on which there was a rollcall. Every vote I cast was always on the side of the small family farmer. Never did I vote against him.

To answer all the mail and other things a Congressman must do, it is difficult to have a perfect attendance record in Congress. Yet, I did accomplish just that. For the farmers interests I did all humanly possible. There just weren't enough of us here. I repeat it is not party but men who will solve the farm problem.

The Civil Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Winchester Evening Star of Monday, July 23, 1956, entitled "A Way to Destroy Constitutional Government."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WAY TO DESTROY CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

It will be a dark day in American history if Attorney General Brownell is able to force down the throats of the Congress his so-called civil rights bill. As the Washington Evening Star points out, "its words mean, or court mean, so many different things" that while the Attorney General wrote the bill "maybe Alice, or Humpty Dumpty, had a hand in it."

The fight being waged against it in the Congress is bearing fruit at least it is exposing its great dangers.

Congressman TUCK says the bill will "throttle, hamper and restrict the States and localities in the orderly administration of their affairs * * *. The proposed Commission would have the power to investigate manifold allegations in areas where the Federal Government has no authority, constitutional or otherwise, and the proposed legislation grants to a Commission not chosen by nor responsible to the electorate, powers of such magnitude as to shock the sensibilities of the citizenry.

"A politically-minded Attorney General, armed with power which the bill expressly confers, could invade the States and localities upon the flimsiest allegations and without any supporting evidence * * * Under these procedures citizens would be deprived of the basic right to trial by jury.

"The broad language would open the entire field of State elections to unlimited Federal intervention * * * and the rights of the States and localities would be subverted to the authority of an unnamed Assistant Attorney General who would be supreme."

Winchester's Congressman HARRISON says about the bill: "Any State or local official, any businessman—in fact, any citizen—could be hauled before this Commission, under threat of a prison term for contempt, and required to answer the allegations of any troublemaker that he had been subjected to unwarranted economic pressures—whatever they are—because of color, race, religion, or national origin. And, believe it or not, the person claiming he was being discriminated against would be assigned a Government lawyer, free of charge."

The chairman of the House Judiciary Committee (Mr. CELLER, of New York) who is leading the fight for the bill admitted last week that it would permit charges to be brought in Federal court against any member of a State legislature who voted for an interposition resolution on the school integration issue. In other words, the Attorney General would be looking over the shoulder of legislators in the 48 States. He could haul a legislator into a Federal court if the legislator voted contrary to what the Attorney General thought was in the best interests of civil rights. (This is not just our view, it is admitted by the chief sponsor.)

Further, section 3 of the bill says the Attorney General may bring action against any person or groups of persons "whenever any persons have engaged or are about to engage in any acts or practices" outlawed by the bill. In other words, the Attorney General would be given the right to read a person's mind to see whether he is "about to engage." In answer to a question, the chief sponsor replied: "Well, it is broad in the sense that the Attorney General will use his discretion whether he would or would not proceed. But it gives him pretty wide power."

To us the so-called civil rights bill is so fantastic as to be unbelievable. And the more one digs into it, the more vicious it appears. This is becoming apparent even to advocates.

For example, Thursday, Republican Congressman WILLIAM E. MILLER, of New York, told a startled House:

"As one of the sponsors of this legislation and as one who voted for it in the Judiciary Committee, I say in utter sincerity that after a further analysis I feel it would destroy more civil liberties and civil rights than it will ever protect."

The proposed Commission, he said, could subpena anyone "who ever had a conservative thought. The Attorney General would have unlimited powers and States rights could be destroyed." We repeat that this statement was made by one of the sponsors of the legislation who, "after further analysis," declared it too dangerous to enact.

Why was such a bill proposed? Congressman TUCK gives the answer:

"It constitutes a brazen and unbridled attempt on the part of the superhierarchy in both of our national political parties to attract and hold minority groups in pivotal States in order to control elections."

Is this the biased view of a Democrat? Well, let's listen to the words of the Republican leader of the House of Representatives, Congressman MARTIN, of Massachusetts. Commenting Thursday on Congressman MILLER'S denunciation of the bill, Mr. MARTIN told the House that the Miller speech "has put us (Republicans) where the ultimate consequences could be great indeed in the coming elections. The one people who will be blamed for the defeat of this bill, if it is defeated, will be the Republican Party."

Not one word did the Republican leader say about the merits (or lack of merits) of the bill. Not one word did he utter in reply to charges made against the bill by his Republican colleague, Mr. MILLER. Not one moment did he allot to defending the proposal. His whole plea was that the Republicans "will be blamed for the defeat of this bill."

What he was saying, and what his colleagues fully understood was that the purpose of the bill is to corral the Negro vote in pivotal States like New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Michigan, Ohio, and Massachusetts. National Democratic leaders are supporting the bill for the same reason. Each is vying with the other for the minority vote.

We feel this is a sad day for America. This is how constitutional liberties are destroyed: Not by intent but from expediency.

Colgate Answers the Plight of the Private College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, certainly it is not necessary for me to remind this body of the series of crises facing private higher education in our country today. A combination of rising costs and reduced purchasing power is each year placing our independent colleges in an increasingly difficult position.

I do, however, rise to tell you with great pride what one institution, Colgate University, in Hamilton, N. Y.—my own alma mater—is doing through the efforts of its alumni and friends to solve its problems. Perhaps the example of Colgate will prompt and assist others to do likewise.

Colgate University has always been seriously undercapitalized, both in endowment funds—income from which helps to defray the 40 percent more it costs to educate a student that he pays in tuition—and in available sources for important improvement and replacement of its physical plant. Never the recipient of State, National, or other public funds, or of large gifts from individual philanthropists, Colgate has had to make its own way financially. That it has built itself into a vital national institution while developing and maintaining the highest academic standards, is a tribute to those who have believed in the college, and have worked hard for it.

To meet today's problems, Colgate first took careful stock of all of its needs and resources, particularly in relation to the position it is determined to play in the future of American higher education. Then it listed those needs on a priority basis and made long-range plans to satisfy them.

For the most pressing of these, it planned a campaign among alumni, parents of students, and friends, to raise $3,300,000 in capital funds. This was to be used for the endowment of faculty salaries—in the light of all that has been written, I need hardly remind you of the desperate need that exists here if our colleges are to maintain their high standards of classroom teaching—for a new library to house its excellent collection of books and pamphlets, including the printed material issued by our own Government; and for the William A. Reid Athletic Center, honoring the great leader and a great friend of all Colgate men.

Colgate turns to alumni, parents, and friends, for these funds because the officers and trustees of Colgate University believe strongly that they cannot ask others for help unless they have done everything possible to help themselves.

They also believe that every man has three great duties to be recognized when he apportions his philanthropic dollar—duty to church, duty to charity, and duty to education.

Furthermore, the university has enlisted the loyal support of its alumni in conducting the campaign. In each of the larger centers where Colgate men live, an alumni chairman has organized captains and workers—matched by a similar organization among parents, who have been most generous and faithful in supporting their adopted college—who are calling on other alumni to obtain gifts.

Today, the campaign has passed the halfway mark, with more than $1,800,000 subscribed; it is this fall entering its second phase. This is focused on the week of September 24—September 29, designated as Homecoming Week, and lying between Founders' Day, set aside annually to honor the 13 men who founded the university in 1819; and Homecoming, when Colgate meets its traditional rival, Cornell, in football on its homefield. This game, I might add, will be televised over NBC stations, and will be seen here in Washington as well as in New England and the Middle Atlantic States.

During this week, workers will call on every alumnus in their areas who has not subscribed to the fund and give them an opportunity to send in their pledges. This will also hold true for parents. Those who live in scattered areas where there can be no such organization will receive a mail appeal, enclosing a pledge card and asking them to make sure that their gifts are included in the total which will be announced during the Homecoming celebration. This total, I know, will be an impressive one.

This, as I said, is what one American college is doing to meet the serious situation which confronts higher education. Because of the nature of the campaign—its reliance on alumni, parents, and friends for gifts and for the organization conducting the appeal—it might well be termed "Operation Bootstrap."

Certainly it is most commendable for such an institution to insist on finding its own way out of its financial difficulties. I am sure you will agree with me that Colgate has set a fine example. She scorns to palm the public purse and true to her rich heritage remains proud, independent, self-reliant and, above all, reverent. I am proud of Colgate University.

Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in extending a tribute to SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER. SHEP, as he is known to those of us who have been associated most intimately with him, entered the Congress at the same time that I did. As always is the case, Members become much better acquainted and more closely associated with their own class.

SHEPARD CRUMPACKER comes from a long line of legal talent. His family has made its name known throughout the State of Indiana for keen understanding of law and the principles of justice, equality, and freedom. All of these principles were exemplified in SHEPARD CRUMPACKER during his three terms in the House of Representatives.

I feel confident that the Third Indiana District will miss his excellent services. All Members who will be privileged to return likewise will miss him because of his friendliness, his understanding, and studious application to the work to which he was assigned.

I join his many friends in wishing all good things to him and his family. My prayer is that he will be able to continue to serve his community and his fellow man in the same able and capable manner that he served his Nation during the years that he represented the Third Indiana District in the Congress.

Post Office Department Will Shortly Announce a New 3-Cent Stamp To Be Issued in Honor of Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that the Post Office Department will shortly announce a new 3-cent stamp to be issued in honor of Labor Day and as a tribute to the cause of labor and the workers of the Nation.

It is also gratifying to learn that the city of Camden, N. J., will be made the place for the first issue of such stamp on Labor Day, September 3, 1956.

In my endeavor to have such a stamp issued and the city of Camden, N. J., selected as the place of first issue, in conjunction with the several labor organizations of Camden and elsewhere interested in the matter, I have urged that it would be most appropriate in the issuance of such stamp to have Camden, N. J., selected for the honor of having the first issuance because of the fact that the founder of Labor Day was the honored and distinguished labor leader, Peter J. McGuire, of Camden, N. J.

In my endeavor to have such a stamp issued and Camden, N. J., selected as the place of first issue, I have had the helpful support of Morris C. Rothblum, Courier Post stamp editor and a member of the Camden Typographical Union, No. 132, and Louis W. Tomafsky, Joseph H. Johnson, also members of the Courier Post staff, and like Mr. Rothblum, members of local 132.

These gentlemen with Walker Gill prepared a resolution that was presented to and adopted by the Union Printers League of New Jersey on February 23, 1956, reading in part as follows:

Whereas Peter J. McGuire, a member of the carpenters' union and the founder of Labor Day, was a resident of the city of Camden, N. J., and his remarks are interred here; and

Whereas Peter J. McGuire was a tireless worker in behalf of the labor movement: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Union Printers League of New Jersey * * * go on record requesting that the stamp issued commemorate Peter J. McGuire and that the city of Camden, N. J., be designated as the first-day sale office.

Furthermore, it seems appropriate that in this connection there be made a part of these remarks a sketch of a historical character relating to the establishment of Labor Day as a national holiand, and, also of each of the 48 States by separate legislative enactments.

Although there has been come controversy in the past as to whether the Knights of Labor in New York City or the New York City Central Labor Union originated Labor Day, it has been confirmed through investigation that the Knights of Labor had nothing to do officially with the declaration of such a holiday. The idea of a day to be set apart for labor was first made public by a resolution offered at a meeting of the Central Labor Union held on May 8, 1882, by Peter J. McGuire, at that time the general secretary of the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, and later the vice president of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. McGuire suggested that the first Monday in September be made the day for paying public tribute to American industry, "as it would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, and would fill a wide gap in the chronology of legal holidays."

The resolution was passed and a committee was appointed to prepare for the celebration. However, the first Labor Day observance was held not on the first Monday, but on Tuesday, September 5, 1882. About 10,000 union members marched up Broadway, after which they and their families and friends spent the rest of the day on the picnic grounds in Elm Park, where all sorts of amusements were provided. From a platform which has been erected on the grounds, the crowds were addressed by numerous labor leaders from 2:30 in the afternoon until nightfall. This first celebration was a great success and led to the establishment of the annual observance of Labor Day by which the American people, in the words of Mr. McGuire, "honor the toilers of the earth, and pay homage to those who from rude nature have delved and carved all the comfort and grandeur we behold."

The second Labor Day was celebrated Wednesday, September 5, 1883, and the parade on that occasion was reported as an imposing demonstration of the Central Labor Union. In 1884 it was decided by the Central Labor Union to hold the celebration on the first Monday in September, which was the first of the month, and central labor bodies in other cities were urged to celebrate that day as a universal holiday for workingmen.

On October 7, 1884, a resolution was unanimously adopted by the American

Federation of Labor convention to the effect that "the first Monday in September of each year be set apart as a laborers' national holiday, and we recommend its observance by all wage workers, irrespective of sex, calling, or nationality."

During the next few years Labor Day became officially recognized in scattered localities through municipal ordinances. State legislative recognition was developed as a result of a campaign conducted by organized labor, and, by the end of 1893, 23 States had enacted Labor Day laws. Oregon was the first State to pass such legislation by the enactment of a law in 1887 designating the first Saturday in June as Labor Day. This act was amended in 1893 to conform to the general plan of observing the first Monday in September as Labor Day, which by that time was widely accepted.

The increasing interest in setting aside a day for honoring the workers of America, and the efforts of the American Federation of Labor to get national recognition for such a day, resulted in the passage of a bill, known as the Kyle bill, by the Congress of the United States which made Labor Day a legal holiday for public employees. The bill was passed with very little discussion; the only objection raised was that for the sake of symmetry in national holidays, Labor Day should be fixed for the first day of September instead of the first Monday. However, since the holiday was being created by Congress, and not by an event, it was thought better to make it the first Monday to conform to the prevailing practice.

On June 28, 1894, President Cleveland signed the act and it became law. It reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first Monday in September of each year, being the day known and celebrated as labor's holiday, is hereby made a legal public holiday, to all intents and purposes, in the same manner as Christmas, the 1st day of January, the 22d of February, the 30th of May and the 4th day of July are now by law made public holidays.

The recognition thus accorded Labor Day by the action of the Congress and the Executive added to the significance of the movement and the prestige of the holiday. The act was acclaimed as establishing Labor Day as a national holiday, although it actually applied only to Federal employees.

By 1900 Labor Day had been officially recognized by most of the States, but it was not until February, 1923, that the 48th State, Wyoming, fell into line. Most of the States in their original acts set the first Monday in September as the holiday. In Wisconsin and Wyoming, Labor Day is set by the governors, but in practice, of course, they designate the first Monday in September for the observance. Thus, Labor Day is now established both as a National and State holiday in all of our States.

The issuance of a post stamp to commemorate Labor Day and its founder, Peter J. McGuire, is most appropriate. It is appropriate that on each succeeding Labor Day, exercises are held in Arlington Cemetery, located near the city of Camden, N. J., to honor Peter J. McGuire, known as the Father of Labor Day, who was buried there in 1906, the year he passed on into the Great Beyond.

Mr. McGuire was born in Dublin, Ireland, in 1852. At an early age he came to this country. He identified himself with trade-union activities, and eventually became general secretary of the Carpenters and Joiners International Union. In his effort to achieve recognition of labor's rights, he advocated the setting aside of a fixed day each year to be known as Labor Day. The day to be observed as a national holiday in tribute to labor and the workingman.

The tribute that is yearly paid to this great man is well deserved. We consider it an honor that he made his home in our city of Camden. He died in our city a poor but respected man. Though poor in earthly goods, he was rich in the honor and respect of hi fellow man. His memory has continued through all the years that have intervened as a wholesome influence. His allegiance to the cause of labor is even yet an inspiration to all who believe in the dignity and importance of labor and the rights of workers.

There can be no higher compliment paid to this great man than for each to seek to emulate his character, his high regard for principle, is unswerving belief in the rights of man and his loyalty to America.

The issuance of a stamp in his honor and as a tribute to Labor is highly appropriate.

World Communism and Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, recent months have seen farflung and well-publicized efforts of the part of the U. S. S. R. to extend her influence throughout the world on the diplomatic and economic fronts. These efforts have not overlooked Latin America.

The Communists have added fuel to the Middle Eastern caldron by supplying important military assistance to Egypt, hoping to undermine the Anglo-American position in key Arab countries and to bring those countries under their own sphere of influence. Increasing emphasis in Asia on the part of the Soviets has been highlighted by the wandering tourists—Khrushchev and Bulganin—in India and Burma, well documented in the world press. New attention to Africa is notable in, among other things, economic overtures to Liberia and propaganda support of the Mau Mau terrorists in Kenya.

Meanwhile, as Russian armaments reach new heights, the peace offensive in the Western World is renewed by Premier Bulganin, seeking to recapture the shattered Geneva spirit. Although Bulganin's letter to President Eisenhower requesting an American-Soviet treaty of friendship has been firmly turned down by the President in a note of reasonable moderation, the Soviet Premier's overtures, renewed in a second letter to the President, remain a kingpin in Communist peace propaganda.

I

Soviet desires to give this peace offensive the appearance of universality have naturally led to the inclusion of the Latin American Republics in its scope, although this phase of the overall effort seems to have been somewhat overlooked by Western commentators. The public kickoff for the Latin American offensive took place on January 16 in a Moscow press conference conveying the written answers of Premier Bulganin to a series of questions put by the New York-published Spanish-language magazine, Vision. Premier Bulganin extended the prospect of full diplomatic relations with all the Latin American Republics and dangled the bait of extensive foreign-trade possibilities between the Soviet Union and Latin America.

In offering diplomatic relations to those Latin American countries with which such relations do not presently exist, Premier Bulganin promised certain benefits which he said had been obtained from uninterrupted diplomatic relations with Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay. These benefits were alleged to include cooperation between those three states and the U. S. S. R. for maintaining and strengthening peace, and the stimulation of economic, cultural, and other relations. As an attraction to Latin American States not maintaining diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R., Premier Bulganin ascribed to the existence of such relations between the U. S. S. R. and Argentina "the reason for the substantial increase in trade" between those two states.

In the economic sphere, the Premier assured Latin America that "the U. S. S. R. would be able to export to the Latin American countries various types of industrial equipment and machinery, including equipment for the petroleum industry, complete production equipment, complete sets, and all types of machine tools, automobiles, and agricultural machinery." The offer of technical personnel was extended, with the U. S. S. R. eager to share her experience in the field of industry, electrical energy, construction, transportation, and agriculture. Other items were offered by the U. S. S. R.: wood products, cellulose, and paper goods; petroleum and petroleum derivatives; sheet metal; cement; asbestos; dyes; chemical, and other products.

In exchange, the U. S. S. R. would "be able to import from Latin America agricultural products, livestock, and mining products."

These Kremlin overtures to the Central and South American Republics suggest the need for an appraisal of the major roles of the Soviet Union and her satellites among those Republics at the present time. Only from such an examination can there be projected a sober evaluation of potentialities inherent in that phase of the "peace offensive" aimed at Latin America.

II

Any effort to measure the degree and kind of Communist activity in a given area runs immediately into the fact that the tactics of international communism make it extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible, totally to dissect "direct" operations of the Soviet Union or her satellites in the official sense from those operations which are carried on by local Communist parties or front organizations. The efforts of each type are commonly the product of a centrally defined and directed "line," dedicated to the single purpose of the fulfillment of the designs of the Soviet Union.

Thus, wherever international communism functions, its operations in propaganda, in economic and cultural fields, as well as in more sinisterly subversive areas, are all a part of a common scheme. These operations are carried on by a variety of organizations, official and unofficial, which may give the appearance of separateness. But official agencies of Communist bloc governments and unofficial local Communist parties and "front" organizations are meshing parts of a machine functioning for the same purpose.

A general demonstration of this theme is provided by the attached chart of major types of Communist activity in the Latin American Republics. By and large, where one kind of activity exists, other types likewise exist. Note, for example, that in Argentina, there are virtually complete Communist bloc diplomatic representation, an active local Communist Party, trade agreements with six Communist states, a large number of "friendship societies," and front organization activity. With respect to the other Republics, it is generally true that if one form of Communist activity exists, there is at the same time one or more other sort of operation.

Latin American Republics	Communist bloc diplomatic missions						Communist bloc trade agreements (N=negotiating)						Number of Communist bloc supported "friendship societies"	Local Communist Party legal	Abstained from or repudiated Caracas anti-Communist Party resolution	Local Communist Party numbers (where available); total party membership for Latin American estimated 250,000
	U.S.S.R.	Czechoslovakia	Poland	Hungary	Rumania	Bulgaria	U.S.S.R.	Czechoslovakia	Poland	Hungary	Rumania	East Germany				
Argentina	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	13	X	X	30,000 (Communist Party claim).
Bolivia		X											1			
Brazil		X	X					X	X	X		X	1			100,000 (Communist Party claim).
Chile								N	N			N	7		X	
Colombia												X	0	X		Activities banned though party "legal," 5,000.
Costa Rica													0		X	
Cuba													0			
Dominican Republic													0			
Ecuador		X											0	X		
El Salvador													0			
Guatemala													0			
Haiti													0			
Honduras													0			
Mexico	X	X	X					X					6	X	X	
Nicaragua													0			
Panama													0			
Paraguay								X	X	X			0			
Peru													0			
Uruguay	X	X					X	X	X	X	X	X	2	X	X	
Venezuela													0			

What is being suggested here is not that any one Latin American Republic is about to become Communist dominated but that there is a clear pattern for the mode of Communist penetration. Further, that pattern is the result of a combination of activities on the part of official representatives of Communist states and at the same time of local parties and front organizations.

However, it should not be assumed that an easy response to the Communist threat lies in the simple denial, for example, of diplomatic relations, or in the banning of a local Communist Party. The whole apparatus of penetration is geared to the exploitation of national problems in the Latin American Republics and seeks to manipulate those problems in such a fashion as to gain local support for some phase of Russian policy. The very real economic problems of the underdeveloped Latin American states, with their domestic and international implications, offer a fertile field for Soviet-directed activity. Historical fears of the "Colossus of the North" can be reawakened, and new feelings of national consciousness on the part of the Latin American states can be turned to the benefit of the Soviet Union.

A sensible appraisal, then, of Communist activities in Latin America must include an understanding of the tactics of penetration, but must never lose sight of the underlying problems which supply opportunity to the Communists. Efforts to combat such Communist works simply by countering or blocking them on the tactical level offer no permanent solutions.

III

The ground which the U. S. S. R. must cover to make any headway in the diplomatic field is sharply delineated by the limited number of Latin American countries in which the U. S. S. R. and Communist bloc states now maintain diplomatic missions. The U. S. S. R. itself now maintains such missions in only three Latin American countries: Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay. Five other Communist bloc nations are represented by 12 diplomatic missions in 6 Latin American Republics: Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay, plus Bolivia, Brazil, and Ecuador. Czechoslovakia is responsible for 6 of these 12 satellite missions, Poland for 3 of them, with Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria supplying 1 each. In short, neither the Soviet Union nor her satellite states are represented in 14 Latin American Republics by diplomatic missions.

Further in the way of obstacles to a successful diplomatic offensive, the 20 Latin American Republics are associated with the United States in the Organization of American States, a regional grouping for the betterment and the security of the Western Hemisphere. Within this organization, mutual understanding and respect among the 21 American Republics develops as the representatives of each of the republics work jointly in economic affairs, defense questions, health problems, and other activities of common concern. Backstopping hemisphere security is the Rio pact which clearly warns that any attack on an American state will be considered an attack on all the Americas. Beyond that, 16 of the 21 American Republics have given positive support to the Caracas resolution of March 1954, which puts domination by international communism of the political institution of any American state in the same category as military attack upon any state as "a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America." The pattern, then, for a strong bulwark against the blandishments of communism exists; the degree to which this pattern is filled with actions based on mutual decision and common needs will determine its continuous effectiveness.

Similarly, it is impossible to ignore, in considering the impact of the new Soviet overtures, that the U. S. S. R. and international communism received a major setback in the Western Hemisphere when the openly pro-Communist Arbenz regime in Guatemala was overthrown by

the present anti-Communist Castillo Armas government in early summer, 1954.

The limited degree of Soviet and satellite diplomatic relations in Latin America has been noted. It should further be noted that local Communist Parties are outlawed in 15 of the Latin American Republics. The widespread degree of the outlawry of the Communist Party poses, of course, an additional difficulty in any efforts of the Communist bloc to gain diplomatic representation or recognition.

However, although the Communist Party of Brazil has been illegal since 1947, it remains in existence as the presumed largest Communist Party in South America. In other republics, driving the Communist Party as such underground has resulted in Communist efforts to infiltrate existing legal political parties or to form new parties under new labels. For example, Communist Party support was probably accorded the winning Kubitschek-Goulart ticket in the recent Brazilian presidential election. Local Communist Party desires for respectability and legality in their respective states leads them, among other things, to press for Soviet and satellite diplomatic representation and recognition. Local pressures for recognition of the U. S. S. R. seem strongest in Brazil and Chile.

Currently it is reported that no directly specific Soviet efforts to expand diplomatic representation in countries beyond the three republics wherein such missions are maintained are observable. Some overtures to Ecuador may have been made during a recent tourist visit to that country of the U. S. S. R. Ambassador to Mexico. Most analyses, however, of the Bulganin diplomatic overtures seem to suggest that the U. S. S. R. was seeking to inspire initiative for recognition from the Latin American States themselves. Note Bulganin's strong emphasis that Argentina had profited heavily from increased economic relations with the Soviet Union as one of the results of Argentine-Soviet diplomatic intercourse. The effort to inspire Latin American requests for diplomatic relations is hardly a subtle one.

IV

Beyond the normal diplomatic and commercial activities of recognized embassies, Soviet and satellite missions are the centers of other types of activity—a rule to which Latin America is no exception. The totalitarian Soviet Union does not hesitate to use all its instrumentalities for the pursuit of a total foreign policy, regardless of the inhibitions of regular diplomatic usage. Revelations made, for random examples, from the Canadian spy inquiry and the more recent ones in Australia have certainly made clear the fact that the Soviet Union considers direction of basic espionage a regular activity of their diplomatic missions. The degree to which such activities take place is not a matter, however, of thorough public documentation; and the degree of success of such activities varies with the level of security service scrutiny on the part of the nation wherein a given Soviet embassy lies. It should be noted that the numbers of personnel at Soviet and satellite missions in Latin America, particularly military attachés, are reported to have been increased in recent months.

In the pursuance of a total foreign policy, Soviet missions likewise may operate as communication links between local Communist parties and the Kremlin, from which new directives as to the currently correct party line may emerge. One of the sources of tactical as well as strategical coordination of local Communist Party and front activities with the overall purposes of the U. S. S. R. is frequently a Soviet or satellite embassy.

V

Currently the Communists have stepped up in Latin America all phases of their propaganda offensive. These propaganda efforts in Latin America are noteworthy in their strategy because they reflect the effort to apply a "new" line in an area where communism has been basically weak and in an area where at the same time a terrific economic potential remains essentially undeveloped. Indeed, the Communist strategy in Latin America is worth studying not only for its impact on Latin America but also as an example of how the Communists hope to woo the so-called underdeveloped areas. Much of this approach parallels the Communists' effort in China, for which reason alone its impact should not be underestimated.

The "line" in Latin America does not at the present time take the form of an outright bid for political power for Communist parties as the Latin American phase of world revolution and domination. Rather, the Communists present themselves in the South American Republics as truly concerned with the national interest of each Republic, as truly "patriots" interested in forming broad coalitions against "foreign" imperialistic domination. Thus the Communists' attempt to capitalize on two existing facts of political life in Latin America: Strongly awakened nationalism and the not so latent historical antipathy to the Colossus of the North. The United States is presented as aggressively dominating the Latin American area, ecomically, politically, culturally, militarily, to the detriment of the rightful aspirations and normal development of the Republics of that area. The Communists then hope for the creation in the politics of the Latin American States of broad coalitions of political power, nationalistic in nature, anti-United States, and sympathetic to the Soviet Union.

For the current period, then, communism is seeking to move closer to political domination in Latin America through a kind of "back door," wherein its naked desires for control are cloaked in the guise of nationalism and economic well-being. As a consequence of the effort to build up "National Democratic Front" governments, the Communists are willing to work through political groups and economic classes which they once publicly denounced. Current propaganda in Latin America does not avow the revolution of the proletariat and the overthrow of the existing economic order. Rather, the Communists emphasize the "common interests" of workers, of the middle class, of intellectuals, of those capitalists who have not "sold out to Yankee imperialism," of small farmers, and so forth. These "common interests" which cross traditional class lines are portrayed as involving at root the combating of the American domination which is held to be the cause of economic illness and instability in Latin America.

The efforts to create this kind of "National Democratic Front" have involved some interesting switches in Communist tactics. In Brazil, the Communist Party supported a presidential candidate it had previously denounced. In Argentina, the Communists are avidly courting the support of those elements of organized labor which had been the main reliance of ex-dictator Perón. Indeed, the new line has seen quite a few groups and persons formerly called Fascist become favorites of Communist propaganda efforts.

VI

This strategy of capitalizing on nationalism, anti-Americanism, and economic instability is carried on tactically in a variety of ways. Front organizations carry on many of the overt activities of the Communists in Latin America. Various movements for peace are active in the Communist campaign in Latin America, particularly in Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. The themes stated above are angled in the peace movements to demonstrate the warlike intentions of the United States for world domination. The United States is portrayed as the aggressor in the pursuit of its own imperialistic economic interests, interests described of course, as directly contrary to the best development of the national economies of Latin America. Efforts are constantly underway to increase the degree of Communist penetration of labor unions and the amount of Communist support in organizations of farm workers and intellectuals.

Thirty binational centers, maintaining close ties with the Soviet and satellite diplomatic missions in the area, are focal points for general propaganda. These hyphenated national societies, Argentine-U. S. S. R. Cultural Relations Institute—IRCAU—for example, are maintained in six Latin American republics, with their distribution indicated on the chart attached to this paper. The centers promote cultural exchange, display Communist films, translate and distribute Communist publications, and serve as the transmission point for speeches advancing the "National Democratic Front" idea. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five was a year of tremendous expansion of such activities in Argentina, with 500 representatives of Argentine official and cultural circles attending the inaugural ceremonies of new offices of the IRCAU in Buenos Aires. Then President Perón was represented by a personal telegram of good wishes for the success of the institute.

Various types of published material are used as vehicles for Communist propaganda. Spanish translations of Soviet books are available in large numbers in Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, and other Latin American countries; it is reported that the U. S. S. R. Spanish translation program was up to 63 titles last year,

compared to 28 in 1953. Various foreign published Communist journals circulate in Latin America, carrying over recent months far more material aimed at that area. In 1955 25 articles in the Cominform Journal were devoted to Brazil alone. Additional types of propaganda pamphlets and booklets in a variety of languages were distributed in great numbers, including some aimed at children. Soviet and satellite films are used as a major part of the propaganda effort.

Local Communist sources maintain around 80 newspapers and magazines in Latin America, with a particularly significant emphasis and success in Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, and Argentina.

Although little headway has been made in local radio and TV in Latin America by the Communist propagandists, Soviet and satellite radio aims over 50 hours per week of broadcasting to the area, an increase during the last year of around 167 percent. It should be noted, comparatively, that USIA beams around 12 hours of broadcasting to Latin America per week from the United States.

The exchange of cultural, sports, and economic delegations is another major area of Soviet propaganda activity. From such exchanges and sponsored visits, the Soviet hope to reap the reward of sympathetic travelogues and articles written by those returning from behind the Iron Curtain. A limited success has been achieved.

VII

The trade policy of the U. S. S. R. and her satellites springs from a rigidly planned and controlled economy. Soviet foreign trade does not result from the interdependence of the Soviet economy with the economies of the free world. The primary purpose of foreign trade for the Soviet Union may reasonably be assumed to be that of serving as a complementary and important phase of the overall world political purposes of the Soviet Union. Thus Soviet foreign trade policy may be specifically tailored to meet the demands of the immediate strategy and tactics of international communism. Russian and satellite efforts to increase trade with Latin America are properly viewed from that perspective.

Latin America as a nonindustrial area wherein a vast economic potential remains yet fully to be developed presents some very pressing economic problems. With the basic exportable items of Latin America agricultural commodities, petroleum, and metal ores, there is often a difficulty in marketing these products in those countries of the Western World which are able to supply Latin America with needed finished products in return. This problem is enhanced by the fact that individual Latin American republics are frequently heavy producers of one major commodity upon which their foreign trade relies. Thus, for Cuba, sugar; for Brazil and Colombia, coffee; for Chile, metal ores; and for Bolivia, metal ores are the dominant exportable items. When demand for these products is limited in the countries normally supplying Latin America with finished goods, large unexportable surpluses develop in specific Latin American states which immediately depress the economy of those states.

The trade of the United States with Latin America runs considerably over $3 billion per year in each direction. Balance of United States imports with United States exports is relatively even, but with discrepancies in the case of individual countries. Frequently, of course, exportable Latin American items run into surpluses in the American domestic market, or a particular price situation, as in the case of coffee, temporarily shrinks the American consumption market. When this happens, there is a tendency in the affected Latin American nation to blame the United States, the big customer, for the resulting weakening effects on the domestic economy of that Latin American nation.

It is in this sort of situation that the Soviet Union's trade policy can be manipulated to create an attractive appeal, and that we can best understand the nature of the current economic offensive in Latin America. Trade policy becomes the material partner of the propaganda offensive described above; indeed, it is reasonable to view the kind of trade policy the Soviet Union is pursuing in Latin America now as part and parcel of the overall propaganda strategy. To nations with unexportable surpluses creating domestic economic and political unrest, the Soviet Union appears in the guise of the savior, prepared to accept surpluses of an agricultural or mineral commodity in exchange for capital goods badly needed by the Latin American States, or in exchange for dollars. An alternative is offered to "Yankee domination"; this is the economic side of the appeal of the new line to nationalism and anti-United States feelings.

Efforts to use trade in this politically motivated fashion are on the increase on the part of the U. S. S. R. and her satellites since the Bulganin overtures of last January. Reference to the chart attached to this paper will indicate those countries maintaining formal trade agreements with the U. S. S. R. and her allied states. Note the heavy emphasis on Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. In addition, however, the Communist-bloc states are capable of "single shot" trade arrangements, an example being the purchase last year of some 700,000 tons of Cuban sugar which helped alleviate the tremendous surplus of that commodity in Cuba.

Existing trade agreements between Soviet bloc countries and Latin American countries sought a trade level of $500 million for 1955, a goal double the 1954 trade level between the two areas, and nearly 3 times the level between the 2 areas in 1948. Trade by the Communist bloc with Argentina and Brazil has been responsible for the bulk of this increase.

Total Soviet-bloc trade with Latin America remains—even if the goal of $500 million is reached—less than 15 percent of the total United States-Latin American trade. It is difficult to conceive that the U. S. S. R. and its allies could materially increase the proportion of its share of Latin American trade on a permanent basis in the kinds of machinery and capital equipment suggested by Bulganin in his overtures. This is not, however, to say that significant inroads could not be made by the Communists or that future increases in trade of some size may not be expected.

In this respect, it should be remembered that the U. S. S. R. is under terrific pressure to supply heavy goods, machinery, equipment, and the like for the needs of its expanding domestic economy. The Soviet Union at the present stage of its development does not have the productive levels in capital goods to supply its own needs fully, much less to export large quantities of them. It must further be remembered, however, that the foreign trade of a controlled Communist economy is capable of being manipulated for purely political purposes along the lines suggested above. Thus the U. S. S. R. may judge that the gains for its international designs from a specifically tailored exchange of machinery for agricultural products in surplus in a given Latin American State may outweigh the momentary loss to the expansion of its domestic economy. Further, of course, is the fact that the U. S. S. R. is short in agricultural commodities for its own consumption; it could make likewise good use of imported consumer goods. But the decision to obtain these items in exchange for heavy equipment and the like remains one geared to the overall political purposes of the U. S. S. R.

The attractiveness with which dealing with the Soviet Union and its satellites may be viewed by given Latin American countries in economic straits should not obscure certain clear dangers in such trade.

First. As has been pointed out above, Soviet foreign trade is an integral part of the drive for respectability and acceptance in the recipient nations. Reliance on such trade might increase the acceptibility of the national democratic front idea.

Second. Acceptance of key items of machinery and so forth from the U. S. S. R. creates the possibility of undue reliance on the Soviet Union for the maintenance and expansion of critical types of equipment.

Third. Since the Soviet Union is not forced to rely on the essentially politically motivated trade, it might exact from the recipient of such trade the price of support of the U. S. S. R.—or at least coolness toward the West—in international negotiations and organizations for the continuance of such trade.

Fourth. Acceptance of heavy machinery and equipment from the Communist-bloc nations entails frequently the importation of technicians from those nations for the maintenance of that equipment, with the possibility of an undue reliance on the technical know-how of the Communists. Communist technicians are not unknown to indulge in other kinds of activities.

Communist trade overtures to Latin America, then, can be seen to have a certain degree of attractiveness to individual Latin American Republics facing particular economic problems. At the same time, the nature of the Communist-bloc government and economy allows such

trade to be carried on principally for its effects on the overall political strategy and goals of the Soviet Union. Acceptance of such trade by Latin American States involves dangers to the recipient state and to the Western World along the lines described in the previous paragraph.

VIII

The future of Latin America as an industrial world stronghold remains to be developed, but Latin America carries the full potential for such a future. Brazil alone has been described as comparable to the United States of the mid-19th century, capable of an expansion over the coming decades equal to that of the United States in the past century. The stake of the United States in the future of this great area is large, not only in the coldly material sense but in the best sense of the policy of the good neighbor concerned for the proper development of Latin America as an area wherein economic success takes place in a society devoted to the values of the Western World—freedom, liberty, dignity of the individual.

It is important to present to Latin America an image of the United States which accurately reflects the United States as a nation sharing so fully in the ideals present in current Latin American aspirations. Central to the ideology of the American democracy is the Declaration of Independence, which is a living documentation of abhorrence of imperialism and of developed nationalism based on the recognition of human values, not narrow materialistic chauvinism.

But there is far more for the United States to do in implementing the policy of the "good neighbor." The individual economic needs of each Latin American state ought carefully be appraised, and the wealth of the United States wisely used to aleviate economic distress. Out of the billions and billions of dollars of foreign-aid grants and credits of the past decade, Latin America has received around 2.4 percent; in the last fiscal year around 2 percent of all foreign grants of the United States went to Latin America.

It should not be argued that grants of economic aid represent the sole or final solution to the problems of nonindustrial areas; it should not be argued that the bulk of the economic expansion of such areas is not the proper province of free enterprise. However, the underlying immediate needs of Latin America as an underdeveloped area do require large-scale development funds which cannot be found in private investment sources. Highways, railroads, communications, development of power resources, and the like, are all fundamental to the creation of a modern industrial economy. The lag in such areas in most of Latin America is tremendous, and the large-scale jump in these areas can only be made by provision of development funds from sources other than private enterprise. By substantial increases in its assistance to development projects carefully chosen in mutual cooperation with the affected Latin American state, the United States could do much to create the basis for broader economies of greater stability.

It may be argued that this represents the application once again of the philosophy of the foreign-aid program of the past decade, but one must remember that that program has barely touched Latin America. Further, the greatest opportunity for the effective use of such aid funds lies in the more underdeveloped areas; much of the criticism attached to aid programs for areas more economically mature does not apply in the case of Latin America.

Leading Latin American spokesmen put this argument most strongly at the Rio Economic Conference in November 1954. President Cafe Filho of Brazil underlined the necessity of putting greater emphasis on the economic aspect of the inter-American system, hoping that future generations would not be able to say that the statesmen of today met the crucial problem of cooperation for economic development with "too little and too late."

The current stress of the Eisenhower administration on the United States as the "good partner" seems to rely far too far, in the minds of many Latin American leaders, on private programs in economic development. Given the United States grants necessary to construct the bases for a modern economy, the possibilities for future free private enterprise investment are limitless. But the dominant current need is development capital not being supplied from private sources, and not, in its nature, likely to be supplied from private sources.

This suggestion for economic aid on an increased scale to Latin America should not be viewed as the single approach to our relationship with that area. Concurrently, programs of technical aid to Latin America ought to be expanded by the United States. The accurate presentation of the image of the United States to Latin America, the continued maintenance of the inter-American security system, the expansion of United States private enterprise capital, south of the border, the performance in all United States relations with Latin America as a "good partner" who remains a "good neighbor," are all vital to a proper relationship. New ways of exploring common interests should be steadily sought, such as, for example, Senator MANSFIELD's recent proposal for a university of the Americas.

IX

The current Communist offensive in Latin America has been examined, its strengths and weaknesses noted. Brief suggestions have been made for the United States response to this offensive. Such a response could be the most effective repulse of the Communist offensive in that area, and could open a new era of constantly expanding and mutually profitable relations between the cultures and the economies of the free Americas. If the Communist offensive may have the effect of reemphasizing to the United States its stake in the magnificent future of Latin America, it may be a blessing in disguise.

The St. Lawrence Seaway as an Opportunity for Maine's Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Edward R. Place, information officer, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation at a meeting sponsored by Aroostook County Development Committee, Presque Isle, Maine, July 20, 1956:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AS AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MAINE'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

It seems like a homecoming to me to revisit Presque Isle and the State of Maine.

It is always exhilarating to come to the Land of Remembered Vacations, whether for business or pleasure.

As a newspaper reporter, my brother started coming to Maine summers with his family for fishing. He ended up by buying a general store in the southern part of the State so he could combine business and pleasure for the rest of his life. Now the entire family visits Dick for summer vacations. I am no exception. We squeezed in a fishing trip to Rangeley last summer.

I can say with the utmost sincerity that I am highly honored and delighted that you invited me to participate in this wonderfully organized meeting to report to you on the progress of the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects.

To my knowledge, this meeting, which has been sponsored by your very wide-awake and forward-looking Aroostook County Development Committee, is without precedent anywhere in New England. It is gratifying to find that the seaway has fired the imaginations of so many influential citizens in this region. I am greatly impressed by the drawing power of this seaway meeting not only locally but also statewide and, indeed, across State lines and the international boundary.

I am pleased to bring the cordial greetings of Mr. Lewis G. Castle, Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to your Governor, Edmund S. Muskie, and to Chairman Harry Hedrich and his 60 committee members, as well as distinguished guests from the New England States and the Maritime Provinces of Canada. It is Mr. Castle's earnest hope that much good will come from the program that will take place this evening.

I regret that your Congressman, CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, is unable to be present, as he had planned up to a couple of days ago. He feels obliged to stay in Washington for the closing sessions of Congress. He has asked me to express to you his very great regrets.

My itinerary these days is primarily from Washington to Massena, N. Y., the area where United States seaway and power project construction is mostly concentrated.

I ask your indulgence therefore to reminisce a bit upon returning to New England, where I resided for 40 years until World War II.

After a dozen years of newspaper work in and around Boston, I had the good fortune some years ago to become associated with Gov. Louis Brann and the Maine Development Commission in launching a nationwide pub-

licity and advertising campaign on behalf of Maine recreation and agriculture.

Those years of 1935 and 1936 bring back many cherished memories of Maine experiences and my associations with Governor Brann and such zealous promoters of Maine as Harold Schnurle, George Stobie, Frank Washburn, Arthur Staples, Herbert Swett, George Wentworth, Harry Coe, Joe Stickney, Everett Greaton, Earle Doucette, and many others I could mention.

Some of these men have passed on, but it is your good fortune that Maine continues to produce leaders, in all phases of your economic life, who are constantly striving to advance the best interests of the State and the people. This meeting is another example of how Maine is looking ahead to its future opportunities for prosperity and welfare.

You are to be commended on getting the jump on some other areas in seeking the answer to the provocative question of how Maine and Aroostook County can most advantageously capitalize on the deep-draft navigation the seaway will provide less than 3 years hence.

It is a sound procedure to get all available information, neither too little nor too late, before going ahead with an action program. Your able Governor is leading the way in seaway exploration.

In a recent address, Governor Muskie called attention to the fact that the New England Governors' Committee on Transportation has issued its report surveying New England's transportation needs and especially the impact of the St. Lawrence seaway upon New England. I assume that you are familiar with this report.

The Governor has stated his position that Maine should make all possible effort to realize benefits from the seaway, and he has said that he has definite reason to believe that this can be done.

The Seaway Corporation appreciates the attention being given to the seaway by Governor Muskie and the New England Governors as a group, and that he and they recognize that the seaway is today actually under construction after many years of discussion, pro and con.

Personally, I am confident that Maine will find ways to benefit from the low-cost transportation the seaway will provide in the years to come.

Congressman MCINTIRE could vouch for the fact if he were here that the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are moving along rapidly, and are further advanced than a great many people realize. He was a member of a congressional delegation which made an inspection tour of the construction area at Massena, N. Y., last weekend.

He saw concrete being poured in wooden forms at the rock-bottom of the immense lock chamber area of the Dwight D. Eisenhower lock, whose massive lock walls will rise some 115 feet. He observed the Grasse River lock 3½ miles downstream, where the first concrete was placed this week. To give you some idea of the construction task, 478,000 cubic yards of concrete must be placed in the Eisenhower lock and 500 tons of steel will be used in the lock structure and approach walls. A unique feature is a tunnel which will pass under the upper gate to provide uninterrupted highway traffic. Excluding the excavation contracts, the "Ike" lock construction will cost some $20,172,000, and the Grasse River lock will cost some $26,751,000. The latter will be equipped with bridges to accommodate highway traffic while ships are in transit.

Congressman MCINTIRE and his colleagues marveled at the earthmoving miracles being performed by some 12,000 men employed on all phases of United States-Canadian seaway-power projects and millions of dollars worth of mighty machines—draglines, shovels, dozers, gantry cranes, and the like—participating in what is often described as the "greatest construction show on earth."

Your Congressman inspected the excavation and dredging of the main portion of the 10-miles-long Long Sault Canal, now 11 percent complete, witnessed the huge 650-ton dragline from the Kentucky strip mines, nicknamed "the Gentleman," swinging its 15-cubic yard bucket on a 165-foot boom at the westerly end of the canal, now 60 percent complete.

He was a guest of Chairman Robert Moses of the Power Authority of the State of New York, and traveled over the world's longest cofferdams erected to seal off the surging St. Lawrence River so that the 162-foot-high St. Lawrence power dam and 145-foot-high Long Sault spillway dam can be constructed upon bedrock below the dried-up riverbed. He learned that the 32 turbine-generator units of the St. Lawrence power dam, half in the United States and half in Canada, will generate 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity.

On the basis of installed capacity, the St. Lawrence power project is the second largest hydroelectric power development on the North American Continent, with a capacity of 1,880,000 kilowatts and 13 billion kilowatt-hours per year. Only the Grand Coulee project on the Columbia River, which has a capacity of 1,954,000 kilowatts, is larger.

The average annual discharge of the St. Lawrence at the outlet of Lake Ontario is 236,000 cubic feet per second, exceeded by only a few rivers on the continent. Its primary advantage from the standpoint of hydroelectric power production, however, is not the total discharge, but uniformity of flow, year by year and season by season. The maximum flow on record is only a little more than twice the minimum. Other streams of comparable size vary much more widely. The Columbia River has a ratio of 35 to 1; the Mississippi 25 to 1; and the Ottawa River 31 to 1.

After witnessing the Massena construction drama, involving a total expenditure in excess of $900 million for both navigation and power projects, Congressman MCINTIRE could assure you that the seaway has long since passed the stage of being still a dream of modernizing the St. Lawrence navigation facilities, and harnessing its rapids for hydroelectric development. Also, he could tell you that he counted more than a dozen canalers either passing through the 14-foot Cornwall, Ontario, canal, or on open water in the river—a reminder that ships today carry an average tonnage of 10 million tons annually on Canada's canal system extending from Montreal to Iroquois.

Canadians started improving St. Lawrence River navigation by building shallow canals to bypass obstructive rapids in the Lachine area above Montreal as early as 1700. Later on, other rapids along the river were bypassed and in 1833 the first Welland Canal was completed to provide connecting navigation facilities between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. Hence, the new seaway will be the culmination of more than 250 years of man's efforts to tame a great river and provide deep-draft navigation for oceangoing ships and lake-type vessels.

Currently, the river has a controlling depth of 14-feet from Montreal to Lake Ontario. Over this 182-mile stretch, 22 locks are required to raise or lower ships a total of around 220 feet. To bypass the cascading Niagara River, its rapids and Niagara Falls, ships utilize the Welland ship canal with 8 locks, having a total lift of some 327 feet, between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, if headed upstream to Cleveland, Toledo, and other Erie ports, or downstream toward Ogdensburg and Montreal. Canada is deepening the Welland Canal to 27-foot controlling depth, the same as the new seaway channel.

When the seaway is opened for 14-foot navigation in July 1958—just 2 years from now—the existing 14-foot canal system will be flooded out. At the beginning of the navigation season in 1959, the seaway will be open for 27-foot navigation. Navigation will be expedited inasmuch as the number of locks between Montreal and Lake Erie will be halved—from 30 to 15. The existing 8 locks of the Welland Canal will be in service, but in the St. Lawrence River, 7 new locks having nominal clear dimensions of 768 feet long, 80 feet wide and 30 feet deep over the sills, will replace the present 22 much smaller ones through which transit is confined to vessels of about 250 feet at a maximum depth of 14 feet.

Of the 7 new seaway locks, Canada is building 5—2 in the Lachine section, 2 in the Soulanges section, and one at Iroquois in the International Rapids section—while the United States is building and will operate in the International Rapids section the 2 locks of the Long Sault Canal to which reference has already been made—Dwight D. Eisenhower lock and Grasse River lock.

Currently, United States seaway construction is about 12 percent complete overall, and on schedule. The Seaway Corporation has awarded 18 principal construction and supply contracts with an aggregate value of some $70 million. Some 25 contracts remain to be let, including equipment for the 2 locks, dredging, navigation aids, railroad and highway relocation work, and construction of an office building at Massena.

At this point, I will try to anticipate some questions usually asked about the seaway project.

What agencies are responsible for constructing the seaway?

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is the United States Government agency created by an act of Congress (Public Law 358) in May 1954, to construct, operate, and maintain the seaway. Its Canadian counterpart is the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority, a Crown corporation, established by act of Parliament in December 1951. Its president is Hon. Lionel Chevrier. These agencies necessarily collaborate very closely on program coordination and mutual engineering features, and, in fact, held meetings this week in Montreal and Ottawa for their latest exchange of information and views on pending matters.

How are the seaway costs being shared?

Congress provided a limit of $105 million to build the United States portion of the seaway. Mr. Chevrier has stated that seaway costs to Canada will be around $215 million.

What agencies are responsible for the power development and what are the costs?

The power project is being undertaken jointly by the Power Authority of the State of New York (PASNY) and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario (HEPCO). They are sharing equally an expenditure of some $600 million.

What are the target dates of the seaway and power projects?

The target date is the same, July 1, 1958. At that time, generation of power will commence. Creation of a 35-mile power pool, also termed "seaway lake," will flood out the existing 14-foot canal facilities in the International Rapids section, and the normal river traffic will utilize the seaway canals and locks. The seaway's initial season for full-scale 27-foot navigation will be 1959.

What is the length of the seaway navigation season?

The answer is approximately 8 months. The St. Lawrence River is normally frozen over about 4 months of the year commencing in December and running into April.

How will the seaway be paid for?

The seaway costs will not be borne by American or Canadian taxpayers. The seaway is a self-liquidating project which will

depend upon tolls paid by shippers to pay off borrowings.

Have the tolls been fixed?

No. It would not be possible at this time to speculate on the basis on which tolls will be charged. The seaway tolls committee, having an American section headed by Seaway Corporation Comptroller E. Reece Harrill, and a Canadian section headed by Seaway Authority Vice President Charles Gavsie, has held several preliminary meetings for general discussion, and is conducting studies. An inspection trip was taken to the Panama Canal to study its toll system. It will be realized that the toll structure must be sufficiently high to insure paying off obligations, while at the same time low enough to attract shipping.

When will deep-draft navigation be provided all the way from the Atlantic Ocean to Duluth?

It has been estimated that the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will be deepened to 27 feet to conform with the controlling depth between Montreal and Lake Erie by 1961 or 1962. However, there may be pressure to expedite the works authorized by Congress this year. Costs will run approximately $110 million for this work, to be performed by the United States Corps of Engineers. A start this year in the Detroit and St. Clair Rivers and Lake St. Clair has been made possible by an initial $5 million appropriation by Congress. The Straits of Mackinac, between Lakes Huron and Michigan, and St. Marys River, between Lakes Huron and Superior, also are to be deepened. Deep-draft ocean ships will be able to penetrate the heartland of our country more than 2,300 miles from the Atlantic Ocean, when the connecting channels project is completed as an adjunct of the seaway modernization. Ships virtually sail uphill on such a long journey westward, as Lake Superior is 602 feet above sea level.

How much tonnage is expected to be carried on the new seaway?

It has been estimated that tonnage through the new seaway for 1959 will run to some 36 million tons, and for 1965–70, this figure will be increased to more than 50 million tons. Traffic for the initial season of 1959 has been broken down as shown in your folders?

What size ships can use the new seaway?

The size of the locks is the controlling factor. The new seaway will be used by lake-type vessels having dimensions of about 700 feet overall, 72-feet beam, and 25-feet draft. These bulk carriers will have a capacity of 25,000 net tons as compared with the 2,500 tons of the largest canalers using the existing waterway. Oceangoing vessels having a deadweight of about 10,000 tons are expected to be the general cargo carriers to foreign destinations.

What are the various seaway and lake ports doing to get ready for the seaway?

The seaway is sparking a billion-dollar trade race. Port improvements and expansions are being carried out, or planned, in a score of cities ringing the five Great Lakes all the way from Oswego, N. Y., the country's first fresh-water port, to Chicago and Duluth, Minn. It is estimated a billion dollars in public and private funds is likely to be spent in and around the lakes and connecting rivers before ships from the Atlantic Ocean steam up the seaway and into the lakes. Some of the cities preparing for the seaway include Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Toledo, Buffalo, Erie, Oswego, Rochester, Ashtabula, Lorain, Muskegon, and Green Bay. Also, Windsor, Toronto, Hamilton, and Cornwall, in Canada. By and large, the port cities realize that the seaway will help this which help themselves.

Are tourists and "sidewalk superintendents" being encouraged to visit the seaway construction sites?

Definitely. Both seaway entities, as well as the power entities, are providing overlook stations, with parking facilities and other attractions and conveniences for the use of the public. Five overlooks on the American side at Massena, N. Y., are described in the new seaway-power tourist folders which are being passed out at this meeting. One of the seaway overlooks is on the north side of Eisenhower Lock. Congressman MCINTIRE visited it last Saturday. PASNY will provide not only an orientation film but also television closeups of the construction of the two power dams. It is estimated that 200,000 tourists will visit Massena between Memorial Day and Labor Day. Inspection tours by public officials, businessmen, students, newspaper editors, foreign visitors and other groups are frequent on both sides of the border. The New York newspaper editors will hold a convention at Massena August 5 to 7 and will tour the projects.

By the way, Albert Rowbotham of the Rumford Falls Times recently toured the project. The Canadian press has reported that he declared he felt "humble" when he realized the greatness of the development.

How do the United States and Canadian seaway entities get along together?

Without qualification, it can be said that the United States and Canada are setting a shining example to the world of the meaning of international friendship and cooperation. Despite the intricacies of the construction programing and the complex and unexpected problems being faced, the two seaway entities are working together harmoniously, effectively, and with complete good will. Probably never before in world history have two nations been such understanding and congenial partners in so vast a public enterprise.

Is there any opposition to the seaway?

As I scan scores of newspapers and magazines and read hundreds of letters of inquiry from all over our country, and talk to many visitors to the seaway information office, I am impressed by the widespread enthusiasm for the seaway and what it will mean to the economy of this country and Canada. The seaway seemingly has a tremendous popular appeal. The feeling in the seaway corporation is that in an expanding world and national economy, brought about by increased consumption of goods by an astounding population growth here and abroad, there will be plenty of customers for all types of transportation. We doubt that coastal ports will be affected very much.

And now a final question which relates to power. How is St. Lawrence power being allocated?

As to distribution, the New York Power Authority is bound by certain preference in its law and license. Out of the 730,000 kilowatts of firm power available, the authority has made allocations as follows:

	Kilowatts
Aluminum Company of America, contracted	177,000
Vermont, contracted	103,000
City of Plattsburg, N. Y., contracted	33,000
Airbase, contracted	11,000
Reserved for further industry on the river	183,000
Reserved for other municipalities, co-ops and REA's	75,000
Residual for sale to private distributors with rates to ultimate consumers fixed by contract	143,000
Total	730,000

Availability of this abundant electric power, and access to deep water, which will be made possible by the seaway, are influencing the consideration of industrial sites in the St. Lawrence Valley area.

In the Nation as a whole, we find that agriculture, industry, and commerce are moving to the banks of the inland waters at an accelerated rate. American Waterways Operators, Inc., recently reported the selection of 147 waterside sites throughout the country for new or expanding processing or distribution projects during the second quarter of this year. The number during the first quarter was 138. The total for 1955 was 470.

The new seaway seems to have stimulated Maine agriculture to look into the economics of seaway transportation for its products, especially potatoes.

Even though I conducted the Maine potato queen contest here in Presque Isle in the fall of 1935 on an assignment from State Commissioner of Agriculture Washburn, I was not then, nor am I now, a potato expert.

However, I have consulted with Dr. Ezekiel Limmer, Transportation Economist of the United States Department of Agriculture, and others, with respect to possible advantages of the new seaway to Maine's potato industry for shipping potatoes to Chicago and various other lake cities.

According to official U. S. D. A. statistics for 1955, Maine shipped last year 44,217 carloads of white Irish potatoes. Carloads shipped by rail totaled 36,714. Potatoes moved by truck amounted to an equivalent of 7,503 carloads. The figures reveal that Presque Isle shipped 3,058 carloads by rail. I could not get separate truck figures for Presque Isle.

Sixty percent of Maine's potato shipments took place during the months of January, February, March, and December, the months when navigation is shut down on the St. Lawrence. Obviously, the seaway would be of no use to Maine's potato industry during these winter months.

Maine's biggest potato market is New York City, which received 8,030 carloads by both rail and truck last year, followed by Boston, which received 5,634 carloads and Philadelphia, 2,188 carloads, both rail and truck in 1955. The principal markets for Maine's potato crop are not on the seaway route.

The Maine potato is in demand, however, in lucrative markets located in the Great Lakes area. Here are some figures on Maine potatoes shipped by rail: Detroit, 1,020 carloads; Cleveland, 647 carloads; Toledo, 276 carloads; Milwaukee, 65 carloads; Chicago, 43 carloads; Albany, 490 carloads; Buffalo, 124 carloads; and Syracuse, 37 carloads. These eight cities account for 2,702 carloads.

There are other problems besides the limited seaway shipping season and your lack of a highway connecting with the port of Quebec, or other ports on the St. Lawrence River. Potatoes can't be loaded in a bulk carrier like ore, coal, or grain. Heat or refrigeration might be required in shipping potatoes by waterway, depending upon the season.

In this atomic age, there is some speculation as to the use at some future time of atomic reactors, or other methods, to warm the waters of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence and thereby prolong the shipping season.

Stranger things have happened. While fishermen may shudder at the idea of catching fish in a parboiled state, shippers nevertheless would take off their hats to men of science if they could find a way to eliminate the seaway ice blockade.

Here in Maine, your mining industry is depending upon scientists to find a satisfactory treatment method for upgrading your manganese ores to economic grades. Up to now, I understand, there has not been any production from your manganese deposits, nor has any satisfactory treatment method been evolved.

Your imaginations have been stirred by ore discoveries and developments across the border in recent years.

I have just read a fascinating article about Seven Islands on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, 484 miles downstream from Montreal.

In October 1950, this Quebec fishing village was virtually unknown. Today from its developed harbor, shipping dispatches 7 to 10

million tons of Labrador ore annually in a 200- to 240-day shipping season. Four years after the first construction equipment was landed at the village pier, the docks, the entire shipping operation, and the 357-mile railway to the iron deposits were completed. A trickle of ore was shipped in 1954, and in 1955 the full-scale operation was under way.

In closing, may I thank you for listening and express the hope that my remarks have expanded your knowledge and stimulated your thinking about the seaway and that you will redouble your efforts to get a satisfactory access highway through the wilderness to the seaway area. It will be a great day of rejoicing for the United States and Canada when the new seaway is opened with gala ceremonies in which Queen Elizabeth of England has already been officially invited to participate.

Now you will see the first public showing of the Seaway Corporation's new documentary color film, with narration, of the initial seaway construction season. It is entitled "The Fourth Seacoast." It was completed only last week for preview by the congressional delegation at Massena, and shipped here to Bob Bruce for this meeting.

Nelson Poynter and the Congressional Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Congressional Quarterly has taken some exception to the remarks in my newsletter charging that their evaluation of Members' voting records have carried a noticeable bias.

I had not intended to go into any great detail in the matter—but in view of the Congressional Quarterly's rather strong attack against me of July 26, I believe the people of my district are entitled to know something about that publication and who is back of it.

First, the publication is owned and published by Nelson Poynter, of St. Petersburg, Fla., and it has no official connection with the Congress of the United States. Mr. Poynter is also the owner and publisher of the St. Petersburg Times, a publication which is undeniably New Deal in its sympathies, and certainly in its editorial slanting of the news.

Second, Mr. Poynter is not unknown to the members of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and the official files of that body show that Mr. Poynter is listed as initiating sponsor of the organization known as Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The official files show that his name was carried on the letterhead of that committee, and his association with the committee was reported in the Communist Daily Worker of December 24, 1944.

In a separate report entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions" the Committee on Un-American Activities stated:

The meeting was sponsored by a Communist-front organization known as the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions is a descendant of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which was repudiated in 1946 by Harold L. Ickes, its chairman, because of its Communist character.

In August 1945, June Hoffman, representing the cultural section of the Communist Party at its New York State convention, declared proudly:

"We built the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, and it is a great political weapon."

At that same meeting Lionel Berman, husband of Louise Bransten, a known contact of Soviet espionage agents, was praised by the cultural commission of the Communist Party for his role in setting up the ICCASP—Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

On August 2, 1948, Louis F. Budenz, former managing editor of the Daily Worker, testified before the Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department as follows:

"The Independent (Citizens) Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was worked out originally in my office in the Daily Worker. It was worked out by the cultural commission of the Daily Worker, of which Lionel Berman, of the cultural section, organizer of the party, was a member, and he was entrusted not only by that meeting but by the political committee, as the result of these discussions with the task of forming the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

I am not implying that Mr. Poynter or his wife are necessarily Communists, Communist sympathizers, or fellow travelers, but it must be admitted by even the most casual observer that they have been keeping "biased" company.

Mr. Poynter's pious protestations of political unbias are clouded seriously by the strong New Deal flavor of his St. Petersburg newspaper and by the fact that files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that Press Research, a publication also organized and published by Nelson Poynter, was an admittedly biased periodical.

To complete the picture, records indicate that Mr. Poynter served with the Office of War Information under a Democrat administration.

The files of the House Un-American Committee also show that Mr. Poynter was a member of the Political Action Committee and that he arranged with a Mr. C. B. Baldwin, assistant chairman of the PAC of CIO, to give PAC free copies of his publication even though they were prepared for other clients who were paying for the service.

The hearings also contained admissions that the Poynter publication, Press Research, contained the personal opinions of Mr. Poynter and his managing editor. If further evidence than the above is needed to determine Mr. Poynter's strong personal prejudices toward the New Deal philosophy, a look at some of these Press Research reports should satisfy even the most skeptical.

I would not be so concerned over Mr. Poynter's background if his research methods were more accurate and fair. The rollcall votes, however, which he chooses to designate as in support of President Eisenhower are picked by a peculiar formula which is completely arbitrary and open to bias since on some occasions measures proposed by members of the Eisenhower Cabinet are not included, even though they are undeniably a part of the overall Eisenhower program.

Under Poynter's methods, an anti-Eisenhower Democrat may vote for four amendments to a major bill and then vote to kill the bill. According to Mr. Poynter's system of counting, such a Democrat could come out with an 80-percent record in support of the Eisenhower administration, even though he voted to destroy the basic bill sought by the President.

I must also take exception to Congressional Quarterly's Thomas M. Schroth, executive editor of that periodical, when he says that he can predict whether Eisenhower would have voted "yea" or "nay" on each of the 41 rollcall votes he mentioned. Some, as Congressional Quarterly certainly knows, were parliamentary measures which depend for their interpretation on the overall strategy of the leadership for the passage of that particular bill.

In any event, if CQ is claiming to be a "predicting service," it is hard to correlate this with their claim "nothing but the facts." Crystal gazing and factual reports are widely separated journalistic arts.

I have no quarrel with Mr. Poynter nor with Congressional Quarterly so long as they stick to facts and to an accurate job of news reporting; but when they circulate in my district material which is incorrect and which is obviously slanted, I feel that it is my obligation to call to the attention of my constituents something of the background of the men behind this movement and of their methods.

Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker

SPEECH
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, during my years in the Congress, it has been my privilege to note the coming and going of various Congressmen. I remember so well when SHEPARD CRUMPACKER entered the 82d Congress along with a number of other new Members in January 1951.

I knew some of his family background and from my experience in the Indiana State Legislature had learned that the name Crumpacker in Indiana represents the best elements that are to be found in individuals. SHEPARD CRUMPACKER was no exception to this rule.

In my various associations with SHEPARD CRUMPACKER, I found him to be one of the most studious and attentive Members on the floor. He entered into debate and discussion of legislative proposals with a display of understanding and appreciation of the problems involved.

The third district can well be proud of the services that he rendered. His community of South Bend where he was reared will be fortunate indeed if he continues to make it his home in the future. I join my many colleagues in wishing him God's richest blessings in all his endeavors.

Address of Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, delivered an address in connection with the celebration of the 250th anniversary of St. Mary Anne's Church at North East, Md. This community, in common with other parts of the district I am honored to represent, has a rich history and values the tradition, culture, and freedom of worship which it has inherited from past generations. As always Governor McKeldin's remarks are timely and appropriate. Under leave granted they are inserted herewith:

ADDRESS OF GOV. THEODORE R. MCKELDIN

It is the common custom to speak of our country as young, and indeed our three and a half centuries seem little when one reflects that England had 800 years of recorded history when the Venerable Bede wrote, and Bede died 300 years before William the Conquerer landed, which, in turn, was 900 years before our time.

But age is relative. England itself is a young nation by comparison with Egypt, and the tremendous history of Egypt is no more than a flicker, as compared to the immeasurable ages that passed before men began to write history. The true measure of time is not the passage of the years, but what has been thought, and learned, and done in those years.

So measured, this parish and this building are venerable indeed. They have been witnesses of the whole history of the Republic, which is to say that what has been thought and learned and done includes a great part of all that man has accomplished toward mastering the art of self-government. In all the great crises that have confronted the United States representatives of this parish have played an honorable part. They have shared in the triumphs of the Republic and they have shared in its agonizing ordeals. When the country was rent asunder 90 years ago, this parish was rent, even to its religious leadership; clerics who had served it were chaplains on both sides.

It is, therefore, a peculiarly appropriate spot on which to turn our thoughts to the relation of the two loyalties strikingly symbolized in the tradition that explains the unusual name of the church. It is called Saint Mary Anne, not, as is usual when a church is doubly dedicated, "Saints Mary and Anne." The explanation commonly offered is that the second name is not that of the mother of Mary, but that of the English queen whose generosity endowed the church with some of its most cherished treasures. The name, therefore, may be considered an expression of loyalty to the Queen of Heaven and to an earthly queen.

To Saint Mary and to Queen Anne—it is a charming idea, a delicately feminine but nonetheless faithful rendering of the sterner dedication, "To God and Country." It is the pledge of this parish to obey the command of its Master, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." It is certainly the earthly honor and, I think, also the honor in Heaven of St. Mary Anne that for 250 years it has faithfully kept this pledge.

As the representative of the State, that is to say, representaitve of the power that has succeeded to the authority of Queen Anne, I am honored to acknowledge this loyalty, and rejoice in the confident expectation that it will be continued for 250 years more.

For the experience of 1,956 years goes to prove that Caesar has nothing to fear from those who are scrupulously careful to render unto God the things that are God's. Unfortunately, Caesar has not alway remembered this. The long and dreadful history of persecution for religion's sake is proof, all too abundant, of the tendency of the secular power to intrude where it has no right to go.

But I venture to remind you that there is another side of the story. All too often the secular power has been urged to this intrusion by the very people who should have been first and most urgent in protesting against it. Pontius Pilate was not the last earthly governor who has heard the representatives of religion raise the terrible cry, "Release unto us Barabbas."

So I do not feel that we can afford any touch of complacency in reviewing the relation of church and state, even in this free land. I am happy to believe that we have established here a more just and reasonable relation between the two than exists anywhere else in the world; but I am keenly aware that the relation can be kept just and reasonable only by eternal vigilance and complete good faith on both sides.

Indeed, we are finding that as civilization grows more complex the task of maintaining a right relation between church and state does not grow simpler but, on the contrary, more difficult and perplexing. For it is not, as the thoughtless assume, strictly a matter of the adjustment of two institutions that can be perfectly regulated by the adjustment of civil and canon law. It goes far beyond that. The law is indeed the servant of justice, but justice is more than the law. It is a heresy in both politics and religion to assume that because a thing is legal, it is therefore moral.

We Americans plume ourselves on having effected the peaceable separation of church and state; and we have reason to be proud of it, for it was a great achievement in the art of self-government. But some have plunged beyond that, and have fallen into the error of believing that in separating church from state we have also separated religion from public affairs.

They are guilty, of course, of confusing religion with the rituals of its observance. They are of those who "make broad their phylacteries" and at the same time "bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders." If that is religion, then the more completely we separate it from politics the better. But if religion is "to do justly and to love mercy," as well as "to walk humbly with thy God," then we can never separate it from government without converting government into a monstrous thing. The state from which justice and mercy were separated would be a horrible tyranny and the damnation of the men who created it.

Yet to administer justice, about the simplest thing in the world to say, is about the hardest thing in the world to do. The difficulty is not in the act itself, but in finding out what is equal and exact justice. This doesn't depend entirely on the official; in part it depends on public opinion, for officials are human and cannot help being influenced by the climate of opinion. Make up your mind to this—when the public gives way to hysteria, justice is not going to be done, I care not how conscientious your public officials may be.

The Christian religion offers us a glaring example of this. At the time of the supreme tragedy of the world Pilate knew he was doing wrong, and tried to squirm out of it; but he was no hero. He could not stand up against a public opinion whipped into hysteria by designing men seeking their own ends. I takes a great man to do so, and great men are rare.

I beg you to believe one who speaks from long experience—decency in government does not depend entirely on the men elected to public office. They must have decent instincts, of course; but even so, without a strong public opinion supporting them their conduct will fall a long way short of ideal, even though they may be sincerely trying to do the right thing.

I contend that one of the things that belong to Caesar, and perhaps the most important thing that is his by right, is the prompt and powerful support of Christian men when he does the right thing, especially when it is an unpopular thing. When he stands up for justice to some poor wretch without a friend in the world, when he shows mercy to some unfortunate overwhelmed by disaster, it is his right to expect the approval of men who profess to obey the divine injunction, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

On the other hand, he should expect and receive the condemnation of those same men whenever he undertakes to dictate any man's conscience. The moment he interferes with conscience he is laying unhallowed hands on a thing that is God's which is conduct that no Christian man is permitted to tolerate. I believe the record will bear me out in saying that this is in error to which the legislative branch of government is more vulnerable than the executive; but it cannot be condoned wherever it occurs.

It is not conventional to speak of a man's having a right to disapproval; but it is a right. None of us is so wise that he doesn't occasionally slip into error without realizing it, but if he meets sharp and instant criticism at the first false step he can frequently correct the error before it has done much harm. So it is literal truth to say that one thing that is Caesar's is a right to be promptly and emphatically informed the moment he takes a step that offends the sense of justice of Christian men.

Seventy years after this parish was established and 34 years after this edifice was built the people of Maryland joined with the people of the other States in launching the greatest experiment in self-government that is known to history. That experiment continues. It has been wonderfully successful so far, but it is a long way from finished, and its successful conclusion will test all the moral and mental powers we can bring to its support. At this moment I am the Governor of Maryland; but no Governor of Maryland has as yet had, and I trust none will ever have, the insolence to say, like Louis XIV, "I am the state." I am the instrument of the State by which its laws are executed, and to that extent a part of it. But you are the greater part of it. My responsibility is to see that the laws are faithfully executed; but yours is the far greater responsibility to see that the laws that I execute are just and right.

Let no American complain of the faults and failures of government until he has examined his own conscience and by that tribunal has been cleared of any failure in perfect loyalty to Saint Mary and Anne—to the queen of heaven and to the queenly State that we have loved and cherished and that has been and will ever be our safety and our delight.

But I doubt that the man who has been utterly and equally faithful to God and country will be much disposed to complain; for he will be so confident of the future, so filled with the faith that is "the substance

of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," that he can say of our present fears and pains—

"They pass by me as the idle wind,
Which I respect not."

Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, "Independence Through Employment—Hire Disabled Veterans" is the pointed message on an attractive Independence Hall 1956 calendar card recently distributed to some 300,000 employers, under the sponsorship of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. "Call your public employment office" is the notation above the calendar and below it appears the following words: "Printing costs paid by the Irving J. Phillipson Rehabilitation Fund of the Disabled American Veterans' Service Foundation."

Coincidentally, the Chairman of such President's Committee, Melvin J. Maas, major general, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired—now blind—is the present national commander of the Disabled American Veterans.

A veteran of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, Mel Maas, as he is known to his friends, has, in both these important positions, been successfully emphasizing the advantages to employers of employing handicapped employables, both civilians and veterans, by utilizing their remaining abilities in suitable jobs, which they can just as satisfactorily perform as able-bodied persons, with less time loss because of accidents, absenteeism, or indisposition. Mel believes that the Nation can make no better investment, both from a financial and a humanitarian standpoint, than the money expended in effectuating the physical and vocational rehabilitation of handicapped persons—civilians and veterans—thus enabling them to live in the American way, for which America's disabled defenders have sacrificed much of their bodies and of their health. The DAV and its service foundation have taken an active part in publicizing the need for employment of the physically handicapped.

The DAV Service Foundation is an incorporated trusteeship. One of its principal functions is to see that certain charitable funds of the DAV are properly invested and expended, and also to assist in raising funds. It has been my privilege to serve for some years as a trustee of this foundation together with Gen. Melvin J. Maas, national commander of the DAV. Other trustees are: Gen. George C. Kenney, Lewis L. Clarke, Arthur W. Proctor, and Francis Buono, of New York City, Daniel W. Bell, president of the American Security & Trust Co., in Washington, D. C., Maple T. Harl, director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., Washington, D. C., Boniface R. Maile, lawyer, of Detroit, Mich., Floyd L. Ming, of Bakersfield, Calif., John L. Golob and James L. Monnahan from Minnesota, and Miles H. Draper, attorney, of Tampa, Fla., who is chairman. The trustees serve for staggered terms, thus assuring continuity of policy.

The foundation's executive secretary, and full-time executive director, is a DAV past national commander and former national service director, Millard W. Rice, with offices located at 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D. C.

The foundation has taken part in the raising of the funds which, under its charter, can be used only for the charitable purposes of the DAV. During the last 7 years it has conducted puzzle contests, which have enabled it to make appropriations to the DAV during that time in the aggregate sum of $2,490,000, in addition to smaller amounts to DAV State departments and units, by reason of localized fund-raising efforts.

Unfortunately, after the DAV Service Foundation established the formula for raising funds by conducting word values puzzle contests, many other organizations, one after another, decided to do likewise, which whas thus resulted in diminishing gross and net receipts for the DAV Service Foundation. Its trustees must therefore look for other effective methods of raising substantial funds, so much needed each year by the DAV, to enable it to continue, uninterruptedly, its nationwide setup of full-time experienced trained national service officers, to advise and to assist, each year, scores of thousands of distressed disabled veterans and their dependents, in proving their entitlement to the governmental benefits to which they believe themselves legally and equitably entitled.

Designations in trust agreements, wills, and insurance policies, assignments of stocks and bonds and other properties to the DAV Service Foundation, by disabled veterans, and by social-minded Americans, are greatly needed and highly justifiable, and will be reflected in the humanitarian helping-hand services extended by the DAV to so many disheartened disabled veterans and their dependents, who are thereby converted from community liabilities into community assets.

The future welfare and security of our country is inevitably linked up with the welfare of its disabled war veterans, because America's possible future war veterans will naturally be impressed by the fact that our country does not permit its disabled defenders to become mere forgotten heroes, but enables them to become self-sustaining taxpaying civilians.

Too many of my fellow Americans unfortunately assume, erroneously, that governmental benefits to disabled veterans are automatically awarded, not realizing that more claims are denied by the Veterans' Administration than are allowed.

It is more difficult, ordinarily, for a disabled veteran to prove factual and technical entitlement to the benefits to which he may be justifiably entitled than is the case as to an able-bodied World War II or Korean veteran who may thereby be entitled to some benefits under the so-called GI bill of rights.

When official records fail to substantiate a disabled veteran's claim that his disability originated during his military service, then the burden of proof rests upon him positively to prove his claim, by detailed specific fact-giving affidavit evidence, which, too frequently, becomes exceedingly difficult, if not impossible.

Expert advice is needed by the average disabled veteran claimant, from an experienced service officer—one who knows what is required by the Veterans' Administration under the some 1,000 laws administered by it—to justify favorable adjudication of the claim. Digging into the memory of such a disabled veteran, and of those who have observed the pertinent facts, DAV service officers can frequently persuade them to set forth such facts convincingly and in sufficient detail to establish such technical merit of the discouraged disabled veteran's claim.

It should be obvious that this task cannot be properly performed by an employee of the United States Veterans' Administration, because, in the final analysis, it must act as the judge and the jury and, if the claim is awarded, it must provide the awarded disability compensation, vocational training, medical treatment, etc.

The DAV maintains the largest staff of full-time national service officers, located in the regional offices of the Veterans' Administration throughout the country, of any veteran organization—nearly 200 of them—in addition to about 2,000 part-time and volunteer service officers maintained by its State departments and local chapters.

This nationwide service officer setup is under the jurisdiction of the DAV national director of claims, Capt. Cicero F. Hogan, who has his offices at the DAV national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington 9, D. C.

At such national service headquarters is also located the DAV's national legislative director, Maj. Omer W. Clark, former Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and, incidentally, chairman of the Disabled Veterans committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

A vitally important aspect of the DAV services comes under its national director of employment, John W. Burris, who is also its national civil service officer—also at the same address.

The administrative activities of the DAV come under the jurisdiction of its national adjutant—a wounded marine of World War I—Mr. Vivian D. Corbly, located at the DAV national headquarters, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati 13, Ohio.

Under Mr. Corbly also comes the DAV's chief fund-raising project—sending out miniature automobile license tags to automobile owners—as a result of which 125,000 sets of lost keys are each year returned to their owners—without regard as to whether the owners

have previously made any contribution for such idento tag.

Very unfortunately, only about 20 percent of the recipients of such key insurance idento tags do send back donations to the DAV, but, fortunately, those who have done so have enabled the DAV to maintain its some 200 full-time national service officers.

Every Idento Tag recipient is the owner of an automobile and ought to attach such Idento Tag to his key ring, as a key insurance that his keys if lost would probably be deposited by the finder in some post-office box, whereupon the Post Office would deliver them to the DAV national headquarters, and the DAV would then return the set of keys to its owners—some 125,000 sets being so returned each year. Surely, this nationwide key insurance—which commercially used to cost at least $1 or more—ought to be worthy of a donation of at least $1. The manufacture of these tags is conducted by the DAV at its Idento Tag plant at national headquarters in Cincinnati and furnishes employment for hundreds of disabled veterans and other handicapped people.

A more liberal response by Idento Tag receipients would make the DAV financially able to employ additional very much-needed full-time national service officers in all of the some 166 hospitals maintained by the United States Veterans' Administration throughout the country. There is a great need for them at such hospitals, to advise, counsel, and assist the thousands of hospital patients, first, technically to establish their entitlement to such governmental benefits to which they may be lawfully and equitably entitled; second, to guide them toward physical restoration and vocational rehabilitation; and third, to assist them to become useful, self-sustaining taxpaying civilians.

No charitable donation could bring greater dividend returns, both from a financial and a humanitarian standpoint, to the local communities of these hospitalized disabled veterans than by making it possible for the DAV to give them the helping-hand service that they so sorely need.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who are grateful for the sacrifices of America's disabled defenders, of parts of their bodies or of their health, will generously support the vitally important service program sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans Service Foundation and so effectively operated by the congressionally chartered 36-year-old Disabled American Veterans—DAV.

Red Lake Indian Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to say how happy I am that the bill which I introduced in May of this year, relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill, passed the House today. This bill—H. R. 11033—has been under advisement for the past several years and it just could not seem to be brought up at the right time.

I want to thank the members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives for being so helpful during the year and for helping me to get this bill to the floor.

The Indian people do not expect much, they only want someone to help them to help themselves. This bill will enable them to proceed in a technical and scientific way in the running of their sawmill, which will make the business more profitable and thus give them more income.

Good Relations in Duval County and in Florida Are Noted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to bring to the attention of Congress the following editorial from the Florida Star, a stimulating and vigorous newspaper published primarily for Negroes in Jacksonville, Fla. The editorial clearly points out that race relationships are very good in the Jacksonville area and that the atmosphere is such that good relationships can be expected to continue and prosper in the future. As the Congressman from this area, I am certainly happy to make this report. The editorial reads in part as follows:

GOOD RELATIONS IN DUVAL AND FLORIDA IS KEY TO PROGRESS THROUGH COOPERATION

Two things for which citizens of Duval County and most of Florida can be truly proud—and thankful—are the good racial relations that exist here and that we have a moderate group of Negroes and whites in our community.

Time and time again it has been proven that the citizens of this community do not allow themselves to be carried away by emotionalism nor are they easily swayed by rabble rousers or agitators.

In our years here we have seen incidents peacefully settled here that would have excited race riots in some other places. The reason for this is that the bulk of the Negro and white people who compose our middle-class society are basically decent, peaceful citizens.

Take the recent Negro march-on-the-beaches rumor. That thing could have resulted in a pitched battle if either side had taken the rumor seriously. But it all goes to prove that there aren't too many rabble-rousing whites nor hardly any Negro agitators.

In Duval, although the Negroes have been denied many privileges we have had no boycotts or demonstrations, which retard progress such as we have seen in some other parts of the State and Nation.

The only regrettable thing about the situation is that we are not making the best of this wholesome atmosphere that exists here. Our governing agencies could use this harmony between the races to weld unity that will work to build a progressive community.

On the other hand, our white businessmen who sit complacent and just wait for the normal trickle of Negro business could do a great deal to stimulate business from colored patrons. In order to do this it will be necessary to cooperate with some of the Negro projects and promotions by assisting them in sponsoring fashion shows, beauty contests and by appealing to Negro trade through advertising in the Negro press.

Just recently we noted that through the chamber of commerce a "Million Dollar Day" sales promotion was sponsored, but no direct appeal was made to Negroes through the Negro press. The result is that the downtown businesses were deprived of thousands of dollars in sales from the Negro market.

The banks and the public utilities could make invaluable contribution to the progress of Jacksonville and at the same time do themselves some good too. We have noted that several of the local banks run some very interesting messages of the value of savings and some of the features of the banks' service in the white press. We feel that if these messages were brought directly to the attention of the Negro people who certainly could do with more education on the need of saving and the services the banks offer it would certainly help toward building a prosperous community.

The same goes for the city light department's and telephone company's messages. The telephone company sponsors a message reminding folk to limit the length of telephone calls. We think that since colored housewives and teen-agers are constant offenders it would do a great deal of good if a similar message was pointed to Negro homes through the Negro press.

Duval and Florida is a great place to live. Let's work together for progress, but let's not forget progress marches on both sides of the street.

Good Work, Mr. Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include the following editorial printed in the Sacramento (Calif.) Union on Monday, July 16, 1956:

SNUBBING A SNUBBER

California's DICK NIXON already has achieved the distinction of being the ablest, most active, and most efficient Vice President in the long history of the country. He is quite generally recognized as an ambassador of good will throughout the world, and as an outspoken champion of the American way of life.

In his recent trip around the world, he added to his laurels in yet another field—snubbing the snubber. In Karachi, Pakistan, Mr. NIXON made direct reply to yapping done by Prime Minister Nehru of India for warning neutral nations that they flirt with Soviet Russia at their peril. The Vice President said: "Soviet economic aid is offered, not with strings, but with a rope. And the recipient runs the almost certain risk of having the rope tied around his neck."

NIXON snubbed Nehru directly by flying over India and into Pakistan, a nation Nehru detests. For the first time, a United States leader refused to turn the other check to the Indian chief, who has conducted himself as though we would take unlimited insults from him.

NIXON left with Chiang Kai-shek on Formosa a letter from the President assuring Chiang that this Government has no intention of selling him down the river to the Chinese Reds.

NIXON looks good as a good will ambassador abroad, and as an able statesman at home. More power to him.

Comprehensive Report on Armed Forces Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of the Army-Navy-Air Force Journal there appears an article written by Lou Stockstill, the Journal's Capitol Hill reporter, which merits the attention of all Members of Congress.

Entitled "Eighty-fourth Congress Scores Impressively for Services," the article is a comprehensive report on the legislation which has been approved by this session of Congress for the benefit of the nearly 3 million members of the Armed Forces and their families.

It vividly demonstrates the long hours of hard work which the House Armed Services Committee, under the skilled leadership of the Honorable CARL VINSON, has devoted to the task of improving military career incentives.

In the day-to-day hurry and scurry of the Capitol we too often neglect to pay tribute to those who earn our admiration as they quietly go about their duties. The entire House membership can be proud of CARL VINSON and the House Armed Services Committee staff for these excellent laws which are designed to increase reelistments and reduce resignations in the Armed Forces.

The Journal article also covers legislation which is the work of other committees such as the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits which spent months writing a new, more equitable survivorship law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to read this excellent article:

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS SCORES IMPRESSIVELY FOR SERVICES

This has been a stellar legislative year for the Armed Forces. New military career incentive benefits worth hundreds of millions of dollars have been approved by the second session of the 84th Congress.

The list includes just about everything in the Pentagon's 1956 hope chest. When added to the multimillion dollar program enacted for the benefit of servicemen and their families during the first session, the list is even more impressive.

The second session overhauled and broadened family medical benefits with a program that will go into effect in December.

The Congressmen boosted survivor benefits and made payments more equitable under a new plan that takes effect in January. The same law places all military personnel under full social security coverage.

A tax cut was awarded retired military personnel.

Service doctors won a pay increase and added promotion opportunities.

Thousands of active duty reservists will be given a chance at Regular commissions.

Improvements in family housing are underway and in prospect as the result of congressional action in this important field.

Here is a complete roundup of the steps Congress has taken to make service life more attractive.

FAMILY MEDICAL CARE

This $76 million plan (Public Law 569), is a marked departure from tradition in that it establishes an insurance program under which military dependents will receive medical care at civilian facilities when space is not available in a service hospital or when there are no nearby military hospitals. The Pentagon currently is completing work on the insurance program and the plan will go into effect in December. Service families will pay only a small portion of the hospitalization cost involved. Provision of the new medical care assures the serviceman that the health and well-being of his family will be provided for while he is away from them. Like most of the other career incentive legislation, the program is expected to bolster the reenlistment program and stem officer resignations. In addition to the insurance program, the new law provides uniform regulations for the medical care of active duty service personnel (giving them the right to treatment in any service hospital regardless of their uniform), and establishes statutory authority for the treatment of retired members and their families in military facilities on a space available basis.

SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Along with the new medical care program, the $690 million Survivor Benefits Act shares top billing on the list of military laws enacted by the second session of the 84th Congress. All widows of men who die on active duty or from service-connected causes after they leave active duty will receive increased compensation under this law beginning on January 1, 1957. The amount of compensation for each widow will be $112 per month plus 12 percent of the deceased serviceman's active duty pay. The measure also brings all active duty members of the military services under contributory social security beginning next year. This means that service personnel will pay 2 percent (2½ percent under the revised social security law now pending enactment) on the first $4,200 of their basic pay into the social security fund. At age 65, they will receive both their retired pay and social security pay. The measure also increases the minimum 6-months-death gratuity from $468 to $800 and reduces the maximum from $6,857 to $3,000. The $10,000 free life insurance program is terminated, and Federal Employee Compensation Act benefits are discontinued for Reservists coming on active duty after passage of the bill. The new law also provides portal-to-portal coverage for all Reservists who are killed or die while traveling to or from active duty for training or inactive duty training.

MEDICAL CAREER INCENTIVES

All physicians and dentists in military uniform received substantial pay increases under the terms of the new Medical Career Incentives Act (Public Law 497) which was approved by the Congress and the President in April and became effective on May 1. The $19 million program provided longevity pay increases averaging $50 per month and ranging as high as $76 per month. The measure authorizes constructive credit of 4 years for dentists and 5 years for physicians who have completed internships. It also increases the special incentive pay for doctors from $100 per month to $150 per month after 2 years' service, $200 after 6 years' service, and $250 after 10 years. Some officers received an annual pay boost of more than $2,700 under the terms of the act. The measure was designed to halt the growing resignation rate among physicians and dentists and to attract and retain more medical personnel in the armed services, thus providing adequate medical care for servicemen and their families.

REGULAR OFFICER AUGMENTATION

One of the career incentive bills to be signed most recently by the President is the Regular Officer Augmentation Act (Public Law 737), which gives all of the services permanent authority to integrate officers into their Regular ranks. The measure permanently extends present Navy and Marine Corps authority to integrate officers through pay grade O–3. It gives both the Army and Air Force higher ceilings for Regular appointments and authorizes integration through the grade of colonel in the Army and lieutenant colonel in the Air Force. Under the new act, the latter two services will bring their Regular officer strength up to approximately 36 percent in 1958, and to approximately 40 percent in 1963. The President will have to decide after that date whether the Army and Air Force should continue to increase their Regular officer ranks to 50 percent. In 1958, the Army will integrate an additional 7,000 officers, making a total of 35,640 Regular, and the Air Force will integrate an additional 25,000, making a total of 36,640 Regulars. Additional appointments will be made thereafter until 1963 to boost the total Regular officer strength to 40 percent. The Army will make new appointments on a base age of 27, which may be increased by the officer's past active commissioned service and also up to 2 years of constructive credit. In the Air Force, some Regulars will receive additional promotion-list service based on the amount of prior commissioned service and up to 2 years of constructive service. The basis for new appointments in the Air Force will be age 30, which can be increased by their commissioned service and up to 2 years of constructive service. Such service will be the basis for determining the promotion-list credit which is required for appointment to the various grades. The act limits appointments in the Air Force to the grade of lieutenant colonel and below but initial augmentation will be through the grade of major only.

RETIREMENT IN HIGHEST GRADE

Permanent authority for military officers and enlisted men to retire in the highest temporary rank which they have satisfactory held was signed into law (Public Law 547) on May 31. More than 900 retired officers, warrant officers and enlisted men received promotions on the retired lists under the act, at a cost of $692,000. Thousands more now on active duty will benefit from the legislation in the future.

RESERVE READJUSTMENT PAY

Reserve personnel involuntarily released from active duty won rehabilitation pay under Public Law 676, which was signed on July 9. The pay, which goes to all reservists who have served at least 5 years of substantially continuous active duty and are involuntarily released, is designed to help them readjust to civilian life. Payments are based one one-half of 1 month's basic pay in the grade in which the man is serving at the time of release for each year of active warrant, commissioned or enlisted service up to and including the 18th year. Approximately 4,335 Reservists will receive $11.8 million under the program during the current fiscal year.

TAX CUT FOR RETIRED

The first important military law to be signed during the 2d session of the 84th Congress was Public Law 398, which reduces the taxes of all retired personnel. Regardless of age, retired servicemen and women are en-

titled, under the terms of the act, to earn up to $1,200 in outside income and take full tax credit on $1,200 of their retired pay. The law also provides that retired personnel who are 72 or older may earn any amount of outside income and draw their full retired pay. For those under 72, the new law provides that the tax credit is reduced dollar for dollar by any amount over $1,200 which the taxpayer earns. The tax cut for the first year will amount to more than $11 million.

USCG RETIRED PAY

Retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard won increased pay checks under Public Law 489, signed on April 23. The act provides that a USCG commissioned officer who was advanced one grade on retirement under the law of January 12, 1923, shall receive the retired pay of the grade in which he was retired. The cost of the pay boost was estimated at $116,000 through fiscal year 1956 and $15,000 annually thereafter.

NAVY PERSONNEL MEASURES

Five important measures affecting Navy personnel were approved by the second session and all but one have been signed into law. They include Public Law 581, which changes the Navy's system of assigning running mates to lieutenants, junior grade, in the staff corps by excluding USNA graduates and NROTC officers appointed ensigns in the Regular Navy from the fanning provisions of the Officer Personnel Act. When promoted to lieutenants, junior grade, these officers, under the terms of the new law, are assigned running mates in accordance with their position in order of merit upon graduation.

Navy promotion exams were changed by Public Law 584, which gives the Secretary of the Navy broad authority to tell Navy examining boards what professional qualifications to look for in officers up for promotion.

WAVE promotion laws were changed by Public Law 585, which permits the Navy to use unfilled WAVE commander billets to promote more lieutenants to lieutenant commander. The new law also permits the Navy to retain on active duty until they complete 15 years' service a limited number of lieutenants who have completed 13 years' service and have not been selected for promotion.

Regular and Reserve Navy nurses in certain specialties were authorized to transfer to the Navy's Medical Service Corps under the terms of Public Law 606.

The fifth measure, now awaiting the President's signature, is H. R. 9892, which changes the procedures for physical examination of Navy and Marine Corps officers prior to promotion. The measure vests in the Secretary of the Navy, instead of in a board of naval surgeons, the responsibility for prescribing the method by which Navy and Marine Corps officers eligible for promotion shall physically qualify for such promotion.

FORGIVENESS LAWS

A number of new laws were enacted to permit service personnel to keep pay which they received erroneously through a mistake by the Government.

The first of the group, Public Law 561, authorized waiting pay for approximately 4,000 Regular Army officers and 1,200 Regular Air Force officers. Payments already made in the amount of $2 million were validated by the legislation which also authorized new payments of approximately $385,000. The payments in question were made between December 31, 1947, and June 1953 to Regular Army and Air Force officers for pay and allowance for the time from their appointment until their assignment to initial duty stations.

The second, Public Law 526, validates payments of longevity pay made to Army and Air Force nurses on the basis of civilian service with the United States Public Health Service during the period April 15, 1947, to October 1, 1949.

Another forgiveness bill, Public Law No. 620, validates $6 million in reenlistment bonuses erroneously paid to approximately 20,000 enlisted personnel.

A fourth such measure, H. R. 7611, now at the White House awaiting the President's signature, establishes a date of rank for pay purposes for 2,880 United States Naval Reserve officers who were recalled to active duty during the Korean emergency and promoted to lieutenant and lieutenant commander. The legislation permits the officers to keep more than $600,000 which they otherwise would have to repay to the Government.

Three other measures went to the White House this week. The first, H. R. 8617 validates payments of sea duty pay totalling $153,800 made to 1,445 enlisted men who served on board vessels in the Great Lakes during the period November 1, 1950, to October 31, 1953.

The second, H. R. 2121, would refund approximately $63,500 to about 700 Army, Navy, AF, and USMC personnel who were required to pay part of the cost of shipping their household goods back to the States from overseas stations.

The third, H. R. 7121, validates payments of mileage totalling $87,170 made to Army and AF personnel as a result of PCS orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft during the period January 1, 1950, through March 31, 1951.

OTHER LAWS ENACTED

Here are some of the other measures which have been signed by the President or on which the President's signature is pending:

Yellow fever workers: Public Law 424, increased the pensions of those associated with Maj. Walter Reed in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever from $125 to $200 per month.

Pay for Reserve trainees. Public Law 490, increase the pay of trainees in the 6-month Reserve program to $78.

Free shipment of autos overseas: Public Law 538 authorizes free shipment of automobiles of military personnel to overseas stations by commercial vessel.

Military personnel claims: Public Law 571, increases from $2,500 to $6,500 the maximum amount which military personnel can receive from the Government in cases in which their property is lost, damaged, or destroyed through some fault of the Government.

Mileage allowance overseas: Public Law 576 authorizes payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private automobiles outside the Continental United States (6 cents per mile).

Quartermaster service: Public Law 601, provides that service as an Army field clerk or as a QMC field clerk shall be counted for retirement purposes.

Enlistment contracts: Public Law 614, provides that enlistment contracts for enlisted men appointed to service academies shall not terminate by reason of their appointment.

USCG temporary promotions: Public Law 738, extends the authority of the Coast Guard to continue making promotions under the Temporary Promotion Act of 1941.

Missing Persons Act: Public Law 749, extends for 1 year the benefits of the Missing Persons Act.

Dependents assistance: H. R. 10683, now at the White House, provides punishment for fraudulent acceptance of benefits under the Dependents' Assistance Act.

Marine Corps band: H. R. 8290, now at the White House, provides for appointment and promotion of director and two assistants of USMC Band.

Counsel in foreign courts: H. R. 7646, now at the White House, authorizes services to hire counsel to defend military personnel tried before foreign courts.

Unused leave: H. R. 9246, now at the White House, authorizes payments to survivors of former members for unused leave credit.

Lost time: H. R. 8407, now at the White House, requires enlisted members of the Armed Forces to make up time lost during enlistments.

Merchant Marine medals: H. J. Res. 569, now at the White House, authorizes medals and decorations in the United States Merchant Marine.

Osteopaths: H. R. 483, now at the White House, authorizes appointment of doctors of osteopathy in the Medical Corps of the Army and Navy.

ROTC flight training: H. R. 5738, now at the White House, authorizes flight instruction during ROTC programs.

Nurses for National Guard: H. R. 7290, now at the White House, authorizes appointment of female nurses in the Army and Air National Guard.

Home loans for servicemen: H. R. 9260, authorizes a second GI home loan for the active duty serviceman if he has to dispose of his home because of military orders.

Numerous other bills have been approved by either the House or Senate, or were pending conference decisions after passage by both Houses in different forms.

THE $2 BILLION CAPITOL STORY

The Armed Forces will salute the two sessions of the 84th Congress for enactment of farseeing personnel legislation, valued at about $2 billion, which will do much to enhance national security. Particularly noteworthy is the complete nonpartisan attitude which marked the joint efforts of the administration and Congress to make military service more attractive. This was an instance of dynamic Government teamwork.

The administration formulated a detailed program, which was pushed vigorously by Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson, his principal civilian manpower aide, Assistant Defense Secretary Carter L. Burgess, and the service Secretaries. A brilliant legislative liaison record was achieved by the career incentives task force, headed by Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, United States Navy, who is heading for a new assignment.

At the Capitol, the Armed Services Committees worked diligently through both sessions to process vital legislation that would make certain the Nation's security is not jeopardized by the presence of large numbers of second-raters in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. With the assistance of their skilled professional staffs, Chairmen RUSSELL and VINSON of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, and the senior Republican members, Senator SALTONSTALL and Representative SHORT, were able to score brilliant successes, as reviewed in this issue.

On the basis of this record, the services can look forward to a continued campaign next year to complete the job. This will mean passage of a new military pay increase and the enactment of the various bills which are described in an adjacent article. The prospects for the future are brightened in the glow of the record of the 84th Congress.

Frequently in past years, there has been much valid criticism of action on Capitol Hill which had adverse effects on the Armed Forces. No such charges can be made against the 84th Congress. It has done a magnificent job for all servicemen and their families.

Don't Sell Our Young People Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress is aware of the de-

termined effort made by our colleague, Mr. FEIGHAN, to alert the American people of the dangers to our national security involved in continuing foreign aid to the Communist dictator, Tito. I recall that our colleague has made informative and telling speeches each year that the issue of continuing foreign aid to Tito has been before us. Last month when the 1957 appropriation for foreign aid was under debate Congressman FEIGHAN made a very significant analysis of the relationship of Communist dictator, Tito, with the leaders of international communism in Moscow. He pointed out that Tito's first loyalty was to Moscow and international communism and that it would be foolhardy for us to assume that Tito could ever be won over to support the cause of human freedom.

While our colleague was delivering his speech, his 16-year-old daughter, Fleur, was sitting in the gallery.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported this interesting incident in a regular Sunday column, Ohio Under the Dome, June 16, as follows:

OHIO UNDER THE DOME

(By Walker S. Buel, Edward Kernan, Phil G. Goulding)

FEIGHAN GETS ASSIST FROM DAUGHTER

WASHINGTON, June 16.—Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, of Cleveland, was bolstered during debate on the foreign aid bill by a note from the galleries. It was delivered by page as the House was debating his proposal that mutual security funds be denied Tito's Yugoslavia.

The author was his 16-year-old daughter, Fleur, who attends Georgetown Visitation Convent here.

She wrote:

"Dad, tell them again and again that communism means world conquest and there has been no difference between Tito's communism and Moscow's. Keep repeating.

"I loved your speech (give 'em the business). I'm up watching you.

"Love,

"FLEUR."

Behavior of American Servicemen Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been increasing publicity given to the crimes being committed by American servicemen abroad. These stories are injuring American prestige abroad and are causing apprehension in the United States about the criminal tendencies apparently shown by some American youths and concern as to how it will affect the attitude of friendly nations toward us. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have been attempting to find out if these charges have been magnified and learn the true facts of this alarming situation. I have been collecting newspaper clippings and editorials for some time on this subject. These also show a growing apprehension on the part of the American people over the behavior of the American soldiers abroad and how it may affect our country.

At first I intended to get statistics on the number of American servicemen abroad and the number of crimes supposedly committed by them to determine a percentage. I have, in a general way, done this; but since the number of American troops in any locality is classified as secret information, for obvious reasons it would be improper for me to make public these figures. However, I do want to assure you that the number of crimes committed by our American soldiers abroad is, in my opinion, less than crimes committed by the youth of the same age not in the service. If 20,000 American troops in 1 locality have committed no major crimes in a period of several months, it is not news; and naturally it does not make the headlines; but, as soon as 1 American soldier commits a felony, that immediately becomes headlines. It is my sincere belief that with reference to the crimes committed abroad the American people and the people abroad should give equal importance to the fine job being done and the good will displayed by the hundreds and thousands of our American boys abroad.

I do not mean to condone the crimes being committed by American servicemen abroad. It is true that the publicity given these crimes is being used as a pretext by Communist and Fascist factions abroad to force us to bring our American troops home. I am not attempting to discuss our foreign policy and the number of troops that we should have in foreign countries; but I do want to point out some possible actions which the United States can take to cut down the number of crimes committed by our American troops abroad. From investigations which I have made, I believe that the Army, Navy, and Air Force have not used sufficient care in the selection of servicemen for overseas assignments. This carelessness in handling personnel is not new. To my personal knowledge it existed during and after World War II and up until the present time. By proper study, observation, and tests we could eliminate from overseas duty 90 percent of the potential troublemakers that are going to become a part of any Army under the draft system.

As I stated above, I am not trying to comment upon the advisability of the number of American troops abroad; but I do believe that all America has the right to demand that the servicemen we send abroad well represent the best in our way of life. A merchant does not put his poorest and worst merchandise on display; neither should the United States send troublemakers as our emissaries abroad.

It has been my personal experience that a capable company commander can tell almost to a certainty the men in his command who cannot be trusted, and those who are potential troublemakers. We cannot afford to send second-rate servicemen abroad to represent America. To continue to do this is going to bring about a situation whereby public opinion abroad and in America will force the return of our forces abroad.

While many believe that we should bring American servicemen back to the United States, I do not believe any American wants us to do so because of the loss of prestige of our American youth abroad.

All I am asking—and I intend to continue to work toward that goal—is that the United States weed out from overseas duty that very, very small dangerous few that are giving the United States a bad reputation overseas.

The United States World Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has approved and thus signed into law my resolution, House Joint Resolution 604, to focus world attention on the United States World Trade Fair. Thus is completed the legislative process which began on April 18, 1956, when I introduced this measure. The bill was at that time referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under the chairmanship of the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS. Because of the committee's work on the Mutual Security Act of 1956, my resolution could not be considered immediately, but I was assured from the start that as soon as the Mutual Security Act had been presented to the House, the way would be clear for the committee to take up and consider my bill.

Needless to say, Mr. Speaker, Chairman RICHARDS was true to his word and on June 21, 1956, the committee met and unanimously ordered that the resolution be favorably reported to the House. The report was filed on June 28, and on July 16, the House passed the resolution. The bill was then sent to the Senate where it was immediately placed on the Senate calendar, and on July 20 the Senate considered and passed the bill.

As a result of the introduction, passage, and Presidential approval of this bill, the President has been authorized to issue a proclamation inviting the States of the Union and the nations of the world to participate in the fair which is to be held at the New York Coliseum in the district that I represent. The fair will be held in April of 1957.

Mr. Speaker, the interest in this international exposition is great. The Governor of the State of New York has already issued an invitation to 71 nations that they participate. The mayor of the city of New York has issued an official greeting to those who might wish to participate. There will now be added the proclamation of the President of the United States.

This World Trade Fair presents our Nation with a great opportunity. The aim of our foreign-aid programs has always been to lend our friends in the world the economic assistance that they require to become economically self-

reliant. By focusing attention on a world marketplace for all of these nations, and by encouraging their participation in it, we develop at the same time the means by which the nations of the world can exhibit and offer for sale their goods and services. The fair will include nine different categories of products, covering some 60 different types of goods.

This method of sustaining our friends and aiding their economies will add to their independence and self-reliance and may eventually lead to the replacement of foreign aid with foreign trade. The nations of the world realize this. Already, the following have agreed to participate in the fair: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Ceylon, Denmark, Finland, France, West Germany, Great Britain, Greece, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korean, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, and West Berlin, which though not a nation will be accorded equal status with the other participants.

The interest of these nations is for me a strong indication of the fact that we have done a great service in passing House Joint Resolution 604. I am very grateful to all who aided in its passage in the Congress.

Why I Would Like To Visit Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. The Workmen's Benefit Fund, the largest fraternal benefit society with national headquarters in Brooklyn, N. Y., recently conducted a letterwriting contest among its members throughout the country in cooperation with Lufthansa German Airlines. The subject of the contest was Why I Would Like To Visit Germany, and is part of a program of the Workmen's Benefit Fund to establish closer ties between the United States and West Germany. The text of the prize-winning letter submitted by Mr. Hans O. Peters, of 32 Foskett Street, Somerville, Mass., is as follows:

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO VISIT GERMANY

My many years in our wonderful America have been influenced by the underlying memories of a happy childhood in Germany. To return once more to the scene of this basic guidance and the loved onces that were instrumental would be a realization of a dream long cherished.

Hardly a day has passed when I have not counted my blessings in working with my fellow men, with my boss, instead of "fur den herrn Chef." My greatest ambition has been to seek an interview with the personnel managers of great German firms and explain to them the difference between those two little words, "for" and "with." Thus, I would like to make a start of good-fellowship in Germany, as we have it here.

As to the worker himself, I would like to learn how he thinks, what his attitude is, how his ideas could benefit us, and how he would feel to enter a German bureau and not be able to tell at a glance: "Who is boss around here?"

The tremendous suffering of the German people should give an interesting aspect of the religious teaching and how it applied in times of stress. What would they think of our individual support of churches and of our uncompelled true faith?

For his work and craftsmanship, I would like to praise the German worker in person. I admire their courage to build and rebuild against all odds, and would tell them so. My heartfelt message would be that we are with them and hope they are with us. With them, let us work for the good of all mankind.

An American Message to the People of Poznan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article written by Dr. Zoltan Michael Szaz, entitled "An American Message to the People of Poznan":

During recent weeks the population of the Polish city of Poznan desperately attempted to liberate itself from Communist rule, and was crushed in the bitter fighting by 240 tanks and massed artillery. It began with a peaceful demonstration for more bread and improved living conditions and against the Soviets who still drain Poland's economy. The demonstration developed into a revolution only after the police, acting under higher orders, fired on children in the crowds. The ensuing fight had many of the bitter earmarks of the unsuccessful Polish revolt against the Germans at Warsaw in 1944. Now the curtain of terror has descended again on the city in the wake of the revolt which showed the hollowness of the post-Stalinist slogans of liberalization and of more respect toward public opinion by the Communists. As the Western businessmen, visiting the Poznan trade fair, left the city, and the rule of secret police once again takes its bloody toll, it is an appropriate time to think about whether we, in the United States, have a message to offer to the heroes of Poznan who only represented the armed vanguard of all the long-suffering people of the satellites whether in Poland, Hungary, Eastern Germany, or in the other captive countries.

First, we have to realize that it can only be a message of sympathy and hope, and not a lecture. We take our freedoms too much for granted to lecture those who were willing to sacrifice their lives and liberty to catch a glimpse of the spark of freedom which to them has become the climax of their desires.

Second, let it be a message conveying spiritual value. Man does not live by bread alone, and despite the assertion of some historians, the great movements of history were guided by spiritual values rather than by material factors. Let us remind them that we, in the West, believe in the brotherhood of men; in the dignity and rights of the individual; in the inherent victory of freedom with order over the forces of collectivism; and finally in the presence of Divine Providence in today's world despite the terrible suffering of the righteous under an atheistic-materialistic rule which no pseudo-concessions of post-Stalinist epigones nor the bloody terror which was not completely restricted to the Stalin-Beria dictatorship can end.

Third, let our message be one of hope which conquers the world. Hope which fired the spirits of patriotic Poles during the revolts of 1830 and 1863 against Czarist oppression, which conquered the vicissitudes of time and history in Poland's long fight for freedom between 1795 and 1919. Hope that could not be erased from the soul of freedom-loving Poles and other Central and Eastern Europeans by the defeats at Osterolenka, Világos, in the fights of 1939 and 1944. A message of hope which will triumph over collectivism and secret police, and over the exploitation of workers for the power of the police state, as soon as the present Communist regime will come to an end as a result of internal strains, and ideological confusion.

Fourth, let our message be one of courage. It may not be needed in view of the desperate heroism of the people of the city, and by many other Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Germans, openly professing their preference for freedom and democracy. Let, however, them be reminded that freedom in any country is only earned by the toil and sacrifice of the people offering them to this great cause. Let them be reminded, too, that we still have the kind of courage called for to defend our freedom come what may, should the emergency arise. That we still possess the spirit of '76, of New Orleans, and Guadalcanal, and that we hope that the Polish people, too, will hasten the day of their liberation by any means short of armed uprising, and the day when all Central and Eastern Europe shall be free is no longer in the distant future.

Last, let our message be one of sympathy and understanding, a message of remembrance. Let it be known that we treasure the leaders of the revolt as representatives of mankind's highest aspirations, and as our own heroes. Let us tell them that we have not forgotten them in their present predicament, and that we are ready and willing to send them free the bread which they wanted and to keep flame of freedom aglow in the country under the ashes of terror.

While our meassage is directed toward the people, let it be a warning to those who believe in communism, or who are too easily reconciled with the loss of Central and Eastern Europe to the free world, that no lasting peace can be achieved until the chains of enslaved nations can be seen despite peace displays and offensives, and until the peoples themselves shall be permitted to decide who their rulers shall be and what policies shall be pursued. Let it be known that the United States, as all through her history, is not interested in false security as could be had by a peace that leaves the problems of freedom in the captive countries unsolved, but that we stand for the freedom and welfare of these suffering people.

This should have been our message to the captive peoples west of the Soviet Union at our Independence Day.

Opposition to Elimination of Cumulative Voting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a telegram received by me,

which is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

The undersigned shareholders of the newly chartered Tappan Zee National Bank of Nyack appreciate that it is the desire of Congress to make cumulative voting permissive rather than mandatory for the election of directors of national banks. We respectfully call your attention to the article in the New York Times of July 22 which shows convincingly that there is substantial doubt whether S. 256 accomplishes this end for the following reasons: instead of making change from the present system permissive, it abolishes cumulative voting mandatorily unless "the articles of association so provide." The permissive element, therefore, is simply a permission to attempt to insert cumulative voting into the articles of association through organized action of shareholders.

We say this because the existing articles of association of national banks, if drawn according to the prescribed form of the Comptroller of the Currency, do not now provide for cumulative voting. As we found in forming the Tappan Zee National Bank, the practical way to prepare for obtaining a charter is to adopt without change the ready-made and printed articles which come from Washington. We are, therefore, confident that no national bank created since cumulative voting was introduced through congressional legislation has any mention of cumulative voting in its articles.

The Comptroller thought it superfluous to place such a clause in his ready-made articles of association.

Prospective shareholders, not anticipating that Congress would ever propose mandatorily to change an established voting procedure, thought it superfluous to add such a clause at the time of incorporation.

What effect will S. 256 have on our little country bank which is owned by more than 150 local merchants, businessmen, and investors? In order to preserve our existing voting rights and maintain our existing voting procedure, we would be compelled to organize with other shareholders and obtain a majority of votes or proxies to restore cumulative voting.

In the thousands of national banks throughout the country, shareholders are faced, by S. 256 in its present form, with the same distasteful choice either to accept the loss of a safeguard which may have influenced their investment, and be partially disenfranchised, or to organize a campaign to restore cumulative voting at a special meeting called by stockholders for that purpose. Where there is opposition from management, and it is plain from testimony on S. 256 that this will be widespread, such a campaign can be damaging to community harmony and to the stability of national banks themselves. We do not believe that the Congress, by adopting the present text of S. 256, will deliberately force this ugly decision upon communities throughout the Nation.

Taking the long view of this proposed legislation, it relies on shareholders to reestablish existing voting procedure, where they are to maintain it, through the method of proxy fights.

We are baffled why the Congress should deem this desirable. We are especially baffled why Congress should put bank shareholders in this predicament without extending to them the protection of the proxy regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission, which, as we learned from the New York Times, has not yet been done.

We appeal to you, whom the Nation trusts as a congressional statesman, to weigh the merits of the alternative proposal to make cumulative voting permissive on a genuinely democratic basis. This constructive solution is explained in the New York Times and follows the logical course of permitting shareholders of each national bank to vote on a change in the procedure of electing directors before, repeat before, the change is made. Following this alternative, the Congress, in removing the mandatory effect of present law in respect to cumulative voting, would provide instead that cumulative voting continue in each national bank until and unless shareholders vote to make a change.

The consequence of this proposed alternative would be to place the initiative for change with management, so that change would be recommended only where there was a clear desirability for change, and would take effect only where a majority of the shareholders vote affirmatively in a routine expression of opinion.

We urge, therefore, that S. 256 either be revised on the floor in the foregoing sense, or, if this is not practical in the closing days of Congress, that it be recommitted to the Banking Committee for further hearing and study. We realize that recommittal may result in the session closing without passage of a bill. However, we feel this would be the lesser of two evils, in view especially of the fact that a continuation of cumulative voting (which would result from the absence of legislation), as reported by the New York Times to be favored by so eminent an authority as William McC. Martin, former president of the New York Stock Exchange and now Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

It may even ultimately prove wiser to let the next Congres consider this controversial question since the specific complaints presented are admittedly isolated and no urgency for their solution has been shown.

We are sending copies of this telegram to our Representative, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and Minority Leader MARTIN. We will urge upon them that they support you in bipartisan and constructive action to make a change in the present voting system permissive rather than forcing it upon the Nation's bank shareholders as S. 256 would do in its present form.

ELIAS D. ARDAVANY,
Theater Owner.
VERNON CHURCH,
Florist.
LEWIS H. HEYDEMAN,
Gunsmith.
LAWRENCE E. DeNEUFVILLE,
Investor.
JOHN G. KEENAN,
Attorney.
JOHN B. KARKOS,
Schoolmaster.

Congress Should Act on Unused Visas Before Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT W. CRETELLA
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I called to the attention of the Congress the fact that 40,000 quota numbers would be left unused if the Refugee Relief Act as it now exists were allowed to expire at the end of this year. This is a shameful waste and a disappointment to the many worthy aliens, especially from Italy and Greece, who are prevented from coming to our shores because the numbers for their countries are exhausted.

The Refugee Relief Act was a modest endeavor to continue the humanitarian policy of our country for the relief of persons displaced by war and persecution. Its full intent will not be accomplished should the law be allowed to expire with 40,000 quota numbers unclaimed by some nations and with others begging for consideration.

I am pleased that President Eisenhower is solidly behind Senator WATKINS' proposal to allow the pooling of these quotas. It is a disappointment and no credit can be given to certain Senate leaders who, despite the strong possibility of wide congressional support, have not seen fit to schedule this legislation. The following editorial from the July 26, Washington Post, speaks eloquently on the subject:

UNUSED VISAS

The President, in a strong letter to Senator WATKINS that has been virtually overlooked in Congress' rush to adjourn, has urged once again the prompt amendment of the immigration laws to permit reallocation of unused refugee relief visas. "Unless action is taken in this session," Mr. Eisenhower declared, "immigration from a number of friendly nations such as Greece and Italy will be drastically reduced when the visas which have been available to those countries under the Refugee Relief Act are exhausted this summer."

Thousands of visas available to escapees from Communist countries now living in Germany and Austria have not been applied for, but under present law these quotas cannot be shifted to other countries where many refugees are stranded. Senator WATKINS hopes to tack the necessary amendment on the so-called "sheepherders' bill"—the only House-passed immigration bill on the Senate calendar—if and when it is called up by the Senate leadership. Full hearings have been held on the Watkins proposals, and Congress ought to heed without fail the President's renewed plea for this humanitarian and long overdue legislation.

Congressman Harley O. Staggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last spring, in answer to students' inquiries, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my idea of the average Congressman. I chose from among the Members of the House of Representatives my colleague, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia. Since that time, several things have happened in the ordinary work-a-day life of Congressman STAGGERS that I think should be brought to your attention in order to complete the record of the achievements of this Congressman.

Culminating years of hard work, Congressman STAGGERS has been instrumental in having authorized a new Federal building in Martinsburg, W. Va., to house the post office and the Federal court. It is estimated that the cost of this building will be approximately $1,500,000.

Through the efforts of the second district Congressman, a bill has been put

through Congress for the relief of the city of Elkins from an airport indebtedness.

Another project which adds to Congressman Staggers' credit is the establishment of a fish hatchery in his district. He has diligently pushed through the House of Representatives a bill which will provide a $600,000 Federal fish hatchery in the second district which will supply the streams throughout the national forests in West Virginia and some of the streams in adjoining States. This bill provides a maintenance fund of $100,000 yearly.

Your average Congressman has also had enacted by Congress a resolution authorizing $30,000 for planning and surveying of the Greenbrier River in Marlinton, W. Va.

A definite decision has now been made to locate the Radio Astronomy Center, to which I referred in my previous speech, in Pocahontas County, W. Va.; $3,500,000 has been earmarked to start this project. STAGGERS played a large part in seeing that the funds were appropriated and earmarked for this project.

In addition to major achievements, the Congressman is daily working for the best interest of America and the good of the people.

He has helped thousands of people and works on every problem just like it was his own. He makes hundreds of speeches yearly and is always available when needed.

Mr. Hanson Demurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is well for us to occasionally reflect upon the burdens being progressively imposed upon business enterprise and to ask, too, whether or not intended benefits are always altogether in the best interests of the beneficiaries. A challenging thought in that connection will be found in the following excerpt from a letter that I have received from Mr. James R. Hanson. Mr. Hanson is engaged in business at Fremont, Nebr., and is a former mayor of that city. He writes:

It looks as if payrolls are in for additional old age benefit taxes starting with 1957, unless the House upsets the Senate in this regard which is hardly probable. Doubtless it is already too late to say anything about this and we shall have to bow to the inevitable.

As we read the newspapers, the Senate was moved to tears by the dramatic and impassioned plea made by Senator GEORGE to let him retire from the Senate with this lifelong ambition of his to make disability insurance benefits available to people who have attained the age of 50 instead of the age 65. Of course, the immediate result is additional taxes to be paid by the employer, the employee, and the self-employed, but what does he care.

The Government, be it Congress or the executive department, takes it for granted that there is no limit to the burden that business can stand in the way of additional taxes. It is certainly too bad that legislation has to be largely motivated by political considerations. How long can a country last if practically every decision of importance has to first pass the test of political expediency. No doubt it has always been that way and always will be but nevertheless it is a bad situation.

This seemingly small payroll tax his gradually crept up on us until it really amounts to something. In a way it is deceptive because the part of the tax that comes out of the employee is subtracted from his salary and all he knows is that he has so many dollars of take-home pay and if it shrinks it is the boss' fault.

Here is a practical illustration of the severity of taxes on business. On the desk in front of me I have the annual financial statement of Marshall Nurseries, Inc., of Arlington, Nebr., with branches at Omaha and Denver. For the fiscal year ended May 31, 1956, the total tax expense (except Federal income tax) at all three places aggregated $25,113.74. Of this amount $14,009.24 consisted of the 2-percent old age benefit tax and State and Federal Unemployment Taxes. The remaining $11,104.50 was State, county and local real estate, personal property tax and numerous city taxes and licenses.

The comparable total figure was a little over $17,000 4 years ago so you will see how it has increased. The Federal income tax is in addition to the above. Nor of course, do we attempt to show what the hidden taxes amount to on gas and oil, tires and dozens of other things.

One reaction from these severe payroll taxes has been an enormous increase in the use of machinery to replace human beings. Wherever it is possible to put in a machine that will do the work of humans it is being done. Some day a lot of people will be looking for work, who will not be needed and a great howl will go up.

H. R. 10535

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower recently signed into law a bill I introduced H. R. 10535 expanding Zion Park to include Zion Monument. I received a letter from Mr. Leo A. Snow who contributed to the initial designation of this beautiful area as a national park. Since this letter is of historic interest, I am including the following extracts in the Appendix of the RECORD:

In 1908 I was assigned the work of carrying on the survey of public lands included in what is now the Zion National Park. We carried out work up to the east side of the main canyon and there set our flags that might be seen from the west side. Next day my party of 12 men walked from the east around the head of the canyon and down on the west side to a point where we could pick up the flag on the south boundary of the township and then triangulated 2½ miles across the canyon and continued our surveys of all that was in our judgment surveyable in that part for which we held directions to survey.

In April 1909 we finished the report and in summing up the narrative I compared Zion with the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and suggested that it be made into a national park.

Others had, of course, been working on the project and had no doubt made many reports and done much toward the accomplishment, but in August of 1909 President Taft made his order creating the Zion National Monument which was later designated as a park.

I consider Zion one of the most beautiful of nature's undertakings.

Republicans and Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the 1952 campaign promises and pledges of the Republican Party was to stop inflation and bring down the high cost of living. Of course, in their campaign speeches and literature the Democrats were responsible for the rising cost of living. Who is responsible for it now? For 4 years it has continued to climb. Note the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of July 26, 1956:

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

Living costs climbed to a new peak last month, and the end is not in sight. Consumer prices registered their fourth straight monthly advance in June, are rising again in July, and may go still higher in August. The June upsurge was the sharpest for any month since January 1951. It carried the Bureau of Labor Statistics' consumer price index to a record high of 116.2 percent. Living costs in June were 16.2 percent higher than during 1947–49 and were 2 percent higher than in January 1953, when the Eisenhower administration entered office. The administration's proud boast of having carried out its campaign promise to stabilize prices is in jeopardy.

There is a surprising explanation for the living-costs rise. Much has been made of a 2-percent jump in retail food prices from May to June. But, even though the cost of living reached a new peak last month, food prices remained below their alltime high and, in fact, have edged up only a thin 0.1 percent since January 1953. The villain has been the cost of services—haircuts, permanent waves, manicures, doctors' bills, cleaning and pressing, automobile repairs, and the like. Service costs have been rising ever since 1939, and in the first 42 months of the Eisenhower administration they climbed an additional 9 percent.

The increase in the cost of living since January 1953 has occurred even though buying demand was quieted during part of the period by the brief 1953–54 recession. The United States may be demonstrating that it

is impossible to have full employment without some price inflation. A 1947–49 dollar was worth only 88 cents when the Eisenhower administration entered office. It stayed within 1 penny of that figure until June, but now it has slipped to 86 cents. The dollar has become cheaper in response to the strong buying demands and price pressures that a prosperous economy generated before and after the recession. If this is the way a fully employed economy normaly behaves, it is disturbing to think about what may happen the next time business and consumer demands soar the way they did during the Korean emergency.

Trip-Leasing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have expressed an interest in a brief explanation of the provisions contained in the trip-leasing bill, which has passed the Congress.

When the bill passed the House, I gave a full explanation of the bill. Even though it was thoroughly discussed, I fully realize the difficulty in readily comprehending the bill, because of its technical features.

In an effort to be helpful, I have prepared a memorandum as briefly as possible in explanation of the legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the memorandum in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF TRIP-LEASING LEGISLATION, S. 898, 84TH CONGRESS

The legislation would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to exercise certain regulatory control over the leasing of motor vehicles by motor common and contract carriers, when such vehicles are to be driven for the carriers by the owner, or an employee of the owner, of the vehicle. This legislation is not concerned with the leasing of a motor vehicle when such vehicle is leased without the services of a driver.

The Commission is granted authority by this legislation to prescribe regulations as to certain contents of the lease, and regulation which would assure that the motor carrier would have full direction and control of the leased vehicle and be fully responsible for its operation. The Commission is also given authority to establish requirements with respect to inspection and the safety of operation of such vehicles.

However, the Commission is denied authority to regulate the duration of a trip-lease of a motor vehicle, with driver, or the amount of compensation for the use of such vehicle, when the vehicle is that of (1) a farmer, (2) a farmer-cooperative organization or federation, or (3) a for-hire or private carrier when such vehicle has completed a movement of property specified in the agricultural exemptions specified in section 203 (b) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act. Under this section, motor vehicles used in carrying property consisting of ordinary livestock, fish (including shellfish), or agricultural (including horticultural) commodities (not including manufactured products thereof), are exempted from economic regulation by the Commission, but are subject to its safety regulations.

In other words, regulated motor common and contract carriers would be permitted to trip lease the motor vehicle, with driver, of a farmer, a farm cooperative association or federation, or the motor vehicle of a for-hire or private carrier which has completed a movement of property specified in section 203 (b) (6) of the act. Also, regulated motor carriers would be permitted to trip lease the motor vehicle of a private carrier when such vehicle is used regularly in the transportation of perishable products manufactured from property specified in section 203 (b) (6). Examples of such perishable products are frozen orange juice, or frozen vegetables.

The direction of movement of the trip-leased vehicle is limited generally to a single movement, or one or more of a series of movements, in the general direction of the general area in which the trip-leased vehicle is based.

A more detailed statement of this legislation is given in House Report No. 2425, 84th Congress.

Leadership From the Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article by W. Dale Parker, of Wilmington, Del., entitled "Leadership From the Heart," a tribute to the late Charles Fletcher, superintendent of the Seaboard Airline Railroad shops, Portsmouth, Va.:

LEADERSHIP FROM THE HEART

(By W. Dale Parker)

Undoubtedly the most impressive example of leadership in my life happened while working as an apprentice carman for the Seaboard Airline Railroad in Portsmouth, Va.

One day a fellow carman accused the foreman of slapping his son who was also an employee of the railroad. Because of the highhanded actions of the foreman the men in the shops and in the yards threatened a strike if the superintendent didn't dismiss him.

As the strike deadline, 2 p. m., approached no word had been received from the superintendent concerning the foreman. Railroaders began to leave their shop and yard duties to form in small groups gathering at the shop entrance. Someone standing on a box began to organize the groups into a mob, bent on destruction and violence. He asked those favoring the strike to stand on his right and those opposed to stand on his left. Most of the men moved immediately to the right of the speaker. After an oration (studded with railroad slang) to his railroad men at arms the mob moved off intent on seizing the foreman bodily.

Suddenly a door opened and out into this mainstream of humanity stepped the railroad superintendent. A man of ruddy complexion whose 200 pounds stretched over a medium frame crammed with unwavering courage made Charles Fletcher look every inch the superintendent he was. Well, Charles Fletcher took himself a vantage point and stood up so he could be seen by all. He put up his hand and spoke in his most commanding voice: "Now boys, I'm the daddy of this gang." Well, at this point everyone just yelled and applauded. Here was a man whose long railroad service was of little value in settling any dispute but whose faith in men and his love for the individual had given him the many qualities necessary for leadership. This leadership was being put to a test. He went on, "And I know one of my boys has made a mistake. I want you to go back to work and let me take care of this matter. I'm not going to let any one of my boys get away with any rough stuff and I'm not going to let any of them jump on another one if I can help it. If there's any stomping to be done 'round here, I'm going to do it."

I don't remember just how Charlie Fletcher concluded his very brief remarks that day but I do remember the men going back to work feeling like controlling interest stockholders who were working for a man with a big heart who knew his duty and did it.

Segregation in the North

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have many times directed the attention of our southern colleagues to the fact that my attitude and votes on civil-rights legislation are directed as much against the problems that confront us in the North as those that confront us in the South. At least in the North we recognize the problems and we face up to them.

I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of July 25, 1956:

SEGREGATION IN THE NORTH

It is surprising how many Americans believe their principal racial problem is confined to the South. For the fact is that nearly one-third of the Negroes in the United States now live in the North. They are largely concentrated in "cities" within cities, 12 having a population of 100,000 each and 3 nearly 1,000,000 each. And adjustments are by no means always easy or peaceful, as recurrent disturbances prove.

There is no legal segregation in the North but segregation forms the general pattern wherever large groups of Negroes are found. Their own desires to live among their own kind plus economic pressures tend to restrict them to certain crowded and deteriorating neighborhoods. And since children normally attend schools nearest their homes segregation naturally governs there too as a general practice.

Such segregation, although never touching the experience of millions of northerners, greatly concerns many city and school officials. In some cases they are attempting to force a mixing of races—even going across normal school zones to do it. The theory is that mixing is itself educational. Directly involved is the old concept of the melting pot as an adjunct of democracy. And there is insistence on the right of equal opportunity.

Considering the official and political efforts to combat segregation in the North, it has proved remarkably persistent. In several respects it resembles a phenomenon American cities have long known—immigrants from abroad forming their own racial or national enclaves, maintaining their own customs and languages, even their own newspapers. Often the forces making for such

clannishness come as much from within as from without.

So it is with the American Negro—in the North and the South. Too often it is assumed that segregation is a wholly artificial pattern enforced by unworthy prejudice. Some of it is like that. But much segregation comes about naturally through the same processes of selection which cause individuals to choose like-minded associates or families to seek congenial neighborhoods. And white resistance to Negro migrations within cities arises partly from the fact that such movements are usually in groups—due in turn to Negro desires to have friends or relatives as neighbors.

Officials in the North who are trying to force a mixing in the face of such forces of natural selection should be able better to understand why desegregation moves slowly in the South. So, too, should northern whites who object to their neighborhoods being changed either by racial migration, by industrialization, or by any social force causing deterioration. And possibly also Negroes who prefer not to live alone in white neighborhoods, a preference which reduces the opportunity for them to be treated as individuals and centers attention on race.

All of us can deal more wisely with this situation if we recognize that here there are two rights in conflict. One is the right to equal opportunity. The other is the right of the individual to choose his associates. Both are closely related to the democratic ideal. To enforce either against the other by law takes something away from that ideal. To seek accommodation of the one to the other by voluntary action supports the democratic ideal and is likely to bring the most practicable and enduring solution.

Dr. Townsend and Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the final approval this week by the Congress of amendments to the social-security law is a big step forward in social insurance for the people of our country.

It is another step toward the goal envisioned by Dr. Francis E. Townsend, who pioneered for a plan to bring economic freedom, dignity, respect, and security to the old folks of this Nation. His proposal which became known as the Townsend plan gave inspiration and hope for the past score or more years to millions of senior citizens throughout the Nation.

Dr. Townsend was appalled at the sight of poverty in the midst of plenty. He saw how the Hoover depression brought dire hardship to millions of people. Old folks then were especially affected by privation and despair. Many of them rallied under the leadership of Dr. Townsend in a fight for social justice. The Townsend plan was proposed to abolish poverty and to bring lasting prosperity to all Americans as well as justice and security to elderly folks.

Much of the credit for the progress that has been made in social insurance is the result of Dr. Townsend's pioneering efforts for old-age pensions or for what he now refers to as a plan for national insurance.

Dr. Townsend's plan has been presented in many Congresses but has never reached the floor of Congress. It has been introduced again in this 84th Congress, 163 Members of the House have signed a discharge petition to bring the bill to the floor for debate and action.

This support gives evidence that many Members of Congress see the need for consideration and action on legislation which goes much further than the present social security law and beyond the amendments which were finally approved by Congress this week.

The Townsendites were not dismayed by the powerful opposition they faced. They continue to press for the Townsend plan—a program that will adequately meet the needs of all elderly folks. Even the modest improvements just made in the social-security law by this Congress were opposed by Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, Marion B. Folsom, a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. If the administration opposes these very mild changes today, it can be understood why the Townsend plan faced bitter opposition from extreme conservative forces during the past 20 or more years.

These mild social-security improvements of 1956 were also bitterly opposed by the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Medical Association, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and other big money groups who have been long-time foes of such humanitarian and liberal legislation. Despite such opposition, great advances have been made in the field of social insurance, thanks to Dr. Townsend and other men of vision who were not influenced by deceptive propaganda and scare labels used by opponents of such programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of attending meetings of Townsend Clubs in my district on a number of occasions. These meetings are attended by many senior citizens of Reading and Berks County. These elderly folks are making a great contribution to the understanding of the problem of the aged. They point to the need for organization and action, particularly by senior citizens, in seeking legislative action to obtain their worthy objective.

Growing numbers of citizens, as a result, now recognize the need for this humanitarian legislation. They believe that people who have contributed a life of service to the Nation have a right to enjoy their twilight years in dignity, self-respect and security.

The Townsendites have taken a keen interest in politics realizing the importance of their ballots in obtaining adequate security legislation that will bring justice to the old folks and prosperity to all.

It is quite proper that we give proper recognition to Dr. Townsend and to his faithful followers for their contribution to the progress that has been made in social insurance. Dr. Townsend is a man of great social vision. He is nearing his 90th birthday but has remarkable energy. He continues to carry on at a great sacrifice to himself for a cause which will eventually triumph.

Dr. Townsend may not live to see his plan, or another which meets the objective he seeks, adopted by the Congress. But he can take pride in knowing that he has played a leading role in easing the burden of millions of old folks and in making life for them more full and happy.

A Public Letter to the Honorable John W. McCormack From the Embattled Owners of the Boston & Providence Railroad Urging Passage of the Walter Bill, H. R. 9459

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

A PUBLC LETTER TO THE HONORABLE JOHN W. MCCORMACK FROM THE EMBATTLED OWNERS OF THE BOSTON & PROVIDENCE RAILROAD URGING PASSAGE OF THE WALTER BILL, H. R. 9459

The Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Democratic Floor Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The embattled owners of the Boston & Providence Railroad call on their distinguished majority floor leader, JOHN W. MCCORMACK of Boston, to have Speaker RAYBURN suspend the rules and bring up the Walter bill, H. R. 9459, for enactment forthwith.

There is still time to pass this civil rights bill for the 125-year-old Boston & Providence Railroad.

Our senior director, Mr. Samuel H. Wolcott, of Boston (acting in the absence of our president, Mr. George Peabody Gardner of Boston), and our principal Boston counsel, the Honorable Jacob J. Kaplan of the firm of Nutter, McClennen & Fish, have already pleaded with you to put this bill through in order to prevent grievous injustice to a great Boston institution.

As you know, the old lease of the Boston & Providence Railroad to the New Haven ended in 1938.

For 18 years the freight service between South Boston and Providence and the splendid passenger service between South Boston, Back Bay, and Providence enroute to New York and Washington, have been held to be a Boston and Providence operation conducted through the New Haven as agent.

For 18 years the New Haven has been collecting its own revenues west of Providence and collecting our revenues east of Providence. The net railway operating income thus collected from the public by the New Haven for both companies amounts to $200 million.

For 18 years the Boston & Providence owners have been waiting for their share. So far they have received less than 1 cent.

The two companies have not agreed on how to divide the revenues. And the New Haven now openly refuses to make an accounting. Some fiduciary.

I need not remind you that no Boston enterprise has ever been more distinguished than the Boston & Providence. The property has never been mortgaged. Its investment value exceeds $940 per share according to ICC valuation studies. Its traditional ownership by religious and charitable trusts continues in considerable part.

Yet the New Haven openly plans to keep all the joint income for itself and to allow the Boston & Providence none. This is confiscation of the use of our $36 million property.

The Walter bill aims to provide just relief. It was drafted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It was recommended to Congress by ICC Chairman Arpaia, who comes from New Haven, Conn., and knows the truth.

The House Judiciary Committee held a public hearing so that the New Haven could come and object. But the New Haven did not appear.

Of course the New Haven has not appeared openly—because its opposition cannot stand the light of day. But now the Capitol is crawling with New Haven lobbyists. You could see them yesterday in gallery 7.

All that the Walter bill does is to provide that when a railroad lease has ended and the owner has arranged for another railroad company to conduct the operation as agent, the owner can have the same protection which Congress has granted to every other railroad company—to have its operating revenues regulated fairly by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That regulation is a legislative function, which the Constitution assigns to Congress. And Congress has set up the expert ICC to regulate rates and divisions of rates for all railroad companies on just, reasonable, and equitable standards (49 U. S. C 15 (6)). The fifth amendment requires just compensation.

When we applied for this equal protection under the laws, the wily New Haven discovered an imperfection in the acts of Congress which made the ICC unable to grant its normal protection to the Boston and Providence.

Congress never intended any such defect. The ICC and the House Judiciary Committee (acting unanimously by report 2775) have done their part to repair the unintended defect.

Now, sir, it is up to you. If you will support the Boston & Providence owners today with the same will and ability that you displayed yesterday when you put through the cranberry bill on the second vote, then the Boston & Providence will have its civil rights after all.

We are all counting on you.

Respectfully submitted by direction of all Boston & Providence protective committees and groups.

ARMISTEAD B. ROOD,
Washington Counsel.

Tribute to a Great Democrat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of deserved tributes recently in the public press in recognition of the fine qualities of statesmanship and the quiet wisdom of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN F. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this time in the RECORD editorials from two great newspapers, the Oregon Journal and the Minneapolis Star:

[From the Oregon Journal of July 22, 1956]

GROUPS THAT SHOULD NOT BE FOES

Must there be a wide gulf between the politician and the intellectual?

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, in a recent address at Harvard University, said there is a growing hostility between the two based on what he called "unfounded feelings of distrust."

For proof that this condition need not exist, he pointed to the fact that "our Nation's first great politicians were among the Nation's first great writers and scholars."

KENNEDY pleaded for an armistice between these contending groups, for an understanding that both would profit by increased political cooperation, and so would the Nation.

He reminded both that they operate within a common framework, a framework we call liberty, and that freedom of expression is not divisible into political expression and intellectual expression.

"The lock on the door of the legislature, the parliament, or the assembly hall—by order of the king, the commissar, or the fuehrer—has historically followed or preceded by a lock on the door of the university, the library, or the printer's. And if the first blow for freedom in any subjugated land is struck by a political leader, the second is struck by a book, a newspaper, or a pamphlet."

KENNEDY'S voice may not be heard very loud or very far, but he has hit upon a matter which is of great concern to a nation which has had world leadership thrust upon it.

We will never furnish the best kind of leadership so long as men in Government distrust scholarship and at the same time the intellectuals hold only contempt for those engaged in political affairs.

The words "politician" and "intellectual" both have been badly abused. Perhaps there ought to be a reappraisal of what they mean. Certainly our system of government needs both. It cannot function at its best until each is willing to recognize the other's place.

[From the Minneapolis Star of July 20, 1956]

KENNEDY FOR "VEEP"

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, has been mentioned with increasing frequency in recent weeks as a potential Democratic candidate for Vice President. And for good reasons.

KENNEDY is young, handsome, and able. He is the author of two books, including the recent best seller, Profiles in Courage. Harvard, his alma mater, recently awarded him an honorary doctor of laws degree for his achievements.

He had a distinguished record in the navy in World War II. He served on a PT boat in the South Pacific, was seriously injured when his boat was rammed in two while attacking a Japanese destroyed in the Solomons, and was decorated by the navy for his "courage, endurance, and excellent leadership" in towing injured members of his crew to safety.

Elected to Congress in 1946 at the age of 29, he was re-elected in 1948 and 1950, and in 1952 became the third Democrat ever elected to the Senate from Massachusetts. He is a grandson of Boston's one-time mayor and congressman, John F. Fitzgerald, and the son of Joseph P. Kennedy, former ambassador to Great Britain. He early rejected his father's isolationism, and has become a leading Senate advocate of United States cooperation in world affairs. He often has displayed unusual political courage in the Senate, as when he backed the St. Lawrence seaway even though it was opposed by eastern seaport interests.

But in the minds of some politicians, KENNEDY still is not a qualified candidate because he is a Catholic. It is true that no Catholic ever has been elected President or Vice President, and the only one ever nominated for either office by a major party was the late Al Smith. But in considering KENNEDY, the Democrats might well recall the words of Herbert Hoover when he tried to cool the prejudice against Smith, his opponent in the 1928 campaign:

"By blood and conviction, I stand for religious tolerance, both in act and in spirit. The glory of our American ideals is the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience."

The Administration Program for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to represent a great agriculture district. Naturally, a foremost consideration of mine has been how best to advance the welfare of our farmers, how to solve the problem of accumulated surpluses which depress prices that the farmer may receive his fair share of our national income.

This, I am proud to say, has also been a foremost consideration of the entire Eisenhower Republican administration. The first special message which President Eisenhower submitted to the Congress, following his state-of-the-Union message, was on the farm problem. The Congress had been in session only a week when he urged early action on a nine-point farm program.

Under President Eisenhower's leadership a great deal has been accomplished for the benefit of the American farmer. It was his determined efforts to put into effect a workable program, and the cooperation of the Republicans in Congress, that enables us to review with some pride what has been accomplished during this Congress for the benefit of our farmers.

The Agricultural Act of 1954 was greatly strengthened along lines recommended by the President. The Congress built on an act which, as the President said, "permanently reinforced the foundations of all agriculture." It was apparent, however, early in this session that the unprecedented stocks of surplus food and fiber accumulated from previous farm programs were such a market-disturbing factor that the more economically sound provisions of the 1954 act were prevented from functioning effectively. Therefore, additional legislation was needed to overcome the imbalance between production and consumption.

At the start of this year, farm income had been in an 8-year decline, with the single exception of the Korean war year of 1951, and the farm price parity ratio had been in a 5-year decline. It is true the parity decline had been substantially slowed down in recent months. For example, the parity ratio had de-

clined from 113 in February 1951 to 94 in January 1953—a total decline of 19 points. This contrasted with a decline of only 14 points in the 3 years from January 1953 to January 1956. We were not satisfied with a mere slowing down of the decline which had been underway most rapidly when this administration assumed office. The trend had to be reversed. The President recognized this last January 9 in his message when he pointed out that "for 5 years, the farm economy has declined. Unless corrected, these economic reversals are a direct threat to the welfare of all of our people."

The President's recommendations were, practically point by point, enacted into law, but it was accomplished only by his courage to veto an impractical bill and his insistence that the program be sound. It is unfortunate that in many cases enactment came too late in this session of Congress for the full benefits of the program to be realized by farmers this year. This was because the Democrat-controlled Congress made the farm legislation a political football.

While the farm bill as passed by Congress was not in all respects what the President desired, there has been an economic quickening throughout the agricultural economy as a result of its adoption.

It is gratifying to all of us to note that prices received by American farmers have risen 11 percent since this session of Congress convened last January. The farm price parity ratio for last month stood at 86—a rise of 5 points in 6 months. It is now 1 point higher than a year earlier. This is the first time in over 5 years that the parity ratio was higher than it was a year earlier.

There is every indication that the farm economy has passed the turning point and is definitely headed upward. However, we cannot accomplish miracles overnight. It will take time to work out of the situation that we were a dozen years working into. The important thing is that we are faced in the right direction. Net farm income is currently running half a billion dollars above the level of late 1955. This is the first time in 8 years that net farm income has headed upward, with the single exception of the Korean war year of 1951.

This new strength in the farm economy stems in large part from adoption and implementation of the President's recommendations for constructive agricultural legislation.

This new strength in the farm economy stems in large part from the President's recommendations to tackle the surplus problem head on. This was a courageous effort to correct basic causes underlying the farm maladjustment, not merely to rub salve on symptoms.

Of the many difficulties that aggregate the farm problem—

The President said in his January message—

mountainous surpluses overshadow everything else.

It was on his recommendation that this Congress gave the Secretary of Agriculture authority to press surplus disposal programs even more vigorously than before. This year the Department moved $2.7 billion worth of Government-owned commodities into use at home and abroad—more than ever before and 5 times as much as in 1953. In the 3½ years of this Administration, over $6 billion worth of surplus commodities have been moved by the Department of Agriculture.

But the farmer's hope does not lie in continued Government disposal of surplus. The farmer is interested in expanding markets and in effective balancing of production and consumption.

On the recommendation of President Eisenhower, the Congress enacted a soil bank. This legislation has far-reaching provisions to correct imbalance between production and consumption, and thus to attack the basic cause of the agricultural income recession. This will be done in such a way as to provide cooperating farmers with income assurance during the years the adjustment is being made. At the same time our great agricultural production resources will be strengthened against the day when this Nation will need increased production of food and fiber. Thus every American will benefit from this forward looking program, whether he be farmer or urban dweller.

That day last January when President Eisenhower first recommended this Congress enact a soil bank, there was agreement among Republicans and some Democrats alike that such legislation was needed. The leadership of both parties in Congress expressed desire for its prompt enactment.

However, it soon became apparent that the soil bank would be delayed substantially because of numerous attempts to load it with crippling amendments. One hundred amendments were offered when the bill was reported to the floor of the Senate. Over forty of them were adopted.

The net effect of these amendments was to produce such a legislative hodgepodge that the President in good conscience could not accept the bill. Some provisions of the first farm bill passed by this Congress would have perpetuated into the future the very arrangement that got agriculture into the mess it was in.

It took political courage for President Eisenhower to veto a farm bill which had been erroneously heralded by its proponents as "the answer to the farm problem."

The ink on the President's veto message was scarcely dry when the overwhelmingly favorable reaction from all parts of the country indicated his good judgment. Principle had dominated politics. Farm and non-farm people alike rallied behnd the Presidential veto. Tens of millions of Americans responded enthusiastically to this manifestation of integrity in Government. The effort to override the veto in Congress failed to achieve even a simple majority.

This Congress is to be congratulated for pitching in again promptly, after veto of the first unworkable farm bill, for hammering out a soil bank bill following the recommendations made by the President last January. It is unfortunate that nearly half a year's delay resulted from the political maneuverings on the first bill. This delay made it impossible to get the soil bank in full operation this year, and cost the farmers hundreds of millions of dollars. For this, the Democratic leadership in Congress alone must accept responsibility.

It is well for us now to review briefly the recommendations made by the President in his January message, and to take stock of what has been done about them.

He asked for—and Congress enacted—a soil-bank law.

He recommended strengthening of the commodity programs. This has been done on a broad front.

He asked for and received extension and enlargement of the special school-milk program.

The President's recommendations for improvement of the Agricultural credit system were approved.

The brucellosis eradication program was enlarged.

A start has been made toward a Great Plains program as recommended by the President in order to maintain a more stable agriculture in an area beset by drought and wind erosion.

Congress approved the President's recommendations for a great expansion of agricultural research to develop new uses for crops, new markets and new crops. Appropriations for research and extension have been increased $43 million since 1953.

Congress followed his recommendation to relieve farmers of the Federal tax on gasoline used on farms. This meant a saving of $60 million annually.

Though the Rural Development program to assist those farm families which benefit little if at all from price support and other programs is going forward, the Congress did not see fit to implement this on the scale recommended by the President.

In the main, thanks to our President's firm leadership, the Congress came fairly close to following the blueprint laid down by the President last January. Bipartisan effort was made to heed the criterion of the President when he said in the message:

Historically agricultural policy in this country has sought to foster family-sized owner-operated farms. This has been a sound and wise policy—not only in the development of an efficient agriculture which has become the envy of the world, but also in fostering a sturdy, resourceful, self-reliant citizenry.

The principle of flexible rather than rigid supports, carried over from the Agricultural Act of 1954, makes it possible for the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out this historic policy. The Secretary demonstrated anew that under this principle, supports can be "flexed" upward as well as downward, depending upon circumstances.

Conditions were such that the Secretary announced that supports would be flexed upward in order to relieve a squeeze on wheat and corn growers and on producers of dairy products. Higher support levels were announced for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums.

It is pertinent to note a few additional facts about the farm economy.

More farmers own their farms than ever before in history.

Farm tenancy is at an all-time record low.

Farm foreclosures are near record low.

About 7 out of 10 farmers have no mortgage debt whatever.

Total farm indebtedness is only about 11 percent of the value of farm assets. This is near an all-time low ratio. Indeed, farmers own more cash and bonds than their total indebtedness.

Farms now have more and better machinery than ever before.

More farmers than ever before have electricity and telephones. The REA has aided markedly in this program during the past 3 years.

Farm families have a record high level of living.

New and expanded water management programs have been put into effect under legislation enacted by this administration.

Never before has there been so much soil and water conservation activity on so broad a front as now.

More disaster and drought aid has been extended to farmers during this administration than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, it is easily apparent that the 84th Congress was able to enact such a broad program of constructive legislation for American farmers because of the far-reaching recommendations for legislation made by President Eisenhower during the opening days of the Congress. If it had not been for determined leadership of the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, combined with enlightened demands from our farm leaders in all 48 States, it is doubtful we would have this constructive record on the part of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this Congress has made a real contribution to the welfare of American farmers. I am glad that our program can take some share of responsibility for revising the 8-year downturn in farm income. I am happy that we have in President Eisenhower and in Secretary of Agriculture Benson two outstanding individuals who have the insight and the courage always to place principle before politics. I am proud that a sufficient number of Members of Congress followed their leadership and their recommendations to have enacted into law the constructive measures which they had recommended.

Social Security Still Inadequate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the social-security conference report which was approved by the Congress on yesterday. I noted for this bill when it passed the House of Representatives last year because it is a step in the right direction and does bring about some very badly needed improvements in this law—particularly in reference to the age reduction for women and the disability protection for workers aged 50 or over.

My own bill to amend the social-security law is still pending before the House Ways and Means Committee and would make the following improvements:

First, reduce the eligibility age for retirement benefits—now age 65 for everyone—to age 62 for men and age 60 for women.

Second, provide that widows who have been entitled to mother's benefits because there were young children in the home when the father died may become eligible for benefits in their own right at age 55, regardless of whether there are still children under 18 in the home. Under existing law, the benefits to such a widowed mother cease when the youngest child reaches age 18, and she must wait until she is 65 years of age before she is again entitled to a benefit.

Third, provide that workers aged 50 and over who are retired prematurely from their jobs by a disability which is so severe that they cannot work at any job shall be entitled to benefits on proof of such disability.

Fourth, provide substantial increases in benefits ranging from 33⅓ percent in the lower and middle brackets to 10 percent in the highest.

The greatest need under our social-security program today is a substantial increase in benefits. Present rates are completely inadequate and unrealistic in the light of living costs and economic conditions generally. It is deplorable that our retired people should be expected to live on a pension as low as $45 per month for man and wife.

I hope the House Ways and Means Committee will renew its study and commence hearings on this important subject immediately upon the adjournment of Congress so that the matter can be given further consideration next January.

Government Budgeting and Accounting Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to comment on the passage of my bill to revise the governmental budgeting and accounting methods, since I feel that with its passage many progressive steps can be taken in our Government accounting system. As originally introduced, this measure implemented the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission to revise our governmental accounting methods, estimated by the Commission to save billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money when fully implemented. The bill as I introduced it in the House called for the executive departments and agencies to provide: Budget information on program costs and accomplishments; departmental budgeting on a cost basis; synchronization of organization structure, budget classifications and accounting systems; accounting an an accrual basis; simplification in the subdivision of appropriations of funds; it also contained the provision that Congress make annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, or that Congress could not vote more than the administration planned to spend in any fiscal year.

The bill received the unreserved endorsement of the Government's foremost financial authorities—the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. It was widely supported by many organizations and individuals interested in fiscal reform, and in economy in Government.

While the House Committee on Government Operations deleted one of the major provisions of the bill providing that Congress make annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, it was felt that substantial progress in governmental accounting would be possible by the passage of the amended bill calling for the departments and agencies to start to put their budgets on a cost-based basis and set up their accounts on an accrual basis. The amended bill, as the original bill, received the support of Mr. Percival Brundage, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and in this connection I would like to quote from a letter from Mr. Brundage directed to Senator KENNEDY, who sponsored the bill on the Senate side: "While I favor putting appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, and believe that legislation to accomplish this should ultimately be enacted, I regard the other sections of your bill to be of such great importance that I would strongly favor the enactment of your bill, even without the section to place appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis." Also approving the passage of the amended bill were Mr. J. Harold Stewart, chairman, Hoover Commission Task Force on Budgeting and Accounting; Clarence Francis, chairman, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report; John Coleman, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Meyer Kesnbaum, special assistant ot the President; and former President Hoover.

I would like at this time to quote a telegram to me from Mr. Clarence Francis, the national chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report: "Thank you for your splendid work on behalf of the Hoover Commission's Budget and Accounting Report. The conference-approved bill will be a major stride in the history of Federal fiscal practice, and lead to important savings. The citizens committee hopes the conference version will be speedily enacted. Please accept our congratulations."

I am keenly interested in seeing all of the Hoover recommendations for budgeting and accounting reforms enacted, and I have already introduced a bill, H. R. 12410, to carry out the deleted provision of our accounting bill, calling for annual appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis, which will give Congress the control it does not now have over the

money it appropriates, and which will ultimately result in the savings of many dollars of the taxpayers. I introduced H. R. 12410 at this time in order to clearly set forth the provision which will bring about the annual accrued expenditure budget. It is my plan, if a Member of the 85th Congress, to reintroduce this measure on the first day of the session.

Polish Liberation and Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very striking impressive information bulletin of the Polish Government in Exile issued from London in November 1955.

This bulletin, as those who read it may readily observe, is a frank, forceful statement of the present situation confronting Poland, and certain basic aspects of the policy of the Polish Government in Exile.

It is particularly significant in that it indicates that the Polish leadership has not been intimidated by Russian blandishments and threats, but remains militant in pressing its cause for liberation and reestablishment of freedom in Poland.

It is also marked by an intelligent, realistic analysis of the so-called "spirit of Geneva." Let me state that, prior to Geneva, I had occasion to set forth my views concerning the then approaching conference. While I expressed hope for progress toward peace, I took pains to warn our leaders to be on guard against Russian tactics and carefully to scrutinize the Russian attitude. I stated then what can now be repeated, that until sincerity of purpose and honesty of method and forthrightness and fairness of dealing can be integrated into international relations the prospects for world peace cannot be secured.

While for a short period smiles replaced scowls on the face of Soviet diplomats, the fundamental principle of Soviet world policy remains the same. It is world domination by the international marxist state. It would entail the suppression and destruction of freedom and the subjugation of all to the will of totalitarian masters. American statesmen and the American people must keep that fact in mind.

It is very important never to underestimate the strength of a potential adversary, but it is equally important never to overestimate it. I feel that influential leaders in our country and the free world tend to overestimate the economic power and military strength of the Soviet and on the basis of these calculations formulate and follow certain policies of appeasement and compromise. It is my opinion that this is entirely the wrong approach. There can be no compromise with tyranny: there can be no appeasement of those who have already enslaved a large part of the world and are trying to destroy freedom.

The hesitancy of our leadership since World War II in facing up boldly to the Soviet world threat has brought the free world to the brink of fresh disaster. We well know the unswerving principle of Soviet policy to envelop the world and to execute this policy with persistent conspiracy against free nations designed ruthlesly to destroy the rights of the weak and to practice sinister contempt of the ideals of the free world.

If we continue to permit the policy of this Nation to be predicated on unreasoning fear, appeasement, and compromise with those striving for our destruction, there will be little hope for human freedom or indeed, in the long run, for our own freedom. If we permit the Nation and our people to be dominated by hysterical fear of nuclear destruction and on that basis to tolerate continued infiltration, aggression, and war on democracy and freedom, our long-run prospects for maintaining our free institutions will be meager.

The free world has the means of coping with this menacing situation, if it would but employ them. If the United Nations and the free nations work together and join hands to check the outrageous conduct of the Soviet and honestly throw our resources behind a determined policy designed to that end, we could secure respect for our rights and best insure world peace. These problems are difficult, all embracing, and tremendous in scope and seriousness, but they must be tackled and solved in a courageous spirit or the consequences will be grave. The free world should lead from its strength, not from its weakness; it should not be awed either by the strength or the threats of would-be totalitarian masters.

Poland is in a sense the real test of our sincerity toward liberation of the oppressed and the reestablishment of freedom. Let us again indicate in unmistakable terms our support of courageous Polish leadership and the cause of Polish freedom because it is in truth our own cause.

It would be truly unbelievable that anyone should ever advocate an American foreign policy which included the technique of bringing the world to the brink of war in order to achieve diplomatic victories. But if such a practice has ever received support or credence of our foreign policymakers, it should be flatly repudiated. Our policy must ever be, by all honorable means, to avoid war—not to invite it. And responsible leaders who would trifle with or endanger the cause of peace could not long retain public confidence in this Nation or in the world. I hope that appropriate disavowals will soon be expressed reassuring the American people and our friends overseas that this great Government sincerely stands for and works for the cause of peace and the cause of freedom and that we propose by every means in our power to achieve the one and protect the other.

The material follows:

STATEMENT MADE BY THE POLISH GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE CONCERNING THE SUMMONS TO RETURN TO POLAND

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—During the past 10 years, as a result of the Yalta agreement, the question of the reinstatement of the independence of the Polish State has disappeared from the agenda of all international conferences.

(The trend of events has brought the question up again. Without a solution of this problem, there can be no real easing of the tension between the East and West and, consequently, no permanent peace.

(The Polish people will never become reconciled to occupation by the Soviets any more than they submitted to the occupation of their country by the Germans during the war. This is a fact which should be understood and recognized by the whole civilized world.

(When driven from their country by the enemy, the President of Poland and his Government continued in the land of their exile the struggle against the occupants. And, as the legal, constitutional authorities of the Polish Republic, they are still continuing in the West their campaign for the reinstatement of an independent and sovereign Polish State.

(The object of the present bulletin is to give the foreign press information about the activities which are carried out in the international field by the heads of the true Polish Government in defense of the Polish problem.)

We have been called upon to return to our home country which is at present under the occupation of Soviet Russia and ruled over by its agents. We have been summoned to return, but at the same time there is complete indifference and silence as to the fate of the many thousands of Poles who have been deported to Russia and are slowly dying in prison camps.

The rightful Polish Government herewith asserts that:

1. In order to further the Polish cause it is essential that large numbers of Poles should continue their sojourn in free countries beyond the frontiers of their occupied land, for it is only they who are at liberty to say the truth and to speak on behalf of their silenced fellow countrymen.

In the present state of affairs only the Polish Government and, with it, the free Poles can put a true value on the sacred rights of freedom for their fatherland and other enslaved countries of central and eastern Europe, and they alone can say what the politicians of the free world do not want to say.

2. The hypocritical promises made by the Soviet agent Bierut in exhorting us to return are not to be trusted. In 1945 an assurance of safe conduct by air to London was given to 16 Polish underground leaders—but they were taken to the Lubianka prison in Moscow.

Several members of the prewar polit parties in Communist Poland were promised an amnesty on account of their activities during the period that their country was an independent and sovereign one. Nevertheless many of them have been arrested, no matter whether their activities were of a political or of an administrative nature. Many refugees, especially exservicemen, who returned to their home country, were promised an amnesty. Yet, shortly after their arrival, they disappeared without trace.

In making the above statement the Polish Government in exile is convinced that citizens of the Polish Republic who are now in exile will be restrained by their patriotism, a sense of their obligations towards their home country and their sense of self-preservation from taking at their face value the fraudulent promises of the Communist administration in Poland."

Professor Pragier, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Council of the Pol-

ish Republic, recently gave an interview to the editor of the Information Bulletin of the Polish Government in Exile. A translation of the questions asked and the replies given reads as follows:

Question: "Professor Pragier, do you today, 10 years after signature of the Yalta Agreement, consider that the Polish Government acted rightly in rejecting that agreement at the time, and in lodging a formal protest against it?"

Answer: "The 10 years that have elapsed have established beyond doubt that the stand then taken by the Polish Government, of which I was then a member, was the right one. We were of the opinion that the appointment of an administration for Poland by the three great powers, that is by three foreign powers, was in itself a suppression of the sovereignty of Poland. That Moscow agents predominated in that administration and that the whole executive power of the country was placed in the hands of Communists made it obvious at once that the country would come under the exclusive occupation of Soviet Russia. And this is just what happened. Mr. Mikolajczyk's attempt to collaborate with the Communists in an effort to retain in non-Communist hands some influence in the country was doomed to failure, as was the case in many other countries in Europe and Asia. That is the reason why the Polish Government condemned the attempt. Subsequent events proved that it was right.

"The Polish Government warned its western allies that the occupation of Poland and other countries of central and eastern Europe would lead to the military and political domination of Soviet Russia on the European continent, and upset the balance of power through the world. This threat was further strengthened by Russia's rule over the eastern parts of Germany, as agreed by the Anglo-Saxon powers. Today it is clear that the parts of Europe that have remained free are incapable of defending themselves. An indubitable proof of this fact is the creation of NATO with the participation of America. The tension throughout the world cannot be eased as long as the present situation in Europe persists. Therefore every effort should be made to compel Russia to withdraw to her pre-1939 frontiers. In practice this means reunification of Germany under a democratic government and withdrawal of Russian troops and Soviet political agents from eastern and central Europe."

Question: "What are your views on the so-called Geneva spirit and the Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Great Powers?"

Answer: "For various reasons the Soviets have changed their political tactics. They are experiencing economic difficulties, especially in agriculture. They have not yet been able to give their hierarchy a definitive shape following upon the death of Stalin, and this has resulted in a collective dictatorship. They are faced with gigantic industrial problems and the armament of China, two factors which are overtaxing their strength. Their aggressive activities, namely, the blockade of Berlin, the war in Korea and Indochina, and the arming of Viet Minh have provoked an increase in the rearmament of America and given rise to greater vigilance on the part of the Western World.

"The purpose behind that change of tone recently adopted by the Soviet is to put a brake on the vigilance of the Western powers, to weaken their rearmament drive and thereby to turn the balance of power in their favor. The conferences of the top men at Geneva have been conducted in this atmosphere from which has arisen the so-called spirit of Geneva. If it were not for the gravity, nay even peril, involved, the term 'spirit of Geneva' could be looked upon as the bad joke of our dark age.

"I must point out that not one of the problems discussed at Geneva resulted in an agreement between the East and the West, nor anything approaching an agreement.

"As regards the unification of Germany, the Soviets have not renounced their plan for the domination of Western Germany. They made their agreement to a reunification conditional upon a dissolution of NATO and a withdrawal by America from bases in Europe and Asia, or in other words, on a weakening of the Western Powers.

"The disarmament conference at Washington between Russia and the Western Powers, which was arranged at Geneva, has also ended in a complete deadlock.

"The third question discussed by the Great Powers was that of the promotion of tourist traffic and cultural exchanges. The subject of these discussions, as compared with the above-mentioned problems shows to what heights of absurdity the Geneva Conference has fallen.

"It is worthy of note that in order to avoid irritating the Soviets the Western Powers did not raise the question of withdrawal of the Soviets, occupation from Central and Eastern Europe. It was mentioned casually by President Eisenhower, but as it was not supported by Sir A. Eden and M. Faure and was opposed by Bulganin, the matter was dropped.

"In the end the conference of the top men of governments at Geneva did not achieve anything and the only result was that, as desired by Russia and in accordance with tactical requirements, widespread discussions were started in the West on eastement of the tension—and there is no tension in the West.

"Today on the eve of a new Geneva Conference, which is to turn the spirits of the previous conference from one of hot air into one of solid deeds, the Soviets are taking advantage of the situation and have opened up a new front in North Africa, reaching from Egypt to Morocco.

"The agreements concerning the supply of armaments from Egypt and the Arabian oilfields and, furthermore, given rise to the danger of a renewed war with Israel. The revolts in Algiers and Morocco are given support from Cairo by political and military organizations who are taking advantage of Soviet technical aid and propaganda.

"These are the incidents which will loom large on the horizon when discussions are opened at the forthcoming Conference of Foreign Ministers at Geneva.

Court Review for Veterans With Service-Connected Disabilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on February 16 of this year I introduced a bill to provide court review from decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals which disallow in whole or in part any claim for a benefit or payment for disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred in or aggravated by active military or naval service.

Under existing law the Board of Veterans' Appeals is the Supreme Court so far as disabled veterans are concerned. Its decisions are final both as to law and fact. If this Board make a mistake, there is no way to correct it unless the Board itself changes its viewpoint.

I have handled many cases for disabled veterans and their dependents during my service in Congress where the decision of the Board of Veterans' Appeals was clearly in error. In some instances I have been able to persude the Board to reverse its previous decision, but in most instances the Board refuses to budge—right or wrong. I am sure many Members of this House have had experiences similar to my own, which is one of the reasons I am convinced that some method of providing further review of these decisions must be found.

During the last session of Congress I introduced a bill in behalf of a veteran who had lost the vision in one eye from an injury received in service. This bill was passed unanimously by both the House and Senate. The Board of Veterans' Appeals had repeatedly denied this veteran his pension. Thus we had a situation where 435 Members of Congress disagree with 3 members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals on the question of this man's entitlement to compensation.

It should not be the function of Congress to review the decisions of administrative agencies, and therefore the proper procedure in these cases is to permit a veteran with a service-connected claim to have his day in court. That is what my bill seeks to do.

The House Judiciary Committee held hearings on my bill last spring. Unfortunately that committee did not report the bill in order to give the House an opportunity to consider it. I am confident that, when the bill is considered, it will pass this House with an overwhelming majority.

The legislation has the approval and support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion of Michigan, and I am sure will ultimately have the support of the national departments of all veterans' organizations.

Other citizens are entitled to their day in court, and it is high time we provided the disabled veteran and his dependents with this same privilege.

Benson's Pet Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, approval of the Secretary of Agriculture of Iowa State College, at Ames, Iowa, as the site for the location of the new Department of Agriculture Animal Disease Laboratory has been met with mixed emotions. Secretary Benson formerly attended this school, and people are justified in raising the question of partiality in the selection of his alma mater.

Although delegations came to St. Louis from 70 cities with sound proposals, there was no consideration given to any of them. Mr. Benson's method of lightning-fast, on-the-site inspections of only nine proposed midwestern sites left little doubt that his alma mater had it in the bag. Typical in its expression

of the unfairness with which most of the applicants were treated by Mr. Benson and his committee is the following letter from the Honorable Nelson O. Howarth, mayor of Springfield, Ill., to Mr. Benson, dated July 12, 1956, the text of which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, ILL.,
July 12, 1956.

HON. EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Some weeks ago the city of Springfield, Ill., along with more than 80 other cities in the Midwest, received a news release from your office indicating that hearings were to be held in St. Louis, Mo., to decide upon the location of a new Animal Disease Laboratory for the Department of Agriculture, and that the hearings committee would be interested in 7 specified matters, upon which a decision was to be based.

Like all cities, the people of Springfield, Ill., are proud of their community, but because we were also a community well adapted to furnish services for governmental agencies, we made a special bid for this site. In that connection, three important business men of our community, the entire city council, the president of our local Federation of Labor, and the officers of our local Association of Commerce and Industry made a trip to St. Louis, at some expense, and there made a presentation on behalf of our city.

From the rapidity with which your committee left St. Louis to visit a few college towns and the rapidity with which you announced the selection of Ames, Iowa, it is quite apparent that any city that was not also the site of an agricultural school was disqualified from the start. It is quite within your jurisdiction and authority to make such a qualification, but this letter is written in protest to the almost insulting abuse you made of the time and efforts of the other 70-some cities and their officials. If you were going to make such limitations you should have so stated in the beginning and saved our time.

I might add, as a personal note, I have been a Republican all of my life. In fact, I was an Eisenhower man before the June 1952 convention and the only lawyer in Sangamon County to so announce. Overall, I am still satisfied with the administration except that I consider the manner in which you handled this particular problem of your office to be insulting to the intelligence of a great many civic leaders throughout the Midwest.

Very truly yours,
NELSON O. HOWARTH,
Mayor.

Absurdity of the Joint Economic Report on Domestic Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, recently there came across my desk a copy of the report of the Joint Economic Committee, published and transmitted to the Congress on July 18, 1956, and titled "Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy." This report on such a profound subject attempted to use the watch industry as a case study example.

In the beginning of this amazing report, it is stated that the hearings of the Committee were initiated in review of a wide range of considerations affecting our foreign economic policy and further states that during the course of such hearings, limited attention was given to the argument that trade restrictions may be required for reasons of national defense. Just how extraordinarily limited such attention was is not too frighteningly apparent until we come to part IV of the report, reciting conclusions and recommendations, and which is subdivided into two hearings, one of which is Watches.

When we reach that part of the report, it becomes frightening, indeed, to read such emphatically decisive and pretentiously expert pronouncements, founded upon "limited attention" that are unsubstantiated contradictions of the recorded findings, based upon exhaustive evidence and study, of such authoritative governmental units and agencies as the Department of Commerce, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, of the 83d Congress, and, indeed, even the President himself.

Among the more strikingly absurd generalities starstudding the watch part of this report, and backed up by not one shred of testimony or evidence, are such gems as these:

> Importation can stimulate the ingenuity and efficiency of the watch industry; watches are not likely to be produced in this country in any war in which Switzerland is cut off from us (because) it is likely then that factories in both countries would be destroyed.

And finally—

> The 1954 decisions on watches by the Department of Commerce, the Interdepartmental Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and of the President were not accompanied by completely developed analyses of defense essentiality.

The first statement quoted above is as fantistic as anything out of fairyland. It is an established statistical fact that imports have cut the very heart out of our domestic watch industry, to the extent that employment is down now to fewer than 5,000. Competition is so unequal that our domestic firms, one after another, have been forced to use movements manufactured by cheaper Swiss labor.

The second statement of the report outlined above is even more fantastic than the first in its unwarranted and unfactual projection of prophecy about any future war. In this vague and pointless wordage, it is difficult, indeed, to try to determine the meaning of the writer or writers. If it means anything at all, it would seem to be a predestined resignation from and abandonment of our own traditional ingenuity if anything unfortunately happened to the Swiss watch industry. If this language approaches anywhere near the substance of argument, it is, indeed, an appeal to American practicality and wisdom, in the interest of our own self defense, to begin to plan the placing of our essential domestic watch manufacturing units under bombproof shelter.

However, the most astounding paragraph of all the absurdities contained in this part of the report pertaining to domestic watch manufacturing is the last one quoted above. The casualness, amounting to unwitting affrontery, with which evidence studies and factfindings conducted and determined by the most responsible units of the Federal Government, including the President, are dismissed, with a not too subtle implication of carelessness on their part, is rather shocking to anyone concerned with serious study and factual reporting. If these observations were not contained in an official congressional committee report, they could, perhaps, best be shrugged off as verbiage of indifferent consequence and unworthy of comment.

However, since the language can only be interpreted as a direct attack against our domestic watch manufacturers and their employees, and the report might accidentally fall into the hands of some unwary and unknowing readers, it appears necessary to remind ourselves of a few essential facts.

The decision of the President of the United States to apply tariff protection for the preservation of domestic watch manufacturing as an essential industry was founded upon exhaustive analyses and factual recommendations made by the most responsible units of the executive department under his command, as well as some congressional units. A listing of them includes such authoritative agencies as the United States Department of Labor, the Chairman of the Munitions Board, the United States Department of Commerce, the National Resources Planning Board, the United States Department of Defense, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Preparedness Subcommittee No. 6 of the United States Senate Committee on Armed Services of the 83d Congress. All of these responsible agencies of Government, after long study and critical examination of factual evidence, promulgated their common judgment that the domestic watch manufacturing industry was essential to our adequate national defense. With justifiable confidence and trust in these separate departments of Government, the President made his determination in the national welfare.

Mr. Speaker, if the callousness and carelessness of this watch report, with respect to our adopted principle of trade restriction where necessary to preserve essential American industries, did not emanate from an official source, most of us would be inclined to disregard it entirely. However, in these unhappy times of international tension and domestic uncertainty, it seems but a part of our patriotic duty to keep reminding ourselves that if we are going to continue to promote economic growth and progress abroad, while preserving it here, we had better constantly concentrate our attention upon the things that produced the economic growth and progress in this blessed Nation.

If we are going to fall victim to the temptation of abandoning our traditional Christian philosophy of high

wages, good working conditions, fair trade practices, and established rules against economic monopoly, then we shall neither be competent to lead the free world in peaceful achievement, nor shall we be worthy of the sacrifices and struggles that gave us our heritage. The foolish destruction of the confidence of the American people in the justice and wisdom of their own Government agencies will be the first step in our own disintegration. It is the duty of us all to guard against that catastrophe wherever and whenever it seems required.

International Finance Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following item by John R. Gibson which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 26, 1956.

I am pleased that I played a small part, as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, in the enactment of the legislation that brought the International Finance Corporation into being.

INTERNATIONAL AGENCY HAS $78 MILLION FUND TO INVEST IN PRIVATE COMPANIES IN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS—NEW GROUP WILL SEEK PROFITS WHILE SELLING FREE ENTERPRISE TO THE WORLD

(By John R. Gibson)

WASHINGTON.—A rare phenomenon has just come into being here. It's an international lending agency that's out to make money on hardheaded investments in private business.

The agency is the International Finance CORP., an offshoot of the multination World Bank. It's just beginning to function this week after a quiet birth last Friday.

Businessmen looking into enterprises abroad, investors watching offbeat new ventures, foreign-policy makers attempting to counter communism and plain citizens trying to keep up with the world will all do well to keep an eye on IFC.

The infant's sponsor disclosed some details of its prospective career at a press conference yesterday, but they told only part of the story.

FUNDS TOTAL $78 MILLION

IFC has $78 million in its pocket, of which $35 million came from Uncle Sam and rest from 30 other free world countries ranging from France to tiny Panama. IFC will invest its grubstake bit by bit in private companies that will set up shop in underdeveloped regions of the world.

Already, IFC has drawn what its big friendly Mississippi-born president, Robert L. Garner, counts as dozens and dozens of inquiries from potential investors here and abroad. Most queries so far deal with Latin America. Four apparently firm proposals now getting IFC staff study propose a metal manufacturing business, a food products plant, a mining operation, and a chemical development in, variously, Latin America, Africa, and the Far East.

Private industry will provide the management and most of the capital for each venture, while IFC will put up the rest of the cash and the international experience of its own and the World Bank's staff.

Its leaders expect to parcel out from $100,000 to several millions at a time for such medium-sized concerns as those already proposed. They say they wouldn't want to put as much as 10 percent of their capital in any one venture. "We wouldn't go into a new steel mill because it's just too big for us to finance, but we might well put up money for a steel fabricating shop down the street," one official explains.

NO GOVERNMENT GUARANTIES

Into the agency's portfolio will go a variety of bonds and other securities issued by the enterprises IFC backs. It won't require any Government guaranties for its investments as do other big international lenders like IFC's papa, the World Bank.

Like many a private financier, IFC intends to sell its good investments for as healthy a profit as possible when they mature. Such maneuvers could add extra millions to the original $78 million capital hoard.

These planned sales also help explain why the new agency wants to make money. "We're going to be hardheaded businessmen, not philanthropists," bluntly promises an IFC policymaker. "Since we're taking risks, we've got to count on making profits from the good investments to pay for the bad ones."

An even more important reason for turning profits is summed up by a Government official who observes: "To sell private enterprise to these regions, you have to show it pays off."

In this way, IFC points up the latest worry among western diplomats. They increasingly fear that though United States economic handouts around the world funnel funds to local governments, they only incidentally strengthen private enterprise in these lands. "That's just building up a lot of little Russias," snorts one aid thinker, with calculated overstatement.

TO AID PRIVATE INVESTMENT

If all goes well, the men who head IFC hope to give a noticeable hypo to already rising private investment abroad—particularly from the prospering United States, Western Europe, and Canada. These experts fondly refer to IFC as a "catalyst" in drawing out private funds that would otherwise fear to travel to the economically immature areas.

The birth of IFC comes just as American companies are boosting their overseas investments to record levels. Booming European countries, particularly Germany, have lately joined this far-ranging search for foreign profits with increased intensity.

As happy as this makes United States Government leaders, the existing trend still misses its No. 1 cold-war objective, Eisenhower administration planners contend. Too little of the traveling cash goes to the underdeveloped countries where Russia's economic offensive hits the hardest, they explain. President Eisenhower has reportedly given top priority to search for new policies that will cope with this and other phases of the East-West economic struggle. British, French, and German leaders, too, are pressing for answers to these problems.

And that's where IFC fits in. United States policymakers flatly call the agency an experimental operation that can be widely expanded if it succeeds in boosting investments.

IFC's Mr. Garner refers to modest initial outlays. "IFC won't make a big splash at first but we believe it's important." He figures the first IFC investment will take 2 or 3 months to work up.

IDEA IS 6 YEARS OLD

Although actually just a few days old, IFC has been kicking around in idea form for about 6 years. World Bank officials roaming the earth first picked up the idea when they ran onto likely investment opportunities for private business. They couldn't push this kind of investment, though, chiefly because neither the bank's required governmental guaranties for all loans nor its policy of fixed interest loans suited private business. Finally, in 1954, the Eisenhower administration gave its O. K. to the IFC scheme and the organization has pushed forward, almost without a hitch, since.

IFC's parent, the World Bank—formally, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—has grown wealthy and influential since its founding 10 years ago. The bank puts up cash on strictly business terms for gigantic development projects around the world—a steel mill in India, roads in Colombia and electric power facilities in Japan, to name a few. Only the 58 countries belonging to the World Bank can join IFC; the bank's president, Atlanta banker, Eugene Black, is the IFC's board chairman, and the bank's staff will handle most of the IFC's economic research and other services.

The IFC's bosses have considerable experience in the sort of work they're tackling. Mr. Garner has been a World Bank vice president since 1947. His second-in-command, Britisher J. G. Beevor, used to be managing director of Britain's privately financed Commonwealth Development Finance Co., Ltd., which does just the job its name implies.

TYPICAL WORK ARRANGEMENT

The majority of IFC investments will spring out of private proposals, officials figure. They foresee a typical arrangement working out something like this:

A British manufacturer sees what looks like a good opportunity to produce "widgets" in Central America but he doesn't know the ropes outside Europe nor can he line up enough money from private sources. After looking into the deal, the IFC decides to put up part of the capital and to give all the advice that's needed. It may try to line up a South American investor to go into the new enterprise, too. But it will leave the British "widget" concern managing the plant.

IFC will make its money as interest on bonds or through some profit-sharing arrangements. Although it can't hold stocks or other equity securities giving it part-ownership of an enterprise, officials say IFC will probably take many convertible securities which could be turned into stock by whomever buys the securities from IFC.

But suppose the "widget" company falls on dark days and loses money in Central America. Does IFC take over the management? Never, promise the corporation's topmost men. "We'll go in and talk to management and maybe even put on pressure such as bankers do in a similar domestic situation," explains an IFC spokesman, "but we won't try to manage the business."

Management holds the key to the investment scheme's value, Mr. Garner explains. "We think the key to the underdeveloped countries is management. They need most philosophy, techniques, and experience in this field. When a company from here or Europe opens a plant there is sends in management down to the foreman level, sometimes. They recruit labor, train mechanics, and local managers."

PROJECTS IT WON'T CONSIDER

Some kinds of investments simply won't get IFC consideration, the Corporation has decided. This list includes social projects like hospitals and nonprofit enterprises; agricultural investments like coffee or cotton growing because they're rated too risky; huge projects like dams that are simply too big to finance, and public utilities which also ordinarily require large investments and are generally so strictly regulated they promise only limited profit possibilities.

On the other hand, Mr. Garner said, the Corporation won't go into enterprises of the 5-and-10-cent-store size.

"Promoters" need not apply, the Corporation's executives warn. "IFC's not going to deal with people who don't have available their own money or money they control," declares Mr. Garner. "We don't have to deal with any intermediaries."

IFC officials will be surprised if they draw much interest from big companies like General Motors, International Harvester, and the major oil and mineral companies that already operate extensively abroad. These concerns generally have their own capital sources lined up and know all the ins and outs of overseas operations without IFC help.

United States Vice Presidency No Longer a Dead End

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article which appeared in the Evening Star of July 26 which I believe will be of interest to each of you. The editorial follows:

UNITED STATES VICE PRESIDENCY NO LONGER A DEAD END

(By Joseph A. Fox)

The Vice President of the United States no longer is a forgotten man on a political dead-end street, as has become obvious in developments this week.

Once characterized as a "limbo" by Theodore Roosevelt, and rated by Woodrow Wilson as having no more than "anomalous insignificance," the Vice Presidency has acquired an importance second only to that of the Presidency itself.

The age has imposed new demands on the office, and on its occupants—whose heritage at any moment may be the most powerful place in the world.

EXPERT CITES IMPORTANCE

In a thoughtful study, The Rise of the Vice Presidency, published today (Public Affairs Press, Washington, $4.50), Dr. Irving G. Williams of St. John's University, Brooklyn, a leading authority on the subject, puts it this way:

"Today, neither the Nation nor the free world can afford the succession to the American Presidency of a man who is not fully capable, intellectually and morally, of making the complex decisions that will rush upon him from the first day of his succession."

And again:

"A Vice President who succeeds to the Presidency in the hydrogen age must make decisions which, if erroneously or unsoundly based, could result in radical shifts of the world balance of power, and/or plunge the United States into the abyss of total war."

STRESSES SUCCESSION ISSUE

In stressing the importance of Vice Presidential selection, Dr. Williams underscores the need for clarifying the law governing succession when a President becomes incapacitated.

The Constitution says simply that in case of the President's inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President.

Still unanswered, however, is the query raised on the floor of the Constitutional Convention in 1787 by John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania:

"What is the extent of the term 'disability' and who is to be the judge of it?"

The same question—in almost the same words—was raised 168 years later, after President Eisenhower's heart attack. In fact, it has recurred throughout history.

It was posed, for instance, in the summer of 1881, when James A. Garfield lay dying from an assassin's bullet—but it was passed by.

Again the issue arose 30 years later in the long months the invalided Woodrow Wilson occupied the White House before his term ended—but it never was met head on.

"In the case of President Eisenhower, a period of 143 days lapsed between his heart attack and the announcement as to his recovery," the author says.

It is coincidental that a year earlier Dr. Williams had urged measures to cope with the inability problem, writing:

"The usual American habit of avoiding decision until compelled by ad hoc circumstances will no longer serve us in the coming age of continued global involvement."

PROPOSES INABILITY COMMITTEE

Dr. Williams suggests creation of a special Inability Committee headed by the Chief Justice of the United States to pass on a President's continued capacity to serve. On the Committee also would be the Secretary of State, Senate majority and minority leaders, Speaker of the House, and House majority and minority leaders.

Periodic checks on the President's health would be made by a physician assigned to the White House for that particular purpose, who would notify the Vice President and the Inability Committee should the state of the President's health cause concern.

It would be up to the Committee then to decide if succession should take place.

However, the question may be decided, Congress sooner or later must face up to it, Dr. Williams says.

TEN MOVED UP BY DEATH

The high incidence of Vice Presidential succession to the Presidency and the age factor are other elements to be considered in connection with these two top offices, Mr. Williams argues.

In the 167 years between 1789–1956, 33 men occupied the Presidency, among whom were 10 former Vice Presidents. Seven succeeded by death, and three of these, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman later won election in their own right. John Adams, Jefferson, and Van Buren went from Vice President to President by election.

These 10 held the Presidency for almost 51 years, or for approximately one-third of the life of the Republic.

OLDER PRESIDENTS ELECTED

Commenting on "the more recent tendency to select older Presidents, particularly during period of world tension," the author cites five elections between Wilson and Eisenhower which "took place in time of defense preparation, war or cold war."

The average age at inauguration of the Presidents was 61, and 3 of the 5 terms involved a medical crisis. The reference is to President Wilson's collapse; the questionable state of Franklin D. Roosevelt's health in his closing days, and the Eisenhower heart attack.

"This aspect of the problem of vice presidential succession thus has become considerably more acute," Dr. Williams says. "There seems to be a propensity of the parties to nominate and of the people to elect to the Presidency men too old to carry the burdens of office in times of great crisis. But it is precisely during periods of national peril that the probability of vice presidential succession by death is greatest."

IMPROVEMENT IN STATUS NOTED

While the Vice Presidency fell into low estate during "the century of the Throttlebottoms," as Dr. Williams describes the years between Aaron Burr and Theodore Roosevelt, there has been in the past fifty-odd years "a slow put clearly discernible renaissance" of the office. It has long since ceased to be regarded as "a political football, a pawn for factions, reward for mediocrity and a pasture for superannuated men."

("Throttlebottom" was the name of the vice president in the stage hit of several year ago, Of Thee I Sing. It has become a synonym for a political nonentity.)

Encourage Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, great corporations are getting larger all the time through natural growth, corporate mergers and monopolies, the buying up of small enterprises and reaping the giant's share of the Federal procurement dollar. Small business, the heart of our free-enterprise system, is battling with its back to the wall in many instances for its fair share of profits and growth under an expending American economy.

Small business is presently being squeezed in innumerable ways. Raw materials are hard to get in many fields. A constant rise in labor and material costs is not so easy for small business to absorb as it is for the large corporations; labor problems not so easy to solve. Competition from cheap imports is impossible for small business to meet. Prime defense contracts are the exception for small business. There is a definite lack of subcontracting opportunities for the small-business man. Small business is unable to compete with the large corporations for skilled technical people. Engineers and other skilled professional help are leaving small-business enterprises every day for the attractive wages, working conditions and other inducements offered by big business. Small business is fighting for its very existence.

In the face of these problems, small business is not sharing, in proportion to its productive capacity, in the general prosperity which prevails in most of the country. At this very time when the expanding national economy creates greater demands upon the production facilities of this country, we are faced with an alarming trend of small business failures in an expanding number of fields—automobile dealers are not moving a heavy backlog of cars, some are closing their doors; small retailers have large inventories of alliances and other goods, many are closing up shop; suppliers reflect general conditions in many retail enterprises, and on the whole small business is being pushed to the wall by its larger competitors and by certain governmental policies, or the lack of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is decidedly an unhealthy and threatening atmosphere for small business, especially when the financial pages of our newspapers record almost daily the huge profits of giant corporations while the level of earnings

of small corporations is in steady decline.

In the light of present conditions facing small business, the Federal Government should and must take affirmative action to assist this vitally important part of the Nation's economy. There are many areas in which the Government could move effectively to narrow the gap and dissipate the ruthless economic forces that are crushing small business.

One such area is the Government's procurement business. More of it should and can be channeled to small business. That is why I introduced in this Congress H. R. 4380 to require the Department of Defense to set aside up to 20 percent of the total defense procurement solely for small business. In addition, my bill seeks the award of competitive contracts to small business on other than a price basis so as to insure that the full capabilities of small business are utilized to the greatest possible extent in the defense procurement program.

The text of H. R. 4380 is as follows:

A bill to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, with respect to the procurement of supplies from small-business concerns

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (b) of this section, if the agency head determines that such action is advisable in the interest of the national defense in order to make or keep suppliers available for furnishing supplies in the event of a national emergency, or that the interest either of industrial mobilization in case of such an emergency, or of the national defense through maintenance of active research and development, will be served by such action, supplies may be procured on the basis of, and in accordance with, an invitation for bids containing provisions which specify—

"(1) that a part, not exceeding 20 percent, of the total procurement involved when practicable may be withheld from the successful bidder or bidders for distribution among the small-business concerns, not exceeding five, which submit, as to all or such part of the procurement involved as may be specified in the invitation, the lowest bids submitted by small-business concerns; and

"(2) that the part of the total procurement so withheld when practicable may be distributed among such small-business concerns (either by acceptance of the bids made by them or by negotiated purchase or contract) on a basis involving payment to each of a price not in excess of 15 percent above the lowest price paid to a successful bidder."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by inserting after "2 (c)", wherever appearing therein, the following: "or 3 (c)."

SEC. 3. Section 7 (b) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The power of the agency head to make the determinations or decisions necessary under section 3 (c) shall be delegable only to a chief officer responsible for procurement."

A second bill I have introduced dealing with Government procurement is H. R. 4386, which gives priority to small business for Government contracts when a substantial proportion of the work is done in a labor surplus area. H. R. 4386 reads as follows:

A bill to provide that preference will be given in the awarding of Government procurement contracts to firms which will perform a substantial proportion of the production on such contracts in areas having a surplus of labor

Be it enacted, etc., That before any procurement agency awards a contract to any firm on the basis of its bid or proposal when a substantial proportion of the production on such contract will not be performed in areas classified under Defense Manpower Policy No. 4 (18 F. R. 6995) or any similar rule, regulation, order, or policy, as areas having a current or imminent surplus of labor, such agency shall give an opportunity to match such bid or proposal to firms which submitted bids or proposals on the contract not in excess of 120 percent of the bid or proposal made by the lowest responsible bidder, and which will perform a substantial proportion of the production on such contract in areas so classified. Such opportunity shall be given among such firms first to the small business firm which submitted the lowest bid or proposal, next to the small business firm which submitted the next lowest bid or proposal, and so on until the contract is awarded or until all small business firms among such firms have been given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal. If the contract is not awarded to a small business firm, such opportunity shall be given among such firms to the firm (other than a small business firm) which submitted the lowest bid or proposal; next to the firm (other than a small business firm) which submitted the next lowest bid or proposal; and so on until the contract is awarded or until all such firms have been given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal. If a firm which is given an opportunity to match such bid or proposal matches such bid or proposal, the contract shall be awarded to such firm, unless such firm is not entitled to be awarded the contract for reasons other than the amount of its bid or proopsal.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "firm" means an individual, partnership, corporation, company, association, or joint-stock company.

H. R. 4386 would make it possible for small industries in labor surplus areas, which are unsuccessful in obtaining Government contracts because of high bids, to match the successful bid when made by companies outside labor surplus areas. Preference would be given to small-business firms who came closest to the low bid when the original bids were submitted. The net effect would be to reinstate the match bid regulations in effect for a short time prior to the Korean war in favor of distressed areas which spread a substantial part of this huge business among smaller units.

Under the present regulations to help labor surplus areas, the Federal Government has this to offer: "There is plenty of Government business; all you have to do is go out and get it." That advice might help the unemployment problem of large cities with many diversified industries. But in the case of small communities, dependent upon one or a few major industries for annual payrolls, the assistance of the Federal Government leaves much to be desired. Small business does not seek special favors and special privileges. But it protests against a situation which permits special favors and special privileges to huge corporations.

Another area in which the Federal Government could provide definite help to small business is through tax incentives. In cooperation with the Smaller Business Association of New England, I have sponsored several tax bills in the 84th Congress to assist small business.

One of these measures is H. R. 4381, which provides that the allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered that is deductible as a trade or business expense shall not be considered unreasonable if not in excess of amounts paid in similar enterprises even though in excess of sums paid or salaries and compensation by the taxpayer in previous years.

This legislation would make it possible for small business to meet the big corporations on more even ground in holding on to key professional and technical corporation officers and employees. The text of H. R. 4381 follows:

A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 (a) (1) (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to deductions allowed for income taxes) is hereby amended by adding at the end of said subsection the following: "An allowance for salaries or other compensation for personal services actually rendered shall not be considered unreasonable if it is not in excess of salaries or other compensation paid by others engaged in similar enterprises or businesses similar to the taxpayer's in the same taxable year for similar services rendered, even though it is in excess of the sums paid for salaries and other compensation by the taxpayer in earlier years."

Another bill is H. R. 4382, which allows a deduction up to $25,000 from the gross income of corporations for amounts actually expended during the taxable year for capital expenditures or other corporation purposes.

Testimony presented to the House and Senate Small Business committees confirms the need for this desirable legislation to help small business. Under the present tax structure, it is almost impossible for small business to accumulate additional working capital to permit even a minimum expectancy of expansion.

No matter how much small business tries to lay aside enough earnings to make the investments and take the gambles that must be taken in research and development work, the tax load beats the small enterprise at every turn.

H. R. 4382, by exempting the first $25,000 spent on capital improvements, represents a step in the right direction in helping small business taxwise. It would help correct some of the evils which are strangling small business enterprise and initiative.

The heavy tax load on small business is a definite handicap to normal development and growth, so much so that it represents a real threat to the American economy. H. R. 4382, the text of which follows, would ease the tax burden of small business:

A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by

inserting at the end thereof the following to be known as subsection (bb).

"(bb) Increase of capital assets by corporations: In the case of a corporation and notwithstanding any of the provisions of section 24 of the Internal Revenue Code, and after all other allowances permitted under this section such sum, not exceeding $25,000, as has actually been expended during the taxable year for its own capital expenditures or for other corporate purposes."

Another bill, H. R. 4388, which I introduced in the House in cooperation with the Smaller Business Association of New England, is similar to H. R. 4382 with regard to the $25,000 exemption. It has an added provision making the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000. The text of H. R. 4388 is as follows:

A bill to allow to corporations an exemption of $25,000 for income-tax purposes, and to provide that the combined normal tax and surtax rate of 38 percent shall be applicable to corporations having taxable incomes of less than $50,000

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to normal tax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the normal-tax net income of every corporation (except a corporation subject to the tax imposed by section 14 or section 231 (a), supplement G, or supplement Q) a tax of 24 percent of the amount of the normal-tax net income in excess of $25,000."

SEC. 2. Section 14 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax on corporations with normal-tax net incomes of not more than $25,000) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 14 (c) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to tax of foreign corporations engaged in trade or business within the United States) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) In the case of a foreign corporation engaged in trade or business within the United States, the tax shall be an amount equal to 24 percent of the normal-tax net income."

SEC. 4. Section 15 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Imposition of tax: There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the corporation surtax net income of every corporation (except a Western Hemisphere trade corporation as defined in section 109, and except a corporation subject to a tax imposed by section 231 (a), supplement G or supplement Q) a surtax of 14 percent of the amount of the corporation surtax net income in excess of $25,000."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this act shall be applicable with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949.

Early in the second session of the 84th Congress, I introduced, in legislative form, another tax proposal of the Smaller Business Association of New England. This bill is H. R. 8850, which increases from the present $25,000 to $50,000 the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income. This bill would also permit corporations with income tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to pay its tax in four equal installments. The text of H. R. 8850 is as follows:

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount exempted from the surtax on corporate taxable income from $25,000 to $50,000, and to permit a corporation with income tax liability for a taxable year of less than $100,000 to elect to pay its tax in four equal installments.

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 11 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to surtax on corporations) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(b) Paragraph (7) of section 12 of such code (relating to cross references to the tax on corporations) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(c) Section 821 (a) (1) (B) of such code (relating to surtax on certain mutual insurance companies) is hereby amended by striking out "$25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

(d) Section 821 (b) (2) of such code (relating to surtax on certain interinsurers) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) Surtax: A surtax of 22 percent of the mutual insurance company taxable income (computed as provided in subsection (a) (1)) in excess of $50,000."

(e) The first sentence of section 1551 of such code (relating to disallowance of surtax exemption and accumulated earnings credit) is hereby amended by striking out $25,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$50,000."

SEC. 2. Section 6152 (a) (1) of such code (relating to election by corporations to pay income taxes in installments) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) Corporations: A corporation subject to the taxes imposed by chapter 1 may elect to pay the unpaid amount of such taxes—

"(A) in two equal installments, if the amount of the taxes imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year (reduced by the credits against tax provided by pt. IV of subch. A of ch. 1) is $100,000 or more; or

"(B) in four equal installments, if the amount of taxes imposed by chapter 1 for the taxable year (reduced by the credits against tax provided by pt. IV of subch. A of ch. 1) is less than $100,000."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955. The amendment made by section 2 of this act shall apply with respect to payments of tax for taxable years ending after the day on which this act is enacted.

The Federal Government should offer every measure of protection and encouragement to small business. The bills which I have enumerated represent a few of the corrective remedies which are required to help small-business units throughout the country. There are many others, which would do much to restore a more wholesome and healthy climate than that surrounding small business at the present time.

The growth, vitality, and vigor of small business are the strength and prosperity of our great Nation. Let us promote better opportunities and more equitable conditions for this vital segment of our American economy. If we do not, the system of free private enterprise will be endangered, weakened, and damaged to the extent that our country will be left open to the machinations of those who would destroy American business, big and small.

Let us be just and fair to all American business when it is legitimate and lawful and socially aware of its responsibilities to the Nation and the American people. But let us be vigilant and willing to act in order to insure for small business its opportunity to live and to enjoy its rightful share in the national prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent article appearing in the Boston Herald written by William F. Homer, Jr., on small business.

The article follows:

SMALL BUSINESS FALLS BEHIND BIG COMPETITORS IN PROFITS

(By William F. Homer, Jr.)

The record-breaking profits of big business are not being enjoyed on the same scale by the 4,200,000 small-business firms of the Nation, about 60,000 of which are in New England.

These little fellows, or many of them, are experiencing acute profit problems. They are confronted with static or lower sales, and more and more mergers in the profit squeeze.

There is the highest failure rate for industry in 15 years of 46 for each 10,000 firms. The average liability in bankruptcies for 1955 was down around $40,000.

Of course there are more companies now than ever, and some of them are bound to stumble. But New England industry leaders find five principal small business headaches which curdle the milk and honey of profit. They are: (1) management; (2) taxes; (3) financing; (4) labor; (5) costs.

What is small business, since we're talking about it? The cynics used to have a word for it.

"Business is small if it can't afford a lobbyist in Washington."

The serious rule of thumb was a firm with less than 500 workers independently owned and operated.

Currently, the popular version holds that small business is the firm that says yes in a merger. And on a statistical basis, the 1,100 members of the Smaller Business Association of New England adopt a more flexible approach.

They look at the industry itself. A 150-man diamond tool shop could be big. An 800-worker tire plant, by Akron standards, can be small.

SUBCONTRACTING DIPS

But big or small, the volume of subcontracting that came to postwar New England, when consumer goods and materials were scarce, has vanished. Industry giants now do the farmed-out work themselves to help meet overhead.

In Government contracts, industrialists say, the line of least resistance leads to the big company. Small company ingenuity bows to large company assets in atoning for promises not performed. The national Small Business Association now carries the fight to get defense contract set-asides for small firms, after it rules on their competency.

This is one object of SBA, explains Edward J. Stewart, regional director. The others are to advise on technical and management problems and to give financial aid when other sources refuse.

Since its founding in 1953 to April 1956, the New England SBA office has made about 75 of these loans in a total of more than $3 million Stewart declares.

On a State basis, Massachusetts Business Development Corp., concentrating on financial not development aid to small business, has made 62 loans for $9,157,000 in approximately the same period.

These are all to the good, businessmen agree. The trouble is that they are not

enough to make up for the tax drain on working capital and the high cost of replacing equipment.

NO COLOR LINE

Don't think that all small business writes in red ink, and all big business in black. There is no clear color line. But little business, profitwise, has not kept pace with big. In 1955, the profit margin before taxes for the giants of $100 million or more assets, was 13.4 percent. For manufacturing firms with less than $250,000 resources, it was 2.6 percent of sales.

Stewart agrees with S. Abbot Smith, member of the board of advisers of SBA and former president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, that rising money rates put the clamp on the small business borrower who can't meet the higher loans cost or finds his bank "lines" cut off.

They concur that the upsurge of fringe benefits and wage-guaranty plans puts an added burden on starting new small enterprise or continuing the old.

"Lack of management ability is the biggest single cause of small business folding," Stewart insists.

"Good management is essential, but it's no good if companies do not get the financing for reserves, replacement or growth," Smith adds. "This financial middle ground is a big cause of failures. Companies have grown beyond the point where they can finance themselves. They're not big enough, too risky, to go on the stock exchanges. It's hard to attract money to them. A wealthy man would be better off buying tax-exempts.

"If the company makes any money, the Government takes 52 percent of it in corporation taxes," Smith continues. This makes the Government what Joseph D. Noonan, executive secretary of the New England association, calls a "majority partner." This is the basis for the graduated business tax provisions of the current Patman act.

SCANT RESERVES

This tax bite means scant reserves set aside in good times for harsher weather. It means a squeeze to replace a machine that cost $7,000 originally with an improved model that costs $18,000 some 15 years later.

"The small company cannot carry a big inventory," Smith explains. "It has to buy materials at a higher price than large firms and sell goods competitively at the same price. When materials become scarce, suppliers cut off the least important companies first. Then they're up against a scarcity squeeze and a price squeeze as big companies continue to hold the price line, with a typical 5 months inventory to work on."

"It's harder for the small company to hold skilled labor," Smith, a wallpaper manufacturer, adds. He calls "unbelievable" the salaries paid technical men, figuratively "stolen right out of their previous plants."

"Don't forget," he concludes, "that small business still has advantages. It can move fast. It offers quick opportunity for ingenuity—the New England machine shop. It gives a well-rounded business training. Good management on good products can pay off rapidly. Finally, a man can be his own boss and build an equity for himself and his family.

"Yet under present tax and financing inequities, some big industries run three shifts. Well managed small competitors run not at all."

A Report to the People of Berks County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the 84th Congress, I feel that it is appropriate to make this preliminary report to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th District of Pennsylvania. I will also issue a final report, summarizing those activities not covered by this preliminary report.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

I have always felt strongly that an informed and alert citizenry is one of the most important foundations of our democratic form of government. For this reason I have attempted to report as widely as possible my activities and the work of Congress as a whole. Through these reports, as well as through weekly radio reports, I have tried to keep Berks Countians fully informed on the deliberations of the 84th Congress and to express my own stand on important issues.

REPRESENTING ALL THE PEOPLE

In my years in the House of Representatives I have conscientiously endeavored to represent and serve the needs of all the people of Berks County. In the field of legislation I have always tried to support measures which would truly benefit the greatest number of our people and which would genuinely serve the public interest. Of course, reasonable individuals will differ because of various interpretations placed on some phases of legislation. For this reason, no legislative record could possibly please every one of my constituents in every respect. This is to be expected in a healthy democracy, with its complicated social, economic, and political patterns. I do feel, however, that an elected Representative has the duty to carefully consider all viewpoints presented to him by all constituents, regardless of their political affiliation, personal motivation, or any other consideration. This I have always attempted to do to the best of my ability. All the views and aspects of particular legislative proposals are studied, weighed, and thoroughly considered before my final decision is made on how my vote will be cast. I have consistently voted for what I thought was in the best interests of the people of Berks County and our Nation.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

It has been my privilege to personally serve the people of my district who have contacted me about particular problems involving some phase of Government. I have tried to give this service promptly, courteously, efficiently, and fairly to all who have sought my help. Of course, it is not always possible to bring about the type of action needed to satisfactorily resolve each problem. However, every possible effort which is legal and reasonable is made in behalf of those seeking my assistance. Such services range from routine requests for Government publications to complicated problems involving veterans benefits, tax problems, social security and railroad retirement cases, immigration problems, Government contracts, and many other types of services to citizens in their relationships with their Government.

ATTENDANCE

My attendance record during the years of service as your Representative in Congress has been near perfect. I answered 98 percent of the rollcalls and quorum calls during the 1st session of the 84th Congress and my second session attendance record will be almost equally high. Conflicting duties often make it difficult or impossible to respond on every call.

READING OFFICE

My office in the Reading Post Office Building is open 6 days a week to receive visits of constituents who desire information, help, or advice. I try to arrange my schedule to spend a maximum number of weekends at my home in Reading, when I am available at my office to personally discuss particular problems which constituents may have. Whenever humanly possible, I accept invitations to attend various gatherings of community organizations, clubs, fraternal groups, unions, and other types of organizations. I am always willing to discuss any issue, answer questions, debate, or otherwise explain my views on specific issues before any group.

WASHINGTON VISITS

Again during the 84th Congress, it has been my pleasure to welcome many individuals and groups from Berks County on their visits to the Nation's Capital. Numerous school groups, religious groups, women's organizations, and Boy and Girl Scout groups met with me in the Capitol Building. With the assistance of Mrs. Rhodes, I have tried to help make their visits interesting, educational, and enjoyable. A visit to Washington to see our Government in action is one of the best ways for people to understand and appreciate the priceless heritage of freedom and democracy which we enjoy.

COMMITTEE WORK

During the 84th Congress, I have served on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the House Administration Committee. I also served on numerous subcommittees and was chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics in the Government Service. Near the end of the second session I was appointed to fill a vacancy on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Com-

mittee. I have also presented my views on pending legislation to other committees both in the House and the Senate on such subjects as railroad retirement, public and aged housing, distressed-area assistance, veterans' pensions, minimum wages, problems of low-income families, small-business defense contracts, textile-industry problems, postal rates, and arbitration procedures for Federal employees.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

Perhaps one of the best guides to the scope and interest of any Member of Congress is the type of legislation which he introduces. During the 84th Congress, I introduced bills designed to reduce the retirement age for social-security benefits, grant tax relief to disabled taxpayers, raise personal income-tax exemptions to $800, provide social-security disability benefits for totally and permanently disabled persons, to liberalize the Civil Service Retirement Act, to establish a Federal Agency for the Handicapped, to improve the Fair Labor Standards Act, to provide increased railroad retirement benefits, to reduce corporation taxes on small businesses, to exempt nonprofit swimming-pool associations from Federal excise tax, to provide recognition and grievance machinery for Federal employee organizations, to assist aged persons obtain public housing, to limit postal subsidies, and to establish a Bureau of older Persons.

CONGRESSIONAL DEBATE

I have taken part in important debates on the floor of the House and discussed such issues as social security, railroad retirement, public housing, postal pay, vocational rehabilitation, farm legislation foreign policy, trade policy, postal rates, and numerous other issues.

CONSERVATIVE COALITION

A coalition of extreme conservative Republicans and Southern Democrats was a dominant force in the 84th Congress. This coalition succeeded in blocking or watering down many important measures which liberal Members of Congress considered essential.

The 84th Congress did however, enact some significant and important measures which will benefit the vast majority of our people. Other important legislation fell by the wayside after being partially acted upon. Still other meritorious bills received little attention. Over 12,500 separate bills were introduced in the House of Representatives and over 4,500 were offered in the Senate. Of this total, less than 900 were enacted into law. Some of the most important of these new laws enacted in the second session will be discussed briefly in this report.

DEMOCRATIC COOPERATION WITH ADMINISTRATION

Democrats in Congress have maintained a responsible, constructive opposition to the Eisenhower administration, supporting and strengthening administration proposals which we believed in the public interest and opposing those measures which benefit the privileged few at the expense of the welfare of all. I did not approve of resorting to blind and irresponsible opposition simply for political reasons. I voted with or against the administration solely on the merit of the question under consideration.

A summary of the administration's legislative record shows that Democrats supplied the margin of victory for the President on many House rollcalls where his program was successful. Democrats in both House and Senate supported the President's foreign policy to a greater extent than did members of his own party.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The 84th Congress took some important strides forward but the progress was not what should have been made to meet successfully the challenge of automation, abundance, and surpluses.

The average citizen did not properly share in the prosperity created by increased production, scientific and technical advances.

Those of us who wanted to channel some of this prosperity to aged, retired, disabled and handicapped citizens were in a minority. We wanted to aid these people through the enactment of legislation to expand and improve social security and retirement programs. We urged improved service in Federal regulatory and inspection activities to protect the consumers and the public. In part we were successful. But in numerous cases monopoly restrictions were weakened or removed and had the effect of aiding monopoly interests at the expense of the average citizen. Small business also suffered because of the advantages won by monopoly interests.

Listed below are some of the important proposals acted upon by the 84th Congress:

PENSION AND RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

Social security: One of the most important measures enacted by the 84th Congress makes liberalizing amendments in the social security law. This action was taken despite vigorous opposition of the administration. The new law lowers the retirement age for women to age 62, provides benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50, continues benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18, increases grants for public assistance to the needy aged, blind and disabled, and extends social security coverage to many professional groups. While this measure does not go as far as I personally hoped for, it is a significant step forward in meeting the needs of our senior citizens.

The social security amendments were approved despite objections from President Eisenhower and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Marion B. Folsom. It was in the final days of the session that the bill was brought out of the Senate Finance Committee where it had been crippled and delayed by the conservative coalition. Over strong opposition by the Republican leadership and Senator BYRD the Senate restored two important provisions. One was the lowering of the retirement age for women; the other was the disability feature. This key provision was opposed by both Republican Senators from Pennsylvania, but was approved by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 45.

That was the important decision on this year's social security bill. This margin of 2 votes means that next November social security benefits will be paid to women retiring at age 62. Disability benefits will start July 1, 1957.

I joined with the liberal Democrats in working, voting for, and passing improved social security legislation.

Railroad retirement: Railroad retirement pensions were increased by 10 percent. A bill I introduced and worked for proposed a more liberal increase. It was for a 15-percent raise, which I felt was meritorius and justified because of increased living costs since the last pension increase. However, administration opposition made it a choice between 10 percent or nothing.

Civil-service retirement: The Civil Service Retirement Act was liberalized and improved, thus benefiting the millions of postal and Federal employees. Unfortunately, another bill to increase the annuities of retired Federal employees was killed in the House after being strongly opposed by the administration.

TAXES

I introduced legislation to increase personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800, and voted for a compromise tax relief bill which passed the House in 1955. The bill was strongly opposed by the Eisenhower administration and passage was blocked in the Senate. I feel that the average citizen is entitled to tax relief which was denied him in the 1954 Republican tax bill which gave 91 percent of the savings to corporations and upper-income groups.

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

Highways: A long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires. I gave my support to this legislation.

Water-pollution control: A program to assist States in research and water-pollution control was enacted. I voted for the proposal which I believe is important in guaranteeing future supplies of water to meet the growing needs of our people.

Economically depressed areas: The 84th Congress took a big step toward the enactment of legislation to provide long-range Federal assistance to sections of our country suffering from chronic unemployment and economic stagnation. Although the House did not act on a depressed areas bill passed by the Senate in the closing days of the Congress, this issue will be a major target in the next Congress. I strongly support this type of program to help people and industry in depressed areas to help themselves in developing new skills, attracting new industry, and diversifying the types of products manufactured.

Flood insurance: The 84th Congress enacted legislation to provide a Federal flood insurance program on an experimental basis. This program was prompted by the disastrous floods in the northeastern part of our country last year and should help to reduce personal

property losses in the event of future flood disasters.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

One of our most priceless resources of our Nation is our people, aged, adults, children, and those generations to follow. The 84th Congress made a significant record in enacting programs to provide long-range health and research programs to conquer disease and allieviate suffering among those Americans already stricken by diseases.

Salk polio vaccination program: Originally authorized last year, the program was extended until July 1, 1957, offering protection against crippling polio for many millions of children, young people, and expectant mothers.

Hospital construction, health research: Federal grants were authorized for an expanded hospital construction program, for training programs for nurses and public health personnel, and research and training grants to State mental institutions. Congress also provided for expanded dental research and construction of facilities and research programs into the causes of cancer, heart disease, polio, cerebral palsy, mental illness, arthritis, and other crippling diseases.

School milk program: Increased funds were voted for the school milk program and the program was broadened to include camps, nurseries for underprivileged children, non-profit-child-care centers and agencies.

School construction: The conservative coalition in the House of Representatives blocked passage of the important bill to provide Federal aid in the construction school classrooms to meet the growing shortages. The bill would have authorized $1.6 billion in Federal funds, to be matched by the States, in the 4-year construction program. Pennsylvania's share of the Federal grants would have been slightly more than $100 million. One main controversy was over an amendment to implement the Supreme Court antisegregation decision. Many of us who supported both the Supreme Court decision and the school construction bill sought to separate the two issues, but when this was not possible, I voted for the antisegregation amendment and for the school construction bill itself. Ninety-six Republican Members voted for the antisegregation amendment and then voted to defeat the school construction bill once it had been included. This issue will be an important one in the new Congress, as the school shortage continues to grow.

Rural library service: Congress enacted legislation to provide grants to States to expand and develop library service in rural areas of our country. Almost 90 percent of the people in rural areas do not have access to public library facilites. This legislation will bring library service within the reach of most of our citizens.

NATIONAL DEBT

The national debt under the Eisenhower administration has increased by $7 billion during the past 4 years. Finally, in the final year of the administration a balanced budget was achieved. This was done by making sharp cuts in the Armed Forces and by economic curtailment policies of the administration. The cuts in the armed services caused heated debate and warnings that the Nation's security was being imperiled. The curtailment policies which adversely affected small business and employment opportunities also was the subject of bitter debate.

SMALL BUSINESS

The growing problem of small businesses in our country has caused much concern among many Members of Congress. Big defense contracts have gone to giant corporations and monopolies while small businesses are failing at the highest rate since the depression of the 1930's. Profits of big businesses are reaching record levels but many small businesses are operating in the red or making only skimpy profits, insufficient to finance expansion plans.

Small business is the keystone of our free competitive enterprise system. In many sections of our economy they are being squeezed out of existence by monopolistic big business. I supported legislation to aid small business by an "equal opportunity" bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and sponsored legislation to reduce corporate income tax rates on small businesses.

FARM LEGISLATION

An attempt was made to restore high, rigid price supports to basic farm commodities during the 84th Congress. I voted against rigid supports and in favor of flexible supports, which were favored by the overwhelming majority of the farmers of Berks County. I also favored the principle of "domestic parity" advanced by the Grange, in the hope that it might provide the best long-range solution to the problem of farm surpluses.

COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOLS

I introduced legislation to repeal the 20-percent Federal tax on fees and dues paid to private, nonprofit swimming pool associations. I feel that tax relief for these worthwhile community projects would encourage the organization of more such groups. Neighborhood swimming pools play an important role in curbing juvenile delinquency. They provide needed recreational facilities in the neighborhood to encourage clean, wholesome, and healthful family-type activities. My bill received favorable reaction from people in many parts of the country who are interested in the development of swimming pool projects. It was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and placed in an overall excise tax readjustment bill which will be considered next year.

MORALS AND ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT

I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics in Government. Our subcommittee considered legislation to establish a code of ethics for employees of the Federal Government and reported a bill favorably. While it is obvious that morals and ethics cannot be guaranteed through legislation, this bill outlines a code of conduct which, if used as a guide, would do much to raise the moral climate of government.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

In addition to my efforts to liberalize the social-security program, I sponsored legislation to permit single aged persons or couples to occupy public housing units and also worked for inclusion of special aged housing provisions in the overall housing legislation passed by the 84th Congress. The conservative coalition succeeded in blocking the type of aged housing program which many of us felt was necessary to meet the growing needs of our elderly citizens.

I also joined in sponsoring legislation to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Its duties would be to formulate and carry out broad new types of programs to give older citizens the opportunity to enjoy more productive and independent lives, with adequate income, medical care, housing, and the chance to participate more fully in community activities. This legislation would provide the logical first steps in providing for the necessary Federal-State and private organizational cooperation in the development of plans and projects to assist older persons toward the attainment of these humanitarian objectives.

SURPLUSES AND ABUNDANCE

The real challenge which Congress must face is the challenge of automation and abundance. A way must be found to channel our productive genius in the fields of manufactured goods and farm commodities into the hands of the millions of Americans now existing on meager pensions, substandard diets, in dilapidated slum housing, the children attending inadequate schools, growing up amid poverty and disease on a standard of living which is shameful in this great land of abundance.

The cost of living remains high and continues to be a hardship on unemployed workers, their families, small farmers, and the millions of our retired senior citizens who struggle to exist on inadequate pensions or social-security benefits.

We must initiate policies to establish a full employment, expanding economy to provide more jobs at decent wages. We must have increased purchasing power in the hands of our neglected, low-income families and our old folks so that they can afford to buy the manufactured goods and farm surpluses which bulge from our warehouses and storage bins.

In a brief report it is not possible to completely tell the full story of this session of Congress. Another report, resuming this summary of the work of the 84th Congress, will be mailed to you at a later date. Meanwhile, I will make myself available, without expense, to any group in Berks County which desires me to speak, answer questions, or debate on issues of national importance.

Contact my Reading or Washington office with any such request or on any matter in which you may be interested.

Aswan Gamble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Washington Star of Sunday, July 22, 1956:

ASWAN GAMBLE

The State Department's decision to withdraw from our agreement to help build the Aswan Dam on the Nile is a calculated—we hope carefully calculated—risk.

Two formal explanations for this about-face have been given: First, a failure by Egypt and her neighbors to settle the question of the use of Nile water rights, and, second, doubt as to Egypt's willingness and ability to accept the severely austere internal program necessary to enable that country to foot its share of the bill. Consequently, says the State Department, this Government has concluded that "it is not feasible in present circumstances" to participate in the project.

This, of course, is by no means the whole explanation. The Aswan Dam is vital to Egypt's future. It was expected that the project, when complete 12 to 16 years hence, would increase Egypt's irrigated land by one-third and her electric-power resources eightfold. Without this, there is little future for the rapidly expanding Egyptian population. So it is safe to assume that our Government's decision was not taken lightly.

What the other reasons which influenced the decision? Our officials realize, of course, that the Russians may move in, now that we are pulling out. And it is said, informally, that it might not be a bad idea to let them do it. The idea behind this is that Russia is suffering from internal economic stresses. The Russian people want a better standard of living and the Soviet Government has been hinting that they are going to get it. So, it is reasoned in some quarters here, let the Russians take over the Aswan project. If they do, we will try to capitalize on resulting discontent within the Soviet Union.

That, to us, sounds like wishful thinking. Perhaps we could reap some propaganda benefits of that sort, but they would be trifling compared to the disadvantages to us of having Russian influence firmly established in Egypt. If that should happen, our whole position in the Arab world would be gravely undermined, and we dare say that nobody knows where we would go from there.

But perhaps the State Department does not think it will come to such a pass as this. The phrase "in present circumstances" in the official release should not be overlooked, for it leaves the door open.

Egyptian President Nasser has been trying to work both sides of the street in recent months. Unable to buy arms here because he lacked the dollars, he made his deal to buy Communist arms and mortgaged Egypt's present and future cotton crop—its only export crop—to do it. He has also been following a neutralist line which, in many ways, is much more pleasing to the Kremlin than to us.

So perhaps the State Department has decided to serve implicit notice on Mr. Nasser that he can no longer have it both ways. If he wants to—and he certainly does not want to—he can turn to the Russians for help on the Aswan project. Or, presumably, he can come back to the west for aid if he changes his tactics in such a way as to alter present circumstances.

If this is the thinking that really underlies our action, we are taking a gamble—a big gamble. For Egypt desperately needs its dam, and Nasser will be forced to accept aid from whatever source he can get. We hope that our officials have weighed the risks very carefully, and that they know what they are doing.

The Great Circle Route

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the sound economic development of our State requires that the restrictions on Pan American World Airways' transpacific route be not reimposed, so that it may operate between our Pacific ports and the Orient, over the great circle route.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following authroized statement by 23 members of the California delegation; a copy of statement by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, July 23, 1956; and a copy of telegram dated July 24, 1956, from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce:

STATEMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

The people of California for a century have had a deep interest in commerce with the Orient. The only through one-carrier air service between our State and the Orient has been rendered by Pan American World Airways, which pioneered transpacific operations over 20 years ago.

California and our carrier, Pan American, are now confronted with a problem as to the continuation of this service which is of serious concern to the people of our State. Recent resolutions which we have received from the Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco and Los Angeles illustrate this problem.

Pan American still holds only a temporary authorization, expiring early in 1960, to serve Tokyo, the principal traffic center of the Orient. Northwest Airlines, the other American flag carrier, which provides through one-carrier service to the Middle West and Eastern States also holds only temporary authorization to serve Tokyo which now expires 2 years later in 1962. Both carriers must utilize jet aircraft costing many millions of dollars to provide efficient service beginning in 1960. President Eisenhower decided early in 1955 that neither carrier should have permanent authorization until such time as they had demonstrated they could operate without subsidy.

Our carrier, Pan American, operated without subsidy in 1955 and will again be subsidy free as soon as the archaic restrictions requiring it to fly from its four Pacific coast gateways to Tokyo via a mid-Pacific island are removed and it is permitted to provide our State with short, fast service over the direct route via Seattle.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we urge the President and the Civil Aeronautics Board to now grant our carrier, Pan American World Airways, permanent authority to serve Tokyo. Unless this is done, this carrier cannot be expected to acquire the fleet of jet aircraft at a cost exceeding $50 million which are needed if California's historic position in trade with Japan and other Orient traffic centers served via Tokyo is to be preserved.

CARL HINSHAW, Chairman, the California Delegation; JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., Member of Congress; JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR., Member of Congress; CLAIR ENGLE, Member of Congress; CHARLES S. GUBSER, Member of Congress; EDGAR W. HIESTAND, Member of Congress; CHET HOLIFIELD, Member of Congress; CRAIG HOSMER, Member of Congress; JOSEPH F. HOLT, Member of Congress; CHARLES TEAGUE, Member of Congress; JAMES B. UTT, Member of Congress; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Member of Congress; PATRICK J. HILLINGS, Member of Congress; DONALD JACKSON, Member of Congress; LEROY JOHNSON, Member of Congress; CECIL KING, Member of Congress; GLENARD LIPSCOMB, Member of Congress; WILLIAM MAILLIARD, Member of Congress; GORDON MCDONOUGH, Member of Congress; JOHN PHILLIPS, Member of Congress; HUBERT SCUDDER, Member of Congress; JOHN SHELLEY, Member of Congress; ROBERT C. WILSON, Member of Congress.

STATEMENT, SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, JULY 23, 1956

In 1935, more than 20 years ago, Pan American World Airways inaugurated air transportation across the Pacific to the Orient from California and has been serving the California gateways since that time. It was well aware that the Great Circle Route was by far the shortest one to the Orient and as early as 1931 made aerial surveys of this route. However, because of obstacles of a political character then existing the route was not available to it. For that reason it established its route across the central Pacific via Honolulu, Wake, Guam, and Manila to Hong Kong. In 1946 it was authorized by the United States Civil Aeronautics Board to serve both Tokyo and Shanghai from California but was denied the right to use the Great Circle Route which it then sought even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter from California to Tokyo. Instead it was confined to the central Pacific route and Northwest Airlines was authorized to use the Great Circle Route for a competing service from the United States to Tokyo. Since that time Pan American has made repeated efforts to be released from the arbitrary Civil Aeronautics Board restriction which requires its Tokyo services from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island en route.

In the most recent proceding the transpacific certificate renewal case of 1953 Pan American's authorization to serve Tokyo was temporarily extended to April 10, 1960. At that time Northwest's authorization was temporarily extended until April 10, 1962. Again, however, Pan American was restricted to the longer central pacific route.

The proceeding has been reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the Great Circle Route to the Orient.

The question of permanency of the authorization was an issue in the proceeding. However, in a decision by the President only 18 months ago he took the position that the time was not yet appropriate for the issuance of permanent certificates either to Pan American or Northwest for service to and through Tokyo. Rather, it was pointed out that the temporary certificates should run their course and the situation be reviewed in the light of the operating results near the end of the temporary period. Nevertheless, the question has again been raised by a new application filed by Northwest for a perma-

nent certificate and is now pending before the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If a decision is now to be made as to the permanency of the certificates for service to Tokyo there is no question that Pan American, the carrier which pioneered the Pacific routes and which has been serving the United States-Orient traffic for over 21 years, should be given first consideration for permanency. The manifest fairness of this statement is pinpointed by the following facts:

1. Japan generates better than 50 percent of the total United States-Orient traffic.

2. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through the California gateways.

3. Despite the handicap of restrictions which force Pan American to serve Tokyo by a route more than 1,000 miles longer from California Pan American has been carrying nearly 70 percent of the United States-Tokyo traffic.

It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification must first apply to the primary gateways and the primary carrier. In this case California and Pan American.

The matter of subsidy is not involved since both Pan American and Northwest were free of subsidy in the Pacific operation during 155. However, this will not remain a fact with respect to Pan American in the event it is denied the right to use the Great Circle Route to the Orient for its west coast gateways including Portland and Seattle whether the certificates remain temporary or are made permanent.

Northwest alleges that they are faced with a "very real hardship" for lack of permanent operating rights to Tokyo and urges that "money is being invested to promote services on the strength of a temporary certificate. Changes in equipment and services required by the advent of jet aircraft are a very real and pressing possibility. Time delay will cause damage that may well be irreparable." These arguments apply even more forcefully to Pan American. Pan American did not hold back on ordering jet aircraft. It has anticipated the public need by placing orders for such equipment amounting to approximately $243 million including a fleet for its transpacific service at a time when the Tokyo certificates of both carriers were temporary and there was not the slightest indication that one would be extended on a permanent basis without the other. Failure to now grant Pan American a permanent Tokyo certificate while at the same time granting Northwest such permanency would cast such a cloud over Pan American's continuance on the Pacific that in Pan American case the damage would "be irreparable."

In the postwar years Tokyo has come to occupy the dominating position as the gateway to the Orient. Plainly a carrier excluded from Tokyo or placed under a severe handicap in respect to serving Tokyo and other countries of the Orient through Tokyo would be in a hopelessly inferior position. At the same time, the California gateways which such carrier is serving would suffer from the inferior service to which they thus would be restricted. They could enjoy none of the advantages which true and effective competition can bring to them.

Failure to grant Pan American the Great Circle Route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted Northwest would be manifestly unjust not only to Pan American but the west coast gateways which it serves.

COPY OF TELEGRAM RECEIVED FROM THE LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

JULY 23, 1956.

HON. CARL HINSHAW,
House Office Building:

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce recently actively participated in Civil Aeronautics Board docket No. 5031 known as the reopened Trans Pacific Certificate Renewal case. The proceeding was reopened by the Civil Aeronautics Board at the direction of the President of the United States, to determine the single issue of whether Pan American should be authorized to use the great circle route to the Orient. Pan American inaugurated air service across the Pacific to the Orient from California gateways in 1935 and has provided service since that time. However, Pan American was and has been denied the right to use the great circle to the Orient even though it is more than 1,000 miles shorter to Tokyo via that route. Present route restrictions require Pan American's Tokyo service from California to stop at a mid-Pacific island enroute. These mandatory circuitous routings have caused many passengers who would logically be routed through California gateways to choose other more direct routes. Carriers not serving California gateways advertise this fact, and thereby attract additional traffic away from California gateways.

The California businessman is already at a considerable disadvantage with his competitors for the Japanese and Chinese markets because of great distances involved. Certification of Pan American to serve Tokyo via the great circle route will considerably offset these handicaps. In another docket, No. 7725, presently before the Civil Aeronautics Board, Northwest Airlines, who are presently certified to fly the great circle route to the Orient from Seattle, have applied for permanent authority to serve this route. We take no position as to whether this application should be granted or denied. We feel that is a decision now to be made as to the permanency of the certificate for service to Tokyo from the west coast. There is no question but that Pan American, who has been serving the west coast to Orient traffic for over 21 years, should be given at least equal consideration along with Northwest. Failure to grant Pan American the great circle route on a certificate of duration equal to that granted to any other carrier would be manifestly unjust to Pan American and the west coast gateways it serves. The matter of subsidy is not involved in either proceeding since both Pan American and Northwest Airlines have been free of subsidy in the Pacific operations during and since 1955. However, if present routing restrictions are not lifted and if Pan American is not permitted to fly the shorter great circle route from California gateways via Portland and Seattle to the Orient, it does not appear that they will be able to remain in a competitive position and stay off subsidy.

Tokyo at present occupies the dominant position as the gateway to the Orient. Over 50 percent of the total United States Orient traffic is generated by Japan. More than 70 percent of this traffic moves through California gateways. It logically follows that any consideration for permanent certification should be given to the primary gateways and the carrier handling the traffic, in this instance Pan American. The Civil Aeronautics Board should give favorable consideration toward the permanent certification of this much needed more expeditious air route between California gateways and the Orient, which has already been established as convenient and necessary to the public.

A. O. BECKMAN,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress I was assigned to the Subcommittee on Roads. On that subcommittee was a member who is voluntarily retiring from Congress. It did not take us long to recognize the ability, the patience, and the willingness to be of service of JESSE WOLCOTT, the gentleman from Michigan.

Since that time I have really become acquainted with JESSE WOLCOTT and his very fine wife. They are great Americans and certainly their records will go down in history for their many friends to look at with admiration. As Speaker RAYBURN has said, Congressman WOLCOTT, affectionately known as JESSE, has been one of the outstanding lawmakers of this period. His ability has not only been recognized in this Congress but throughout the country.

We will miss JESSE WOLCOTT, Mr. Speaker, but certainly our blessings and good wishes go with him wherever he goes.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—X

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

No attempt has been made to include votes on all of the numerous bills, motions, and amendments. The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 14,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. I believe this word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which unfortunately do not always completely reflect the nature or purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 10th report of my voting and attendance record. These 10 reports show how I voted on 1,430 questions in the House of Representatives during the last 12 years. Based on quorum calls—calls of the House—and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Call of the House	Present.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes: On passage. (Passed 387 to 0)	Yea.
4	Jan. 31	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1)	Yea.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 358 to 3)	Yea.
6	Feb. 2	Call of the House	Absent.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 309)	Nay.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947: On passage. (Passed 372 to 2)	Yea.
9	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
10	Feb. 28	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26)	Yea.
11	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Call of the House	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Call of the House	Present.
14	Mar. 1	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On passage. (Passed 256 to 136)	Yea.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act: On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 150 to 231)	Nay.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166, extending to April 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4)	Yea.
17	Mar. 20	Call of the House	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Call of the House	Present.
19	Mar. 21	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956: On motion to agree to the conference report (thus rejecting Senate amendments to extend these programs for 2 years). (Rejected 195 to 215)	Nay.
20	Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0)	Yea.
21	Mar. 21	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 310)	Nay.
22	Apr. 11	Call of the House	Present.
23	Apr. 11	H. R. 12, The Agriculture Act of 1956, providing rigid 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Yea.
24	Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181)	Nay.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments: On passage. (Passed 377 to 3)	Yea.
26	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
27	Apr. 18	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing rigid 90-percent support for basic crops: On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211)	Nay.
28	Apr. 23	H. R. 7728, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce: On passage. (Passed 284 to 8)	Yea.
29	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
30	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
31	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
32	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
33	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Absent.
34	Apr. 25	H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill: On amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184).	(1)
35	Apr. 27	Call of the House	Present.
36	Apr. 27	H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956: On passage. (Passed 388 to 19)	Yea.
37	May 2	Call of the House	Present.
38	May 3	Call of the House	Present.
39	May 3	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank): On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195)	Nay.
40	May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208)	Nay.
41	May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211).	Yea.
42	May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78)	Yea.
43	May 9	Call of the House	Present.
44	May 9	Call of the House	Present.
45	May 10	Call of the House	Present.
46	May 10	H. R. 10986, the Defense Department Appropriation bill: On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Yea.
47	May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0)	Yea.
48	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
49	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
50	May 17	H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172)	Nay.
51	May 21	Call of the House	Present.
52	May 21	H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges: On passage. (Passed 238 to 52)	Yea.
53	May 22	H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1957: On amendment to provide $100,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170)	Nay.
54	May 23	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank): On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 304 to 59)	Yea.
55	May 24	S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin Unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming: On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 176-126)	(2).
56	May 31	H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956: On passage. (Passed 246 to 4)	Yea.
57	June 6	Call of the House	Present.
58	June 6	Call of the House	Present.
59	June 7	Call of the House	Present.
60	June 8	Call of the House	Present.
61	June 8	Call of the House	Present.
62	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
63	June 11	H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act: On passage. (Passed, 275 to 122)	Yea.
64	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
65	June 11	H. R. 1894, to strengthen the Robin-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination: On passage. (Passed, 393 to 3)	Yea.
66	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
67	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
68	June 12	Call of the House	Present.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
69	June 13	On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected, 179 to 209.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators:	
70	June 13	On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected, 151 to 228.)	Yea.
		H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act:	
71	June 13	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected, 165 to 213.)	Yea.
72	June 13	On passage. (Passed, 338 to 31.)	Yea.
73	June 20	Call of the House	Present.
74	June 25	Call of the House	Present.
		S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October:	
75	June 25	On passage. (Passed, 199 to 120.)	Yea.
76	June 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of nonservice-connected veterans pension awards:	
77	June 27	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 110 to 305)	Yea.
78	June 27	On passage. (Passed 364 to 51)	Nay.
79	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
80	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
81	June 28	On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department Dispersal order: (Agreed to 200 to 197)	Nay.
		H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction:	
82	June 28	On adoption. (Adopted 327 to 67)	Yea.
83	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
84	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.:	
85	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 325 to 59)	Yea.
		S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing:	
86	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 254 to 133.)	Nay.
87	July 3	Call of the House	Present.
88	July 5	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction:	
89	July 5	On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.).	Nay.
90	July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Yea.
91	July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 202.)	Yea.
92	July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Nay.
93	July 6	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
94	July 6	On passage. (Passed 217 to 165)	Yea.
		H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956:	
95	July 9	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected, 29 to 343.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site:	
96	July 9	On passage. (Passed, 287 to 80.)	Yea.
97	July 11	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957:	
98	July 11	On passage. (Passed, 284 to 120.)	Yea.
		H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138 making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:	
99	July 12	On adoption. (Adopted, 361 to 30.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957:	
100	July 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. (Rejected, 24 to 370.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances:	
101	July 12	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
102	July 17	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations:	
103	July 18	On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act:	
104	July 18	On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
105	July 19	Call of the House	Present.
106	July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
107	July 20	Call of the House	Present.
108	July 21	Call of the House	Present.
109	July 23	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction:	
110	July 23	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
111	July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126)	Yea.
		S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies:	
112	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 245 to 145)	Yea.
		H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair:	
113	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123)	Yea.
114	July 24	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act:	
115	July 24	On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private businesses. (Adopted 201 to 185)	Nay.
		H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors:	
116	July 24	On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199)	Yea.
117	July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191)	Yea.
118	July 25	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956:	
119	July 25	On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299)	Nay.
		H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
120	July 25	On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9)	Yea.
121	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
122	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
123	July 26	On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194)	Yea.
		H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
124	July 26	On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178)	Nay.
		H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
125	July 26	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153)	Yea.
126	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration;	

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JOHN W. BYRNES, 8th District, Wisconsin (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll call No.	Date, 1956	Measure, question, and result	Vote
127	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126)	Nay.
		S. 3368, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
128	July 27	On passage. (Passed 201 to 140)	Nay.
129	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
130	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7830, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho:	
131	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168)	Yea.
132	July 27	Call of the House	Present.

[1] Not voting. Would have voted "nay" if present.
[2] Absent (not voting). Would have voted "Nay" if present.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

Of necessity the report contains parliamentary and legislative terms with which the reader may not be familiar. An explanation of some of these terms may, therefore, be helpful:

A. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

B. Recommital: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adopted, does not kill the bill.

C. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

First. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

Second. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

Third. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

Fourth. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

D. Rule: Important bills, after approval of the committee concerned, go to the House Committee on Rules where a rule, in the form of a House resolution (H. Res.), is granted covering the time allowed for debate, consideration of amendments, and other parliamentary questions.

E. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

F. Ordering the previous question: A motion to order the previous question, if adopted, shuts off further debate on the question before the House and prevents further amendments to such proposition.

G. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

First. Voice vote: The Speaker first askas all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

Second. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

Third. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

Fourth. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote is recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

The outcome of various votes are indicated in parentheses in the record above. In the case of rollcall votes, the actual vote is shown—the yeas first and the nays last.

Congressional Racketeering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the U. S. News & Report under date of July 13, 1956. The editorial follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RACKETEERING

(By David Lawrence)

The House of Representatives last week, by a vote of 225 to 192, recorded its view that, unless the Southern States abandon their convictions and surrender their principles, they should be punished by the withholding of Federal funds for the erection of new schools and for other educational purposes in those States.

Fortunately, this amendment to a general bill which was to provide Federal aid to education was nullified later when the entire measure was rejected. But the vote on the issue stands out as a disgraceful piece of attempted coercion.

For this was an effort to enforce conformity of thought in America.

The whole bill, of course, threatened an invasion of the historic right of the States to control their own educational systems. It never was intended that billions of dollars of taxpayers' money should be used to transfer control of our 48 separate educational operations from the States to a centralized bureaucracy in Washington.

Last week, moreover, the voting happened to be on a stipulation that certain Southern States must give up their lawful right to appeal from adverse court orders in any proper steps they may seek to take to postpone integration, even temporarily.

Next time the voting could be on a provision in an appropriation bill declaring that no funds be granted for any school unless there is conformity to a national curriculum of studies.

Once the principle of usurpation is accepted under the guise of financial paternalism directed by the Federal Government, arguments about unconstitutionality will be of little avail. Even without a vote in Congress on any specific amendment, administrative action could be taken by an executive department to deny funds for schools in Southern States.

Fears of just such a contingency are well founded. Thus, there is no warrant of law today for the action of the President's interracial commission which asserts the right to withhold Government contracts from companies that do not comply with an Executive order forbidding employers to discriminate

in employment on the basis of race or creed or color or national origin. Companies which refuse to do the bidding of the Federal Government are threatened with loss of contracts. The present Executive order could even now be readily broadened to deny to Southern schools aid of any kind, such as the payment of veterans' tuition under measures like the GI bill of rights.

States, therefore, which decline to accept the discipline of an executive agency in Washington in the conduct of their schools could, under any bill in the future providing aid in general to education, find themselves unable to construct the necessary buildings in their localities or to keep up with the growing needs of an increased school population.

The Eisenhower administration, to be sure, has publicly frowned upon the imposition of any conditions in connection with the grant of Federal funds to aid the public schools of the States. The rollcall nevertheless showed 148 Republicans and 77 Democrats from the North voting for the coercive amendment sponsored by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York City.

This punitive proposal was a mockery of America's boasted freedom of conscience and freedom of thought.

It will be recalled that the Supreme Court of the United States itself, in its 1954 decision, placed no time limit on the specific orders that it expected the lower courts to issue in bringing about a gradual adjustment to the integration mandate. But if the amendment voted on last week by the House had become law, it would have foreclosed the opportunity to some Southern States to get Federal funds during the interval that lower court orders on specific points were being argued or appealed to higher courts, as permitted under lawful procedures. The States were to be told, in effect:

"Give up your constitutional right of appeal or you get no money. Accept now without argument whatever orders are to be issued by the lower courts hereafter, or you will pay the penalty of having millions of dollars for schools withheld from your State in the meantime. Even if you do comply, a bureaucrat in Washington will have to be satisfied as to the exact nature of your compliance before your State gets any money."

What a tragic example of organized punishment and organized bribery—and this in free America, where the States are supposed to be sovereign and where even a Communist is given his full right of appeal from the lowest to the highest courts.

What new crimes will be committed in the name of "liberalism" and "equal rights under the law?"

What new extortions and demands will be made upon the minority by an intolerant majority which seeks to use the devices of legislative racketeering to establish conformity of thought in the House of Representatives today?

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. PERKINS BASS
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, on this closing day of the 84th Congress, I am moved to extend my remarks in tribute to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON, who for reasons of his own has decided not to seek reelection to Congress.

Even though I am a freshman in Congress and have only known OLLIE BOLTON 1½ years, I have developed a friendship with him which I shall value, and a high regard and respect for him. The Congress is losing a good man, a fine legislator who has an excellent record, and I hope since he is still young and has a great future before him that he may some time return to Congress.

Keynote Speech of Congressman William L. Springer Before the Indiana State Republican Convention, June 27, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, on June 27, 1956, our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] made the keynote speech before the Indiana State Republican Convention.

In view of this fact, I felt sure the Members of the House would be interested in what he said on that occasion. Under unanimous consent, I append herewith the speech made on that occasion in full:

Mr. Chairman, fellow candidates in 1956, delegates to this convention, and my Republican friends, this convention convenes again in the spirit of this great Republic, to declare your principles in a party platform, to nominate the candidates to high office who shall serve you both at home and in Washington, and to reassert your confidence in the administration of the greatest President within our lifetime.

From him, and all of his administration in Washington, I bring you personal greetings and best wishes for a successful convention and for the election of all of your State and National candidates this fall.

I cannot think of Indiana without this personal note of fond recollection. Here I was born and grew to manhood. Some of my first boyhood friends and college classmates are among you here today. My father and mother are hallowed in your ground—as are their parents before them. And dear ones of my family still reside among you. I could not look out upon this audience without thoughts of long ago.

I now live among the finest people in the world, but I can look back upon my former association with friends in Indiana with long and abundant affection.

The Indiana Republican State convention is a time when old friends return to Indianapolis to renew ties with the party. There are among you many old delegates who have seen service in the party wars of yesteryear. I see also those who are probably coming to this convention for the first time and will be here years hence when many of you have handed over the reins of party leadership.

Just 24 years ago, I walked through the portals of this building for the last time as a delegate to this convention from Sullivan County. The keynote speaker on that occasion was the late Will Hays. I can remember his words as if it were only yesterday when he said:

"Hoosiers are friendly people. No matter where you may roam, when a Hoosier meets a fellow Hoosier, it is time to sit and have a friendly chat."

In the past few years, I have travelled over much of the globe, and it seems that regardless of where I am, I always manage to meet a transplanted Hoosier. In connection with this gregarious and friendly trait among your people, I am reminded of thse lines of Rupert Brooke in speaking of his beloved England:

"If I should die, think only this of me:
That there's some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England.

* * * * *

Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter learnt of friends, and gentleness."

You who have gathered here today are reflecting on the significance of the Republican Party in 1956 on the life of the State and the Nation. In any democracy, we must have a theory about the principles which make it up. One theory given us in the wisdom of our founding fathers was that every 4 years the President should return to the people with an accounting of his stewardship and ask for a vote of confidence in his actions and his policies. So, in 1956, the Eisenhower administration returns to the people for an approval of its actions during the last 4 years.

This is only fair—it is only just—it is only right—that we do so.

Not within my lifetime has a Republican administration been able to return to the people with such a record of accomplishment—either in the White House or in the Congress. We should be shouting from every street corner about this great record. Never has a party had a better record or a better program to stand on. All recent polls indicate that this Republican administration in Washington is approved by a solid majority of the American people.

If we are to give an accounting of this stewardship, what have we done during the past 4 years?

Let us look at the situation in Washington in 1953 when the Republicans were returned to power:

I. There was a shooting war in Korea: Between 1945 and 1953, in the short space of 7 years, 600 million people had disappeared behind the Iron Curtain.

There were hot spots all over the world, any one of which could have involved us in a war.

After just 3 years in the White House, this administration is in this situation:

We have finished the war in Korea and we are firmly at peace for the first time since 1940.

By wisely allying ourselves with friends in Europe and Asia, we have brought about an increased military strength to the entire free world and we are able to meet and defeat any aggressor, wherever he might appear.

In my estimation, this was the major issue before the American people when they went to the polls in 1952. I leave it to your best judgment as to whether or not this administration has performed on its promise to end the Korean war and to keep ourselves strong enough that no aggressor, nor combination of aggressors, can bring on world war III.

II. When the people of America went to the polls in 1952, they were conscious that during recent years there had been scandal and dishonesty which had run rampant through the Truman administration from 1948 on.

I would like to recall for just a moment some of the headlines of 1952. Here they are:

December 1951: New Scandals in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

January 1952: House Judiciary Votes Investigation of Department of Justice.

March 1952: Newbold Morris Called In To Clean Up Mess.

April 2, 1952: Morris, McGrath, and Truman Clash.

April 3, 1952: McGrath Fires Morris, Truman Fires McGrath.

April 4, 1952: McGrath Tells McGranery, "Bring a Pair of Asbestos Trousers With You."

I don't know what you people called it in Indiana, but in Washington we termed it the "Scandal-a-Day Administration."

In the past 3 years, what have we and the President in Washington done about this mess?

First of all, we got rid of the questionable people in high places who were making possible this corruption and we replaced crook-and-crony rule by able and honest administration.

I am not contending that all of the honest people are in the Republican Party. That is not the test of a successful and honest administration. The test is—when these crooks arise in high places, the President meets the person and the issue head on and removes them from Government. This is what I charge the Truman administration failed to do. This is what I assert the Eisenhower administration has done on every occasion where ethical standards have been tested.

On the issue of honesty in Government, I believe that the policies of the Eisenhower administration have received the substantial approval of people everywhere.

III. When the people of this country went to the polls in 1952, there was great uneasiness and serious lack of confidence in the ability of the previous administration to deal effectively with the question of the internal security of the United States. Some of this had been brought about by its record of negligence in the Hiss case, the White case, and many others which could be named. There had been a failure on the part of the previous administration to follow the reports and the findings of the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to the danger of Communist infiltration into high places in Government.

What is the record of President Eisenhower on this point? First, he tightened the security standards not only for those who might be involved in a Communist conspiracy against the United States, but also set up standards which removed from Government those weaklings who might be subject to indecision when confronted with the question of making a choice between their Government and their own advancement.

The laws with reference to these matters have been more strictly enforced than ever before. This administration has deported 157 alien Communists in 3 years. In the previous 7 years of the Truman administration, only 95 alien Communists were deported.

The Congress has passed laws which more nearly fit the penalty for subversion and espionage, and has given our Justice Department the necessary weapons with which to deal with this entire matter.

But most important of all, we are making as sure as possible that none of these people will get back on the payroll again.

IV. When the people of the United States went to the polls in 1952, they had witnessed fiscal irresponsibility for 20 years. During that time they had seen only 2 balanced budgets—both by the Republican 80th Congress, in 1947 and 1948.

I am happy to report to you that on June 30, 1956, this administration will have balanced the budget and will have a modest surplus of between 1½ and 2½ billions of dollars.

Your Congress, with the support of the President, passed the Tax Revision Act of 1954. This was the first general overhaul of the tax structure of this country in 57 years. Under that act, we granted to the people of this country the greatest tax reduction in all history.

This tax cut amounted to $7½ billion.

Sixty-two percent of the entire amount went to individuals, including a 10-percent across-the-board decrease in income taxes. Thirty-two percent of this tax cut went to businesses of all kinds, including agriculture. A large portion of this tax reduction to business was responsible for the tremendous incentive to business to expand and has resulted in the unparalleled employment and prosperity in this country in the last 3 years.

V. When the people of this country went to the polls in 1952, they knew that for 20 years they had been watching a gradually decreasing dollar and that inflation was rampant.

In the last 3 years of the Truman administration the value of the dollar decreased 12 percent alone. From a 100-cent dollar in 1932 the previous administration had brought us in 1952 to a 54-cent dollar in purchasing power.

The factory mechanic, the white-collar worker, and the farmer were seeing whatever economic gains they made gradually disappear in the mirage of inflation.

During the past 3 years, this administration has halted the inflation spiral which threatened the economic gains of every group in America. The dollar today, in purchasing power, varies less than 1 percent from what it did in 1952.

VI. During the campaign in 1952, the opposing party went up and down the country saying, "Elect a Republican President, and you will see the greatest depression in history."

How many of you remember that?

Let us take a look first at the general business picture. In the past 3 years, retail sales, building construction, and personal income have set alltime records; 1955 was the greatest year in history for business and the worker.

The number of people employed in 1955 was the highest in history. This is in striking contrast with the administration during the previous 20 years. They were never able to produce maximum employment except from war or the after effects of war.

In 1940, which was the last peacetime year before World War II, after 7 years of boondoggling and leaf raking, there were 4 times as many people unemployed in America as there are today. In 1949, President Truman's last peacetime year before the Korean war, there were twice as many unemployed as there are today.

The proof of any pudding is in the eating. In my estimation, this proves that our policy of encouraging individuals to create jobs is better than the New Deal policy of relying primarily on Government to make jobs.

Your administration has not only given to the people the greatest prosperity ever known, but it has kept our economy on an even keel in all of its efforts.

The gross national product is $12½ billion more than 3 years ago.

We are currently employing between two and three million more people in America than was ever reached under a Democratic administration.

By wise labor policies, and more especially, due to incentive employment factors, strike losses are down 53 percent in 1955 from 1952.

VII. When the people of America went to the polls in 1952, our opposition said, "Elect the Republicans and you will get the most reactionary Government in our history."

I am convinced that a majority of Americans want their Government to be progressive and humanitarian—but they do not want it socialistic.

This has been a guiding beacon light in all that this administration has tried to do. Your Republican administration in Washington has these accomplishments to its credit:

1. Established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

2. Extended Social Security to 10 million more people and liberalized benefits for all of them;

3. Extended unemployment insurance to 4 million Government and small-business workers;

4. Increased railroad retirement and unemployment benefits;

5. Set up a Small Business Administration to assist small business;

6. This administration has advanced the civil rights of minorities everywhere. This administration has done more in 3 years to reduce discrimination than our predecessors did in 20 years;

7. Your President has proposed to Congress programs for highway expansion; medical and health research; and aid to depressed labor areas; all of which are now pending before your Congress in Washington.

I wish to emphasize that all of this has been done without regimentation or centralization. In whatever has been accomplished by your party in Washington, it has reversed the trend of the previous 20 years toward regimentation and centralization.

I am sure the people want an administration which does not look to the past, nor is satisfied with the present, but one which by deeds even more than by words shows the way to new and greater hope for the future. I believe that this program, designed in the very best of American tradition, will keep America on the road to progress. True conservatism has always been progressive • • • and for this we could point to the great record of Theodore Roosevelt.

May I emphasize to my good friends in this convention that the choice this fall is not between the Eisenhower program and something more conservative, but between the Eisenhower program and something far more radical.

So, in conclusion, may I say that the Republican Party can return to the people this fall with an excellent record of stewardship and accounting in the National Government.

Your Members of the House of Representatives have given a good account of themselves. CHARLES HALLECK did an able job as your majority floor leader in the 83d Congress. Other Members, CECIL HARDEN, RALPH HARVEY, EARL WILSON, CHUCK BROWNSON, BILL BRAY, JOHN BEAMER, ROSS ADAIR, and SHEP CRUMPACKER have all stood to be counted on the difficult issues which have faced all of us in Washington. These Members have never surrendered on principle.

They have given your President and your Republican administration all the backing which they conscientiously could and have acquitted themselves to their constituents in excellent fashion. I could not let this moment pass without commending them to your good graces.

May I close this speech with a personal word—you who are here this morning are those who will be the frontline troops in 1956. This is a worthy cause. You will be fighting to continue in office an administration which has ended war—thrown out corruption and waste—and brought great security to the people of America. You can glory in that fight and you can win.

Let us all join the battle so that this cause, so great in its promise and so magnificent in its performance, will not fail, but shall be victorious.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON,

is voluntarily retiring from Congress. We need young men such as OLLIE BOLTON in our legislative halls. He is a hard worker, honest and has most capably represented his district during the period he has been in Washington. Although he has only been with us a short time, he has made an excellent record and has many accomplishments.

Mrs. McGregor joins me in extending to him and his family best wishes in whatever their endeavors might be.

Agriculture in 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, today the most important single fact is that this Nation is at peace. Peace has been achieved and maintained under the courageous leadership of President Eisenhower.

Peace, prosperity and progress under his administration are spelled out by the fact that more Americans are at work today, earning more, producing more, building more and investing more than at any other time in history.

Inflation has been halted. The savings, the insurance policies, the pension rights of our people are no longer being whittled away by advancing living costs. A dollar saved in 1953 is still worth as much as it was then. A dollar saved in 1940 was worth only 52 cents by 1952.

Under the Eisenhower administration, the Nation as a whole is enjoying higher earnings, lower taxes and stable living costs—all at the same time.

The saving, rather than the spending, of a dollar has again become a respectable objective in Washington. Reductions in Government expenditures have made possible the greatest dollar tax cut in history—$7.4 billion annually. That is the equivalent of $180 a year for every family in America. Along with this record tax cut, the Federal budget has been balanced.

Stifling bureaucratic controls over the national economy have been eased.

The Nation has the strongest and most efficient Armed Forces in all its peacetime history. A tax dollar is buying a dollar's worth of defense.

This administration is determined that farmers shall share fairly in this unprecedented national prosperity. A concentrated attack upon price-depressing surpluses is underway.

There has been a sharp upturn in the general level of farm prices during recent months. Since January farm prices, as an average, have increased by about 11 percent. During the first 6 months of 1956, net farm income was running at a rate of half a billion dollars higher than for the last 6 months of 1955.

The parity ratio, which measures prices received by farmers against those they pay for goods and services, moved from 80 in January to 86 in June. This is in marked contrast with farm price trends during the last 7 months of the Truman administration when the parity ratio dropped 7 points. In fact, during the final 23 months of that administration, the parity ratio tumbled 19 points in one of the sharpest farm price declines of record. This happened despite the fact that the country was at war throughout the entire period.

A substantial part of the general improvement in farm prices has come in hogs and beef cattle. These two items account for approximately 30 percent of farmers' total cash receipts nationally—more than all of the 6 basic commodities.

In recent months top quality hogs have been bringing $17 to $18 in the principal markets. The 8 percent reduction in spring pig farrowings would indicate strong prices in the year ahead.

Beef cattle prices have strengthened about 10 percent since January.

The current political controversy over Government farm policies involves a clash of two basic philosophies. The 1956 elections will determine whether American agriculture is to remain free or be driven down the road of regimentation and State control.

The position of the President and the Republican Party on this fundamental issue is clear-cut. We believe that the role of Government in agriculture should be that of a helpful partner, never a master. We believe that Government can and should assist agriculture in such important fields as research and education, grading and inspection services, market expansion and development and credit. We believe that Government should—as it is doing—carry forward commodity loan programs and direct purchase operations which protect farmers against undue price declines but at the same time permit our abundant production to move into consumption rather than into storage.

We believe, too, that while Government should help farmers to do the things that they cannot do individually, the hand of Government must never replace the hand of the farmer in the operation of his own farm. Farmers must remain free to make their own management decisions. They must be permitted to be competitive in both the domestic and foreign market places. They must not be shackled by burdensome controls and regulations which deny them the opportunity to make the most efficient use of their production facilities. Not only farmers but all Americans have a stake in a free agriculture.

Farmers realize that the primary cause of their present problems are surpluses—surpluses of food and fiber piled up under wartime programs continued too long after the need for vastly expanded production has passed.

This administration is vigorously attacking the surplus problem on two major fronts. The soil bank is being placed in operation as a means of bringing current production into better balance with demand and at the same time building up the fertility of the land against future needs. This program could have been applied on a much broader basis this year had not the Democrat leadership dawdled and delayed action until farmers had planted their spring crops.

The surplus problem is also being met through a program of greatly expanded farm exports.

The Republican administration got to work at once to regain and expand our shrinking export markets. In fiscal year 1954, the dollar value of farm exports went up 7 percent, in fiscal 1955 they went up another 4 percent, and for the fiscal year 1956, they will be up still another 9 percent.

The Republican 83d Congress enacted the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to help dispose of farm surpluses without unduly disturbing markets. Since July 1953 we have moved into use more than $5.5 billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities. Gains in exports are apparent this past year in all major crops except cotton. Excluding cotton, exports this year are expected to be the highest of any year for the past 30 years.

Here are some of the commodity highlights:

Wheat up 20 percent from last year.

Feed grains up 84 percent from a year ago.

Soybeans up 37 percent from last year and a new record.

Soybean and cottonseed oil up 52 percent and another record.

Lard up 31 percent and the largest of the last 4 years.

I would list these other accomplishments of the past 3½ years:

When this administration came to Washington in 1953, it found prices controlled, grading of beef compulsory, and prices going down. Government restrictions were removed. A vast beef purchase program was undertaken to help stop the decline in prices.

Government worked with industry to market beef vigorously—and not only beef but dairy products, vegetables, pork, and other plentiful foods. In the past 3 years, the American people have been eating more per person—more beef, chickens, and turkeys than ever before.

Under this administration we have had the biggest expansion of grain storage facilities in all history.

We have moved swiftly to give aid to farmers hit by floods, drought and other disasters.

We have developed a program for upstream protection of watersheds, to conserve soil and water, to help prevent floods and to preserve our precious national heritage for future generations.

School lunch programs have been expanded to serve 11 million children.

We have sought to use every appropriate and effective means to enlarge markets so that farmers can produce and sell their output, increase their incomes and enjoy an improving level of living.

A Great Plains program was developed to provide a stable, profitable agriculture for the farm families of this vast region.

A prosperous, expanding and free agriculture is important not only to farmers but to all of us.

We have measured our farm policies on the basis of what is good for the farmer

and the Nation. Farmers know they have in the White House a friend who is concerned with their problems and is determined that they shall share fairly in our unprecedented national prosperity.

Report to the District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have always considered it one of the duties of a Representative in Congress to keep the people of the district he represents informed about his activities and about the work of Congress. While Congress is in session, I send a letter from Washington to the newspapers of the district which is printed in most of them. During this Congress I have also made frequent radio and television reports. This year, as I have done before at the conclusion of a term of Congress, I have prepared a summary or report on this, the 84th Congress, and have included in it a summary of my own activities. In addition to presenting this report to the House now, I shall have reprints of it made which will be circulated as widely as possible in the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, which I represent.

A DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

During the 2 years of this Congress the authority and responsibility for the operation of the Federal Government is divided. The executive branch of the Government which must administer the laws passed by Congress and operate the numerous executive agencies is headed by a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, with a Republican Cabinet. The Congress is controlled by the Democratic Party. Although the margin of control is only 1 vote in the Senate and 29 votes in the House, these majorities mean that all committees are not only headed by Democrats, but the committees are dominated by Democratic majorities. For example, the Rules Committee, of which I am a member, has 8 Democratic members and 4 Republicans. Although this is the largest majority control of any committee, the others have majorities sufficient to insure majority control.

As a practical matter then, with Congress controlled by one party and the administration by the other party, the element of politics inevitably becomes a part of most of the important actions of the Congress.

At the beginning of each Congress the President presents it with a statement of his ideas as to what legislation should be enacted. These suggestions are known as the President's program. When the President's party controls Congress, as it did in the first 2 years of this administration, the Republican Congress could and did go ahead and enact into law most of the President's program.

This Congress apparently could not, as a matter of practical politics, give such wholehearted support to an opposition administration. The record shows that it did not do so.

PARTS OF PROGRAM PASSED

On the other hand, in spite of the sharp party and political battles over legislation to carry out the President's program, the record of this Congress is fairly good. As I look over the record of the accomplishments of this 84th Congress, it is pleasing to note that many of the important items in the President's program were enacted into law. It is true that practically none of the recommendations of the President were followed exactly. In many instances the legislation which was passed, although dealing with the same subject, represents quite a different approach to the problem from that suggested by President Eisenhower.

For example, the President suggested a big, long-range highway improvement and construction program. The big program was approved by Congress, but in a completely different form which involves heavier taxes which will pay for the construction program as it is completed. The political battle over the highway bill, which failed of passage in the first session, caused a delay of more than a year in the beginning of the program.

The President suggested a farm program designed to reduce the enormous surplus of farm products which the Government owns and to withhold from production land which had been forced to produce food for war. It was necessary for the President to veto the first bill passed by this Congress. The final version which he accepted did not fully represent the program he recommended. The political struggle over the farm bill caused delay which was costly to the farmers.

Most of the President's program having to do with foreign policy was given bipartisan approval except the request for foreign aid.

The President recommended $4.9 billion, which was reduced by a billion in both the authorization and the appropriation bills.

A few of the President's recommendations were passed without material change. The Housing Act revision was quite similar to the President's request. The upper Colorado River reclamation project was authorized. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended. The minimum-wage law was amended to increase the hourly rate. Disaster assistance legislation which he recommended was enacted, including a flood-damage insurance program. The 10-year improvement and expansion program for the national parks, known now as Mission 66, was immediately approved, both with additional legislation and with appropriations.

Several recommendations made by President Eisenhower were not approved. He urged Federal assistance to help local school districts construct classrooms, to be in the form of credit support and grants-in-aid on a limited basis in distressed areas. After struggling with this recommendation for most of both sessions, a bill, which did not represent the President's recommendation but provided a large program of outright grants to all States irrespective of need, was rejected by the House.

Although the much discussed aid-to-education bill failed to pass, this Congress voted to continue two school assistance programs which have been very helpful in our congressional district. One provides money assistance for operation and maintenance to those districts where the school population has been swollen because of some Federal activity such as a large construction project, a military camp or logging in the national forest. The other program provides construction money for such districts. The Congress authorized a total of $368 million for the two programs during the present and next fiscal years.

His proposed health-insurance plan, which would make available to more people a prepayment plan for medical care, was not even taken up for consideration in this Congress.

OTHER LEGISLATION REJECTED

The administration recommended that Congress increase postage rates as a means of decreasing the huge deficit from operating the Post Office Department. The annual loss is about $500 million. The House passed a bill which, among other rate increases, would have boosted the charge for mailing a first-class letter from 3 cents to 4 cents. Although the Senate committee held hearings and had the bill prepared for action, it was not taken up by the Senate before adjournment. There will be no postage increase this year.

A large irrigation and reclamation project in Colorado known as the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, which had the approval of the administration, was killed by the House in a close rollcall vote.

The much discussed Hells Canyon high-dam proposal was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 51 to 41. It was not taken up for consideration by the House. A careful reading of the extensive Senate debate on the Hells Canyon bill reveals that many of the facts claimed as compelling virtues for the high-dam project were not facts at all. The waterpower resource of that stretch of the Snake River is being developed under a license issued to a power company by the Federal Power Commission. Most hydropower in the United States has been developed on that same basis. Such development has never before been referred to as a "giveaway" which is the political cry against the Hells Canyon decision.

In the closing days of Congress an attempt was made to pressure through the House a bill directing the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed at once on a program involving the expenditure of $400 million to build large atomic reactor plants for the purpose of producing electricity on a full-scale commercial basis. This scheme was opposed by the administration, by our military people, by the Atomic Energy Commission, and by several atomic scientists. It was urged only by one outstanding scientist and the Joint House-Senate Committee on Atomic Energy. On a rollcall vote the

House sent the bill back to committee—in other words, killed it.

MY LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

Much of my own legislative activity was in the general field of conservation. The destruction of the fish runs in the Rogue River because of the lack of proper screens for the turbines and ditch outlets at Savage Rapids Dam has been a serious and costly problem for several years. The project was too big to be undertaken under State law and since the dam is not strictly a Federal dam has not been eligible for the appropriation of Federal funds. To solve this problem I worked out proper authorization language and an appropriation item of $208,000 and was able to get both the authorization and the appropriation made in the 1957 public-works appropriations bill when it passed the House. Construction of the fish screens will begin soon.

For several years, since the value of standing timber on Government-owned land has increased so sharply, I have been endeavoring to secure the passage of legislation which would separate surface and subsurface rights on mining claims. In other words, the timber on a mining claim should remain the property of the Government when a mining claim is filed. My first success in this endeavor was with a bill of mine approved in 1948, when Congress enacted such a law protecting the timber on Oregon and California lands in Oregon. In succeeding Congresses I worked in cooperation with other Members of the House in an effort to enact similar legislation for the protection of national forests and other public-domain lands. Until last year, when conflicting interests were brought together and an acceptable bill was passed, our efforts were plagued by conflicting committee jurisdictions and by a very sharp conflict between the mining industry and conservationists. The 1955 act is the first important change in the Federal mining claim laws to be made since 1872. It is one of the most important pieces of conservation legislation passed by Congress in many years.

Other conservation legislation included increased appropriations for forest recreation areas; authorizing legislation and appropriations for the Nation Park Service Mission 66 program; the creation of the position of Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries and Wildlife; and a bill to authorize a research program on forest range and watershed management. Another piece of conservation legislation which I was glad to support was the bill which became Public Law 660, to increase Federal research grants to States and an expanded program for water-pollution control.

Legislation which I sponsored and which was passed by the House included the transfer of surplus land at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Roseburg to the city of Roseburg for use as a park. A bill for a comprehensive survey of the Rogue River Basin which I introduced in the House was incorporated in the omnibus flood-control bill but with slightly different language from that contained in my bill. A bill to convey a historical old house and its contents in Roseburg to the city of Roseburg for the Douglas County Historical Society was passed by the Congress.

PUBLIC-WORKS PROJECTS

We have numerous flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects in our Fourth Congressional District which must be constructed with Federal funds. During this Congress, as in previous years, I have worked diligently toward securing appropriations for these needed public works. Some of these projects are discussed in the following paragraphs:

Talent irrigation project: For 10 years or more the previous administrations worked on a survey of an irrigation plan for the Rogue River Basin. When the Eisenhower administration took over, the Department of the Interior Reclamation Bureau was directed by Secretary Douglas McKay to prepare and send to Congress a project report for the Talent division of the Rogue River reclamation survey. I immediately introduced a bill to authorize this $22 million project and in 1954 fought it through to final passage in the House, winning on a rollcall vote by the narrow margin of 19 votes. An appropriation for completion of the planning of the project was passed in 1955. The first big appropriation for construction of the project, $2,400,000, was budgeted by the President and approved by the Congress this year.

Coos Bay Harbor: Soon after the end of World War II, I sponsored the legislation necessary to deepen the inner harbor at Coos Bay and increase the depth over the bar to 40 feet. This legislation was passed promptly. Subsequently, the necessary appropriations were made by Congress and the project is now completed with the exception of the Charleston Small Boat Harbor, for the completion of which funds have been appropriated this year.

Harbor at Gold Beach: My bill to authorize the construction of a harbor at the mouth of Rogue River was passed by Congress in 1954. That project is needed badly as a water shipping outlet for the products of the Curry County area. It is now eligible for appropriations. I am making every possible effort to get planning and construction money for the Gold Beach Harbor included in the next budget.

Green Peter Dam: One of the three urgently needed dams for the Willamette Basin flood-control project, the Green Peter Dam on the South Santiam, is an alternate site for a main stem dam authorized in 1938. That authorization was for flood-control construction only. A better benefit-to-cost ratio could be obtained by redesigning the dam and including power, so in 1954 my bill to authorize the dam as a multiplepurpose project including power was passed. Planning of this dam under the new authorization is partially completed. In the public works appropriation bill this year $200,000 was included for that purpose.

Cougar Dam: The Cougar Dam on the McKenzie has substantially the same status as the Green Peter Dam. It, too, is an alternate dam for one authorized in 1938. Cougar Dam was also authorized for power in 1954 in legislation which I introduced and passed through the House. Planning for this dam has been completed. It is now under construction with $1,650,000 in the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957.

Partnership plan for Cougar and Green Peter: Three major units of the Willamette project are either under construction or in the advance planning stage—Cougar, Hills Creek, and Green Peter. The total estimated cost of these 3 projects is:

Cougar	$37,400,000
Hills Creek	32,300,000
Green Peter	58,365,000
Total	128,065,000

Since these dams are to be constructed almost simultaneously, it means that very large amounts must be appropriated annually for the next several years. In fact, the amounts necessary to complete construction of these projects at a maximum rate would be so large that they would tend to unbalance the annual public works appropriation bill in favor of the one river basin in Oregon, as compared with appropriations for projects in the other 47 States. It is evident, therefore, that if non-Federal money can be used on these projects along with appropriated funds, we stand a far better chance of having the projects completed at the earliest possible moment than if we are compelled to depend entirely upon annual appropriations made by Congress. For this reason, as well as because of the soundness of the partnership plan, I introduced in 1954 bills which would authorize the Federal Government to contract with local utilities in the Cougar and Green Peter areas for the construction of power facilities and the necessary reregulating dams for the Cougar and Green Peter projects.

In 1954 the partnership bill for Cougar passed the House without a dissenting voice, but was blocked in the Senate. The Green Peter partnership bill, which came up late in that year, did not reach House action in 1954. In 1955 I again introduced the partnership legislation, this time incorporating both Green Peter and Cougar Dams in one bill. The Flood Control Subcommittee of the House Commitete on Public Works favorably reported my partnership bill to the full committee. It was stopped there by political pressure.

The opposition is endeavoring to make of this partnership proposal a public power versus private power issue. They evidently think they can brainwash the people with the emotional appeal of the magic phrase "low-cost Federal power" in order to make votes in this election. The truth is that there is no public versus private power aspect to the Green Peter-Cougar partnership proposal. Regardless of how the dams are built, people will purchase their power from the same utility that they do now and at the same rates. All power produced in the Pacific Northwest goes through the Northwest

power pool so that there can be no question of harming or disturbing the overall Northwest power program by the adoption of the partnership plan. Facts in both House and Senate committee hearings show that the publicly owned power system at Eugene, through partnership, would get power cheaper than it can be purchased from Bonneville.

Chetco Small-Boat Harbor: Several years ago I succeeded in getting a bill passed to authorize the construction of a small-boat harbor at the mouth of the Chetco River at Brookings. This year $225,000 was appropriated for its construction.

Amazon project in Eugene: The growth of the city of Eugene has made necessary the control of Amazon Creek which runs through the city in order to prevent great annual damage from the flooding of this stream. I have been working on this project for several years. A substantial part of it is now completed. A new unit of it is under construction for which $100,000 was included in the public works appropriation bill this year.

Willamette Valley flood control project: The gigantic flood control project for the Willamette Basin which was first authorized in 1938 was somewhat delayed by World War II. Since I have been a Member of Congress, Dorena, Detroit, Fern Ridge, and Lookout Point dams have been constructed. As stated above, Hills Creek and Cougar are now under construction and Green Peter is in the planning stage. A total of $180 million has been appropriated for this project since I have been in Congress. I have worked each year for appropriations to keep the rate of construction on these projects at a high level.

Coos flood-control survey: My bill, H. R. 8074, in the 83d Congress, was passed, providing for a water use and flood control survey in the Coos County area. Protective works are needed but their nature and extent can only be determined by a proper survey. This year I have worked toward increasing the appropriation for such surveys.

APPROPRIATIONS THIS SESSION

This year the final appropriation figures for projects in our Fourth Congressional District are as follows:

Amazon Creek (Eugene)	$100,000
Chetco River Harbor	225,000
Coos Bay	300,000
Couger flood-control dam	1,650,000
Green Peter flood-control dam	200,000
Hills Creek flood-control dam	2,125,000
Holley Dam	100,000
Savage Rapids Dam fish screens	203,000
Talent irrigation project	2,400,000
Willamette River bank protection	300,000

In addition to the above appropriations for specific projects by name, the bill carries funds for flood-control surveys, rehabilitation money for two of the older irrigation districts in the Talent project, harbor maintenance money, and funds for small projects to be allocated by the Army engineers.

POWER DISTRIBUTION

Allocated for expenditure in the Fourth District for the current fiscal year by the Bonneville Administration for additions and improvement of transmission facilities is $4,158,000. This is the largest share of the Bonneville funds for any of Oregon's congressional districts. As I have consistently done in the past, I appeared before the House Appropriations Committee requesting these funds and others to improve power availability in Oregon.

To further distribution of power through rural electric cooperatives and for telephone cooperatives, the past Congress authorized appropriations for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 in the amount of $665,735,000. This makes a total of more than $2 billion in loan funds for REA that I have voted for since coming to Congress.

Allocations of funds to electric and telephone cooperatives serving the Fourth District from January 1955 to July 1956 were as follows:

Douglas Electric Cooperative (2 loans)	$150,000
Douglas Electric Cooperative	184,000
Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative	2,000,000
Lane County Electric Cooperative	339,000
Benton-Lincoln Cooperative	1,830,000
Pioneer Rural Telephone Cooperative	90,000
Pioneer Rural Telephone Cooperative (2 loans)	432,000
Total	5,025,000

THE POWER ISSUE

Briefly stated, my policy, which is also administration and Republican policy, regarding Northwest power development is that far more generating capacity is needed in the Northwest than can or will be built entirely at Federal expense. Approximately $100 million annually, or 20 to 30 percent of the entire Federal appropriations for multiple-purpose power development has been approved by Congress for the Pacific Northwest States. At least three times this amount must be spent annually to provide additional power. We favor the construction of power generators with capital from all sources—Federal-State, local REA's public-utility districts or individuals. Unless the economic development of the Northwest is to come to a halt, we must have more electrical energy at the rate of 500,000 kilowatts of new generating capacity each year.

I, and Republicans generally, have supported appropriations for the Bonneville system, for the Big Columbia River Dams, for the Hills Creek, Lookout Point, Detroit, and other Federal project dams which include power. The partnership proposal for Green Peter and Cougar is merely designed to provide $40 million in supplemental local funds available to speed completion of these projects and relieve the people of the average annual $2 million in flood losses.

ACCESS ROADS

An expanded program of timber access road construction is sorely needed for the proper management of the national forests in our district. I have been battling on this subject every year. The first favorable break came in the passage of the Highway Construction Act of 1954 by the 83d Congress. That law not only increased the authorization for access roads—Forest Service roads and trails—to $22,500,000 but permitted funds to be obligated over a 3-year period, thus permitting fairly long-range planning.

When the Public Works Committee had the highway bill under consideration last year and again this year, I urged that the authorization be increased to $25 million with that sum earmarked for construction, plus another $10 million for annual maintenance. The previous authorizations have not separated construction and maintenance. The House committee did not go all the way, but it did increase the total figure to $27 million. It passed the House in that form.

The Senate committee struck out the House increase and sent the bill to the Senate floor with the 1954 figure unchanged. Fortunately, Republican Senator BARRETT, of Wyoming, supported by other Senate Republicans, was able to secure the passage by the Senate of an amendment which restored the House access road figure and added to the amount for forest highways. The Barrett amendment increases were approved in conference and the higher figures are in the law.

MINING DEVELOPMENT

With the establishment of the Bureau of Mines Electrometallurgical Laboratory which former Senator McNary and I were able to have located at Albany, there has been an expanded interest in the development of mining and smelting in our district. The Albany laboratory developed the first commercially successful method of production of zirconium metal, essential in atomic industry. Private production of zirconium for the Government continues to provide employment for people in Albany. Two new industries now employing hundreds of men are in operation: The Hanna Co., at Riddle, mining and smelting nickel from the low-grade ore of Nickel Mountain; and the Apex Manufacturing Co., at Springfield, which is reducing aluminum from native clay.

Had it not been for congressional interference almost to the point of persecution under the guise of a committee investigation, I believe the old Buzzard Mine, in Jackson County, now known as the Al Sarena Mine, might be in production on up to a 10,000-ton-a-day basis and providing considerable employment.

For more than 50 years the area in which the Al Sarena property is located has been known as a mineralized area yielding gold, silver, lead, and zinc. Reliable estimates place the ore body of the Al Sarena Mine at 150 million tons or more. Some $200,000 has been spent on development of the property in tunnels, buildings, and mining equipment. A 100-ton mill was installed to make experimental runs to determine the ore values. I am informed that the owners had intended, when the patents were granted and financing could be arranged, to spend several hundred thousand dollars in core drillings and "blocking out" the ore body, whereupon, according to usual mining procedure, the financing of some $5 million for the ma-

jor development could be done. The mineowners were made the victims of a vicious political attack, aimed at the administration, which slandered and maligned them. They were compelled to temporarily abandon their plans for commercial development, thus delaying into the future a needed payroll industry for Oregon. The congressional investigation served only to prove the falsity and fiction of so-called "charges" and their political origins.

It is possible that the attack on the Al Sarena people may have created a climate in Oregon which might make other potential development in doubt.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The House of Representatives passed a number of bills to provide adjustment in payments to veterans to make such payments more in line with the present value of the dollar. These bills would have increased payments for non-service-connected veterans who are unable to support themselves and would have likewise increased payments for veterans who suffered service-connected disabilities. Spanish-American War veterans' widows' pensions were also increased in legislation passed by the House.

The Senate failed to act on any of these veterans' bills before the adjournment of Congress, thus none of them became law.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As finally passed by both Houses and sent to the President, amendments to the Social Security Act added compulsory coverage for osteopaths but left doctors and Government employees as the only major groups not covered under the social-security law. The new law would also permit women to draw reduced benefits at the age of 62. Widows at that age would receive full benefits. Provision is also made for payments for total disability at age 50 and after.

The payroll tax levied on the first $4,200 of annual income, now 2 percent for employer and employee, will be increased January 1 to 2¼ percent. The tax on self-employed will be increased from 3 percent to 3⅜ percent.

OTHER LEGISLATION

In all, a total of 16,782 bills were introduced in this 84th Congress. Of this number about 1,900 were passed by both Houses and sent to the President. In this report it is not possible to discuss dozens of other items of beneficial legislation, but I shall be glad to answer inquiries concerning any of these bills.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During this session of Congress the roll has been called 132 times in the House of Representatives. Fifty-nine of these rollcalls were simple quorum calls and 73 were record votes on legislation. My attendance record is one of the best of any Member of the House. I missed only one vote and it was on a bill having to do with the Distric. of Columbia. I missed only 3 of the 59 quorum calls.

I had first thought to include the details of my voting record in this report, but space will not permit. However, I shall be glad to furnish such information to anyone who desires it.

TO NATO CONFERENCE

Your Congressman received a nice honor which was announced just a few hours before Congress adjourned. Speaker SAM RAYBURN named me as one of 9 House members who, with 9 Senators, will represent the United States Congress in the parliamentary conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization member nations. The conference will be held in Paris beginning November 19. Our delegation is being sent to this conference pursuant to a joint resolution passed by Congress a few weeks ago. The future course of NATO is a matter of very serious consideration in all of the member governments. The Paris conference promises to be one of considerable importance.

YEAR-ROUND SERVICE

The Washington office of your Congressman is kept open year round whether Congress is in session or not. Our office is a busy place. Mail will average about 50 letters a day. Many people from Oregon visit my office every year. We are always glad to see them because they bring news from home. I have been called upon many times for assistance by our State, county, and local officials and by veterans and others in connection with their problems with the Federal Government.

I am always glad to be of help in any way that I can. I welcome letters commenting upon legislation and expressing opinions. I hope the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon feel free to call upon me at any time if they think I can be of help to them. While I shall have an office at 217 Pacific Building in Roseburg during adjournment, letters will always reach me if addressed: Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

F. Ertel Carlyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, when the gavel falls to indicate sine die adjournment of the 84th Congress, it will bring to a close the distinguished congressional career of my friend, ERTEL CARLYLE. ERTEL will take back with him to Lumberton, N. C., all of satisfactions that flow from outstanding public service.

It has been a great privilege to have had the opportunity to serve here with ERTEL CARLYLE during the last 4 years. I have been greatly impressed by his conscientious devotion to duty and by the able manner in which he has discharged the responsibilities of his high office. He has earned the confidence, respect, and esteem of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

ERTEL served with distinction on one of the most important committees of the House, the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and much important legislation came out of that committee. Due to the tremendous growth of Government in the last quarter century, Members of Congress cannot possibly keep abreast of all of the activities of the various committees and we must of necessity rely upon those who serve on committees other than our own. Frequently I have gone to ERTEL for advice on matters pending before his committee and on legislation cleared by his committee for House action. He always responded freely and generously and I could count on any advice from him being sound and sincere.

In the retirement of ERTEL CARLYLE, the country is losing the service of a dedicated public servant, a man of outstanding ability, and one who has demonstrated by his service in the House a profound devotion to country, State, and district. As he ends his distinguished career in this body, he will take with him the affectionate regard of all of his colleagues and our best wishes for a long life filled with health and a full measure of joy and happiness.

Confusion and Contradiction in Joint Economic Committee Report on Domestic Watch Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include a most timely editorial, entitled "How's That Again?" which appeared in the July 25, 1956 issue of the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune.

The editorial speaks for itself and follows:

HOW'S THAT AGAIN?

Of all the gibberish emerging from Washington in recent years, that which flowed from the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee studying watch industry problems made the least sense.

It dealt a body blow to the domestic watch manufacturers by declaring protection through trade restrictions for national defense purposes is not warranted.

This is directly contradictory to the long-held opinion of the Department of Defense, which ought to know. It is also contrary to judgment of the National Resources Planning Board. It represents only a subcommittee action, but has been given both branches of the Congress as a full committee report, and therefore can't be taken lightly.

The portion of the study findings which had us rereading the passage again and again, perhaps to discover a typographical miscue, declared importation can stimulate the ingenuity and efficiency of the watch industry.

Such a statement is fantastic. Imports have cut the very heart out of the domestic industry, to the extent that employment is down to fewer than 5,000. Competition is so unequal, United States firms, one after an-

other, have been forced to use movements manufactured by cheaper Swiss labor.

But consider this, and try to figure out what the report was trying to get across. We confess utter inability to grasp it. He goes:

"Watches are not likely to be produced in this country in any war in which Switzerland is cut off from us. Under such circumstances it is likely then that factories in both countries would be destroyed; or, if they were not, certainly our plants would have higher priority assignments to fulfill than the production of watches."

Take that again, slowly, and see if you can come up with anything which makes sense.

It seems to us there ought to be an investigation, not of the watch industry, but of the subcommittee which brought forth such absurd conclusions. Haven't the members ever heard of the essentiality of timing devices to the national security?

Hon. Brady Gentry

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay just and due tribute to a member of the Texas delagation who is retiring this year. He is our good friend and able colleague, the Honorable BRADY GENTRY, of Tyler, Tex. BRADY has spent many years in public service and enjoys the deepest and most profound respect of all with whom he has dealt during his fine service. It was his honor and privilege to serve as county judge of Smith County, Tex., for a number of years. During this tenure of office he so deeply impressed the people with his sincerity of purpose, his fine character, his unswerving honesty, and his keen ability that he was subsequently named as a member of the Highway Commission of the State of Texas. At the time BRADY was serving in this capacity, many decisions of great import had to be made. Decisions that could have shaken the very foundations of the State government had the wrong course been pursued. Decisions that affected the lives and interests of people throughout the entire Southwest. But let it be said that BRADY GENTRY, without fear or favor, walked a straight line down the middle of the road, yielding neither to influence on the one side nor emotions on the other. It was during a time that tried the souls of men, but the fine character of BRADY GENTRY stood out like a beacon in the night, and by reason thereof, Texans and their children in the years to come were the benefactors. BRADY continued this course of conduct when he was honored by election to the House of Representatives of the United States. And the record that is now written of his activities in the Congress is full evidence of his independent thinking and his desire to preserve and perpetuate the fundamental principles upon which this great country was founded and upon which it must survive.

BRADY chose voluntarily to retire from further Government service. We all hope that his departure from these ranks will not take him away so that his fine counsel and advice will be lost to those of us who valued it so highly.

There are so many compliments that could be paid BRADY that time and space will not permit, so let me say in conclusion that I hope he and his many friends will understand how I feel when I say that, if there was ever a man whose life and work do justice to the term, "a gentleman and a scholar," it is BRADY GENTRY, of Texas.

Leadership on the Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Leadership on the Airways," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 23, 1956. This editorial discusses the efforts of former Civil Aeronautics Administrator Frederick B. Lee to improve air safety and compares his efforts to the record of the Secretary of Commerce and the present CAA Administrator.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

LEADERSHIP ON THE AIRWAYS

As time goes on the march of events is making more and more inexplicable the ouster of Frederick B. Lee last December as Civil Aeronautics Administrator. Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks and his assistant, Louis S. Rothschild, explained the decision "was reluctantly reached that someone better suited in leadership talent and teamwork was required."

These words fairly mock them now. They mock them because the evidence now indicates that as administrator Mr. Lee showed great concern for safety on the Nation's dangerous airways while Secretary Weeks and Mr. Rothschild apparently were thinking more of penny-pinching. Among the reasons that Mr. Lee has cited for his firing were his development and pushing of a 5-year plan for making the airways safe and his persistent efforts to obtain appropriations considerably higher than his superiors would approve.

What happened after his dismissal for a leadership that Secretary Weeks and Mr. Rothschild deemed so unsuitable? The Air Line Pilots Association continued to assert the airways were dangerous and predicted a calamitous collision between giant airliners might occur at any time. Senator MONRONEY of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate Aviation subcommittee, charged that the budget slashes inflicted on the CAA were directly responsible for the dangers so apparent on the airways. Then came the airliner collision over the Grand Canyon—128 persons dead.

Now how do things stand? The Department of Commerce and its new CAA head, Charles J. Lowen, are talking of taking only 3 years to accomplish a $250 million airways safety program that had been slated for 5 years. And, most striking development of all, President Eisenhower asked Congress last week for a $68 million supplemental appropriation for the airways program to be added to the $40 million granted for the current year.

What about Mr. Lee's leadership abilities now, Secretary Weeks and Mr. Rothschild?

Address of Hon. William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address to the graduating class of the Page School on June 11, 1951, in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building:

Mr. President, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it an honor to have been invited by the members of this class to make the address on this occasion. It is a genuine pleasure to participate in these exercises on this memorable night in the lives of these young men.

Members of the graduating class, this is a serious hour in the history of America, and a critical period in your own lives. I would suggest to you, and to the youth throughout the land, that you set a goal in life—a goal toward which you must constantly strive. The earlier we set for ourselves a goal of accomplishment, the more likely will be our chances of success.

I remember hearing a story about a young boy who was employed as a carpenter in the new building which was to be the meeting place of the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. This young lad was observed by his foreman to put forth special interest in the chair in which was to sit the chief justice of the supreme court. The foreman asked this young boy, still in his teens, why he spent so much time on this particular chair. The lad replied, "Someday I will sit in this chair as the chief justice of this State." Years later this young man did become the chief justice of the supreme court in the great State of Oklahoma. He set for himself, early in life, a high goal and worked toward that end. It is no small wonder that his ambition was crowned with ultimate success.

I hope the youth of America today, seeing the shortcomings of this generation, will set for themselves the goal of rectifying the chaos we find in the world today. I hope you young men, in facing the menace of foreign ideologies, and "isms" which would enslave the world, will be bold and aggressive, and that you will have no fear. The foreign policy of our great country tonight seems to be predicated on what Russia might or might not do. Fear hysteria is sweeping the country. Fear cannot solve the problems of this great Nation.

The Bible says the things which we greatly fear will come upon us. As you face the future, with its stupendous task of arriving at lasting peace, I know you will face those tasks with the same type of fortitude that our forefathers had when they founded the early American Republic. They were afraid of nothing, except to do wrong.

The motto of the late Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, is found on the monument at his resting place in Crawfordville, Ga. This motto reads: "I am afraid of nothing on the earth, under the earth, or above the earth, except to do wrong. In the path of duty I shall ever endeavor to walk, fearing no evil and dreading no consequences." And what a wonderful motto that would be for the youth of America today.

France and England, in the years preceding World War II, contributed to the outbreak of that war by being afraid to stand on principle and back up the little nations who desired freedom. They were, by their policy of fear and appeasement, just as guilty of starting the war as were the aggressor nations. A bold, determined stand by these two nations for righteousness and the sanctities of treaties in 1938 could have prevented World War II. Whenever any nation surrenders principle for a temporary respite or fleeting expedience that nation later will pay a terrible price in blood.

America has reached the coveted position it occupies in the world today because of its belief in God and in freedom of opportunity. Our forefathers were builders. They gave us, on a silver platter, this land as we know it today. We have the highest standard of living any people in world history have ever enjoyed. Our educational systems are comparable to those of any other nation. The masses in America have a far greater opportunity for an education than those of any other nation.

When I was in the Far East in April, I was told that 83 percent of the Chinese people are illiterate that eighty-plus percent of the people of India are illiterate—they cannot read or write. Our literacy rate, in America, is higher than the illiteracy rate of these two countries.

I enjoy living in America. I am proud of my American citizenship. We should be grateful to God and the Founding Fathers of our Republic for the great America we see every day. No civilization has ever excelled ours in religious tolerance or freedom from class hatred. Minority races of people have advanced further here than in any other country. Strong moral and spiritual beliefs have always placed our Nation on the side of right and principle as opposed to tyranny and oppression. Our democratic form of government has created an American citizen who is tolerant, self-reliant, intelligent, and conscious of his rights and the rights of others.

The American system of free enterprise has given to the American people more automobiles, television sets, more telephones, more washing machines, more of the luxuries of life than all the rest of the peoples on this globe combined. Think of it—150,000,000 people have more of these modern conveniences than all the other 2,000,000,000 people in the world. This is a tribute to our democratic way of life, to our free-enterprise system, and to the individualism of the American people. We cannot maintain this great era of accomplishments by tearing down or by socializing the system which has made this era possible. The youth of our Nation must work, in the years ahead, to guarantee the preservation of our system of government with its equal opportunities.

Booker T. Washington was born a slave in Virginia. Never knowing who his father was, he went from that humble beginning to establish Tuskogee Institute, one of America's greatest colleges today. I visited this college, in the "black belt" of Alabama, not long ago. It is a monument to the character and perserverance of Booker T. Washington. He could have accomplished this only in the United States.

Abraham Lincoln was born in a one-room log cabin in the backwoods of Kentucky. With little formal education, he gradually ascended the ladder of fame. He was defeated for Congress and for the United States Senate. He did not become disillusioned and embittered. Instead he continued onward and became the President of the United States.

Alfred E. Smith was born in the East Side of New York City. He worked in the fish markets and, as he grew up, saw little of the world except the slum sections of that great city. But Al Smith was four times elected Governor of New York State and was the Democratic standard bearer for the Presidency in 1928.

Immorality in government and among the American people is today posing as a great threat to true democracy. This threat is paralleled by complacency and indifference on the part of the American people. If we are to preserve democracy, we must use democracy. If freedom is to grow, we must use that freedom.

In 1948, 93,000,000 Americans were eligible to vote in the Presidential election. Only approximately 47,000,000 voted. Forty-six million did not vote at all. They did not evidence enough interest to exercise the sacred privilege of casting their ballot for whomever they pleased.

How many people today exercise the privilege of publicly stating their views on the state of the Nation? One-half of the American people are members of no church of any denomination whatsoever. Yet, America was founded and has prospered on Christian principles and a belief in God.

I do pay special tribute tonight to the press and radio for exercising the sacred privilege to write and discuss the things which they believe.

If any man, woman, or child in this audience tonight were to go home, get in bed, and lie flat on your back for a year without exercising the limbs, you would lose the use of arms and legs. We maintain the physical limbs of our body by constant use and exercise. So it is with the "four freedoms" and our democratic way of life. If we do not use them, we will surely lose these sacred privileges.

You members of this graduating class, as you face the many problems of today, are probably thinking of the obstacles of seniority. You are probably thinking that you will have to wait many years before you can serve your community, your State, or your Nation. You are probably thinking that youth and lack of experience will be a stumbling block.

Remember the words of Benjamin Franklin: "Fools learn by experience; wise men through the experience of others." In the 4th chapter of First Timothy, the 12th verse, we find these words: "Let no man despise thy youth." These words are taken from Paul's letter advising the young minister, Timothy, as he went out into the world of men. Youth is your greatest asset. You have all the history of the past centuries to draw from. If in this modern age, with its libraries and great teachers, we have to learn in the bitter school of experience, then we are indeed very foolish. If we must put our hand in the fire to learn, by experience, that we will be burned, then we are what Benjamin Franklin said of those who learn by experience—very foolish indeed. We can turn back through the pages of history, or we can look at our contemporaries in the various fields of endeavor and find that youth has played an important role.

I am thinking tonight of scientific advancements. The men who made the atomic bomb were but little older than you who sit in this graduating class tonight. The average age of the members of the American Association of Atomic Scientists is 29 years.

Let us turn to the field of literature. William Cullen Bryant began writing poetry at an early age and wrote until he was past 80. Yet the greatest poem he ever wrote was Thanatopsis, written at the early age of 17. Byron, Keats, and Shelley, of England, were all young men when they wrote their masterpieces.

In the realm of government and politics, William Pitt was Prime Minister of Great Britain at the age of 24. He is acclaimed by most historians as the greatest Prime Minister Britain ever had, greater even than Winston Churchill. William Pitt saved England in the great Napoleonic era of world conflagration.

In America, Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence when he was 33 years of age. Alexander Hamilton, the father of the American currency and one of the founders of the American Constitution, was adjutant to Gen. George Washington at the age of 20 and helped to plan the campaigns which made this country independent. Madison and Monroe were both young men when they fought for the American Constitution. John C. Calhoun, who once represented the district it is now my honor to represent in Congress, was elected to the House of Representatives at the age of 28 and in a few months was one of the outstanding leaders of the country. Henry Clay was United States Senator at the age of 29. A few years later on the same day he took his oath of office as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was elected Speaker of the House, at the age of 34.

In the field of music, Mozart was playing publicly at the age of 6 and composed his first symphony at the age of 9.

In military science and tactics, the greatest generals the world has ever produced were young men, little older than you. Alexander the Great conquered the world before he was 33 years old. Napoleon Bonaparte was a lieutenant general at the age of 27, and dominated Europe at the age of 31. Hannibal was commander of the Carthaginian Army in Spain when he was 25. Gustavus Adolphus was commander of the Norwegian Army at the age of 19. These four men are credited by most historians as being the greatest military generals of all times. They were at their best when they combined their great intellect with the vigor and imagination of youth.

The members of this graduating class are all young men—but we must not forget the ladies. Joan of Arc was a French leader while in her teens. Florence Nightingale also made great accomplishments early in life.

Jesus Christ hung on Calvary's cross at the age of 33, after He had started a movement which is still growing today and has hundreds of millions in its ranks. And today a young evangelist in America—Billy Graham at the age of 32—has won hundreds of thousands of Americans to the cause of Christianity.

We are never too old nor too young to serve our country. Let no man ridicule you for your youth.

I hope you will pardon this personal reference. I received no encouragement when I ran for the legislature of my State of South Carolina at the age of 22, but the people of my county elected me. Two years later, at the age of 24, I received no encouragement when I ran for the State senate, but I was elected over two opponents. I was advised by many not to run for Congress in 1946 because I was what they termed too young, but still the people elected me to the House of Representatives.

Let us not be discouraged by the cynics and those who would have us wait while America may be passing through its hour of greatest danger. Our country needs us today. Tomorrow may be too late. The past generation has failed to give us, the youth of today, the peace that they promised, the security that was to be ours. Let us not make the same mistake and pass on to the next generation a world of chaos, of war, of fear, and of apprehension. We must act now, before it is too late, to save our country in this hour of crisis.

A story is told of Napoleon Bonaparte when he was being defeated by the Austrians at the Battle of Austerlitz. He had done his best and defeat was staring him in the face. As his veterans fell back in disorder, he rode up to a little 14-year-old drummer boy, and the great general said, "Son, beat a retreat." The little boy looked up at his great commander and said, "Sir, I don't know how. You never taught me how to beat a retreat. But, sir, I can beat a charge on this drum that will wake the dead on this battlefield." Napoleon thought for a moment and then said, "Beat it, then." The old guard, seeing the courage of this little boy and hearing his stirring notes on the drum, rallied and won for Bonaparte the greatest victory in French history.

The great minds of America may fail to solve the present-day problems. Just remember the great General Bonaparte and all of his commanders had given up that day in the Battle of Austerlitz, only to see defeat turned into a great victory by a 14-year-old lad. The youth of America today, like the little drummer boy, might save this country after our leaders have done their utmost.

I wish you great success in the years ahead. May you serve your community, your State, and your Nation as well as yourselves and your families. God bless you, each of you.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the promises made by the President and his administration were fine—they followed the entire Democratic program of Roosevelt and Truman—but that is as far as they went; they remained idle promises. As soon as the administration's purposes and aims were announced, the Republicans started to chip away, bit by bit, every promise that had been made or to evade it entirely, whenever they could get away with it. The comparatively few bills, in the best interests of the people, which finally became law never would have seen the light of day if it had been necessary to rely on Republican support.

For 3 years the administration lagged in making recommendations on many vital issues and definitely opposed numerous liberal measures and programs. However, in this election year the President and the Republicans have done an about-face and now pretend to favor many programs they opposed in the past. Furthermore, they try to take full credit for helpful measures passed by the Democratic 84th Congress, although the record shows that not one of the major accomplishments during this administration would have been possible without the Democratic majorities in the House and Senate. The Democratic Congress has, as always, been the protector of the people's welfare.

REPUBLICANS' BROKEN PLEDGES

The administration's boast of prosperity is an empty one. We find that areas of chronic unemployment exist in 24 States and Puerto Rico; in some areas more than 12 percent of the working population is jobless. The administration broke it's pledge to deal with the unemployment problem in depressed areas and has shown no real concern for our millions of unemployed. The wage earner cannot meet increased living costs which have reached an alltime high, but the President and the Republicans opposed the Democratic fight for a decent minimum wage. The Democrats fought for a minimum wage of $1.25 but the administration was insistent upon 90 cents, so a compromise had to be accepted setting the minimum at $1. The fate of small business is tragic under the Republicans, for the administration favors big business and has remained heedless to the needs and problems of small business. Small-business failures are up 36 percent and many thousands have closed their doors. So, we ask, prosperity for whom?

Tax relief was promised, but we find that the Republican "trickle-down" tax philosophy still holds full sway. In the 83d Congress, tax relief amounting to millions was given to corporations and the rich but when the Democratic Congress attempted to give a $20 tax cut to the ordinary taxpayer, the action was termed "irresponsible" by the administration.

Civil rights has always been one of my major concerns. There was never any doubt that a good civil-rights bill would pass the House. Although the President promised a civil-rights program at the beginning of his administration, it took his Attorney General 3½ years to make his recommendations. The administration knew that by stalling on the issue so that it would come before the House in the closing days of the session, the Senate would never act on it. Had the President asserted his leadership and kept his promise, the bill would have come before us long ago; there would have been ample time to overcome the threatened filibuster in the Senate and the Senate would have ultimately acted on the bill. The debate in the House indicated clearly that Republican strategy was to capitalize politically on the issue; in my opinion the Republicans had no sincere intention to allow the measure to become law.

Although Candidate Eisenhower said: "We need to rewrite the unfair provisions of the McCarran Immigration Act" they are still law; the administration took no action for 3 years and then proposed several futile amendments, worthless when we consider the cruelty and inequities of our present immigration laws. Attempts by me, as well as by many of my colleagues, to correct this sad situation have been in vain because of strong opposition by the administration.

The President, in 1952 and 1953, stated that he was in favor of amending the Taft-Hartley Act. This pledge was also broken, and the administration's record shows it to be against labor and the American worker.

The Federal school-construction bill was killed in a shameful debacle because of the Republicans' failure to support the President. It is to the best interests of our country that we have a literate and trained citizenry; it is important that our children have adequate and safe school facilities. It is a tragedy that the children of this Nation must now suffer danger and inadequate school facilities because of the refusal of some of our lawmakers to meet their true responsibilities when the bill came before us.

It is appalling that in a country of our great wealth, tremendous numbers of our people should be poorly housed, forced to live in slums, or homeless. Many campaign promises were made by the Republicans that the need for low-income public housing would be met. The Democrats passed the Housing Act of 1949 which has been wrecked through the years by the Republicans. This year the Senate passed a bill authorizing 135,000 units, while a bill approved by the House committee would have provided for 50,000, annually for 3 years, but this was termed "unrealistic, excessive, and ill-conceived" by an administration spokesman. Because of strong Republican opposition, the housing bill as finally passed provided for only 35,000 units annually for 2 years.

Social security was bitterly opposed by the Republicans in the beginning but they also give this Democratic program their approval now in order to save themselves politically. They point with pride to the social-security amendments passed this year, but it is well to remember that this beneficial legislation was not passed during the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration when Republicans were in control; the Democratic 84th Congress is entitled to full credit.

Space does not permit my covering all important legislation. The foregoing are only a few of the instances which show failure of the President and his administration to keep promises made to the people in an effort to win votes.

LEGISLATION

In my 1955 report to constituents, I discussed in detail the numerous bills I had introduced which would be beneficial to the people I represent and the Nation, so I shall not repeat that information now. I am continuing my efforts for civil rights, aid to consumers, aid to Israel, unification of Ireland, employment for older workers, as well as many other matters.

I feel that my neighbors in the 23d District of New York would like to know how I voted on major bills which came before us. I voted in favor of the Mutual Security Act; extension and liberalization of the Social Security Act; reduction of individual income tax and excise taxes; admission of 200,000 refugee immigrants; Housing Act, providing for additional public-housing units; Federal aid for highway construction; Federal aid for school construction; increased benefits benefits for veterans; broadening of unemployment compensation program; pay increases for postal workers and other Federal employees; increase in minimum wage; Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska; St. Lawrence seaway development; reciprocal trade agreement extension; civil-rights bill; civil-service retirement bill; railroad retirement bill.

I opposed and voted against: The Tidelands Oil giveaway bill; the Dixon-Yates

contract; the natural-gas bill; the shipment of arms to Arab States; the reduction of the Air Force budget; the curtailment in building veterans' hospitals; the increase in first-class mail rates; the disposal of Government-owned synthetic rubber plants.

In addition to my legislative duties, I have had the opportunity to try to help many thousands of my neighbors with their individual problems, and I am pleased that they feel free to call upon me for assistance.

BRONX CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE

I maintain a congressional office at 938 Simpson Street, Bronx, which is open daily. My constituents are invited to call there and to take up any problems they may have. I also invite them to write me so that I may have the benefit of their views and suggestions regarding legislation.

It is a pleasure and honor to represent the people of the 23d District of New York. They have my pledge that I shall continue to extend my best efforts in their behalf.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, to add my personal tribute to the Honorable DICK RICHARDS is an honor. It is also a joy carrying with it deep tones of sadness. This is a most peculiar combination of facts, but the facts are clear and true.

For the very name of JAMES PRIOLEAU RICHARDS is different. He, too, is different from the average man. As one of the Representatives of South Carolina in the Halls of Congress, he became one of the great public servants of that State and one of the great public servants of our United States. In his capacity as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, he became known not only to his colleagues and to those in all branches of Government, but also to the leaders in all the capitals of the world. His ability and integrity placed him in the highest esteem of all who were fortunate to meet him. His fairness is a characteristic extolled by all. It was a joy to serve as one of the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Every meeting was a pleasant experience—courtesy was shown to members and witnesses alike, humor came at just the right time and in the right instance. Tensions might mount, but DICK always cleared the air.

The deep tones of sorrow are present in my tribute because DICK is voluntarily returning to private life too young, too able, in these trying days when he is needed most in the affairs of our Nation. I cannot blame him for his decision. In private life he will be able to enjoy more time with his family—his lovely wife, their children and grandchildren. I wish them all many long and happy years together. I want to close with one of the baseball terms he loved, "I learned to hit that strike, reach for the curve, and let the foul ball go by."

Illinois Scandals Shock the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith editorial comment entitled "Illinois Scandals Shock the Press," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 27, 1956. Editorials included are from the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, the Chicago Daily Tribune, the Chicago Daily News, and the Louisville Times.

ILLINOIS SCANDALS SHOCK THE PRESS

THE MADISON (WIS.) CAPITAL TIMES

The million-dollar "Hodge-podge" which has shaken the foundations of the Illinois Republican organization should go a long way toward showing American voters that boll weevils have made considerable headway in the armor of Eisenhower's moral crusaders.

The Illinois scandals, blashed into the open by the Chicago Daily News, reached a peak with the issuance of warrants for the arrest of resigned GOP State Auditor Orville E. Hodge on charges of embezzling State money.

The impact of this tremendous scandal on the Illinois GOP is obvious. Hodge, one of the State's most popular Republican officeholders, was a nominee for reelection before the scandal broke and he had been frequently mentioned as the GOP heir apparent to the Illinois governorship in 1960. That's the year when Republican Gov. William G. Stratton, fair-haired boy of the Chicago Tribune, was scheduled to make his bid to succeed President Eisenhower in the White House. Stratton was called into service in 1952 as a GOP hatchetman in the effort to smear his predecessor, Adlai E. Stevenson, in the presidental campaign.

Stratton's demand that Hodge resign was a little too late to absolve him of administrative responsibility for public looting. He can't duck. As for Democrats who have been flayed unmercifully by GOP campaigners over the petty mink coat and deep-freeze scandals, we suggest they now figure out how many such coats and refrigerators can be purchased with a million dollars. This "Hodge-podge" could be a mighty good issue.

THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

While it is quite possible that the State in the end will not suffer financially, that all of Hodge's speculations will be recovered, the fact remains that the party put into office, and renominated, a man completely false to his public trust.

Banker Hintz, who cashed fraudulent checks for Hodge, said that he knew at the time that the actions were irregular, but assumed that the procedure was a regular one among politicians, to collect their cut on public contracts.

Hintz ruefully confesses that he was stupid. Nevertheless this blasé assumption, by a man who spent over 40 years in the banking business, that politicians may be expected to be grafters, is as shocking in its way as Hodge's offenses.

Only the most strenuous efforts by Illinois Republicans, directed toward cleaning up the mess and making its recurrence impossible, can avert defeat in November. Governor Stratton has been alert to his responsibilities, both as public official and as party leader. The moment it appeared that Hodge had betrayed his trust, the Governor devoted all his energy to bringing him to justice and to removing him from office and from the Republican ticket.

A generation ago Colonel McCormick, late publisher of the Tribune, defined a newspaper as "an institution developed by modern civilization to present the news of the day, to foster commerce and industry, to inform and lead public opinion, and to furnish that check upon government which no constitution has ever been able to provide."

Chicago newspapers, in the last month, have demonstrated the accuracy of that description.

THE CHICAGO DAILY NEWS

The fantastic operation of the State auditor's office under Orville E. Hodge defies comprehension. The moral obtuseness that made it possible, however, may be glimpsed in Hodge's conception of ethical conduct in relation to State banks under his supervision.

At the heart of this shocking scandal, of course, is the cashing of State checks with fraudulent endorsements at the Southmoor Bank & Trust Co. How and why this was done, and with whose connivance, is the primary target of the investigation.

Another bank affair, the facts concerning which are better established, shows the approach of Hodge to such matters. This concerns his acquisition of stock in the Bank of Elmwood Park during its reorganization after he had ordered it closed because of irregularities.

The spectacle of Orville Hodge, broken and weeping, promising to make restitution to the full extent of his ability, is tragic. Normally genial, easy-going and friendly, he has been a popular man. At the recent primary, in which most of the Republican candidates for State office at Springfield were unopposed, he got the biggest vote.

Thoroughness rather than speed ought to be the watchword of the investigation. Several jurisdictions are involved in the ramifications of the Hodge case. Unless they cooperate carefully and in good faith with each other, they can botch the job like a couple of outfielders, a shortstop, and a second baseman all fielding a pop fly at the same instant—and dropping the ball.

THE LOUISVILLE TIMES

In the presidential campaign 4 years ago, General Eisenhower delivered one of his major addresses in Illinois. In the course of his remarks, as usually in the course of his remarks in those days, he lashed out at what he called the mess in Washington.

We can imagine that William G. Stratton, Orville E. Hodge and Latham Castle (Republican nominees for governor, auditor and attorney general of Illinois) all three whooped lustily as Ike poured it on the "wretched record of this scandal-a-day (Truman) administration." We imagine that all three applauded the speaker's piety. But his words made no indelible impression on their minds—least of all on Hodge's mind.

Three years and nine months later, he has had to resign as auditor, under scathing fire and in deep disgrace, the center of scandals that rock the whole State of Illinois. Estimates of the amount of the boodle have been steadily increasing.

Governor Stratton and Mr. Castle lacked vigilance. The discoveries about the flagrant conduct of the auditor's office were made not by them but by the Chicago newspapers. The revelations by the press began as long as two months ago. It is only recently that Mr.

Stratton and Mr. Castle acted—after events started moving at faster than a scandal-a-day clip.

Political dispatches say that the shameful disclosures have gravely imperiled Republican prospects in Illinois this fall. Certainly if Mr. Eisenhower was right in what he said at Chicago in 1952 on the general subject of impurity in Government and how it should be punished, Republican prospects in Illinois this fall ought to be nil.

Federal School Construction Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 5, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the problem of providing vitally needed Federal aid to school construction in this country is second to none in its challenge to the legislative duty and individual conscience of the membership of this House.

The bill before us, the Kelley bill, H. R. 7535, should be enacted if we are to meet our duty and accept our conscientious obligation.

The overwhelming array of authoritative testimony of factual record leaves no question but what this Nation is faced with a dismaying shortage of classrooms. The situation has grown more critical each succeeding year since World War II. During the depression years few schools were built and during the war years even fewer, partially because of the shortage of materials. The nonexistence of classrooms coupled with the increasing birth rate has resulted in a catastrophic school situation in almost every community in the country.

The astonishing and astounding facts now are that 18 percent of our schools are fire hazards, a third are health and safety hazards, and thousands of school buildings are more than 50 years old. Coupled with these distressing figures is the cold fact that the school enrollment figure in 1955–56 was 1,675,000 over that of the previous year. By 1959 it is reliably reported that the total school enrollment will be more than 38½ million children.

This admitted classroom shortage problem goes beyond and is much deeper than the restriction of facilities and materials. Obviously the root of the problem and the real cause for national concern is that a shortage of classrooms and classroom facilities deprives the Nation's youth of adequate educational opportunities. Limited classroom space and old, unsafe, and unhealthy buildings are not conducive to learning nor are they by any means an inspiration to the faithful teacher. If we ignore this critical problem our greatest asset and investment for the future—the Nation's youth—are continuing to be improperly trained for the tremendous responsibilities of leadership which someday will be theirs.

Associated with this classroom shortage is perhaps even the more important problem of the shortage of teachers. The Nation's education authorities advise us that we are each year accumulating a deficit of 60,000 teachers while at the same time the yearly need is 150,000. Obviously, the almost sacred profession of teaching is becoming more and more unattractive to those who would best serve in it if they could afford to do so. The educators tell us further that the major reason for the teacher shortage is the low pay that teachers are offered, together with the poor facilities and overburdening number of pupils in the individual classrooms. In most States teachers are paid less than the average industrial worker. It is no wonder then that over 425,000 teachers have left their desks for other positions in the last ten years.

Enactment of a sound Federal Aid to School Construction bill will at least result, indirectly, in helping to make the teaching profession more attractive. Taking advantage of Federal aid for construction will permit State and communities to allocate more of their education budgets to the increase of teachers' salaries.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who honestly feel that any type of Federal Government injection into the national school system will hold the great danger of Federal interference and control. I should like to point out to these individuals that the committee hearings will show the great care and precautions taken by the committee to make certain that there shall be no undue interference by the Federal Government in the control of our school system. I would be the first to protest any unwarranted intrusion, or danger of intrusion, by the Federal Government into the supervision and direction of the schools of this country. I am extremely happy that the committee has seen to it that this legislation carries provisions that preclude any possibility of Federal control of our schools.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate perhaps that in connection with this school construction bill we are being forced to vote on an amendment providing that no financial aid shall be advanced to any State that does not recognize the decisions of the Supreme Court. It is, of course, very clear that the purpose of the amendment is to sustain and emphasize the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court that outlawed segregation in our public-school system on the basis that such was opposed to the provisions of the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights. It is an unhappy circumstance that this amendment creates a dilemma in the minds of many of the Members of this House. It is clear that herein lies a challenge to be determined and resolved in accord with the individual conscience, and that the challenge must be met.

In these tremendous days of tension at home and turmoil abroad it is obvious to me that the authority, the stature and prestige of the Supreme Court of this land must be ever and forever upheld in its dignity and position of one-third of this Government as established and defined by the Constitution upon which our democracy rests. Any other course, to my conscience, would be an abandonment of the judicial part of our Government and unwittingly provide the Communist propaganda machines with an inexhaustible amount of material to undermine our efforts of world leadership.

I earnestly hope and pray that the majority of this membership can find it in their minds and hearts to support the Constitution while they are supporting the Nation's children and that we can in conscience and in patriotism preserve the Nation and provide for our youth by adopting this Federal school construction measure which is essentially good for all of America.

A Report to the People of the Second District of the State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to take this opportunity to look back over the 84th Congress, evaluate and reiterate some of the legislative progress that has been made, and to point up some of the benefits the Second Congressional District has received during this period.

As the House lights dim and the spotlight of campaign activities picks up each Member of the House of Representatives, I feel it a fitting time to pause briefly to sum up just what we have done in this, the 84th Congress, and to point up some of the problems, and solutions to them, I have had while representing the second district in this Congress.

A Congressman has three broad fields of work in representing his district. One is on the national scene where overall programs and policies are enacted by the Congress. Another is in the operation of Federal agencies which affect his district. And the third is the personal problems of constituents which can be solved by action of governmental offices or by remedial legislation.

I would like to outline a few of the highlights of the past Congress, and developments, which I think are of significance to the second district in each of these fields.

As we return to the cool climate and warm friendship of our home districts, we Republican Members of the 84th Congress carry with us a mixed sense of satisfaction and frustration. Satisfaction over the solid progress we have been able to make in some fields, and frustration over the political bickering and

shameful flaunting of the Nation's welfare by the opposition party in the closing days.

Nationally, we are enjoying a day-to-day standard of living unequaled in all history. President Eisenhower's program for the people of this Nation has provided us with burgeoning economic development, a secure outlook for the future, and a calm sense of trust in our National Government.

The 84th Congress passed a monumental piece of legislation in the highway bill. This measure will link our 48 States together with thousands of miles of broad, smooth highways—which will facilitate movement of goods from region to region and provide fast arterials for passenger-car travel.

We have passed social-security legislation which will provide benefits at age 50 for those who are disabled, and will lower the retirement age for women to 62.

For the first time in many years we are ending the fiscal year with a surplus in the Treasury and with prospects for a balanced budget for the year ahead. This money will be applied to reduce the national debt—a sum which requires that every family in the Nation pay $14 per month just for interest payments each year.

We have appropriated $66 billion this year. The Department of Defense will receive around $35 billion. The interest payment on the national debt will take $7 billion. Benefits to veterans will take $5 billion. Foreign aid will take about $3.7 billion. Agricultural programs will get nearly $2 billion. The operation of governmental agencies will take the rest.

It is a sobering thought that what might be called the price of peace is $50 billion of our tax money annually. I am sure that we in the second district feel we can well pay the price for the guaranty of continued peace and the security of knowing we are discouraging aggression by being strong and ready.

The 84th Congress passed the soil-bank plan, which will not have a major effect in the second district, but which will benefit the Nation's agricultural picture. Administrative changes in farm policies have bolstered the dairy scene in recent months and the road ahead looks brighter for our milk producers. The tax on gasoline used in farm implements was removed. We have extended the brucellosis-eradication program, and the schcol milk and lunch programs which will consume more farm products.

In the field of governmental operations, we have continued under the Eisenhower administration to combat waste. We have required that the Defense Department call for bids on all contracts over $2,500 to secure the best price.

We have launched a general program of efficiency. By passing constructive legislation establishing benefits for career Armed Forces personnel, we have cut the new recruit training needs and kept experienced military men in the service. The Army alone has upped reenlistment rate from 47 to 67 percent. At a cost of $5,000 to train each recruit, the 30,000 men who came back for another hitch represent a saving of $150 million for the taxpayer.

Our shipping bas benefited from the launcing of the largest peace-time building program in history, which should stimulate and enforce our shipyard economy. The Bellingham yard has been successful in participating in the Navy's minesweeper construction program—a part of our defense expenditures, of $2.7 billion for modernization of the naval fleet.

Increased funds for health and medical programs will mean more research on disease prevention such as the Salk polio vaccine. This Congress has appropriated more money for health and welfare than any other in our history. This is an integral part of President Eisenhower's program and we took great satisfaction in earmarking $184 million for research.

Last year we acted on pay increases for postal workers and other governmental employes, to bring salaries more in line with those offered by private industry. We have improved the civil-service retirement programs and have added incentives to keep talented people on the job in agencies where efficiency can save money for the taxpayers.

We have appropriated $3.7 billion in foreign aid. I supported this bill after it had been trimmed from its original $4.9 billion request. I feel this program, since it is mainly military aid, is in reality a part of our defense budget. It has only about a billion for economic aid. I believe the entire program should be reevaluated and some thought given to tapering off and eventually ending this wartime emergency program.

Where have we failed? I regret deeply the demise of the school construction bill. Any honest evaluation of the sinking of this bill leads to the inevitable conclusion that sectionalism and stubborn refusal by the Democratic majority to make the program workable led to its death. President Eisenhower's incentive plan would have made it a fair program to the taxpayer. States would have received maximum Federal aid in return for maximum State effort. The sorry Southern tactics of endless amendment, brick-wall resistance to civil rights, and the failure of Northern Democrats to support the incentive plan doomed this needed legislation from the start.

We however, did pass a school-aid bill which will mean thousands of dollars to our district. The Federal-impact area school construction and operation program affects a great number of our districts. We appropriated $378 million for this program.

The President's overall program suffered from studious neglect by the leaders of the majority party. Obstructions to Government economy were voted, such as the crippling bill to halt closure of Government installations without specific permission from Congress. The atomic peace ship, atomic electric power development, civil rights, Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Alaska-Hawaiian statehood, putting the Post Office on a sound fiscal basis—all thees were blocked by one means or another.

The Second District has fared well under the Republican administration during the past 2 years. I have received a minimum of complaints about conduct of Federal offices, and many agencies are proving to be of more assistance than ever before to residents of the district.

The economy of the District is flourishing. We have been able to get more appropriations for roads and trails in the national forests. More timber sales personnel will mean smaller units and more opportunity for small bidders. Our mission 66 program will mean millions of dollars worth of roads and campgrounds for Olympic National Park during the next 10 years. Eight major oil companies are interested in establishing refineries in our district. It has been my pleasant privilege to talk with the leaders of these firms, and to assist them with information and introductions to governmental procedures relevant to preliminary arrangements for these plants.

Our farmers have been hard hit by the weather. We have been able to secure disaster loans at low rates of interest and an emergency feed program. The weather has been more cooperative in recent months and the outlook now is for alleviation of a threatened feed shortage throughout our farming area. I am in hopes that my dairymen's self-help plan will be adopted eventually by the Congress, as I believe it will stabilize the dairy industry at a high income level.

Our marine industries are off on a development program unparalleled in our history. The seven harbor projects for which I was able to get authorization in the 83d Congress, have received much attention during the past two years. Funds to start construction on Everett, Bellingham, Blaine, Anacortes, Neah Bay and Quillayute harbors have been approved, and promises extended for action on Port Angeles next year.

In addition, we authorized the Port Townsend harbor project this year and the Sammamish River flood control plan. I plan, if reelected, to push for funds for these projects next year.

Navigational surveys will be undertaken on three of our major rivers due to action I was able to secure this year. The Skagit, Stilliguamish and Snohomish Rivers will be studied by the United States Army Engineers to determine the feasibility of navigational improvements.

My mail bag has brought a host of letters outlining individual problems requiring consultation and negotiation with governmental agencies. Many of these were settled to the satisfaction of the party which sought the help of my office. I am grateful that so many residents of the district have written to express opinions on legislation, in answer to the questionnaire I sent out this year, and in requesting help for specific problems.

As we leave Washington for the political battlefield, I would like to extend to my colleagues in the House my appreciation for the cooperation and fellowship I have enjoyed. I'm sure it is the hope of all of us that we are saying, in the words of the old song "Au Revoir," but not "Good Bye."

Illinois Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "The Illinois Scandals," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 17, 1956:

THE ILLINOIS SCANDALS

It is a long time since there has been a set of scandals anywhere to assume the proportions of the disclosures of misuse of public funds that are now rocking the Republican State administration in Illinois. Consider just two facts:

In November 1952, Orville E. Hodge, of Granite City is the second biggest vote getter on the successful Republican ticket. Running for State auditor, he outpolled even Governor Stratton, 2,336,000 to 2,317,000. Then, on his record and as the most popular member of the Stratton team, Orville Hodge is renominated to succeed himself—renominated without opposition.

In July 1956 this same Orville E. Hodge is the center of scandals so deep and so far reaching that he shakenly resigns his office under fire. He also withdraws from the Republican ticket as a candidate for reelection. His comment to the press is: "I'm beat, but I didn't kill anybody, did I?"

No, Orville Hodge did not kill anybody.

All he did was to involve the State auditor's office—the one office in the State of Illinois that should be cleaner than all the others—in ramifying State check scandals that have already reached proportions of more than $500,000.

All he did was to become the center of disclosures so offensive to public morals that the prospect was that he would drag the entire Stratton ticket down to defeat in November—something which he may very well still do.

All he did was to produce a political situation so hot that there was no possibility of riding it out as Republican Gov. Dwight H. Green tried to do when high-level payoffs and numerous other financial scandals overwhelmed the Green administration 8 years ago.

Yet even this time the immediate reaction among Hodge's running mates was to wait and see if it all would not blow over. For the first disclosures came 2 months ago and it is only within the last few days that Governor Stratton acted publicly to save the threatened ship.

Why did Governor Stratton and Attorney General Latham Castle wait so long?

Could they not find out for themselves what the newspapermen were digging out?

Actually did they not know before the scandals broke upon the public?

For how could they not have known when so many others were in on the racket by which big State checks were made out to individuals and firms and then cashed for agents of the State auditor's office?

A grand jury is already at work and other investigations—12 separate ones by a recent count—are in process. Orville E. Hodge, second high man on the GOP State ticket 4 years ago, will answer under the law as will Edward A. Hintz, former officer of the Illinois Bankers Association, who is the resigned president of the Southmoor Bank which paid so many of the checks apparently with full knowledge of what was going on.

But the feeling must be general over Illinois that this is only the sign of other things to come. There is much else to look into including, for example, the full facts about the Stratton toll road program and the sale of $415 million in bonds—the largest public bond issue in history outside the Federal Government.

Investigators and grand juries and prosecuting officials ought to have a busy time in Illinois for the next few months. And the people of Lincoln's State ought to be learning a lot more about how their State government has been run for them during the last 4 years.

Congress Fails To Do Its Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, a case has recently been brought to my attention which is an example of rank injustices inflicted upon Federal employees because of the failure of the Congress to do its duty. Instead of writing out and setting its own rules and regulations governing the dismissal of employees working for the Government, Congress has allowed the Civil Service Commission to make its own.

In this case a young woman who has 18 years of creditable work behind her was involuntarily retired because of disability. She has been denied access to the personnel files, records, reports, and statements made by her supervisor, and was not given a chance to refute or explain them. She was sent to a psychiatrist, with the lasting stigma which that act implies, and was not able to obtain the files and reports sent to the Public Health Service, nor copies of them.

In the rules and regulations set forth in chapter ZI of the Federal Personnel Manual, section 29.11, Disclosure of Information (a) (1), there is this provision:

Files, records, reports, and other papers and documents pertaining to any claim filed with the Civil Service Commission, whether pending or adjudicated, will be deemed privileged and made in confidence, and no disclosure thereof will be made except as provided herein (p. 342).

I have been told that this regulation continues:

Except to a claimant or to his duly authorized representative in matters concerning himself alone when such disclosure would not be injurious to the physical or mental health of the claimant or be regarded as a breach of confidence. Determination as to when disclosure of information would be injurious to the physical or mental welfare of a claimant will be made by the Medical Division.

Under the same section—II—it is stated:

Copies of papers, records, etc., the furnishing of which would be prejudicial to the interest of the Government; copies of reports of examining surgeons; or copies of records of departments and other confidential matters, will not be furnished.

Why should not a person dismissed for disability be informed as to what is allegedly the basis for his dismissal?

If there is anything in Russia that can beat this for absolute denial of the rights of our citizens to be heard in their own defense. I do not know about it. As reported in the Evening Star of July 12, 1956, in another similar case, the United States Court of Appeals for the District held that—

Federal employees retired for disability are not entitled to see civil-service medical files on their cases, nor are they entitled to hearings.

For over a year this woman has been beating her head against the stone wall of bureaucratic secrecy and unconstitutional withholdings of information, and there are undoubtedly numerous similar cases which have so far not been brought to public attention.

If we are to retain any semblance of our Bill of Rights, it is high time that Congress passed a law taking away from the various bureaus and agencies in Government the right to make their own rules and regulations without the right of hearings or appeal and see to it that the rights of our citizens are protected.

These regulations refer to physical and mental health of employees. That gives the Civil Service Commission ample leeway to hold back information on the ground of mental health. There may be nothing wrong with an employee as to mental health, and how does it come that the Commission is the sole arbitrator of this delicate question?

This woman has lost her job, and she does not know what the reasons are. While the stigma of being sent to a psychiatrist remains, she cannot get a job anywhere. This Commission has taken away from this employee a thing of the highest value. Shakespeare said:

He who steals my purse steals trash, but he who robs me of my good name steals that which does not enrich him, but makes me poor, indeed.

Are we in the United States carrying on a gestapo in the question of mental health? Are we to make the Commission the supreme ruler over the very lives of Federal employees? In this case the employees cannot get work while this resort to mental health, secretly applied, with no chance for the victim to vindicate himself, remains, and, finally, the victim will be robbed of life. Is that the authority Congress has given to bureaucrats? I would like to know.

Hon. George A. Dondero

SPEECH
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns we realize that many ties will be broken. For many years, Mr. Speaker, I have been closely associated with the Honorable GEORGE DONDERO, of Michigan, who is voluntarily retiring from public office. He has been chairman of the Public Works Commit-

tee, of which I am a member. He has been the guiding hand, always being courteous and giving consideration to his fellow men.

Congressman DONDERO is a great American, a gentleman, and a scholar of the highest order. He has completed 50 years of public service. He will be missed in these legislative halls, but I am certain that many will continue to seek his guidance and help in ironing out the difficult problems. To you, GEORGE DONDERO, and your family, we wish the very best of everything.

Stassen's Drive Long-Range Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes:

STASSEN DRIVE'S LONG-RANGE GOAL—GOP INTERNATIONALISTS SEEN PLANNING TO TAKE OVER FROM EISENHOWER

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Generally overlooked is a long-time objective in the Harold Stassen versus Vice President NIXON affair.

It involves control of the Republican Party.

Though Harold Stassen's prompters in this anti-NIXON campaign have remained thunderously silent up to now, they include persons highly placed politically and in our industrial and financial community who belong to the eastern internationalist wing of the party that was back of the nomination of General Eisenhower in 1952 and, before that, of Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, in 1944 and 1948, and the surprise nomination of the late Wendell L. Willkie in 1940.

Harold Stassen has trained politically with this wing of the party since 1940, when he became floor manager for Wendell Willkie at the 1940 Philadelphia convention. Since then this wing of the party has won every national convention though in between Congress continued largely under the domination of another wing, less liberal on domestic policy and nationally inclined on foreign policy, which for a long period found an anchor in the late Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and is still strongly entrenched in the party organization, particularly in the Midwest, where its strength is concentrated. This hard-core, conservative, orthodox GOP backed Senator Taft unsuccessfully for the Republican nomination against Messrs. Willkie, Dewey, and Eisenhower.

Now as for today—Harold Stassen's war on Vice President NIXON bespeaks the fear of the eastern, internationalist, moderate wing with which he is affiliated that, in a second Eisenhower administration when the President can exercise much less control than now, the young, aggressive, and politically adept RICHARD M. NIXON might be able to gain control of the party if he still occupied the strategic position of Vice President. Especially if he enlisted the help of the GOP conservative wing which is so well placed in key positions in Congress and at the Capitol where the Vice President also makes his headquarters and can operate independently if he so chooses and in virtual seclusion.

DICK NIXON'S record in Congress as a Member of House and Senate would seem to identify him more closely with the conservative wing of the party. As Vice President, however, he has been a loyal Eisenhower supporter, which, of itself, demonstrates his maneuverability in accommodating himself to different policy and philosophy. Accordingly, he is not trusted completely by the Eisenhower wing of the party, including some persons in inner White House councils. They recognize in him a restless ambition capable of treading carefully along the path of expediency as necessity dictates.

All of this is reflected in the Stassen effort to get him out of the way, which so far has only boomeranged.

A key background figure in the Stassen anti-Nixon enterprise is understood to be the devoted sponsor of the Minnesotan's successive unsuccessful tries for the Republican Presidential nomination—Amos J. Peaslee, of Clarksboro, N. J., eminent international lawyer and diplomat. He offers a liaison with powerful New York figures and interests influential in the eastern international wing of the Republican Party in this endeavor. When Peaslee returned a few months back from a tour of duty as Ambassador to Australia by appointment of President Eisenhower, he immediately began to busy himself with the revived political interests of Harold Stassen.

Amos Peaslee still would like to make Harold Stassen President—and the latter would acquiesce willingly.

For present purposes, the symbol they have put forward to supplant Vice President NIXON—and without the least success—exemplifies the interests in conflict, for Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, is a member in good standing of the eastern internationalist wing of the party.

The Stassen tactic was designed to meet a situation the party will face if there is a second Eisenhower administration. The President's hold on the reins of party control will be much weakened by a new condition which he is the first President to experience. That is the constitutional limit of 2 terms for a President. While there was a sort of tradition, almost an unwritten law, against more than 2 terms until Franklin D. Roosevelt scuttled it in 1940, there was always the chance that a popular President might seek a third term, as Roosevelt finally did, and that kept the party in line during a second term. But that potential restraint is gone with outlawing of the third term, initiated by the Republican 80th Congress midway of President Truman's first term.

Consequently, the very minute that President Eisenhower has taken his oath of office for a second term—if he should be reelected—there will begin a struggle for control of the party, and for the "succession," so to speak. In such contests, which we may expect hereafter, a President gradually will retire to the sidelines with only such influence as comes from his personal prestige and popularity among the rank and file of his party and the people generally, which could, of course, be considerable, depending upon who the President is.

This has its bearing on the Stassen-NIXON affair.

Hon. John Phillips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, 14 eventful years have passed since JOHN PHILLIPS and I came to Congress. It has been a real privilege to serve with this alert and constructive man.

For many years my offices were across the hall from those of JOHN PHILLIPS. I observed that JOHN was always busy serving the Nation, California, his district, and his myriad of friends. His retirement is a loss, of course, but his 14 years of diligent service is a true gain.

We wish for JOHN and his wife, Dorothy, everything good in the future.

Congressional Unit of Department of Agriculture Wins Well Earned Citation for Superior Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House an outstanding award recently made within the Department of Agriculture to one of its branches of which the Congressional Inquiry Unit is a part. The awards to individuals and units within the Department of Agriculture were a part of the William A. Jump Memorial Foundation citations.

Without doubt the outstanding service rendered by the Congressional Inquiry Unit to Members of Congress contributed materially to the record which caused the Inquiries and Distribution Service, headed by Richard A. Hollis, to be singled out for this citation.

The citation declared that the award was "for transmitting information about Department services and the results of its work to Members of Congress and the public with outstanding efficiency, marked initiative, and exemplary teamwork."

In connection with the awards, Hon. Ezra Taft Benson, the Secretary of Agriculture, said:

Service to our fellow men is a source of great satisfaction. This satisfaction compensates for long hours of work, patient waiting, and sometimes tedious effort. It is an earned satisfaction. And it explains, in part at least, the dedication to service which is so characteristic of so many Department employees.

The Congressional Inquiry Unit of the Inquiries and Distribution Service is headed by Miss Mary I. Parrett and is the unit with which congressional offices must frequently come in contact with the Department. This branch is the traffic manager for our congressional inquiries and I sometimes marvel at the expeditious manner in which requested material is dispatched to our offices for reference use, for use as speech material and for use in answering letters from our constitutents making specific and often complicated requests for agricultural information.

It was indeed appropriate that the Department of Agriculture should include in the unit citation program a place for an award to Mr. Francis J. P. Cleary,

retired, and presently of Woodstock, Va., the organizer and first chief of the Inquiries and Distribution Office. The setting up of the Congressional Inquiries Unit within the Information Office assigned exclusively to handling congressional inquiries, was an idea originating with Mr. Cleary. At the unit award program he was given a gold 50-year service pin for his more than 50 years on active duty with the Department.

The staff members of the Inquiries and Distribution Service who worked together to make this superior service award possible for the unit deserves individual mention. I have previously mentioned that the branch is headed by Mr. Hollis. His assistant is Fred L. Zimmerman. The other units participating in the citation and their personnel follow:

Adminstrative Service Unit: Thomas L. Cullinan, chief; Edna B. Davis, A. Sidney Frye, Caroline M. Gray, Rudolph A. Stewart and Martha E. Ridgway.

Congressional Inquiries Unit: Mary I. Parrett, chief; Clara J. Irwin, Thelma H. Brown, Ann S. Steuer, Lois I. Bruce, Arthur R. Garner, Beatrice V. Carthorne and Harry W. Hart.

Government and Public Inquiries Unit: Vitura P. Sanders, chief; Martha J. Mount, Cleopatra S. Caras, Barbara A. Barnes, Mabel E. Heinecke, Lydia Bell Jones, Julia L. Johnson, Hilda B. Norris and Katherine A. Cook.

Mailing List Unit: Gretchen W. Costello, chief; Ann Rogers Hickey, Alice G. Cobert, George M. Brown, Ann B. Smith and Sarah L. Pruitt.

General Inquiries and Publications Unit: Eleanor W. Clay, chief; Harry L. Reed, Roby W. Stehr, Alice M. Shoemaker, and Ella J. Green.

Warehouse Unit: Edward Buck and Clarence O. Irby.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "Financial Scandal in Illinois," which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 12, 1956:

FINANCIAL SCANDAL IN ILLINOIS

Governor Stratton has done the only thing the No. 1 Republican leader in Illinois could do in calling on State Auditor Hodge, of Granite City, to get off the GOP ticket as the part's official nominee for reelection.

With the FBI now entered into the investigation of $500,000 worth of questionable State checks, allegedly issued by Auditor Hodge's office, the scandal in the GOP household at Springfield has reached amazing size.

Apparently the first reaction within the Stratton "team" at Springfield was that the Hodge scandal could be ridden out—as Dwight H. Green thought about the scandals that broke all over the place in 1948. But Governor Stratton now realizes that this situation must produce a full and complete accounting. And so he says that public and party confidence in Orville E. Hodge "no longer exists."

The Governor is also well advised in demanding that Auditor Hodge double his surety bond from $50,000 to $100,000, the legal maximum. If many improper State checks have been written and handled through the State auditor's office the total could run up to a large figure in a hurry.

While Governor Stratton is to be commended on what he is doing now, it is in order to ask why none of this was known about Auditor Hodge's office before he was renominated last April as part of the Stratton team. Why did it all wait until the Chicago Daily News did Illinois the service of digging into the facts?

There are a lot of questions to ask and to answer and State Auditor Hodge is not the only Illinois official to do some explaining.

Postal and Federal Employees Retirement and Annuities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the confusion and hurry toward adjournment of the Congress, I earnestly hope vitally needed revision and improvement of the currently outdated retirement and annuity setup for faithful postal and other Federal employees will not be passed over and forgotten.

Our Federal employees for a large and important part of our population. The service they render is fundamental and essential to the Nation.

As I have said on many an occasion in this House, the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and practically extend to them equitable salary, retirement, and annuity treatment.

It is only ordinary practical common sense and recognition of the facts of life that if our faithful postal workers and Government employees are encouraged, by a reasonable salary and retirement system, to meet their family obligations and face the future with a certain confidence, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist propaganda temptation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of importance to remind this House that the last major revision of the Federal employees' retirement and annuity system was made in 1948. I do not believe it is necessary to remind the House that the cost of living and major changes in the pension and retirement systems of our commercial and industrial businesses have changed considerably since that date. The comparable systems within Federal Government employment have fallen far behind and are now completely outmoded.

In realization of existing deficiencies, there is legislation pending before the Congress to increase the present inadequate annuities by at least 20 percent, to reduce the permissible retirement age of those with 30 years of service without unjust penalty, to liberalize survivor benefits for widows and children of Federal employees by lowering the penalty percentages and raising the maximum to which they are applicable to a figure in accord with the reality of our modern economic conditions. In comparison with competitive private business, there is little incentive for competent individuals to enter Government employment when there is no reasonable assurance that a surviving wife and children will not be granted some assistance in case of death. It would also seem but simple justice to me to make any liberalized benefits applicable to those presently retired following long years of loyal, faithful, efficient service, and I hope that such action will be taken when we consider this legislation.

Legislation to sensibly liberalize the retirement benefits and annuities of our postal and Federal employees while at the same time improving the overall financial soundness of the civil-service retirement fund is ready to be acted upon. The present setup is antiquated and far behind similar systems in the competing employment field of private enterprise. Our loyal and faithful Government employees are at the mercy of the Congress, unlike the employees of private business. It is the duty of the Congress to encourage Federal employment of persons of competence and character.

These good objectives in the national interest can be accomplished by the enactment of this legislation to sensibly increase Federal retirement benefits. I most earnestly urge the leadership to bring this legislation before the Congress now, so that we can act upon it in fairness and in justice to all our faithful Government employees.

Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to serve in the New York State Assembly with IRWIN D. DAVIDSON and to have appeared before him when he was a judge in the courts of our State. I was delighted 2 years ago when our friendship was renewed upon his election to this body, and his assignment to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, on which I also have the honor to serve.

Representative DAVIDSON'S fine capabilities were recognized both in the New York State Assembly and by the attorneys who have appeared before him when he served on the bench. They have also been recognized by his colleagues here in Congress, and most especially by the members of our committee.

I regret the decision that has been made to return to the judiciary of the State of New York. Though it is a dis-

tinct loss to the country as a whole it is a very real gain to the legal profession in the State of New York. I look forward to appearing before him again in his judicial capacity, and renewing his friendship whenever we meet in our hometown of New York City.

Appropriations Made in the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission given to me, I am submitting a table showing the appropriations made in the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

It will be seen that, without the cuts in the mutual-security setup, the Congress on direct appropriations appropriated more money than the budget asked for by $523 million. In addition to the direct appropriations, there were reappropriations involving very large sums of money, probably at the very least $500 million.

One of the worst things that we have to contend with is that so many of the expenditures are provided for in different acts which permit expenditures from public debt receipts. That authority is outstanding as of July 1 last, according to the estimates that have been furnished us, in the amount of $19,772,000,000. This is almost one-third of the direct appropriations made by the Congress, so that the availability of funds is in the neighborhood of $19,772,000,000, plus obligated and unobligated balances that are carried forward, plus the authority to spend from public debt receipts, and the management and revolving funds which run to a total of about $74 billion carried over from the 30th of June 1956. You add to that the $68 billion of new money available on July 1, and you have $142 billions.

We have been fortunate in that, notwithstanding about $72 billion withdrawals from the Treasury, we had net deposits of $77 billion; and, although the actual surplus is only about $1.8 billion, the cash balance picture is quite a lot more. With these $19 billion of authority to spend from public debt receipts, there is no possible way for the Congress to keep a tight control upon funds.

With the advent of the new highway bill and the trust fund proposal, the gasoline tax receipts and that sort of thing will not appear as Treasury revenue, but will go into a trust fund. The withdrawals will not be labeled a charge against the Treasury. For the fiscal year 1957 the charge for this trust fund is $300 million. The story of the appropriations no longer means the control over appropriations that we had 30 years ago.

Comparison of estimates and appropriations, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Title	Estimates considered by House	Public Law	Increase (+) or decrease (−) appropriation compared with estimates
I. Fiscal year 1957 bills:			
Treasury-Post Office:			
Treasury	$648,507,000	$643,434,000	−$5,073,000
Post Office	3,000,000,000	2,984,340,000	−15,660,000
Tax Court of the United States	1,365,000	1,365,000	
Total	3,649,872,000	3,629,139,000	−20,733,000
Interior and related agencies:			
Interior	287,682,600	280,857,250	−15,135,950
Forest Service	96,773,000	100,970,750	+4,197,750
Related agencies	42,292,600	42,106,100	−270,000
Total	426,748,200	423,934,100	−11,208,200
General Government matters	15,014,475	14,969,975	−44,500
Independent offices	5,783,704,000	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826
Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare:			
Labor	421,084,000	380,785,500	−40,535,500
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,925,988,400	1,972,121,781	+46,133,381
Related agencies	16,576,000	13,473,500	−3,102,500
Total	2,363,648,400	2,366,380,781	+2,495,381
District of Columbia	(182,899,500)	(181,612,490)	(−1,287,010)
Federal payment	22,358,650	22,558,650	+200,000
State, Justice, and Judiciary:			
State	181,207,285	175,065,872	−7,076,413
Justice	235,880,000	216,043,650	−19,836,350
Judiciary	37,582,535	36,321,435	−1,261,100
U. S. Information Agency	135,000,000	113,000,000	−22,000,000
Refugee relief	8,500,000	8,500,000	
Total	598,169,820	548,930,957	−50,173,863
Commerce and related agencies:			
Commerce	1,453,568,000	1,347,872,000	−105,696,000
Panama Canal	15,660,000	16,410,000	−250,000
Related agencies	53,445,000	53,450,000	+5,000
Total	1,522,673,000	1,416,732,000	−105,941,000
Defense:			
Office of the Secretary	14,950,000	14,950,000	
Interservice activities	657,375,000	643,875,000	−13,500,000
1. Fiscal year 1957 bills—Con.			
Defense—Con.			
Army	$7,761,425,000	$7,539,280,000	−$222,145,000
Navy	10,047,900,000	9,999,497,000	−48,103,000
Air Force	15,666,500,000	16,459,125,000	+792,625,000
Total	34,147,850,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000
Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration	1,987,302,268	[1] 1,993,744,968	+3,903,300
Public works:			
Tennessee Valley Authority	5,357,000	5,357,000	
Department of Interior:			
Power Administrations	28,478,000	28,478,000	
Bureau of Reclamation	195,789,000	181,114,400	−14,674,500
Army civil functions	588,877,000	641,777,500	+52,900,500
Total	818,501,000	856,727,000	+38,226,000
Legislative branch	93,664,903	[2] 117,804,058	−4,692,875
Mutual Security	4,859,975,000	3,766,570,000	−1,093,405,000
The supplemental, 1957	1,222,849,525	1,691,341,875	+436,977,350
Second supplemental, 1957	1,912,095,000	[3] 3,036,029,438	−458,023,600
Rescission of "Federal-aid highway" funds contained in other bills above		−875,000,000	−25,000,000
Net, second supplemental 1957	1,912,095,000	2,183,029,438	−433,023,600
Subtotal, fiscal year 1957	59,424,426,241	[3] 59,655,107,628	−545,729,181
II. Deficiency and supplemental acts, fiscal year 1956:			
Urgent deficiency, 1956	64,505,201	65,695,066	+1,189,865
Labor (Bureau of Employment Security)	(13,000,000)	(13,000,000)	
Second supplemental, 1956	835,902,923	852,414,896	−25,721,631
Subtotal, fiscal year 1956 and prior	900,408,124	918,109,962	−24,531,766
III. Grand total, session	60,324,834,365	[4] 60,573,217,590	−570,260,947
Permanent appropriations (estimate)		7,564,859,833	
Grand total, regular annual supplemental, deficiency, and permanent		68,138,077,423	

[1] Includes $1,250,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[2] Includes $400,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[3] Includes $1,650,000 in fiscal year 1956 funds.
[4] Does not include $1,200,000,000 contained in H. R. 10654, which the House did not act upon.

[5] Includes estimates of $1,150,500,000 and appropriations of $1,150,300,000 out of permanent highway trust fund, to reimburse general fund appropriation accounts for expenditures made subsequent to June 30, 1956, and such reimbursed appropriation accounts to be rescinded not later than June 30, 1957; public law column includes only $800,300,000 for such purpose.

Health Amendments Act of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 18, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we approach adjournment date of this Congress, I earnestly hope that the vitally important so-called omnibus health bill will not be overlooked.

This pending legislation is designed to increase the supply of public health specialists, certain categories of professional nurses and trained practical nurses, extend for an additional 2 years the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, due to expire on June 30, 1957, and in addition authorize the Surgeon General to conduct investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health.

Authoritative statistics reveal a shocking need for vastly more trained personnel to administer to the medical needs of our rapidly increasing population. The need for trained public health specialists by local, State, and Federal public health agencies is urgent because of the severe shortage.

It is estimated that we need thousands of professionally trained nurses to adequately staff the Nation's hospitals, to teach and train other nurses and to increase the number of nurses qualified to fill important administrative and supervisory positions.

We are all aware, I am sure, that most of our chronic-disease hospitals and mental institutions are deplorably lacking in the number of practical nurses that are required to adequately attend upon these unfortunate people. The provisions in the bill would be of invaluable assistance to most of our States and communities to help them deal with this problem by increasing the number of practical nurses and relieving professional nurses to handle more technical medical care.

The extension for another 2 years of the Hospital and Medical Facilities Survey and Construction Act, known so well to us as the Hill-Burton Act, is an outstanding feature of this pending legislation. It has already helped States and communities of the country to build more and better hospitals, but there is still a great need for the continuing assistance that it affords. The knowledge that it has been continued will permit and encourage States and communities to make plans for their future hospital needs with the assurance that reasonable Federal assistance will be available. The unquestionable record of the universal benefits and success of this hospital construction program is a most convincing reason for us to insure its continuation.

Mr. Speaker, the challenge of the mentally ill in this country is recognized and accepted by the provisions of this proposed legislation. Unfortunately, today slightly more than one-half of the hospital beds of the Nation are occupied by mental patients. This is a distressing fact, but it is a fact nevertheless and it must be dealt with.

Title V of the health bill is to aid States in solving mental illness problems. In addition to research and training grants which the Surgeon General is now authorized to make, it would make special project grants available for the support of investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in the field of mental health. Its emphasis would be upon projects designed to improve the operation and administration of State institutions for the care or treatment of the mentally ill. The results of such pilot studies and experiments would benefit all States, yet, only several States would need to perform the basic research and incur the expense. Because of the already heavy strain on State budgets in just providing for the mentally ill, they have been reluctant to conduct such expensive experiments. Yet, the need for experimentation and research in the methods of operation and administration of State mental hospitals is just as greatly needed as research into methods of diagnosis and treatment of the mentally ill. The funds provided for in title V could be used to develop such new programs as outpatient care, and day care for the mentally ill to reduce the strain on the hospitals. With over half of the Nation's hospital beds filled with mentally ill persons, it is certainly appropriate for the Federal Government to give this serious national problem attention.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing health of and adequate medical care for the American people should be of primary concern to this Congress and we will be negligent in our duty if we do not act upon this omnibus health legislation for the good of all America.

Russians Press Education Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Drew Pearson entitled "Russians Press Education Plans," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 11, 1956:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND
(By Drew Pearson)
RUSSIANS PRESS EDUCATION PLANS

While the House of Representatives was defeating the school construction bill last week, here is what was happening to education in Russia.

Forty years ago under the Czarist regime, Russian illiteracy was about 75 percent. Surveys show that illiteracy in Russia today is about the same as in the United States, maybe even less. The reason is a 7-year system of compulsory primary education, which under the new 5-year plan will soon be extended to 10 years.

In other words, Russian youngsters will be compelled to take 3 years of high school. In most of the United States high school is not compulsory.

This 10-year program is already in effect in Russia's larger cities. Emphasis is placed on science and technology. During the past 6 years, 40 percent of the curriculum has been devoted to science and mathematics, with 6 years spent on foreign language, usually English, to help Russian engineers keep abreast of American science.

As a result of this concentration on technical training, the U. S. S. R. is already ahead of us in turning out engineers.

American Policy on Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter dated July 24 addressed to the New York Herald Tribune by Harold L. Oram. I think it is excellent and deserves wide distribution.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZEN SUPPORT

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

The Alsop brothers' column on the Revolt Against Foreign Aid in Sunday's Herald Tribune (July 22) points out that many Members of Congress have been receiving a steady stream of letters denouncing sending all that money abroad. Presumably, very few letters came urging acceleration of the great giveaway.

Any one familiar with the process whereby great measures in American policy win public acceptance and legislative action will be pardoned for suspecting that the team is not too enthusiastic about certain of President Eisenhower's legislative programs. Under Presidents Roosevelt and Truman it was different. When those administrations desired measures, involving enormous sacrifices and, sometimes, risks in the public interest, citizens were encouraged to cultivate public sentiment through organized action. Congressmen soon began to be impressed by visits and letters from constituents calling for farsighted statesmanship. Meanwhile, White House emissaries were quietly making the rounds pointing to aroused public sentiment and, occasionally, knocking a few heads together to show that the administration really meant business. This system worked pretty well.

It is inconceivable that the American-destroyers-for-British-bases deal would have gone through without the leadership of William Allen White's Committee To Defend America; highly doubtful that the European-aid program would have been legislated without Henry L. Stimson's and Robert P. Patterson's Committee for the Marshall Plan; impossible that the Refugee Relief Act of 1948 would have been enacted without the work of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons led by Earl G. Harrison and Lessing Rosenwald. These organizations were not kept but reflected a legitimate public interest. Often they were out far ahead, thus affording the administration an opportunity for compromise between the obvious public demand for action and congressional reluctance.

Enormous sacrifies must yet be faced by the American people if the uncommitted, largely underdeveloped nations are to maintain their freedom from Communist domination. Any national administration that means business in this critical area must encourage creation of citizen support for the essential sacrificial policies involved. The case of the foreign-aid program is a warning.

HAROLD L. ORAM.

NEW YORK, *July 24, 1965.*

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Illinois Phenomenal Bilking," which appeared in the July 25, 1956, issue of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

ILLINOIS PHENOMENAL BILKING

The most amazing thing about the sensational fraud upon taxpayers of Illinois is not that Orville E. Hodge, already a wealthy man, engaged in fake transactions that mulcted his State auditor's account of almost $1 million.

The stunning factor is that this could have happened, that the setup of Springfield State government was such this conspiracy could have flourished so long without detection.

The evil conduct, admitted certainly in part by Hodge, must have occurred over an extended period. Just how long investigations probably have not yet developed. Are there no checks and safeguards to prevent misuse or embezzlement of Illinois' public funds?

Manifestly the people must place trust in high officials. Normally that trust is justified. Far too frequently in political office, stewardship falls prey to betrayal.

For some completely immoral reason, men reasonably honest in private business seem to believe public office is fair game for boodle gouging. Look at the statement of Edward A. Hintz, resigned and indicted president of the Southmoor Bank and Trust Co., who fobbed off his illegal cashing of Hodge warrants by saying he felt this "sort of thing was done all the time in political circles."

Fraud in political office and filching of public funds are not being done all the time. It is intolerable that a scandal such as the Hodge depredations could have occurred at all—without detection until an investigation by the Chicago Daily News blew the complex of official chicanery into headlines and into Federal and State courts.

Apparently there are not adequate, compulsory safeguards in the system, or they were not enforced.

Undoubtedly a top fiscal office like that of Illinois State auditor is not as subject to supervision as lesser posts. But why did not outside audits reveal dishonest operations? Have there been no certified public accountant checks of this office over the last several years? There is evidence the Hodge manipulations began shortly after he took over his job.

Or if the auditor was able to cover up misuse of State funds by falsifying records, how can it happen that huge chunks of public money could be dropped from sight, disbursed in phony warrants? And no one ever notice?

Did nobody have any inkling of the Hodge associations with East Side gangsters? With gambling figures and racketeers?

Doubtless Governor Stratton did not know what was going on, had no suspicion, though he might have kept closer tab on State spending, where graft and leeching usually intrude their ugly heads. It seems inconceivable, however, that someone of authority in Illinois government did not know or suspect something was rotten in the auditor's office.

This flood of investigations should be exhaustively pushed until the whole faithless story is unfolded. Then statutory precautions should be erected to prevent such a public sellout again.

House Proves Friend Indeed to Veterans of War With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the minutes run out on the 84th Congress and I glance over this historic Chamber, gladdened by seeing dear faces on both sides of the aisle, saddened by the thought that all will not be returning, I feel that I should speak what deeply is in my heart.

Close to six decades have passed since the 55th Congress in its second session decreed that Cuba should be free and that Spanish rule on this hemisphere should cease. Since then there have been 29 Congresses. In these a total of 98 veterans of the war with Spain have served as Members of this body. As the last of this number I have sought, as best my opportunity and diligence would permit, to represent the spirit and the interest of the survivors and the widows of survivors of the faraway war that started our United States of America on the road to world responsibility.

From the bottom of my heart I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the understanding and the help they have given. I could not let the 84th Congress slip into history without saying what is in my heart. The leadership on both sides, the membership of the House without a single exception, have shown a friendship for the Spanish War veterans and their widows that I shall never forget, that will not be forgotten as long as life and memory remain with any in that group.

HOUSE PASSED MORO BILL

By unanimous vote in the first session you passed the so-called Moro bill, intended at long last to give recognition to the few who remain of that valiant army that carried on in hostile Philippine provinces with great sacrifice and loss after the arbitrary cutoff date of the Spanish-American War.

HOUSE PASSED LAMBERT BILL

By unanimous vote in the second session you passed the measure placing the name of Gustaf Lambert, soldier of the war with Spain and hero of the yellow-fever experiments in Cuba, on the honor roll where it should have been many, many years ago. Also you adopted, by unanimous vote, an amendment to an appropriation bill providing money for the gold for a medal for Gustaf Lambert.

HOUSE SAVED THE "OLYMPIA"

You were not deaf to my expression of the sentiment among my comrades of the war with Spain for the preservation as a historic shrine of the warship *Olympia*, Dewey's flagship in the naval battle in Manila Bay and that bore to our shores the Unknown Soldier of World War I for burial in Arlington National Cemetery. As a result I am assured the *Olympia*, instead of being junked, is on the list of the historic battleships of our country to be preserved.

HOUSE PASSED WIDOWS BILL

By unanimous vote you passed a bill for an increase in the pension for our Spanish War widows. God's blessing will reward you for this action. There are not many widows of Spanish War veterans. There are fewer every month. They are too old to work. For the most part they receive no social-security assistance. They are in dire need. Trying to stretch out a piteously meager pension, many of them are unable to buy the medicines they so badly need. The Spanish War veterans asked nothing for themselves, only that these widows be probided with minimum pensions of $75 a month. To its everlasting glory, the House responded.

THANKS TO YOUNGER VETERANS

To all my colleagues in this body again and again the thanks of the gentleman from Illinois and all his comrades. You have been magnificent. Most of you are veterans of World War I or World War II or both. You have given a helping hand to the lone Spanish War veteran remaining among you in this Chamber in the finest expression of comradeship. When the time shall come that among the many veterans of World War I and of World War II but one remains a member of this body, it is my prayer that from his younger colleagues this last surviving veteran will receive in full measure of richness the understanding and the help you have given the last of the Spanish War veterans in this body.

CREDIT TO GREAT LEADERS

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans was the Honorable Lloyd Thurston, who came to Congress as a Representative from the State of Iowa the year our beloved minority leader, JOE MARTIN, was a freshman. He served for many years with great distinction, being a member at different times of the Rules, Appropriation, and Ways and Means Committees.

Commander in Chief James H. Johnson, serving as head of the United Spanish War Veterans during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, is a veteran of the war with Spain, of World War I, and World War II. He is a great soldier and a great American. His military record is outstanding.

Past Commander in Chief William J. Otjen as chairman of the legislative

committee of the USWV, working side by side with Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld as cochairman, has done a prodigious job in the promotion of worthy and patriotic legislative causes. He has been as tireless as time itself, and even at this moment when adjournment is near and hope is fading he is at the post of duty and of honor on the other side of the Capitol striving to get action on our widows' bill by the other body.

OTJEN'S TESTIMONY IN FULL

Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the testimony of Past Commander in Chief Otjen before the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as follows:

Mr. OTJEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am William J. Otjen, of Enid, Okla., past commander in chief of the United Spanish War Veterans and chairman of the national committee on legislation and its administration of that organization.

I have with me Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, a past national president of our auxiliary and cochairman of the auxiliary legislative committee.

Of course, we have given due study to the proposals incorporated in the measure before this committee. We do not question the major portion of H. R. 7089, which is apparently designed principally for the relief of dependents of career personnel. We are in complete accord, especially with the objective of increasing death compensation rates for service-connected dependents of the honored dead.

With that thought in mind I wish to confine my remarks in considering the objectives of H. R. 7089 to a proposed amendment which has been introduced by Senator GREEN, of Rhode Island, and which is before you, and I understand that an amendment is to be introduced by Senator COTTON, of New Hampshire, for the same purpose. They are both similar in character and the efforts of both meet the same objective.

These objectives are that for reasons, which I hope to be able to describe in full, intended to request that surviving widows of deceased veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer uprising be included within the terms of the Hardy bill as service-connected and at the proposed rates defined under that bill.

As we are advised, at this time the rolls of the Veterans' Administration will show 334 Spanish War veterans as service-connected; they show 1,193 dependents as service-connected. They show as of December 31, 1955, 56,019 non-service-connecetd veterans and 80,903 such dependents. We do not dispute the rolls of the Veterans' Administration, but we certainly know that this tabulation of figures does not do justice to the veterans of the Spanish War. Let me emphasize that embraced in the Spanish War veterans are the veterans who served during the official period of the Spanish War in 1898. Also embraced are those who served until July 1, 1902, either in the Boxer Rebellion or in the Philippine Insurrection. Our tabulation shows that 61 percent of the Spanish War veterans—covering this period—served overseas.

There are Members of this honorable body, Senator Martin, of Pennsylvania, Senator Green, of Rhode Island, Senator Neely, of West Virginia, and of those who have recently retired, Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, and Senator Gillette, of Iowa, all of whom were Spanish War veterans, and who have vivid recollections of what was faced by that volnuteer army of 1898.

They were all volunteers; they enlisted for the meager pay of $13 per month. They drilled in heavy blue uniforms, ate hardtack, and food which was supposed to be left from the Civil War. The food was such, the facilities of the camps were such—lack of sanitation, lack of medical supplies, lack of proper food—that sickness became abnormal. It could not be coped with. These men drilled in their blue uniforms with sticks instead of muskets. Disease was rife and the death rate very high. Scarcely any hospital records were kept. The senior Members of the Senate will remember the tales of Montauk Point where sickness became almost unbelievable. It was appalling.

Of that terrible period of the Spanish War, no adequate records were kept, no hospital records available. When the regiments were mustered out, the men were simply glanced at with no physical examination, and they returned to their homes. They had no benefits of the present GI training which we think that Congress can be greatly commended for putting into effect. None of the Spanish War veterans had the advantage of college training—it would have meant much to them. They had no benefit from loans for business purposes; they had no bonuses except in a few States, but in their declining years, the thing which is worse for them is that there is no record of hospitalization, no record of service-connected disability. That is the reason why so few are shown as service connected.

In my own experience in the Philippines my company lost one-half of its men, but men of that company shot and wounded grievously were—and are—carried on the Veterans' Administration rolls as nonservice connected.

The Veterans' Administration—and I say this without criticism—just does not have a tabulation of the living Spanish War veterans who were service connected, nor does it have a complete tabulation of the deceased Spanish War veterans who were service connected. If it had such records, those records would doubtless show that many of the veterans of 1898–1902 would have disabilities directly resulting from armed service. However, the absence of such records is the reason why the vast majority of the Spanish War veterans are receiving the pension rates, and that is why I am appearing before this committee.

We feel that considering the advanced age of Spanish War veterans, their increased death rate—1,367 of our veterans passed away during the 3 months ending December 31 by VA computation—that something must be done immediately about the widows of these veterans. As for the widows, the maximum number has been reached. The rolls fluctuate just a little from month to month now, but the roll will decrease steadily. We think it only just and fair, and we advocate strongly that the dependents of the Spanish War veterans be included in H. R. 7089 as presumptively service connected.

I would like to call attention at this point to a brief colloquy that took place on the floor of the House last July 13, when the Hardy bill, H. R. 7089, was being considered.

The reference is to a question asked by the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA of Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas. Congressman O'HARA is the last surviving veteran of the Spanish-American War serving in the House of Representatives, and, as this committee well knows, Mr. TEAGUE is the chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and was a most important member of the select committee which drafted and approved the Hardy bill.

The colloquy follows:

"Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes. I am not accustomed to criticizing committees. I think this committee has worked hard and has come before us with a bill that has much merit. The members of the committee are outstanding in ability and in knowledge of veteran problems. I doubt, however, that we have had sufficient time to read the bill and to study its provisions. I regret that the bill comes to the floor under a closed rule. It would have been more quieting to our concern in guarding against inadvertencies if the rule had been open. I am speaking especially for the Spanish-American War group. My colleagues will appreciate my position as the last remaining veteran of that war of the 96 or 97 who have served in this body. Among our Spanish-American War veterans, there is some concern. We feel that the House could have quieted that concern if there had been an open rule, and it had been permissible to present an amendment that in substance would have recognized that in the Spanish-American War there were no records kept. Now, I know how difficult it is for younger veterans to appreciate conditions at that time. So that it may be made clear in the record, I have requested this time to ask one who knows, the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas—Mr. TEAGUE—to make comment on that phase.

"Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I would certainly agree with the gentleman that the records kept during the Spanish-American War and during World War I and World War II are altogether different. The records are very poor, when we find any record at all, so far as the Spanish-American War veterans are concerned.

"Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. So that it would be impossible for a Spanish-American War veteran or his widow to prove that the veteran had service-connected injuries?

"Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. That is so in practically every case."

This status has been recognized officially by our Government on two occasions. You Members of the Senate will recall the Economy Act that was passed during 1933. Two years later, the Congress restored the pension payments to Spanish War veterans and their dependents, and when President Roosevelt approved the restoration bill, he issued a statement which called attention to what could be termed a great difference between the services rendered by Spanish War veterans and those rendered in subsequent wars.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the text of the White House statement explaining the reasons which actuated the President in signing the bill restoring these pension rights. It follows exactly:

"The President, in signing today (August 13) H. R. 6895, a bill reenacting laws dealing with pensions granted to veterans and the dependents of veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, made clear the definite distinction between legislation relating to veterans of early wars and the veterans of the World War.

"The Congress on many occasions has recognized that because of the complete absence of any system or policy initiated during or immediately following the Civil War, the Indian Wars, and the Spanish-American War, and because of lack of adequate medical care from the point of view of modern standards, the veterans of these earlier wars could be compensated and taken care of only through some form of pension system.

"In the case of the World War, however, the Congress at the very beginning of the war adopted an entirely new system of care and benefits. This new system applied to all who fought in the World War, extended to them additional compensation if they had dependents, as well as insurance, hospitalization, vocational rehabilitation, and the adjusted service certificate (the bonus).

"The veterans of the Spanish-American War now approaching an average age of 62 years, had none of these advantages except hospitalization in recent years. Their case therefore, cannot be compared to the case of World War veterans. For the same reason the approval of this bill establishes no ground or precedent for pensions for the World War group; theirs is an entirely different case.

"There are some inequalities involved in this legislation but the President recognizes the fact that the Spanish-American veterans were once on the rolls, under prior legislation, that they are approaching advanced age, that their disabilities are increasing.

"The President's action is taken appropriately on the anniversary date of the occupation of Manila by the American forces."

Later, in 1951, the Congress passed the bill known as our outpatient treatment bill, which was vetoed by the Chief Executive. It was passed by both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming vote over the veto. That bill provided that because of lack of hospital records and service-connected records, Spanish War veterans should be presumed and considered as service connected for outpatient treatment purposes. So, we think this is a just measure which will not cost the Government of the United States much for the reason that our ranks are so rapidly thinning.

The veterans of the Spanish War are asking no increase in pension for themselves in this Congress, but the pension of $54.18 which is paid the elderly widows of the Spanish War does not provide a decent living expense. We feel that this amendment would be a just recognition of the incomparable service of these aging veterans and aging widows. Every elderly man and woman realizes the high cost of living and the high cost of medical treatment for the aged. Our people are no exception.

We veterans of the Spanish-American War are inclined to boast that ours was the last war this country has won in which the peace treaty did not give away the benefits obtained. The achievements of the Spanish War veteran added to this great country of ours, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. They made us a world power. Ours was the only war in which this country has been engaged in which returns to this country were far greater than the cost. The Spanish War opened up the markets of Asia and the Far East to the United States, and increased the trade of the Nation enormously. You gentlemen know that the period following our war was commonly referred to as "The golden era."

We feel that it would be but just compensation to that volunteer army of 1898–1902 to adopt our requested amendment to H. R. 7089, which would provide that the death of a veteran shall be conclusively presumed to have resulted from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while so serving.

I might suggest, Mr. Chairman, that a member of the Hardy committee suggested that we present this amendment.

Mrs. TRAZENFELD. As cochairman of the legislative committee for the United Spanish War veterans, may I say that our organization—and I speak for the 80,000 widows that this amendment would affect—concurs completely in the statement rendered by our chairman, Mr. Otjen, and we feel that should this committee in their deliberations find it within their hearts to grant this request, a great injustice of long standing could be corrected, and that much happiness and much good and at very little cost would be accomplished.

Hon. Jesse Wolcott

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose there have been few men in the Congress who have had a broader grasp of American economics than JESSE WOLCOTT. His service on the Banking and Currency Committee has been brilliant. Not only that, JESS has a keen sense of humor that has endeared him to everyone who knows him.

We wish JESS and his wife every success in the years to come. He richly deserves every good to come his way.

Tomorrow's Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article by Lt. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell as told to Ed Hymoff which appeared in the September 1956 issue of Real magazine. The article, entitled "Can You Fly in Tomorrow's Air Force?" follows:

CAN YOU FLY IN TOMORROW'S AIR FORCE?

I recently heard a man who holds a high official position claim, "Since guided missiles are around the corner, there'll soon be no need for an Air Force as we know it today." Statements of this type, if repeated often enough and accepted by large segments of our people, in my opinion, constitute a real threat to the security of the United States.

Anyone who really knows anything about fighting in the air knows the limitations, as well as the capabilities, of weapons of the air. These weapons include aircraft, rockets, guided missiles, or ballistic missiles, and the peculiarly complex systems which convert these airframes into frightful devices of war.

Reduced to simple terms, this means that the backbone of America's first-line fighting force is today, tomorrow, and for a considerable time in the future the manned airplane. Pilots and combat aircrews are here to stay, even should we be successful in the development of reliable and accurate missiles. We don't dare abandon the older proven weapons—combat aircraft—until it's certain beyond a doubt that our missiles are not only reliable and accurate, but also capable of flexibility of operation—vital in sky combat.

Edgar Schmued, vice president in charge of engineering for Northrop Aircraft, of Hawthorne, Calif., cogently sums up our position. "The pilot is not being replaced," Schmued says, "because he is still the finest emergency control system ever designed. Any automatic device can perform only within the limits designed into it. Outside of their prescribed performance, automatic systems are helpless, and it is then that the human brain shows the vast superiority given by its Creator."

To which I can only add a fervent "amen."

Of course, we will eventually have ballistic missiles and guided missiles. But right now we're developing the experimental X–2 rocket-propelled plane. Lt. Col. Pete Everest is flying this job, and he's expected to exceed well over 90,000 feet and hit speeds in excess of 1,650 miles an hour—if he can push through the heat barrier.

Remember, the X–2 is just a rocket-propelled research plane capable of hitting high speed at fantastic altitudes—but only for a few minutes. This is a prototype of the fighter plane of the future. We still have to solve the problems of fuel capacity and range, and we're going to have to build a plane—actually an envelope—that will permit a pilot to live in space for a longer period of time than the few brief minutes he spends there now.

Flying these hopped-up creatures can be extremely hazardous if you're not properly equipped. An average man has less than 2 minutes of useful consciousness at about 30,000 feet. At 50,000 feet, without protection, he would become unconscious in 11 to 17 seconds. The resultant oxygen starvation would cause brain damage that would almost certainly be fatal. At 63,000 feet it would be too horrible to contemplate. The pressure is so negligible that blood at body temperature fizzes and bubbles like a pot of boiling water. Tissue bloats and bursts.

I make these rather gory comments merely to state the problem, and to point out that aviation medicine is doing a superlative job in protecting the flyer of tomorrow. One of the most astounding developments is the so-called man-from-Mars suit, which can provide the external pressure necessary for survival. Aviation medicine is keeping pace in every way with the progress we are making in conquering outer space.

Can you fly in tomorrow's air force? Of course, you can.

Jets will be faster and flying may be a bit more complicated in some areas of instruction and learning, but we won't need superintellects to fly our planes. What we'll need is the all-around American boy; the kind of youngster who is enthusiastic by nature and mentally and physically alert. He's the young fellow—and he might even be you—who has a vast desire for excitement in his blood.

Remember this: There's no more seat-of-the-pants flying except under rare emergency conditions. It's not like the old days of flying fabric-covered, wood-ribbed biplanes—when there were no such things as flight safety aids as we know them today, meteorology stations filing constant reports, radio beacons for navigating, or airports outside every small city. Even when I was flying the B–17 in the Philippines at the start of World War II, I never dreamed of the unbelievable strides we've made since. We're moving fast today and we'll be moving much faster tomorrow. You can bet on that.

Naturally, we constantly try to take as much of the risk out of flying as we can. We don't approach our flight problems as blindly as we formerly had to. Actually, our accident rate has decreased steadily over the past 4 years. Flying is fast becoming an exact and scientific process. Fighters today are making contact, firing at and hitting targets that they never see—entirely by instrument at night or in bad weather and at very high altitudes. These contacts are made with precision and safety. So you can see that in many ways there is less risk in flying today at speed-of-sound-plus and at fantastic altitudes, than there was 20 years ago, when the unsolved problems of inadequate communications, icing, and unreliable equipment took their heavy toll.

That's why we want the right men with us. When the Air Force attains its presently conceived goal of 137 wings of all types, our strength will be a total of 975,000 men, including more than 140,000 officers. Of this number of officers, 50 to 55 percent will be rated flying personnel (pilots and observers). As we convert to modern aircraft, the air crews become smaller because of space limitations. Therefore, each man in the new combat crews will have to do the same job formerly handled by 2 or 3.

The fighting arm of the Air Force ultimately will be composed exclusively of officers. They'll be men who are triple threats—men who can pilot, navigate, bomb, and handle all sorts of additional jobs in the air with accuracy and safety. We'll need flying officers—combat ready—who can handle several jobs, either individually or collec-

tively as a crew. Leading them and supporting them will be combat-experienced command and staff officers—men capable of making hard and right decisions in the air or on the ground. And we'll need the right decisions if we ever go to war.

Let's say you want to become an Air Force pilot. What are your chances? If you meet the physical and mental requirements, your chances are good. But to complete the flying course, you'll have to have an extra something. This ideal-type person—the triple threat, so to speak—we can call the indefinable man.

In general, the indefinable man is young, in his early twenties, in better than average physical condition, with a good head on his shoulders. He should be alert, able-bodied, clean living, with a competitive and aggressive spirit, and the ability to think logically and fast.

Physical stamina is important. Flying in jets produces some strain on the body, especially when making a tight turn at high speeds. Then again, the student pilot has to be able to keep up the training pace from early morning to late at night, studying from books and learning how to fly from practical instruction and experience. To do both, we want men who are wide awake and in peak condition.

Take the men in SAC (Strategic Air Command). They have to be tough physically and alert mentally to accomplish training missions that last, more often than not, more than 24 hours nonstop. There's no place to stretch in a B–47 medium jet bomber and you can't sleep. Every one of the three-man crew is responsible for the ship and for the success of the mission. This takes physical stamina. Mentally, they have to be alert to handle any emergency in a hurry, to quickly work out problems in navigation, engineering, bombardment, and the like.

The Korean war pointed up why pilots have to be tough. There were times when our fighter pilots returned from missions, waited a few minutes for their planes to be refueled and then took off on another mission. This often went on from dawn to dusk. And there were even times when some of our boys didn't make it back, when they were shot up by MIG's and forced to bail out over enemy territory. Those who were lucky enough to make it back—using the escape and evasion tactics which they learned while in training—had to be tough physically to cover miles of rough North Korean terrain.

These are just some of the reasons why we're looking for men who are above the average physically. And mentally, too.

It doesn't take a superman to fly jets. There's nothing that calls for unusual strength. There's nothing that calls for a superintellect. Average intelligence and a willingness to learn can promise success for the student pilot.

Specific physical requirements consist of height between 5 feet 4 inches and 6 feet 4 inches, and weight graded accordingly. After all, we can't put fat men or extremely short or tall men in cockpits filled with vital instruments. A tall man would be too cramped, a fat man too crowded, and a short man unable to reach the instruments and controls. It's as simple as all that.

In addition, we need men with 20–20 eyesight, normal hearing, and healthy to the point of being physically sound and endowed with the use of all their limbs.

There's a standard Air Force physical test, and the man who's just a cut above the average can pass it easily. There's also a standard Air Force mental test. A high-school graduate from the top 25 percent of his class may pass. Those with college training will find it even less difficult.

That is just a thumbnail sketch of the indefinable man. You can't pin him down. We have all types of physical psychological and intelligence tests to point out the man we want. But he is still an unknown quality. I think the best way to sum is up is to say that the indefinable man who will fly in tomorrow's Air Force has all of the physical and mental characteristics I've just mentioned—but he also has that extra something inside, the drive to succeed in training and to keep going in whatever he endeavors to do.

Perhaps you are that indefinable man, the pilot, air crew member or staff officer in tomorrow's Air Force.

In 1946, it took a full year to turn out a rated combat pilot. Today, 10 years later, it takes 16 months. Yesterday, we trained our men in propeller-driven planes and then checked them out in the hottest combat propeller types we had. Today and tomorrow, we'll still be training them in propeller-driven craft. But they'll be checked out finally in the hottest jet planes we'll have at the time.

Let's chart the steps in a fledging pilot's progress. Say that you are part of a class of 100 students entering the primary pilot training program. During this course of training you learn how to fly propeller-driven airplanes and at the same time attend ground school courses that are composed, mainly, of flight theory, airplane engines, radio communications, navigation and jet propulsion systems.

From the primary school, you go to basic training school, at which time you check out in jets. Also at this time, you continue to study ground courses such as meteorology, radar, radio communications and CAA systems and regulations which enable you to fly civil airways. Upon completion of this training in jets, you'll receive your wings. Of the 100 who started in your class, only about 70 will have won their wings. The others will not have made the grade as pilots for various reasons. However, many of them will qualify as navigators, bombardiers and radar officers—all have a firm place in the jet bomber crews of today.

Then the next step is the advanced flying school for 4½ months, during which time you will fly first-line supersonic aircraft. This is the period we use to polish off the skills required of a combat pilot. Total training time from fledgling to rated combat pilot: 16 months.

Nor can we forget men on the ground—the highly trained men who can service planes and equipment and operate our airbases. In order to fill the many technical jobs required for support of flying operations, we provide formal basic technical training to more than 150,000 young airmen each year. Many other airmen who have already completed basic technical training take advanced training courses "on the job" in their tactical units. This is an extension of training given at school and the result of this extra training effort is a more technically skilled individual.

Today's airman is no longer just a man who can roll a neat pack, look sharp in a parade and handle himself in hand-to-hand combat when and if—and there have been many times when airmen have turned foot soldier. He is a trained and experienced technician working in areas such as radio and radar maintenance, operation and maintenance of armament and communication systems and performing those crucial jobs which keep our planes flying. Our airplanes, even the best of them, and bases with the finest facilities, are sitting ducks unless we have these men to operate them. Every man counts—and every technically trained and experienced man counts double.

When these men first come into the Air Force, they are trained in 29 basic skills, followed by additional training to fill 800 different types of technical specialties. Then these young men are sent out to serve in some 2,000 different units throughout the world—from large commands to small detachments. Each week we rotate large groups of men from overseas back stateside. And we have to fill their slots with qualified technicians and supervisors. It's a sizable task.

The Air Force was at a low ebb in strength at the outbreak of the fighting in Korea. Since that time, we have been continuously building toward our end objective of 137 wings. Meanwhile, our worldwide defense commitments continue to increase. There are few spots in the world—outside of Iron Curtain countries—where Air Force personnel are not stationed. We are a global force in constant high gear, ready to contend with any situation. Maintaining this force is a major task.

The great mass of personnel who came into the Air Force during the fighting in Korea did so to satisfy their military obligations under the law and not to make a career of military service. The greater part of this group have long since fulfilled this obligation. There was no compelling reason for them to remain in service, particularly in view of a healthy economic climate on the outside. Last year alone we lost close to 200,000 airmen out of a total strength of slightly more than 800,000. Unless we are able to retain more of these young men, we are faced with a turnover of roughly one-fourth of our people each year.

Numbers alone do not tell the story. The quality of the people we are losing is even more serious than the quantity. Over 80 percent of our losses last year were at the skilled technician level. These people were not only capable of performing the many complex jobs which support our modern weapons system; they also provided the source from which our supervisory personnel must be obtained. One reason we can't keep these highly trained people is the beckoning finger of private industry. They believe they can earn more on the outside doing essentially the same jobs for which they were trained in the Air Force. For officers, the loss picture is not much better. This is our biggest problem.

In terms of hard cash, we estimate it will cost you and me and all the other taxpayers more than $2 billion to replace our manpower losses this year. This is only one small part of the overall headache. The thing that really hurts is the cold fact that every time a combat-ready pilot or skilled technician leaves the service, we lose in terms of our defense potential. We are combat-ready and we have the best damned Air Force in the world. But we're ready because our career people put in long hours working, supervising, and teaching the young airmen and pilot trainees who come and go at too rapid a rate. Let's face it—where we should have master sergeants and technical sergeants crewing our multimillion dollar airplanes, we often find youngsters with 2 or 3 stripes and with but 2 or 3 years' service.

It all boils down to this: the Air Force is in business. In terms of people, we outnumber the largest single industrial employer in the Nation. Our product is the defense of our country. If we go out of business we're licked. If our business is cut down, there's a good chance we'll be ineffective when the chips are down. We have to stay in business because our product and the dividends reaped from it hit directly at the survival of every last American.

My biggest worry is how to overcome our lack of the kind of people we need on board. What do we do? We leave no stone unturned in trying to interest ROTC people in coming with us as flying officers, or high-school students in joining the Air Force and becoming skilled technicians. To keep our people we're doing our best to make an Air Force career attractive.

Every field in our national economic system requires some sacrifice if the individual is to be successful. Inherently the service requires personal sacrifice in some respects if

we are to get our job done. But it provides many life satisfactions, too.

This may sound like a recruiting speech. But you may be the indefinable man who is going to fly in tomorrow's Air Force or the skilled technician who is going to keep our planes flying.

I think what we need most is to get the new picture of Air Force life to the people—to get them to see that servicemen are as much a part of and capable of community life as any other citizen. When the public understands our objectives, problems, and methods, I feel they will accept and cooperate. This would do much to create satisfaction with military life on the part of military personnel.

It's only natural, I suppose, for those in civilian life to lose sight of the role the military plays, particularly in peacetime, although the peacetime role of the United States Air Force is as deadly serious as it is in wartime.

One interesting occurrence in this area is our jet noise problem. This is not just a civil population problem, but one that concerns every airman who works around jet aircraft. Our aviation medicine people are concentrating on countering this problem. But it is getting worse. New jet engines with powerful after-burners generate 150 decibels, a fury of sound equivalent to 1.5 billion people all talking at once. Naturally, it's the ground crew who suffers the most—and the civilians nearby. We hear from civilians, too, don't think we don't. In 1954, an indignant woman called headquarters of the National Air Force, Dayton, Ohio.

"This is dreadful," she complained. "Airplanes are making so much noise I can't hear myself talk."

"Are they enemy planes?" the officer at our end of the phone inquired.

"Certainly not," she replied, "they're American."

"Then thank God, madam," the officer answered, and hung up.

Truthfully, it's not quite that bad. Ground crews wear ear plugs and take regular audiometer tests. There are also other developments still in the research stage which promise to reduce the noise element and make the ground crew's job that much more comfortable.

Airplanes and engines may be noisier today, but they are much more reliable than the vintage models of a bygone day, and they're easier to maintain. Our big problem is electronic maintenance. We are so short of experienced technicians that we have to depend upon the depot and the factory to take care of serious maintenance problems. In our flying crews we're faced with too many pilots who want to return to civilian life.

The carrying out of the Air Force's mission and, in fact, the very future of this country's freedom, may depend upon those dedicated and loyal aircrews and ground crews who recognize the immensity of the job they have to do and rise to it. We can't expect the old hands to stay on indefinitely. Tomorrow's Air Force is for a younger generation. And right now we're beginning to place some of our younger men in crews to fill jobs held by battle-tested World War II veterans. For all practical purposes, these older crews have been defending the Nation and our allies against possible enemy attack. They are men now in their middle and late thirties—steady, solid, dedicated, and in excellent control of their emotions under stress. We're trying to replace them with the same kind of men.

Let's face it. We need people, trained people, to man, operate, and maintain our aircraft and equipment—equipment that is more complicated than ever and becoming more so every day whether it functions with a stick, a pushbutton, or an electronic control. We intend to get the people we need.

Now, did somebody say something about guided missiles taking the place of a manned Air Force?

The Hoover Commission Recommendation for Improving Government Accounting and Procedural Methods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 11, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this House will soon be accorded the opportunity to vote upon the bills designed to cary out what I consider to be one of the most important and valuable recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission to revise our governmental budgeting and accounting procedures.

There are many measures that have been introduced by various Members, and either the House bill, H. R. 11526, or the Senate bill, S. 3897, appear to incorporate most of the provisions suggested by all other measures.

Anyone who has served in this body for even one term realizes the tremendous difficulty of the individual Member in trying to keep track of all the provisions of the complicated appropriation bills that are presented to us from the different departments of the executive branch. We also appreciate the overzealousness of these various departments to ask for and accept far greater appropriations than they are able to use in 1 fiscal year. These carryovers of departmental appropriations result in creating confusion in the minds of legislators and prevent sound legislative action on these appropriation measures.

This legislation is designed to improve financial administration in the executive branch, first, and secondly, substantially strengthen congressional control over the financial affairs of the Federal Government. It would reform and improve our accounting system by placing our Government accounting and budgeting procedure on a more realistic and orderly basis.

The Congress, by enactment of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, took a significant step forward in providing for the use of program or performance budgets by the executive agencies of the Government. The objective of that law, which I was most happy to support at the time, was to have the Government departments show how they intended to spend their money on the basis of the major programs that the agencies carry out. To make such a budget effective and meaningful, Government accounts must and should be kept on a cost basis and not merely on an obligations basis. The agencies should be able to tell the Congress what a given program has cost in a given fiscal year and not merely how much of the appropriated funds have been spent in a given fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress is to exercise any constitutional degree of effective control over Federal Government spending, it must have clear and concise information on which the exercise an intelligent control action. Effective control over the Government purse is one of the most important devices available to the Congress for protecting the American taxpayer from waste, extravagance, and bankruptcy.

I sincerely hope that we will soon be permitted to enact into law this most important Hoover Commission recommendation to improve the budgeting and accounting methods of the Federal Government. It is reliably estimated that the adoption of these modern accounting methods will result in a saving to the American taxpayer of approximately $4 billion.

Resolution Protesting Action Taken by Communist Government in Poland Against Poznan Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a resolution adopted by the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware protesting the action taken by the Communist Government in Poland against the workers in Poznan on June 28, 1956:

RESOLUTION

We Americans of Polish descent under the auspices of the Delaware division of the Polish American Congress and of the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in the State of Delaware, gathered at the Modjeska Hall in Wilmington, Del., this 23d day of July in the year of our Lord, 1956, in a manifestation commemorating the heroic uprising of Polish martyrs for bread and freedom, which took place in Poznan, Poland, on June 28, 1956, adopt the following resolution:

Whereas deeply shocked with the events which took place in Poznan, we pay our homage to the victims of the Communist terror and express our deepest sympathy to their families; and

Whereas the enslaved people of Poland, risking not only certain death but also bloody reprisals against their families, their women and children and distant relatives to let the outside world know that they hate the Communist tyrants, who incidentally, enslaved Poland with the aid of America and England; and

Whereas once again in the history of Poland, Polish blood has been spilled on the Freedom Square in Poznan demonstrating against the Communist dictatorship demanding bread and freedom; and

Whereas this revolt shows the unbearable situation created by the Communist oppressors, economic exploitation as well as miserable living conditions under the Soviet colonial rule in Poland; and

Whereas the Poznan uprising proves that the Moscow decreed New Look is a sham or myth and the Russian line of peace and friendship is a fraud. The Communists were never, are not today and never will be in the future friends of freedom; and

Whereas the Communist system forcibly imposed in Poland is the result of the Yalta Agreement which sanctioned the division of the world and delivered Poland to Soviet Russia. Since the President of the United States with Stalin became a party to that agreement, we share the responsibility for the present state of affairs in Poland; and

Whereas 3 weeks since the Reds turned rifles, machineguns, and tanks on men, women, and children who pleaded for freedom and bread, and shot them down in the street of Poznan, Poland; and

Whereas 3 weeks and not a single word from the President of the United States in behalf of Polish freedom or a statement that the hopes and prayers of America were with the people behind the Iron Curtain who were now beginning an open revolt against the same tyranny which America had been struggling against for years; and

Whereas this dilemna of the West can and must be converted into a dilemna of the Communist empire. If ever an opportunity existed for such a conversion, with prospects for the defeat of imperialistic Russian communism and the dissolution of its empire, it is now: Be it

Resolved, The free world should not sit on the sidelines while the unctuously penitent men in Kremlin proceed to repeat Stalin's crimes of 1945 and apply the jackboot to Poland once again; be it further

Resolved, We call upon the United States to demand fair trials for those who dared to fight in defense of the freedom from want; be it further

Resolved, We call upon our State Department to demand that competent international observers be present at all forthcoming Poznan trials; be it further

Resolved, That diplomatic measures should be undertaken by the Department of State promptly to bring about in Poland and in other captive countries free elections, with universal secret ballot, held in presence of diplomatic representatives of the victorious powers and of members of the press of all nations, restoring freedom and independence to Poland and to other captive countries; be it further

Resolved, We call upon our Nation to recognize that the bitter struggle for freedom cannot cease until the whole world is free. Poznan has shocked us. The violence of Poznan is an angry outburst against a world that forgets. Let us resolve that their sacrifice shall not be in vain. American silence concerning the fate of Poland will only encourage further Communist aggression: be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Delaware.

ADAM J. ROSIAK,
Chairman of the Meeting.

Attest:

VINCENT J. KOWALEWSKI,
Secretary.

Hon. John Phillips

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress in 1943 with JOHN PHILLIPS, and that in itself is an association which long endures; it is a certain something we have in common which breeds affection.

His service has been brilliant. With his charm of manner, his inquiring mind, his ability to express himself, and his devastating logic, he has contributed much to the cause of orderly Government, and the country is better for his service.

JOHN PHILLIPS will be sorely missed by the host of friends he has made, and he will never be forgotten by those who knew him. I join with his colleagues in best wishes for the days to come, and I hope he and his gracious wife will enjoy years of happiness in the knowledge of a lifetime of fruitful service.

Background Information on United States Citizens Released From UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the following statement containing background information on the seven cases of United States citizens released from UNESCO:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE SEVEN CASES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS RELEASED FROM THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

During the course of 1954 and first half of 1955, seven United States nationals employed by UNESCO were separated from the Organization. In all seven instances the employees had failed to appear for a hearing by the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board of the United States Civil Service Commission. The Board subsequently advised UNESCO that on the record before it, there was reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of these people to the United States. Four of the employees had fixed-term contracts expiring at the end of 1954 or the beginning of 1955. The Director General allowed these contracts to expire. Three of the employees had indeterminate appointments. In these latter cases the Director General found that on the basis of all the facts, they did not possess the degree of integrity required of an international civil servant. Their appointments were therefore terminated.

Owing to the immunity of international organizations from suit, international employees cannot appeal to national courts when they consider that their contracts of employment have been breached. As a consequence, special tribunals have been set up to hear their cases. The specialized agencies of the U. N. located in Europe, as a matter of economy and convenience, use the long-established Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization.

Exercising the rights under their terms of appointment, all seven United States nationals separated from UNESCO employment appealed their cases to the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization and asked to be reinstated or awarded damages. In all seven cases, the Administrative Tribunal of the International Labor Organization held that the Director General had acted illegally in separating the employees. If reinstatement was not possible, damages amounting to approximately $74,000 were ordered to be paid.

The Director General refused to reinstate any of the employees. In addition, he urged the Executive Board of UNESCO to challenge the ruling of the International Labor Organization tribunal in the four fixed-term contract cases. (In order to gain more support for this course of action, he did agree, however, on the grounds of hardship, to advance these four persons one-third of the amount allowed by the ILO Court, pending the final outcome of the challenge, provided they undertook to make full refund should the challenge prove successful.) The Executive Board of UNESCO, with strong United States support, agreed with the Director General that there were grounds warranting a challenge of the ruling of the tribunal by asking the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion in accordance with the provisions of the tribunal statute. The final outcome in these four cases will not be known until the issues involved have been reviewed by the International Court of Justice. The past few months have been devoted by UNESCO to a careful and thorough preparation of briefs, which, along with those of the former employees, are being submitted for the actual oral hearings scheduled to take place in the near future.

In the three cases involving termination of indeterminate contracts, however, the Director General considered that on the record made before the tribunal, the grounds provided in the tribunal statute for an appeal to the International Court of Justice did not make it possible to challenge the tribunal ruling. While the United States member of the UNESCO Executive Board disagreed, the remainder of the Board considered that there were not adequate grounds on which to take the tribunal ruling to the International Court. Therefore, awards amounting to approximately $23,000 were authorized to be paid out of past savings of the Organization, since the Director General did not intend to reemploy the individuals.

Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker, Jr.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, Indiana sent five new Republican Congressman, including myself, to the 82d Congress. Now the first of that group, the Honorable SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, JR., is retiring from congressional service and will not seek reelection.

It has been a great pleasure and privilege for me to serve with my good friend and fellow Hoosier during the 82d, 83d, and 84th Congresses. He has earned the respect of all of us, and the deep affection of those of us who have had an opportunity to know him well. However long I may serve in this body I am sure I will know few who will equal his earnest attention to congressional business, his fervent desire to do the right thing, and his energetic and faithful service to his constituents.

Although we are both Hoosiers and Republicans, we have frequently found ourselves on different sides of a legislative issue. In such cases I have always reexamined my own position, for I know that he does not form an opinion lightly and that he strives as earnestly as any of us to make the right decision.

With the retirement of SHEPARD CRUMPACKER the Nation has lost a superior legislator. However, we know that SHEP's interest and activities for the best in local, State, and National Government

will continue. We also know that the legal profession will be enriched by his return to his chosen profession.

I want to join with his many other friends on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Hill in wishing him the very best of luck in the years to come.

Housing Bill of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11742) to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed most unfortunate that in the hurry and confusion of adjournment rush, it appears now we are going to be negligent in meeting our legislative obligation to continue a Federal housing program that has proved most beneficial to the national welfare for a period of 20 years.

I very deeply regret that the manner in which this legislation is being presented to us today leaves no choice to those conscientious legislators who are vitally interested in trying to help enact a sound and adequate program to enable the multitudinous members of our low- and middle-income groups and the elderly to live in decent homes in accord with our Christian traditions. We have here unfortunately to choose between the most meager housing program that opponents of this objective can devise or no housing program at all.

Under these conditions, of course, I and a great many other Members will vote for the only thing we can, while pledging in our hearts and minds to work unceasingly or. for the enactment of the more complete and expanded housing program still vitally needed in this country.

We all realize that the basic problem of providing public housing cannot be severed from the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal programs. The 1950 census showed there were 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this Nation. Only a full public housing program coupled with a less restricted slum clearance and urban renewal program can eliminate this situation.

If we do not act on this measure before us, the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for veterans and home repair will die next September. If we do not accept this bill, the very modest authorized construction of 35,000 public housing units for the next 2 years will perish, along with the slum clearance and urban renewal program that goes hand in hand with it. The college housing program that has been advocated by our leading educators and that has proved so valuable is continued in this watered-down housing bill, as well as authorization for hospital construction that is in urgent need.

The token housing extension provisions of this bill will at least serve to keep the fundamental program alive. I urge you, then, to vote for it for that reason alone, while at the same time we dedicate ourselves to the expansion and improvement of it at the first opportunity in the future. Let us consciously realize that the family is the basic unit of our national life and the greatest encouragement for good family life and good citizenship is living in a decent home with healthful surroundings.

White House Air Expert Sees Crash Control Nearing Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK. T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the need for a Commission on Air Safety to coordinate all research and activity in this field was ably demonstrated in a talk by James L. Anast, technical adviser to the President's special consultant on aviation.

Mr. Anast is quoted as stating that 75 committees are now at work in this field, none having authority to make or enforce decisions.

My bill to establish a Commission on Air Safety would put an end to the confused situation thus pictured by the White House aid. It would bring order out of chaos. It would give us the opportunity to settle the disputes and differences that now hinder development of sound safety procedures.

The Washington Post coverage of Mr. Anast's remarks reads as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1956]

WHITE HOUSE AIR EXPERT SEES CRASH CONTROL NEARING CHAOS

(By Jerry Landauer)

An administration aide said yesterday the Nation must expect an increase in the number of midair collisons like the one over the Grand Canyon that took 128 lives on June 30.

He declared air safety control was "on the brink of chaos" and that "we are not making any progress."

The speaker was James L. Anast, technical adviser to Edward P. Curtis, who is special assistant to the President on aviation facilities planning. Anast spoke at an Optimist Club luncheon in the Mayflower Hotel.

"I wouldn't be surprised if accidents occur more frequently in the future," Anast said.

The speaker pointed to conflict of interest among the military, the airlines, and private pilots as the major reason for the poor state of air safety.

At last count, he said, 75 Government committees were at work on the problem. Because none has authority to make decisions, he said, problems are passed from one group to another, with no end in sight.

As an example, Anast cited the Air Force TACAN (Tactical Air Navigations System). This has been under development as an alternate to the air-control system used by the Civil Aeronautics Administration since 1948, the speaker stated, but no decision has been reached on adopting it. "It's still in committee," Anast noted wryly.

However, the top-level Air Coordinating Committee is scheduled to reach a decision on TACAN by August 20.

CAA's present control system consists essentially of tracing the progress of aircraft along 167,000 square miles of controlled airspace. Not all established routes lie within controlled space.

Anast commented that the CAA system was designed 20 years ago to handle 130-mile-an-hour craft. Only a combination of luck and ingenuity permit it to function at all, he said.

Charles J. Lowen, CAA administrator, when questioned yesterday, took a different view on the outlook for air safety and control.

He said he was counting heavily on the radar eyes that the CAA proposes to install all over the country. This would permit radar tracking and thus positive control over all planes that fly higher than 15,000 feet, where most collisions occur.

Lowen noted that Congress had been asked for a $108 million first installment on the 5-year $246 million airway-modernization program. If Congress grants the money, he said, installation of the program can be telescoped into 3 years.

Statement on the Area Vocational Technical School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me on the area vocational technical school bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My desire to cosponsor this bill stems from the experience and firsthand information about the need for an adequate supply of skilled workers when I was governor of Minnesota. The permissive legislation for area vocational technical schools in Minnesota was passed and approved while I was governor.

A study by the State commission on vocational and higher education, published in 1953, shows very clearly that we are falling short of trained workers for just the normal replacement of retiring personnel.

Although we have eight area vocational schools in Minnesota, we have waiting lists for enrollment in many of our trade classes, both in public and private vocational schools.

For example, Dunwoody Industrial School in Minneapolis has received applications for enrollment from 1,200 persons for the school year 1956–57. The facilities will accommodate only 400. This same situation is occurring in public area vocational schools. We are unable to supply the demand for skilled technicians needed for the new plant of Remington Rand and International Business Machines, who are now constructing new plants in Minnesota.

This bill, I am sure, would give needed impetus to the specialized training that is needed not only in Minnesota but throughout the country, and in turn would be a step forward in training technicians needed in this age of atomic energy and automation.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of my letter dated July 26, 1956, to Mr. George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, and Mr. Burger's reply, dated July 27, 1956.

There being no objection, the letter and reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business,
Washington Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: As you are aware, I have always shown a deep interest in the problems of small business. I first met you, I believe, about 10 years ago in my capacity as a member of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee which was considering a bill to prohibit tire manufacturers from owning and operating retail stores. The bill had been pending before Congress for several years.

I supported this bill and it was I who made the motion that it be reported out of the committee favorably. This was not done at that time though it was subsequently reported.

I co-sponsored legislation, sought by the independent bankers of the Nation, commonly known as the Bank Holding Act which is now law. It was largely the result of my activity that the Senate, on July 1, 1955, made a continuing committee of the Senate Small Business Committee which is ready at all times to consider small-business problems. Also, I was active in the establishment of an independent agency in the Government, known as the Small Business Administration to give aid to small businesses.

In view of this, I would appreciate your letting me know what further action Congress should take. You may rest assured that I will give close attention to whatever recommendations you may have.

Sincerely,

HOMER E. CAPEHART.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter of the 26th expressing your desire to get our opinion on further actions that can be taken by the Congress as an aid to small business of this Nation, in addition to those which you mentioned specifically in your letter to me.

Senator, we value this request very highly as being of considerable importance because of your seniority in the Senate, and because of our previous knowledge of your interest in the problems of small business. I am glad to have the opportunity to give you our overall opinions, which I know are the opinions of the membership of the National Federation of Independent Business, all independent business and professional men, and all voting members.

I believe the total membership will disclose the federation to be the largest business organization of its kind in the Nation, numbering approximately 102,000 members.

Any position we take is on direct nationwide instruction of our members, and no officer or group of officers can speak or act officially for the federation until they receive the instructions from the membership.

We were vitally interested in the action of the President in setting up a special Cabinet Committee to study the problems of small business. This gave me a splendid opportunity to confer with the Chairman of that Committee, Dr. Arthur Burns, and some of his staff at the White House Annex on July 5, 1956.

I think it's necessary, Senator, to give you the substance of the views we expressed at that important conference, and I believe the subject matters discussed at that time with Chairman Burns and his staff, as outlined below, will give you the answer to your request on what further action can be taken by the Congress as a help to small business.

ANTITRUST

We know from practical experience of owning and operating an independent business establishment that the key to success or failure of a small-business enterprise, whether at the production or distribution level, rests largely in the enforcement of these major laws to protect the free-enterprise system.

We believe there is need for strengthening amendments to these laws, such as is proposed in the present Congress, which will curb deliberate and continual violations of antitrust laws. We find that fines are no deterrent.

It doesn't make much difference how efficient small business may be, or how well financed they may be. If these laws are ignored, or there is weakness in the enforcement, it then means certain destruction to small business of this Nation.

As a help, also, in this direction, the local United States Government attorneys should be utilized in detecting violations at the local level.

To bring about impartial, sincere, and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws, it is our belief that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice should receive increased appropriations, earmarked for antitrust enforcement. Through this competent personnel would be attracted, which would result in the Department continuously being staffed with well-informed personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

The procedure in the Federal Trade Commission should be reviewed, and the agency should confine itself to major economic cases or questions before the Commission so that relief could be secured at the local level for small business through the free-enterprise system. This agency, too, should receive increased appropriations which would attract competent personnel having full knowledge of our economic situation.

CONGRESSIONAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEES

During their existence these past 15 years, they have proved invaluable to the future welfare of small business. It can be said without fear of contradiction that through the creation of these committees by the Congress many of the Government agencies, for the first time, took the proper steps in creating departments within the agencies on small-business problems.

We believe these committees should be strengthened by giving them full standing committee status, with full legislative authority.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

We have closely observed the operation of this agency. It has made progress in aiding small business. It can make greater progress providing the agency is made a permanent agency of the Government, and the full control rests in the hands of the Administrator, subject to review by the Congress.

It is our belief that the agency should exercise its right in going in and taking prime contracts and subletting them to small-business institutions. We make this recommendation in view of the fact the following report appeared in the Senate Small Business Committee newsletter of June 30, 1956:

"Small business' share of defense contracts dropped to new low point in 9-month period ending March 30. Report released by Department of Defense shows small business has received only 19.7 percent of the dollars spent by Defense thus far in fiscal 1956. In fiscal 1955 small business got 21.5 percent of the dollar value of all prime contracts awarded to business firms for work in the United States. In fiscal 1954 the small business share was 25.3 percent."

TAXES

Some definite recommendation should be made by the committee that immediate steps be taken by the Congress in enacting legislation which will permit small business to set up necessary reserves so that they may be able to have funds available to take care of their business requirements during normal or lull periods in our economy.

Such legislation has already been introduced in the present Congress and this could be used as a pattern in bringing about this due recognition for tax relief for small business.

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

It is our belief that proper steps should be taken for the Government to cease its operations in those fields where it works a tremendous disadvantage to small business.

We believe that the armed services should carefully scrutinize the operations of the Government ships stores and post exchanges, and determine whether under present mass distribution of products such branches of the Government, during peacetime are a necessary adjunct of the Government.

TARIFFS

It is well to realize that reciprocal trade with other nations must continue, but this should be carefully scrutinized as to each and every arrangement so that it doesn't work a hardship on our domestic economy.

Many large corporations in the Nation are operated on an international basis so they gain no matter what way the regulation is put into effect, but, on the other hand, reciprocal trade might result in destruction, or an unfair competitive condition for all types of businesses in our Nation's economy, other than the international corporations.

GOVERNMENT FORMS

We realize that, in some instances, the numerous forms now required by Government law for businesses of all descriptions to complete sometimes give invaluable information to the Government, but at the same time recognition must be given to the fact that, in many instances, small business establishments are unable to fulfill the requirements of completing such a maze of forms. It requires outside help, which adds greater expense to the small business operation, or places an undue hardship on the owner of a small business establishment should he attempt to complete the forms himself.

LABOR

On behalf of our members we have repeatedly urged, in our appearances before the platform committees of both political parties, in 1948 and 1952, that labor be brought in under the full provisions of the antitrust laws. This must not be misunderstood as being antagonistic to organized labor because such is not the case, but we do believe, with the increasing concentration in labor leadership, it is necessary today that they be brought in under the antitrust laws,

which, in itself, could even be a help to the constructively organized labor movement.

On this subject matter, we also think that the Wage and Hour Law Division of the Department of Labor could stand some reviewing in its enforcement of the wage-and-hour law as it applies to small business.

We live with this situation daily in our contacts with our nationwide membership. Small business is not asking for any preferential treatment, but we do believe there is necessity for fair and equal administration of the labor laws.

At the conclusion of my conference with the President's Cabinet Committee Chairmain and his staff, I advised them that these were the major subjects for consideration during the conference, and that we trust appropriate action will be taken by that committee in reporting out recommendations along the lines of the above outlined subjects.

Because of the importance of this communication, Senator, it is my hope that you will make the contents of this letter a matter of public information through insertion in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Such action will be invaluable to the overall future interests of small business of this Nation.

With very high regards,

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

Now the Japanese Join the Game of Sock the Yankee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK. T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the infamy of the international agreements under which our servicemen are left to the jurisdiction of foreign nations has attracted the attention of the Saturday Evening Post. I extend in the RECORD an excellent editorial on the subject appearing in the current issue of that magazine.

It is gratifying to add the Saturday Evening Post to the growing list of responsible and influential publications and organizations who are disturbed by the Status of Forces Agreement and similar international agreements.

NOW THE JAPANESE JOIN THE GAME OF SOCK THE YANKEE

The Japanese seem to have joined the exciting international game of free shot at Uncle Sam. At any rate, the Fukuoka district court has ruled that Capt. Lincoln MacKay transgressed Japanese law by dismissing a group of civilian employees on the ground that they were Communists. The captain was sued for damages. The employees declared that they were merely labor-union members, but the court's reason for finding against Captain MacKay was based on more interesting grounds.

As is well known by now, our administrative agreement with Japan, like the Status of Forces Treaties with most other countries in which American troops are stationed, provides that members of the United States Armed Forces shall be subject to trial by Japanese courts for offenses against Japanese law. However, the United States has not conceded that Japan has jurisdiction in civil suits against members of its Armed Forces. This would appear to let Captain MacKay out, but the Fukuoka court found against him on what might be described as a Gilbert-and-Sullivan point of law—namely, that running an officers' club was not a legitimate official function of the American Armed Forces. Therefore the captain was judged liable to suit and his goods and chattels subject to confiscation. The guessing in Japan is that the judgment is not likely to be enforced, since it appears to be in the nature of a needling operation.

An extra piece of needling of Uncle Sam is included in Judge Kiyoshi Kamagawa's opinion. "An armed force constitutes the fighting power of a country and is a symbol of its dignity," opines Judge Kamagawa. "Consequently it is a well-established rule of international law that an armed force stationed in a foreign country in accordance with a treaty is not subject to civil or criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state." Although this well-established rule of international law was enunciated by our own Chief Justice Marshall in 1811, those who advocate surrendering our soldiers for trial by foreign nations, including the defeated enemy, deny that there ever was such a rule of international law. With a sly oriental shrug, Judge Kamagawa hints that, were Japan in our place, she would not compromise the dignity of her armed forces by permitting foreign courts to try her men at arms.

Although Japan's right to try American soldiers rests only on an administrative agreement, instead of a treaty, as with NATO members, the Japanese have exercised this prerogative oftener than has any other country. Face, it's wonderful.

Hon. Clifford R. Hope

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime I have met a great number of different men under varying conditions and circumstances, but I have never known anyone more modest and retiring than the gentleman from Kansas, CLIFFORD HOPE. Quiet in his disposition, always of an even temper, sincere and simple in his attitude, and consecrated in his service to our country, he will never be forgotten by those who know him.

CLIFF HOPE is recognized in Government as an authority on agriculture, and his views are much sought after and highly respected. Never a demagog, he won people to him by his friendly attitude, his quiet persuasion, and his logical argument. His loss to the cause of good government is very great but we can appreciate his desire for rest after the many years he has devoted to the best interests of our country. Congress is better for having had him as a Member, and I feel sure we all agree to that fact.

It is hard to think of CLIFF HOPE in retirement, and I venture the thought that he will be called on from time to time for his advice and counsel. Can anyone imagine a man better equipped to be the Secretary of Agriculture in any administration?

Whatever the future may have in store for CLIFF HOPE, I join with his host of friends in wishing him good health, happiness, and contentment.

Social Security Amendments, 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7225) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, for the past 10 years I have repeatedly and emphatically declared in this House my conscientious judgment that the enactment of and continuing improvement in our social-security system is the greatest bulwark that can be legislatively erected against the danger of domestic inroads upon our people from subtle Communist propaganda and criticism of our so-called capitalist society.

It is, therefore, with the deepest earnestness I express the hope that this conference report will be adopted unanimously. In my opinion, such action will represent the most historic and far-reaching improvements yet made in the social-security system that was first enacted in 1935.

The bill and conference report lowering the age at which women become eligible for benefits, providing disability insurance at age 50, expanding coverage to thousands of individuals not now within the system, and increasing the Federal old-age assistance payments is a major step forward in providing the people of this Nation with a truly adequate and comprehensive social-security program.

I am particularly gratified that our older citizens are being extended an additional measure, which could still be expanded, of assistance. The problem of reasonably helping our older people is one of the most challenging facing the country today. Since 1900, the number of persons over 65 has quadrupled, while the total population has only doubled. By 1975, there will be more than 20 million Americans 65 and over; there are over 14 million today. The average income for a man and his wife over 65 now is only $1,500. Just think of it for a minute, these millions of our older folks trying to live on such pathetically small incomes in these days of high living costs. At least we are beginning to deal with that deplorable situation, and I trust we will continue to give it even greater sympathetic consideration in our further actions.

Allowing disabled persons to obtain benefits at the age of 50 is a genuinely

Christian and humane provision of this new legislation. Indeed, we may well question the justice of setting this arbitrary figure of disability at 50. It is quite obvious that disabled persons of whatever age need and should morally be granted social-security coverage. I look forward to the day when we will realistically realize that age is not a just factor in considering the needs of a disabled person. At whatever age such tragedy occurs, the individual and family members are plagued with expenses beyond normal living for medical care, medicine, correctional appliances, nursing care, and so on. Anyone who has experienced any temporary family sickness at all realizes the tremendous financial burden that accompanies sickness and disability these days.

Let us further appreciate that in setting up this program it is not in any sense an imposition on the Public Treasury or our taxpayers. The additional cost of taking care of these disabled persons is to be met out of an additional one-fourth of 1 percent payroll tax to be paid by the workers themselves and a like amount to be paid by the insured workers' employers, the compiled amount to be earmarked and reserved to pay disability benefits. This process removes any possibility of depleting the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, another outstanding feature of improvement in this current legislation is the lowering of age limit at which women can become entitled to benefits. I refer, of course, to the provision to lower to 62 the retirement age for workingwomen, wives and dependent mothers. Widows and surviving dependent mothers will be given full benefits at age 62. Workingwomen and wives would be given reduced benefits if they began to draw them between ages 62 and 65, in accord with a well-defined formula. This is, indeed, a definite improvement in our long-neglected consideration of American women under this system. It still leaves an obvious inequity by excluding other groups of women from the same benefits.

We all know and experience proves that after the age of 50, or even before, in our modern industrial life, women who lose their jobs or are otherwise unemployed find it extremely difficult to get new positions, far more than men under the same circumstances. Women, therefore, are frequently forced into retirement much earlier than men and therefore need the benefits earlier. These are hard facts which must be dealt with sooner or later, but at least we are taking a step now in the right direction; I hope that we will continue this present promise of progress in this field.

There are, Mr. Speaker, many more sound and beneficial provisions in this bill, such as the extended coverage to certain farmers, ministers, agricultural workers, and self-employed individuals, including lawyers and dentists. All of these provisions have been carefully explained to the House and thoroughly justified. There is no need of repeating them here.

Mr. Speaker, these current improvements in our social-security system, as spelled out in this legislation, are in entire accord with our Christian principles and traditions. They are within the capacity of this blessed and bountiful Nation to assume. We have been extremely anxious these last 10 years and extremely generous in providing billions of dollars to aid and assist friendly peoples, and even some enemies, all over the world. Some of those expenditures were and are undoubtedly wise in our self-interest, but the wisdom and practicality of certain others becomes even more and more doubtful.

To those who question our own ability to reasonably participate in a sound social-security system at the Federal level, I suggest they take a look at the staggering and astounding amounts of money that we have spent abroad. I ask them, in all sincerity, what will it profit us to spend abroad if we neglect to the point of discouragement and demoralization the welfare of our own people? I would remind them that the primary duty of this National Legislature is concern for the people of the United States.

This social-security measure is truly in accord with the exhortation of the President to legislate for the good of all Americans, and I now urge its unanimous adoption without further delay.

Hon. John Phillips

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from California in paying tribute to JOHN PHILLIPS. Mr. PHILLIPS and I came to this House at the same time almost 14 years ago. One always feels a special kinship for the people of one's own class, so to speak.

JOHN PHILLIPS is an extraordinarily industrious person, with a capacity for infinite pain in analyzing facts and figures. He is a hard-headed and a level-headed man who looks at the fine print as well as the big print. He has worked steadily and courageously in the best interest of our country as a whole in the complicated field of appropriations. At the same time, he is always kindly, courteous, and considerate.

All of us who have known and worked with JOHN PHILLIPS have experienced ever-increasing regard, respect, and admiration for him. We are sorry to see him retiring, voluntarily, because I am sure he could have stayed here as long as he wanted to, if he had been willing to run.

Mr. Speaker, I extend to Mrs. Phillips and JOHN my warm good wishes and trust that in their retirement they will have the best of all goods things.

Seizure of Suez Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the action of dictator Nasser in seizing the Suez Canal is another example of our ridiculous policy of buying friends with money. If any nation should be grateful to America, that nation is Egypt. When Rommel was knocking at the gates of Cairo with his Nazi and fascist legions, it was America and Britain who came to her rescue. Since the war, the United States has poured millions into Egypt in the form of economic and military aid. Now, because we did not advance the money to build the Aswan Dam on her terms, Dictator Nasser is ready to join up with Russia and possibly start another world war. If the United States had not sent her a single dollar, I believe she would be much more friendly to us today. The same will eventually be true of the whole free world. One by one they will kick us in the teeth when they find out that our money is running out.

Korea should be an example to our policymakers. How many friends came to our aid in Korea? The whole effort was negligible outside of the United States and South Korea. Mr. Speaker, with our billions and billions, we have only bought hatred, distrust, envy, and jealousy. We have helped others at the expense of our own solvency and national security.

There are many ill fed and ill clothed people throughout the world. We as a nation of surplus commodities can and should help these people but this should be done through the Salvation Army, Red Cross, church groups, and international relief organizations. These organizations are free of politics and are trained and equipped to administer aid directly. The people receiving this aid would know that it was not politically inspired and was not sent as a selfish means of helping America but sent through brotherly love and from the heart of our people.

In opposing foreign aid, I have always urged that we adopt an alternative plan, spend our money on a giant air force, guided missile program, research and development. If we had done this the last 10 years, we would have friends in every section of the world. We would be strong and powerful and nations throughout the world would be anxious to be our allies. Yet we have followed this policy of buying friends and we have failed. We have failed at the expense of our own security. The Russians are turning out more technicians than we are, which is the key to the cold war. It is not too late yet to divert our money to science, engineering, training for technicians, guided missiles, and overwhelming airpower. If we lose the battle of research and development, we will lose the war. By pouring out our money

to other nations, we are contributing to their eventual downfall by contributing to our own weakness. The only protection the free world has is a strong America developing annually superior weapons and superior technicians to any other nation. If we scatter these resources all over the world, we will weaken ourselves and weaken the free world.

Mr. Speaker, let us at the next session of the Congress abandon this policy of spending and appeasement, and initiate a strong offensive policy that will win the respect and admiration of the whole world.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK. T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as the elected Representative of Ohio's 16th Congressional District, it is my duty once again to report to the people of Stark, Tuscarawas, and Wayne Counties on my activities in their behalf and in behalf of good government. With the close of another session of Congress, I want to thank the thousands of citizens who have sent me their views on the many important issues Congress has considered. Government is everybody's business and our system of government works best when every citizen takes an active interest in its operations, voting in each election and expressing his opinions to his representatives for their guidance and the guidance of the Republic. Sixteenth District citizens have demonstrated that they appreciate these facts.

This report calls attention to the complexity of our district as it is reflected in the work of the Congressman. We have the richest agricultural county in Ohio, the largest concentration of clay industries in America, one of the Nation's most important centers of diversified industry, splendid coal resources, one of the world's outstanding watershed conservation projects, and many other interests that bring us into daily contact with the operations of the Federal Government. Almost every Federal activity has an effect on our progress and prosperity and must be of interest to the 16th District Representative.

AGRICULTURE

Dairying is a primary factor in our farm income and therefore in the income of all 16th District residents. During the past 2 years I have worked with dairymen, their organizations and the Department of Agriculture to make adjustments in price formulas that have added some $3,500,000 to the income of area farmers. The latest such adjustment eliminated the seasonal reduction in the marketing order on a statewide basis, meaning $10 million to $14 million additional income this year for Ohio dairymen.

These accomplishments were of importance to city people, too. They helped to secure an ample supply of wholesome milk without the interruptions and violence experienced in some other regions. The increased farm income in reflected in the sales and salaries of the city people with whom the farmers do business.

My dairy self-help bill would permit dairy farmers to take over from the Government the entire milk-marketing program and operate it themselves. I also introduced legislation to permit the sale of Government feed grains to farmers, and fought for an amendment to remove controls on grain grown solely for use on the farm.

In late spring I introduced the President's soil-bank bill. Though delayed by partisan squabbles and finally enacted in modified form, this program has had a good effect in our district and Wayne County has an especially high record of participation. Farm prices have strengthened and farm income is on the upgrade.

SMALL BUSINESS

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee providing funds for the Small Business Administration, I have taken an active part in its work to strengthen the competitive position and financial stability of small business. In our district where diversified industry predominates, worthwhile and necessary loans have been made, considerable advice and counsel has been offered, and a number of Government contracts have been secured through the assistance of this new agency. Established at the request of President Eisenhower, it is the first permanent independent agency devoted solely to the interests of small business, the backbone of our free-enterprise system.

Under this program small business has enjoyed an increasing share of Government contracts and its competitive position relative to larger enterprises has steadily improved. This is reflected in a better profit outlook, a high rate of new business firms, and a relatively low rate of business failure.

Ohio is enjoying a remarkable expansion of business and industry, reflected in more jobs and better wages in our district as well as others.

POSTAL SERVICE

No Government agency is closer to the people than the post office, and I have made very effort to improve postal service in the 16th District. In addition to improvements in a great many post-office quarters, new buildings are completed or under way at Apple Creek, Doylestown, East Canton, and Navarre. Rittman is soon to have our first post office constructed under the 83d Congress lease-purchase law. Other places are under consideration.

Progress is being made also to provide city delivery wherever local conditions meet minimum requirements. City delivery has been established in Orrville and Navarre and is expected soon in East Canton. Doylestown is under consideration, and others are making preparations for this improvement.

Rural routes have been extended in a number of areas and many individuals have benefited.

AKRON-CANTON AIRPORT

Expansion and improvement of Akron-Canton airport has been a special concern. This spring we secured CAA approval of the first $400,000 Federal matching grant toward a $2,020,000 3-year program that will include a new terminal building and improvements to existing facilities. The Federal airport program authorizes CAA to provide about one-half the funds.

Military construction at Akron-Canton also was authorized this spring and will amount to almost $3 million in the next 2 fiscal years. A new hangar for Air National Guard use will be constructed, with supporting facilities. Other military contributions toward making Akron-Canton a first-rate air terminal are under consideration.

Efforts also are being made to improve service into Akron-Canton and New Philadelphia-Dover, both by the major scheduled airlines and by Lake Central, our local service carrier, the only employee-owned airline in the world. Lake Central is now seeking extension of its routes to connect our area with Buffalo, Erie, and Detroit.

My appropriations group also handles CAA and CAB funds, and I take a personal interest in these activities. I am working now to establish a Commission on Air Safety to provide a coordinated and comprehensive attack on this problem, and have introduced the necessary legislation. President Eisenhower has recognized the need for such work and has appointed a special consultant on aviation.

MUSKINGUM CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The Muskingum Conservancy District, with headquarters in New Philadelphia, is receiving this year the final payment on the debt of the United States for properties acquired by the Corps of Engineers many years ago. I was able to overcome opposition to the appropriation of $425,000 for this purpose, thereby making it unnecessary to levy special assessments against the thousands of property owners against whom benefits assessments have not been made for many years. We are proud of the conservation accomplishments of the district, and it is a privilege as your Representative to be able to help so many who are affected by this appropriation.

BALANCED BUDGET

Three years of diligent effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee, cooperating with the administration, brought us this year a balanced budget. As a member of the committee, this has been my objective through the years and it is an accomplishment that holds promise of further reductions in taxes as well as continued stability in the cost of living. I think the achievement particularly noteworthy when we consider that it has been done despite a tax-reduction program in the 83d Congress that saved the Nation's taxpayers $7.4 billion. It shows what thrift and good management can do.

My own Subcommittees on Commerce, State, and Justice made total savings of $227 million this year, more than enough

to pay all of the expenses of the Congress for over 18 months.

INDIVIDUAL PROBLEMS

Many hundreds of 16th District citizens have brought me their individual problems arising out of dealings with the Federal Government. Veterans, servicemen, and those on pensions make up the largest number. There are many immigration and passport problems with which I have been able to help. I have made it a point to give immediate attention to every such request, and have a staff of experts in such matters in my Washington office. My Canton office is open every weekday to receive such calls. Your Congressman is as close to you as your telephone whenever problems arise.

During the past Congress I have been able to help several individuals with personal problems that required legislation. Because she was more than 10 years old, little Mary Torcasio had to be left behind in Italy when Mr. and Mrs. Paul Torcasio, of Canton, adopted her two little brothers. She was able to rejoin the family in Canton by virtue of a special act of Congress which I introduced. The same 10-year-old age limit in the Refugee Relief Act made it impossible for Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Lemmo, of Canton, and Mr. and Mrs. Bernardino Nasci, of Alliance, to bring their adopted daughters to this country. By virtue of special acts of Congress this spring, both little girls should be with their new families in Ohio soon. These humanitarian measures make a Congressman's work doubly rewarding.

Other bills have been sponsored to help groups of individuals who are in difficulty, such as farmers who are opposed to compulsory social security. I am pressing for action on my bill to make this insurance optional for farmers.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Designation of the work of September 17 to 23 as Constitution Week was an act of Congress in which I had a part. For the past several years I have urged designation of September 17 as a national holiday in honor of the Constitution. Opposition to additional national holidays made this effort very difficult, but designation of the period as Constitution Week will serve to call attention to the document that makes our Republic the most successful association of free men in the history of the world.

I also sponsored the House resolution on treaty law which in its Senate version is known as the Bricker amendment.

During the past session I have made the status of forces agreement, giving jurisdiction over our servicemen to the nations where they are stationed, my principal interest in foreign affairs. My resolution to modify or denounce this treaty is winning support in every State in the Union, including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Daughters of the American Revolution, and many other fine organizations.

VOTING RECORD

Any man who seeks office as a Representative in Congress is duty bound to remain on the job at all times to cast his vote in behalf of the people whom he represents. Occasionally official business in his district may cause him to miss a vote. I am glad to report that your Congressman missed only 2 votes this year for that reason, and that I have a record of voting on 96 percent of the rollcalls during my entire service here. Few can equal that record.

As a guide in legislative work, I have sent a congressional questionnaire to the residents of the district each year. The response is helpful, and I was glad to observe that on most issues the views of the majority who respond are the same as my own.

Following is my voting record on some of the major rollcall votes of the 84th Congress:

Subject	Bow's vote	House action
1ST SESSION		
Continue GI education program	Yes	Approved.
Protect domestic industry against tariff cutting.	Yes	Failed.
Extend reciprocal trade program	No	Approved.
Increased pay for Federal employees.	Yes	Do.
Use surplus agricultural commodities for relief.	Yes	Do.
Reaffirm opposition to colonialism and communism.	Yes	Do.
Extend the foreign aid program	No	Do.
Broaden social security benefits	Yes	Do.
Raise Federal minimum wage to $1.	Yes	Do.
Extend Federal Housing Act	Yes	Do.
2D SESSION		
Refund tax on farm-use gasoline	Yes	Do.
Construct upper Colorado River storage project.	No	Do.
Agricultural Act of 1956 including soil bank.	Yes	Do.
Extend foreign aid program	No	Do.
Provide pensions for World War I veterans.	Yes	Do.
Increase service-connected disability payments.	Yes	Do.
Federal Highway Act of 1956	Yes	Do.
Provide Federal grants for school construction.	No	Failed.
Eisenhower civil rights program	Yes	Approved.

Hon. George A. Dondero

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House of Representatives in the 78th Congress I became a member of the old Rivers and Harbors Committee, and it was there that my friendship for the gentleman from Michigan, GEORGE DONDERO, first started. I soon learned to respect his sound judgment, his spirit of fair play, and his devotion to this country. He aided me in many ways and gave me much help in the work we were both engaged in.

GEORGE DONDERO'S service in the House has been outstanding and he has always enjoyed the respect and admiration of his colleagues. He is a real gentleman, and, in his courteous way, has tried to teach us all good manners and respect for the traditions of the House of Representatives.

GEORGE DONDERO'S retirement is a loss for us all and the Nation is losing an experienced legislator who is free from bigotry, intense in patriotism, and devoted to the highest standards of statesmanship. May his days to come be filled with God's rich blessings, and I trust that he will find time to return to the Capital from time to time and keep fresh the bonds of affection which his colleagues have for him.

Alaska Tuberculosis Deaths Drop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a dramatic chapter in American medical history has been written in Alaska in the last 10 years. Great strides have been made in conquering tuberculosis. It is still a dread disease in Alaska, a veritable plague and a killer; but the degree and rapidity with which it is being brought under control are almost miraculous.

Only the other day Dr. Charles R. Hayman, Acting Alaska Commissioner of Health, announced that deaths in Alaska from tuberculosis in 1955 dropped to a new low of 50.

On the other hand, new cases of the disease continue to be discovered at a high rate. The average was a 80 a month with a total of 955 for the calendar year. In making this report Dr. Hayman emphasized that there may be many undiscovered cases.

The splendid progress which has been made is emphasized by the fact that in 1950 with a total population just over half what it was in 1955, total deaths from tuberculosis numbered 234. The death rate 6 years ago per 100,000 population was 181.9. Five years later it had been reduced to 43.3 per 100,000. Despite all the good work that has been done much remains to be accomplished because the death rate for Alaska is almost four times that in continental United States.

For the first time in history, a concerted effort to gain control over this devastating disease, which has made such terrible inroads in Alaska, was begun about 10 years ago. Then the Federal Government began to make appropriations for hospitals dedicated to the care of the tubercular. Then it was that the women of the Methodist Church took over some abandoned Army buildings at Seward and opened a sanatorium there which has had an instrumental role in the fight against tuberculosis. A fine, new hospital was constructed at Anchorage with 300 beds for the care of those ill with tuberculosis. Navy facilities on Japonski Island adjacent to Sitka were taken over by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including a hospital building. There are other hospitals where beds are available for the care of those ill with this disease. Eleven years ago there was not a single hospital bed designed or used specifically for the

treatment of Alaska's tuberculosis patients. Now there are close to a thousand available in Alaska and the States for Alaska patients.

The most dreadful ravages of tuberculosis are among the native population, the American citizens living in Alaska of Indian, Aleut, and Eskimo blood. They have been the hardest hit and they cannot be made healthy in a day. Indeed, it will be difficult if not impossible to effect complete control until their economic conditions and housing are improved.

However, the gains made have been so significant as to cause rejoicing among all concerned with the problem. The Federal Government through Congress and through the executive department has provided funds and personnel so sorely needed. The people of Alaska have played their part too through their legislature which has appropriated ever-increasing amounts to the Alaska department of health in the fight against tuberculosis. And the people of Alaska in their individual capacities, too, have worked hard and successfully.

The battle, for such it is, has included case finding, hospitalization and what is known as the ambulatory-chemotherapy program. This program, which is under the general control of the Arctic Research Health Center, is said to be remarkably effective and hold out great promise for the future.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the work which has been done by a devoted little group of women at the small Kuskokwim town of Aniak. Not too long ago I came into possession of the first annual report of the Aniak health council. Normally one would not expect a community as small as Aniak to create a health council which has functioned so splendidly as has this one. Mrs. Ernest Begin was president, Mrs. Norman Potoski was secretary, and Mrs. David Leach was secretary-treasurer for the period for which the report was made. As Mrs. Begin stated in opening the report:

You may wonder why a small group like the Aniak health center presumes to publish its activities and why this report is being mailed to you.

First, it gives us the opportunity of expressing our appreciation to the various official and lay organizations and individuals who have helped us during the past year. It records the council's activities, it accounts for the moneys raised and spent; it outlines plans for the coming year, and by the practical examples given throughout the report we hope that other Alaskan communities, similar to ours, will be encouraged to organized health councils.

For those of you who may not be familiar with the Kuskokwim area and for whom Aniak may be merely a pinpoint on the map, I would like to explain that our village is typical of hundreds of native villages throughout the Territory.

Our predominantly Eskimo population fluctuates between 300 and 400 during the year. Transportation of people is by dog team or plane since there are no roads. Supplies travel from Seattle by ocean freighter and river barge, making manufactured goods costly.

Aniak's economy and health level are roughly the same as those of scores of villages in the Kuskokwim and Yukon Deltas and in Bristol Bay, which is to say, it is poor.

We believe if Aniak can support a health council, other Alaska villages can do the same.

Aniak has no doctor or nurse. As the report states:

In the case of illness about the only thing that could be offered was aspirin and the hopeful assurance that the patient would be all right in a few days.

Then at the suggestion of Mrs. Wayne House, wife of the United States commissioner, a money collection was made. Two Eskimo children carried an old cigar box about the village asking for donations to buy medicines for the village people. Seventy-six dollars was thus raised. With that money a community medicine kit was purchased.

That was the inspiration for the Aniak Health Council. Seventeen people gathered at the first organized meeting. Sometimes in the meetings it was necessary to use an interpreter because some Aniak people are not skilled in English.

During the first 10 months of work 22 patients received emergency first-aid treatment for serious accidents or injuries. In serious cases the nearest physician, at Bethel, Alaska, gave advice by radio.

The report of the Aniak Health Council states in simple but eloquent words the situation regarding tuberculosis there:

TUBERCULOSIS IN ANIAK

Until recent years, there has been a hopelessness about tuberculosis in our village. Nobody knew for sure how many active cases existed, relatively few stood a chance of being hospitalized and TB attacked at will. TB was a scourge; born in poverty, bred in crowded, unsanitary homes and maturing right in the village.

In truth, many people never know they had tuberculosis. There were vague symptoms, a lassitude often mistaken for laziness, occasionally chest pain, sometimes hemorrhage, but a lot of tuberculosis was lived with, and died from, without the formality of a diagnosis. The tragic consequence was that tuberculosis spread.

BACKGROUND NOTES

As near as we can determine, the first X-raying from tuberculosis in Aniak dates back to 1948. After that, there was a period of 6 years with no case-flinding by X-ray until the winter of 1954, when Dr. Wendell Matthews, medical officer for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, made a field trip to Aniak for the purpose of checking and X-raying CAA families stationed here.

Dr. Matthews offered to X-ray people from the village, and despite the short notice and severe temperatures, 106 people were X-rayed in 1 day. Unfortunately, many people were out trapping and therefore were missed, but in July of the same year (1954), Dr Ferger and a technician made a 1-day field trip to Aniak and 135 X-rays were made. There still was no baseline survey for the whole village but the tuberculosis picture was beginning to fill in.

CHEMOTHERAPY

Earlier in this report, reference has been made to the daily radio schedules held by ANS hospital physicians and it was a chance interception of such a radio hour that brought information to the council that a new tuberculosis program was to be inaugurated.

Over a period of about a week, Dr. Ferger made the same announcement daily to all who might be listening to the effect that two new tuberculosis drugs were to be given to all known and suspected tuberculosis cases in the Kuskokwim villages. (Later the program was extended to other parts of the Territory.) ANS teachers and lay people in villages where no ANS personnel were stationed were requested to send in names of such cases to augment lists that were being compiled from hospital records.

It was explained that drug treatment at home was not intended to replace hospitalization but that chemotherapy, as it was called, was considered to be the best possible treatment for those who were forced to wait many months before hospital beds became available. The most important result of taking the drugs was said to be that there would be a decline in the TB bacilli produced by active cases. The byproduct of this would be that there would be less TB spread to members of patient's immediate family and close associates.

THE COUNCIL PARTICIPATES

The Aniak Health Council offered to participate in this program so that our village could receive the obvious benefits. Names of all known and suspected cases were submitted on preliminary forms and soon we received dosage sheets and a shipment of two different TB drugs. We agreed to be responsible for dispensing the medicines, for weighing the patients at certain intervals. We also supervised the mailing in of sputum specimens, watched the patients for adverse drug reactions and kept accurate, confidential records.

Later the program became more formalized, and today the ambulant chemotherapy program functions as a tri-agency program with the Alaska Department of Health, United States Public Health Service and the Alaska Native Service as participants. Each agency plays a certain part and at the end of the chain is the chemotherapy aid. In Aniak, this person is Mrs. Wayne House, who devotes many volunteer hours to this important work.

In January 1955, Aniak was visited by a full chemotherapy team composed of Dr. Kenneth Momeyer (USPHS), and Miss Marilyn Porter, supervising nurse. On loan from the Bethel ANS Hospital were Miss Jacqualine Firebaugh, staff nurse, and Mr. S. Crump, X-ray technician. Another X-ray survey was run, standard chemotherapy forms replaced the old, preliminary sheets, files were set up for each patient, home calls were made and several more cases added to the roster. Shortly thereafter free vitamins were supplied regularly to all those on chemotherapy.

One more X-ray survey was to follow when Dr. Matthews returned on his yearly field trip. By this time, the Aniak TB picture was complete. We have been told by workers from the chemotherapy program that Aniak is far from a hot-bed of tubcerulosis, yet at this writing, 23 of our people are on chemotherapy, 9 Aniak people are in TB hospitals, and more are waiting for a bed to become available for them.

CONCLUSIONS

It is perhaps too early to evaluate the effectiveness of the chemotherapy program, and this is a matter for the professionals. On the local level, we who have worked with the TB picture, have seen great improvements in many cases. After being on drugs for a while, the people look better and they feel better. They are hopeful of shorter hospital stays and complete cures eventually.

We believe the chemotherapy program is coping with our village's most dangerous health problem, that of the tubercular person. After many years of stagnation as far as case-finding is concerned, this part of the TB program is receiving adequate attention in Aniak. We still have tubercular children of tubercular parents, but at least there is hope for their future.

With about 1,000 beds accommodating the most seriously ill, with Federal and Territorial agencies cooperating and with individual citizens such as the women of Aniak doing their part, there can be no doubt that tuberculosis, which once was a virtual death sentence for thousands of Alaskans, will in time be subdued and conquered.

The Uncommon Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous matter, I enclose herewith a statement by former President Herbert Hoover, which I believe is a masterful statement illustrating how leadership in a republic such as ours is developed.

Mr. Hoover's own career is a living embodiment of how leaders are developed. Left an orphan in West Branch, Iowa, he was taken to an aunt in Oregon. Then he had the good fortune of being sent to Stanford University where he exhibited sparks of leadership. From then on he continued to be a leader and to be dissatisfied with mediocrity. I need not mention anything more about his stupendous career but I wish to say that in the twilight of his life, he must feel tremendous satisfaction in the great work he has done to help humanity and to make our Government less expensive and more efficient.

The article referred to follows:

THE UNCOMMON MAN—HERE'S AN EVER-TIMELY MESSAGE FROM A FAMOUS ELDER STATESMAN

(By Herbert Hoover)

"That nation is proudest and noblest and most exalted which has the greatest number of really great men." (Sinclair Lewis.)

In my opinion, we are in danger of developing a cult of the common man, which means a cult of mediocrity. But there is at least one hopeful sign: I have never been able to find out just who this common man is. In fact, most Americans—especially women—will get mad and fight if you try calling them common.

This is hopeful because it shows that most people are holding fast to an essential fact in American life. We believe in equal opportunity for all, but we know that this includes the opportunity to rise to leadership. In other words—to be uncommon.

Let us remember that the great human advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women. They were brought about by distinctly uncommon people with vital sparks of leadership. Many great leaders were of humble origin, but that alone was not their greatness.

It is a curious fact that when you get sick you want an uncommon doctor; if your car breaks down you want an uncommonly good mechanic; when we get into war we want dreadfully an uncommon admiral and an uncommon general.

I have never met a father and mother who did not want their children to grow up to be uncommon men and women. May it always be so. For the future of America rests not in mediocrity, but in the constant reneway of leadership in every phase of our national life.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The article above first appeared on this Words To Live By page on February 6, 1949. We reprint it now in honor of Mr. Hoover's 82d birthday August 10—and as an eloquent reminder of the ideas and principles for which he has always stood.)

Report to My Constituents on the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has been my practice for the 14 years that I have been a Member of Congress to make a report near the end of each session to the people I represent. I want them to know how I voted and how I view all public questions. This is their right and my responsibility.

NEWSPAPER AND RADIO REPORTS EACH WEEK

It is the duty of every Member of Congress to keep in close touch with the people he represents, to know their wishes, and to keep them informed. I have tried to do so this year, just as I have done in years past. I write a weekly news letter that goes to approximately 90 newspapers, 14 radio stations, and many individuals in the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska. I tape a weekly radio program entitled "What's Happening the Nation's Capitol" that has been carried regularly over the years by all of the radio stations in the district, and I have made several television films which were carried by the stations that reach into western Nebraska during the past year. The newspapers and the radio and television stations have been kind enough to use these efforts as a public service. I deeply appreciate their help in bringing these reports to the people.

VISITS ALL 100 TOWNS

When the Congress is not in session I am out in the 38 counties of the district, talking with as many people as I can at county fairs, service clubs, church groups, farm meetings, and other gatherings of all kinds. Last year, just as I do in each off-election year, I held a government clinic in each of the 38 courthouses for the purpose of discussing problems of government with my constituents. The first hour of these 2-hour meetings is devoted to a Youth Wants To Know forum with high-school students. The second hour is given to the public at large. These meetings have been extremely helpful in discovering the problems that are bothering the people at home, and they enable me to better represent my district.

FIRM LEADERSHIP—THREE YEARS' PEACE

We are entering the fourth year of a world at peace, an era that began with the end of the Korean war in 1953 and that progresses day by day toward a more permanent, enduring, and solid structure for world conduct. The Communist world, Russia and nations under its domination or in its camp, has grown since 1939 from a population of 170,467,000 to 928,488,000, while the free-world population has declined from 2.23 billion in 1939 to 1.7 billion at present. In recent months we have seen substantial evidence that Russia is losing control over its subject nations; that resistance is developing just as it always has when the inherently free nature of the individual is made to yield to the will of a tyrannical master. Poland has signified that its resistance has progressed to an active stage. Russia's hold on the people of East Germany has become uneasy. More nations and more individuals are ready to seek means of lifting the Iron Curtain.

Our leadership has been firm. We have not jumped from crisis to crisis; instead, we have consistently demonstrated to the nations of the world our sincere desire for peace by positive and constructive acts and needs, insisting on the same course of conduct on the part of the Soviet Union. We have not accepted the new behavior in Russia as evidence of any significant change in attitude so long as the inspection program and disarmament proposals submitted by President Eisenhower go unheeded by the Kremlin.

This era of world peace, tense though it might be, has given us a prayerfully welcome respite from the slaughter and destruction of two major wars.

ADVOCATES FOR "GLOOM AND DOOM" WRONG—EMPLOYMENT HIGHEST; UNEMPLOYMENT LOW

The transition from war to peace has not brought about the depression predicted several years ago by some of the advocates of "gloom and doom." On the contrary, the Nation, industry, and labor enjoy the highest and best level of prosperity in our history.

There are more than 65 million Americans gainfully employed, and the number of people without jobs is reassuringly low. Individual income soared to more than $320 billion in the past year, with an average income per family of $5,520. Twenty-three million American families had incomes above $5,000, and because the Republican 82d Congress gave them a $7.4-billion income-tax cut, and because sound fiscal policies have stabilized the dollar, the average family is able to save and invest more than ever before.

The Government is also prosperous. The administration has successfully carried out one of its most important promises—to balance the budget. The Federal Government closed its books on June 30, 1956, with a credit balance of $1.74 billion. This is the second time in nearly 20 years the Treasury has been able to show a surplus on hand at the close of the fiscal year and for the first time in many years a payment on the national debt will be made.

GOOD FARM PROGRAM CAUSES SICK AGRICULTURE TO GET WELL

There have been several notable changes in the law and governmental policies that relate to agriculture. Farmers, caught in the squeeze between falling commodity prices and rising

costs, did not share in the general booming prosperity of other industry and labor. A number of factors contributed to this hardship. Tremendous stores of supported commodities, continued overproduction of surplus crops, and centralized drought conditions tended to reduce the farmer's gross income, while at the same time his net income has been shrunk by high operating costs.

Recognizing that the major ills of agriculture have been caused by an unwise and shortsighted program that induced market-depressing surplus crops, the Congress and the administration have developed legislation and policies that strike directly at these problems. The first part of this new program is the soil bank law, establishing an acreage reserve and a conservation reserve. Many hundreds of farmers, within a matter of days after the law went into effect, are now participating in the program and benefitting from it. To assist stock growers in drought areas, the administration is permitting the use of reserve acres for grazing purposes.

Realizing that the Government itself was contributing to the surplus crops by long established policies which permitted their production on millions of acres of public lands, President Eisenhower on May 21, 1956, issued an order putting an end to this practice. This order implements legislation which I introduced during this session of Congress.

The soil-bank law and the order restricting public land use effectively attack crop surpluses from the production end. Other legislation and other administrative actions deal with disposal and marketing problems. The administration is selling more and more agricultural commodities to foreign countries in exchange for their currency, under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress, introduced by Congressman HARRISON, of Nebraska. More farm products are being consumed through an expanded school-lunch program, and still more are being channeled into a relief program for the needy of our country.

One of the most important provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is the section establishing a Commission to prepare legislation dealing with further industrial use of grains and other farm crops. More than 1.5 billion bushels of grain that now goes into Government warehouses could be converted into industrial alcohol to be blended with gasoline or used in the production of butadiene, one of the components of synthetic rubber. We know that ingenious American scientists will discover other potentialties out of a wedding of industrial and agricultural processes. I was privileged to join with Nebraska's Senator CARL T. CURTIS in sponsoring this legislation.

These and other measures will in due time cure the problems that have been created by the Government's regulation of a normally free agriculture.

To help in bringing farm price back in line with operating costs, the President increased the support levels on most of the basic crops and Congress raised the parity prices on feed grains and dairy products. In recent months, hog prices have shown a strong recovery from last year's slump, and the cattle market has been firm, even though it has never recovered from the rollback ordered in 1952 by former President Truman.

When all of the political thunder that accompanied the veto of the first farm bill died away, the President and the American farmer emerged victorious with a constructive and forward-looking agricultural program. Farm prosperity is sure to follow.

NEBRASKA SHARES IN 41,000 MILES OF HIGHWAY

In one of the largest public works measures ever presented, Congress passed and the President signed a law authorizing a 13-year road-construction program. A 41,000-mile Federal interstate highway, to be constructed on a revenue basis from increased gas, fuel, rubber, and other related taxes, is the most significant part of this new legislation. Additional grants will be made to States and local subdivisions to construct and improve non-Federal primary and secondary highways. Total Federal cost of the program is pegged somewhere in the neighborhood of $35 billion.

SOCIAL SECURITY BROADENED AND MORE LIBERAL

Both Houses of the 84th Congress adopted extended and liberal social-security legislation. Following the example set by the House last year, the Senate recently passed the bill bringing practically all vocations and professions under social security, lowering the retirement age of women to 62, and making totally disabled persons eligible for benefits at age 50.

FARWELL-AINSWORTH IRRIGATION PROJECTS

Legislation I introduced in this Congress has cleared many of the necessary hurdles. Some of these bills have become law. For example, the Ainsworth irrigation unit was authorized for construction by the Department of the Interior when the bill I introduced was signed by President Eisenhower on May 18, 1956.

The bill authorizing construction of the Farwell project on the Middle Loup River has been passed by both Houses and will undoubtedly be signed by the President.

The Gering Valley flood-control project became a part of the Flood Control Act of 1956, with the splendid assistance of Senators ROMAN L. HRUSKA and CARL T. CURTIS.

Two bills I introduced for extending farm loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act were included with other provisions of the farm-credit bill passed by the House.

The bill I introduced to prohibit the production of surplus crops on Government-held lands was made a part of the President's order of May 21, 1956, and will take effect on or about August 18, 1956; while the bill establishing a Commission to draft legislation for industrial use of agricultural commodities became a part of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Some progress has been made toward establishing a partnership between the Federal Government and the Nebraska Mid-State reclamation district, although it is still incumbent upon representatives of both groups to resolve important differences in the engineering and financial concept of this irrigation, reclamation, and power project.

Other legislation I introduced would have been passed, I am sure, if my political party were in control of the Congress. But with the opposition in charge, conscious of the approaching elections, a high priority has been given to Democrat-sponsored bills almost to the exclusion of all others.

SOUR NOTES ON POLITICAL CONGRESS

The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress has distinguished itself in two ways, neither of which is commendable. First, it has the distinction of being the most obstructionist Congress in recent history. Second, it has been the most political Congress in my memory.

These obstructionists tactics have been manifest in two major ways: First, Congress has refused to act on many bills that were a fundamental part of the President's legislative program; second, the administration bills that were acted upon were either amended so as to be unpalatable or rewritten beyond recognition. Many bad bills were prevented from becoming law only because the President had the courage to use his constitutional veto power.

This Congress has spent hundreds of hours and millions of tax dollars to prove that the Eisenhower administration and its top-level officials have been guilty of giving away the natural resources of America. Investigating committees have probed into mineral and timber transactions, atomic energy ventures, electrical power contracts and policies, reporting volubly that these investigations established the giveaway charge. However, no responsible or constructive action has resulted from these inquisitions, which many times have taken the form of ancient star-chamber proceedings.

Congress has the unquestioned right to investigate, and it is dutybound in many instances to do so. But this power is restricted to a legitimate legislative purpose, and the proceedings must at all times be governed by additional considerations of candor and fair play. I am afraid the committees have not kept these fundamental principles in mind. Instead, they have been driven by the desire to unearth, if possible, or manufacture if necessary, political issues upon which to base a political campaign that will elect or reelect members of their party.

Vote trading, back scratching, and logrolling have been all too prevalent in the Congress during the past year. This has been especially true in the field of reclamation and power legislation, where many worthwhile projects have failed to go forward because their sponsors did not yield to the pressure for other less meritorious projects. In one of the most shabby melodramas of congressional history, I was made the villain of a plot to kill the Fort Randall-Grand Island transmission line appropriation. Although I have supported 98 percent of the public power, reclamation and flood-control projects that have come before Congress in my 14 years—some 371 all told—I was branded as an enemy of public power, ostensibly because I had voted 5 years ago, when the Korean war was

going badly and our budget was running some $14 billion behind, to trim all appropriations 5 percent. On that vindictive basis a public power project recommended by the Eisenhower administration was killed by members of the political party that holds itself out as the public power champion. I later learn, however, that I can redeem myself by supporting a package deal of 5 or 6 Federal power projects, which would cost more than $1 billion, and in return the proponents of this billion-dollar blackjack would support the $8 million Grand Island transmission line. Many other Congressmen have been given the same alternative, with their projects assuming form as the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow.

Politics has been inherent in the conduct of most functions of Government during election years, but the party in control of the Congress this year has surpassed in flagrance and disregard for orderly process any performance I have previously witnessed.

I plan to return to Nebraska just as soon as the Congress adjourns, and I am looking forward to meeting and talking with as many old and new friends in the Fourth District as time permits. I will attend many county fairs and group meetings. A report giving unbiased election facts shows only 5 Republicans who received over 70 percent of the vote in the general election of 1954. Thanks to many friends I was 1 of the 5. Believe me I will continue to do the best job I can.

Hon. Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is always hard for any legislative body to lose the services of a man of courage and high principles and this applies especially to Congress in these perplexing times. CHARLIE DEANE is to be admired for his courage and his strength of character, characteristics which are recognized by all the gentleman's colleagues.

I met CHARLIE DEANE when he first came to Congress and we served together on the District of Columbia Committee. At that time we were making a study of home-rule legislation for the District and the calm brilliancy of his mind, together with the honesty of his character made a great impression on me. He served his people well with zeal and fidelity, and I venture to predict that his constituency will regret the loss of his services.

Of course, we all hate to separate from our friends, but I hope our paths may cross frequently in the days to come. Wherever he may be and whatever he may be doing, my warmest affection will always be with him, and I wish him and his family all the good things of life.

Hon. Woodrow Jones

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I really am glad that circumstances prevented my being present in the Chamber when some of our colleagues paid their tributes to WOODROW JONES. Otherwise I would not have had the opportunity of reading what he himself had to say in a farewell address before expressing my own sentiments. I have since read his speech and wish to say that it is one of the most impressive I have ever read. It is marked by the sincerity and steadfastness to principle that characterizes all of WOODROW JONES' utterances.

WOODROW's successor has already been selected. He is a young man of outstanding ability and one with whom I have been personally acquainted for many years. I am sure he will measure up in every way to the responsibilities of the high office to which he has been elected and that he will render outstanding service to the people of his district. However, I think we will all agree that an unusually high standard has been set by his predecessor and that his shoes will be hard to fill.

No Member of this House has impressed me more than WOODROW JONES. Time after time I have witnessed him vote his convictions in spite of tremendous pressures to do otherwise. I think of him as one Congressman of whom it can truly be said that he put principles and love of country above every other consideration. It takes courage to do that. WOODROW has consistently sought, throughout his congressional career, to protect our heritage of individual liberty, to safeguard our unique system of free enterprise, to maintain and promote sound fiscal policies, and to resist the trends toward concentration of more and more power in the Central Government. I can say these things in all sincerity because, while I consider him a warm personal friend, he and I are affiliated with different political parties. It is a great loss to the Nation for him to leave this body. This country needs men like WOODROW JONES in its service:

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking.

In my book, WOODROW JONES is such a man. As he goes back home in order that he may have more time to spend with his family—those fine sons really need him now as they are in the period when character is moulded and when principles are ingrained—their gain is our country's loss.

In conclusion may I also say to my friend from Rutherfordton that I have greatly enjoyed my association with him in this body; that I deeply appreciate the many courtesies he so freely extended to me; that I respect and admire him for the outstanding record he has made here; and that I sincerely wish for him all of the joys and happiness he deserves.

Fred Abruzzini, Superb Wine Manufacturer, Retires After 24 Years With Beringer Bros.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an article from the St. Helena Star concerning Fred Abruzzini.

Mr. Abruzzini was a man who represented Beringer Bros. and operated their winery and who himself was a man who did not drink wine or any type of spirituous drinks. Behind the office and the winery are a number of caves which were dug by Chinamen many years ago. The Beringer wines and champagnes were cooled in these caves which is a custom common to French practice to give a superb flavor to the wines they make.

Mr. Abruzzini was very much interested in having celebrities call at his place. Among others who were there on visits in connection with making of a movie film was Clark Gable and Carole Lombard. Also in the group was Charles Laughton and they developed a film known as They Knew What They Wanted. This was in 1940.

It was my great pleasure to bring from Berchtesgaden in Germany a glass which I found in the elevator shaft where Hitler's servants prepared meals and served wine for Hitler. I was very much flattered the next time I called on Mr. Abruzzini to notice that he had this wineglass placed in a glass box on which was pasted the statement as to the origin of this wine glass.

Mr. Abruzzini knew people in all parts of northern California. He was very popular with the Press Club of San Francisco which served his wines as well as wines of other vintners of the Napa Valley.

FRED ABRUZZINI RESIGNS AS MANAGER OF BERINGER'S AFTER 24 YEARS

Most St. Helenans were surprised last week with the resignation of Fred Abruzzini as manager of Beringer Bros. winery. For the past 24 years he had headed the big institution, and in that time had built up a State-wide reputation as publicist, so much so that the winery has been a regular port of call for the famous in the entertainment, political, and sports world.

Abruzzini is succeeded by Otto Beringer, nephew of Miss Bertha and Miss Marth Beringer, and the late Charles Beringer. He will be assisted by his brother-in-law, Roy Raymond. Otto Beringer, a noted athlete in high school here and at Stanford, has been assistant manager for 2 years and before that was connected with the winery in other phases of its work.

Abruzzini reported that his private interests demand his attention, and he felt that the expiration of his contract on June 30 was the time to retire from active management. His private property interests include real estate in St. Helena, and farm holdings in various parts of the county. He owns the stone building on the corner of Hunt and Main, which houses the Vasconi Drug Store, among other properties.

He has a warm feeling for Berlinger Bros., he said. There he has spent the most exciting years of his life; moreover the connection will not be entirely broken for he and his three sons will continue to sell the winery some of their grapes.

Abruzzini is a director of the Napa District Fair, and of the Wine Institute, and is a member of the Wine Advisory Board. He came to St. Helena in 1932, after 12 years as vintner for the Madrone Wineries in Santa Clara County.

It was as a publicist that Abruzzini became famous throughout the State. Regular tours from San Francisco and other points have made Beringer Bros. a stopping place. Two barbecue sites have fed thousands of visitors, and it has been a rare weekend in the season which has not seen several large parties using the facilities for outings. Some organizations come year after year, some bring their own chefs, others use the services of local caterers.

But in whatever manner they arrived they all became indoctrinated with the beauty of the valley and the taste of St. Helena's vintages.

Celebrities by the hundreds, not only from the United States but from as far away as Greece and Rome, have enjoyed the Beringer hospitality. Through his close friendship with Karl Weber, Austrian consul in San Francisco, and George Mardikian, both property owners here, the great and the famous visiting in San Francisco, were entertained at Beringer's.

Most of the big names of the Hollywood film colony, at one time or another, most of them several times, were visitors at the winery. Scores of pictures at the winery mark their stay here.

Among these were the late Carole Lombard and Clark Gable. Miss Lombard, with Charles Laughton, filmed "They Knew What They Wanted," in 1940, at Oakville, and Gable has been a frequent guest.

Shortage of Scientific and Engineering Manpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I herewith include a letter I have received from Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

The Honorable MELVIN PRICE,
House of Representatives Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRICE: May I express my compliments on the interim report of the Subcommittee on Research and Development on the shortage of scientific and engineering manpower. The report expresses a very sane and balanced point of view which I hope will be a guide to Congress as it considers ways of meeting our manpower and educational problems.

Sincerely,

DAEL WOLFLE,
Executive Officer.

Hon. John Phillips

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in January 1953, I was given the high honor of assignment to the Appropriations Committee. I think every Member should serve on that important committee. The people have the habit of blaming the Chief Executive or the administration for unnecessary and wasteful spending, but the truth is that no administration can spend a dime unless Congress authorizes it and appropriates the money. Therefore the importance of service on the Appropriations Committee cannot be overemphasized because it is that committee which scrutinizes the requests for funds and makes the recommendations that precede appropriations.

And, Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to be assigned to serve on the Independent Officers Subcommittee, a subcommittee that had the responsibility of handling appropriations for some forty-odd independent agencies and offices of the Government. The chairman of that subcommittee was the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, and he presided over and directed its work with impressive dignity and ability. He knew that I had never had legislative experience and that appropriations work was brandnew to me. He went out of his way to give me the benefit of his experience and knowledge. I soon came to admire him as one of the outstanding Members of Congress.

In my judgment the country is losing the benefit of the services of one of its wisest and most devoted servants. I truly regret that he saw fit to retire from that service although I must confess that I do not blame him in the least for doing so. He has given his people the benefit of 14 of the best years of his life. If any man ever deserved to retire from the tremendous pressures and responsibilities under which we have to work here in Congress, on the basis of having already contributed more than one man's fair share to the preservation of our precious liberties and fundamental principles, that man is JOHN PHILLIPS.

I could not allow this occasion to pass and our paths separate, although I hope not permanently, without expressing my profound thanks to him for his leadership, for the high example he has set for those who may follow him, for his uniform courtesy to all Members, and for the friendship which he has given me. In my book, JOHN PHILLIPS is one of the truly great Americans. I shall never forget him.

Wanted: Executive Talent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include an article written by a close personal friend of mine, Mr. James H. Pipkin, vice president of the Texas Co., which article appeared in the May 1956 issue of the Oil Forum magazine.

I found this article very interesting and feel that it contains some good advice to the young men of our country.

WANTED: EXECUTIVE TALENT

Fifty or more years ago, manpower was not a major industrial problem. Most jobs could be filled by fellows with no particular specialized training. Basically, the machine age as we know it now, inseparable from the petroleum age, is responsible for much of the change that has ensued. And, the uniform history of labor-saving machinery has been that it has increased productivity and ultimately led to greater employment for greater numbers and at better pay.

The petroleum industry has probably had a longer experience with automation than any other American industry. Automated operations were first installed in our refineries more than 30 years ago, and its use has been consistently expanded. Yet the number of refinery jobs has continued to increase, as has total employment in the industry. The real goal of automation is not to reduce operating manpower. It is to create greater productivity, higher efficiency, and lower cost per unit of output. This contributes to progress, prosperity, and job security.

Yet even a little reflection will reveal that this technological advance which has done so much to give the rank-and-file worker in industry a job that is physically easier, better paid, and more productive with less effort, has had a quite different effect upon the management job. It has made that job more difficult and more complex, in much the same manner as it has made the jobs of engineers and other technical personnel more demanding.

First of all, it is now required of men at every management level that they master a great deal more information about operations than ever before. This does not mean that management personnel did not know the operational end of their companies in the past; it means that operations have now become so much more complex that there is a hundredfold more to know, simply to keep current.

Second, because of the increasing pace of the competitive struggle between companies within almost every industry, management must know now a great deal more than its own company backyard. It must be familiar with all sorts of trends and conditions: Economic, financial, political, and social. It must maintain just and friendly relations with labor, customers, stockholders, and communities in which it does busines or maintains installations. It must know the public pulse. It must carry on the best research program it can plan and afford, it must develop new markets and improve its products or bring out new ones. It must provide a pool of executive talent for top-level jobs as the company grows. If it happens to have large foreign operations, it must maintain its own equivalent of the Department of State to keep in close and friendly

relationship with the governments of the countries in which it works. Broad versatility, plus ability for pinpointed concentration on any of these fields of activity on a moment's notice, is now part of the basic qualifications of men fitted for management duty. No wonder there is fierce competition for young men who appear to have the potential of developing into such personnel.

Third, the man needed for future executive duty must possess certain personal qualities which are not found every day: He must be able to formulate and communicate ideas, judge and select men, adjust easily to changed situations, make sound decisions quickly and firmly. He must have ability to run with the ball alone or to merge perfectly and unobtrusively into team play. But, above all—and this is no platitude included merely to please the Godly—he must be a man of character and integrity. There must be no doubt of his trustworthiness or his courage when business decisions with moral implications have to be made. The day is gone, if there ever really was such a day, when a man could be ruthless and unscrupulous 6 days a week in business and respected churchgoer on Sundays.

The catalog of qualifications for executive leadership which I have just recited is admittedly a tough one. Admittedly, also, very few men, if any, possess them all. But there is one qualification that I have so far purposely refrained from including, and for a very good reason, although it is perhaps the most necessary qualification of all. I have not mentioned it thus far because no talent hunt in the colleges could ever expect to find it—in the nature of the case, a college student couldn't have it. It is judgment based on experience.

No man ever became a successful executive without judgment based on experience. And no man ever had such judgment given him as a gift from somebody else. Either he develops it himself, within himself, or he goes through life without it. He cannot get it in any college or in a postgraduate course. He cannot acquire it by listening to the advice of his friends, no matter how sage that advice may be. For the kind of judgment based on experience which alone will fit him for executive responsibility is really simply his own developed maturity built up every day until it becomes the sum total of his reasoned response to thousands of past individual situations. The man who has this will never be taken wholly by surprise in the face of any unexpected event; he will know what to do and his decision will be swift and sure.

Now you know why I said that this qualification could not be found among college students. In its fully developed form, it is not easy to find in large numbers anywhere. But there is no substitute for it. It is not something that can be turned over to an automatic machine. It is not the exclusive product of colleges or of their graduates. The men who have it are, whether they realize it or not, actually the most important and indispensable men in American business and industry. They may or may not have attended college. They may or may not have received wide recognition. But it is upon them that industry depends most as it meets new situations in its growth.

What I believe most executives have on their minds is the difficulty of finding men with the potential to follow in their steps in the next 15 or 20 years. We can afford the luxury of mistakes in securing men less today than ever in industrial history.

I do not anticipate that the supply of potential technical and executive leadership is likely to become greater for some years. The net effect of this, of course, will be to throw added responsibility upon those already at work. The future of any executive as an individual in business will depend very materially whether he is willing to assume these extra responsibilities and whether he can grow with them.

Forgotten Americans: The Philippine Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, following is an article appearing in the July 8 edition of the San Francisco Chronicle concerning the Philippine Scouts.

Fortunately, the House took action on a bill last week to remedy this situation and I am hopeful that the bill will become law before the adjournment of this Congress.

FORGOTTEN AMERICANS: THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS

(By Francis William Leydet)

Soliman Rogacion lay sprawled out on the floor, pinned down by the weight of four Japanese soldiers. "Then one of them take a hose and force it in my mouth. They turn on the faucet and the water start pouring into me. Pretty soon my stomach swell up and up and I feel I going to burst."

A sturdily built man of 43 with a broad, pleasant face, dressed in his uniform as a San Francisco cable-car conductor, Rogacion was describing his 3 months' stay at Fort Santiago, the World War II Japanese torture chamber in Manila. He had been picked up on suspicion of guerrilla activities.

"At other times," he went on, "they tie my hands behind my back and hang me by the wrists from the ceiling. Then they poke electric wires in me, back here"—and he patted his seat—"and turn on the current. You think you going to die. But I'd been pretty strong—used to play basketball in the Army—so I take it."

Rogacion looked uncomfortable—almost apologetic—as he talked. The only visible scar left from this period in his life—"It seemed as long as all the rest of my life," he said—is an inch-long mark on his right cheek. "A Jap take a spike, like that one on your desk, and try to put my eye out. But he miss. Other scars are there, however. It was very humiliating," he sighed. "If I recall, I sometimes feels like crying. Mostly I try to forget."

NO BACK PAY

One thing, however, Rogacion cannot forget. After the war, an Army processing team reviewed his activities from the day he surrendered with 40,000 other United States and Filipino troops on Bataan, and ruled that for the period of the Japanese occupation, he was not in a casualty status within the meaning of section 2 of the Missing Persons Act, and therefore had forfeited his back pay for those years.

Rogacion's is not an isolated case. In San Francisco alone, more than 300 have had experiences similar to his. Many of them can be found in rundown hotels on Kearny or Stockton Streets, hotels that are only a notch or two above skid row flophouses. Most of them work in menial jobs as dishwashers or hospital orderlies, separated from their families in the Philippines and with little hope of seeing them again.

These men were among some 12,000 Philippine Scouts—from 1901 to 1947 an official component of the United States Regular Army made up of Filipino personnel—who fought in the jungles of Bataan. Faced with crushing superiority in numbers and equipment, devoid of air cover against the constant Japanese bombings, ravaged by malaria (with no medicine to fight it) and beri-beri (brought on by a diet of a handful of polished rice and a few canned goods a day), these men helped hold Bataan for 98 days. Over 1,000 of them went on to fight another 5 weeks on Corregidor. Of their part in these actions, Col. E. B. Miller wrote in Bataan Uncensored: "The highest tribute I can pay to (them) * * * is that I have never seen, nor do I expect to see, any better or braver soldier than the Scouts. They were truly an inspiration."

THE BURIAL DETAIL

Of the 12,000 Scouts in the Army at the start of the Japanese attack, some 6,000 survived the fighting, the Death March, the stravation in the concentration camp at Capas, and the rigors of life under the Japanese. Of these 6,000 men, 5,000 were determined by the Army to have been "not in a casualty status" during most of the occupation and were therefore never paid for this period.

To understand the Army's reasoning, one has to follow the Scouts through their ordeal after the surrender. Except for a few who managed to escape and either took to the hills or made it home, the Scouts were marched by their captors to Camp O'Donnell at Capas, and interned with Philippine Army troops. Of 60,000 men of both forces who reached the camp in early April, 1942, 30,000 died in 4 months. Already weakened when they got there, they were subjected to planned starvation and deliberately denied medical attention.

By late May, 500 were dying every day. Lt. Col. Narciso Manzano, a Regular United States Army officer of Philippine descent, was placed by the Japanese in charge of the burial detail, which toward the end numbered 2,000 men.

"At the end of the every day," as Colonel Manzano tells it, "we would collect the corpses from all over the camp. In the morning we would take them to the burial sites. My men were sick, too—of malaria, beri-beri, and dysentery. Two men would carry a corpse slung in a blanket from a bamboo pole. The body would seldom weigh more than 70 or 80 pounds, yet the men staggered as they carried it. Some died while digging the graves."

DEATH ON PAROLE

"By June, we could no longer cope with the burial problem. So the Japanese found a solution: They gave orders that 'all Filipino prisoners who are seriously ill but can stand up' would be turned over to their relatives. Through June, July, August and, I believe, September, this procedure was followed."

This "parole home to die," as Colonel Manzano terms it, was officially declared invalid by the Army on the grounds that it had been signed under duress. Yet it had fateful consequences to its recipients.

On March 7, 1942, Congress approved the Missing Persons Act, a measure designed to protect the rights of men such as these. Section 2 of the act stated that "Any person who is in active service and who is officially determined to be absent in a status of missing, missing in action, interned in a foreign country, captured by a hostile force, beleaguered or besieged shall * * * be entitled to receive * * * the same pay and allowances to which he was entitled at the beginning of such period of absence * * * provided * * * that there shall be no entitlement to pay and allowances for pay period during which such person may be officially determined absent from his post of duty without authority."

When it came time to apply the act to liberated Filipino personnel the headquarters of the United States Army Forces Western Pacific issued a memorandum to the processing teams. This memorandum ruled that any person who evaded capture by the Japanese and returned to his home, or was captured, imprisoned, and subsequently paroled, was absent from his post of duty, and not entitled to pay unless he could prove that he "actively joined a guerrilla force or actively participated in the anti-Japanese movement."

or, failing this, could "prove that material restraint was imposed on him or that he suffered 'serious deprivation' to an extent greater than the restrictions, inconveniences, and lowered standards of living generally suffered by other residents incident to the Japanese occupation, as a direct result of his former official status under the United States. * * * The burden of proof rests with the claimant."

SWIFT VENGEANCE

But the requirement that the Scout join a guerrilla force slammed headon into the Hague Convention, to which the United States is bound, and which outlaws guerrilla activity. Again Gen. Douglas MacArthur expressly refused to authorize guerrilla activities because of the retaliation such activity would bring to civilians.

Every paroled Scout who returned home was subjected to material restraint. He had to report regularly on his whereabouts and activities to the Japanese authorities, and his family and friends were held accountable for his actions. And vengeance was arrow swift when the accounts were unsatisfactory.

When the Japanese became suspicious of Lt. Col. Melecio Santos, of the Scouts, and failed to find him, they killed his wife, sister, and nephew. When they came to Colonel Manzano's house to arrest him (he was on his way to Mindanao under United States orders) they took his wife to Fort Santiago and tortured her for 4 months, all the while hinting to her that her 4 young children were in another cell undergoing the same kind of treatment.

Under these conditions, a good many scouts remained home once they got there and pursued what the Army termed "a normal mode of living." When their cases were reviewed after the war, they found it impossible to prove they had suffered more than other residents ("Those who could have proved that, were dead," claims Colonel Manzano), and were therefore judged not in casualty status and not entitled to back pay.

A NORMAL LIFE

Others, however, risked their own and their families' lives and joined the perhaps 100 different underground units which operated on Luzon. But they fared no better than the others when it came to back pay. Ironically, those units which operated most successfully and avoided detection by the Japanese found it next to impossible to convince the processing boards that they had operated at all.

Odd situations developed. Sgt. Marcos Redoble, of the scouts (Purple Heart, Silver Star), joined the Fil-American underground unit, under the command of a scout. When the Japanese became suspicious of him, they took him to Bilibid Prison in Manila and tortured him for 6 months, releasing him finally when still unable to prove his guilt. Later, Redoble received his back pay for the months he spent in prison, but not for the months during which he had engaged in guerrilla actions which caused him to be imprisoned.

Sergeant Rogacion, the cable-car conductor, was among those judged by the processing team to have enjoyed a normal mode of living during the occupation. "When I get home," he related, "I find my father was killed in a bomber raid. For the first year I was too sick of malaria to move out of the house. My mother look after me. After a year I get married. Then I get in contact with this underground outfit, the Fil-Americans. I get news from the outside, typed-up leaflets, and pass them around.

"Then, one morning, I go over to the wedding of a friend. Somebody come up to me and tell me there are Japs all around my house. I go near my house to see if true, and there they were. Pretty soon I see them drag my wife out of the house, naked, and they begin to beat her and punch her like hell. I think they going to kill her, so I give myself up."

Then began for Rogacion the 3-month ordeal at Fort Santiago. "Whey they release me under 'amnesty'—big propaganda deal—they publish a photo of me and others they let go in Sanseke1 magazine. It says underneath, 'Saved by the amnesty.' I show this picture later to the processing team, but it do no good. I no get my back pay."

THE PAYBACK

As a matter of fact, Rogacion found himself obliged to refund to the United States Army $244 which had been set aside as allotments and insurance premiums in his name during the occupation, a situation which occurred in so many cases that Filipinos often refer to the back pay issue as the payback. It should be noted that the United States Navy, which also had a number (though much smaller) of Filipino personnel who were captured and later paroled by the Japanese, gave them their back pay at the end of the war with no questions asked.

In recognition of services at Bataan and Corregidor by the Philippine Scouts, the United States offered them American citizenship shortly after the war. About 90 percent of them jumped at the chance, little realizing that it would work a hardship on them. But when the men retired from the Army, as most were forced to do a few years after the war, they found themselves barred, as aliens, from the Philippine civil service, which, in view of their age and past service, was about the only place they could hope to find jobs.

With nothing but their retired pay to support themselves and their families (a Scout's retired pay averages between one-third and one-fifth of that of all other United States military personnel) they found themselves backed against the wall. For this reason, and in order to keep their United States citizenship, over 1,000 of them came to the United States, leaving their families behind. And they still come, in groups of 20 or 30, every few weeks through the Military Transportation Service.

For most of these men San Francisco is the port of entry, and over 300 of them have gone no farther. Handicapped by their age (the majority are in their late 50's or in their 60's), by language difficulties and by their lack of civilian experience, they have found jobs scarce. M. Sgt. Jose Magallon, a veteran of 30 years' service and, according to Colonel Manzano, one of the finest engineers in the Scouts lived for a while—and supported his family in the Philippines—on his $77.63-a-month retirement pay. (His American born counterpart draws $250.) Then he got a job mowing lawns at the Presidio.

"MANY SUFFERED"

Many of these Scouts are charity cases, occasionally receiving doles from the International Institute, an agency of the Community Chest sharing in United Crusade funds. Under these circumstances, getting their back pay means more to them than squaring an 11-year-old account. To many it means reunion with their families after several years' separation.

Questioned as to how he felt on the subject, Rogacion remarked: "Sometimes I feel there has been an injustice. Mostly I feel that they (the Army processing teams) didn't know something. But there were many suffered. And it was all in a common cause."

That this philosophical view was not shared by everyone was proved in this year's session of Congress, when Representatives LEROY JOHNSON, Republican, of California, and OLIN TEAGUE, Democrat, of Texas, and Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, introduced bills providing that "entitlement to pay and allowances shall not be denied, in the case of any member of the Philippine Scouts who was captured in the Philippine Islands by the enemy during World War II, solely on the ground that such member was paroled and permitted to return to his home and engage in civilian pursuits prior to the termination of the Japanese occupation of such islands."

EXPENSIVE BILLS

In a letter opposing these bills, sent to Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat, of Georgia, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Army stated, as one argument against them, that "it would be difficult, if not impossible, to reflect with any degree of accuracy, the cost of these bills. * * * The resultant administrative costs alone, exclusive of any benefits paid to successful claimants, would amount to millions of dollars."

Although aware that a considerable sum of money was involved, the national legislative committee of the American Legion, in the February 11, 1955, issue of its bulletin, put the issue this way: "Will American justice ever prevail in the case of the 5,000 Philippine Scouts who were literally cheated out of their pay as loyal and valiant soldiers of the United States regular forces, nearly 10 years ago?"

On the fate of the bills now before Congress may hang the answer to this question.

Building of Alternate Canal Route Is Answer to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Dulles, Eden, and Pineau have reaped what they have sown. The dismay at Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal brings to mind a similar dismay when they learned of the Czech-Egypt arms agreement. They have pursued a consistent policy of appeasement subordinating national self-respect to the fog of fear. They were passive when Egypt closed the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping, failing to see that as a forerunner of Egyptian arrogance. Through United States Ambassadors Caffrey and Byroade, they fed this arrogance and helped to build this outsize picture of Nasser.

Military and economic reprisals would be the least satisfactory of policies. There is, however, the proposal of good sense, and that is the building of an alternate canal from Elath on the Gulf of Akaba—Red Sea—across Israel to Ascalon on the Mediterranean.

The cost would not be too great. The very preparation and original digging for such a canal would reduce Nasser to size. The cost could be kept down to $150 million; bonds therefor could be readily sold. Little government cost would be involved.

The United States, Great Britain, and France should give immediate and serious consideration to this proposal. It is noted that this very proposal is the subject of considerable talk among high Governmnet officials in Great Britain. The proposal, in and of itself, would have considerable merit had there been no seizure by Egypt of the Suez Canal.

Its obvious worth is underscored now. The Western Powers need not be caught helpless in the face of the present international tangle.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, August 1, 1956, represents the 665th anniversary of the founding of the modern Swiss Republic; more than 6½ centuries ago the Swiss people struck off the shackles of despotism and tyranny and began the long ascent toward governments in which the rule of people is supreme. The Swiss philosophy of democracy fired the revolutions against despotism in France, Italy, and elsewhere. It set the framework for constitutional democracy in the United States.

Today Switzerland's people, of German, French, and Italian ancestry, live, work, and prosper together, solving their problems in the open, democratic tradition.

Many of the world's modern humanitarian projects—such as the Red Cross and the World Health Organization—have originated and make their home in that country. Similarly, other agencies in the service of mankind have located there. For example, the League of Nations, the first world peace organization founded on the plans and ideals of Woodrow Wilson, made its headquarters in Switzerland.

Throughout America today we find the descendants of the hardy Swiss immigrants. One of their sons was Albert Gallatin who served as Secretary of the Treasury and represented the United States abroad on many diplomatic missions. He was an early and vigorous proponent of increased foreign trade for the United States.

Modern-day Switzerland is one of the most constructive forces in the promotion of world trade. Because she is poor in land resources, ores, metals, and other raw materials, Switzerland has concentrated on science, skill, and industry upon which to found one of the most vigorous trade economies in the world today. In this manner, Switzerland has become the world-acclaimed source for the highest quality watches, textiles, precision instruments, and other commodities. Relying totally on free competition in a free market, they have won an excellent market in the United States for their products. By so doing they have also enriched American export economy because the Swiss have invariably permitted the United States to acquire a surplus in our trade with that country. Today, after 20 years of Swiss-American reciprocal trade, a concept fathered by Cordell Hull, the United States has accumulated a trade profit in form of a surplus of more than one-half billion dollars.

Among those who benefit from trade with the Swiss are the tobacco farmers of southern Maryland who I have the honor of representing in Congress. In fact the Swiss are the largest and the very best cash customer for high-grade Maryland export tobacco. That is why we are disturbed by the Republican administration's series of decisions which harassed Swiss-American trade by increasing tariffs on Swiss products, including watches and watch movements which constitute the lifeblood of Switzerland. I am pleased to note that the recent report by the Joint Economic Committee of the 84th Congress stated that these Republican trade restrictions represent an undue burden on consumers, on other industries, and on the trade of the free world. I hope every Member of Congress, as well as the President and the members of his administration, have an opportunity to read this report.

Justice Department's Withholding of Information on A. T. & T. Settlement Scored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, I wish to state that the Attorney General's office has refused to supply the Antitrust Subcommittee with any information from the Department of Justice files concerning the circumstances surrounding the settlement of the Government's antitrust case against the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its subsidary, the Western Electrict Co.

The Attorney General's refusal to supply the Antitrust Subcommittee with any information from the Department files concerning settlement of this case is predicated on an asserted need to withhold information concerning A. T. & T. and Western Electric operations obtained in the course of consent decree negotiations, and secondly, on a claim of alleged Presidential privilege to deny to the Congress communications passing between employees of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

At the outset, and by way of contrast, I note that the alleged Presidential privilege which is sought to be invoked did not deter members of the administration from making available apparently without restriction, to a friendly newspaper correspondent, numerous highly confidential minutes of Cabinet meetings, as well as other documents of a confidential nature.

It is strange indeed that the Attorney General would cavalierly deny a request of an appropriate committee of the Congress, seeking access to records necessary to make a determination as to the propriety of the A. T. & T. decree, while at the same time the White House freely supplies confidential information to a journalist who is neither elected nor appointed to any office.

On the one hand, the Attorney General invokes the principle of executive privilege to deny the legitimate requests of a duly constituted committee of the Congress; while on the other hand, there is an unprecedented dumping of confidential files by the administration for the whole world to read. This mocks the efforts of the Congress to keep itself informed of the processes of government.

Beyond that, I note that the Attorney General is seeking to withhold not only documents obtained in the course of consent-decree negotiations and memorandums passing between employees of the Antitrust Division, but documents in other categories as well. No reason is even assigned for refusal to make available for committee examination correspondence between the Attorney General and heads of other executive agencies relating to the settlement of this case.

Careful analysis of the A. T. & T. decree indicates its deficiency in many major respects. The only effective relief in this case against the allegedly unlawful monopoly of A. T. & T. would be a separation of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Yet under the decree, the corporate structure of A. T. & T. and Western Electric was not disturbed. In fact, it is fused even closer together and the manufacturing and telephone monopoly is still concentrated in the same hands. This is in direct contrast to the Attorney General's assertions that the A. T. & T.-Western Electric monopoly has been dissipated by the decree.

The settlement, in short, fails to accomplish the principal objective of the Goverment when it filed suit 7 years ago, namely, the separation of A. T. & T. and Western Electric. Furthermore, Department consent to the settlement undoubtedly will prejudice future administrations in any subsequent efforts to mitigate the effects of the A. T. & T. monopoly.

Against this background and in light of the circumstances surrounding the settlement and the terms of the consent degree, congressional examination is essential to determine, among other things, whether A. T. & T. and its subsidiary, Western Electric, were given preferential treatment in this case by the Department of Justice.

The text of the letter I wrote to the Attorney General and the answer received from the Department of Justice in reply follow:

MAY 29, 1956.

The honorable the ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The House Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee has examined and analyzed the consent decree entered into on January 24, 1956, in the antitrust case of *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.* The subcommittee's study indicates that further and more detailed inquiry into all the circumstances surrounding the settlement of this case is appropriate.

Accordingly, it is requested that you make available for examination by the subcommittee all files in the Department of Justice

relating to the negotiations for, and signing of, a consent decree in this case.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 13, 1956.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Antitrust Subcommittee,
Committee on the Judiciary,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I have your letter to the Attorney General, dated May 29, 1956, requesting that we "make available for examination by the subcommittee all files in the Department of Justice relating to the negotiations for, and signing of, a consent degree in, *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.*"

The staff of the Antitrust Division has examined in detail this Department's files relating to the negotiations and formulation of that decree. The bulk of these documents fall in two categories: first, material submitted by defendants regarding their operations; and, second, memoranda by various members of the Antitrust Division concerning negotiation conferences as well as decree provisions.

Documents relating to defendants' operations, I emphasize, were produced, not pursuant to interrogatories or court order, but rather in the course of good-faith negotiation of a consent settlement. Some touched on confidential aspects of the defendants' operations. Were they made available to your subcommittee, this Department would violate the confidential nature of settlement negotiations and, in the process, discourage defendants, present and future, from entering into such negotiations.

In any event, as I wrote you over a year ago, on May 6, 1955, Department policy does not permit disclosure of staff memoranda or recommendations. As I indicated, the decision whether or not to settle, and if so on what terms, may involve difficult judgments. Reaching these judgments, I am sure you appreciate that men equally devoted to vigorous antitrust enforcement may well differ. To enable intelligent final decision, therefore, full and open discussion is required frequently, not only by all members of the staff but also by the staff with the Assistant Attorney General. This process of interchange may endure over some time. And, as a result of discussion, any participant must feel free to alter his views as the merits of argument dictate. This essential process of full and flexible exchange might be seriously endangered were staff members hampered by the knowledge they might at some later date be forced to explain before Congress intermediate positions taken. The responsibility for explaining such decisions thus rests upon the Assistant Attorney General and ultimately upon the Attorney General.

As the President of the United States directed in a like instance:

"Because it is essential to efficient and effective administration that employees of the executive branch be in a position to be completely candid in advising with each other on official matters, and because it is not in the public interest that any of their conversations or communications, or any documents or reproductions, concerning such advice be disclosed, you will instruct employees of your Department that in all of their appearances before [congressional committees] * * * not to testify to any such conversations or communications or to produce any such documents or reproductions. This principle must be maintained regardless of who would be benefited by such disclosures."

The danger of abandoning that policy in the case of a law enforcement agency seems clear. Revealing staff disagreement on issues might well cramp effective enforcement.

With this in mind, this Department cannot grant your request to examine our files relating to the decree in *United States* v. *American Telephone & Telegraph Co., et al.*

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Deputy Attorney General.

No Crash Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, during the House hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch was introduced into the RECORD. This editorial made totally unfounded claims that our atomic energy program had collapsed. When requested to appear before our committee to give the facts upon which the editorial was based, the editor refused. This refusal can be considered as indicating that the paper could not produce facts to substantiate the statements made in the editorial.

The Washington Post and Times Herald has also printed equally unfounded editorials and news articles on the subject. It is refreshing, therefore, to find that one Washington paper, the Evening Star, can separate the wheat from the chaff. This is indicated in the editorial below taken from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, July 27, 1956:

NO CRASH PROGRAM

The House seems to us to have taken commonsense action in defeating the Senate-approved bill for a Federal crash program in the field of nuclear power—a project strongly opposed by the administration.

Of course, leaving aside extravagant partisan arguments both for and against it, this Democratic-sponsored measure has had genuinely sincere advocates as well as genuinely sincere opponents. Included among the former, for example, is Thomas E. Murray, an able and veteran member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Certainly there can be no question that he and many who share his views in Congress feel a real sense of worry over what they regard as our country's slowness in building nuclear reactors for the production of electricity.

Summarized in somewhat oversimplified form, the contention of these men is that American private industry is incapable, for numerous reasons, of doing the job fast enough on as large a scale as the times require. Hence, as they see the situation, the United States is in great danger of being bady beaten by Russia in the business of exploiting the atom for peace, and it is for that reason that they have urged their crash program for spending $400 million on speedy Federal construction of power-producing reactors at various AEC installations throughout the country.

However, speaking for the administration, Chairman Lewis L. Strauss and the majority of his AEC colleagues have categorically denied that the present program—which relies primarily on free enterprise for the development of A-power plants—endangers American superiority vis-a-vis Russia. Actually, in their judgment, the course now being followed is much better designed than a crash operation to insure that our country will retain world leadership in this field—a leadership that must be measured not by mere numbers of electricity-generating atomic installations, but by progress in developing advanced nuclear techniques and reactor types.

Indeed, according to Mr. Strauss, "One of the most shortsighted decisions we could make as a nation would be to accept an arbitrary goal as to the kilowatt capacity or numbers of full-scale plants we would build by a set date." He bases this view on the ground that such a program would be inflexible in a field where there should be enough flexibility to take advantage of any breakthroughs and discoveries. In short, instead of helping us to maintain the international lead we now enjoy, an operation of that sort might well cause us to lose the game by freezing us to our present point of progress.

Moreover, it is worth noting that no fewer than 15 private and non-Federal public atomic-power plants—with a combined generating capacity of nearly 1 million kilowatts—have been scheduled to be put in operation in this country by 1962. Although advocates of the crash program have challenged the validity of these figures, the prospect may in fact materialize within the predicted time. If so, and if our nuclear technology meanwhile advances as the AEC contemplates, then the Russians will scarcely be able to beat us in the atoms-for-peace race.

In advancing arguments of this sort, Mr. Strauss has been assailed by his critics as a kind of villain. But the case he has presented still appears to be considerably more persuasive than theirs. The House has done well to vote accordingly.

The Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, there is always a note of sadness at the conclusion of any Congress when we must say goodby to colleagues who have been good and close friends and who will not be returning to these halls again. We from New York will greatly miss our distinguished colleague, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, who leaves us to return again to the courts of New York State. Prior to coming to Congress, Judge DAVIDSON served in the New York State Legislature and as a justice in the court of special sessions in New York City. Now he has been called to higher judicial office as a judge of the court of general sessions in New York City. We shall miss his kindliness, his brilliant wit, and his friendship, but we wish him well as he continues his career of public service and know that he will bring to one of the highest courts in our State his deep and profound knowledge of the law and the sincere dedication to his work which he has always demonstrated in whatever high office he has been called upon to fill. Our loss is a great gain for the judiciary.

S. 4301, a Bill To Extend the Scope of Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on S. 4301, a bill to extend the scope of vocational education.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EARLE C. CLEMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH S. 4301, A BILL TO EXTEND THE SCOPE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

On April 26 of this year I introduced a bill, S. 3748, proposing that the Federal Government annually award college scholarships to 5,000 of our most deserving high-school students. The scholarships would be for the pursuit of courses at accredited institutions of higher education, leading to recognized degrees in science and engineering.

At the time of introduction of the scholarship bill, I stated some of the urgent reasons for enactment of it. I drew attention to our national shortage of engineers and scientists, and the gravity of Soviet competition in the production of scientific manpower. I set forth the need for Federal scholarships to be provided in the interest of our physical safety and economic security as a nation. I pointed out that establishment of such scholarships would be a measure to protect our national freedoms, and that these awards would be a sound investment in the future of our youth and in the welfare of our people.

Today I am pleased to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama and others in introducing a bill (S. 4301) which might be considered a complement to the Federal scholarship proposal. The bill which we introduced today proposes that the Federal Government promote the further development of vocational-technical education programs of less than college grade. While the development of legislation in this field at this late hour in this Congress will not enable action to be taken on it at this session its introduction will serve to illustrate the great need and will generate interest and support in order that when similar legislation is introduced at the convening of the Congress in January it will be favorably acted upon.

ORIGIN OF THE NEW BILL

This bill emanates from more than a year's study on the part of a number of persons associated with vocational training in the United States, among whom was James L. Patton, director, vocational education in Kentucky. These leaders in vocational education below college grade are aware of its present limitations and the need for its further development. They are competent to advise the Congress with respect to the Nation's needs and interests in this field. This bill is based upon an understanding of our national problems in vocational education and a desire to find the best answer to them.

PRESENT WEAKNESS IN OUR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Full study of our Federal-State system of vocational education below college grade has highlighted its most outstanding weakness, namely, that it does not reach enough of our people. In many rural areas, particularly, adequate vocational-technical training programs are not available.

Furthermore, the limitations of available funds do not allow the establishment of special training and retraining programs needed by older workers for their adjustment to new scientific and technological processes.

This bill is designed to remedy these weaknesses in vocational education in the United States.

WHAT THE BILL WOULD DO

The bill would encourage the States to establish area vocational schools and programs for the training and retraining of technicians and skilled workers in industry and agriculture. Through such schools and programs, the bill would also promote training in other occupations essential to the Nation's security and economy.

As defined in the bill, the term "area vocational schools and programs" means those "for youths not less than 16 years of age, and for adults," which are "operated by State or local authorities, or both, for a State or an area of a State designated and approved by the State board" for vocational education.

APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS

To assist the States in developing area vocational schools and programs the bill would authorize appropriations by the Congress as follows: $5 million for fiscal 1957, $7.5 million for fiscal 1958, and $10 million for fiscal 1959, and such amounts thereafter as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the act. The funds would be apportioned to the States on the basis of the composite formula in the George-Barden Act (Vocational Education Act of 1946).

POLICY AND PRECEDENT

Enactment of this measure would be thoroughly consistent with established Federal policy and precedent.

Federal participation in vocational education in this country might be said to date from establishment of the Military Academy at West Point in 1802. This was established as a school for engineers. Federal-State cooperation in financing vocational education began with the Morrill Act of 1862, which led to establishment of our tremendously important land-grant colleges. Enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 initiated Federal cooperation with the States in financing vocational education of less than college grade. This highly satisfactory system now operates under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George-Barden Act of 1946.

The new program to promote area vocational schools would be administered by the same authorities as the present program. These authorities are the United States Office of Education at the national level and the State boards for vocational education at the State level. The State in each case would have full authority to designate and approve the area schools and programs.

There would be no opportunity for any Federal control over the schools and programs other than fiscal controls, to assure usage of the funds for the purpose intended by Congress.

MANY STATES ALREADY MAKING EFFORTS

In 30 of our States and Territories, State and/or local educational authorities are already operating area vocational schools. In at least 8 additional States, area vocational programs are in operation as units of State colleges or junior colleges. According to data compiled by the American Vocational Association, my own State, the Commonwealth of Kentucky, is one of those in which area vocational programs are most developed. There are 12 area vocational schools operating in Kentucky. These schools are very popular, but many of them are limited in their offerings. In Kentucky there are long waiting lists for admission to the area vocational schools and programs. Being relatively new in the educational system, these are handicapped in the competition for the educational dollar. The demands of the elementary and regular high schools usually receive priority.

By giving recognition to the national need for area vocational education, Federal promotion of such education would stimulate the States and localities to even greater efforts in this field so important to the national welfare.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Under the Constitution the Federal Government is responsible for the national defense and has a duty to promote the general welfare. Both the national defense and the general welfare are absolutely dependent upon the maintenance of adequate programs of vocational education throughout the country. The Federal Government therefore shares with the States and localities the responsibility for providing vocational training at all levels.

Throughout the history of the United States, many of our national leaders have emphasized the importance of education to the very maintenance of our form of government. Thomas Jefferson, for example, warned that: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

Alexander Hamilton expressed the view that the Constitution assigned the Federal Government responsibility for promoting education. George Washington advocated the fostering of education as an obligation of the Federal Government. John Quincy Adams urged Congress to promote education.

In reference to education, Abraham Lincoln said, "I view it as the most important subject we as a people can be engaged in."

The Congress has repeatedly recognized the Federal responsibility, particularly in the field of vocational education, by enacting specific legislation for its support and development. However, the Federal concern in this field has grown far greater because of the tense international situation.

This has been emphasized very recently by the Soviet Union's open challenge to a technological race with the West.

Our ultimate victory will depend upon the capacities of our whole people. Their abilities will in turn depend upon the amount and quality of their vocational training.

If the Federal Government neglects its share of the responsibility and fails to provide the States and localities sufficient support for vocational education we may not win the new kind of cold war with the Communist world to which I have just referred.

WHAT THE SOVIETS ARE DOING

Let us take a look at what the Soviets are already accomplishing in the educational field and consider how their activities may affect us. According to a study made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in March 1956 entitled "Engineering and Scientific Manpower in the United States, Western Europe, and Soviet Russia," in 1951, Soviet universities and other institutions graduated 30,000 engineers with 5½ years of training including 3 years of close specialization. By 1954 they had increased this number to the startling total of 53,000 while at the same time our universities and colleges turned out only 22,329 engineering students. The following table carried in the report graphically illustrates the rate we may be falling behind the Soviet Union in providing our Nation with persons trained in technical fields:

Structure of graduating classes in the U. S. S. R. and in the United States

Field	U. S. S. R., 1954, graduations by field of study		United States, 1954, bachelors and 1st professional degrees by field of study	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	173,000	100.0	358,699	100.0
Engineering of all types	53,000	30.6	22,329	6.3
Agriculture, including agronomy, forestry, animal husbandry, veterinary medicine	18,000	10.4	[1] 7,832	2.2
Health and medical sciences	24,000	13.9	[2] 23,616	6.6
All other fields (of which university, physical and biological sciences, mathematics are included)	78,000	45.1	304,922	84.9
Additional: Extension training (predominantly in other fields)	57,000			

[1] Does not include veterinary medicine.
[2] Includes veterinary medicine.

Sources: Russian Research Center, Harvard University; and U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, earned degrees, 1953-54, Circular No. 418, pp. 4-5.

Dr. J. H. Hildebrand, president, American Chemical Society, described the Russians as taking more seriously than we here in the United States are taking the maxim that "knowledge is power." Dr. Hildebrand further warned "if we let them get ahead of us in education, the national disaster for us and our way of life is inevitable. Our hope lies in an enlightened people from whom we can obtain the essential leadership necessary to build the kind of world in which we want to live."

With respect to vocational and technical training of less than college grade, it is difficult to make comparisons between the Soviet Union and the United States because of the dicerence in the categories for reporting training programs. However, there has evidently been a tremendous expansion at the secondary- and post-high-school levels of vocational and technical training in the Soviet Union.

The March 1956 issue of Life magazine said that the Soviet Union is producing an elite generation of young scientists and engineers "enormously dangerous to the West, but so far little noticed by it." The article stated further that—

"At the recent Communist Party Congress in Moscow Premier Bulganin boasted that Russia already has an army of 5.5 million specialists, adding that it would have another 4 million by 1960. Then they will far outnumber those of the United States, which already suffers from a shortage of scientists" (p. 31).

The article stated that there are 3,796 "technicums" in Russia that graduate 70,000 technicians per year. These serve in positions between professional workers and skilled or semiskilled workers.

In the United States there is a great shortage of technicians, and there are very few institutions or programs to train them.

The Honorable William Benton, a former Member of this House, now editor of the Encyclopedia Britannica, visited Russia in 1955 to study the Soviet system. He was reported that:

"The Soviets are now challenging us frontally on what have historically been two of our strongest points—technology and mass education. The present rate of Russian education advance is faster than our own. Just as their growth-rate in industrial production surpasses ours. The gap in total performance is closing. It is closing rapidly."

In the May issue of the NEA Journal there is another illuminating article by Mr. Benton, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"A recent trip to the U. S. S. R. has convinced me that education has become a main theater of the cold war; that Russia's classrooms and libraries, her laboratories and teaching methods may threaten us more than her hydrogen bombs—the Communists from the earliest days gave up butter for guns, but they gave up meat for education."

The alarming revelations and the other facts I have set before you demand early enactment of a bill such as my colleagues and I are introducing today. It is an essential measure for the security and progress of the people of the United States.

Problems of International Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the Committee on Ways and Means has been assigned responsibility for a much-needed study of problems affecting our foreign trade. It will be a special privilege for me to participate in this study during the adjournment of Congress, under the chairmanship of our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], as many of the aspects of our trade policy requiring attention are of particular interest to Virginia industry and agriculture.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include, as evidence of the broad public interest in the subject matter of the study, an excerpt from a recent issue of the magazine of Wall Street's Investment and Business Forecast, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY TRADE PROBLEM

Congress has dabbled through the session with legislative and other approaches to solutions of export-import problems and now, in the dying days of the session, has decided there's still much to be said. Result is introduction of the Harrison bill (H. Res. 522) and its referral to the Ways and Means Committee for summertime staff study. A report and recommendations will be ready when Congress returns next January. Since the Hull reciprocal trade agreement policy became tariff practice of the United States a score of years ago, junking the Smooth-Hawley Act, there hasn't been an overall study of world trade barriers on other than a segmented basis. Representative BURR P. HARRISON, Virginia, Democrat, hopes this bill will fill the void.

Experts will be called to Washington, or asked to submit briefs on all aspects of the subject. Covered will be quotas for export and import, monetary licenses, countervailing duties, and procurement practices of this and other trading countries. Also the effect of tariff and trade laws, regulations, the foreign policy of the United States, including mutual-security programs. Peril-point and escape-clause procedures, their speed and efficiency will be probed as will problems resulting from trading with countries having economies which are State controlled, directly or indirectly, by subsidy or otherwise.

The committee will have an open door for businessmen and others with viewpoints to record on such essential study subjects as: the effect on industry, labor, and agriculture of the United States of all export and import factors, such as labor costs, labor standards, production costs, pricing policies, fiscal and monetary policies of the United States, dumping practices, exchanges, quotas, trade agreements, transportation and marketing problems, barter arrangements, preferential tariff systems and agreements.

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in saying a few words in behalf of one of the most congenial and bighearted men who has ever served as a Member of this body.

I have heard of Congressman CHATHAM all my life and all the good things I have heard about him are certainly true. I do not know of any man who has ever served as a Member of the House during the 18 years I have been here who has made more friends than Congressman CHATHAM. History can only tell of the fine service he has rendered the people of North Carolina, the United States, and the entire world.

He has assisted a number of the Members of Congress without receiving any publicity at times when they really needed a friend. He has traveled the entire world, at his own expense, on numerous occasions in an effort to find out how our country could gain a better reputation in the eyes of the people of those countries. He has worked hard in an effort to sell the good things of our country to every nation in the world.

Congressman CHATHAM has rendered distinguished service as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which has been one of the toughest assignments in the Congress during the past 15 years. This committee has not only legislated for the people of the United States but for the people of practically every other nation. I am certain that the services of Congressman CHATHAM will be greatly missed in the next session of Congress.

The people of North Carolina are to be congratulated on sending a man of Congressman CHATHAM's character to

represent them in the Halls of the National Congress as he has not only gained a fine reputation for the people of North Carolina but for the people of the entire United States on his good-will tours, at his own expense, to dozens of foreign countries.

I feel that I am a better Congressman after having known a bighearted man of Mr. CHATHAM's type and I wish for him and Mrs. Chatham and their lovely family all the happiness and good health possible during the future years.

Out of School After 46 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, School Superintendent Louis J. Schmerber, of my home city of Paterson, N. J., has just retired after 46 years in the field of education, and Mickey Lardner, of the Paterson Evening News has written the following interesting article about Mr. Schmerber's philosophy and contributions in his important field:

OUT OF SCHOOL AFTER 46 YEARS

(By Mickey Lardner)

School Superintendent Louis J. Schmerber cleared off his office desk for the last time yesterday closing one phase of an educational career that has spanned practically half a century.

"And every minute of it has been fascinating," he said, looking back over his 46 years in the teaching profession that began in a two-room schoolhouse and ended up in the city's top educational post.

"There have been changes in everything but the children," he remarked, "and I fail to see any great differences in them."

He's of the opinion that juvenile delinquency is being exaggerated out of proportion. "In most cases children's problems are created by parental delinquency," he maintains. "Today many mothers work, of necessity or otherwise, and children are deprived of the security of the close family relationship they're entitled to, so they get in trouble."

To combat this problem he feels that teachers should be given a larger measure of authority than they now have. "If teachers are going to act in loco parentis, they should have many of the authorities now granted only to parents," he insists.

NO SERIOUS TEACHING PROBLEMS

As far as school discipline is concerned, the superintendent said, Paterson has no serious problem. "Changed techniques of teaching have led to a great deal more informality in classrooms," he noted, "but a good teacher uses this to advantage. Under a weak teacher, of course, the class may take over."

Then the pleasant-mannered man with a mind of his own went on to say that "some of the best teachers I have seen in classrooms have been graduates of the 2-year normal schools." This in spite of the fact that some educators are presently agitating for an additional 2 years of teaching training.

Discussing the population changes that have taken place in Paterson within the past 20 some years, Schmerber said that foreign-born and first-generation children are being well assimilated into the city school system.

"It would be much more helpful, though, if nationality groups did not continue living in segregated sections, where English remains a secondary language," he said.

HAS PROGRESSIVE IDEAS

A far-sighted man with progressive ideas, Schmerber is impatient with those who want things to remain as they are simply because they've always been that way. "To be of value, a school must keep growing," he said, "with courses being revised to meet the changing needs of the children."

"Life adjustment courses are a product of the last decade," he pointed out, "with life adjustment and personal hygiene, for instance, tied in with the school guidance programs, to help condition individuals to the things they want to do in the future."

One thing that has never gone out of the Paterson school system, despite what has happened elsewhere in the country, is the teaching of phonetics. "We've found phonetics profitable to children learning to read, and we've hung on to the system," he stated.

But to prove that he's not adverse to changes, Schmerber said he believes that television will prove to be one of the greatest teaching aids ever devised.

"The time will come," he asserted, "when TV will be used in every school as a media of instruction. The Armed Forces have proven its value in teaching large groups, and the schools will find it equally helpful."

During his many years as an educator, he has been both embarrased and amused, with one particularly red face dating from the evening he was to be guest of honor at a board of education dinner and forgot to go.

Then there was the time he found himself in the midst of a pitched battle between the mother who objected to her son's being called a "scurvy elephant" and the harried teacher who finally managed to explain that what she said was "disturbing element."

And there was the time he sent home to the father of one unruly child a note suggesting that "a sound licking" might help tremendously, only to get back a note saying, "You do it, Louis I'm not mad at him."

MAN OF PRINCIPLE

"No one can stay in this job long without a sense of humor," Schmerber said, his eyes twinkling behind shell-rimmed glasses. "Nor," he continued more seriously, "without a flexible philosophy and an ability to compromise on all factors except those of general principles."

And principles are something the retiring superintendent knows a great deal about. From the first day he walked into a 2-room schoolhouse in Annandale, to teach grades 5, 6, 7, and 8, and serve as janitor, all for the yearly stipend of $340, Schmerber has made better education his goal in life, and nothing has been allowed to get in the way of what he considered was the right thing to do.

He served in the school systems of Hawthorne, Pompton Lakes, and Park Ridge prior to coming to Paterson in 1926 as principal of old School 15, and has served as superintendent of schools since 1945. "In all that time," he asserted, "I've never run into the slightest tinge of political interference from any party, and have been allowed to do my job in whatever manner I saw fit."

RELAXATION, THEN WORK AGAIN

Schmerber has retired from his post as superintendent, but he's far from retiring from the field of education. Today he leaves on a 2-week vacation trip, and when he returns he will plunge into a beehive of activity. He has purchased a farm in Sussex County, where he intends to get some relaxation, but he also is scheduled for a number of speaking engagements throughout the country, and will continue with his professional writing.

"I was born in Paterson and intend to maintain my home here," he said, "and I will continue to maintain an active interest in the affairs of the city. In all my life I've never worked with more cooperative people than those I've been affiliated with in the Paterson school system, and I'll be interested in watching their continued progress."

Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr.

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I, with a number of my colleagues, might pay our tribute of appreciation and affection to Dr. Ray W. Gifford, Jr., assistant attending physician of the Congress, who is about to complete his tour of active duty as lieutenant commander of the Medical Corps of the Navy.

Dr. Gifford has been a vital and an important part of the 84th Congress. He was here on the convening of the first session and is leaving on the adjournment of the second session. In the long hard months intervening, when often we were working around the clock and under tremendous pressures, he has been friend and physician. His warm personality, his great professional ability, and his willingness at all times to forego matters of personal concern the better to serve us have been a large contribution. He has taken in each of us a warm personal interest, truly the family physician in the finest and noblest sense. He leaves us with our deep appreciation. Our loss in his departure will be the gain of the Mayo Clinic at Rochester, to which noted institution he is returning as consultant in internal medicine. To Dr. Gifford and his charming wife go our good wishes for everything fine in the years ahead.

In bidding farewell to Dr. Gifford we again are reminded of how much we and the country owe to Adm. George W. Calver, who as physician to the Congress for many years, has kept the lawmakers of the Republic on their feet physically through the wear and tear, the strains of long hours, and demands on endurance when normal precautions were difficult, and the legislative work had to go on to meet the problems and the crises of the moment. Dr. Calver is a great American, respected and beloved by all in the Congress, and a physician who has reflected the highest honor and distinction on the Medical Corps of the Navy. It goes without saying that one working in association and under the command of Admiral Calver must be outstanding in professional standing and personal attributes.

Dr. Gifford was born in Westerville, Ohio. He received his B. S. degree at Otterbein College in 1944, being first in his class. He again was first in his class when in 1947 he received his M. D. degree from Ohio State University College of Medicine. In 1952 the University of Minnesota conferred upon him the de-

gree of M. S. in medicine. He served his internship at the Colorado General Hospital, 1947–48, his senior internship in medicine at the Ohio State University Hospital, 1948–49, and was a fellow in medicine at the Mayo Foundation, 1949–52.

From 1952 to September of 1954, when he came to the Congress as its assistant attending physician, he was instructor in medicine in the graduate school of the University of Minnesota and consultant in internal medicine in the famous Mayo Clinic. He is the author or coauthor of more than 15 articles dealing with cardiovascular diseases.

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUMMA. I join with the gentleman from Illinois. I have had pleasant professional relations with Dr. Gifford. He is a very sincere man and he has considerably improved my health.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois. I, too, owe a lot to Dr. Gifford. I wish him well in his return to private practice.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BERRY].

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in the statement the gentleman from Illinois has made. I think that Dr. Gifford has done a grand job, and I feel that he goes back to Mayo Clinic with the support and friendship of all of the Members of Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois with respect to Dr. Gifford. He was a grand fellow and a most excellent physician. I wish him well.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Hon. Clifford R. Hope

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, CLIFF HOPE, more than any other living American, has been a true champion of the farmers of our great land.

During my 14 years of service in the Congress, it has been my privilege to have had counsel with CLIFF HOPE many times. Always he was patient, courteous, and constructive. We have worked together on many projects and, under his leadership—and with his ability to work with everyone, regardless of partisan or sectional conviction, numerous successes have come to the good of American agriculture. It is a proud record that CLIFFORD HOPE leaves through 30 years of conscientious work.

Hon. F. Ertel Carlyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the other Members of the House of Representatives in congratulating my good friend ERTEL CARLYLE on the fine service he has rendered the people of North Carolina and the United States during his 10 years as a Member of this body.

Congressman CARLYLE's district joins mine for approximately 100 miles and we have worked on numerous mutual problems with complete unity during the past 10 years. I can remember very distinctly the tremendous efforts Congressman CARLYLE made in behalf of the people of North Carolina in having the United States engineers approve the Waccamaw River drainage project which traverses the lower part of his district and completely crosses my district. I feel that Congressman CARLYLE's services in this instance were worth more to the people of North Carolina than the entire salary he received for the 10 years he has been a Member of this House.

Congressman CARLYLE is a hard-working, Christian gentleman, and is one of the finest lawyers in the Congress. I will greatly miss him as a friend and a coworker during the next Congress. His services will be greatly missed by every Member of the House as he joined in on numerous occasions in solving problems not only for the Nation but the entire world.

I certainly hope Congressman CARLYLE will completely regain his health and enjoy a lucrative and pleasant law practice during the future years. I am certainly happy to consider Congressman CARLYLE as one of my closest personal friends.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with my colleagues in all the nice things they have said about OLIVER BOLTON. I had the privilege of serving with him on the Banking and Currency Committee, where he made a distinct contribution. He was always alert to the many problems which we considered in that committee.

OLLIE was an able Congressman. He always seemed to be keenly interested in everything about him and exhibited his interest with a personality that made him a host of friends.

I sincerely regret that he is leaving Congress and wish him the best of luck.

Hon. George Dondero

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us are proud to have had the privilege of working with GEORGE DONDERO.

Human, kind, thoughtful of others, courteous—GEORGE's attributes, coupled with his intelligent approach to the multitude of legislative responsibilities that have come his way, make his service in the Congress one in which we all rejoice.

We wish GEORGE and Mrs. Dondero every good in the years to come.

Senator Tom Wofford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I cannot leave for South Carolina without paying tribute to South Carolina's junior Senator, the Honorable TOM WOFFORD. Gov. George Bell Timmerman made a wise choice in his selection of TOM WOFFORD to represent South Carolina since the resignation of Senator Thurmond in April. Senator WOFFORD in these short months made many friends and admirers on both sides of the Capitol and in both political parties.

Senator WOFFORD ably upheld the principles, ideals, and traditions of the Founding Fathers of this Republic and the great leaders of South Carolina history. He was most cooperative and worked with the other members of the delegation as a team. Senator WOFFORD in his service here was modest, did not seek the headlines, but worked quietly and efficiently for his State and his country.

I hope Senator WOFFORD will not retire from public life but will again someday offer his service to our people. I wish him, his splendid wife, and lovely family the best always.

Important Legislation Requiring Prompt Attention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the last few weeks of this Congress, it is most distressing to me that some very vital and important legislative proposals affecting large segments of our American people remain unacted upon.

ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

For instance, there is legislation pending to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and industries in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial unemployment by providing new employment opportunities for developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, up in my area where inroads are constantly being made because of cheap foreign importations and sectional competition upon the textile, machinery, and armament manufacturing industries, among others, and their associated employment opportunities, there is vital need of sensible legislation of this type.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will not close without corrective legislative attention being devoted to the solution of this problem affecting my own region, and so many other regions of the country.

Because of the hardships continuously being visited upon the textile industry, I earnestly hope that the Congress will go on record with an expression of concern over the disintegration of this most essential industry because of increasing foreign cheap importations and also urge the President to use his emergency powers to control the excess of these damaging imports.

IMMIGRATION REVISION

Mr. Speaker, I very earnestly also hope that this Congress will not adjourn without enacting revision and correction of some of the injustices that are contained in our present immigration laws.

I urge the adoption of sensible amendments which will permit the pooling of unused immigration quotas and their use by those countries such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and others, whose quotas are vastly oversubscribed and impose abnormal waiting periods of several years' duration upon otherwise qualified and desirable applicants.

It would be an added injustice not to renew the provisions of our outstanding Refugee Relief Act and permit the many qualified thousands of refugee relief applicants from the Iron Curtain countries to come to the United States who otherwise will have little hope of ever entering America.

Among other injustices that should be corrected are the present exclusion of certain tubercular immigrant applicants who are members of American families and a great many who are barred because of conviction of a felony in another country when the same offense would not be considered a felony in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether by refugees and displaced persons. In advancing our position of world leadership in these perilous days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our Christian utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Security-screened and qualified refugees are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was established and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earliest days right up to this hour.

I hope and trust that we will be granted an opportunity to enact sensible legislative amendments to expand and correct our present immigration laws before this Congress terminates.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I and a great many other Members of this House have become deeply disturbed by the increasing publicity and propaganda questioning the continuation and cost-of-living adjustments and other benefits being reasonably accorded our veterans.

It is strikingly noticeable that the sources of these doubts about our obligation to war veterans have no hesitancy or question at all about the wisdom of continuing to provide billions of dollars in subsidies to carry on our faltering foreign-aid program. Some of these people even seem to prefer the vaccilating actions of Tito to the loyalty of the American veteran and his family. They seem to think that an astronomical gambling investment in Tito is more valuable than a reasonable investment to fulfill our duty to these American patriots who have been disabled in war and whose families have been visited with extreme material hardship because of military service sacrifices.

I do not believe that the people of this country now wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending to extend farm, home, and business loan guaranties for our veterans, to continue vocational rehabilitation adjustment assistance, to raise the ratings and pensions of the disabled war veterans and dependent allowances, as well as income limitations, in accord with our increased basic living costs. There is pending legislation to extend simple justice to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, who are trying to eke out a bare existence on some $54 per month.

These, and other beneficial measures, such as the so-called War Orphans Education Act, should be enacted without delay. Most of the pending bills are substantially sound and beneficial and are intended to discharge our just obligation to the war veteran and his family. I shall continue to work in support of their enactment as the best investment we can make to insure our national security.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. Speaker, it has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

It is perhaps not surprising that the various department heads in the executive branch have not been overwhelmingly zealous in presenting a program to us to aid the small businesses of the Nation, that nevertheless does not discharge the Congress from its own legislative responsibility.

There are a great many sound measures to grant vitally needed help to small business pending in the Congress, and I sincerely trust that they will not be passed over in the adjournment rush.

It is true that we extended the life of the Small Business Administration last year, and I am proud of the part I had in the original enactment of that beneficial legislation, but thus far that is about all that has been done for small business.

There remain many additional conditions affecting the vitality of small business that can be at least partially removed by applicable legislation.

One of the substantial helps we could give to small business would be to adopt a measure amending the Robinson-Patman Act to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission. It appears the Supreme Court misinterpreted the original intention of Congress and the objective, therefore, is to reemphasize and make clear that intention. The original purpose, and the purpose of current legislation, is simply to grant small business equality of opportunity and remove present discrimination that is allowed against him. It is designed to prohibit the larger concerns from getting preferential discounts, secret rebates, and under-the-counter deals which are discriminatory against the average merchant. The legislation is meant to apply only where there is interstate commerce and its end objective is to guarantee to the man who buys his goods for resale that he will get the same price from the supplier that this supplier grants to his competitors under the same terms and conditions. It permits differences in prices in accord

with the normal rules of good business practice but it prevents the good-faith defense where the effect of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This is sound legislation in the American tradition and it should be passed by the Congress.

There are other bills pending which recognize problems associated with the suffocation visited upon small business when a few giant corporations control raw materials, processing, and manufacturing segments of industry and a large number of very small business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers are two prime examples. It appears clear from the evidence that legislation is urgently needed to restrict these giant suppliers' freedom to unjustly and summarily cancel dealer's franchises without good cause and we particularly need to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow certain policies or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by these corporations.

There is a further need for legislation to strengthen our antimerger laws in these days of increasing tendency of great corporate mergers with resultant harmful limitations upon our traditional competitive enterprise system. These laws should be made more strengthened by helpful amendments and the penalties for criminal violation should be greatly increased.

The Congress should also do all in its power to encourage and request the executive branch to permit small business to participate in defense contracts. It has been authoritatively revealed that in the last 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. Therefore, it is certainly in order for this Congress to enact legislation of stronger intent and requirement for the award of Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids so that small business will have a better opportunity. The Department of Defense in all fairness should itself initiate a program of negotiating contracts with small business whenever such contracts are suitable.

Another field in which remedial action could be taken is in the tax setup affecting small business. Action should be taken to make the corporate form of business more attractive taxwise to small firms now existing as partnerships so that these units could accumulate retained business earnings at corporate rates and taxes on smaller corporations should be investigated in order to work out a system of graduated or progressive rates similar to that applying to individual income. There is much that can be done to help small business in this tax field and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the subject their prompt and earnest attention.

It we neglect the health of small business in this Nation we are betraying our duty of preserving the economic integrity of the Nation; let us then assume our rightful obligation to grant reasonable assistance to small business by the prompt enactment of suitable legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

Just a few of the problems that still challenge our legislative conscience are the enactment of a civil rights program, school construction aid, adequate housing and slum clearance, and flood disaster insurance. These problems, as well as many others, very deeply affect the general welfare and progress of the country. It is my judgment that we are morally bound to remain in session until these vitally important problems are legislatively solved for the good of all Americans.

Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express one's self about the loss of JESSE WOLCOTT to the House of Representatives. His devotion to the principles of free government and the promotion of the free enterprise system in our economy are outstanding and always command the sincere respect of all who know him. Never a demagog, he approached each problem with a keen mind and real vision, and in simple, sincere language presented his arguments with clarity and persuasion. No one ever had any doubt about the gentleman's views and his position on any subject under discussion.

With it all, JESSE WOLCOTT has a warmth of character tinged with a sublety of humor which wins him many friends who cherish deep affection and admiration for him and the principles for which he stands. His loss to the House as well as to the Nation will be great, and if the good wishes of his friends have any effect, his days to come will be filled with the best things of life.

Hon. Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House are taking this opportunity to tell the 25 Members retiring from the House how they will be missed during the next Congress, and to speak of the services they have rendered their States and the Nation.

I want to take this opportunity to speak a word in behalf of my good friend CHARLES DEANE, whos district joins mine. Mr. DEANE, we all know, is liked by every person on the floor of the House and if he has an enemy in the Congress I do not know who it could be.

CHARLES is one of the most likable Members of Congress I have met during the 18 years I have been here. I do hope that he and Mrs. Deane will enjoy good health and will have an opportunity to do some things they have wanted to do during the past 10 years after they return to their home in North Carolina.

I am certain that after the people of North Carolina completely review the fine record Mr. DEANE has made during his service as a Member of this body they will realize how well he has represented the State of North Carolina, the Nation, and the entire world. I am certain that CHARLES DEANE is one Member of Congress who would never knowingly do any person in the world any harm.

I consider CHARLES DEANE an excellent legislator and a gentlemen of the highest character. I wish for him and Mrs. Deane all the happiness and success in the world after they return to their home in North Carolina.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where Mr. Frank Brodie is in attendance during the sessions of Congress to receive orders for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month, and where single copies may also be purchased. Orders are also accepted for the printing of speeches in pamphlet form.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*——Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 6, 1956 No. 133

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Monday, August 20, 1956. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

The Legislative Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress has been one of the most constructive Congresses in the history of our country. It has enacted into law more public and private measures than has been done by any Congress for many, many years. Among the public laws have been many of great importance to the people of our country.

I desire to compliment Members of both sides of the aisle for their industrious and devoted attention to duty, both in committee and in the House during this Congress. For Speaker RAYBURN and myself, I wish to express our thanks for the courtesies and the understanding cooperativeness shown us, and without excluding others, in particular, the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The 84th Congress has been a responsible Congress during which very constructive legislation has been enacted. A Republican Congress, not long past, may have raised fears in the American minds that our system does not work well when the executive and legislative branches are not controlled by the same political party. The 84th Congress, under Democratic leadership, has dispelled such fears so far as Democratic control of the Congress is concerned. This Democratic Congress accepted the responsibility decreed it by the American voters in 1954, and has not broken faith with the voters. In the 1954 election, President Eisenhower, during the campaign, tried to throw fear into the minds of the American people that the election of a Democratic Congress with a President who is Republican would result in a cold war. The deeds of the 84th Congress have shown very clearly that President Eisenhower was in error when he made that statement.

This Congress has received the recommendations of the President of the United States in good faith. It has given thorough and careful consideration to such recommendations and, in so doing, has put national interest above partisan concern. In many cases the recommendations were passed substantially as recommended; in others they were improved upon prior to passage; in still others they were not acted upon because they were not for the best interest of the people. The guidepost of the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress was always, How do these recommendations fit the need of this great country of ours?

The record clearly shows the Democratic Party's selfless indifference to partisan advantage in our dedicated efforts to achieve major objectives. Once again we have substantiated our claim that we are the party of the people. While some members of the minority party have worked just as industriously and diligently as we Democrats to achieve the great record made by this Congress, the major credit lies with the Democratic Members.

Mr. Speaker, there is a very simple reason for this unusual situation which finds the President of the United States largely dependent upon support from the opposite political party than his own in order to obtain the progress and development of his program. In connection with this, it must be borne in mind that the President has embraced many of the basic policies and much of the philosophy of the Democratic Party.

We stood with the President in all matters which we felt were in the public interest. We fought him on issues which were designed to channel ever more of the common man's purchasing power into the coffers of special interest groups. The accomplishments of the 84th Congress clearly show that the Democratic Party was not a party of blind opposition but assumed its role under constitutional government of constructively supporting, of constructively proposing, of constructively criticizing, and of constructively opposing. When we compare this affirmative attitude of the Democratic Party with the blind opposition of the Republican Party under Democratic Presidents, the Democratic Party gains greater stature in the minds of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our record of taking specific and tangible action when the welfare of any segment of our people, large or small, is threatened. We do not condition our policy upon whether or not it is good for General Motors. Nor do we proclaim to the people in distressed areas that the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy. The record clearly shows that the Democratic Party is primarily concerned with the interest and welfare of our people. Under Democratic leadership, people will not, because of economic conditions, be expected to scrounge for survival.

From a statistical standpoint the 84th Congress has been extremely active in comparison with other recent Congresses. In fact, the number of measures enacted into law exceeds that of any Congress for the past 20 years. While the final returns are not yet in on the number of measures enacted, the figure is certain to rank high in comparison with other recent Congresses. These comparisons, standing alone, are an inadequate picture of the real accomplishments but they do give some indication of the workload of the 84th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline some of the major achievements of this Congress because I think it represents an era of enlightenment in the field of bipartisan politics that is unsurpassed in the history of our Nation.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

At the outset, I want to emphasize the fact that in the 2d session of the 84th Congress just completed, it is the first time in years that all regular appropriations bills were through both branches of the Congress by June 30. This is an unusual record.

One of the most critical problems to face in the 84th Congress in its earliest days was Formosa and what to do about her defense. Under Democratic leadership the problem was quickly brought before Congress and action was taken to give the President authority to use the Armed Forces, if necessary, in the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores. This demonstration of American strength and unity aided considerably at that time and for some months to come in the lessening of the tension in the Far East. Unfortunately, that tension has increased from other factors during the past year. I might state that the Formosa resolution was supported almost unanimously by members of both major political parties.

The President's authority to make reciprocal trade agreements and to reduce tariff rates was extended to June 30, 1958.

Economic and military aid amounting to over $7 billion was authorized.

The President's authority to control exports was extended until 1958.

Authority was granted for the United States participation in the International Finance Corporation for the purpose of encouraging private investment in foreign trade.

Congress provided for the settlement of World War II claims against Hungary, Rumania, and other countries.

An appropriation of $57.7 million was authorized to complete the Inter-American Highway.

Numerous important treaties in which the House had no voice were ratified by the Senate.

Last year I had the pleasure of submitting a concurrent resolution designed to place Congress on record as opposing Communist imperialism and calling for administration of our foreign policy and use of our influence to support other peoples in their efforts to achieve self-determination or independence. This resolution passed both branches of the Congress unanimously.

Congress extended to July 1, 1959, the authority to draft men into the Armed Forces. The act relating to doctors, dentists, and allied specialists was extended to July 1, 1957. These actions were necessary in the national interest of our country.

Legislation was enacted into law to establish a trained reserve manpower pool of 2,900,000 by 1959. Unfortunately, this program has not progressed very rapidly due to the confused leadership of the present administration.

An excellent program of construction of armories for training reserves in the sum of $250 million and covering a 3-year period was authorized.

On two occasions Congress extended the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities of critical and strategic materials, and to grant loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act. That authority now will not expire until June 30, 1958.

Officer strength of the armed services was increased by 60,000 men.

Laws were enacted to authorize the President to make the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service a part of the military in times of emergency; and to organize State defense forces to replace the National Guard when that organization is called into the Federal service.

A $532.2 million program of atomic energy projects was authorized.

Legislation was enacted providing for a large construction program in connection with the domestic and foreign bases of the Armed Forces, which legislation included provision for housing military families.

Additional funds were provided for the expansion of research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, as well as for the construction of an aircraft control and warning system.

Legislation was enacted authorizing $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion, including a nuclear-powered cruiser and a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier.

I might also say that considerable other legislation too numerous to mention on this occasion in the field of foreign affairs and national defense were enacted into law.

Mr. Speaker, I will now review some of the major activities of this Congress in a field in which the Democrats have always taken the leadership:

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Under the inspired leadership of a great Democrat, Franklin D. Roosevelt, one of the most important and humane pieces of legislation ever proposed was placed before Congress and enacted into law. This was accomplished against the opposition of a great majority of the opposite party. I refer to the Social Security Act. That act has subsequently been broadened and liberalized in many respects under the late Franklin D. Roosevelt and under former President Harry S. Truman. The 84th Congress accomplished a major revision of the act. It extended benefits to women beginning at the age of 62 instead of at age 65, and to disabled persons at age 50 instead of at age 65; coverage for lawyers, dentists, and other professionals was included; benefits were extended to some farmers; grants to States for aid to the needy, blind, and to dependent children were increased.

Another extremely important measure enacted by this Congress was the extension until July 1, 1957, of the Salk polio-vaccination program. Despite the poor administration of this program for a long period of time, it should be a comfort now to all Americans to know that this battle against crippling disease is now running smoothly, and this was mainly brought about through the justifiable criticism of Democratic Members.

In the field of medical research, of such vital importance to the people of our country both from a legislative and appropriation angle, this Congress has made the greatest step forward ever made in the history of our country. The results of the action of the Congress will inure to the benefit of our people and of mankind. As a result of the legislation passed and appropriations made, medical science will be able to enter into partially explored and unexplored fields bringing about results that will bring hope and confidence and improved care and treatment to millions of sick, afflicted, and disabled persons.

This Congress increased and extended the authorization for milk for schoolchildren; legislation was enacted authorizing a 5-year $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas; the Public Health Service has been directed by statute to survey the extent of chronic illnesses; and appropriations for medical research have been greatly increased.

Following the disastrous floods of the fall of 1955, the present Congress has made an outstanding record in meeting this serious situation. Adequate appropriations have been made for construction of dams and other work during the remainder of fiscal year 1956 and fiscal year 1957.

The Congress has also passed a law giving the Army engineers authority to construct projects, without authority from Congress, up to $400,000 per year in each project instead of the limited $150,000 which was the law heretofore. In connection with the latter, an additional appropriation of $2 million has been made to carry out this law during the coming fiscal year. In addition, Congress took many steps to extend FHA loan privileges to those who suffered during the flood period.

A very important bill of vital concern to the people of our country is the passage of flood disaster insurance legislation. After the disastrous floods of 1950 and 1951 in various sections of the country, particularly in and around the Middle West, former President Truman recommended such legislation. It was bitterly opposed as socialistic. After the floods of last year a public demand developed for the passage of such legislation. As hearings took place in both branches of the Congress, secret and powerful opposition developed against the passage of such legislation. Fortunately, such opposition was overcome with the resultant passage of the bill through both branches of the Congress. The concept of this type of legislation

originated in the recommendation in 1951 of former President Truman; its passage was as a result of bipartisan support, but strictly under Democratic leadership.

This Congress has passed a housing program that represents a compromise but still represents progress.

Legislation was enacted to extend the program for the construction of school facilities in federally impacted areas.

Mortgage insurance provisions were extended and liberalized.

Legislation was enacted to meet the sinister activity of illicit drug peddlers who sell to children, and other provisions effective stricter control of narcotics were enacted into law.

AGRICULTURE

As is well known, the 84th Congress passed and sent to the President legislation providing price supports of 90 percent for basic commodities, increasing price supports on dairy products from 75 percent to a scale of 80 to 90 percent, and providing for a soil-bank program and a two-price plan for wheat and rice. As is also well known, President Eisenhower vetoed that bill, which veto was sustained. Recognizing the plight of the farmers of our country, the Democratic-controlled Congress passed a bill in an attempt to alleviate the same. This bill was necessary as a result of the veto of President Eisenhower. It was not as effective as the Democratic measure.

A Democratic President and a Democratic Congress in 1957 will mean more effective legislation for the agricultural communities of our country.

The Commodity Credit Corporation's borrowing power was increased by several billions of dollars; the Sugar Act was extended until 1960 and foreign and domestic quotas were adjusted; farmers were relieved of paying excise tax on gasoline and oil used in farm machinery; the brucellosis eradication program was increased by $20 million and extended until 1958; a 10-year $25 million program of soil and water conservation was authorized for farmers of the Great Plains States; the limit on sales of surplus commodities for foreign currency under the Foreign Agricultural and Trade Development and Assistance Act was increased by over $2 billion; recruitment of Mexican farm labor was extended to 1959; acreage allotments for durum wheat were raised to meet shortages; onions were brought under the provisions of the Commodity Act; rice acreage allotments were reapportioned; tobacco quotas have been redetermined; emergency loan provisions for farmers and stockmen were extended for 2 years; a 2-year extension was granted for agricultural loans in disaster areas; a $15 million program for distribution of surplus wheat flour and corn meal to needy families was authorized; additional insurance of loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act was authorized; additional appropriations were authorized to the Agricultural Extension Service for special programs to aid farmers in low-income areas; and an important measure to the farmers of our country was that interest rates on farm disaster loans were reduced from 5 percent to 3 percent.

NATURAL RESOURCES

This Congress passed a number of fine projects of importance to different sections of the country in connection with flood control, conservation, and to prevent our natural resources from going to waste. One of the most important of these bills in this respect is the passage of the upper Colorado River bill authorizing a $760 million project for flood control and land reclamation in this great section of our country.

Another important bill passed was one increasing by $1 million a year Federal research grants to States and expanding the water-pollution program to $50 million a year for 5 years. Section 6 of this bill was opposed by the Republican administration.

Funds were authorized for the Washita River Basin project in Oklahoma; the Missouri River Basin project; the Mississippi-Gulf outlet; the Russian River, Calif., development; dam construction in Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri; the Ventura River reclamation project; construction and operation of the Washoe reclamation project in Nevada and California; Trinity River; and Central Valley project.

Several important interstate compacts for apportioning and allocating water—fire protection and other matters—were approved by Congress; Federal aid for wildlife projects was authorized; an 8-year program of research in the development and use of saline waters was enacted; legislation was enacted to permit development of mineral resources on public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development; a bill authorizing $8.5 million Federal matching-fund program to aid States in drainage and flood-control measures for anthracite mines; $15 million was authorized as an emergency fund for protection and repair of flood-control work, flood fighting, and rescue operations.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

This Congress enacted provisions to grant educational benefits to children of veterans who lost their lives in World War II and Korea; social security wage credits were granted for certain periods of military service; pay of trainees under the Reserve program was increased; legislation was enacted to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; the Veterans' Administration program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction was extended to July 1958; pay of medical and dental officers in the armed services and Public Health Service was increased; loans were authorized for the purchase of farm homes by veterans under the same terms as for residential housing; the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war was extended to 1960; and mustering-out pay provisions for Korean veterans were also extended.

And also of great importance, legislation was enacted to increase the pay of all members of the armed services by amounts ranging from 6 percent to 25 percent.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

The Congress, after many months of careful and deliberate consideration, enacted a broad highway construction program. This is distinctively a Democratic measure. If the measure recommended by President Eisenhower had become law, it would have cost the taxpayers of America in a period of 30 years over $11 billion more than the Democratic measure. President Eisenhower and the entire administration at the outset bitterly fought this vital measure. This law authorizes a $33.4 billion program involving 41,000 miles of interstate highways to be spread over a 13-year period. The Federal share of the cost will be 90 percent. The Democratic measure was a "pay as you go" one. The Republican measure was a deferred-payment one, properly known as the big bankers' dream.

The Fair Labor Standards Act was amended to increase the minimum wage rate from 75 cents to $1 per hour. President Eisenhower recommended an increase to 90 cents per hour. The Democractic Congress put through the increase to $1 per hour.

The Small Business Administration's loan authority was increased by $100 million to take care of disasters.

A very important bill, distinctively Democratic in origin, that passed both branches of the Congress under Democratic leadership is the bill to increase exemptions of the amusement tax from 50 cents to 90 cents. In particular, this is a matter of great importance to the moving-picture houses of our country that are operating under severe competition, and more particularly to the smaller moving-picture houses of our country.

Legislation was enacted authorizing a 4-year program of airport construction, and providing $63 million a year for grants-in-aid to States. When we realize the air disasters that have taken place, the importance of this legislation will be recognized and appreciated.

War-risk insurance provisions of the Merchant Marine Act were extended to 1960; renegotiation provisions for recovery of excess profits from defense contracts were extended to 1958; criminal penalties under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act were increased.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Congress enacted legislation to improve budgeting and accounting procedures and methods; civil-service retirement provisions were liberalized; annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system were increased; salary increases were provided for postal employees and other Federal employees, as well as members of the Cabinet, Federal judges, and Members of the Congress; per diem and travel allowances for Federal employees were increased; legislation was enacted to facilitate integration of State Department employees into the Foreign Service, and standards were raised to improve the quality of personnel.

The retirement bill for at least 2,100,000 employees and their 6 million dependents is a very important piece of

legislation. It is probably the most important single Federal employee act of this session of Congress. Under Democratic leadership, the bill as it passed both branches is a much better one than that recommended by President Eisenhower. This bill is another illustration of the considerate and humane leadership of the Democratic Party.

The several pay-increase bills in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, also enacted under Democratic leadership, resulted in higher pay increases for Federal employees than those recommended by President Eisenhower.

Both of these bills were passed over the resistance and opposition of the administration to the higher salaries and higher retirement benefits.

INTERNAL SECURITY

In this field laws were enacted to—

Fix criminal penalties for persons assisting in attempted escape of Federal prisoners; prohibit Government employment of disloyal persons or those who believe in the right to strike against the Government; create a Commission on Government Security to review the present program and make recommendations thereon; provide penalties for threats against the President-elect or the Vice President; provide rewards for information on the illegal importation, manufacture, or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons; and provide penalties for the willful damage or destruction of aircraft.

The record of Congress is not only legislation passed for the best interest of the people but also in exposing or preventing actions that are not for our best interests.

The 83d Republican-controlled Congress was noted for its giveaways of certain natural resources of our people. The 84th Congress stopped such giveaways.

The use of the contract device without advising or consulting with the Congress until after contracts were actually entered into, thereby attempting to commit our Government and compelling Congress to appropriate the necessary money, even if Congress did not agree, upon the theory that Congress had to approve otherwise it would constitute impairing the obligations of a contract, for which large compensation could be received from the Government by the private contracting party has been definitely exposed by this Congress.

An illustration of this is where the Department of the Air Force made contracts involving several billions of dollars over a period of 10 years in connection with the project known as Sage.

This is a case where contracts were made where no authority in law existed for the making of the same. The private companies were innocent. In this case there was no stretched interpretation of law involved. It was the making of contracts without authority in law.

Democratic Members were not opposed to project Sage, but insisted that the constitutional powers of Congress be preserved. It is interesting to note that the Comptroller General ruled that no authority in law existed for the making of such contracts.

As a result, the Defense Department, through the Department of the Air Force, had to come to Congress to get the authority in law to make such contracts, and which authority was granted by the recent session of the Congress.

It is also interesting to note, however, that as a result of the attempt to ignore and bypass Congress that first, $830 million over a period of 10 years has been saved the taxpayers of our country; and, second, the rights of small and independent telephone and electric cmopanies, ignored by the Department of the Air Force, have been protected by congressional action.

This large saving of money and the protection of small and independent telephone and electric companies was brought about by the Members of the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

The number of cases of "conflict of interest" involving at least several high officials of the present administration resulting in their resignation is another illustration of nonlegislative action by Congress, but constructive in nature and protective of the people's interest.

A further illustration of this is the nefarious Dixon-Yates contract which, first, was made in secrecy; and, second, by the very man who represented the Government, and at the same time was an official of the company entering into contractual obligations with the Government.

This hidden deal, contrary to the best interest of our people, was exposed by Democratic Members of Congress against the strong resistance of President Eisenhower and the Republican administration.

Another attempt by this administration is the stretched interpretation of the laws for the purpose of bypassing Congress. An excellent illustration of this was the action of the Defense Department in practically destroying the Donable Property Act, which meant so much to the several States and political subdivisions and to the hospitals, colleges, and schools of our country. This action of the Defense Department was stopped by the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

Another illustration of the constructive work done by the 84th Democratic Congress is the exposing of secrecy in Government where the executive branch withholds information from our people which they should receive. Quite frequently it is through releases by the Foreign Ministry of Great Britain and of France that the American people are made acquainted with valuable information which should be made public by our Government. Also involved is the deliberate withholding of information from the Congress and its committees which makes this a dangerous policy—justifiably subject to severe criticism.

We have seen develop under President Eisenhower during the past 3½ years a strange doctrine known as the doctrine of nonresponsibility, subtly established by President Eisenhower and the executive branch of the Government. The effect of this doctrine means that when bad errors are made by appointees of the President, and when they do things that are wrong, the President is not held responsible. This has created a political vacuum in Washington which is inconsistent with our theory of government.

The continuance of this doctrine of nonresponsibility of the President, with the resultant political vacuum, is not for the best interest of our country and our people. The doctrine of nonresponsibility for the conduct of public office by virtue of being uninformed or not desiring to be informed is dangerous.

The election of the Democratic candidate for President in November will effectively stop the continuance of such doctrine and the conditions that follow therefrom.

The Democratic Party has always been strong for a firm foreign policy and for a powerful national defense. Unfortunately, our country is upon the defensive throughout the world. The quicker that those who are entrusted with the responsibility of conducting our foreign policy get back to the Democratic policy of peace through strength the better it will be for our country and the free world.

Mr. Speaker, this presentation shows that the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress was not only an active one but a constructive one. My presentation does not by any means portray a complete picture of the fine work which has been done by this Congress. Based upon the work performed and the record made, I am proud to include the 84th Congress within my span of my service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mackinac Island

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn the Congress and return to our respective homes many will be seeking a rendezvous where complete rest and relaxation may be found before entering the fall campaign.

Foremost among the historic shrines of the world and equally as outstanding as a vacation spot is Mackinac Island in the straits of Mackinac just off the tip of Michigan's lower peninsula. Wonders of nature, scenic splendor, historic sights everywhere, and an alluring quaintness provide interests for all.

The island is a State park in which historic places and scenic beauty have been retained. Cars are prohibited, and in their place are horse-drawn carriages of various types and a variety of self-propelled cycles, all of which provide a rare atmosphere of carefree enjoyment.

Fort Mackinac, built in 1780 by the British and used as a stronghold in their battle to retain America in the Revolution and again in the War of 1812, stands in its original state, high above the waters of the straits, but visitors have replaced the warriors that paraded across its grounds more than 160 years ago.

Over the years the island has been held by Britain, France, and America.

Here on Mackinac Island you will find the new rearmament assembly center, which has just been completed. Also, you will find the nationally known Grand Hotel, claiming the longest porch in the world, offering elegant accommodations.

In behalf of Mackinac Island I extend an invitation to each and every Member of Congress to seek this beautiful island as their rendezvous.

Peace, Prosperity, and Progress Do Not Change Horses in the Middle of the Stream—Let Good Enough Alone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, if asked to describe in a few words the achievements of the present Republican administration it could be done in three words—peace, prosperity, and progress.

These words without any further elaboration clearly set forth the present-day conditions that are acknowledged by our people and accepted with general satisfaction and approval.

To fully understand the real reason that exists for this general satisfaction upon the part of our people, we need only compare conditions of today with those that existed when the present administration, under President Eisenhower, took over.

At that time we were still at war in Korea, our boys were being killed, wounded, and maimed on the battlefield. The prosperity, so called, that we had at that time was based upon war conditions. It was therefore neither sound prosperity nor the kind of prosperity that our people could enjoy, as it was founded upon the blood of our boys being shed on the battlefield. Thus, there was no peace, no real prosperity, and progress in promoting the real welfare of our people was at a standstill.

Today the scene is changed. The war is over. No longer are our boys being killed and wounded on Korean battlefields. No longer is our prosperity founded upon war. Instead we have prosperity and progress based upon peace. What could be finer? What could provide more genuine satisfaction to the fathers and mothers of our land? It is not strange that our people, regardless of political affiliation, express approval of the results attained under the present Republican administration.

It is accomplishments such as these that rise above and beyond partisan politics. The heart and soul of America is for peace. The desire for peace dwells deep in the heart of every one of our people whether they be Republican or Democrat. Thus, as peace is the basic desire of all our people, regardless of political affiliation, and prosperity and progress the desirable end of all our national efforts, it is not difficult to understand why there is such general satisfaction upon the part of our people with present conditions wherein peace, prosperity, and progress stand out with such preeminence.

What do we desire for the future? Could there be any better objective than "Let well enough alone" or "Don't change horses in the middle of the stream"?

We have peace. Notwithstanding the troubled state of the world, arising from numerous and varied questions, creating problems that are new each day and causing deep concern, yet the fact remains we are at peace and our boys are not being called upon to die on foreign battlefields.

We have prosperity. Today, as a people, we enjoy a degree of prosperity that exceeds that of the people of any other country in all the world. Our employment exceeds the fabulous figures of 65 million workers. Our national production in value reaches toward $400 billion. All of this has enabled us to enjoy a standard of living that exceeds any other period in our Nation's history.

Is it any wonder that thoughtful citizens should be more favorably impressed with these conditions that are the result of policies tried and not found wanting, and more willing to continue them, than to embark upon a sea of untried, uncertain, and questionable policies that could or would, in whole or in part, hamper or curtail the satisfactory conditions that now exist? It is fortunate that here in America, above and beyond the shouting and the turmoil of designing individuals who seek personal advantage by the advocacy of uncertain policies of government, there is a deep-rooted and well-founded commonsense inherent in our people that finds expression in that well-known adage, "Let well enough alone"?

Peace, prosperity, and progress are the important issues that confront our people today. Politicians can raise their voices to the highest pitch in advocating other issues, but the people will undoubtedly, and as they should in their own best interest, continue to give favorable consideration to these fundamental issues: Peace, prosperity, and progress. Of course, there are varying problems that must be met and solved as we deal with these larger issues. Agriculture and labor have problems to be solved. Our people yearn for additional tax reduction, aid for schools, increased health facilities, and so forth, and so on. Much has already been done with reference to these, but there is more to be done with respect to them and otherwise. These are important and must have consideration, but careful consideration leaves no doubt that what we can do with these other problems depends in large measure upon whether peace and prosperity shall continue. We have these now, and the progress that follows. Therefore, is it not wise to "let well enough alone"?

President Eisenhower is entitled to have the support of our people in his desire to continue the fulfillment of these basic principles: Peace, prosperity, and progress, and a Congress pledged to support and assist him in his great endeavor.

May God's blessing continue to be and remain with us as a people, that not only peace, prosperity, and progress shall be our portion, but that righteousness, truth, and morality shall ever be present, and a dominating influence in our land.

Rural Pastor of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the highest honor that any rural pastor in the South can achieve is selection by the Progressive Farmer, the great southern farm publication, as Rural Pastor of the Year. One of the two rural pastors chosen for this honor in 1956 is the Reverend H. C. Ellis, of West, Miss.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article from the Progressive Farmer, describing some of the activities of the Reverend Mr. Ellis which resulted in his selection for this high honor.

The article follows:

BEYOND DUTY

The oldest of nine children on a Mississippi farm, H. C. Ellis did not find the way to his goal an easy one. He often stayed home to help with farming. After entering college, he worked his way. He dropped out during his junior year because of health.

Later, while teaching and serving part-time churches, he went to summer school and completed college work through the extension department. He is now doing work through the seminary extension department.

In 1944 Unity Church in Attala County, Miss., called Mr. Ellis as pastor. A visitation program was started. In 2 years the 1-room church building was no longer adequate for educational purposes. Rooms were added. In 1955 the old building was replaced with a new brick building.

In addition to this full-time church, he serves Emory, Bowling Green, and New Salem Baptist churches in Holmes County on Sunday afternoons.

The church budget is almost four times what it was when he came to Unity. A church library has been added, largely made up of the pastor's personal books.

The church was 1 among 10 recognized at the 1955 State Farm and Home Week at Mississippi State College.

"Mr. Ellis has been an outstanding 4-H club adult leader," says W. R. Sullivan, county agent. "He has gone beyond the line of duty on many occasions to help the youth of his community and entire county."

Mr. and Mrs. Ellis have 2 daughters and 1 grandchild. He owns a farm in Holmes County. He has a small beef herd, and has set out 100,000 pine trees.

He belongs to the Holmes County Farm Bureau, is a trustee of the Durant Community Hospital, and belongs to the Unity community development program.

"A member of another denomination said of him," states one of his members, "'Mr. Ellis is not only the best rural preacher in our State, he is the best rural preacher in the world'."

Reports Which Should Not Be Made

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, on July 20 last the distinguished minority leader of the United States Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, of California, expressed to the Senate his amazement and concern that the United States under the United Nations Charter is required to furnish regular reports to the United Nations concerning Alaska and Hawaii. Under article 73, chapter XI, of the charter, it is held that Alaska and Hawaii are nonself-governing Territories. That is certainly true. But it is likewise true that they are incorporated, organized Territories of the United States and as such are constitutionally part of the Union.

I was delighted to learn that Senator KNOWLAND took such an emphatic position in seeking to bring to an end the furnishing of these reports. I trust his efforts will be successful. It must be sadly admitted, however, that earlier attempts in this same direction failed completely. To the best of my knowledge, it was Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, who in the early winter of 1953 first called upon the Secretary of State to discontinue without delay such reporting. For my part, I followed in the next few days with a letter to the Secretary of State endorsing Senator WATKINS' recommendation. The letter which was directed to Senator WATKINS by Assistant Secretary of State Thruston B. Morton and copy of which was furnished me by the Department of State was about as unresponsive a communication as I have ever had come to my attention. The State Department wrote to Senator WATKINS in these words:

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: The Department has noted with great interest the points which you raise in your letter of February 10, 1953, concerning reporting by the United States to the United Nations on Territories under the administration of this Government.

The Department was glad to learn that you favor the decision recently communicated to the United Nations that, in view of the self-governing status within the Federal Union attained by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under the constitution of July 25, 1952, it is no longer appropriate or necessary to provide information on Puerto Rico under the provisions of chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations.

With regard to Alaska and Hawaii, the ultimate status to be attained within the American Federal system is evidently statehood. The Department of State has always considered that, with the attainment of statehood for these Territories, a full measure of self-government in the language of chapter XI of the United Nations Charter will have been obviously achieved and there will be no question of further reporting to the United Nations. In this connection, it is noted that statehood for Hawaii is among the measures urged by President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message and ranks high on the legislative program of the current session of the Congress. It is also noted that bills have again been introduced proposing statehood for Alaska.

There is no question, as you point out in your letter, that Hawaii and Alaska, as incorporated Territories, are integral parts of the United States. The charter, however, makes no distinction between incorporated and unincorporated territories and calls for the transmission of economic, social, and educational information for territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government.

In 1946, on purely pragmatic grounds, the United States considered that a broad interpretation of this charter obligation would not only cause no disadvantage but would encourage other members of the United Nations to transmit information on their territories on a similarly broad basis, and thus assist in rendering the charter effective in this important sphere. The decision to report to the United Nations on Hawaii and Alaska has remained unchanged in the absence of any modification since 1946 in the constitutional position and status of these Territories which would lead the United States to cease reporting. The United States, it may be added, has actually received much favorable comment for the excellent administration of its Territories.

The Department is constantly reexamining the question of reporting to the United Nations on United States Territories, and your suggestion regarding Hawaii and Alaska will be given further study in connection with this periodic review. A change in status in either case would, of course, bring your suggestion into immediate effect.

I replied on February 21 as follows:

Thank you for your letter of February 20 with which you were good enough to send me copy of the letter addressed to Senator WATKINS under date of February 19. Both these communications have to do with reporting by the United States to the United Nations in respect to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Since you have been in office such a short time that naturally you have not had opportunity to look into matters such as this and also because as a former Member of Congress you must have had your hackles rise upon receiving departmental letters whose weight is based only on wordage and not logic, please allow me to record a personal belief that the letter sent Senator WATKINS is gobbledegook in its most elevated form.

I was particularly taken by the phrase that the United States in 1946 "on purely pragmatic grounds" decided to report to the United Nations on these Territories which are integral parts of the United States. Purely pragmatic grounds is wonderful. Perhaps it would be just as well, though, for the United States to look at this realistically and become unpragmatic. Whoever was the actual author of the letter sent to Senator WATKINS inserted by way of added dividend "The United States, it may be added, has actually received much favorable comment for the excellent administration of its Territories." May I call upon you to supply by chapter and verse the notation of such favorable comment. This would be most interesting. Actually, I would be much more content if the Department of State under the new administration were to cease furnishing to the United Nations precise statistical information which might be useful to Soviet Russia, a nation which naturally is most interested in everything that goes on in the Territory so close to its own Siberia. Better yet, grant us statehood and there would be no question about any of this.

Mr. Speaker, it is not only improper that Territories which, as Senator WATKINS pointed out, have been brought into the Union should be reported on to the United Nations but there are certain inherent dangers in doing so. There is always the possibility that information might be furnished in connection with these highly strategic areas that would be useful to a potential enemy. Alaska is one of the principal bastions of the United States. We do not tell our own people much about what is going on there regarding defense. Why, then, do we report to the United Nations? This practice should be stopped without delay. I am grateful to Senators WATKINS and KNOWLAND for their help.

President Eisenhower an Influence for World Peace Who Should Be Retained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today with its uncertainties in world affairs there is great need for the strength that comes from unity of action as well as of purpose.

From the very beginning President Eisenhower has shown not only a desire for peace, but, also a determination to maintain peace.

The President in all his efforts to effect these purposes has had the loyal and fullhearted help and support of Secretary of State Dulles, who is equally dedicated to the cause of peace. The physical and mental energy that has been displayed by Secretary Dulles is almost unbelievable. Aside from the mental strain that he has been under in meeting the many problems that confront our Nation, and, that he has been called upon to consider and find appropriate solution for, which in itself has been tremendous, there has been also the physical strain incident to the thousands of miles he has traveled by airplane to all parts of the world to meet those in other nations whose agreement and cooperation has been necessary if the best possible results were to be attained.

It is a high tribute to Secretary Dulles that he is honored and respected by congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle, Democrats as well as Republicans, for the wisdom and sincerity with which he has approached world problems. As a result of this, he and President Eisenhower have built up a nonpartisan support for American policies in our own Nation that has enabled us to present a united front to the nations of the world, and thereby gain that cooperation that has been so helpful and necessary to secure the blessings of world peace.

It has been no easy task that the President and his Secretary of State have been called upon to cope with in the effort to maintain our peace, and peace and good will throughout the world.

In this connection, it has been most difficult because of the unusual conditions created by Russia; first, under Stalin and, second, under Bulganin and his associates. The policies pursued by

the latter were distinctly different than those under Stalin. But, was there a real difference in objective? This was the fundamental question. It has not been easy of discernment. Consequently, it has been no easy task to avoid pitfalls that might have led to disaster.

For instance, there was the incident of Premier Bulganin sending to President Eisenhower a communication on behalf of the Soviet Union, in which the latter proposed a treaty of peace solely between Russia and the United States. It was a gesture that could easily have led a peace-loving nation, such as ours, to a quick acceptance. It could have been assumed that President Eisenhower would jump quickly to accept the suggestion as a way to peace, but fortunately our President was not so naive as to accept at full value what on the surface looked like a peace offer from Russia. However, he looked beneath the surface and there he saw a hidden danger and evidence of an ulterior motive. What he saw revealed to him the truth of two old sayings, namely, "All that glitters is not gold," and equally true, "Things are not always what they seem." However, the answer given by President Eisenhower to the Russian note left no doubt that he had looked well beneath the surface and had not been fooled by deceptive words, gilded though they were with the beauty and splendor that surrounds the thought of peace. Had President Eisenhower not been so discerning, and, had he accepted the Russian suggestion for a treaty solely between the Soviets and ourselves, it could have easily wrecked the unity that has existed between the free nations of the world and thereby eventually imperiled the united security for peace that now exists.

Never have I been more proud of our President than I was after reading the answer he made to the Russian Premier. His answer was so dignified, so searching, so simple and clear in expression, and so plain and convincing as to our national desire for peace, that even though the President refused to accept the Russian proposal as offered, and asserted in plain strong language that the failure of Russia to live up to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and its conduct in violating the principles of the Charter in recent years, made it mandatory that Russia first show a desire for peace by deeds rather than words, nevertheless, a spirit of friendliness pervaded the whole document to such an extent that it must have been apparent to even the Russian Premier, and, I hope, to the people of Russia, that our Nation seeks peace and not war.

The answer of President Eisenhower, in my opinion, constitutes one of the most outstanding chapters in the long history of mankind in its effort to create a world of peace and good will.

The friendly language of the President's reply, devoid of any harshness, and yet unmistakably strong and to the point, did not destroy in the slightest degree the eloquence of the answer, nor its effectiveness in promoting a better understanding of the sincerity of America in its desire for world peace. The acclaim of approval with which the President's reply was received throughout the world by all people who seek honestly to follow the ways of peace, and the praise that greeted it by all, regardless of party affiliation, including leading Democrats, such as former President Truman, Adlai Stevenson, Senators Byrd and Russell, as well as all the leaders within the President's own political party, leaves no doubt as to its approval and confidence in its effectiveness as a means of promoting world peace.

There are many equally significant and important incidents that might be set forth. All of such would tend to prove the valuable asset we have in the person of our President to deal with the intricate problems of foreign affairs. President Eisenhower, by his long and intimate association with foreign leaders, when he was commander in chief of the Allied armies, gained for him a reservoir of information that is of the utmost value in times such as these. He is helped immeasurably thereby as he meets with foreign leaders with reference to problems identified with our peace aims, and, also in making his decisions in reference thereto. Furthermore, his influence in all these matters is enhanced by his personal acquaintanceship with foreign leaders whereby he has been in a peculiarly strong position to demonstrate the high purpose that actuates him in all he says and does in the cause of peace.

President Eisenhower's character, ability, influence, and sincerity are so well known abroad, as well as here in his homeland, that it behooves us to retain him in the office of President and give to him a Congress pledged to support him in all his efforts for world peace.

Tribute to Hon. George A. Dondero

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the tribute that is being paid to GEORGE DONDERO in his retirement from Congress. As both the chairman and ranking member of the Public Works Committee, Mr. DONDERO has always been friendly and helpful to me on the committee during our 6 years of service together. He is an able legislator who will be missed greatly in the House of Representatives.

GEORGE DONDERO will also be missed greatly in Washington by his friends and fellow members of the Washington Civil War Round Table. He has been a leader in this organization and has done a great deal to promote proper research and scholarship about the war for southern independence.

Representative DONDERO is without a doubt one of the outstanding present-day authorities on Lincoln. One of the highlights of the past year's program of the Civil War Round Table was his entertaining address on sidelights in the life of Lincoln.

Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

SPEECH
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I avail myself of this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished public service of our fellow Congressman, the Honorable IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. Congressman DAVIDSON is not running for reelection for Congress. He has been nominated by both the Democratic and Liberal Parties of his State for the office of judge of the court of general sessions in New York County. This is tantamount to his election. The city of New York is to be congratulated on its new judicial ornament. The court's gain is a loss to Congress. And a gain to his lovely wife, Bernice, and his two fine sons.

It has been particularly gratifying to note and be inspired by the career of Congressman DAVIDSON. He is a native-born New Yorker who received his education in the city's schools and at the great New York University where he won the highest scholarship award. He went through law school on a scholarship and later engaged in active practice. In these respects he was another example of an aspiring and able young man who followed in the traditional pattern of growth and achievement on the ladder of success.

However, Congressman DAVIDSON was not satisfied with the routine of a successful practice. He yearned for public service. He felt deeply moved by all that the city, State, and Nation meant to him and he was resolved to devote his life to public affairs. From that time of decision his record is a most impressive one.

In 1935 he was appointed counsel to the legislative bill drafting commission in the New York State Legislature. Shortly after that he acted as special counsel to the New York State Mortgage Commission. In 1936 he was elected to the State legislature where he served for 12 years, and for a time was acting Democratic leader of the house.

The record of legislation sponsored by our colleague is outstanding. In 1937 he introduced the first constitutional amendment providing for slum clearance. In 1939 he spearheaded a constitutional amendment providing for five-sixths jury verdicts in civil cases. Juries up to that time had to be unanimous in their verdicts. He introduced measures for liberalization of the workmen's compensation law, for rent control and for the now famous fair lease law which prevented small type catch-phrases in leases which the average tenant never read.

In all, approximately 100 liberal, progressive, and constructive pieces of legislation were introduced and passed during this tenure as an Assemblyman.

In 1938, he attended the New York State Constitutional Convention where

he acted as secretary to the Democratic leader, United States Senator Robert F. Wagner, and during this year conducted a radio program explaining to the public, week by week, the procedures and deliberations of the constitutional convention.

IRWIN resigned from the State legislature in 1948 to become a justice in the court of special sessions of New York City where he performed his judicial duties for the next 6½ years.

Judge DAVIDSON resigned from the court to run for Congress. He was elected to the 84th Congress on November 2, 1954 and is a member of the House Committees on the Judiciary and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

During his first year in Congress, DAVIDSON was quite active in important pieces of legislation, most noted of which was a bill signed by the President to grant a gold congressional medal to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, the scientist who discovered the antipolio vaccine.

He is well known for his many communal activities which include acting as trustee for Rodeph Sholom Temple, the Jewish Consumptive Relief Society, Holy Name Centre, the New York Philanthropic League for Crippled Children and the Grand Street Boys' Foundation. He was chairman of the speakers' bureau for United Jewish Appeal and is permanent chairman of Manhattan for the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies. He is a member of the New York City Bar Association, New York County Lawyers Association, Tau Delta Phi fraternity, the Army-Navy Union and of the board of visitors for the Washington Square College of Arts and Sciences.

I am grateful for this opportunity to salute a man who has given much to his countrymen and who is well on the way to years of still greater service.

We will miss him sorely—his great fund of stories, his wonderful sense of humor and his all-around good fellowship.

Hon. John Phillips

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the many other Members of this House who have so ably paid their tribute to one of the finest men with whom it has ever been my privilege to be acquainted, the Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS, of California—a man of tolerance and understanding, a man of judgment and ability, a man whose counsel and advice has through the years been sought by all Members, and who constantly gave freely of his talents and judgment based upon many years of experience to his fellow Members.

The Congress of the United States is losing one of its most valued Members and the Members of Congress are losing one of their most valued friends in the retirement of JOHN PHILLIPS.

Federal Control Illegal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, in their desire and need for complete home rule under Territorial status, it is my belief that more than any other one thing Alaskans seek local control of their fish and wildlife resources. Time and time again, but never successfully, they have petitioned the Federal Government to grant them such control. In the fall of 1955 the Territories Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee under the leadership of the distinguished chairman, Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, traveled widely throughout the Territory. Public hearings were held in many places. So far as I am aware the committee members were unanimously of the opinion that Alaskans are as capable of managing their own affairs as any other Americans and should have administrative authority over fish and wildlife. It was a matter of deep regret that the Department of the Interior took an opposite position in reporting on my bill which sought administrative transfer, and recommended instead only giving Alaskans the right to manage their wildlife resource. This, of course, was the short end of the stick and was a compromise which Alaskans were unwilling to accept. Had the Department gone along with my bill, there is good reason to believe that the 84th Congress would have approved a transfer bill.

Now Mr. John A. O'Brien, of Ketchikan, Alaska, has presented a well-reasoned argument that Federal control of Alaska's fisheries is unconstitutional. He has written a thought-provoking paper on this subject, which I am glad to present here:

Alaska is the world's greatest producer of salmon, capable of a natural productivity on a sustained yield basis of 5½ million cases of salmon per year, more than the entire rest of the world combined. During the past 19 years, however, production has been steadily and seriously declining, resulting in a loss of $60 million a year at this time to the economy of both Alaska and the United States, an excessively high price of canned salmon to the consumer, and a progressively more serious economic hardship on much of coastal Alaska. Alaskans have uniformly informed Members of Congress that this decline in the salmon has been due to the operation in Alaska of huge devices known as salmon traps, which are illegal in the States of Washington and Oregon, and are operated in Alaska absolutely against the wishes of Alaska's people; and to the mismanagement of the Federal Government of the salmon fisheries. In turn, Alaskans have uniformly recommended: 1. The salmon traps be eliminated. 2. The control of the fisheries be turned over to Alaska. (In a 1948 referendum Alaskans voted 89 percent for the elimination of the trap; in a 1952 referendum Alaskans voted 83 percent that they wished the complete control of the fisheries be turned over to Alaska.) As former Governor Gruening has said, "It has been pointed out to Congress, by Territorial legislatures, by the Delegates, by the federally appointed governors, and finally by the Alaskan people in referendum of 1952, that the concern of Alaskans would necessarily be greater, their association closer, their knowledge more intimate, their understanding of the problem clearer, and their devotion to its solution more intense." I might mention that in 1949 the Territorial legislature created the Alaska Department of Fisheries to prepare for the day when management of the fisheries was turned over to Alaska. This department of fisheries is staffed by the most qualified fisheries biologists obtainable and is fully prepared and qualified to assume management of the fisheries and has Alaska's fullest cooperation.

The purpose of my letter is to go into some of the present legal aspects in regard to the Alaskan salmon situation at the present time.

When Alaska's organic act was prepared in 1912 it was generally assumed that Alaska would have control of its fisheries just as any other State and Territory had; however, the large absentee salmon canners who were canning salmon in Alaska at that time did not wish this to be so, mainly at the time, in an attempt to prevent the Territory from taxing their pack to contribute toward the development of Alaska, such as schools, roads, and so forth. In recent years the canners continue their vigorous efforts to prevent Alaskans from having democracy in this matter in order to preserve their operation in Alaska of salmon traps. The actions of these canners and trap operators has been one of the most important factors which has retarded the development of Alaska, and their organization, known as the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., is one of the few opponents of statehood for Alaska. The thoughts of these nonresident canners and trap operators do not by any means agree with the majority of Alaska's residents and fishermen.

Getting back to the organic act, I'll quote a bit here from the book, State of Alaska:

"Debate, which began in the House on April 17, 1912, lasted several hours. It brought out that since the purchase the expenses of the Federal Government had been only slightly in excess of $35 million, whereas Alaska had contributed in taxes and in the value of its products nearly $450 million, leaving Alaska as the Nation's creditor by the difference, and, according to Representative Flood, 'enriching many of our citizens and adding to the prosperity and wealth of the Pacific Coast States, if it has not at times saved that section from bankruptcy.'

"But while Congress was to grant Alaska a legislature, the interests opposing Territorial government were sufficiently powerful to restrict its scope. * * * Among other things, the legislature was not to touch the game, fish, and fur-seal laws, or laws relating to fur-bearing animals; thereby retaining Federal control and management of Alaska's principal resource (the fisheries)."

Section 3 of the organic act said in part "that except as herein provided all laws now in force in Alaska shall continue in full force and effect until altered, amended, or repealed by act of Congress, or by the legislature: *Provided*, That the authority herein granted to the legislature to alter, amend, modify, and repeal laws in force in Alaska shall not extend to the customs, internal revenue, postal, or other general laws of the United States, or to the game, fish, and fur-seal laws and laws relating to fur-bearing animals of the United States applicable to Alaska: *Provided further*, That this provision shall not operate to prevent the legislature from imposing other and additional taxes or licenses."

By the additional provision at the end of section 3 Alaska could tax the fisheries, which fact was upheld in court, but by the word "fish" in the body of section 3, could not legislate in any manner for the protection and regulation of the fisheries. This remains the case to this day.

One more quote from the book, State of Alaska, and then we go on. "It appeared from the testimony at this hearing that the efforts on the part of the canned-salmon industry to write into the Organic Act of 1912 a definitive prohibition of the Alaska Legislature's right to tax the fisheries has miscarried through lack of coordination of these efforts in the two Houses of Congress. After the act of 1912 had passed the House, Mr. John S. Webb, representing a group of Seattle salmon canners operating in Alaska, according to his testimony, had called the attention of Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, to a speech of Delegate Wickersham declaring the Delegate's intention to secure for the Territorial legislature the right to tax the fisheries. The Senator, according to Mr. Webb, agreed that that would not be right and introduced an amendment in the Senate inserting the word 'fish' between the words 'game' and 'fur-seal,' to exclude fish from the field of legislation upon which the legislature could act, presuming it would debar also the right to tax. However, when the bill went to conference Wickersham persuaded the House conferees to add the sentence to permit the legislature to impose 'other and additional licenses and taxes.'"

The insertion of the word "fish" into Alaska's Organic Act of 1912 as a matter upon which the Territory could not legislate constituted both a discrimination against Alaskans and a direct violation of the contract under which Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867, specifically, article III, treaty of 1867, wherein the United States guarantees "the inhabitants of the ceded Territory * * * shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States." Ratification of the treaty of 1867 by both Houses of Congress therefore made the inhabitants of Alaska citizens of the United States, extended to them the Constitution of the United States, and all the rights, advantages, and immunities enjoyed at the time by citizens of the United States. There is no qualification there; article III does not say "some" of the rights, nor does it say only "the Constitution of the United States," it says "all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States." One right which the citizens of all the States and Territories had at that time was definitely the right to manage their fishery resources, in no case was that right specifically reserved to the Federal Government, and in fact even today the Federal Government reserves this right only in the case of Alaska although Territories of lesser legal status have the right to manage their fishery resources.

Referring to the Constitution of the United States, September 17, 1787, which was in 1867 extended to Alaskans, preamble, "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Article IV, section 3: "The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States."

At this point the Congress has the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting Territories.

Article VI: "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land."

Note at this point included under the supreme law of the land, "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States."

Articles in addition to, and amendment of, the Constitution, article X, effective November 3, 1791. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

This article guaranteed the management of natural resources to the States, or to the people, and not to the Federal Government.

At this point we have arrived at: The Constitution, its articles and amendments thereto, reserve the management of natural resources to the States, or to the people, and to the Territories except in the case of Territories for needful rules and regulations—plus under the supreme law of the land are all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States.

Now we come to the treaty of 1867, a treaty made under the authority of the United States and therefore a supreme law of the land. And at the same time (1867), also supreme law of the land is the Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof. It also follows that if all three are to be the supreme law of the land then none can be in conflict with each other.

Under article III of aforesaid treaty, "The inhabitants of the ceded territory * * * shall be admitted to all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States."

A right and advantage which the citizens of the United States both in the States and the Territories had at that time was the management of their fishery resources since said management was either being practiced or was not prohibited by either the Constitution or the laws of the land made in pursuance thereof, and had not been reserved to the Federal Government pertaining to any territory under article IV, section 3 of the Constitution. At the same time one of the immunities guaranteed by this treaty to the inhabitants of Alaska was immunity from interference of the Federal Government into the mangement of the fishery resources of Alaska since all States and Territories at the time (1867) enjoyed such immunity.

Neither the Constitution nor the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, or the treaties of the United States can be in conflict with each other as collectively they are the supreme law of the land, as so specified in the Constitution itself.

The laws of the United States made subsequent to the treaty of 1867 reserving the right to control Alaska's fisheries to the Federal Government are in my opinion in conflict with the treaty of 1867, a supreme law of the land, as this treaty gave Alaskans the rights of citizens of the United States and such rights included the right to manage their fishery resources at the time of the treaty. I can see no other interpretation of the treaty of 1867 as regards the fisheries and thus from the first law of the Federal Government pertaining to Alaska's fisheries, to the present, these laws are in conflict with a supreme law of the land passed previously. The situation is further aggravated today by the fact that all citizens of the United States, except Alaska, including those in territories of lesser legal status than Alaska, an incorporated territory, have the right to manage their fisheries. Such discrimination appears to be in direct conflict with article III of said treaty, a supreme law of the land.

The treaty of 1867 at the time of its ratification and becoming a supreme law of the land could not, however, be in conflict with the other supreme laws of the land at the time; namely, the Constitution, its amendments thereto, and the laws of the United States in pursuance thereof. The fact that the treaty of 1867 gave Alaskans the right to manage their fisheries, as I feel, was not in conflict with the laws of the United States as there were no laws prohibiting this right to citizens of the United States in the States and Territories. In regard to the Constitution, the Congress had the power to make rules and regulations regarding the Territories only if such rules and regulations were needful. In 1867 rules and regulations regarding the fur seals and sea otters were needful, to mention two such cases; however, in regard to the fisheries (salmon, halibut, etc.) which were, at the time, not being utilized except in a small way as personal food by the native inhabitants, rules and regulations in regard to the fisheries were not needful. I thus conclude that since all citizens of the United States, including those in the Territories, at the time of the treaty of 1867, had the right to manage their fisheries and since at the time of this treaty such right could only be reserved by Congress if rules and regulations were needful, and they were not at the time of the treaty, then this right of management of the fisheries was guaranteed by the treaty at the time of its ratification and any subsequent laws made by the Congress of the United States, and/or rules and regulations by Federal bureaus, are in direct conflict with historic precedent and a supreme law of the land passed previously.

Let us now assume I am incorrect about the preceding and examine it further. The Founding Fathers clearly specified the functions of the Federal Government in the Constitution and stated "The powers not delegated to the United States (Federal Government) by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people. Now since the management of natural resources was not delegated to the Federal Government, and not prohibited by the Constitution to the States, the powers of maanging natural resources are therefore reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, except in the case of Territories, for needful rules and regulations, and only for needful rules and regulations. The Founding Fathers didn't say any rules and regulations; this power was given to Congress only in the case of needful rules and regulations.

Now, in the case of Alaska, since Alaska has established an Alaska Department of Fisheries, staffed by the most capable fisheries biologists obtainable, and since this is a working and active organization supported by funds appropriated by the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, and since this organization enjoys the respect and cooperation of Alaska's citizens, and since this organization is headed by Mr. Clarence L. Anderson, director, a man respected on the Pacific coast, as well educated, acquainted, and informed about Pacific fishery matters, particularly salmon, and, in fact, a former director and assistant director of the Washington State Department of Fisheries and a member of, or adviser to, leading Pacific coast scientific and fishery management organizations, and since the people of Alaska, citizens of the United States, voted by a great majority in referendum of 1952 that they wished the control of the fisheries turned over to Alaska, and since our Territorial legislature has memorialized the Congress of the United States requesting such action, and since our Delegate to the Congress of the United States has introduced a bill in the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to provide for the transferring of the control of the fisheries to Alaska, it is overwhelmingly apparent that rules and regulations by Congress respecting the fishery resources of Alaska, with the exception of passage of the bill transferring control of the fisheries to Alaska, are no longer needful; and since the Congress is empowered to make rules and regulations concerning Territorial matters only if such are needful, then any further rules and regulations by the Congress of the United States

concerning Alaska's fisheries, with the exception of transferring control of said fisheries, are against the intent and wishes, clearly specified of our Founding Fathers and are unconstitutional.

My conclusion, gentlemen, is the control of Alaska's fisheries must of necessity, under the supreme law of the land, be turned over to Alaska immediately. Believe me when I tell you this is not only necessary under the Constitution and the treaty of 1867 and in keeping with the intentions of our Founding Fathers and historical precedent and in the best interests of Alaska and our Nation, but is necessary due to the fact that under Federal management, which naturally originates so far away in Washington, D. C., our salmon are fast going downhill, and we should like to rebuild this resource. It is an absolute necessity for many of our towns, villages, and people that it be restored to full productive capacity as soon as possible.

Need for Thorough Study of the National Banking Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has the slightest familiarity with the Federal statutes regulating national banks must agree that it is high time that all of those statutes were reviewed, clarified, and brought up to date.

Since January 1953, under the aegis of the big banking interests of the country, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, there has been a constant whittling away at the Federal statutes so as to strike down many of the safeguards written into the law after the bank holiday of 1933.

All of the bad practices that were disclosed as a result of the depression and the bankruptcies which came in and after that period are again being encouraged. In the last few years, under the sponsorship of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency, laws were enacted affecting the qualifications of national bank directors; lessening the number of required bank examinations; lifting the requirement for the filing of stockholders lists with the Comptroller of the Currency; and extending and broadening the lending authority of national banks.

A review of the testimony and reports of these Government officials in connection with those bills, together with that which came from them with reference to the bank holding company bill and the attempt to enact S. 256 to eliminate cumulative voting, plus their resistance to regulation of bank stock proxy solicitation, supports the conclusion that this is all part of a pattern to weaken our national banking system and to vest complete control thereof in the hands of the big moneyed interests of the country.

On July 7, 1955, I introduced House Resolution 303, calling for a study of all of these matters. It has received no attention. On July 20, 1956, I offered a motion in executive session of the House Banking and Currency Committee for the appointment of a subcommittee to study all of these problems. The motion was pending at the time the executive session was recessed and there has been no executive session of the committee held since.

Today I wrote to the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee as follows:

JULY 27, 1956.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Several of the members of our committee are very much concerned, as I am, that we have failed to investigate the activities of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is managed by a bipartisan Board of Directors of three members. By law, the Comptroller of the Currency is one of those Board members. Since 1953, the Comptroller of the Currency, Ray M. Gidney, and the Chairman of the Board, H. Earl Cook, have been members of the Republican Party, and the third member, Maple T. Harl, has been a Democrat.

It appears to us that the FDIC has been dominated by the Secretary of the Treasury, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Chairman of the Board. On several occasions, the Comptroller of the Currency and the Chairman of the Board have made statements on behalf of the FDIC without consulting the third member of the Board.

This matter needs thorough investigation to determine to what extent this has occurred. Our attention has been directed to other very serious violations of the law concurred in, or acquiesced in, by Comptroller Gidney and Chairman Cook. To mention but a few—

1. The discharge of an attorney who had tenure resulting in a lawsuit brought by that attorney which has been settled by the payment of $22,500.

2. The employment of not 1, but 2, outside firms of attorneys to defend that suit while at the same time using counsel and attorneys of FDIC to do the same thing.

3. Waste of FDIC funds in that connection.

4. Continuance of an employee, to wit, the chief examiner, on annual leave beyond the time permitted by law.

5. Authorizing, if not instigating, the collection of a substantial fund from employees, for a gift presented to the chief examiner, in violation of law.

6. The waste of funds by giving of cocktail parties and dinners to bankers at the expense of FDIC. We are told that there has been at least one such function in each of the years 1953, 1954, and 1955.

7. The reorganization of a national bank in Chicago by forcing the sale of the stock to the Illinois State auditor who in turn placed his dummy in charge of the organization as the president, as a result of which he was able to cash State checks, improperly drawn to fictitious payees, converting the funds to his own use.

8. Operating the offices of Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for the benefit of big bankers and big banks, forcing smaller banks out of business by sale of assets or merger into the largest banks, and preventing the merger of smaller banks which seek to compete with the larger banks.

9. Violating the law by permitting corporations to organize banks, using dummies as individual stockholders.

10. The Comptroller of the Currency, ever since his appointment as comptroller, has been drawing his full salary of $17,500 per year while at the same time time drawing a pension from the Federal Reserve System in excess of $12,800 a year.

We have every reason to believe that the foregoing charges hardly begin to scratch the surface.

We ask that you immediately designate a subcommittee to investigate all of these problems.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

These matters are all of extreme importance and they should be inquired into without further delay.

Report to Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in Town and Village, a weekly newspaper which is published and distributed in the 19th Congressional District of New York which it has been my honor to represent:

(By Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN)

These are a Congressman's busiest weeks, the weeks before adjournment when legislative proposals that have been studied in committee and debated back and forth, come up for vote. All a busy legislator can do at this time for his scheduled column for Town and Village is to put down random notes and observations having a bearing on the political life of our country.

One of the more ugly revelations at this session was the attitude of detachment manifested in Government circles about the discrimination against American citizens of Jewish faith in international trade with the Arab countries and in the American personnel admitted to those countries. There is a long and glorious history of United States official condemnation of such practice in instances where other countries undertook to lay down the law to the American Government about distinctions between one citizen and another. In all previous cases, United States policy was clearly and unmistakenly one of indignation at such attempts to dominate American attitudes. It remained for this administration to accept the existence of such practices and to do so with the air of stiff detachment and aloofness. Fortunately this is by no means a closed issue. The American people will have an occasion to learn the facts increasingly from in and outside Congress and pass judgment on this yielding of American sovereign rights.

One of the more gratifying public developments recently was the formation of a group of American scholars known as the American Committee for the Study of War Documents. This concerns a subject which perhaps I was the first Congressman to take note of in the House.

Some time ago I learned that a vast amount of historic documentation which had been found and acquired by the United States occupying forces in Nazi Germany had been kept in Washington, had been made available only in small part for research, and—this is most important—was now in the process of being returned to the Federal German Republic. It was not clear just where the responsibility rested for the decision to return this material. At that time I brought

the subject up in Congress in a statement in which I said:

"The German archives contain, no doubt, material that can shed a powerful light on the goals, methods, and processes of the Nazi conquest of one country, Germany; material about the unutterable plans for the destruction of what they called inferior people, first in their own land and then in neighboring countries. It no doubt sheds light on their Machiavellian propaganda techniques, including those by which they contemplated the division of our own country and the weakening of our material and moral strength to resist totalitarianism. Such material is of incalculable historical importance. It must not be jeopardized or lost to us by its casual return to a country where its nationalist forces may be disposed to destroy the full record or to conceal it forever from the scrutiny of the civilized world.

"This record must be kept and, in due course, be made available to American scholarship as the all-important source material by which we can learn from the dread recent past and be strengthened by that knowledge to deal with problems that we may well have to meet in the imminent or far future."

Fortunately, the officials seem to have recognized the stake that the American people have in this material and the value of conserving it by microfilm so that American and world scholarship could have full access to it.

The committee of historians is to be congratulated on its organization. They deserve every aid and encouragement to make it possible for them to carry out this important historical task.

With the political campaign well under way, it is interesting to note the sly action of the Republican national committee in putting forth the notion of Communist preference for a Democratic victory, while, at the same time, giving itself freedom to disown such a smear. A campaign very often gets into ugly impasses. This is one of the ugliest, and it is high time the American people rose up in its wrath to reject these shocking innuendoes against America's oldest political party and against the millions of Americans, probably the majority, who vote for its candidates.

There was a news items just recently reporting how gratified the Soviet leaders were at Eisenhower's decision to run, despite his health condition, because, according to the report, they felt that they could "do business with Eisenhower." I am sure that the Republican National Committee will not include this report in its documentation for the smear and poison that it is trying to inject into our political discussions.

One of the more wholesome things that followed the great Hoover Republican depression was the deflation of public figures so that their pontifications were not all taken as gospel truth. I remember back in the twenties when every successful industrialist was automatically endowed with wisdom in every aspect of life. The big tycoons spoke on American history, or on medicine, or on psychoanalysis—subjects utterly unknown to them—and received an awesome hearing. The depression deflated this, and it was realized that a man may be qualified to speak authoritatively on one subject and be a darn fool on others.

Now we have a recurrence of this situation: the emergence of "political doctors"—men who are qualified in the field of medicine and surgery and who set themselves up to judge as to the exacting demands of high political office. They are expected to know about the condition of an injured heart or an occluded intestine. That's understandable, but now they have gone further. They issue authoritative statements, as to the strain or lack of strain of political office. With the experience that America has had with such so-called experts, it will know how to take this new development with the big chunk of salt that is called for.

Whatever happened to the teamwork that was so highly touted in the last presidential campaign? The promise that there would be no confusion or misunderstanding and that all the members of the new administration would work as a team conscious of each other's actions, consistent with one another's policies? I raise this question whenever I read of a statement by the President, for instance, on the situation of the neutrals; and an opposite view expressed by his wandering Secretary of State. Is it possible that neither reads what the other says? And what happened to the famous pledge to maintain the highest ethical standards when we run across the Chotiner case; and when the head of the Department of Justice plays "footsy" with a commercial organization for whose television broadcast he reserves the announcement of a major bit of Federal action? What happened?

The campaign I gather is going to hear a great deal of gloating about the fact that the present administration has somehow maintained the high prosperity level that was developed by the policies of the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

Question: Prosperity for whom? For the farmers? They need only to be asked to reveal how great has been the drop in the farm income, on which so much of our national prosperity depends. The workers? You need only read the news items of the shortened working week, the layoffs, the drop in employment in the basic manufacturing industries. Small businesses? Here are some figures between 1952 and 1955: big business profits after taxes were up 45 percent, and big business return on investment were up 18 percent. Small business profits after taxes were down from 13 percent to 15 percent and investment return down from 16 percent to 41 percent. Dun & Bradstreet index on business failures since 1900 shows that, on the average, the failure rate has been early twice as high under the Republicans as under the Democrats.

Small business is becoming smaller and smaller and drastically affecting the general picture of the United States economy.

And so I ask, prosperity for whom?

When the Congress ends its session, I hope to prepare for the readers of T. & V. an extensive series of reports as to the legislation passed and the meaning of what has occurred in our Nation's Capitol.

Hon. Edward P. Boland

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words for my distinguished friend and colleague, the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND, of Massachusetts, who serves with me on the Appropriations Committee.

For 2 years I have had occasion to watch his work. During that time I have learned to admire and respect him for his enormous capacity for work and for his keen, alert mind. He grasps the problems which we work with in committee with an understanding that oftentimes amazes all of us.

The people of the great State of Massachusetts and the people of his district are very fortunate to have representing them a man of Congressman BOLAND'S fine moral character, general alertness, and ability to get a job done well.

He is one of the outstanding members of our committee and of the Congress. As the years go on we shall hear of Congressman BOLAND'S ever-increasing achievements.

Farewell to Retiring Members of Congress

SPEECH
OF
HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to associate myself with my distinguished fellow colleagues from North Carolina and others in the House in their tributes to four very able colleagues of ours from my home State who will not be with us in January.

With the departure from our midst of CHARLIE DEANE, ERTEL CARLYLE, THURMOND CHATHAM, and WOODROW JONES, the House will sustain a great loss. The Congress and the Nation are losing the very valuable services of four very able and distinguished Americans.

First, as one of the younger Members of this body from North Carolina, I want to express my deep gratitude to these colleagues and fellow North Carolinians of mine for the very generous and friendly manner in which they received me when I came to Congress. They have been thoughtful, cooperative, and most helpful. I will always be thankful for my associations with them. All of them are men of stalwart character, high integrity, and strong convictions. They have had the respect and love of everyone of us on both sides of the aisle. All of them have been very valuable Members of this House. They have contributed significantly to the legislative enactments of the Congress. They have been loyal and faithful to the people of their respective districts, to the great State of North Carolina, and to our Nation which we all love so deeply.

With the passage of time, the committees on which they have served, more than anyone else, will appreciate the loss of their services.

I did not know all of them well before I came to the Congress, but I have learned to admire and respect each of them.

CHARLIE DEANE has been one of the hardest working Members of this House. He is well known here as a fine Christian gentleman, interested in the welfare of the people of America, especially "little people." He is a kindly man. He has been an unsurpassed combination of unswerving devotion to duty, courageous loyalty to his deeply held convictions, and unfailingly sweet spirit. He has been a faithful and able public servant. I appreciate his friendship and I will miss his presence in this body, as I know you will.

I feel rather close to ERTEL CARLYLE because, upon my arrival here, I learned

that he participated in the marriage of a member of my family to a distinguished constituent of his. ERTEL CARLYLE is one of the most conscientious and likable Members of this House. He has a friendly and hospitable mind and heart which attract you to him. He is always pleasant. He has an excellent sense of humor. Out of nowhere he has the ability to come forward with a short humorous observation, particularly in private conversations, which enables one to at least momentarily lift the weight of congressional responsibilities from his shoulders and relax in the atmosphere of good humor and laughter. Also I have appreciated the quality in him that looks upon every vote in this House as a serious matter. ERTEL CARLYLE will be greatly missed by all of us.

I have also been extremely impressed by the congenial personality and the stalwart character and integrity of our colleague, THURMOND CHATHAM. He is one of those Members who has his own convictions. At the same time I have noticed his extreme respect and admiration for the convictions of those who may disagree with him. I am told by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee that he has been a very valuable member of that committee, thinking always in terms of what is for the best interests of America and contributing significantly to legislation which that committee has reported to this House for our consideration. He has been deeply interested in the security of this Nation and the free world. To that end he has aggressively supplied his splendid talents. We will also remember THURMOND CHATHAM as one of the finest hosts in Washington. He and his good wife, Pat, have, on many occasions, been hosts to the Members of this House and other friends of theirs. In this extracurricular activity they have contributed much to our own health, happiness, joy, and contentment here in Washington. THURMOND CHATHAM will not only be missed by the Foreign Affairs Committee but he will be missed by his many friends who has learned to love and respect him for his fine qualities and for his great ability.

I first met our distinguished colleague, WOODROW JONES, when he was serving as a member of the House of Representatives in the North Carolina State Legislature. Though I was across the hall in the other body, representing my own district in North Carolina, I had the opportunity to observe and work with him in action. He was an extremely valuable member of the State legislature, and then, as now, he had those deep-seated convictions which would not yield to trivial, petty, or political arguments or expediencies. I am quite sure that every Member of this House who has come to know WOODROW JONES well is mindful of his strong convictions, particularly when it comes to expenditures. While on some occasions many of us may not have seen things as he did, I am sure that I bespeak the feelings of every one of us when I say that if all of us had voted on all matters involving appropriations, increases in appropriations, or amendments reducing appropriations as he has voted, our national budget would have been balanced long ago. WOODROW JONES has served a very necessary and essential place in this House by being one of its most economy-minded Members. He has been one of the most able and conscientious Members of this House, devoted to the service of his district, his State, and his Nation. The better you know him, the more you love him. His district and State has every reason to be proud of the statesmanlike service he has rendered during his tenure in this House. He will be missed by all of us in more ways than one. I regret very much that he has made the decision to return to the private practice of his profession—law. And yet, I can thoroughly understand and appreciate his wishes to return to his beautiful wife, Rachel, and his two fine sons who have preferred to remain at home during most of WOODROW'S service here.

The memory of our association with these four distinguished and very capable Members of this House, who are returning to their homes and other avenues of life, is something which I am sure all of us, on both sides of the aisle, will always cherish and hold near and dear to our hearts. May the tie of friendship and understanding which binds them to this House and to us and us to them ever remain stanch and true.

Individually and collectively they have wrought good works upon us, upon their constituency, and upon their country and the world. Yes, they have wrought good works which will be remembered.

What builds the Nation's pillars high
And its foundation strong?
What makes it mighty to defy
The foes that round it throng?
Not gold, but only men can make
A people great and strong—
Men who for truth and honor's sake,
Stand fast and suffer long—
Freeman who work while others sleep
Who dare while others fly
They build a nation's pillars deep
And lift them to the sky.

Mr. Speaker, truly, we are losing four coworkers of indomitable spirit, leaders whose memory we shall ever hold in the highest esteem. They will be hard to replace. While their individual qualities and interests naturally vary, as do all of ours, I think it can be truthfully said that the seriousness with which they have accepted their obligations, the efficient and dignified manner in which they have executed their duties, and the patient understanding they have always exhibited to their colleagues have contributed substantially to the improvement of this body and its accomplishments.

And so, my fellow colleagues, may I conclude my tribute to these distinguished fellow North Carolinians of mine by wishing for them and their fine families in the days, months, and years ahead the very best of everything and, above all, an abundance of good health, success, and happiness in whatever they undertake.

Elimination of Cumulative Voting by S. 256

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on July 20, 1956, in opposition to the enactment of S. 256, to eliminate the right of national-bank stockholders to vote cumulatively:

S. 256 TO ELIMINATE CUMULATIVE VOTING OF SHARES OF STOCK IN THE ELECTION OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1956.

The committee met at 10:20 a. m., in room 1301, House Office Building, Hon. BRENT SPENCE (chairman) presiding.

Members present: Messrs. SPENCE (presiding), BROWN, RAINS, MULTER, BARRETT, O'HARA, FOUNTAIN, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Messrs. VANIK, HOLLAND, HEALEY, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, TALLE, KILBURN, WIDNALL, BETTS, MUMMA, MCVEY, HIESTAND, NICHOLSON, and BOLTON.

The CHAIRMAN. We have met this morning to hear the members who want to be heard. How many members have requested to be heard?

The CLERK. The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MULTER, you better identify yourself.

Mr. MULTER. I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative from the 13th District of New York. I appreciate the opportunity extended me, Mr. Chairman, by you and the members of the committee, to testify on this important bill this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to have your views, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you.

I am authorized to state on behalf of the following Members that they are all opposed to this bill: VICTOR L. ANFUSO, CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, LESTER HOLTZMAN, JAMES J. DELENEY, EUGENE J. KEOGH, EDNA F. KELLY, EMANUEL CELLER, JOHN J. ROONEY, ARTHUR G. KLEIN, IRWIN D. DAVIDSON, HERBERT ZELENKO, SIDNEY A. FINE, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, JAMES A. HEALEY, LEO W. O'BRIEN, BYRON ROGERS, of Colorado, DANTE FASCELL of Florida, SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois, JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio.

There are other Members who have indicated to me their opposition to this bill and have indicated that they will be heard from on the floor. Many of these Members whose names I read indicated if they could possibly get out of their other commitments for this morning they will come in here and ask to be heard. If they do, Mr. Chairman, I have no objection, as they do enter the room, to their being invited to testify promptly as they come in.

I will be very happy to step aside so as to give them the opportunity to be heard.

Now it should be of interest to note that our colleague, Congressman HAYS, is chairman of the board of a national bank, having been elected as such ever since the organization of the bank, by a majority of

the stockholders, and nevertheless he takes the very strong position that it would be a very serious mistake to repeal this provision of the National Banking Act and deprive minority stockholders of the right to representation on the board which they could not have without cumulative voting.

With the permission of the chairman, I have taken the liberty to call for the correspondence file in the committee room on this bill. I have it in front of me. I haven't had an opportunity to go through it letter by letter. The letters begin with a date in 1955 shortly after the bill was introduced on the Senate side. With the committee's permission I will go through them at a subsequent time and add to the record a tabulation of the number of letters you have in favor of the bill and the number that you have against the bill.

From my cursory observation I think they run about 10 to 1 against the bill. The opposition letters come from stockholders of national banks, they come from insurance companies—I am talking now about the opposition—they come from finance companies, a treasurer of a college, lawyers, investment brokers, and the like. I think in almost every instance the proponent of the measure, according to this correspondence folder, is an officer of a national bank.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you tell me why there is such an unanimity of opinion—the independent bankers have been fighting the big fellows and they unanimously, both the independent bankers organizations endorsed the bill.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I challenge that statement, as made by the representative of the American Bankers Association on behalf of the Independent Bankers Association. Mr. Chairman, not the statement that you made. I do not for 1 minute doubt that they have told you that they are for the bill, but what I say to you, Mr. Chairman, is that they are not telling the truth when they say to you, either the American Bankers Association or the Independent Bankers Association, that their banks that are members are unanimously for this. There are letters in this file that is part of your record to the contrary, and there are letters in my files from national bank officers who are not in favor of this bill, but are very strongly opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am referring to no letter they wrote me. I am referring to the action the Independent Bankers took at a convention where they unanimously endorsed this bill and I have a copy of the resolution. You don't deny that and it is in the record.

Mr. MULTER. If you say you have such a resolution, of course, I won't deny it.

I haven't seen it, sir. I have read every bit of testimony that was adduced on Monday morning before I arrived. I have been in this room ever since that time whenever any testimony was offered. I may have missed it, but I have not seen any such resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. It was inserted in the record. You will find it in the record if you will read it.

Mr. MULTER. I have no desire to dispute with you, Mr. Chairman, the accuracy of any statement you make, but obviously your statements on this subject must be hearsay just as some of mine are.

The CHAIRMAN. I am only stating the actual fact.

Mr. MULTER. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, if we wanted to determine the true feeling here of the people who are concerned—and it is the stockholders—oh, yes; somebody testified here that the directors of the banks are trustees for the depositors. Has there been a suggestion made from any of those people that the depositors for whom these directors are trustees should be represented on these boards? Of course, not. The majority stockholders don't want any part of that. Those stockholders who are opposed to this cumulative voting provision and want this bill enacted do not want that.

Do you know what we are actually doing here? We are asking the men who owe their jobs to the majority stockholders to come before you and tell you they don't want those jobs any more. That is what it amounts to when you take their testimony that this is a bad law and that a bill should be enacted to repeal the cumulative voting provision. What you are doing is, you are asking those men dependent on the majority for their jobs to come here and testify against their employers and themselves. It is like asking us to vote ourselves out of office.

Now, if you really want to find the sentiment of the stockholders, then you will direct a survey to be made by FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency, or one of them, and let them find out from the stockholders. Let this committee supervise the kind of questionnaire they will send to stockholders. You don't have to send them to a quarter of a million stockholders throughout the country, but you can send out a sample survey as they conduct all polls, to a good sampling of the 250,000 or more stockholders in national banks and find out how they feel about this. I am certain that most of the stockholders, including majority stockholders who are not bank officers, will say to you that they are in favor of this provision being continued. Now that must be the sentiment of the country, because each year you will find more and more State legislatures considering requiring cumulative voting. Some have it as a permission provision already.

You heard the American Bankers Association representative say to you here that the States are overwhelmingly for permissive as against mandatory cumulative voting. He said that in spite of the fact he sat in this very room, as the Comptroller of the Currency testified and he heard Mr. Gidney say there are 17 States that have permissive provisions for cumulative voting and 16 States have mandatory provisions for cumulative voting. Yet, in his opinion the sentiment is overwhelmingly for permissive. Now, do you want to make it permissive? Then, let's write a good bill. Do these majority stockholders need some protection? In some cases they may. But because a bank president occasionally, or some other bank officer, steals money from the bank and is sent to jail for it, we don't say we are going to abolish all bank presidents or all bank officers. And because there is an occasional bad man among those who seek election to a board of directors as a minority director, is no reason why we should deprive all of the others of their rights as given to them by this statute.

Now, you were told at the first session—and I wasn't here because I didn't know it was being called. I would have been here had I known about it. I would have loved to have had an opportunity to examine Mr. Gidney, the Comptroller of the Currency, on this subject. He referred to the situation in New York City where Mr. Giannini was elected to the National City Bank. I will tell you about that situation. Mr. Burgess, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, if you called him, could tell you about it. He was a vice president of the National City Bank at the time it happened. Mr. Giannini had originally organized the Bank of Italy. It later became the Bank of America, and the talk in the big banking circles around New York City was that there was no room for a "wop" bank. I quote the word "wop."

They tried to get him out of New York banking circles. They finally bought him out and after the deal was closed, he found that they stuck into his agreement of sale that although he got National City Bank stock in exchange for the sale, as part of the consideration for his sale, that he couldn't have representation on the board and he had to get along without representation on the board until 1933 when the National Banking Act was changed and they enacted this provision for cumulative voting.

Do you think they waited for him to exercise his rights under the cumulative voting provision? Of course, they didn't. The very next year they invited him to join the board and from that time Mr. Giannini, as long as he wanted to serve on that National City Bank board, sat by invitation and election by the majority and never was called upon to use his cumulative voting rights under this act.

Now, there have been some other statements that have been made in connection with this bill which I think require some explanation. I would like to add to the record, Mr. Chairman—I don't think it is necessary to do it at this point, unless you so desire—the letters, telegrams, and excerpts from periodicals and newspapers which have been submitted to me in connection with this matter.

May I say to you, sir, and to this committee, that in 1955, I received but one letter, or one communication supporting S. 256. All of the others were opposed to it. This year I received two letters supporting S. 256. All of the others were opposed to it. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, after the conclusion of the testimony, I would like to add to the record those letters and communications and excerpts that were sent to me—and they were sent to me entirely unsolicited.

May I read to you this one telegram which has come to me unsolicited. It is a copy of a telegram sent to our chairman. It is dated July 18, 1956. It reads as follows, and it is addressed to me at the House Office Building.

"For your information following is text of telegram to chairman, House Banking Committee, today:

" 'With the thought of being helpful to you in your consideration of S. 256, I would like to make the following suggestions:'

" 'In place of the 7 words "if the articles of association so provide," insert 7 words as follows: "unless prohibited by the articles of association."

" 'This change would provide a fair way of insuring the opportunity of expression for shareholders of national banks who do not now enjoy the protection of the proxy rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Lacking this protection, the Senate version would severely handicap shareholders in any effort to recover the cumulative voting right. On the suggested wording the cumulative voting right will continue until shareholders vote for change. Thus, the Congress would be spared the onus of depriving shareholders of an existing voting right. I am neither for nor against mandatory cumulative voting. I am sending copies of this telegram to Representative KEATING and MULTER and Senators IVES and LEHMAN of my State.' "

Signed Morris A. Schapiro. He is the president of M. A. Schapiro & Co., Inc., 1 Wall Street, New York City. He has been in that business for 29 years. He deals exclusivaly in national bank stocks and in bank stocks. He has as much interest on behalf of management as he has on behalf of stockholders because they both repeatedly call upon him to dispose of for them, the stock that becomes available from time to time, either by a stockholder who wants to retire or liquidate his holdings, or from estates of deceased stockholders. Obviously it is necessary that such stock be discretely offered for sale so as not to disturb the market. There isn't the same kind of trading in bank stock as there is on the exchanges and it is necessary to discretely offer such stock. If a man dies leaving a large block of bank stocks, if you dump that on the market you depress the price and cause a loss. But, if you call on men like this Mr. Schapiro or his firm to handle it, he feeds it out into the market in small lots and they do not take a loss.

They will first call on management and ask them if they want to acquire additional stock. They will call on majority stockholders and minority stockholders and tell them it is available. If they turn it down, they then look for an outside market for it. That is where they run into trouble many times.

If you permit some of the minority stockholders to come before this committee who have asked to be heard and who have been advised there wouldn't be time to hear them, you will find in any number of instances—and there are two State banks in the vicinity of Congressman KILBURN'S district—where the majority stockholders would not let the minority stockholder have any representation, and tried to force him to sell his stock at less than book value.

Now, there are as many abuses on one side as the other; but, because somebody on the inside tries to take advantage of somebody on the outside, we are not going to say there should be no insiders. Also, just because there are a few bad fellows on the outside, let's not restrict the good fellows who are on the outside.

I started to say if this committee wants to do its full job and its proper job, you must do one of two things. You must either approve the principle of House Resolution 303, which I introduced on July 7, 1955, which calls for a thorough study of the Banking Act, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and the Federal Reserve Act or appoint a subcommittee to do that. Then we can take out of the law the little things that hurt and put into the law the things that are necessary in order to protect the depositors, the stockholders, and the general public.

Now, we have been told by the sponsors of this bill of the necessity of protecting all of those. Not one of them has come forward with an idea as to how you will do it, except to say, "Let's change this law."

Now, let me say this to you, Mr. Chairman, and my colleagues on the committee—and I say this deliberately, after having thought about it very carefully: The introduction and attempt to pass this bill, to my mind, appears to be part of a pattern—a deliberate design to weaken the banking structure of the country for the benefit of the insiders. It is just one more bill nicking away at the National Banking Act, which was improved in 1933 in order to protect everybody who needed protection and having due consideration for all those who have their money invested in national banks.

It wasn't so long ago that this committee was urged to, and did, in response to that urging by the Treasury and FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency, extend the limitations, and took off the restrictions and gave wider latitude to national banks in the making of mortgage loans.

You then had another bill which you pushed through here on the question of lessening the number of examinations required by the Comptroller of the Currency, also sponsored by the Comptroller of the Currency, FDIC, and the Treasury Department.

Mr. MUMMA. Did it weaken the national banks when the law allowed them to take mortgages which were mostly in turn guaranteed by the Federal Government?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. MUMMA, they needed no legal authority for the taking of FHA-guaranteed mortgages. I am talking about the conventional mortgages. The bill we passed here, voted out here and passed on the floor over my opposition, which had nothing to do with guaranteed mortgages, allowed them to make larger, bigger, and more mortgage loans, conventional mortgage loans, to the extent of $6 billion, sir.

Mr. MUMMA. Even the majority of conventional mortgage loans are safe, and especially when they require systematic and methodical paying off.

Mr. MULTER. They are safe in a conservative market, they are safe in a rising real-estate market, they are safe for independent investors, but they are not safe for banks beyond certain restrictions and limitations. Whether that limitation should be 5 percent of their assets or 10 percent, I am not going to argue with you now, but what I want to point out is, that over my objection this committee passed out and the Congress approved a bill which, according to the financiers, according to the banks, according to the Secretary of the Treasury, would pour and did pour another $6 billion of national bank money into the mortgage market at a time not when the market was tight; but at a time when the Secretary of the Treasury was telling this Congress, "We've got to take steps to prevent any more inflation," and the Federal Reserve Board was telling us, "We have to take steps to stop inflation," and you poured another $6 billion into the market by that bill.

Mr. MUMMA. Money must have been scarce, the way we boosted up FNMA.

Mr. MULTER. The situation has changed very much in the last 2 years since we passed that bill.

That was the second in this pattern that I am talking about. The third was the lifting of restrictions for extending the residence requirements of national bank directors. And I say to you, this is another bill nicking away at the National Banking Act. One more step, the fourth step, to weaken that law. And next year, you are going to get some more. You already have a bill in here, I think, to let these national banks go into the investment banking business.

I say to you that what you are doing is tearing down the structure of the banking system, of the dual banking system, and particularly of the national banking system. You are whittling away, at the request of the Treasury Department and of the Comptroller of the Currency—both of them big bankers—and of FDIC, which today is controlled by the Comptroller of the Currency—it does his bidding—we sat here twice while the Chairman of the FDIC came before this committee and pretended to represent to this committee that he was talking for the Board of the FDIC, and the Comptroller of the Currency, one of his codirectors on that board, sat in this room while he testified and pretended to say he was talking for the Board. In both instances he was talking for himself and Mr. Gidney and had not even consulted the third member of the Board. It is quite unimportant that in one instance the third member would have agreed with the opinions they offered here and in the second instance would have disagreed. The point of the matter is that those gentlemen came here and misrepresented the fact as to what was the FDIC Board's opinion.

If you want to know more about how FDIC is not operating, or is operating improperly, I will tell it to you.

Mr. MUMMA. I get telegrams saying, "32,000 members of such and such an organization want you to do so and so." The president of the organization just assumes that as his authority, does he not?

Mr. MULTER. Well, he hasn't the right to do it. Of course, we get such wires. And from our experience here as legislators, we get to know, and we get to the point where you can almost feel when the thing comes in, "This man is talking through his hat; this man is just kidding us."

While the other man we know is sincerely presenting his story and the merits of the controversy.

We can tell the honest lobbyist and the fellow who is trying to put something over.

I appreciate the lobbyist who comes in and fairly and frankly discusses it, says, "this is my interest, I am for or against this bill, these are my reasons, and these are the reasons the other fellow offers."

We will get more information in a minute from him than we will from the other fellow. The latter makes our work twice as hard. After he tells us something we must do a complete research job to determine the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. How would increasing the distance be whittling away the provisions of the National Bank Act? There are many Kentuckians who might want to be a director in a bank in Ohio. It is just across the river and some of them live probably more than 50 miles away. Now, what inherent danger would there be in permitting these people to be directors in a bank? I can't see the great importance of that. And what inherent danger would there be in providing that there should be 3 examinations every 2 years, if the FDIC found it was practical and advisable, instead of 4? Do you think there is inherent danger in both of those measures?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; I do, and I stated my views very fully before this committee both in the brief examinations that we had at public hearings, and before this committee in executive session.

Now, the very men who have sent you letters here and some of them who have testified here, representing the banks in favor of this bill—one of them you heard here the other day say there was a fellow outside his State who wants to get on his board and will get on by cumulative voting. You will probably recall I asked him what his position was on that bill as to the distance within which directors must reside in order to qualify. He didn't even know what I was talking about.

There is enough bad about this bill, Mr. Chairman, without our rehashing the things that were bad about the bills passed over my objection. Those things are on the record. This committee in its wisdom saw fit to vote out the bills and the House and the other body saw fit to pass them and they are now law. All I can do is say to you gentlemen that I will be back here again one of these days and say to you, "I told you so."

Mr. MUMMA. I was going to bring up the point of the residence of the director. The largest bank in my community was held by a family that had few heirs. It happens that the greater percentage of the stock is now owned by heirs who live in Boston and Baltimore. Should they be deprived of the right of representing their interests in the bank by reason of their residence?

Mr. MULTER. Only to the extent that the law provided and I think the law provided at that time—I will get it for you.

Mr. MUMMA. Do you think as a matter of law they should be allowed to represent their interests, which represents several life times of thrift and work?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. That is why I want cumulative voting continued as a matter of right. The law, if amended by this bill will not let those people be represented on the board.

Mr. MUMMA. It does now, doesn't it?

The question I was raising is, were you advocating they be deprived of their right by reason of their residence a certain number of miles away?

Mr. MULTER. The law provided before we changed it that one-fourth of the directors may live outside of the State. You changed it to one-third. Do you think that helped your people?

Mr. MUMMA. Yes. It didn't deprive them in that particular case.

Mr. MULTER. They had the same privilege, before.

Mr. MUMMA. I understand you say it is wrong for somebody that far away to be a director.

Mr. MULTER. They could still have come within the one-fourth rule. You have 20 directors on your board. Five of them could have lived outside the State.

Now, this provision changed that so that one-third, now, can live out of the State. But the objection I directed myself to was that all of the other directors, instead of being required to live within 50 miles, now may live within 100 miles.

Mr. MUMMA. I don't agree with you.

Mr. MULTER. Of course, I don't expect all the members of the committee to agree with me on these things, but I say it was bad and it was just another nick in the statute which we enacted in 1933.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I understood that this proposition on banks was something of a protection for the bank. Other businesses, for instance, some railroad, some manipulator of the stock gets in there and gets elected president and doesn't own any shares of stock and doesn't know anything about the railroad. He gets a $100,000 salary. What do you think about that?

Mr. MULTER. And the witness you addressed your question to the other day said it was exactly the same and he was lying in his teeth when he said it. The director you were talking about didn't have to own any qualifying shares. But the National Banking Act requires he must own qualifying shares in his own right. And Mr. BURDICK has a bill in here that he must own it in his own right and it must be his without any option requiring him to sell it, as happens in many of these big banks. They pick John Jones to put him on the Board. John Jones doesn't have any qualifying stock, so they sell it to him. They take his check and they never deposit it. They take at the same time an agreement that they will return to him his check if and when he resigns or is forced out as a director and they then take back his stock in exchange. Do you think that complies with the laws requiring him to own qualifying shares in a national bank?

Mr. MUMMA. Is there any difference between a bank and Montgomery and Ward?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, yes, unless Montgomery and Ward is authorized to carry on a banking business.

Mr. NICHOLSON. They carry a big reserve.

Mr. MULTER. It is their own money. It is profits accumulated over the years, in order that the men who were drawing the big salaries and bonuses all through the years, instead of taking the profits and going into a higher tax bracket, they let it accumulate there, so that when they sell their stock they can take a capital gains and pay only a 25-percent tax. That is proper. There is no requirement in commercial and industrial corporations for directors to be stockholders or that its officers meet Government agency approval.

Bear in mind, that minority stockholders of national banks can only elect a minority of the board. In no instance has cumulative voting every brought about the election of a majority. The instances that Mr. Gidney and some of these other people put in the record here before you of the possibility of a minority stockholder or stockholders by cumulative voting electing a majority of the board may be theoretically and mathematically correct. It has never happened and it cannot happen.

Mr. NICHOLSON. You don't agree that if somebody gets control of Montgomery Ward who doesn't know anything about selling goods, gets to be president and chairman of the board of directors and takes off all the gravy there is from the stockholders and leaves the company in a pretty bad situation, you don't believe in that, do you?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. NICHOLSON, I don't believe that should be permitted and it can't happen with banks with proper supervision. I say to you if that kind of a situation can happen in any of these banks, these bankers should come forward and say so frankly and let's write a bill which will give them protection against that.

Now, there isn't a single instance where a minority of a board has been able to wreck a corporation or a railroad or a bank. All of the wreckings of the banks all through those days when the banks were being closed up and ever since was accomplished by directors elected by majority stockholders. The banks that have been closed up by FDIC and the Comptroller of the Currency were not controlled by any minority directors. None of them had directors on them put there by cumulative voting. They were majority controlled and the board of directors of the majority controlled and they kept the story to themselves about thir manipulations and bad investments.

Take the situation in New Jersey they skipped over here so lightly. The situation that just occurred in Illinois, that nobody yet has talked about here at any length. Do you think those banks could get away with that kind of manipulation and that kind of embezzlement and that kind of thievery if there was an alert minority director sitting on the board? Of course not. The responsibility for that misconduct is on those fellows who don't want minority representation on the board. Not because they may cause trouble but because they keep light on all things they want kept behind closed doors or under the table where no light will be shed on them.

Mr. RAINS. Let me ask the gentleman a question: I assume you are more interested in the people who put their money in the bank. After all, that is our responsibility, isn't it, rather than worrying about what some man may make as a minority stockholder?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. RAINS, we are interested, and this committee is charged with the duty of supervising these agencies and the operations of these agencies.

Mr. RAINS. For what purpose?

Mr. MULTER. To make sure they do what the law has set these agencies up to do. To make sure these banks are run properly, not solely for profit but in the interests of the community, for the convenience and to meet the needs of the community, to protect the depositor and the stockholder. We didn't set up an FDIC to guarantee deposits to the extent of $10,000 for the benefit of the stockholder. We did that for the benefit of the public.

Mr. RAINS. Isn't it a fact that you name that first, but isn't it first the responsibility to see that the depositor's money is safe? That is what a bank is really for, isn't it, not to make money for some stockholder.

Mr. MULTER. That is the philosophy written into the banking law and it is a good philosophy, but up until the time of the rewriting of the National Banking Act in 1933 and the time of the enactment of FDIC there were very few bankers who ever had any interest in the public. They were interested in getting as much money as they could out of a debtor-creditor relationship and then using that for their private profit. When the banks closed up in the depression days the Congress in its wisdom said, "We've got to stop this kind of business." We then enacted these laws.

Mr. RAINS. But that is not what I am trying to get at, Mr. MULTER. Is your real concern in this bill worry that the deposit won't be safe, or are you worrying because some individual who bought stock in the bank to make money won't be able to make the money off the stock? Which are you more concerned about?

Mr. MULTER. I am more concerned about the depositor and his money, but I am also concerned about the investor who owns the stock in these banks across the country—and let me call your attention to the fact, and I am sure you will agree with me—that there is more money in the aggregate invested in industry and in banking of this country by minority investors—by the small investors—than the big investors.

Take any of your big banks and you will find—and many of the medium-sized banks—and what will you find? Maybe 10 percent of the stock is owned by management. The rest is owned by—some of their friends and the rest is diversely held throughout the country by small investors. Don't they need protection?

Mr. RAINS. That is true in any corporation, of course, but the main thing I am interested in is whether or not this bill is going to endanger the depositors of money.

Mr. MULTER. I think it will.

Mr. RAINS. The people who are interested in breaking down cumulative shares is some automobile man or someone like that so he and his friends can lend that money out the way they want to instead of the way the banks want to lend it. Is that true or not?

Mr. MULTER. There have been some such instances, but I say to you, sir, they are in the minority. One such instance was referred to in the testimony here on Monday morning and then they steered clear of it. They gave the example of a bank in New York where the father-in-law wanted to put the son-in-law—the father-in-law acquired a large amount of stock in the bank and wanted to put his son-in-law on the board.

You were told that in order to stop that, the management sold out to another bank. I think the committee should know what that situation was. They were talking about the Nassau County National Bank. That bank, at the time this man was invited, the father-in-law was invited to become a member of the board and he suggested the son-in-law instead, at that time they were negotiating for a sale of the bank stock and they were negotiating for the sale of the bank stock while they were trying to force this man to sell his stock. They were trying to buy up minority stock interests because they were negotiating to sell that stock to another bank, the Franklin National Bank at a sum almost twice its book value. They didn't want any outsider like this minority stockholder, to know about it. When they finally closed the deal it wasn't to avoid minority representation of this young lawyer on the board, it was to take their profit of almost twice the amount of the book value of the stock when they sold out to the Franklin National Bank. A part of the sale required certain of the management to be continued as part of the management of that bank as a branch of the larger bank.

Mr. BROWN. I have always been under the impression that one reason we had so many failures in the banks in the twenties and thirties, was because they paid out too many dividends. Is that true?

Mr. MULTER. You say that there have been some banks who paid out too much in dividends?

Mr. BROWN. I think that is one of the things that contributed to the failures of the banks in the twenties and the thirties, that they paid out too many dividends. As Mr. RAINS says, people should be more interested in the depositors than in the people trying to make money.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. BROWN, you may know of such instances, but what I know of the banking situation in New York City—and I lived through it in those days; I represented banks in those days as a lawyer.

Mr. BROWN. So did I.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MULTER. Let me answer Congressman BROWN'S question, please.

Mr. TALLE. A point of information. Are there any more witnesses to be heard this morning?

The CHAIRMAN. No more witnesses.

Mr. MULTER. May I now answer Mr. BROWN'S question?

The CHAIRMAN. You may answer Mr. BROWN'S question.

Mr. MULTER. From what I know of those banks, Mr. BROWN, there were some instances where excessive dividends were paid, but the main reason most of them became insolvent is that they were overloaded with bad loans,

they were overloaded with mortgage loans and when the depression hit us and they called their loans, they couldn't collect. They had to go in and foreclose on a business which had to be sold out under the hammer at auction for maybe 10 cents on the dollar. They had to go in and acquire large apartment houses and office buildings that were overvalued when they placed their mortgage. It was a favorite trick of the banks that were forced out of business in those days for someone to go in because he knew a director on the loan committee, to go in when a building was bought—take an arbitrary figure of $100,000—bought for $100,000. The appraiser would appraise it for $200,000 and give him $130,000 or $140,000 in a mortgage. Of course, they had to go broke.

Mr. BROWN. Under such situations they certainly shouldn't have paid out so many dividends.

Mr. MULTER. Under those situations, of course, they shouldn't have paid any dividends and it is the duty of FDIC and the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency to make sure that the dividend rate is a proper rate. It is his duty to see to it that at all times the capital, the undivided profits, and the surplus is maintained in proper proportion to the amount which they owe, and the amount they owe is mainly what they owe their depositors. If the FDIC, the Federal Reserve Board and the Comptroller of the Currency are doing their job, before they let any bank pay out any dividends, they should make sure its capital structure is good and sound. They should require the banks to take part of their profits and add it to their surplus and undivided profits accounts before they pay dividends. That is to make sure the banks continue to remain sound.

Mr. RAINS. One other question, Mr. MULTER. A moment ago you said there was nothing to be worried about in the minority stockholders—and frankly you and I know the minority stockholders don't now run the banks.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. RAINS, I don't think I meant to say there was nothing to be worried about so far as any of the minority stockholders were concerned.

Mr. RAINS. You don't contend, then, that minority stockholders now operate the banks?

Mr. MULTER. No, they don't.

Mr. RAINS. If they don't, when they have the privilege to do it, what is the excitement about this? They are not utilizing the opportunities they now have, are they?

Mr. MULTER. I am sorry, I haven't made myself clear.

Minority stockholders now under cumulative voting can and do get themselves elected to boards of directors, but only as a minority of the directors. Even though a minority, even though only 1 out of 20, they become the watchdog of the treasury, they become the watchdog of the directorship, they become the watchdog of the bank, for the benefit of all stockholders and all depositors.

Now, take this instance of Mr. Brody who testified here. A fine, upstanding gentleman. Absolutely nothing wrong with him. Nobody ever pointed a finger at him. For years they kept him off the bank and then they invited him to join.

Mr. RAINS. Did that hurt the investor or the depositors in that bank because they kept him off?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, it did.

Mr. RAINS. I am not really concerned about him.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, it really hurt the bank and the depositors. It didn't hurt the depositors as such, but it certainly hurt the rest of the stockholders because you know what the directors did after he came on the board? They increased their dividend rate by 77 percent. Was it an improper increase? Did they do it just to satisfy him? He only had one vote. Did the Comptroller of the Currency complain about the increase? Did the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation complain or the Federal Reserve? Of course not, because it was a proper increase. Look at the figures that were submitted not by Mr. Brody but by the representative from the bank who testified here, and see if you wouldn't raise a question as to whether their dividend policy was good or bad before Mr. Brody joined the directorship.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will be discontinued because we are going into executive session.

Special Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 20, 1956

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 7, just 2 days after the House of Representatives rejected the measure providing for Federal assistance to school construction, the Members approved without a dissenting vote a measure authorizing $378 million for aid to schools located in districts which are overburdened by Federal activities. The measure extends to June 30, 1958, Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress.

During World War II the Federal Government engaged in a tremendous number of defense activities which brought large numbers of defense workers and military personnel into new areas. Many of these people were housed in Federal housing projects and were not required to pay property taxes for support of the public school district was terrific. In some cases the enrollment was doubled and tripled, and in one instance that I know of the enrollment was increased 500 percent.

The residents of the various school districts throughout the Nation, although bonding and taxing themselves to the limit permitted by State laws, could not provide sufficient school classrooms, facilities, teachers, and supplies to take care of their increased school enrollments. Congress recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government in the matter and passed legislation which provided for Federal financial assistance to those schools which were most seriously affected by the impact of Federal activities. This assistance continued on a year-to-year basis after the war because many of the Federal activities continued. In the 81st Congress legislation was approved which authorized Federal assistance for a 2-year period. It was extended in 1952 and 1954. This Congress extended the legislation for another 2 years during which it is expected that the Federal impact will continue to be felt in many areas. Although many millions worth of Federal aid was distributed prior to 1950 I do not have the figures. Since 1950, appropriations for school construction in impacted areas has amounted to $609 million. For current school expenses the appropriations have totaled an almost equivalent amount. The present legislation would add another $378 million for construction purposes and for maintenance and operation.

I am sure that the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Washington will be interested to know how this special Federal aid to schools has affected them. The Office of Education has supplied me with figures showing the amount of Federal funds which have been paid to impacted school districts in our area. The following table shows the amounts of Federal funds which have been allocated since 1950 for school-construction purposes in my congressional district:

Renton School District No. 403	$2,812,270
South Central School District No. 406	641,092
Clover Park School District No. 400 (Tacoma)	1,802,341
Franklin Pierce School District No. 402 (Parkland)	536,560
Kent School District No. 415	558,796
Milton School District No. 105	11,339
Lake Washington School District No. 414 (Kirkland)	739,393
Issaquah School District No. 411	217,068
Highline Public School District No. 401	2,463,332
Peninsula School District No. 401 (Gig Harbor)	132,304
Bellevue School District No. 405	666,302
University Place School District No. 83 (Tacoma)	98,648
Pierce County School District No. 404 (Eatonville)	28,281
Steilacoom School District	27,758
Federal Way School District No. 210 (Redondo)	430,034
Auburn School District No. 408	558,849
Mercer Island School District No. 400	124,173
Tacoma School District No. 10	1,255,170
Bethel School District No. 403 (Spanaway)	489,663
Woodland School District No. 33	35,000
Total for construction	13,678,373

The following table shows the amounts of Federal funds which have been allocated for assistance to school maintenance and operation costs in the sixth district:

Renton School District No. 403	$1,201,427
South Central School District No. 406	307,857
Clover Park School District No. 400 (Tacoma)	725,122
Franklin Pierce School District No. 402 (Parkland)	236,939
Kent School District No. 415	174,670
Lake Washington School District No. 414 (Kirkland)	130,336
Issaquah School District No. 411	65,697
Highline Public School District No. 401	907,924
Peninsula School District No. 401 (Gig Harbor)	70,457
Bellevue School District No. 405	115,402
University Place School District No. 83 (Tacoma)	36,196
Pierce County School District No. 404 (Eatonville)	21,573
Steilacoom School District	18,032
Federal Way School District No. 210 (Redondo)	135,431
Auburn School District No. 408	190,780
Tacoma School District No. 10	783,495
Bethel School District No. 403 (Spanaway)	80,208
Woodland School District No. 33	1,590
Total for maintenance and operation	5,203,136
Total for construction	13,678,373
Grand total	18,881,509

The last figure above represents not only the largest amount of Federal funds allocated to any of the six congressional districts in the State of Washington for school construction, maintenance, and operation in federally affected areas, but practically the most which has been allocated to any congressional district in the Nation.

Let the Old Folks Earn All They Can

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 2, 1956. Originally the limit a retired person could receive without losing his social-security benefits was $14.99. Then it was raised to $50 and later to $75 a month. I introduced a bill to lift it to $1,500 a year, and in 1954 the Congress adopted the principle in my bill of a yearly rather than a monthly limit, but set the ceiling at $1,200.

Mr. Speaker, not only is it unfair to these elderly persons to deny them the chance to supplement their earnings without losing their social-security allowances; it is against the whole philosophy on which America was built—the philosophy of encouraging every citizen, young or old, to do his utmost to support himself and improve his lot. Let us not penalize anyone who wants to live by those sturdy virtues between the ages of 60 and 72 as well as during all the rest of his or her life.

The editorial follows:

LET THE OLD FOLKS EARN ALL THEY CAN

Marion Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made a speech the other day in which he expressed his desire to help the old folks. "Activities in the interest of older persons will render the greatest service," he said, "if they do not foster dependence, but, instead, enlarge opportunities for individual effort and encourage self-reliance, initiative, and creative endeavor."

Secretary Folsom could do a great deal in this direction if he would help persuade Congress to repeal the provision that people drawing old-age benefits between the ages of 65 and 72 lose these benefits if they earn more than $100 per month.

A provision of this type was put into the law when it was first passed, in the middle of the depression, when Congress thought there were too many unemployed workers, and it wanted to make people get out of the labor market and stay out. That the lawmakers have an uneasy conscience about it is shown by the fact that the law was originally even more strict; it has been softened from time to time, both as to the amount you can receive without penalty and the age at which you can start unlimited earnings again.

The average person receiving old-age benefits gets only about $746 a year, and doesn't have much from any other source, either. The Twentieth Century Fund has discovered that 36 percent of the aged have no cash income at all, 38 percent have less than $1,000 a year, including OAB, and only 11 percent have from $1,000 to $2,000. The restriction on earnings between the ages of 65 and 72 makes it even harder than it normally is for the elderly to get a job; employers don't want to be bothered with special planning necessary to let you earn about $99 a month. Trade unions bitterly object to people working for less than the regular scale.

The great majority of retired workers are earning either nothing or so little that for most of them the standard of living is low. The experts in this subject are unanimous in saying that it is disastrous to health and morale for old people to sit around and do nothing, especially when a large proportion of them are perfectly capable of a good day's work. Many of them have special skills that are in high demand nowadays, when unemployment is low.

To remove the present restriction would not materially increase the annual cost of old-age benefits, since at present only about 360,000 eligible persons over 65 are known to be earning so much that their OAB is denied them. The action would remove a source of bitterness among the elderly, who know that a man with an income from dividends, rent, or interest can earn all he likes without being deprived of his "unearned" income.

Letter to Chairman of the Platform Committee of Democratic Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in the extension of my remarks I wish to include a copy of a letter I wrote today to the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman of the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention:

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Chairman, Platform Committee,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: The Democratic Party since the time of Thomas Jefferson has consistently fought for the welfare of the laboring people. Today many thousands of workers are being laid off and the working week of others curtailed because of an influx of Japanese textiles. Employees in the chemical, glassware, bicycle, tunafish, coal, and other industries are likewise threatened by excessively low tariffs and unfair trade practices.

The Democratic Party has traditionally been the party of free trade and low tariffs. We still are staunch advocates of world trade, but the Democratic Party has never advocated tariffs so low or trade practices that placed the American worker at an unfair advantage. The Democratic Party has taken the lead in improved working conditions and raising our standard of living.

I urge you with all the sincercity at my command to prevail upon the platform committee to adopt a plank against tariffs so low as to cause unemployment among American workers. I also urge your serious consideration of import quotas in those industries seriously affected. You represent in the Congress a great textile State. You are familiar with the disaster facing many American workers due to competition with low-wage countries. You have fought long and hard for many years to improve the lot of American labor. I have great confidence that you will make every effort in the platform committee to offer some hope to the American textile worker and other industries so affected.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,
WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

The Nickel Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter dated July 26, 1956, and the copy of a letter of July 20, 1956, enclosed therewith:

ROCKWELL SPRING & AXLE CO.,
Coraopolis, Pa., July 26, 1956.

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: Thank you very much for sending me the reprint of the extension of your remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of July 20, 1956, which included my letter to the New York Times on the nickel situation.

Enclosed is photostat of a letter from the manager of the Quality Plating Co., Inc., 55–57 Meserole Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., which will show you that your Brooklyn constituents are among the victims of the Government's very bad bungling in nickel. I am sorry that the New York Times did not print Mr. Lakos' letter, but I imagine they have so many letters from other victims they could not print them all.

The International Nickel Co. showed a profit after taxes of $26 million in the first quarter of this year, and will probably show even higher profits in the second quarter. In the Business and Defense Services Administration, the WOC's who advise the Government are almost entirely employees of the International Nickel Co. or of their distributors.

INCO has stated very plainly that it fears there will be a glut of nickel and, therefore, will not expand their own operations to a maximum. Their agreement with Dr. Flemming in 1953 to hold the price of nickel to 64½ cents a pound has discouraged other potential producers of nickel from entering competition. Nevertheless, INCO did recommend that our Government build standby refinery equipment—but the suggestion was ignored.

If the big users of nickel can get all of their requirements by paying $3 per pound, the shortage of nickel cannot be very great and must be far less than the amount which the Government places in its stockpile and holds in dead storage. The big automobile companies buy their nickel in the gray market, but they say they will not protest against Government mismanagement for fear the Government will restrict the use of nickel for passenger cars—and big business does not like Government controls. It is impossible to see why anyone in business, big or small, would want Government controls after the horrible mess created by the Government stockpiling plans, but control of nickel would be a very simple matter. The gray market has been fed by the so-called scrap sales of defense contractors who obtain all the nickel they order, and some contractors are said to hold 9 months' supply of nickel which they are hoarding against a possible shortage.

Within the last few days ODM placed an embargo on shipment of nickel scrap, which is a step which should have been taken 3 years ago.

It is impossible to understand why ODM has purchased some strategic materials, paying more than $1 a pound above the world market price, and have left the nickel situation get out of hand by holding to the agreed price of 1953. The great Government stockpile inventory is completely unbalanced unless there is sufficient nickel to build jet engines and to provide stainless steel for supersonic plane wings and fuselage.

Congress would have acted, but the bureaucrats repeatedly testified to congressional committees that there was almost no black market, and only a very small amount of nickel showing up in the gray market. They now have admitted (as you will see by the enclosed photostat), that their arithmetic was bad and that they were very lax in checking defense orders.

We believe that if the Government raised the price of nickel so that it increased production immediately, and released part of the 300 million pounds in its stockpile, the shortage of nickel would end immediately and future production up to the maximum defense needs would be assured.

Some 17,000 users of nickel and many more thousands of other employees will benefit by anything you can do to end the nickel shortage.

With best wishes, I am,

Respectfully yours,

WILLARD F. ROCKWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

QUALITY PLATING CO., INC.,
Brooklyn, N. Y., July 20, 1956.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York City.

SIR: I hope you will find the following letter worth publishing in your column:

"Mr. Rockwell's letter in your July 20 issue, on governmental stockpiling of strategic materials, particularly nickel, is a masterly appraisal of quartermasterly nonsense. This writer is the owner of an electroplating shop which has a record going back to 20 years of never laying off a single man for lack of work, and now it is on the verge of having to shut down altogether, because of shortage of nickel.

"If mankind blunders its way into a nuclear war, the first attack will break down all our communications. Just remember what such relatively minor disasters as the snowfall of March 18 and the Wanamaker fire did to the traffic of New York City. In a holocaust following a nuclear attack of what possible usefulness would be the various strategic materials safely cached?

"If we do have a nuclear war, our descendants, thousands of years from now, when they come off the trees and out of the caves once again, will find all the nickel neatly piled up for them. Right now, to the writer's mind, stockpiling for use in an unimaginable war, makes no more sense than putting food in the tombs of the Pharaohs.

"There is only one kind of policy which makes sense: Spreading good will and elevating living standards the world over.

"A. LAKOS.

"BROOKLYN, *July 20, 1956.*"

In case you don't find my above epistle suitable for your paper, I would consider it a great favor if you would send my letter to Mr. Rockwell. I called many people's attention to his fine letter.

As to the last paragraph of my letter, re good will and elevating living standards, I conceived a program as per attached leaflet. I sent the same to a small number of civic-minded business leaders (my means are limited), and received an amazing percentage of encouraging answers, on the basis of which I can continue working on this project.

Sincerely,

A. LAKOS.

We Should Settle Native Land Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, contrary to an impression that seems to be rather widely held, the decision of the Supreme Court made on February 7, 1955, in the so-called Tee-Hit-Ton case did not bring a judicial and final conclusion to the important matter of Alaska native land claims.

It is true that the majority of the Supreme Court in that decision narrowed the issues. Justice will not be served and there will not be full knowledge of land ownership in Alaska until another and concluding step is taken. This must be by congressional action. In an effort to achieve this, I introduced H. R. 11986 in the House of Representatives on June 27, 1956. It is my hope that the executive branch of Government and particularly those Departments chiefly concerned—Justice and Interior and Agriculture—will examine this proposed legislation carefully during the period of congressional adjournment so the bill may be considered should it be reintroduced, as I hope will be the case, early in the 85th Congress. It was not offered with the thought that it represented legislative perfection. Rather it was intended to serve as a guideline, as a point of departure.

As Mr. James Craig Peacock, Washington attorney who represented the Tee-Hit-Ton group before the Court of Claims and before the Supreme Court, said in explanatory notes prepared in connection with H. R. 11986, this bill may be considered as a modernized version, giving effect to the Tee-Hit-Ton decision, of the latest committee print on this bill which was before the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the 83d Congress. There is a dual need, as Mr. Peacock has pointed out. There is a need for the sake of the Indians and Eskimos and Aleuts and their white brethren in Alaska to settle those land claims. At the same time, there is a need to accord to the natives what the Supreme Court has called their moral deserts. It is correct to note that the Supreme Court found that native possessory rights cannot be maintained under the act of May 17, 1884, or the act of June 6, 1900. But, as the majority opinion went on to say:

No case in this Court has ever held that taking of Indian title or use by Congress required compensation. The American people have compassion for the descendants of those Indians who were deprived of their homes and hunting grounds by the drive of civilization. They seek to have the Indians share the benefits of our society as citizens of this Nation. Generous provision has been willingly made to allow tribes to recover for wrongs, as a matter of grace, not because of legal liability.

And again:

Every American schoolboy knows that the savage tribes of this continent were deprived of their ancestral ranges by force and that even when the Indians ceded millions of acres by treaty in return for blankets, food, and trinklets it was not a sale but the conquerors' will that deprived them of their land. The duty that rests on this Nation was adequately phrased by Mr. Justice Jackson in his concurrence, Mr. Justice Black joining, in *Shoshone Indians* v. *United States*, a case that differentiated "recognized" from "unrecognized" Indian title, and held the former only compensable.

Certainly the concluding paragraph of the Supreme Court's decision in the Tee-Hit-Ton case provides ample evidence that the conclusions of the Court are not to be interpreted as meaning that the native people of Alaska are to be foreclosed from seeking justice at other places:

In the light of the history of Indian relations in this Nation, no other course would meet the problem of the growth of the United States except to make congressional contributions for Indian lands rather than to subject the Government to an obligation to pay the value when taken with interest to the date of payment. Our conclusion does not uphold harshness as against tenderness toward the Indians, but it leaves with Congress, where it belongs, the policy of Indian gratuities for the termination of Indian occupancy of Government-owned land rather than making compensation for its value a rigid constitutional principle.

Mr. Speaker, we have delayed too long in settlement of this issue. Our tardiness should weigh heavily upon our collective conscience. I sincerely hope that the 85th Congress will act.

Rejected UNESCO Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the July 26, 1956, issue of the Standard-Times of New Bedford, Mass., one of the great American newspapers serving the New England area:

In a little-noted but constructive action, the United States House refused Monday to pass a bill that would have cleared the way for increased propaganda in behalf of UNESCO and made gifts to that agency tax exempt.

UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) is dedicated to "the building of a world community." It sponsors the U. N.'s Covenant of Human Rights, which rejects the right to hold private property and would subject freedom of religion, speech, and press to certain limitations.

In 1954 Russia and five of its satellites joined UNESCO and have taken influential roles in its programs. The 1955 American Legion convention denounced UNESCO as an agency which "propounded world citizenship and adherence to a nebulous world government."

Sponsors of the legislation in the House sought unanimous consent for suspension of the rules in order to obtain immediate approval for the bill, a procedure ordinarily reserved for noncontroversial matters. This was balked, mainly under the leadership of Republican Congressman GROSS, of Iowa.

The bill would have authorized the United States National Commission for UNESCO, a

quasi-governmental body of not more than 100 members, appointed by the Secretary of State, "to receive and accept gifts or bequests of money" to carry out the purposes of UNESCO. The funds would be held by the Secretary of State and spent through the facilities of the Treasury Department "as the terms of the gift or bequest may require."

The effect of this unusual aspect of the legislation would be to invite the use of Federal Government facilities, and the name of the Government, by organizations and persons favoring UNESCO's one-world program. Already there has been confusion arising from the semigovernmental status of the National Commission. This change would only compound it, so that the average person would have no way of knowing whether UNESCO ideas were officially sponsored by the United States Government or whether they were not.

But the worst aspect of the bill is that it would extend tax exemption for all gifts to the National Commission. This would, in effect, place UNESCO in a select and unique position. Even church, educational, and hospital gifts are subject to some limitation—not more than 30 percent of one's income so allocated can be tax exempt.

Such apparently innocent legislation offers the very opening that one-worlders require to entrench their philosophy, to give it official backing and the status it needs to gain strength.

UNESCO, already largely supported by United States funds, was properly rebuffed by the action of the House.

The Goodness of the Human Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, Dr. You Chan Yang, Korean Ambassador to the United States, recently made a very fine address at the State department convention of the American Legion held at Fort Wayne, Ind. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that address:

THE GOODNESS OF THE HUMAN HEART

When I received the invitation to talk to you I was very pleased, as I regard it a great privilege any time or any place to address an American Legion gathering. The reasons for my intense desire to respond to a request such as yours can be simply stated.

First, the American Legion is, and always will be, a proven defender of human freedom.

Second. It knows full well the terrible menace of communism and is extraordinarily vigilant in protecting your wonderful country against that evil thing which we all have come to know as communism.

Third. As a Korean I am most conscious and most grateful to the Legion—and your Legion not only is men but the women beside you—for your understanding of the tragedy of Korea. Never once have you failed us. You have given us medicine, clothes, and food to help us bind up the wounds of war. You have shown us in the fullest measure what I have chosen to make the title of this little talk today. It is "The Goodness of the Human Heart."

I shall have more to tell you about that later. Did I say "I"? No; not I, but one of your fellow Americans will speak for me. He won't actually speak, but I shall read you his words, addressed to me as the Korean Ambassador in Washington, for transmission to that grand old defender of freedom for men and women everywhere—Syngman Rhee, the President of the Republic of Korea.

In this tense and worried world we, as our forefathers who also lived in a tense and worried world, gather around standards.

America gave you gathering around standards—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and your present great leader, President Eisenhower. And when we gather around individuals like those I have just mentioned a great part of us, I feel, flows into them. They just know we are with them, and the strength, the courage, and the determination they may have had all alone perhaps are a part of us, and grow into greatness because they know we are a part of them.

So it is with the Korean people. We have a standard out there.

Take a second look at my great Korean President.

He exemplifies everything the American Legion stands for.

Love of God.

Love of country.

Love of the people that maybe God has directed him to represent and work for.

Hatred of tyranny and injustice.

Hatred of indecency in any form of cruelty that might be visited upon any living thing.

Hatred of anything that interferes with or tries to ride roughshod over the rights of man.

And if you'll permit me, and I say this with a schoolboy's memory of the American Revolution, I should like to say a further word about Syngman Rhee.

A newspaper correspondent not too long ago went to visit him at Kyung Mu Dai.

Kyung Mu Dai. The Communists describe it as a mansion.

Well, it isn't. It is just a two-story house. It stands on the side of a mountain, and it overlooks our ancient capital, the city of Seoul. Seoul once was populated by nearly 2 million persons. Then, when the Communists struck, it became a city of the dead and dying.

And that could happen here if the Communists ever think they are strong enough to get away with it. They thought they were in our case. But thanks to God and General MacArthur, they weren't. And thanks to God and your sons, brothers, and husbands, who fought beside us, they soon found out they weren't strong enough, evil enough, or overpowering enough to put handcuffs on a people dedicated to freedom.

Now, I'll get back to that newspaperman and his interview with my President.

He said: "Dr. Rhee, what just exactly are you? A politician? A statesmen? Or what?"

And Dr. Rhee replied: "No; I'm just a revolutionist."

The young man, and I am sure he knew the story of the Boston Tea Party, looked curiously at my President and asked: "A revolutionist for what?"

My great president, who had suffered imprisonment, torture and exile with a Japanese price upon his head—$300,000 dead or alive—looked kindly upon the young man, and his words must have sunk in on that person, for he reported them.

This is what he reported: "Dr. Rhee, how would you describe yourself? I have heard you described as a politician and a statesman, and now you say you are a revolutionist."

Dr. Rhee said: "Yes, I am a revolutionist. I was born a revolutionist, and I shall die a revolutionist, a revolutionist for the rights of man."

My dear American friends, now I shall give you proof of all the foregoing.

First of all, a few days ago, I opened a letter and a check fell out. The check was for $1,500. That made me look again. You look twice at $1,500. I thought: who is sending me a check for this amount of money?

Then I read the letter which accompanied the check. I had tears in my eyes when I finished. I showed it to only one other person—a man who could have won the war in Korea, a man who is the father of the Korean Army, a man with whom a lovely lady paid through their son, an aviator, the supreme sacrifice to freedom and Korea, and his name is General Van Fleet. In my book, he will go down into history along with those I have mentioned before. Now, I will read you the letter from Lt. Newcomb Cleveland. He lives in Stoutland, Mo.

Before I read it to you, let me repeat, I am only the agency. He wants it to go right to my president, Syngman Rhee.

The letter is as follows:

"DEAR SIR: I am very proud that I now find myself in a position to do what I have been hoping I could do and meaning to do for some while.

"I am a veteran of service in the Korean war. I was in active combat as a lieutenant in the United States Army, seeing frontline duty for about 6 months in 1951, after which I was evacuated as a casualty. I was not seriously wounded but while in the hospital it was found I had contracted tuberculosis. It was my incapacity from that for several years which has delayed my sending you what I am.

"In all my active service (which also includes duty in World War II) I never encountered finer people with more sheer courage and determination than I did among the Koreans. Never has a nation been so besought with problems. Though inadequately trained at the outset in the ghastly refinements of modern warfare, the Koreans never lacked in spirit. With selfless devotion they provided the free world with its greatest victory. They stemmed the Communist tide. They fought and resisted for their liberties where others, seemingly more physically able, simply gave in. You have reason to be proud, of what you have done and are still striving to do.

"It was a great honor for me to have served in Korea and I am glad that I volunteered both to go back on active duty and to have duty in Korea. Mine has been an undistinguished career and what little I did probably did not amount to much. But however little it was, to me it was a great privilege.

"But I have never felt right about having taken compensation for those months in Korea. In our fighting it was necessary to commit vast damage. The pictures of the burning towns, the destruction of homes, bridges, and other buildings, and the laying to waste of the countryside are all still vivid in my mind. But even more memorable are the deaths. I never got a medal for anything I ever did but if I had it would have seemed very petty compared to the quiet courage of your people. Their submission to the privations of war in the manner that they did was the most laudatory thing in our times.

"For some of these reasons given above I would like to give you a sum roughly equal to the pay I received while on duty in Korea. It is not much and will not go very far in helping bind up the wounds you have suffered not only for yourselves but for us. But it is all that I can do and perhaps it will be of some use. I feel it is a soldier's debt.

"I have written my check out to your President. I hope he will find use for it someplace, somewhere in Korea. Perhaps it will help some family rebuild their home or provide a little food to others who are going without. I would like to think of it being used in some way to rebuild something which was destroyed. But I leave your distinguished President with complete discretion as to its use as I know no one could be more painfully aware of good uses it could be put to than he.

"Sincerely yours,

"NEWCOMB CLEVELAND."

Now the Congress of the United States tomorrow night vote umpty-ump millions or billions of dollars for relief here, there, and elsewhere, but nothing can match Lieutenant Cleveland's $1,500.

Yes, something else can. Your GI's out there, out of their meager pay, dug up nearly $19 million to help our widows and orphans when they saw the desolation of a Communist war.

The goodness of the human heart just can't be measured by an adding machine.

I thank you.

The Farm Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the following letter which I received from Hawaii:

LANAI CITY, HAWAII, *July 26, 1956.*
Hon. ABRAHAM MULTER,
New York.

DEAR SIR: In the Saturday, July 7, 1956, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mr. Earl Butz is quoted by Hon. Ross ADAIR, of Indiana, on his address given to the American Stockman and the American Way. Mr. ADAIR says it was a scholarly and factual speech; of course, the rhetoric and grammar were fine and fluent, but not one real constructive word on how to solve the farmer's pressing problems. In the first place there are several different types of farms in America today. The colonial type farm has gone, the southern plantation has gone; instead we have the family-size farm; and let me make it very clear everything I say refers to that type of farm; that is the real American way to farm that Mr. Butz makes so much talk about. First, family-size farm; second, rich man's farm, one for a hobby and to reduce income tax; third, small farm under 100 acres; fourth, established farm, well-to-do, mortgage paid, nothing to meet but taxes; fifth, the beginner who is in debt for everything.

Up until the First World War the farmer subsidy was free land; that came to an end by 1920.

Messrs. Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover refused to do anything about the problem.

Coolidge said, and he was supposed to be a brilliant man, "Let them go back to work; only hard work will solve the problem. They never did make money anyway." At that very time I was working 16 hours per day trying to pay off a small mortgage on a small farm, and it was just impossible. Let us suppose I was a poor manager and did everything wrong; strange isn't it that thousands of my fellow farmers were in worse shape.

In many cases all they could do to keep from starving was to walk off and leave a lifetime of hard work behind them.

The politicians have always said we need a surplus in time of war and famine; this being true it certainly is not fair to throw back the surplus in the farmer's face to carry the burden. My wife used to say what they do not know does not give anyone a headache. What the American taxpayer does not seem to know is that since colonial days, every business has been subsidized in some form or other. Railroads, airlines, steamship lines, for carrying mail; industry and business by high tariffs; but when it hits the breadbasket and pocketbook they really yell.

All my life I have tried to get the farmers to unite and work together as other business, industry, and labor do.

The Grange, Farm Bureau, Farmers' Union, credit union, and cooperatives should have a united front and coordinated purpose and program. They will not do so, therefore, 80 percent is there own fault, that they are exploited.

Some time ago I wrote a letter to the Rural New Yorker, and among other things, said that the farmer must control his own product at the grassroots. They did not see fit to publish my article, but wrote me a letter, saying I was absolutely right. If farm produce, especially the perishable ones, were controlled by the men that produce them, in 3 days they would realize a price and a reasonable profit as every other business expects.

Just visited my cousin's ranch in Washington; 800 acres of excellent land, 80 head of Herefords, hogs, chickens, crops, and equipment; a real family farm, run by father, mother, and daughter, with what additional help they can get in harvesttime.

In 1948 they were getting $39.50 per hundredweight for nice, young steers; in 1956 they are getting about $19.50 for choice yearlings. I said to them, that is just the same as stealing $25 per hundredweight right out of your pocket.

Now this has not solved the farm problem, but certainly is more of a practical point of view than the harangue Mr. Butz put on about the American way of life, free enterprise, free economy, etc.; free for what? to lose your fortune, your health, happiness, and your farm like we did in the twenties.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON says we can solve this problem, but when? Some areas are having drought, some too much rain, etc. Of course, these things can be solved, but it takes capital to do so. There is also an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about a banker who understood and helped the farmers, which was very good. They need liberal, long-term loans, especially those just starting. Let me say, also, there is no more hazardous business today—drought, wind, rain, hail; all kinds of insects—lice, mites, worms, and all kinds of diseases affect pigs, poultry, and other livestock.

Some of the reactionaries come right out and say there is no need for the small-marginal farmer he should be put out of business. How would he like it if someone moved in and said, "Move over, Bud, we need your room."

Mr. Butz, with his "pie in the sky" talk, is disgusting to a real farmer. The family-sized farm needs plenty of help or other business will suffer sooner or later.

Mr. MULTER, I address this to you, because I know you are interested in all these problems and my own representative and I do not agree too well on how they should be solved.

Quote this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD if you care to, as I am a real Pennsylvania Dutch farmer and know what it's all about.

Respectfully,

FRANK A. SNYDER.

Tribute to Hon. James P. Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in the eulogies being given DICK RICHARDS. As I have stated previously on the floor of the House, he is a great American who has met well the responsibilities thrust upon him in the difficult period since World War II. I think that when the history of congressional actions during this period is revealed, no Member of either body should deserve higher credit for the success of American foreign policy than DICK RICHARDS.

Pitfalls of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted by the House, I present for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Journal of Commerce:

PITFALLS OF CONTROL

Exponents of controls never die; they don't even fade away.

A considerable number of Democrats in Congress would like nothing better than to slap new mandatory priority controls on nickel.

They did not get their way when the Defense Production Act was up for extension. But that apparently did not discourage them. The Senate Small Business Committee is currently readying a report on nickel which in all probability will make another strong play for controls. In addition, the Department of Commerce has been asked to submit a nickel survey which, as the congressional critics of recent administration nickel policies hope, will provide them with more ammunition in their fight for nickel controls.

During the Production Act debate, the majority of Congress refused to swallow the argument that only a tough priority control can bring about an equitable distribution of nickel.

Even the so-called Morse amendment to the Defense Production Act that proposed to give the President discretionary authority to impose additional nickel controls in case of an emergency failed to pass Congress.

What lifted this discussion out of the ordinary, however, was not so much the defeat of the Morse amendment but rather some byplay that developed over this issue between Senator FULBRIGHT and the Department of Commerce. This newspaper was drawn into this controversy because of an article dealing with the nickel discussion in which an official of the Business and Defense Services Administration had been quoted as saying that "since the amendment requires the exercise of administrative discretion * * * they would not be put on, under any circumstances."

This remark did not sit well with Senator FULBRIGHT. He saw in it "an attitude toward the constitutional legislative process which is little short of contempt." We believe that he read more into the statement than was in it. At any rate, he interpreted it as meaning that "a statutory provision, if enacted, would not be followed but would be totally disregarded."

The good Senator went on the warpath against the Department of Commerce, which is responsible for the BDSA, and obtained

an answer from one of the Department's key officials that he had been unable "to find any responsible official who had discussed this matter with the press," and that, at any rate, "press reports are not always accurate."

Senator FULBRIGHT sent us his correspondence with the Department of Commerce "as a disavowal of the views attributed to a BDSA official" in our article on this subject.

We are not particularly concerned over the controversy between the Senator and the Department of Commerce. We don't even know—and care less—whether the Department succeeded in getting itself off the hook in this affair or not.

Our concern is over the attitude on controls that both parties to this controversy displayed.

The Eisenhower administration has long fought the use of controls in peacetime. Spokesmen for the administration, from the President on down, have asserted time and again—and with great eloquence—that controls have no place in our economy, except under emergency conditions.

Only a few weeks ago, Felix E. Wormser, Assistant Secretary for Mineral Resources in the Department of the Interior, publicly reiterated this administration attitude and made much of the argument that controls beget controls. "It has been my observation," he said, "that any movement to initiate one type of Government intervention in commodity markets, if successful, leads inevitably to another."

We would be greatly disturbed if we were to find out that there are important administration officials who refuse to live up to this principle.

It would be too much to expect that the whole Congress could be convinced that peacetime controls should have no place in our free-enterprise system, or that, as another BDSA official expressed it, reimposition of civilian materials controls in peacetime would mean "the end of the free-enterprise system as we know it."

It would be an entirely different matter, however, if such deviations from the policies laid down by President Eisenhower for his administration were to develop among the lower echelons of his official family.

Hon. Woodrow W. Jones

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this Congress to adjourn without telling my colleague, Congressman WOODROW W. JONES, of North Carolina, and the Members of the House how much we Members who know him will miss his services here in the House of Representatives during the next Congress. We all sincerely regret that Congressman JONES decided not to be a candidate for reelection after this year. He is one of the most valuable men serving here in Congress as he votes his own convictions at all times and party lines mean nothing to him when a principle is involved.

We should have men of Congressman JONES' ability, character, and experience serving on our Federal benches throughout the United States and on the Supreme Court. I am certain that he has a bright future ahead of him as, I understand, he is one of the most brilliant lawyers in my neighbor State of North Carolina. I have certainly enjoyed having Congressman JONES serve on the House District Committee, as I always knew that he would vote on every proposed piece of legislation for the best interests of the people of the entire Nation.

The Congress of the United States is losing the services of some of its most valuable Members this year and some of them are among my closest personal friends. I do not know of any Member who is retiring from Congress who will be missed more than my good friend, Congressman JONES of North Carolina. I hope that I will continue to have his friendship when he returns to the private practice of law, and wish for him and his family all the success possible during the future years.

Leasing of Lands in Superior National Forest to Inco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on page A4177 of the May 24 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] called our attention to Warren Unna's excellent summary of Republican giveaways in the May issue of Harper's magazine.

In particular, I noted the section dealing with a mineral lease now being developed by the Department of the Interior with the International Nickel Company of Canada, Ltd.—Inco—for lands in the Superior National Forest. I have always taken an interest in the protection of the public domain.

When I looked into this matter, I found that it also raised many other important questions, among them national defense, monopoly versus small business, and a critical shortage of an indispensable metal. All these made it imperative that this proposed lease be carefully scrutinized.

On page A4473 of the June 5 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I called attention to this lease.

As part of my remarks I included a letter in which I addressed several questions on this lease to the Secretary of the Interior. I also included the introduction of Senate Document No. 4, 82d Congress, "Investigation of the Preparedness Program." In that report the Senate Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee said Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found."

Later additional information on the Inco monopoly came to my attention. On page A4963 of the June 22 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted two letters which indicate that even a South African concern may not sell nickel to an American businessman without the transaction going through Inco in New York.

To complete the record, at least for now, I am making available Interior Secretary Seaton's reply to my inquiry and the answer I have sent him. These letters follow:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1956.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. METCALF: This will reply to your letter of June 5 in which you raise a number of questions concerning the International Nickel Co.'s application to this Department for mineral leases on lands located within the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

In your letter you list eight questions to which you request answers from the Department of the Interior. These questions, you state, involve "national defense, conservation, monopoly, a critical shortage of an indispensable metal, and the attendant injury to small business." You further request a copy of the proposed lease form. We are happy to comply with both requests.

I shall attempt to answer your questions in the order in which they were raised.

1. When will the lease become effective? The lease, if granted, would become effective on the first day of the month following its execution, unless the applicants were to request that the lease be dated the first day of the month of execution.

2. What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency * * *? This provision is covered in detail in section 7 (e) of the enclosed proposed lease form under heading of "National Emergency."

3. Has your Department had access to a copy of the Office of Defense Mobilization letter to the Forest Service on the desirability of stimulating production in the national interest? While I am not certain as to the letter to which you refer, it is my understanding that there is a classified document of this nature in the confidential files of the Forest Service. The Department of the Interior has not seen such a document.

4. Has your Department examined the assays of samples from the diamond drillings by Inco in the Superior National Forest? If so, what did they show: Were minerals in addition to nickel and copper found in commercial quality? What were these minerals? What royalty provisions for all minerals involved are contained in the contemplated lease? The Geological Survey of this Department which has examined the assays submitted by the company has reported thereon. That report is now receiving departmental consideration. The details in such geological reports and findings of this Department are not considered to be public information. They are a matter between the Department and the lease applicant. To betray the confidential nature of these reports would not only compromise the position of the applicant but would also be contrary to established procedures for considering mineral-leasing applications. The royalty provisions are dealt with at length in section 2 (b, c, and d) in the proposed lease form.

5. In view of the current emergency, has ODM been consulted with respect to the terms of the proposed lease? Representatives of the Office of Defense Mobilization were active participants, along with representatives of this Department, the Forest Service, and other interested parties, in the preliminary meeting when the proposed lease form was discussed and formulated.

6. Is Inco to have an undivided interest in the lease? If not, what other companies will have an interest and how much? If executed, the lease would be between the De-

partment of the Interior, as the appropriate agency of the Federal Government, and the International Nickel Co. Any overriding royalties or other possible arrangements would be between the lessee and other parties with whom the Department would have no connection.

7. In view of the Senate subcommittee's finding that Inco is "one of the most formidable monopolies the subcommittee has found," has the proposed lease been referred to the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice for determination as to whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease? I have been advised informally that the Anti-Trust Division has no interest in reviewing the proposed lease. Explicit monopoly and fair price provisions are contained in section 6 (b) of the proposed lease form. Interior has, however, submitted the proposed lease form to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the congressional committee most concerned with the overall aspects of the proposed lease. On May 11, 1956 Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of this committee, wrote to the Department of the Interior that his committee has no objection to issuance of the proposed lease. Senator MURRAY's letter said, in part: "I hereby rescind the request that execution (of the lease) by the Department of the Interior be held in abeyance."

8. Is there a requirement in the proposed lease that the plant, which will process this ore from public lands, be located in the United States? We believe that location of a processing plant is always dictated by the economics of the prevailing situation; by availability of transportation facilities, electrical energy, employee housing, etc. It would be highly unusual to include as a provision of a lease the stipulation that this Department would have the right to dictate the location of a processing plant even before the company actually got into production. However, there are special stipulations listed in section 3 (f) of the proposed lease form that guarantee the preservation of the forest character of the area. It should also be noted that none of the area embraced by the lease application lies within the roadless area of the Superior National Forest.

As you point out in your letter, there is widespread interest in the potential development of a significant source of nickel in this country. As you no doubt know the present production of this strategic material in the United States is insignificant in comparison with consumption. The exploration and study in the Superior National Forest mineralized area have taken a number of years. Most of the prospecting permits embraced in the present lease application were issued in 1951 and 1952. The law provides that after a prospecting permit has been granted a lease must issue if minerals are found to be in commercial quantity.

During the 5 years since the first prospecting permits were issued the question of lease issuance has been given thorough and continuous study. The proposed lease form has been cleared by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture.

If there is any additional information with which we can furnish you please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

FRED A. SEATON.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have your letter of July 19 concerning the International Nickel Co.'s application for mineral leases on lands in the Superior National Forest.

As I have indicated previously, this is a matter of real concern to me, involving as it does questions of national defense, protection of the public domain, monopoly versus small business, and a critical shortage of an indispensable metal.

You will recall that my second question was contained in this paragraph:

"(2) What provisions are made in the proposed lease for the stimulation of production during a period of emergency such as we are experiencing now? I consider this a most important question in view of the allegations of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee in Document No. 4, 82d Congress, with respect to Inco's monopoly position in nickel production and distribution."

Now I, too, want to see a lease go into effect. But I want it to be a lease which will assure production, not permit one of the most formidable monopolies the Senate subcommittee found to tie up, thus foreclosing development by anyone else if Inco chooses to sit on the lease, the public's minerals for 50 years. I believe section 7 (e) of the lease form could well be reexamined with this in mind.

If the Department of the Interior has not seen the document referred to in my third question, the Department should. And if, as you say in answering my fifth question, representatives of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Forest Service, attended the preliminary meeting when the proposed lease form was discussed and formulated, it is strange that Interior has not seen the ODM letter to the Forest Service.

You write that the assay report is now receiving departmental consideration. I would think that one of the first things the Department would have done would have been to study the assays—to find out what it has to lease before a lease form is drawn up. If these assays reveal the presence of rare minerals, they would certainly affect the royalty provisions of the lease.

In answering my sixth question, you indicate the Department is not concerned with any other company which might get a piece of the lease from Inco. I have been informed that another American nickel producer is interested in this lease. If this is the case, then substantially all the known nickel deposits in this country may be tied up by two companies.

I am happy to learn that the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has approved the lease, and that the lease form has been cleared by the Forest Service. However, I would point out that a determination of whether Inco's monopoly would be enhanced by this lease is not within the jurisdiction of either the committee or of the Forest Service. I assume that each approved the lease within the scope of its jurisdiction. Neither has anything whatsoever to do with monopoly. I cannot understand why the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has no interest in reviewing the proposed lease. According to my recollection, the Department of Justice previously considered action against Inco and entered into a consent decree several years ago.

One purpose of this lease is to develop our domestic nickel supply. At the same time, however, you oppose inclusion in this lease of a requirement that the processing plant be located in the United States. I believe the development of our supply would be enhanced by the location of the processing plant in the United States.

I know that present United States production of this strategic material is insignificant in comparison with consumption. That is one of the reasons I am concerned.

I know, too, that Interior cannot be in the position of holding up the development of this source of the indispensable metal. But it is your responsibility to see that every contract you make in the Government's name is in the public interest.

You will recall that Public Law 632 of the 84th Congress provides for a special study of the entire nickel situation by the Department of Commerce. I presume that the study will cover all possible sources of supply, including this proposed lease. I will be very much interested in this study. I also will continue to watch the development of this lease very closely.

As I promised I would, I shall place your letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because of the importance and widespread public interest in this matter. Once the lease has been executed I also plan to place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. For that reason, I will appreciate your advising me of any changes in the lease form.

Guardian of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of June 13, 1956:

GUARDIAN OF LIBERTY

The decision of the Supreme Court that the present Federal employee security program has been carried far beyond the limits intended by Congress is a judicial way of saying one of the things that lay critics have been saying all along. The high tribunal, in an opinion written by President Eisenhower's latest appointee, Justice John M. Harlan, held that summary suspension and unreviewable dismissal of Federal employees as security risks could apply only to those in sensitive jobs, not indiscriminately to any or all employees of the Federal Government.

The effect of this major pronouncement of a majority (6 to 3) of the Court is not in any way to destroy the security program, but to impose upon it the commonsense limitation that a Federal employee holding a position that had nothing to do with the national security could not be fired under existing security-risk procedures. The Court took pains to point out that he could be fired by other methods, if need be. Since about half of the Federal employees dismissed as security risks were in nonsensitive positions, the far-reaching application of the decision can readily be appreciated.

In this case—involving one Kendrick M. Cole, a former Federal food and drug inspector—the Nation's highest Court has once again affirmed "the need for procedural safeguards * * * in the absence of some overriding necessity"; and it has thus once again proved itself the bulwark of individual rights against undue extensions of either administrative or legislative power. It was a fitting end to the 1955–56 term that saw the Court consistently restating the principles of liberty, dignity, and justice, which are the spark that gives to American democracy its unique meaning in the world.

In a number of instances during the past 8 months, the Supreme Court has reinforced its historic antisegregation decision of 1954, not only in the field of education but also by outlawing segregation in, for example, public recreational facilities. The Court has repeatedly reminded the country that the Constitution still stands as the fundamental law, with all its guaranties to the individual. In the Ullman case it upheld the Immunity Act, but restated the importance of the fifth amendment; and in the Slochower case it reiterated that the individual must be protected through due process from arbitrary action. Civilian rights were reaffirmed in the

Toth case restricting the jurisdiction of the military courts.

In the legal war waged by State and Federal Governments against the Communist Party, the Supreme Court did not hesitate to risk unpopular reaction by maintaining, in the Nelson case, that the Federal Government had preempted the field of antisubversive activities and that "no room has been left for the States." The Court showed what it thought of professional informers who have been accused of perjury (but who had been used by the Justice Department) by ordering the Subversive Activities Control Board to reappraise their testimony, before the constitutionality of the law under which the Communist Party is being prosecuted could be determined.

A number of these decisions have, in fact, been so unpopular in some quarters—coming as they have on top of the antisegregation decision of 1954—that a serious move is under way in Congress to overturn some of them and generally to limit the power of the Court. We think that Congress would do well to approach such legislation with the most extreme caution, and not let the passions of the moment cloud its judgment of an institution that through the years has demonstrated time and time again that its independence is one of the most fundamental safeguards of our Nation and one of the most effective—probably the most effective—guarantor of our liberties.

Accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include for the benefit of the businessmen of my district, a brief summary of the accomplishments during the 4 years of the Eisenhower administration.

As of the close of this session, marking the fourth year of the Eisenhower administration, as businessmen I thought you might be interested in a brief summary of its accomplishments.

Successful businessmen generally make plans or policies. Because of the bigness of Government, I find that policies in Government are of the greatest importance.

The first act of this administration was to agree upon a blueprint of sound policies, as follows:

First. To stop the war in Korea.

Second. To achieve efficiency and economy in Government, and put an end to waste.

Third. To reduce taxes.

Fourth. To encourage free enterprise.

Fifth. To stabilize the dollar, and balance the budget.

Sixth. To get the Government out of business.

Seventh. To work toward the goal of world peace.

I believe the facts will prove we have gone a long way in 4 short years in accomplishing the above objectives.

The first policy—stopping the war in Korea—can be checked as accomplished.

The second policy of efficiency, economy, and the stopping of waste has been accomplished by reducing the unnecessary cost of Government during the past 4 years by over $20 billion.

That policy made it possible to reduce Federal taxes by $7½ billion—our third objective.

By reducing taxes and revising the tax code, we gave business and the free enterprise system the green light of confidence, which encouraged business to expand, employing additional millions of our people, increasing our production, and increasing the wealth of our Nation.

This fourth policy had such a dynamic effect on the expansion of the business of the Nation that the threatened peacetime depression was beaten off, and even with a tax reduction of $7½ billion given to the people, we were able to balance the budget for the first time since 1951, and the second time in a quarter of a century.

With a surplus in the Treasury of over $2 billion, we have stablized the dollar, brought inflation under control, and are getting the Government out of competitive business as rapidly as possible. The Defense Department alone has closed down 195 business-type activities. We have sold 24 synthetic rubber plants, getting back 97 percent of the taxpayers' investment—a record never before equaled.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The power for peace which has been built up in this Nation through the experience and leadership of President Eisenhower has stopped the Russian Bear in his tracks. Our massive retaliatory military power which has deterred Russia and has preserved the peace has been accomplished at a minimum cost to the taxpayer—yet it offers a maximum striking power for defense.

In the fact of our most powerful military force in the history of the Nation, Russia has paused in her plan of aggression, she has started no new wars, she has enslaved no new peoples. Today, as we stand on the threshold of world peace, we have every reason to have continued confidence in our Nation's foreign policy, in her defense program, and in her leadership. But we must not relax our vigilance. We must not be disarmed by Russian smiles, we must keep the line taut.

THE RESULT OF SOUND POLICIES

In adopting sound policies and keeping the avenues of opportunity open, the expansion of business, resulting in millions of jobs, with the new wealth created in the past 3½ years almost staggers the imagination.

This economic strength snuffed out the threatened depression, and prosperity, with the exception of the farmer for a time, has been rolling forward on the broad highway, nationwide, reaching one peak after another; in fact, the strength of our economy has been so powerful that the Federal Reserve Board working in close cooperation with the Treasury has kept putting on the brakes for the past 2 years to keep the business boom from getting out of hand.

The underlying strength of the boom continues to confound the pessimists and amaze most of the optimists. Not even a 1 month's industrial steel strike on top of the major slowdown in automobiles is likely to make much of a dent in our economy.

It is expected that the year 1956 in business spending will top the record-high 1955 total spending of $322,300,000,000. While our gross national product, or yearly production, for the fiscal year 1952 was $346 billion, 1956 has finally broken through the $400 billion yearly rate of total production. In other words, the Nation's wealth has increased $54 billion since 1952, and is expected to gain momentum in 1957.

Personal income rose to a new high annual level of $317.5 billion the first quarter of this year, which is $3 billion above the last quarter of 1955.

NEW CONSTRUCTION HEADED FOR RECORD

Outlays for new construction are expected to total $44.5 billion in 1956, a 4-percent increase over last year's record level, according to revised estimates prepared by the Commerce and Labor Departments. Further gains were forecast for utilities, private industrial buildings, and highways.

RETAIL SALES

A check of store managers across the country, including department stores, indicates that total retail sales in 1956 will top the record year of 1955—finishing up with a record-high Christmas business.

HIGH EMPLOYMENT

American employment has reached an alltime peak with over 66 million persons holding jobs. A record backlog of savings and purchasing power by accumulation of E and H bonds, which are now held by the people, has reached the alltime high of $40,929,000,000, an increase of bond holding by the people of $5,605,000,000 during the past 3½ years of the Eisenhower administration.

LACK OF CONFIDENCE IN 1952

Confidence in the Government's leadership plus sound policies are absolutely essential. Because of the lack of confidence of the people in their Government in 1952, they cashed in $523 million more of their bonds than the Government was able to sell back to the people. With confidence in the new administration in the first year, 1953, the trend changed, and the people bought and held $211 million more in bonds than were cashed in.

In 1955, the sales of E and H bonds exceeded redemptions by $717 million, and the figures indicate to date that in 1956 the people will buy and hold again this year about $700 million worth of bonds in excess of cash-ins, or redemptions.

On June 30, 1956, $14,900,000,000 matured Series E bonds were being retained by their owners under the optional automatic extension program voted by Congress; in other words, approximately 70 percent of the bonds that had come due are being held by their owners as part of their backlog of savings—another evidence of confidence.

AGRICULTURE

One of the outstanding achievements has been the courageous stand of President Eisenhower and us in the Congress

who have backed him. We attacked the cause that was depressing farm prices rather than yield to political expediency and continue high-price supports that were responsible for the mountain of surpluses which depressed farm prices and cost the taxpayers over a billion dollars last year.

By treating the cause, we will ultimately save the taxpayers billions of dollars a year, and at the same time bring real prosperity to the farmers.

HIGHLIGHTS OF FARM EXPORTS

Our farm exports are up 20 percent from last year. Corn and other feedgrain exports are up 84 percent—an all-time high record; soybean exports are up 30 percent; lard exports are up 31 percent. If you exclude cotton, our farm exports this year are expected to be the highest in the past 30 years.

These exports of surplus farm commodities should result in higher prices, increase the farmers' spendable income which should reflect in local business.

Farm prices have turned upward with a gain of 9 percent over the low reached last December. During the last several months there has been an increase of 40 percent in the price of hogs.

THE WASHINGTON SCENE

As businessmen, I believe you want the facts. Notwithstanding the general optimism of the people, and this favorable report of the Nation's prosperity, in frankness we must admit a lot of sour notes have been blown in Washington which could have been avoided had the people, after electing the President and a new administration, given the President a majority of his own party to help him complete the job he had so well begun.

May I say to you in all seriousness, it appears the Democrat majority in the House and Senate has constantly voted to increase appropriations, in an apparent effort to prevent the President and his administration from balancing the budget. I feel sure careful analysis of such excess spending, which the people will have to pay back in taxes, will total over $2 billion for the last 2 years.

While we balanced the budget with a $2 billion surplus, it could have been $4 or $5 billion had the President had the cooperation of a friendly Congress.

HOOVER REPORTS

The Hoover Commission has just issued a report as follows:

Of 314 recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, more than 80 reports have been put into effect by the President through Executive action, while only about 20 of the recommendations have been implemented to any degree, by the action of Congress. The report further states it appears that the adoption of its reports, which would reduce the cost of government by $10,000 a minute is of little interest to many leading Democrats in Congress. This statement is made by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

The Eisenhower administration during its first 2 years passed a law empowering the Secretary of Defense to get the Government out of business where private enterprise could do a better job, and much progress was made during the first 2 years.

When the Democrat Congress came in 2 years ago, they threw up a roadblock which has greatly slowed down the program by enacting legislation which the Eisenhower administration opposed, which compels the Secretary of Defense to get the consent of the Armed Services Committees of the House and Senate before the Secretary can act. We tried to repeal that provision in the present session, but were voted down, with the Democrat Members almost solidly opposing us.

WORLD PEACE

Our greatest hope for the future is that under the leadership of President Eisenhower we may ultimately achieve the goal of world peace. May I say to you, in all sincerity, the facts show we have made great progress in that direction.

Voting Record of Hon. Charles A. Boyle, of Illinois, in the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record in the 2d session of the 84th Congress:

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
Jan. 3, 1956	1	Quorum call	Present	376 Members present.
Jan. 26, 1956	2	do	do	332 Members present.
Jan. 31, 1956	3	Rollcall, gas tax on farms	Yea	387 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	4	Rollcall, funds for Committee on Un-American Activities	do	385 yeas, 1 nay.
Feb. 1, 1956	5	H. R. 7993, to authorize construction of certain naval vessels	do	358 yeas, 3 nays.
Feb. 2, 1956	6	Quorum	Present	367 Members present.
Feb. 8, 1956	7	Rollcall, H. Res. 396, re sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant (rubber) (resolution condemned sale).	Yea	61 yeas, 309 nays.
Feb. 20, 1956	8	Rollcall, H. R. 8710, to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947	do	372 yeas, 2 nays.
Feb. 28, 1956	9	Quorum call	Present	347 Members present.
Do	10	H. Res. 311, for rule on H. R. 3383 (Colorado River project)	Yea	354 yeas, 26 nays, 53 not voting.
Do	11	Quorum call	Present	376 present.
Feb. 29, 1956	12	do	do	400 present.
Mar. 1, 1956	13	do	do	392 present.
Do	14	H. R. 3383, Colorado River project (on passage)	Nay	256 yeas, 136 nays.
Mar. 7, 1956	15	H. R. 9739, request for a separate vote on the Dowdy amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the GSA.	Yea	150 yeas, 231 nays, 52 not voting.
Mar. 13, 1956	16	H. R. 9166, extends for 1 year the present corporate income tax rate and the present tax on liquor and certain other excises.	do	366 yeas, 4 nays, 63 not voting.
Mar. 20, 1956	17	Quorum	Present	384 Members present.
Mar. 21, 1956	18	do	do	408 Members present.
Do	19	Conference report on H. R. 8320, to amend agricultural act with respect to the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.	Nay	195 yeas, 215 nays.
Do	20	To concur with Senate amendments to H. R. 8320	Yea	406 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	21	Motion to recommit H. Res. 432, to authorize appointment of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge to civilian position in Department of Justice (Immigration).	Nay	80 yeas, 310 nays.
Apr. 11, 1956	22	Quorum	Present	410 present.
Do	23	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 12 (farm bill)	Nay	181 yeas, 238 nays.
Do	24	Conference report on H. R. 12 (farm bill)	Yea	237 yeas, 181 nays.
Apr. 12, 1956	25	H. R. 9893, to authorize certain construction at military installations	do	377 yeas, 3 nays.
Apr. 18, 1956	26	Quorum	Present	406 Members present.
Do	27	H. R. 12 on President's veto of the farm bill	Nay	202 yea, 211 nays.
Apr. 23, 1956	28	H. R. 7228 for bridge over Potomac River at Jones Point	Yea	284 yeas, 8 nays.
Apr. 24, 1956	29	Quorum	Present	309 Members present.
Do	30	do	do	299 Members present.
Do	31	do	do	292 Members present.
Do	32	do	do	298 Members present.
Apr. 25, 1956	33	do	do	375 Members present.
Do	34	H. R. 10721, State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations on amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of Department of Immigration.	Nay	179 yeas, 184 nays.
Apr. 27, 1956	35	Quorum	Present	384 Members present.
Do	36	H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956	Yea	388 yeas, 19 nays.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.—Continued

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
May 2, 1956	37	Quorum	Present	
May 3, 1956	38	do	do	393 Members present.
Do	39	H. R. 10875, agriculture bill, Albert's amendment to include $50,000,000 for grazing lands	Nay	199 yeas, 195 nays.
Do	40	H. R. 10875, amendment to maintain price support for 1956 crop of upland cotton at 84 percent of parity	do	186 yeas, 208 nays.
Do	41	H. R. 10875, amendment to make 50 percent prepayment on 1957 crop in 1956	do	184 yeas, 211 nays.
Do	42	H. R. 10875, on the passage of the bill	Yea	314 yeas, 78 nays.
May 9, 1956	43	Quorum	Present	
Do	44	do	do	
May 10, 1956	45	do	do	
Do	46	H. R. 10986, defense appropriation bill for 1957. Amendment on sec. 633 (question of striking out).	Yea	222 years, 156 nays.
Do	47	H. R. 10986, on passage of the bill	do	377 years, 0 nays.
May 16, 1956	48	Quorum	Present	359 Members present.
Do	49	do	do	341 Members present.
May 17, 1956	50	H. R. 8901, mass transportation in the District of Columbia, motion to recommit	Yea	161 yeas, 172 nays.
May 21, 1956	51	Quorum	Present	291 Members present.
Do	52	H. R. 11124, annuities for widows and dependent children of Federal judges	Yea	238 yeas, 52 nays.
May 22, 1956	53	H. R. 11319, public works appropriation bill, 1957 on Abernethy amendment to provide $160,000 for resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway.	do	179 yeas, 140 nays.
May 23, 1956	54	H. R. 10875, conference report on farm bill	do	304 yeas, 59 nays.
May 24, 1956	55	S. J. Res. 135, conference report for providing payment to Crow Indian Tribe for transfer of right-of-way for the Yellowtail Dam unit, Missouri River Basin project.	do	176 yeas, 126 nays.
May 31, 1956	56	H. R. 10285, Farm Credit Act of 1956	do	246 yeas, 4 nays.
June 6, 1956	57	Quorum call	Present	359 Members present.
Do	58	do	do	311 Members present.
June 7, 1956	59	do	do	379 Members present.
June 8, 1956	60	do	do	345 Members present.
Do	61	do	do	299 Members present.
June 11, 1956	62	do	do	388 Members present.
Do	63	H. R. 11356, Mutual Security Act of 1956, on passage	Yea	275 yeas, 122 nays, 2 present.
Do	64	Quorum call	Present	391 Members present.
Do	65	H. R. 1840, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination on passage of the bill.	Yea	393 yeas, 3 nays.
June 12, 1956	66	Quorum call	Present	358 Members present.
Do	67	do	do	350 Members present.
Do	68	do	do	351 Members present.
June 13, 1956	69	H. R. 5881, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects, and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. On motion to recommit the conference report.	Nay	179 yeas, 209 nays.
Do	70	H. R. 4090, amending Communications Act of 1934. On motion to recommit the bill	do	151 yeas, 228 nays.
Do	71	H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act, on motion to recommit.	do	165 yeas, 213 nays.
Do	72	H. R. 9540, on passage of bill	Yea	338 yeas, 31 nays.
June 20, 1956	73	Quorum call	Present	382 Members present.
June 25, 1956	74	do	do	328 Members present.
Do	75	S. 3295, extend to last Sunday in October daylight savings time in the District of Columbia	Yea	199 yeas, 120 nays, 1 present.
June 27, 1956	76	Quorum call	Present	411 Members present.
Do	77	H. R. 7886, veterans bill on motion to recommit	Nay	110 yeas, 305 nays.
Do	78	H. R. 7886, veterans bill on passage	Yea	364 yeas, 51 nays, 1 present.
June 28, 1956	79	Quorum call	Present	394 Members present.
Do	80	do	do	394 Members present.
Do	81	H. R. 9852, extension of Defense Production Act of 1950, on adoption of conference report	Nay	200 yeas, 197 nays.
Do	82	H. Res. 554, on H. R. 7535, school construction bill, on passage of resolution for consideration of bill.	Yea	327 yeas, 67 nays.
June 20, 1956	83	Quorum call	Present	343 Members present.
Do	84	do	do	
July 2, 1956	85	H. R. 9801, authorizing construction of bridge over Panama Canal at Balboa, C. Z.	Yea	325 yeas, 59 nays.
Do	86	S. 2379, training of fishing industry personnel, passage of bill	do	254 yeas, 133 nays.
July 3, 1956	87	Quorum call	Present	363 Members present.
July 5, 1956	88	do	do	385 Members present.
Do	89	H. R. 7535, school construction bill, on Gwinn amendment of allowing States to retain 1 percent of Federal income taxes for school construction.	Nay	168 yeas, 250 nays.
Do	90	H. R. 7535, on Powell amendment to allow no funds to any State which fails to comply with decisions of Supreme Court.	Yea	225 yeas, 192 nays.
Do	91	H. R. 7535, on motion to recommit	Nay	158 yeas, 262 nays.
Do	92	H. R. 7535, on passage of bill	Yea	194 yeas, 224 nays.
July 6, 1956	93	Quorum call	Present	394 Members present.
Do	94	H. R. 11830, to increase postal rates, on passage of bill	Nay	217 yeas, 165 nays.
July 9, 1956	95	H. R. 9893, Military Construction Act of 1956, on conference report, on motion to recommit	do	29 yeas, 343 nays.
Do	96	H. R. 11967, on National Memorial Stadium, on passage of bill	do	287 yeas, 80 nays.
July 11, 1956	97	Quorum call	Present	377 Members present.
Do	98	H. R. 12130, mutual security appropriation bill for 1957, on passage of conference report	Yea	284 yeas, 120 nays.
July 12, 1956	99	H. Res. 584, on H. R. 12138, supplemental appropriation, 1957	do	361 yeas, 30 nays.
Do	100	H. R. 12138, supplemental appropriation, 1957, on motion to recommit	Nay	24 yeas, 370 nays.
Do	101	H. R. 12038, to provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and to increase dependency allowances on passage of bill.	Yea	391 yeas, 0 nays.
July 17, 1956	102	Quorum call	Present	379 Members present.
July 18, 1956	103	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of Communist China into United Nations.	Yea	391 yeas, 0 nays.
Do	104	H. R. 11708, to increase from $1,500,000,000 to $3,000,000,000, the total amount of the foreign currency transactions for distribution of surplus commodities.	do	389 yeas, 6 nays.
July 19, 1956	105	Quorum	Present	398 Members present.
Do	106	Motion to lay on table move that further proceedings be dispensed with	Nay	104 yeas, 290 nays.
July 20, 1956	107	Quorum	Present	400 Members present.
July 21, 1956	108	do	Absent	261 Members present.
July 23, 1956	109	do	Present	399 Members present.
Do	110	H. R. 627, Civil Rights Act of 1956, on a motion to recommit	Nay	131 yeas, 275 nays.
Do	111	H. R. 627, Civil Rights Act of 1956, on passage	Yea	279 yeas, 126 nays.
Do	112	S. 1644, the Federal Construction Contract Act, on suspending the rules and passing the bill (⅔ majority needed).	do	245 yeas, 145 nays.
Do	113	H. R. 12227, amending certain wool import duties to suspend the rules and pass the bill	do	216 yeas, 123 nays.
July 24, 1956	114	Quorum	Present	379 Members present.
Do	115	H. R. 7992, enacting certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act on passage.	Yea	201 yeas, 185 nays.
Do	116	H. R. 12061, providing for a civilian atomic-power-acceleration program on striking out the enacting clause.	Nay	195 yeas, 199 nays.
Do	117	H. R. 12061, atomic-power-acceleration program, on motion to recommit	do	203 yeas, 191 nays.
July 25, 1956	118	Quorum	Present	382 Members present.
Do	119	H. R. 11742, housing bill, on amendment to strike out title V authorizing public housing	Nay	92 yeas, 299 nays.
Do	120	H. Res. 638, to cite for contempt of Congress Arthur Miller	Yea	373 yeas, 9 nays.
July 26, 1956	121	Quorum	Present	380 Members present.
Do	122	do	do	374 Members present.
Do	123	H. R. 412, Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado, on H. Res. 641	Nay	179 yeas, 194 nays.
Do	124	H. Res. 602, to consider H. R. 8902, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from the sale or other disposition of certain property.	Yea	184 yeas, 178 nays.
Do	125	H. R. 8902, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from the sale or other disposition of certain property, on motion to recommend.	do	196 yeas, 153 nays.

Voting record of Hon. CHARLES A. BOYLE of Illinois in the 2d sess. of the 84th Cong.—Continued

Date	Rollcall No.	Issue	Vote of CHARLES A. BOYLE	Vote on issue
July 27, 1956	126	Quorum	Present	336 Members present.
Do	127	H. Res. 625, for consideration of S. 3338, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects.	Yea	219 yeas, 126 nays.
Do	128	S. 3338, relating to rates charged for electric power, on passage	do	201 yeas, 140 nays.
Do	129	Quorum	Present	337 Members present.
Do	130	do	do	339 Members present.
Do	131	H. Res. 604, to bring up H. R. 7850, Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho	Nay	173 yeas, 168 nays.
Do	132	Quorum	Present	327 Members present.

Another Look at UNESCO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, repeated attempts have been made to misrepresent the American Legion's position on the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—UNESCO. J. Addington Wagner, national commander of the Legion, sets the record straight in the following article which appeared in the August issue of American Legion Magazine:

The propaganda apparatus for UNESCO in this country is extensive, but much of the line for the organization can be found in the Newsletter issued by the United States National Commission for UNESCO. In the issue of this Newsletter for April 6, 1956, the following appears:

"The current congressional appraisal of American participation in UNESCO continued on March 19 with the appearance before the House Subcommittee on International Organizations of Congressman HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Henry Hope, chairman of the department of fine arts at the University of Indiana. The hearings are part of a general inquiry into United States participation in the specialized agencies.

"Testifying on his observations as a United States delegates to UNESCO's Eighth General Conference, Congressman SCOTT pointed out that 'every major policy that our delegation advocated secured the majority support of the Conference.'

"He added: 'I doubt if there are many activities in which the American delegations going out from the State Department can point to a 100-percent batting average—to use the analogy of baseball, 1,000-percent batting average—and if we were to meet with similar success in the United Nations, for example, many of our problems would be behind us."

"Commenting on the criticism of UNESCO by the American Legion, Congressman SCOTT said: 'I don't know what we are going to do with the various Legion posts, for example, who will not look at the facts, and who continue to ignore the Murphy report. * * * I believe that this effort to straighten out the Legion's thinking should continue at the next Legion convention, and perhaps the question can be brought up at the time when the delegates are not so hot and sweaty and willing to pass matters on a few seconds' determination, and not reading (the Murphy report); and possibly the extension of literacy to Legion conventions, while not a function of UNESCO, might well be considered as a desirable achievement.' "

Passing over the Congressman's insulting reference to Legionnaires as being illiterate, it is regrettable that the Pennsylvania politician, himself a Legionnaire, either knows so little about the organization to which he purports to belong, or is so eager to join the pressure groups in their efforts to smear the Legion on this issue that he will advance such palpable nonsense. However, since these are the tactics of the UNESCO partisans, the following is published so that Legionnaires will not fall for the kind of brainwashing that is attempted in Congressman SCOTT's statement.

Here are the facts concerning UNESCO as the American Legion views this organization:

There has been much discussion, and some confusion, about the position of the American Legion on the subject of UNESCO. Public understanding has been made difficult by certain inaccuracies in many of the published reports and discussions which have followed the action of the American Legion's national convention at Miami last October. In view of all this I appreciate the opportunity to clarify the American Legion's position on UNESCO.

UNESCO is the abbreviated name for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. It is well to bear in mind that this Organization is an affiliated, but not a subordinate, agency of the United Nations. As such, it is not under the control of the United Nations. Nor is the United States representative to UNESCO responsible to the senior United States delegate to the United Nations. He is, I believe, under the direct control of the United States Government.

In the interest of accuracy, I would like to quote from the resolving clauses of the resolution adopted by the delegates to the American Legion's Miami national convention. They read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion urges Congress to repeal the laws creating the United States National Commission for UNESCO and its Secretariat; and that Congress deliver mandates to all administrative departments of the United States Government to desist from further dissemination of UNESCO and United States National Commission for UNESCO materials, reports, and programs within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States.

"That Congress be urged to make a complete current investigation of the operations of UNESCO to determine whether or not that agency has complied and is complying with the terms and conditions of Resolution 215 of the House of Representatives and Resolution 122 of the United States Senate, 79th Congress; said resolutions being the basis of the United States participation in UNESCO: *Provided further*, That investigation be especially made to ascertain explicitly whether there has been violation of the provisions of the final portion: *Provided, however*, That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration. And, if upon investigation, it be determined that UNESCO has violated any of the conditions as set forth in the resolutions, that Congress be urged to take appropriate action to enforce compliance therewith."

The American Legion's convention action on UNESCO climaxed the most extensive study, debate, and discussion ever given to any subject by Legionnaires.

Aside from the 2 days of discussion and debate by the members of our joint foreign relations-Americanism convention committee and by witnesses who appeared before it, UNESCO was considered by delegates to many of our department conventions this past year. As a matter of fact, 10 department conventions adopted resolutions on the subject. All of these State conventions preceded the national convention of last October. All 10 supported existing American Legion policy in opposition to certain activities of UNESCO.

This subject has also been thoroughly studied and discussed by the national executive committee of the American Legion. This committee includes a representative from every one of the United States.

The American Legion's objections to UNESCO can be placed in three major categories. Each of them is supported by voluminous evidence, all of which is taken from the public record.

First, the American Legion believes that from the days of its organization UNESCO has been a haven for many individuals whose loyalty to the United States is severely compromised, if not submerged, by a demonstrated sympathy for Communist objectives and the principles of one-world government. The activities of these people, as carried on through the instrumentality of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, have been subsidized by American taxpayers.

There is a wealth of information available regarding the Communist or Communist-front associations and activities of many of the people who have been or still are participating in the work of UNESCO. The American Legion will be happy to provide such information to anyone who wishes to write for it to our National Public Relations Division, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Our second principal objection to UNESCO is that, through its own publications, UNESCO appears to us to advocate world government. The American Legion, by convention resolution, is firmly opposed to the creation of any form of world government.

The most clear-cut examples of this type of propaganda are to be found in the series of pamphlets entitled "Toward World Understanding." While attempts have been made to disclaim the responsibility for UNESCO in the publication and distribution of these pamphlets, nevertheless they appear to have been published by UNESCO and are being sold and distributed through UNESCO outlets as of today.

To illustrate my point, I will make just one direct quotation. Volume IV of the series entitled "The United Nations and World Citizenship" states on page 6:

"Worldwide organization for the conduct of human affairs is therefore essential. No teacher with a sense of realism and even an elementary knowledge of world affairs will ignore this basic need or be indifferent to its consequences for education. World machinery is required; and human beings with the right outlook are required to utilize it or to insist that it be utilized. The educator thus has a double task—to teach about the machinery of world cooperation and to foster the growth of the spirit that will make it function. Education has, in short, the urgent duty to develop informed and competent world citizens."

The third of our major objections to UNESCO is that it is, in our opinion, endeavoring to influence the educational system of the United States through the United States National Commission for UNESCO. We submit that this is in violation of the terms and conditions that were expressed in Resolution 215, House of Representatives, and Resolution 122, United States Senate, 79th Congress.

Here again I will use one illustration. Further documentation will be provided on request.

In November 1949 a pamphlet entitled "UNESCO Today" was published as State Department Publication No. 3694 for the United States National Commission for UNESCO, which reported that:

"Largely as a result of Commission activities, at least a dozen universities and colleges now have UNESCO courses on international understanding. Scores of grade-school teachers interested in the UNESCO movement have brought it to the attention of their classes; international themes have been stressed in pageants, plays, and music; and national scholastic newspapers and magazines, as well as those published by schools, have stressed UNESCO along with the U. N. and other specialized agencies."

I have summarized here in capsule form information relating to UNESCO operations in this country which is a matter of public record.

The American Legion objects most vigorously to the continuance of an American-financed propaganda campaign which, in our belief, is contrary to the spirit and the laws of the United States of America. We believe that the intended effect of such a campaign can only be the destruction of public appreciation of American values and confusion and division among our people.

On March 7 of this year I had the honor to present a detailed explanation of the American Legion's position on the subject of UNESCO to a subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress. Following this testimony, members of the congressional committee expressed agreement with our belief that a congressional inquiry into the activities of UNESCO in the United States was justified. I felt there was good reason to hope that such an inquiry would be undertaken during the present session of Congress.

However, there has been no further indication that the inquiry which the American Legion believes necessary will take place. If you believe that the American Legion's position on this subject has merit, I would encourage you to write your Congressman and ask him to inform his colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee that you favor such an investigation.

The ultimate referee in all issues such as this is the American people. The American Legion is content to leave the final decision in the hands of all the people. We are confident that when the people are in possession of all the facts they will approve the action of the American Legion calling attention to this serious matter.

I know that the American Legion's position on UNESCO has been misrepresented by some persons and groups. Naturally we resent such misrepresentation, although we cannot prevent it. But the American Legion has never been a rubber stamp for any official or quasi-official agency of the Government. I assure you that we will continue to be independent, and to fight for the things we believe to be right. As veterans of the Nation's wars, we believe that this is a service we continue to owe to our country. We intend to continue to discharge our obligation as patriotic Americans. In our endeavors we hope for the support and encouragement of the American people.

Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item from the New Republic of July 23, 1956, puts a different light on the problems in Cyprus, regardless of whether we agree or disagree with the author:

WHAT THE BRITISH FEAR IN CYPRUS
(By G. L. Arnold)

LONDON.—It is now the British Government's stated policy that Cyprus must remain under British control indefinitely, and that a NATO base there would not be welcome if it meant the termination of such control. In the words of the Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, speaking at Barry on July 7:

"It is sometimes suggested that a NATO base on Greek soil should suffice for us. That cannot be so. Much more than NATO is involved. Not only is Turkey concerned, but our country's industrial life and that of Western Europe will depend for many years to come on oil supplies from the Middle East."

This statement is puzzling, since, after all, Turkey and Greece are both members of NATO, and NATO is supposed to exist for the purpose of protecting Western Europe, including its oil supplies.

The answer appears to be that the British Government has lost confidence in Greece as a member of the western alliance. This is such a serious matter that Whitehall is naturally reluctant to have it discussed in public. The Greeks for their part are less inhibited. After Soviet Foreign Minister Shepilov's brief stay in Athens at the end of June, the Greek Foreign Minister did not hesitate to say that it would be folly for Greece to join the Baghdad Pact (of which Turkey is a member), since this would spoil her relations with Egypt, from where Mr. Shepilov had just arrived. This naturally ruled out a Cyprus solution based on common Greco-Turkish membership in a western-sponsored pact system.

But there is more to the Anglo-Greek imbroglio than meets the eye. One of the hidden facets was suddenly illuminated by the Manchester Guardian on July 9: It now turns out that Whitehall has after all taken very seriously last year's attendance at the Bandung Conference of Archbishop Makarios, the exiled leader of the Greek Church in Cyprus. It had been vaguely known that Makarios was present at this conference of Afro-Asian States (what was he doing there?) and had met Egypt's Colonel Nasser and other Arab leaders. But only now is the public informed that, in the words of the Guardian's diplomatic correspondent, "he is believed to have given a firm assurance to the leaders of the Arab countries who attended it that, whatever the future of Cyprus might be, the people of the island would never allow it to be used as a base for military action against any of the Arab countries.

"The people of the island" in this connection is a euphemism for the Greek nationalist organization on Cyprus (and, of course, the Communists, who control about 40 percent of the electorate and most of the trade unions). Following Makarios's appearance at Bandung, a similar assurance was broadcast over the Athens radio; whether it was made in his name or in that of Greece generally was not clear, but the Arabs (and particularly Colonel Nasser) may be forgiven for not seeing the difference. In any case, the incident has weighed with British policymakers as an important factor in prejudicing them against Makarios. As London sees it, there exists an unofficial tie-up between the Greek Government, the Cyprus terrorists and Colonel Nasser. Faced with this unholy alliance, the British prefer to fall back on Turkey.

The official position is that Britain must have a base from which the Arab countries can be bombed. If British control over Cyprus ends, the reasoning goes, there will be nothing to stop Colonel Nasser from gobbling up Jordan and isolating Iraq. This may be true. If it is, the Middle Eastern position is even worse than it appears on the surface. What then is all the talk about Britain being ready to grant Cyprus self-determination within a specified period of time? Twenty-four hours before Mr. Lloyd made his speech at Barry, the British Government had formally consented to transfer its naval and airbases on Ceylon to the neutralist government of Mr. Bandaraneike, under an agreement which concedes Ceylon the right to decide whether or not these bases shall remain available to Britain. Similar rights could not be denied to a self-governing Cyprus, and it is now the accepted view here that this would be too risky. But if a British base on Cyprus is needed to protect Britain's oil supplies, it will presumably be needed as long as these supplies are essential—for the next half century, that is. This seems to rule out the idea of letting Cyprus have self-determination in the near future, in spite of assignment of Lord Radcliffe, the noted jurist, to negotiate a constitution. The official line is that the holdup is due to Turkish opposition, but that is only half the story. It does begin to look as though British distrust of Makarios now extends to Greece itself.

The Eden government will not be persuaded by arguments dwelling on the reliability of Makarios. This somewhat sinister cleric is beginning to look to the British like a spiritual cousin of the former Mufti of Jerusalem.

Farewell to Retiring Members of Congress

SPEECH
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our two very good friends, JESSE WOLCOTT and GEORGE DONDERO. JESSE is rounding out 26 years of outstanding service in the House of Representatives and GEORGE is concluding 24 years of equally fine representation of his congressional district. Between the two there is a total of 50 years as Members of this body. Michigan, or any other State, never sent to the Nation's Capital any better Representatives.

Eight years ago when I was first elected, both JESSE and GEORGE could not have been more kind and helpful to a freshman. Their counseling was invaluable. My first 2 years were on the same committee with GEORGE DONDERO, the Committee on Public Works. It was an enlightening and stimulating experience to work with him and see the universal

respect for him by his fellow members. No newcomer in the Congress could have had a better example of how to be a constructive committee member. I only hope and trust that my future efforts and conduct on whatever committee will approximate his high standards.

JESSE WOLCOTT has deservedly been the leader of our Michigan delegation and all of us have profited immeasurably by the leadership which he gave us. His great accomplishments for the State and Nation have made all Michiganders rightfully proud. We wish he would stay here with us for many more years for the country needs his wisdom, experience, and integrity, but he has decided to retire for more pleasant and less arduous pursuits.

May I say in closing that I have lost through their voluntary retirement two of my closest friends and advisers. Michigan, in their retirement, is losing two statesmen whose contributions to the public good are beyond comparison. The Congress and the Nation are being deprived of their wisdom, competence, and experience. Their departure is our loss but each of us wish them the very best in health, happiness, and success.

I Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "I Believe," by Dr. Walter U. Kennedy, president of the Indiana State Medical Association.

Dr. Kennedy has not only served as a medical practitioner for more than 50 years, but he has also made a great contribution to the medical profession and thereby to the people of our county and the State. Long a leader in his profession, he has told the people what the medical profession should do for them and the medical profession what they should do for the people. The initiation and advancement of Blue Cross and Blue Shield were in great part due to his efforts.

He has long been my trusted friend and adviser, so it is with great pleasure that I include this article, I Believe, which appeared in the Indianapolis Star:

I BELIEVE

(By Walter V. Kennedy, M. D., president, Indiana State Medical Association)

Medicine, always conservative, continues its policy of announcement, clinical evaluation, approval, and, finally, release for use. The soundness of this policy is established and its continuation is an essential. A fine example of its working was shown in the year past when well-meaning enthusiastic laymen, lacking practical knowledge, inaugurated an emotional program of use of a vaccine not yet accepted.

Confusion and resentment arose. Demands for betterment and adequate evaluation were made and on their completion the vaccine was accepted generally and is now in wide use, with the profession completely satisfied as to safety and value.

In every field of medical contributions to public health and welfare, the same deliberate processes are in reality measures of safety and denote the solicitude of the profession for the public good.

The medical vision for the future is a promising one, with never-ending efforts to improve present facilities and create new methods of attack on human illness. Surgery for a generation has been the leader, with theretofore undreamed-of entrance to every part of the body.

Now, medicine is regaining its proper place by extension of chemical and biologic knowledge to exterminate many of the most devastating diseases. So great has been this progress that a child born in 1956 has an expectancy of 70 years, while 50 years ago, it was around 40, and in Caesar's time, about 23. Life expectancy increased more in the last 10 years than in the preceding 50 and more in the last 50 than in the preceding 2,000 years.

The vista of increasing freedom from disease, the prolongation of active life, by a better knowledge of the aging processes comes closer each year.

We confidently expect that the secret of the genesis of cancer and leukemia, now formidable diseases, will be made plain in the measurable future. We shall then yet have before us, principally, the secret of life itself which may continue a mystery until the Creator decides to release it to humans.

The medical profession in its constant zeal for making available the benefits of the advantages of its progress to all men, has in every State introduced insurance programs such as our Blue Shield, to carry out its ideals to make available the best medical care to every economic class.

If it can avoid the certain deterioration of medical service always inherent in a bureaucratic government control, the medical profession, through its own efforts, may well look forward to an era of health and happiness for all mankind, finally achieving the priestly standards which gave birth to medical care 2,800 years ago.

Medical training is a long and costly process, with a relatively short earning period and, with death, complete loss of the investment. So if physicians' fees seem large, they render a service to man not to be calculated in dollars. They represent comfort from suffering, regaining and maintenance of health to an unprecedented degree. And yet the total costs of medical care are lower than total expenditures for dispensable luxuries.

As man's days grow longer, healthier and happier, his productivity and needs increase beyond imagination. To the attainment of that splendid era, medicine will have made its contribution.

Cablegram From the President of the House of Representatives of Paraguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I inculde herewith a cablegram received from the President of the House of Representatives of Paraguay:

ASUNCION, PARAGUAY, *July 6, 1956.*
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

I have the honor to address Your Excellency for the purpose of informing you that the House of Representatives of the Paraguayan Nation in its session of today paid tribute to the United States of America by commemorating yesterday's 180th anniversary of the emancipatory action [independence] of you, our sister nation bound to ours by ideals of freedom, justice, and emancipation [independence] of America. Please accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

PASTOR C. FILARTIGA,
President Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ASUNCION, *July 5, 1956.*

Abetting Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 24, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from the Congress Weekly of July 23, 1956:

ABETTING BIGOTRY

We are deeply disappointed that the recent convention of the National Education Association turned down a proposed resolution directing the organization not to sponsor tours that include countries barring the admission of Jews. The issue arose from the circumstance that NEA-sponsored tours for its members to foreign lands include some Arab countries that refuse to issue entry permits and travel visas to American citizens who are Jews. Despite its record of opposition to discrimination, despite the protests of many civic groups and a substantial number of its own members, the NEA has continued to sponsor these tours and has adopted the practice of informing its members that if they apply for tours that include countries that discriminate against Jews they will have to submit affidavits from clergymen, stating that they are not Jewish.

The official reply to critics who have chided the NEA for thus abetting the discriminatory practices by foreign countries, and for subjecting its own members to a religious test, has been that the organization itself imposes no restrictions as a condition for the tours, and that it does not approve the policy of certain Arab States toward entry of visitors of the Jewish faith. There is of course not the slightest doubt that the NEA opposes discrimination generally, but this passive opposition is not enough.

In recent years, significant progress has been made toward ending inequality through the application of the principle that it is morally wrong for groups to cooperate in the discriminatory practices of others. Thus, a number of organizations, including the NEA, have refused to hold meetings at hotels that discriminate. The parallel between rejecting hotels that discriminate and leaving out countries that discriminate from NEA tours is evident. The same principle underlies both situations.

The NEA could well profit from the example of another educational group, the World University Service, an international

student welfare organization, which promptly canceled plans to hold its annual meeting in Indonesia in protest against the refusal of that country to grant visas to two delegates from Israel to the meeting. A service official roundly scored the Indonesian action as ungenerous, and declared "we have decided to search elsewhere for a meeting place." The supine attitude of the NEA stands out in glaring contrast to this forthright and moral act.

The NEA issue is not foreclosed. We are confident that the bulk of the membership of the NEA, once it becomes fully cognizant of the principle at stake, will demand that its leadership respond in a manner consonant with the democratic values and character of the NEA which certainly do not sanction cooperation in furthering bigotry and discrimination.

Detroit Airport Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, recently the House Government Operations Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, of West Virginia, held 17 days of hearings and issued a report on the Government's handling of aviation problems.

Included in those hearings was an examination of administration of Federal airport aid funds in the Detroit metropolitan area.

At my request the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics prepared a table showing allocation of funds to various airports in the State of Michigan for a 10-year period, 1947 to 1957. For those interested in aviation matters and particularly for my colleagues from Michigan, I incorporate that tabulation at this point in my remarks, together with the cover letter from C. J. Lowen, Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, dated July 20, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that one airport in the State of Michigan received in that 10-year period $6,011,472, or 49.4 percent of the total of $12,146,227, which the whole State of Michigan received in that period. This is more remarkable when it is realized that only one scheduled air carrier has been using the Detroit-Wayne major airport, the recipient of this Federal bounty, namely, Pan American World Airways, which within the last 3 years has commenced scheduled flights, never exceeding 1 a day, into the Wayne County landing field.

Meanwhile Willow Run Airport, which has served for the past 10 years as the air passenger terminal for Detroit, has received $150,031—1.2 percent—of the Michigan total for that decade.

Mr. Speaker, the question naturally arises, under what philosophy of Federal aid has the bulk of Michigan's allocations of airport aid funds gone to an airport which has practically no scheduled airline traffic?

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, July 20, 1956.

Hon. GEORGE MEADER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEADER: In accordance with a telephone request from your office to Mr. Merle W. Hemphill, Deputy Director, Office of Airports, there is enclosed a summary by years and locations of the Federal-aid airport program in the State of Michigan for fiscal years 1947 through 1957.

If we may be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. LOWEN,
Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Federal-aid airport program, State of Michigan, fiscal years 1947–53 and 1955–57

City	1947		1948		1949		1950		1951	
	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost
Adrian	$19,500	$18,133								
Alma									[1] $9,500	$8,990
Ann Arbor	91,469	[2] 0								
Bad Axe	30,000	23,111								
Battle Creek					$40,000	$19,805				
Bay City	82,759	50,000								
Benton Harbor-St. Joseph	75,000	42,000								
Boyne City	4,775	[2] 0	$225	[2] 0						
Cadillac	22,000	32,474								
Coldwater	25,000	16,180								
Crystal Falls										
Detroit City					150,000	149,728			[1] 17,500	[2] 0
Detroit-Wayne-Major			240,000	$528,617	1,061,600	1,039,641	$1,000,000	[3] $1,407,810	500,000	488,820
Detroit-Willow Run										
Dowagiac										
East Tawas-Tawas City										
Escanaba	20,000	20,000	15,000	13,991			22,000	39,898		
Flint			55,000	57,448					100,000	215,233
Fremont					10,000	5,923				
Grand Haven	44,250	47,350								
Grand Marais	116,500	[2] 0								
Grand Rapids			100,000	110,931					102,000	85,354
Greenville										
Hart	10,375	11,041								
Holland			15,000	[2] 0						
Houghton	312,680	290,524	28,320	2,461						
Howell	19,000	[2] 0								
Indian River	6,250	[2] 0								
Iron Mountain	45,000	45,000					45,000	26,896		
Ironwood	32,500	51,438			25,000	14,850	32,500	2,351		
Jackson					4,000	2,982	77,000	47,697		
Kalamazoo	51,375	12,785								
Lakeview	10,100	[2] 0							[1] 9,400	7,321
Lansing			75,000	123,731	20,000	20,000	75,000	[3] 106,900	75,000	52,261
Ludington	14,500	14,500	7,000	4,750						
Manistee										
Marquette	43,000	50,000							8,500	[4] 5,969
Menominee			65,000	65,000					9,000	4,824
Midland	47,972	60,000	12,028	14,960			[1] 7,100	9,030		
Monroe	20,500	30,572								
Montague	7,400	[2] 0								
Mount Pleasant										
Muskegon			70,000	70,000	70,000	[3] 120,128				
Niles	27,459	59,632	[1] 72,550	39,151						
Northport					7,100	[2] 0				
Owosso			40,000	75,430						
Pellston							20,000	28,191		
Pontiac					40,000	27,861				
Port Huron	65,000	89,143			20,000	24,365				
Saginaw Bay City									7,150	11,974
St. Ignace	11,500	(2)								
Sault Ste. Marie	75,000	(2)								
Sebewaing							[1] 10,100	6,905		
South Haven					15,000	15,116				
Sturgis					10,000	18,487				
Three Rivers	10,500	10,500	7,000	6,088						
Traverse City							10,000	7,897		
Watervliet	12,881	13,893								
Total	1,354,227	988,276	802,123	1,112,558	1,472,700	1,449,886	1,298,700	1,083,375	838,050	880,746

Footnotes at end of table.

Federal-aid airport program, State of Michigan, fiscal years 1947–53 and 1955–57—Continued

City	1952		1953		1955		1956		1957 allocation	Total Federal funds obligated or allocated	Percent State total
	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost	Allocation	Final cost			
Adrain									$19,000	$37,133	0.3
Alma										8,990	.1
Ann Arbor							$55,000	(3)	9,090	[4] 64,090	.5
Bad Axe							28,000	(3)	7,250	[4] 58,361	.5
Battle Creek							100,000	(3)		[4] 119,805	1.0
Bay City										50,000	.4
Benton Harbor-St. Joseph					[1] $50,000	(1)	51,589	(3)	90,000	[4] 233,589	1.9
Boyne City										0	
Cadillac										32,474	.3
Coldwater							40,000	(3)		[4] 56,180	.5
Crystal Falls							50,000	(3)		[3] 50,000	.4
Detroit City										149,728	1.2
Detroit-Wayne-Major	$250,000	$345,306	$170,000	$154,664	80,000	$80,000	975,614	(3)	1,000,000	[4] 6,011,472	49.4
Detroit-Willow Run			74,000	70,031	100,000	80,000				150,031	1.2
Dowagiac									24,000	24,000	.2
East Tawas-Tawas City									23,000	23,000	.2
Escanaba							40,000	(3)	87,500	[4] 201,389	1.7
Flint			30,000	33,000	60,000	(3)	25,000	(3)	40,000	[4] 430,681	3.5
Fremont										5,923	.1
Grand Haven							10,000	(3)	10,000	[4] 67,350	.6
Grand Marais										0	
Grand Rapids	210,000	222,796	75,000	[3] 88,000	190,000	[3] 165,000	150,000	(3)		[4] 822,081	6.8
Greenville							21,000	(3)		[3] 21,000	.2
Hart										11,041	.1
Holland										0	
Houghton									25,000	317,985	2.6
Howell										0	
Indian River										0	
Iron Mountain			5,000	4,905			40,000	(3)	29,000	[4] 145,801	1.2
Ironwood							25,000	(3)	5,000	[4] 98,639	.8
Jackson									94,000	144,679	1.2
Kalamazoo							89,500	(3)	80,000	[4] 182,285	1.5
Lakeview										7,321	.1
Lansing	70,000	[3] 70,000	70,000	[3] 62,400	100,000	[3] 66,000	375,000	(3)	153,000	1,029,292	8.3
Ludington										19,250	.2
Manistee							10,000	(3)		10,000	.1
Marquette									45,000	100,969	.8
Menominee							7,200	(3)		[4] 77,024	.6
Midland										83,990	.7
Monroe							6,000	(3)		[4] 36,572	.3
Montague										0	
Mount Pleasant									50,000	50,000	.4
Muskegon			20,000	[3] 20,000	21,530	[3] 65,530	50,000	(3)	80,000	405,658	3.4
Niles									50,000	148,783	1.2
Northport										0	
Owosso										75,430	.6
Pellston										28,191	.2
Pontiac					[1] 5,901	[3] 5,901	138,000	(3)	31,500	[4] 203,262	1.7
Port Huron							10,000	(3)		[4] 123,508	1.0
Saginaw Bay City							55,000	(3)		[4] 66,974	.6
St. Ignace							37,000	(3)		37,000	.3
Sault Ste. Marie										0	
Sebewaing										6,905	.1
South Haven										15,116	.1
Sturgis									29,500	47,987	.4
Three Rivers									17,000	33,588	.3
Traverse City										7,897	.1
Watervliet										13,893	.1
Total	530,000	638,102	444,000	433,000	607,431	462,431	2,388,903		1,908,750	12,146,227	100.0

[1] Added during year.
[2] Canceled.
[3] Active project.
[4] Some projects still active.

A Cooperative Ministry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report of the Protestant Council of the City of New York:

A THUMBNAIL REPORT OF THE GROWING COOPERATIVE MINISTRY OF THE DENOMINATIONS, CHURCHES, AND AFFILIATED AGENCIES THROUGH THEIR PROTESTANT COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, FROM FEBRUARY 22 TO MAY 31, 1956

The following five areas are herewith summarized:

I. Our cooperative ministry to children and youth:

(a) In the released time religious education program, which is just completing its year, 22,000 boys and girls were enrolled in 360 community church schools. This year, there are 30 more schools than last year. They were held in virtually every community throughout the city, and the children who attended received instructions in the Protestant faith and were encouraged to become active in church schools on Sundays.

(b) In the children's court in Brooklyn, more than 220 children and families received the friendly, patient, and inspired guidance of our full-time religious counselor, Mrs. Muranyi, who represents all of us to those children who otherwise would stand alone.

(c) The chaplaincy program for the children at Youth House, Children's Center, Girls' Home, the State school for the deaf, the public school for the deaf, school for the blind, children chronically ill, Heart House, and employment of chaplains for the 6 Boy Scout camps for this summer will reach more than 7,000 boys and girls in the course of this spring and summer.

(d) In the 8 areas of highest juvenile delinquency, our youth-board-trained social workers brought creative and positive influence to the lives of 700 young people from the ages of 12 to 20 years.

(e) In the home term court, more than 500 children and families received religious guidance and counsel by our Lester Baker.

(f) In the vacation church school program, it is planned to have 18,500 boys and girls enrolled. These schools are also held in virtually every community throughout the city and are conducted 5 days a week from 2 to 6 weeks. Their tremendous positive influence on the lives of these thousands of children who otherwise are unable to escape from the city streets during the hot summer months simply defies measurement.

For leadership of these schools, specific and intensive training will be provided for 330 of the teachers.

Many of the schools in marginal areas will receive financial help from the council.

(g) Through our camp scholarship fund, 200 children from the poorer families in our churches will be given the privilege of attending summer camp. In addition to these, some 35 children will be referred from children's court in Brooklyn for the summer camp experience.

(h) Twenty carefully selected youth leaders will be sent to a summer camp for special training for Christian leadership.

II. Our cooperative ministry to adults:

(a) During this period, 420 television programs and 218 radio programs have carried our sponsorship. We have reached more unchurched people by this medium than all

the other media put together. The commercial value of this time for these 4 months is over a quarter of a million dollars.

(b) In the Bronx, thousands of families have been visited in one of the most complete religious censuses and visitation evangelism programs conducted in this city.

(c) Leadership training schools were conducted throughout the city bringing high quality instruction to 2,490 church school teachers for some 35 hours of classroom study and work.

(d) More than 1,400 women attended the World Day of Prayer and the May fellowship services.

(e) Nearly 6,000 persons attended the special United Nations service.

(f) Through the services of 31 full-time chaplains and more than 100 volunteer chaplains, a total of well over 100,000 patients were visited in the hospitals and 2,000 inmates in the prisons.

(g) A total of 12,000 persons attended the special services of thanksgiving and prayer commemorating the Supreme Court's decision on integration.

(h) The Easter sunrise services were attended by more than 15,000 church people.

(i) The Billy Graham organization was set up with the establishment of offices at 46th Street and Broadway.

(j) The new department of ministry to students in colleges and universities was established and the correlation of this work involving some 25 workers on campuses is now continuing the work formerly carried by the board for Protestant student work.

III. Our united expression to the city and the State: (a) We have made our united voice heard on matters of bingo and other forms of gambling, housing needs in our city, Christian citizenship, discrimination, juvenile delinquency, and others. Special meetings have been held with the mayor concerning the need of Protestant churches in new housing developments.

IV. Our united study and planning:

(a) The department of church planning and research has completed several important studies which are now being used by our denominations in developing Protestant strategy.

(b) The new Protestant Church Directory is printed, released to the public and is available for all who desire it.

(c) The evaluation committees in each of the borough divisions which have been studying the council for nearly 2 years have submitted helpful recomemndations for the improvement of the work of the council.

(d) An analysis is being made concerning the need of the Protestant Puerto Rican church in the city.

(e) An approach is being made in one of the areas in the Bronx in cooperation with the New York City Youth Board to develop a total community approach in meeting problems of delinquency in a particular area.

V. Our financial stewardship: (a) Collectively, we have contributed and raised through our regular campaign $165,467.81 from 8,333 contributors toward our goal of $560,000. This is one phase of our responsibility to which all of us must give increased energy and time during the course of the next few months.

The moral and spiritual condition of New York City is our united responsibility. We must move together if we, as Protestants, are to make our full contribution to the life of our city in the name of our Lord.

Credit for these activities belongs to no one person, no one division or department of the council. This program is the result of the work of God through individuals, through our churches and clergy, through committees, borough divisions, boards of managers, departments, church women, affiliated organizations, the board of directors, through the chaplains and through the 75 members of the staff.

REV. DAN M. POTTER,
Executive Director.

The Sixth Washington Pilgrimage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address of Executive Director Theodore A. Distler, of the Association of American Colleges, before the sixth Washington pilgrimage.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BEFORE THE SIXTH WASHINGTON PILGRIMAGE, SENATE CAUCUS ROOM, BY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR THEODORE A. DISTLER, OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, APRIL 28, 1956

Fellow pilgrims, we are now gathered in a place that is the very center of our national life.

Under our incomparable Constitution, each of the three branches of the Federal Government has a vital role to play in preserving for Americans those rights of freemen which are proclaimed by the Declaration of Independence to be the whole end of government. But neither the President of the United States, as head of the executive branch and Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, nor the judiciary, as interpreter and guardian of our Constitution, stands so close to the daily life of the ordinary citizen as the two Houses of Congress. Senators and Representatives reflect—State by State and district by district—the hopes and fears, the interests and aspirations, of their fellow Americans. In debating issues of public policy and in making the laws by which our lives are regulated, they strive to take account of our hopes and fears, to balance our interests and to satisfy our aspirations. Here in the United States Capitol is expressed and distilled the consent of the governed.

"The voice of the people is the voice of God," said a scholar and statesman of the Middle Ages. In these words, Alcuin anticipated by nearly a thousand years the basic principle of modern democracy—that every individual man, being made in the image of God and endowed with his own spark of the divine wisdom, is entitled of right to an equal share with his fellow men in determining the destiny of the society in which and through which they live.

But I do not think that Alcuin meant to suggest that the people were infallible, any more than our Founding Fathers conceived of the Republic as an infallible form of government. As a Christian, he knew that the children of God may betray the divine spark that is in them and sever themselves from their Father. He knew that God acts through us only insofar as we seek to know His will and subordinate our own wills to it. So, too, the Founding Fathers, while erecting in the Constitution every imaginable bastion of liberty, made provision through a careful system of checks and balances for the only certainty in political affairs—the certainty of human error. Again, Abraham Lincoln proclaimed that our Nation might win a new birth of freedom by the sacrifices of the War Between the States, but only under divine guidance. It has been the mark of the greatest statesmen down the ages to recognize with humility that "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."

At no time in history has this confession of human inadequacy been so urgent as in our own day. The quarrels and rivalries with which the human race has tormented itself from its first beginnings have been magnified into a demoniac menace by the growth of populations, the improvement of communications, the ever-accelerating development of physical sciences divorced from spiritual values, and the emergence of ideological conflicts on a worldwide scale. It is just a part of this awesome picture—but a part of portentous significance for Americans—that the old wistful dream of safe and dignified isolation has faded forever. There is no room for self-righteousness. No nation can shield itself any longer from contact with the rest of the world with a curtain of any material whatsoever. Whether we like it or not, our own problems have been immensely complicated by the changes that the world has undergone in our lifetime. And it must be said that our record in coping with them offers little ground for reliance on mere human wisdom.

We know from our own experience that the inescapable duty of every citizen to form his own judgment on these complex issues is a heavy burden. How much heavier is the burden we impose on the men and women we elect to represent us here and to take in our name decisions on which the life of our Nation and the peace of the whole world may depend. To an extent unmatched by any similar body in the world, they bear the weight of the world on their shoulders. They are answerable, not only in the formal sense, to the electorate, but morally to the whole of humanity. This is a responsibility that calls for more than human wisdom.

I imagine that some such thought must have been present in the mind of Senator MONRONEY when he said to Representative BROOKS HAYS: "Don't you think it would be a good thing for us to have a place at the Capitol where we might meditate and pray, where the mood of prayer could be encouraged?"

Under the inspired leadership of these two men, both Houses of Congress, by unanimous vote, resolved to establish a room for prayer and meditation. Its purpose is twofold. First, it bears renewed witness to the historic conviction of the American people that this Nation is founded on trust, not in human wisdom, but in divine providence—and this in the spirit of religious tolerance embodied in the first amendment of our Constitution. Secondly, it offers our chosen representatives the opportunity of refreshing their mind and spirit in calm and quiet and, if they so desire, of seeking that divine guidance the need for which they have solemnly acknowledged.

You and I cannot enter the Prayer Room, for it is essential to its purpose that it should be reserved for Members of the Congress. But we know it is here, in the heart of the Capitol—at the center of the center. With that knowledge, you can go back to your own communities at the end of this pilgrimage and testify of the Republic: "God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved."

Statement of Hon. Frederick G. Payne, of Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERICK G. PAYNE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, as this session draws to a close I should like to pay a few words of tribute to the two great legislative leaders of this body in the 84th Congress—my distinguished colleagues, Senators LYNDON JOHNSON and WILLIAM KNOWLAND. Much of the credit for what we have accomplished here since January 1953 should go to these two outstanding Americans.

When LYNDON JOHNSON became minority leader in 1953 he set forth a philosophy which he has maintained right down to the closing hours of this session. "There are two courses open to a minority party," Senator JOHNSON said, "it can indulge in the politics of partisanship or it can remain true to the politics of responsibility."

I believe that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle will agree that after the majority shifted, Senator JOHNSON, through his own personal skill, maintained his pledge to a policy of moderation and responsibility, and this has also been true of BILL KNOWLAND.

Senator KNOWLAND has lived up to the confidence placed in him by his party, by the administration, and by his fellow Republican colleagues here in the Senate. His able and courteous leadership on this side, at all times, has been a great moving force behind the enactment of the President's legislative program.

These two great leaders, who have walked among us, have not always seen eye to eye on major issues. But under their leadership I would venture to say that the traditions of fair play, of honest debate, and of congressional integrity have been maintained at a level unequaled in Senate history.

No two men could ever display greater patience many times under trying conditions and circumstances.

Now, as the days of the 84th Congress have diminished into hours, and these hours are rapidly diminishing into minutes, we come to realize more fully the leadership which these men have provided. While political experts and the press of the Nation set out to evaluate what the 84th Congress has done or has failed to do, we can turn these issues aside temporarily and say a word of personal thanks to LYNDON JOHNSON and BILL KNOWLAND for their leadership, for their inspiration, and for their friendship, which all of us, regardless of party or policy, have come to value so highly.

The United Nations Resolutions and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article, published by the American Zionist Council, is worthy of the attention of our colleagues:

THE UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTIONS AND THE MIDDLE EAST

The following summary of essential facts about the United Nations resolutions on the Middle East is intended to provide a background on major points of issue between the Arab States and Israel:

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

After World War I, the non-Turkish territories of the Ottoman Empire were placed under League of Nations mandates exercised by Britain or France, or became independent sovereign states. Saudi Arabia, Yemen, and Egypt (the last named had been a British protectorate since 1882) were among the latter category. The mandate over Iraq was conferred on Britain; those over Syria and Lebanon went to France. Iraq became an independent state in 1931; Syria and Lebanon achieved sovereignty 10 years later with the decline of French influence in the Levant. The former Italian colony of Libya which had been wrested from Turkey by Italy in 1912, after a period of military government by Britain, became independent in 1951. The Sudan, previously an appendage of Turkish power in Africa but a condominium of Britain and Egypt since 1882, declared its independence in January 1956.

In March 1945 Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Syria, and Lebanon formed an alliance known as the Arab League which was subsequently joined by Jordan, Libya, and the Sudan. The total area of the 9 countries of the League is 2,999,150 square miles, with an estimated population of 56,132,000.

The mandate over the territory known as Palestine was assigned by the League of Nations to Britain. Article 2 of the mandate stated:

"The mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative, and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and development of self-governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion."

This was in accord with the terms of the Balfour Declaration made by the British Government in 1917. In 1922 all of the area east of the Jordan River (about 35,000 square miles) was declared the Emirate of Trans-Jordan which later became the Arab Kingdom of Jordan.

THE PARTITION RESOLUTION

The remaining area of Palestine west of the Jordan, amounting to 10,000 square miles, was the subject of conflict between Arabs and Jews. Britain, the mandatory power, failed to discharge its obligations stemming from the Balfour Declaration and the mandate. With the worsening of the situation, the U. N. in April 1947 dispatched a special commission to seek a solution for the area. The commission recommended partition of Palestine into independent Arab and Jewish states, united by a common customs and economic union. On November 29, 1947, by the two-thirds majority requisite under the United Nations Charter, the General Assembly of the United Nations voted to divide Palestine into two such states.[1] The Jews of Palestine immediately announced their acceptance of the U. N. decision. The surrounding Arab States rejected it out of hand. One of their leading spokesmen, Dr. Mohammed Fawzi, now Egyptian Foreign Minister, succinctly stated the Arab position: "We do not choose to comply with the General Assembly's resolution on Palestine." Immediately upon the resolution's adoption, the Arabs began active preparations for war.

Bands of Syrian and Iraqui regular troops and guerrillas proceeded to occupy areas of Palestine without interference by British military forces, while the British-commanded and officered Arab Legion began an undeclared war against the Jewish population. On May 14, 1948, on the eve of the date set for expiration of the British mandatory regime, the Jews declared the independence of their state in accordance with the will of the United Nations. The Arab Legion seized the Old City of Jerusalem and bombarded the New City, occupied by Jews, with heavy loss of life. Egyptian armies with token Saudi Arabian contingents invaded Palestine from the south, while Syrian, Iraqui, and Lebanese armies violated the north and northeast frontiers of the country.

Probably the clearest idea of what the Arab States intended was provided by the Secretary-General of the Arab League, Azzam Pasha, who stated at a press conference in Cairo on the day of invasion: "This will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre that will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacres and the Crusades."

The unleashing of that war brought about the death of thousands of Arabs and Jews, the destruction of millions of dollars' worth of property, and a tragic aftermath of hundreds of thousands of displaced persons. The grave verdict for the responsibility of that war was recorded by the U. N. mediator, Dr. Ralph Bunche, in December 1948:

"The Arab States had forcefully opposed the existence of a Jewish state in Palestine in direct opposition to the wishes of two-thirds of the members of the Assembly. Nevertheless their armed intervention had proved useless. The (mediator's) report was solely on the fact that the Arab States had no right to resort to force and that the United Nations should exert its authority to prevent such a use of force."

THE ARMISTICE AGREEMENTS

On February 24, 1949, Egypt and Israel signed a formal armistice agreement, under U. N. auspices, on the Island of Rhodes. Under the terms of the agreement, each side promised that "no aggressive action * * * shall be undertaken, planned, or threatened against the people of the other"; that "the right of each party to its security and freedom from fear of attacks by the armed forces of the other shall be fully respected"; that "no forces of either party, including non-regular forces, shall commit hostile acts against the civilians of the other"; that no unauthorized crossings of the borders would be permitted; and that the armistice was to be regarded as an instrument "to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine."

Similar agreements under U. N. auspices were concluded with Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria during the next 5 months. Among other provisions, the agreement with Jordan called for the speedy establishment of a special committee to facilitate opening of vital roads to traffic, the resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus, free access to the holy places, and the use of the Jewish cemetery on the Mount of Olives. In fact, none of these provisions has been implemented, and the cemetery on the Mount of Olives has been desecrated.

In the agreements Israel and the Arab States bound themselves to accept each other's request for meetings to consider any proposed modifications or revisions of the armistice terms. The agreements made it clear that any alteration of boundaries, demarcation lines, and so forth, could be effected only with the mutual consent of both sides.

On August 11, 1949, the Security Council declared its satisfaction at the conclusion of the armistice and expressed the hope that Israel and the Arab States would at an early date achieve agreement on the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them, leading to permanent peace.

How the Middle East armistice agreements have been lived up to is a matter of record. Instead of proceeding to the peaceful settlement of differences envisioned by the United Nations, the Arab States have engaged in a military, political and economic campaign against the State of Israel unparalleled in history.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT

Israel is today in a state of complete boycott by each of her Arab neighbors. It is the only country in the world in such a position.

[1] No Arab State was allowed to come into being. Most of the land set aside for such a state was later seized and annexed by Jordan and Egypt.

Not an ounce of freight moves across any of its frontiers. There is no telephone or rail communication between her and her neighbors. Even information such as storm warnings or the direction of locust flights is withheld from her. Many foreign firms dealing with Israel are blacklisted by Arab States.

Sealed off from the hinterland by this boycott, Israel has suffered hundreds of millions of dollars loss by the shutting off of markets for her goods and the necessity of making purchases of needed commodities in distant lands at high prices.

The Arab boycott also prohibits any firm, including American firms which have offices in Israel, from doing business with the Arab States. In addition, a number of the Arab States have prohibited all Jewish companies in any part of the world from exporting goods to their countries, and have refused to issue visas to any Jewish national of any country, including the United States of America.

THE ARAB BLOCKADE

Shut off from trade with her neighbors, Israel regards the sea lanes as her lifelines. Yet here, too, her existence is threatened by her Arab neighbors who have placed her under a state of blockade. No ship may touch at an Arab port which is bound to or comes from an Israel port. The vital Suez Canal is shut to her by Egypt in defiance of international law. Though Egypt has repeatedly assured the world that she would respect the rights of all nations to free passage in the canal, Israel ships cannot pass through the waterway and foreign ships suspected of carrying freight to Israel are stopped. Eighty tankers which defied the ban and delivered oil to Israel are blacklisted and cannot use the international waterway, an act which has deterred all countries from active resistance to the Egyptian blockade.

In this connection, on June 13, 1951, the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervisory Organization in Palestine reported:

"It was certainly never contemplated at Rhodes that what is, in effect, an act of blockade would be continued by one of the parties to the General Armistice Agreement more than 2 years after it had been signed."

On September 1, 1951, the U. N. Security Council condemned the Egyptian blockade and directed that it be lifted. It is still in effect today.

A similar blockade has been instituted by Egypt at the entrance of the Gulf of Aqaba which connects Israel with the Red Sea and the sea routes to Africa and Asia. In direct violation of international law, this blockade, too, continues.

ARAB BORDER VIOLATIONS

The armistice agreements specifically forbade the unauthorized crossing of borders, but the frequency of the violations which have taken place since the war indicates that the Arab States do not respect the pledges they made.

From July 1949 to October 1955, Israel's losses as a result of frontier violations were as follows:

Killed and wounded	1,039
Armed attacks	2,231
Cases of serious sabotage	272
Cases of armed robbery	237
Cases of theft	5,467

Although Israel has repeatedly offered to conclude nonaggression pacts with her neighbors and to negotiate all points at issue, these overtures have just as repeatedly been rejected. Border warfare, like the boycott and blockade, could be brought to an immediate end if the Arabs respected the armistice agreements.

JERUSALEM

The original U. N. resolution, adopted at the second session of the General Assembly on November 29, 1947, provided for an international regime for Jerusalem. Under the terms of the resolution the U. N. was to "insure that order and peace, and especially religious peace, reign in Jerusalem." The resolution also provided for "a special police force of adequate strength * * * to assist in the maintenance of internal law and order."

This was accepted by the Jews, but rejected by the Arabs who denounced the principle of internationalization. Leading the opposition to the plan were the Syrian, Iraq, and Egyptian delegates.

With the outbreak of war Jordan (then Trans-Jordan) seized the old city of Jerusalem and bombarded the new city. The envisioned U. N. special police force did not materialize and Jewish loss of life was considerable. Over 1,500 casualties were sustained.

The armistice found a divided Jerusalem—a completely Jewish Jerusalem in the new city and a completely Arab Jerusalem in the old city. It was obvious that the clock could not be moved back and the internationalization plan revived. It was opposed by both Jordan and Israel.

The question of internationalization was referred back to a subcommittee of the General Assembly where opinion was divided on the feasibility of the original plan. Finally, at the seventh session in 1953, the question of internationalization was raised again. A resolution calling for "a reiteration of the principle of the internationalization of Jerusalem" failed to get the required two-thirds majority and was, therefore, rejected. Among those voting against the reiteration of internationalization of the city was the United States.

Israel's position is that it is prepared to provide safeguards for free access to the holy places, including the right of inspection by the U. N. Jordan has rejected the whole plan.

THE ARAB REFUGEES

One of the aftermaths of the war was the emergence of the Arab refugee problem.

It is noteworthy in this respect to record the views of Mr. Emile Ghoury, secretary of the Arab Higher Committee and former commander of the Arab forces in the Jerusalem area, who stated at a press conference in Beirut in August 1948: "The fact that there are these refugees is the direct consequence of the action of the Arab States in opposing partition and the Jewish State. The Arab States agreed upon this policy unanimously and they must share in the solution of the problem."

A word should be said of the United Nations' record on this matter. On December 11, 1948, the General Assembly expressed the hope that the 600,000 Arabs who left Israel during the war—despite the assurance that they would be unharmed and granted equal rights—would be repatriated if conditions allowed. The resolution specifically intended that this would take place in a situation where Israel and the Arab States were at peace with each other.

With the passage of time, and as the prospects of peace grew more remote, the U. N. General Assembly subsequently pressed for the reintegration of the refugees into the economic life of the Near East, and set up a fund of $200 million for this purpose. This plea has been reiterated each year since 1950, but thus far the Arab States have refused to heed the recommendations and the refugees are regarded as unwanted pariahs. Though Israel, with a land area one-three hundred seventy-fifth the size of the Arab States, has taken in over 800,000 Jewish refugees, the Arab States will not integrate the Arab refugees into their own vast territories.

The Timeless Philosophy of a Great Commoner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker pro tempore, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered at the Hotel Jefferson, Richmond, Va., on February 27, 1955, by the Honorable Robert Crosser, who—excepting the period from March 4, 1919, to March 4, 1923—was a Member of Congress continuously from March 4, 1913, to January 3, 1955:

Madam Toastmistress and members of the Kappa Alpha Theta Sorority, when the very estimable member of your organization invited me to address this convention, she suggested that I stress the importance of achievement by members of your sorority. I called attention, however, to the fact that achievement is often not unmixed good.

It occurred to me that to a group like this, the most important service I might render would be first to call attention to the fact that many of the conventional notions in regard to the right purpose in life are fallacious. It seemed, therefore, that the best service which I might be able to render is to state what, from the standpoint of the absolute, is the true purpose or goal of mankind.

Let me say, then, without quibbling, that man's aim, purpose, or goal should be the realization of absolute harmony. I appreciate the fact, of course, that from the human standpoint, relative harmony only may be reasonably expected.

I am sure, however, that we can all agree that earnest devotion to and continuous support of one's best understanding of right, or truth, is the individual's most sublime expression of life.

Right means to be in accord with the Supreme Power of the universe. The terms "right," "truth," and "reality" all have the same meaning. Such constant support of the right by the individual, therefore, indicates also his recognition of the existence of infinite good and its action which he desires to manifest by his conduct.

When the individual becomes regularly conscious of his identity, he then experiences a continual eagerness to know the right, the truth, in order to be able to determine what is his proper course of conduct. In addition to his eagerness to know the right, the individual becomes vividly aware of the fact that the urge to do right, the truth, felt by him, is the activity of the cause, the power, which gave him existence, and is the only real cause or creator.

If the individual's thinking and activity manifest at-one-ment with, accordance with, the Supreme Power, then that thinking and action are right. Right or truth being the essence and law of action of the Supreme Power, the infinite mind is, therefore, all that is real. The real is that which is right or true. The philosopher Herbert Spencer said also: "That which is real is permanent; that which is not permanent is not real."

Now, my friends, to both you who have been, as well as you who are now, college students, it must be evident that the true purpose in striving for an education should be the improvement of our understanding

of the right; to increase our knowledge of the law of life, of the way of action of infinite mind, and that means the truth which will make mankind really free. In brief, the purpose in seeking an education should be to acquire the knowledge of the law of life, and thus become conscious of our "at-one-ment" with infinite mind and so be better able to fulfill the Creator's purpose of our existence. William Thompson Seaton well said: "Manhood, not scholarship is the first aim of education."

The words "mind" and "spirit" are synonyms of each other. The terms "Infinite mind" and "Infinite spirit" are appropriate names for the universally present, all-knowing, omnipotent and only Power that exists. Others may designate the Power by such names as Creator or God, but there should be no quibbling about names or titles. That which is all-important is knowledge of the Power and its action.

Whether we are considering the conduct of the individual in what is usually regarded as private affairs, or, on the other hand, we are discussing his conduct as a member of the collectivity known as society, in the exercise of his rights, or in the discharge of duties, the true law of life is the law of action of the infinite mind.

Now, my friends, you will have concluded no doubt from what I have already said that I regard what is called matter as a nonreality, and in that conclusion you are entirely correct, although I prefer to say: "Matter is a misinterpretation of reality."

Today, no truly outstanding physicist contends that so-called matter and material objects have existence as independent entities. The nonreality of matter has been demonstrated from different viewpoints. John Fiske, late professor of philosophy at Harvard University, said: "Take away the cognizing mind and (then) the color, form, position, and hardness of the table before you * * * all the attributes, in short, that characterize it as matter, at once disappear. Apart from consciousness, there are no such things as color, form, position, or hardness, and there is no such thing as matter."

In 1934, when he became president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Sir James Jeans was reported as saying in his inaugural address, that the physical world has no objective reality apart from the mental concepts of it which man contrives with his mind. When asked to comment on the statement of Sir James Jeans, Sir Arthur Eddington, famous physicist, astronomer, and professor at Cambridge University, England, promptly said that he agreed entirely with the statement of Sir James Jeans.

The two men whom I have just quoted were regarded in their time as certainly the outstanding authorities in the subjects of physics and astronomy.

Professor Oswald, of Leipzig University, said many years ago: "Matter is only a thing imagined." Prof. Max Muller has said: "To speak of matter as something existing by itself and presented to the senses, is mere mythology. And yet," he said, "we are asked by materialists to believe that the perceiving subject, or mind, is really the result of long-continued development of the object, or of matter. This is a logical somersault."

Many years ago, Prof. Osborne Reynolds, F. R. S., LL. D., M. Inst. C. L., a great mathematician and professor of engineering at Owen College, Manchester, England, published a carefully prepared mathematical treatise in which he proved mathematically the nonreality of matter.

If there are any who are inclined to scoff at those whose statements have just been quoted, let them note what has been said by two other very eminent men of science. Dr. Le Bon of the Royal Institute of Belgium in his notable work entitled "The Evolution of Forces" referring to what he called the fixed belief in the reality of matter, said: "Scientific ideas which rule the minds of scholars at various epochs have all the solidity of religious dogmas. Too often do we forget that the scientific idols of the present day have no more right to invulnerability than those of the past."

Dr. J. W. Heysinger, M. D., author of Spirit and Matter Before the Bar of Modern Science, referring to so-called material science, writes as follows: "The dogmatism of theology finds a full counterpart and coworker in her newer sister, dogmatic science."

When I was a student in college, the world's physicists in general declared the atom to be the smallest particle of matter, although it had not been a great many years prior to that time when the molecule had been declared to be the smallest particle of matter. Emphasis was placed also on propositions as to the indestructibility of matter and the continuity of energy. In less than 10 years after my graduation from college, however, every scientific publication in the world announced in big headlines that the electron had been proved to be the smallest particle of matter. It was soon thereafter demonstrated also that the electron consists of lines of force at right angles to each other. It was then proved that the ether, which had long been designated as the elemental form of matter, really consists of the total of the electrons in the universe.

What, in all fairness, it may be asked, what had become of the so-called matter stuff? The answer is that it never really did exist. Matter is a misinterpretation of reality.

The age-long general belief in materialism was, of course, accompanied by a practically universal belief in the existence of innumerable, seperate, and distinct beings, even insulated from each other. This very common belief led people in general to believe mistakenly in the inevitability, indeed, in the unavoidability of conflict because of a being's eagerness for personal advantage over others.

To believe in the existence of innumerable, distinct, separate entities is, of course, to believe in materialism. The usual definition of matter given by materialists themselves is: "Matter is that which is outlined." Since, as has been shown, there is no matter, it must follow logically that there is no outline, and of course, if there is no outline, then there can be no division, and if there is no division then it is clear that all that exists is a unit—one—and that one, as has been said, "is all in all."

It is logically certain also that the one power is mental. It must be mental, must be infinite mind, in order to know how to control the universe, created by itself, the one power. The only thinking that is possible is the thinking or consciousness of that which is true or real. All of reality is, however, inherent in the one mind. All thinking or consciousness, therefore, must be the consciousness or thinking about that which is real, or in other words, must be in the truth existing in the Supreme Power, that is, the Infinite Mind.

The consciousness or awareness of Infinite Mind, of God, is necessarily the contemplation of himself, that is, His self-contemplation, His expression, His exact likeness, which is man.

As already stated, mind creates and controls by consciousness or thinking. The one mind must be eternally conscious of all reality and truth, must be constantly conscious of all true ideas and their action. If this were not so there would cease to be harmony. Absolute harmony is the perfect adjustment of all reality, all truth, of all real ideas. If harmony should cease to be, the result would be instantaneous and universal destruction.

Now, my friends, I am sure you will agree that our somewhat extensive discussion of what is basically true and what is false is not without justification. I am sure indeed, that a moment's consideration will convince earnest students that in the discussion of serious problems, the conclusions reached and advocated as the desirable course of action for the promotion of the welfare of mankind should be, and in fact such conclusions must be derived from fundamental principles, the soundness of which will have been established beyond doubt.

We have shown that infinite mind or spirit and its consciousness are one and all in all. The whole of reality, that is, all that is true or right, being inherent in infinite spirit, mind, has eternal existence. Creation is, therefore, complete, perfect and eternal.

It is evident, then, that no person really creates anything. He discovers creation. Man does not make truth but becomes conscious of, that is to say, becomes aware of truth. The discovery of the truth, that is, becoming conscious of the real, the right must be the constant, unchanging goal of man, the true aim of education.

The great importance of knowing the truth is recognized almost universally, and yet comparatively little rational, systematic effort has been devoted to the task of explaining and demonstrating the proper approach to the solution of the problem: "How to succeed in knowing the truth."

If, therefore, at the conclusion of my remarks to this group, I shall have done something worthwhile to indicate the logical approach to the solution of the problem: "How to succeed in knowing the truth," I shall be more than pleased.

I am sure that some of you have observed that even when they are engaged in mental fields of activity requiring deliberation and reflection many persons become almost frantic in their eagerness to evidence the fact that they are strenuous in their efforts. This is another illustration of the fallacy of the belief that the intense constant exertion of and reliance upon the human will can assure real progress. In fact, at the beginning of the present century it became almost a fad to be strenuous from hardly any motive except the desire to be known as being constantly strenuous for strenuosity's sake. In other words, it was a fair illustration of the old saying, "Much ado about nothing."

It is clear that the consciousness or knowing of the truth, that is, of reality, is not the result of personal finite contriving, planning, designing, or the result of any other kind of mechanical effort. On the contrary, truth is the right, eternal action or expression of the One and Only Power, which may be properly designated also as either infinite mind or infinite spirit, because the words "mind" and "spirit" are synonymous. The Master Christian said ,"God is Spirit."

Many persons, notwithstanding earnest, even intense, efforts to know the truth fail in their sincere purpose because of their wrong approach to the problem. They assume wrongly that it is necessary for them to contrive, construct, yes, even to originate, truth. The Supreme Power, infinite mind and its action, constitute all of reality, and hence all that is right. The cooperation and mutual attraction of all the ideas in infinite mind are controlled by the constant and eternal action of the Supreme Power.

No person can ignore or disregard with impunity that which is absolute right or truth and its eternal law of action. Whether he be a person confronted with a task in the workaday world or a student concerned with his studies, if he depends upon materialistic notions which he has outlined as objectives, and upon his so-called personal will to accomplish such objectives, he will find himself ultimately to be distressed because of failure to make true progress.

If, in accordance with what he may have decided to be advantageous from a material standpoint, a person endeavors to control the course of his life, there could be only one certain result. That result would be his

failure to increase his awareness of the eternal verities of being, his failure to recognize progress toward the realization of his complete identification with all that is true, right, and good.

If, however, men will listen to and obey "the still, small voice," will "be obedient to promptings of their own soul," as urged by William Ellery Channing, or, as others have said, "be true to their best inspirations," if they will give heed to these wise plans, then they will know the truth which will make them free.

When, however, in his quest for the truth, the individual will have acquired the constant attitude of being the receiver and not the creator of the good he enjoys, he will then no longer be hampered and harassed by the belief that he must struggle to contrive, design, and construct that which is required for his pleasurable existence.

The discovery of the truth, that is to say, the becoming conscious of the real, the right, must be the constant unchanging goal of man, the true aim of education.

No greater pronouncement was ever uttered than that which is expressed in the words, "Ye shall know the truth ,and the truth shall make you free."

Let me repeat that the right, the truth, is not, however, the result of human contrivance. The fact is that the trials and tribulations of mankind are due to the erroneous notion that members of the human family can devise their conduct, can calculate their actions, in such fashion as to present the appearance of right, notwithstanding the fact that their planning is for personal advantage. Regardless, however, of the plausibility of such action, those who regularly pursue such a course of conduct will be doomed to disappointment. They will finally realize that disregard of the promptings of their better consciousness cannot assure them harmony.

The experience of those who pursue such a course is well illustrated by a few lines of verse which came to my attention some years ago, from which I quote as follows:

"When you get what you want in your struggle for self
And the world makes you king for a day,
Just go to a mirror and look at yourself
And hear what that man has to say.

"For it is not your father or mother or wife
Whose judgment upon you must pass:
The fellow whose verdict counts most in your life,
In the man staring out of the glass.

"You may be like Jack Horner and chisel a plum
And think you're a wonderful guy;
But the man in the glass says you're only a bum
If you can't look him straight in the eye.

"He's the one to please; never mind all the rest
For he's with you clear down to the end;
And you've passed your most dangerous, difficult test
If the man in the glass is your friend.

"You may fool all the world down the pathway of years
And get pats on the back as you pass;
But your final reward will be heartaches and tears
If you've cheated the man in the glass."

Individual or collective conduct may be discussed at length from the standpoint of ethics, political science, political economy, religion, metaphysics, or according to other formal treatises concerning mankind's conduct, but always and inevitably, the real desire of the individual is to know and to do what is right.

My friends, in order to manifest the harmony with which man has been endowed, we must realize, must live the truth otherwise called the right or reality. One of America's early and able writers concerning fudamental principles urged the importance of obedience to the promptings of one's own soul. That was equivalent to saying be obedient to the direction or guidance of the Supreme Power, the One Infinite Mind. The promptings of the soul is the activity of the Infinite Mind as wisdom. The activity of the One Infallible Mind constitutes the true law of life. The relationship of the true ideas is controlled by the laws, or we may say, the ways of action of Infinite Mind.

Whatever aspect of the perfect government we may consider, the fact is that the consciousness or way of action of the One Unerring Mind is eternal. The action and control by Infinite Mind in creation is absolutely right, unchanging, and needs no statute books to prove its existence and authority.

The law or ways of action of Infinite Mind must be recognized by the individual as the true law of his life, if he is to live aright. It is therefore absolutely necessary also, if the conduct of human government is to be just, that it must constantly improve its interpretation of the perfect government, it must reflect the right as it prevails in the One Perfect Government.

In the light of what has been said, it must be clear that everyone has an unavoidable responsibility which requires him not only to live the right, the truth, but also that he must earnestly and constantly endeavor to disseminate the truth, and by so doing to hasten the universal realization of the reign of justice.

I realize the fact, of course, that some people seem puzzled and even disappointed when told that all truth, all reality has existed eternally. The vanity of some is offended by even the inference that the individual can create nothing. The disappointment of such persons is due in part to the misunderstanding of the word "individual" which has often been defined inaccurately. Instead of meaning a being which is apart and distinct from all else, the word is derived from the Latin prefix "in" meaning "not," and the Latin verb "dividuus" meaning divided. The word etymologically therefore means "not divided from." The individual is not divided from the one all-inclusive life. He individualizes the one life, becomes conscious of, or discovers creation, but does not make it.

Consider, then, the possible glorious experience of those whose attitude is in accord with the truth, with the real creation, as they realize the joy and bliss which unfold to them as a result of their constant and unending discoveries of truth.

This discovery, the awakening to the understanding and realization of truth is, or should be, the true aim of education as distinguished from schooling or training. The word "education" is derived from the Latin prefix "e" meaning "out of," and joined with the Latin verb "ducere" meaning "to draw" or lead. The word "education," therefore, means to draw out. Obviously, whatever may be drawn out must have been within. Education is, therefore, a spiritual process, as distinguished from training or schooling, which is largely mechanical in nature. People were formerly schooled to believe that the earth was flat, and as a matter of fact, during the Middle Ages in Europe, many people were executed, burned to death, because they disputed the statement that the earth was flat.

I have already mentioned the fact that many materialists scoff at the expression, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," and when the statement is voiced approvingly, they almost instantly bark the question, "What is truth?" When Pontius Pilate asked the question, "What is truth?" the Master Metaphysician answered, "He that doeth the will of the Father shall know of the doctrine" (the truth). He spoke of the Supreme Power as Father.

Let me quote also what a very distinguished scientist has to say about the truth, that is, the right. Dr. Warren Weaver is chairman of the board of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation. For 20 years he has been responsible for a worldwide program in the natural sciences. Dr. Weaver said: "When I am trying to work out a problem of right and wrong, then God is a clear unambiguous voice, an unfailing source of moral guidance. I do not understand how these things happen; but I do know perfectly well, if I listen to this voice, what is the right thing to do. I have many times been uncertain as to what course of action would best serve a certain practical purpose; but I cannot think of a single instance in my life when I asked what was the really right thing to do and the answer was not forthcoming."

Alexis de Tocqueville, a distinguished French writer on the subject of political science and author of a notable treatise on the subject Democracy in America, came to America 120 years ago to travel and study. He was a great champion of democracy and once said: "The cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy."

During 1835, while speaking of America de Tocqueville said: "I sought for the greatness and genius of America in her commodious harbors and her ample rivers, and it was not there; in her rich mines and her vast commerce, and it was not there. Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the secret of her genius and power. America is great because she is good, and if America ceases to be good, America will cease to be great."

Webster defines righteousness as the state or quality of being rightful or just. De Tocqueville uses the words "right" and "good" interchangeably. There is no doubt that the French writer understood the word "right" exactly as I have emphasized it during these remarks. He undoubtedly meant: "America is great because she is righteous, and if America ceases to be righteous, America will cease to be great."

Earlier in my remarks I called attention to the fact that William Ellery Channing had said, "Be obedient to the promptings of your own soul." The Master Christian said, "Be obedient to the still, small voice." Others have said, "Be obedient to your best inspirations." The all-important implication in all of these statements is, however, the recognition of Infinite Mind's guidance, its proper direction of the individual. Some persons nevertheless argue that the still, small voice is not reliable. In answer to such statements we might emphasize the fact that the voice is always clear and readily understood, and that the difficulty, if any, consists of the person's failure to listen intently and earnestly; his failure to exercise regularly what we might facetiously designate as his listener.

Do not doubt for a moment that the earnest effort to know the truth assures the individual of true pleasure. Certainly, a receptive and expectant attitude will assure him of incalculable joy and bliss, which will cause him to become a veritable crusader for that which is right.

Enthusiasm for the right will fire the individual with an earnest desire to give proper account for the talents with which he has been entrusted, and make him eager to arouse the consciousness of truth in others.

Horatio Bonar expresses the idea well in the lines which I quote as follows:

"Thy soul must overflow, if thou
Another's soul wouldst reach;
It needs the overflow of heart
To give the lips full speech.
Think truly, and thy thoughts
Shall the world's famine feed;
Speak truly, and each word of thine
Shall be a fruitful seed;
Live truly, and thy life shall be
A great and noble creed."

Because of its transcendent importance, I feel that I may be excused for again emphasizing the fact that truth, reality or right is already complete, perfect, and has eternal existence. The real, the right is not the result or effect of any finite being's contriving or designing. Nevertheless, everyone is anxious to become aware of, that is, to know the truth, otherwise called the right.

For the assurance and acceleration of the awareness or knowledge of the truth, the most important requirement is the clear recognition of the existence of the one supreme and all-inclusive power which is spirit or mind and also properly designated as principle. The consciousness of that mind is not only right, but is also eternal.

All aspects of truth are expressions of the one mind. The consciousness of that mind constitutes the eternal, the unchangeable laws or ways of the perfect government which human governments profess to imitate.

When he is certain of the existence of the all-knowing mind and its consciousness, then the individual sincerely manifests not only the receptive attitude toward the truth but also becomes confidently expectant as to the realization of what is truly good, helpful, and gratifying.

Certainly it must now be clear that the practice of devising courses of action in order to secure self-advantage is wholly unscientific and results in disappointment and distress. In view of the fact that the cause of all creation and the law or way of its action are eternal, it follows logically that the duty of mankind is constant compliance with the direction of infinite mind. The way of action of that mind is what constitutes right, the truth or the real, and disregard of that truth, reality or right by the person makes his punishment more certain than if he were to disregard the effect of gravitation with harm to himself.

The perfect government consists of the all-knowing, omnipotent mind and its action.

As college women you are eager, I know, to be as helpful as possible in the promotion of true mental development of humanity, in the clarification of the understanding. It is, therefore, of first importance to realize clearly the unity of creation, the allness of the one mind or spirit. When we realize clearly the oneness of infinite mind or spirit and its action, we then understand the necessity of determining our conduct according to what is right as determined by the eternal thoughts or ideas and their cooperative action in infinite mind. In other words, we shall then be knowing the truth.

We shall then cease to puzzle about the relative good or bad of so-called altruism on the one hand, of so-called egoism on the other. We shall clearly understand then that there are, strictly speaking, no others, as assumed by altruism, and actually no selves. All is inherent in the infinite and indivisible one mind. The Greek philosopher Pythagoras said: "Friend is another I." How wrong then, and how ridiculous even to consider injuring one's other "I," a so-called "self."

Serving the unity of creation is the only concern of the really enlightened person. The ideal of universal brotherhood awakens in mankind not only the desire for the manifestation of that glorious order but also the eagerness of experience the reign of justice prevailing therein. More important still, it awakens in him the willingness and the eagerness to obey the mandates and guidance of the supreme power of that realm of harmony.

As time goes on we shall be more and more impressed by the great truth as to the unity of creation, and by the ideal stated by the poet Burns when he said: "Man to man the world o'er shall brothers be for a' that." As men acquire increased understanding of the truth, their conduct becomes more and more like that exemplified by the Bridge Builder, described in the lines which in conclusion I quote as follows:

"An old man, going a lone highway,
Came, at the evening, cold and gray,
To a chasm vast, and deep, and wide,
Through which there flowed a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim;
The sullen stream held no fears for him;
But he turned, when safe on the other side,
And built a bridge to span the tide.
'Old man,' said a fellow pilgrim near,
'You are wasting your strength with building here:
Your journey will end with the ending day;
You never again must pass this way;
You have crossed the chasm, deep and wide—
Why build you the bridge at the eventide?'
The builder lifted his old gray head;
'Good friend, in the path I have come,' he said,
'There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way;
This chasm that has been as naught to me,
To that fair-haired youth may a pitfall be.
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim;
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him.'"

The Health Issue, 1824 and 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following very interesting item appeared in the July 23, 1956, issue of the New Republic:

THE SUPERFICIAL ASPECT: HEALTH ISSUE, 1824

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

One must go back more than a century and a quarter to find a historical parallel to the situation created by President Eisenhower's decision to run again regardless of his physical handicaps. In 1824 William H. Crawford, of Georgia, now forgotten, but a mighty politico in his time, was leading the field at least as far as Adlai Stevenson is leading it today, and the wiseacres were predicting that Crawford was a shoo-in for the Democratic nomination, which then was called the Republican nomination and, in view of the dissolution of the Federalist Party, was equivalent to election.

But when the campaign had been under way long enough for everybody to have become committed, Crawford had a stroke. It was not too heavy, and he made a good recovery—as a matter of fact, he lived 10 years longer—but it was a stroke, and all the world knew it.

Unfortunately, the Crawford men of 1824, like the Eisenhower men of 1956, simply had nowhere else to go. Furthermore, Crawford's doctors, like Eisenhower's doctors, felt it their duty to do nothing that would depress the patient's spirits, so they encouraged him to take a very optimistic view of his illness. They succeeded so well that they convinced the man that partial paralysis really was no insurmountable handicap to a President.

There were three other candidates: John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, and Henry Clay; but Crawford's prestige, like Eisenhower's, was very great. It was so great that his backers convinced themselves that he could win, stroke or no stroke; they knew that there were people in the country who would continue to vote for Crawford as long as he was able to wiggle a little finger, and they hoped that there were enough to elect him. Besides, they had no alternative candidate, so they threw up their hats and shouted themselves hoarse when Crawford determined to stay in the race—even as Republican politicians have shouted over Eisenhower's decision.

But it didn't work out that way. There were too many hardheaded voters who simply couldn't see the sense in putting a bad insurance risk in the White House. Yet there were some who believed that Crawford, as a half-time President, would be better than anybody else full time, and they voted for him. There were enough to bring him in third. He got 41 electoral votes, against 37 for Clay, 84 for Adams, and 99 for Jackson. He got 44,000 popular votes against 46,000 for Clay, 105,000 for Adams, and 155,000 for Jackson.

This had two important effects. It threw the election into the House of Representatives, and it knocked Clay out of the race, for the Constitution provides that the House must choose from the three candidates having the highest electoral vote.

Most historians believe that if Crawford had withdrawn, none of his electoral votes would have gone to Adams. They would have been divided between Jackson and Clay. If 32 of the 41 had gone to Jackson, they would have given him a clear majority; but with only half of them he would have been so far ahead that a deal to put in Adams would have been virtually impossible and the country would have been spared the campaign of 1828, one of the dirtiest in our political history. The inescapable inference is that when an obviously sick man runs for President, complications are inevitable and they may take any sort of unexpected turn.

Yet to denounce Crawford is grossly unfair. A sick man is never the proper judge of his own condition. Everyone around him is doing everything possible to cheer him up, for boosting the patient's morale is an important contribution toward his cure. If their efforts are successful, it is pretty certain that he will think he is better than he is. Eisenhower certainly believes that he is physically fit to stand another campaign and another term of office. Perhaps he believes that he is practically as good physically as he was when he entered the White House. But does anyone else believe it?

People certainly didn't believe anything of the sort in 1824. Crawford's long lead evaporated before election day, not because he had done anything to make people like him less but simply because the voters knew that a man who has had a stroke is not as good a man physically as he was before his illness.

People know the same thing about a coronary occlusion, especially one that has been followed by major abdominal surgery. By November every realistic voter will realize that the odds are that a vote for Eisenhower is in reality a vote for the man on the tail of the ticket. If NIXON is that man, then a voter who sincerely opposes NIXON for President will have to square it with his own conscience if he casts a vote for Eisenhower.

This has no bearing whatever on people's attitude toward the President himself. No rational human being can hold Eisenhower to blame for his illness, or think the worse of him for his misfortune. But, on the other hand, neither are the voters responsible for the illness, while they are responsible for the man they put in the White House; and they will be responsible if they precipitate another mess such as followed 1824.

The Issue Today and Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, camouflaged as it may be, the real issue confronting the 84th Congress and—if we stay out of war—the one which will be predominant in the 85th, is private enterprise versus socialism.

Oh, I know you have heard that story before. But make no mistake. It was over that issue that the real battle in Congress was carried on this last session. Unless correctly resolved, it may destroy us.

The issue is not being fought by Republicans on one side, Democrats on the other. The battle is carried on on each side of the aisle between the two factions in each party.

Roosevelt was elected on a platform and on his individual promise that he could and would reduce national spending and Federal jobs 25 percent. That the country would remain on the gold standard. That constitutional government would be his goal. No real worthwhile effort was made to adhere to any of those promises.

On the contrary, Federal spending increased. We went off the gold standard within 6 months after he was inaugurated. All pretense of constitutional government went out the window.

The advocates of paternalism took over and, from that day until this, there has been a vigorous, persistent effort on the part of a financially and politically powerful group in both parties to establish the doctrine that "Papa knows best." That is to say that the representatives you send to Congress, your hired men, and the bureaucrats who are thoroughly entrenched in the executive departments, know more about how you should live, carry on your own businesses and affairs, than do you.

The only thing they concede is that you may work at least 3 of the 12 months of the year to earn the tax dollars on which the Federal Government operates.

During the 84th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations on which I am the ranking minority member, and the 11 special subcommittees, on which I serve, had a special appropriation of $995,000—no, I am not mistaken; that was only $5,000 less than a million dollars; the committee asked for another $100,000 but the $100,000 was abandoned when a point of order was raised—and the committee had another $100,000 out of the contingent fund to carry on investigations and hold hearings. The committee had at least $1,100,000.

In my judgment, the overall purpose of some of the investigations of its subcommittees has been to establish the doctrine that the Government should take over and operate from Washington practically every business in which businessmen or business organizations are engaged.

The slaphappy bureaucrats and their adherents would, if they could have their way, take over.

You may think I misjudge the situation. But read this quotation from David Lawrence, who, referring to this group, writes:

> They will not be happy until all food stores, all department stores, all retail stores, all steel plants, all factories are owned by the Government.

And remember former Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of Agriculture Rexford Guy Tugwell's statement that "Business will logically be required to disappear" and "Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance."

Some, your representative included, have long fought this trend. With the administration's aid, we have stopped some of it.

Do not be discouraged—I am not. The quicker the results of this drive take shape and bear fruit, the sooner we will get back to constitutional government, respect for the rights of individuals and of the States.

Opposition to socialism is one of the tasks which keeps me from growing old in spirit and activity, if not in years.

What Second District People Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following summary of a questionnaire which I sent to the people of my district, in order that they may know the results.

I was most pleased with the returns on the questionnaire which I sent to residents of all sections of the Second Congressional District. The 11,000 answers convey the opinions of a representative cross-section of occupations and geographical sections of the district. I am deeply appreciative of the promptness of the returns and for the many people who took time to write additional comments on issues not covered specifically by the questionnaire.

Analysis of the results reveals an interest in good, sound governmental management on the part of those replying, and increasing interest in fiscal policies, our relationships with other nations, and our own defense efforts. Here is what the answers revealed and actions taken on the subjects:

First. The first part of this questionnaire was divided into 11 categories, which represented 11 important aspects of government Answers given were ratings of the top six issues in the opinion of the answerers. Here is how these issues ranked in importance to Second District residents: First, defense; second, balancing the budget; third, foreign policy; fourth, farm policies; fifth, taxation; sixth, Government spending; seventh, highways; eighth, labor policies; ninth, schools; tenth, civil rights; eleventh, power policies.

Second. Should the United States continue foreign military aid? For, 56 percent; against, 44 percent. Economic aid? For, 63 percent; against, 37 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed $3.7 billion military- and economic-aid bill, cut from original $4.9 billion request. I voted for cuts and for bill in its final form.

Third. Should the Government pay farmers for taking acreage out of production? Against, 92 percent; for, 8 percent.

Should we return to high rigid price supports? Against, 84 percent; for, 16 percent.

Action taken: Congress voted hodgepodge farm bill with high supports. President vetoed. Congress passed second farm bill with soil bank, flexibles. I voted against high rigid supports. Voted to sustain President's veto. Voted for second farm bill.

Fourth. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction? For, 70 percent; against, 30 percent.

Action taken: House killed school bill after lengthy debate. I voted for the bill, which would have appropriated $400 million annually for 5 years.

Fifth. Do you favor a highway-construction program supported by increased gas and tire taxes? For, 68 percent; against, 32 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed 15-year program to build $38 billion worth of roads. Interstate, primary, and secondary roads to benefit. I supported this bill.

Sixth. Do you favor unbalancing the budget to get an income-tax cut? Against, 82 percent; for, 18 percent.

Do you favor a cut in taxes before reduction of the national debt? Against, 76 percent; for, 24 percent.

Action taken: No income-tax legislation considered. Administration's balanced budget means $1.7 billion can be applied toward cutting national debt.

Seventh. Do you favor the partnership program for power development? For, 73 percent; against, 27 percent.

Action taken: No House votes on specific projects. Progress made on Priest Rapids and Rocky Reach partnership dams.

Eighth. Do you favor increasing postal rates to meet the post-office deficit? For, 71 percent; against, 29 percent.

Action taken: House passed postal-rate-increase bill. Senate ignored it. I voted for bill, which would have erased $500 million annual postal deficit.

Ninth. Do you think the Taft-Hartley Act should be:

(a) Repealed? For, 9 percent; against, 16 percent.

(b) Strengthened? For, 18 percent; against, 6 percent.

(c) Left as is? For, 10 percent; against, 10 percent.

(d) Amended as recommended by the President? For, 26 percent; against, 5 percent.

Action taken: No action in either House of Congress this session.

Tenth. Do you believe we are spending enough for defense? Yes, 72 percent; no, 28 percent.

Action taken: Congress passed $35 billion defense appropriation bill. I voted for this measure when it passed the House.

This questionnaire was of great value to me in considering legislation presented to the Congress. I intend to continue, if reelected, this procedure in order to get the views of the people I represent.

President Eisenhower Should Have a Republican Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of Congress it has become more and more apparent that if President Eishenhower is to accomplish all that he expects, and is expected to do, he should have a Congress that is in full accord with his aims and purposes and willing to help.

There have been times when the President has had the help of the Democrats in Congress in some matters. However, more often he has not had their help and cooperation. In consequence of this, much that the President has desired to do has not been done at all, or, in such a manner that the compromise bore little resemblance to what the President had asked for. Thus, although the President had prescribed a worthwhile program to promote the welfare of all our people, he was unable to accomplish it in its entirety because his party—Republican—was not in the majority and consequently could not direct congressional action.

There are many who do not understand the necessity of a President having a Congress in control of his own party. Too often it is thought that the election of a President is all that is necessary. It would seem that many such people overlook the fact that the President has no power to put into effect the program upon which he conducted his candidacy. His program even though most worth while and desirable remains nothing more than a group of suggestions for legislation unless and until the Congress enacts them into law. It is only when this has been done that the proposed law comes before the President for his approval or disapproval. Thus, it can be readily seen that whether any such legislation is passed or not, or whether in satisfactory form to the President, depends upon whether the Congress is one that is willing to carry out the President's wishes. Hence the necessity for the President to have a Congress wherein his own party has control.

I have gone into this detailed explanation to show that President Eisenhower, if he is to accomplish all that is expected of him, should have a Congress that is in full accord with his viewpoint. To deny him such leaves him handicapped and makes highly uncertain his ability to fulfill in entirety his promises and the program he has advocated.

I am well aware that the people of this Nation have a high degree of confidence in President Eisenhower. They are certain of his high purpose and desire to be helpful to our people in every walk of life. They like what he has done. They are in favor of what he seeks to do, and they expect him to do it. But too often they overlook the fact that in the final analysis it is the Congress that must enact the legislation that will make effective the program of the President.

Why do I emphasize so strongly the importance of President Eisenhower having a Congress with a majority of his own party? First, because it is necessary if he is to accomplish all that is expected of him. And, second, because so many people who have confidence in him and desire his program of welfare think that all that is necessary is to elect him. This, of course, and as I have already pointed out, will not be sufficient. Anyone who believes in President Eisenhower and intends to support him should give him a Congress that will help him. It is not fair nor reasonable to elect him and then withhold from him a friendly Congress. To do so is only to handicap and prevent him from doing the very things for which he was elected.

Furthermore, in these uncertain times, when questions of great international importance are continually arising, there should be an assured unity of action between the President and the Congress. With such unity our position is strengthened in world affairs and without such, it can be greatly weakened. Thus, it is to our welfare, both from a domestic as well as a foreign standpoint, to have a President in full accord with the Congress and a Congress in full accord with the President. Our national welfare can best be promoted at this time by reelecting President Eisenhower and giving him a Republican Congress.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, we members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who have served and worked with JIM RICHARDS for some time know him as a fair-minded and friendly chairman of that important committee. JIM RICHARDS has handled the affairs of the committee on a bipartisan basis so that he has been one of the real and cogent factors in the development of the basic present American positions in the foreign field.

The chairmanship of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has developed tremendously in stature under his leadership, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee is respected for its care and judgment in handling the interests of the United States of America where they arise throughout the world. I am glad to join with my fellow committee members and Members of Congress who have risen to express their personal regret that he is retiring at the end of the current session and will no longer be with us either in the House or with his colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

My Voting Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make part of the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a listing of my votes on the important rollcall issues of the 84th Congress. I feel it is a duty to the electorate which has sent me back here to represent them in Congress, and a willing desire of mine to compile and publish this record so that they know how my vote was cast on the important issues of the day.

Since the House of Representatives had some 22,000 bills introduced during the 2 years of the 84th Congress, it is apparent that only a relatively small percentage of them ever got to a vote before the House. Many smaller bills, having to do with private legislation, were not brought to a rollcall vote. For practical purposes, since these are the votes officially recorded by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, I have confined this record to those votes requiring a yea-or-nay answer—a rollcall. These, of course, include the topmost issues before the Congress during the past 2 years.

For simplification I have divided these measures into categories according to the general fields they encompass. Some are difficult to classify as they are considerably broad in scope and I request the reader's pardon if the categories overlap on some bills.

BILLS RELATING TO DEFENSE AND ARMED SERVICES

Voted for H. R. 6042 in 1955 and H. R. 10986 in 1956. Both bills provided for appropriations to operate all the armed services through the Defense Department.

Voted for H. R. 4393 in 1955 and H. R. 7993 in 1956. These bills provided $1.3 and $1.4 billion for Navy shipbuilding and modernization of fleet programs.

Voted for House Joint Resolution 159, which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Voted for H. R. 3005, to increase benefits under dependents' assistance pro-

gram and provide for a continuing Armed Forces personnel program.

Voted for H. R. 7000, to strengthen the Armed Forces Reserve program which offers youths choice of several ways to fulfill their military obligations.

Voted for H. R. 6829 in 1955 and H. R. 9893 in 1956, which provided nearly $4 billion for military construction projects.

BILLS AFFECTING BUSINESS AND TRADE

Voted against Resolutions 170 and 171, which would have kept the Government in rubber plants operated at loss to taxpayers.

Voted for H. R. 1, which authorized the President to enter into beneficial trade negotiations with various nations of the world.

Voted for H. R. 8710, which removed authority of Defense Department to negotiate big contracts. Bids must now be called on contracts over $2,500.

Voted for H. R. 6227, which provides regulation by the Government of bank holding companies.

Voted for H. R. 11380, which would have provided sufficient revenue to operate the Post Office Department on a sound fiscal basis.

Voted for H. R. 1840, which strengthened antitrust laws and prohibits price discrimination.

BILLS AFFECTING VETERANS, SOCIAL SECURITY, EDUCATION, AND HOUSING

Voted for S. 2126, to provide Federal housing, reconstruction and slum clearance projects, and H. R. 11742, the 1956 version of the same bill, which included my amendment to provide authority for single elderly people to occupy public housing projects.

Voted for H. R. 7535, to authorize a Federal-aid program for school construction.

Voted for H. R. 7886, to provide increased pensions for World War I veterans.

Voted for H. R. 587, to extend the GI education bill.

Voted for H. R. 4721, to increase pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

Voted for H. R. 7225, to lower the retirement age for women to 62 and start disability payments at age 50 under the social-security program.

Voted for H. R. 12038, for increased payments for service-connected disabilities.

Voted for H. R. 7089, to provide increased survivors benefits for servicemen.

BILLS ON GENERAL OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT

Voted for H. R. 10660, which sets up a 13-year, $38 billion program to develop interstate, primary, and secondary highways in the Nation.

Voted for H. R. 4259 and H. R. 9166, for extension of corporation taxes.

Voted for H. R. 5924, to authorize Inter-American Highway completion within 3 years.

Voted for H. R. 7224 and H. R. 12130, which provided foreign aid funds. Voted for all reductions.

Voted for H. R. 6766, which set up increased funds for the United States Army engineers, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 265, which expressed Congress' opposition to admittance of Red China into the United Nations.

Voted for H. R. 627, for furtherance of civil rights.

Voted against H. R. 7992, which would impede Defense Department getting out of competition with business and require Defense Department to submit proposal to Congress before getting out of business.

Voted for H. R. 12061, which would speed up governmental development of atomic electrical power by establishing reactor plants at Hanford and other locations.

BILLS AFFECTING LABOR

Voted for H. R. 7214 to increase the minimum wage to $1 per hour.

Voted against H. R. 9852 which would require dispersal of defense industries, such as Boeing from coastal areas.

Voted for H. R. 567 to increase pay for certain types of civil-service employees.

Voted for H. R. 4644 to increase postal workers' pay, eliminate inequities in service.

Voted for Bacon-Davis amendment to highway bill that requires prevailing rates of pay for all labor on highway construction projects.

BILLS AFFECTING FARMERS AND FARMING

Voted for H. R. 10875, President Eisenhower's farm program with soil-bank provisions, and other programs designed to bolster farm income. Voted to sustain veto of hodgepodge, unworkable farm bill originally proposed.

Voted for H. R. 8780 to eliminate gasoline taxes on fuel used in operation of farm machinery.

Voted for H. R. 8320 which extended school milk program and set up $75 million fund for program; also extended the brucellosis eradication program.

Voted for H. R. 3383, the upper Colorado River project, which provides for conservation and beneficial use of water resources of the great water basin.

Voted against H. R. 12 which provided high rigid price supports with no production controls, the cause of surpluses which cost taxpayers $8 billion.

Voted for H. R. 2851 to make Commodity Credit Corporation—farm surplus—commodities available for distribution to distressed areas.

Voted for H. R. 11708 to increase appropriations for disposal of agricultural products.

Voted for House Resolution 641 to take action on Fryingpan-Arkansas project for development of agriculture and beneficial usage of Fryingpan River.

Tribute to Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult at the close of a Congress to say goodby to the many colleagues whose leaving breaks up both a pleasant professional association and the prospects of enjoying fully the close relationships which have developed. The people of the United States will miss many of the men who are leaving Congress tonight. I wish I could pay individual tribute to each of them.

I am particularly interested in pointing out the effective congressional service and the outstanding personal qualities of SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER who has so ably represented the Third District of Indiana for three terms in the House of Representatives. In 1950, Indiana sent five new Republican Members to the House: SHEPARD J. CRUMPACKER, 3d District; E. ROSS ADAIR, 4th District; JOHN V. BEAMER, 5th District; WILLIAM G. BRAY, 7th District; and me, CHARLES B. BROWNSON, 11th District. The companionship between Congressmen of a given class is always a close one but the relationship between five of us who came at the same time, serving the same party, from the same State, has been a particular bond. We all regret it must be broken, at least to a degree, as Mr. CRUMPACKER resumes the private practice of law.

SHEP, as we know him, has been a quiet Congressman, whose advice has been eagerly sought by those of us who respect his ability to cut through superficialities and arrive at a penetrating analysis of any given problem. I am sure the great Committee on the Judiciary will miss his skills as a lawyer. I know the people of his district will miss the high quality of service which he has rendered to his constituents over and above his legislative responsibilities.

Value of Federal Health Program—Polio Vaccine an Illustration of What Can Be Done by Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member and have been chairman, has jurisdiction over many important subjects, such as transportation of all kinds; communications, radio, television, telephone, and telegraph; aviation; stock exchanges; investment legislation; scientific programs; Federal trade; pure food and drugs; railroad retirement; and many other subjects of a regulatory character. However, the jurisdiction within our committee that gives me the greatest pleasure, in study and accomplishment, is that which relates to the health of our people.

The work in connection with the subject of health has brought many satisfying results. I take great pride in the several research activities we have set up. These include all that relate to the major diseases that take such a terrific

annual toll of our people. By way of illustration, I refer to cancer, arthritis, nervous diseases in all their different forms, including mental diseases, muscular dystrophy, and so forth.

In addition to the numerous and varied programs of a research character, there have also been accomplishments, of which I am proud, in providing for additional hospital facilities, both general and mental, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, and centers for clinical purposes. Such as I have mentioned constitute only a small part of the many programs that have engaged our attention in an effort to improve the health of the Nation.

POLIO

I would feel remiss if I did not make special mention of the achievements in the field of polio, particularly as a result of the splendid work of Dr. Jonas Salk in producing a serum that is helpful in preventing certain types of polio.

There has been no happening in recent years that has brought so much happiness and relief to parents and others than the announcement that the polio vaccine discovered by Dr. Salk can be helpful in preventing paralytic polio. Dr. Salk is entitled to the high honors that have been paid to him. His modesty, and particularly his refusad to patent his important discovery for his own financial gain, is one of the most outstanding and unselfish acts recorded in the history of medicine.

The history of medicine is replete with instances where doctors and scientists have made contributions of scientific discoveries to promote the welfare of people without any thought of financial reward. I wish that time and space permitted me to enumerate them all. It would be a list of which we all might well be proud. All of this, including Dr. Salk's recent contribution, should be sufficient to impress us that after all there are men and women who think in terms of service to their fellow man as being above and beyond the mere accumulation of wealth.

It is my hope that Dr. Salk may live long to experience the joy and happiness he has brought into the lives of those who otherwise might have experienced the crippling results of infantile paralysis.

The important discovery of a polio vaccine is an illustration of what can be accomplished by continued and intelligent research. Sufficient funds as a means of carrying on and expanding research activities pays off in greater returns by improving the health of our people than any other activity of our Government. Consequently I feel that the time and effort I have put forth in committee hearings and the drafting, introduction, and passage of legislation to maintain, increase, and improve health research facilities has given to me a real sense of compensation and great satisfaction to have had a part in the promotion of ways and means of improving health conditions for our people.

The following letter which I have received from Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States, means much to me because it brings to mind the memory of the work we have done in the cause of health. It reads:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: In departing from Washington and my Government career, I want you to know how much I have enjoyed and have appreciated my association with you. I shall always cherish the experiences during my years in Government service, and I want you to know that among the most pleasant has been my relationship with you. Your understanding and your sympathy with the aims of the Public Health Service have been an inspiration to all of us. Much of our accomplishment—and I like to think of it as substantial—would not have been possible without your counsel, your friendly and constructive criticism, and your support.

I will be located in New Jersey, as you know, but I hope to come back to Washington from time to time and hope that I may be privileged to appear before the Congress in the future in behalf of health legislation. I am sure that our paths will continue to cross.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

It is my hope that I may be privileged to continue to engage in the noble and rewarding work of promoting the welfare of our people, by improving and expanding the facilities that can do so much for the future health of our people.

A Decade of the Japanese American Citizens League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the Japanese American Citizens League.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, when the Japanese American Citizens League meets at San Francisco during the coming Labor Day weekend for its 14th biennial convention, it can look back upon a series of accomplishments on behalf of harmony in our land which, I feel sure, will give its membership and officers a deep sense of pride.

This is perhaps especially true of its work of the past decade. Meeting at Denver in the spring of 1946 for their first postwar convention, League delegates undertook a 10-year program to attain first-class citizenship for themselves and their parents, and to gain full acceptance as worthy Americans. They incorporated the antidiscrimination committee to serve as their legislative-legal arm and chose Mr. Mike Masaoka, a veteran of the famed 442d all-Nisei Regimental Combat Team, as national legislative director of the committee.

Utilizing the instruments of democracy within the framework of our American system of government, the League obtained the passage of remedial legislation, won court decisions outlawing racial discrimination against those of Japanese descent, and gained the acceptance of their fellow Americans. It is a shining record.

By 1952, the major legislative objectives adopted at the Denver convention had been realized. The privilege of naturalization was extended to resident alien Japanese, who since 1790 by Federal law had been denied citizenship in the land of their adoption and of their children's birth. The Japanese Exclusion Act of 1924 was repealed, and immigration quotas were extended to Japan and other Asian countries. The Refugee Relief Act of 1953, the orphans' bill, and the so-called soldier brides' laws enabled additional Japanese to come to America as nonquota immigrants to join their families here.

An Evacuation Claims Act was approved in 1948. It authorized the payment of losses suffered by Japanese-Americans during the 1942 wartime evacuation. This act was amended by the 84th Congress, 2d session, to provide a similar measure of justice with respect to claims which have not yet been processed.

Another law in which the Japanese American Citizens League interested itself authorized the Attorney General of the United States to adjust the status of deserving Japanese aliens who had come here as treaty merchants, students, and temporary visitors but were stranded by the war. Many of them assisted the United States against the country of their nativity. The law has had the humanitarian result of averting the forced separation of some 2,500 alien Japanese from American citizen families comprising approximately 10,000 persons.

Other statutes included naturalization for alien Japanese who served in the Armed Forces of the United States during World War II, restoration of citizenship to those who had lost it solely because they voted in the postwar elections in Japan during the occupation period, reimbursement for those who lost contraband articles deposited with State and local police officials when the war broke out, and recovery of improperly vested property by dual nationals.

And, of course, there was the treaty of peace with Japan which inaugurated a new era of friendship and cooperation in the Pacific.

One of the last bills passed by the 84th Congress eliminated the prohibition against using Mongolian labor on Federal reclamation projects. Perhaps this was an accomplishment of greater significance than the public realized. For the first time since this prohibition was written into law, in 1902, there is no statute which discriminates against Asians. Our Japanese-American citizens have reason, I believe, to be proud of the progress in fair and equal treatment which this enactment represents. So, too, have Americans of every other ancestry good cause herein to feel that our Nation continues to advance along the highway of understanding and tolerance.

A remarkable degree of the credit for these accomplishments can be given to the national legislative director. As a Nisei, Mr. Masaoka had misgivings when he registered as a lobbyist for the first time. But because he represented in his person the problems of the Japanese-American and spoke of them with the genuine concern of his constituency, he was accepted without question. His war record attested to his loyalty to the land of his birth. He holds the Combat Infantryman's Badge, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, and Italian War Medal.

This leadership in the cause of solving the problems of the Japanese-American has been acknowledged in a feature article pub-

lished by Reader's Digest entitled "Washington's Most Successful Lobbyist." In that account, published in 1949, Masaoka was described as one "who practices personal lobbying by appealing to the conscience of America." His simple, and completely American, creed is "Anyone can sell fair play and justice."

The Japanese American Citizens' League decade, which will be commemorated at San Francisco from August 30 to September 3, is an inspiring documentary to the efficacy of democracy. The theme of the convention is "Changing Perspectives." Secure now in their future, and cognizant of the great and many opportunities which are rightfully theirs, our fellow citizens of Japanese blood will take stock of the changing perspectives of our times and will look forward to a new decade which all of us hope and believe will be as constructive as the one now coming to a close.

The United States and Japan, on different sides of the great Pacific Ocean, are united in their determination to continue as free nations. I am sure that in the years ahead the Japanese American Citizens' League will use its organization and facilities and membership to enrich the friendship which exists between America, their native land, and Japan, land of their ancestry. The league has demonstrated that it is peculiarly well qualified for this challenging task.

My Record in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to include a summary report of my legislative activities during the 84th Congress to the people of the Fourth Massachusetts Congressional District whom I have the honor to particularly represent in this House.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

Mr. Speaker, throughout my public life I have consistently respected and complied with the moral obligation imposed upon every officeholder by the Biblical mandate to "render an account of thy stewardship." I have made it a rule to submit at the end of each term of office a summary report of my activities to the people I represent.

It is, of course, obviously impossible to report my every word and action in detail during the brief period allowed. I am prevented from full comment on each and every one of the more than 1,200 varied pieces of legislation which came before the House. I do, however, wish to reveal and make clear my personal stand and judgment upon some of the major legislative issues of 1955 and 1956.

TRUTH FROM THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, there has probably never been a time in our national history when it was more vitally important for the American voters to know the truth about the actions and philosophy of those to whom they entrust the guidance of their Government for domestic security and progress, as well as leadership in a troubled world. The foundation sources of fact on the deeds and words of those serving in this United States House of Representatives are the official Journal record, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, required by law to publish the proceedings of each legislative day in the Congress, and the official reports of committee hearings.

The main body of this report, with some accompanying comments, will reveal the exact words I spoke and actions initiated during particular legislative discussions and debates.

DISTRICT AND REGIONAL—FLOOD TRAGEDY

Mr. Speaker, on August 19 and 20 of 1955 the whole Northeast area, including my own State and district, was visited by overwhelming floods in the wake of a torrential downpour of continuous rainfall through the 3 preceding days and nights. Just 2 short years previous, on June 9, 1953, my city of Worcester, Mass., and surrounding communities were suddenly struck by the most vicious tornado in our history, leaving more than 100 dead in our area and tremendous property damage.

On the afternoon of August 19 when these floods began to dangerously threaten, I was in my home office meeting with constituents on congressional business. Local public officials contacted me, and I immediately telephoned the Civil Defense Administrator in Washington requesting the cooperation of all Federal agencies in lending the vitally needed assistance to our stricken area. The President very soon declared the region a major disaster area within the provisions of Public Law 875 of the 81st Congress, which I am happy to say I had a voice in enacting.

Under this law and by Presidential direction, the resources of our National Government are authorized for use in assisting people and communities upon whom any serious natural disaster has fallen. The help of all Federal agencies, in cooperation with local and State government units, and that splendid organization, the American Red Cross, was soon at hand. The personnel of every Government agency at every level performed in the most heroic and expedient manner, first, to prevent any continuing flood damage, and, second, to assist in the rehabilitation and recovery from the great and widespread flood damage. The United States Army Corps of Engineers distinguished themselves and the military by their heroic and untiring efforts to save lives and property. Our people themselves exhibited the highest courage and capacity for sacrifice in Christian neighborliness and humaneness. The wildness of the uncontrolled flood elements made it a sad day, but the heroism of our people in time of tragedy also made it a proud one for Massachusetts and New England.

In spite of all efforts, several lives were lost in our immediate area and the amount of property damage staggered the imagination to assess.

Precise figures have not even yet been accurately established, but the financial losses from unemployment, damaged personal property, and disintegrated places of business reached into the hundreds of millions. The memory of the family tragedies through the loss of loved members will never be erased from our minds.

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Personally observing and realizing the terrible danger from recurring floods to the lives and property of my people, it was only natural that I, and a great many other national legislators, resolved to concentrate our minds and devote our energies to the enactment of Federal legislation to prevent further floods and provide insurance against property damage from floods.

Toward that objective, in the national and regional welfare, I introduced four different bills in the 84th Congress: H. R. 8342, to authorize the construction of protection measures against damage from extraordinary floods; H. R. 8343, to authorize the construction of protection measures against damage from extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms; H. R. 10744, to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance; and House Joint Resolution 468, to establish a Northeastern United States watershed development and flood protection commission.

Below is a chronological listing of my actions to encourage the enactment of flood-protection measures for our district and a national flood-insurance program:

GENERAL FLOOD PROTECTION

(Excerpts from testimony before special congressional committee at Springfield, Mass., October 24, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you are here, of course, primarily in recognition of and sympathy with the tragic results of the double disaster of floods that have been visited upon this area within the space of 3 months.

In my opinion, the modern history of congressional action in relation to the water resources and power of this country clearly reveals the continuing congressional conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water-control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation or initiative is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import where projects, because of size or complexity or potential multiple purposes or benefits, are beyond the means or the needs of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England floodwater-control problem lies, and the Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem. It will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of this flood-ravaged region are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster may strike again.

WORCESTER DIVERSIONARY TUNNEL

(Excerpts from testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, January 19, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very grateful for the opportunity to appear even briefly before you today. I shall confine my remarks at the moment to the particular project commonly described as the Worcester diversionary tunnel, so vitally necessary to the life, safety, and property protection of the citizens of my native city, and for which, as you all know, there has been included a sum of $60,000 in this bill to enable the Army engineers to complete a resurvey of the area and planning involved.

The essentiality of this project to the continuing welfare of Worcester is undoubted by anyone. Prayerfully remembering the personal sorrow and human tragedy which cannot be materially valued, it has been reliably but conservatively estimated that the presence of this tunnel during our most recent flood disaster would have prevented approximately $15 million of the property damage that was done. The Army Corps of Engineers has repeatedly and authoritatively stated that the tunnel is a vitally needed protection and it will do the job within reason. They have also testified that the project is well justified economically, inasmuch as the benefits that will derive are far greater than the cost and that the ratio of annual benefit to annual cost is exceedingly good. The President has included and requested the funds for this flood-control work, and in order to initiate the resurvey that must be accomplished before actual construction is started, which is planned for 1957, there remains only the approval of this committee; without your approval, the whole project could encounter tragic disruption. I most sincerely urge that you give this item your very sympathetic consideration.

TUNNEL APPROPRIATION APPROVED

(Excerpts from House speech, May 22, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, flood control and protection has, indeed, these past several years, become one of our most pressing domestic problems, and the responsibility of the Federal Government to assist the various States and municipalities of the Nation in solving that problem is great.

In my particular city, the most efficient Corps of Engineers had long recognized the vital necessity of a flood-protection tunnel and they recommended the participation of the Federal Government in the achievement of such a project for local protection. Last January 18 I appeared before the committee to present a detailed explanation of the need and urgency of this particular project for the safety of the people of my city and area, and there was then approved in the urgent deficiency appropriation bill a sum of $60,000 to permit the Army Corps of Engineers to complete their resurvey of this Worcester diversionary tunnel flood-control project.

It was a matter of modest personal gratification to me that the committee approved the initial resurvey sum and further recommended in this present bill the additional sum of $840,000 to begin construction of the tunnel in this next fiscal year.

I earnestly urge the unanimous approval of the bill by this House so that projects of imperative importance, such as the Worcester diversionary tunnel in my area, and similar projects throughout the country, may soon have a beginning, primarily in protection of the lives of American citizens.

FLOOD INSURANCE APPROVED

(Excerpts from House speech, July 21, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, in realization of the practically unanimous sentiment of the House concerning the vital necessity of enacting an adequate program of Federal flood insurance, and in consideration of this late Saturday hour, I have no intention of prolonging my remarks.

Flood damage, as we all know, hits with paralyzing effect, first, those ordinary homeowners who lose their homes by flood but still owe the mortgage debt on their homes; and, secondly, diligent businessmen, whose credit is so impaired by flood loss as to make it practically impossible for them to recover and resume business operations. We all realize further that Federal disaster grants are not now generally available for individuals as such, and private insurance companies cannot handle the situation.

I earnestly hope that every Member will grant this flood insurance legislative proposal his most conscientious consideration and that it will be approved without further delay.

TAX REDUCTION

(Excerpts from House speech, February 25, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this measure providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption because it is directly in line with the sentiments expounded by the President himself in his recent budget message.

It is my very deep belief that this tax credit for individual income taxpayers in general, and very particularly for our low-income taxpayers, is urgently needed now to sustain an expanding economy. I supported the tax legislation enacted in the last Congress mainly because it contained the first major revision in over 50 years for improving our antiquated tax system. However, I felt then, as now, the specific provisions of that legislation did not extend fair and just tax consideration to those working people and their families within our lowest income brackets. This present measure before us contains provision for the correction of that past deficiency because it benefits all taxpayers and is distributed to every taxpayer evenly on a dollar basis with respect to each personal exemption.

AMERICA'S ANSWER TO COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA—SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, in my firm conviction, adequate social-security legislation is one of the soundest barriers we can erect against the advancing scourge of Communist propaganda and philosophy which is today forcing us to fight for the survival of our democratic system.

How much stronger, how much more resistant to Communist entreatment and intrigue this Nation will be when its citizens are assured that our great business system and our Government, working harmoniously together, establish a dignified, humane financial operation making them eligible to receive what every worthy working American and family deserve; namely, reasonable security in time of old age, adversity, and dire need.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1955

(Excerpts from House speech, July 18, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, the changes offered in this bill, while not by any means completely sufficient to the needs, represent a progressive measure of improvement in the current social-security structure. Briefly and substantially, this bill provides (a) monthly benefit payments, under qualifying conditions, to workers who are totally and permanently disabled at or after the age of 50; (b) payment of monthly benefits at the age of 62 to women who are insured workers, wives of insured workers, and widows and dependent mothers of deceased insured workers; (c) continuation of monthly benefits to children who become totally and permanently disabled before the age of 18; (d) coverage extension to the self-employed professional groups now excluded—except physicians—to certain farm owners, and others; and (e) increases in the present schedule of contributions of one-half percent each on employers and employees and three-fourths percent on the self-employed.

No one can reasonably doubt that these liberalizing advancements in our present social-security pattern are in accord with the fundamental Christian principles and philosophy of American political and economic life, as opposed to the atheistic concept of a Communist slave state. I urge you all, therefore, to approve the amendments embodied in this bill without further delay, while we look forward to the enactment of even more equitable and liberalizing provisions of our social-security system in the near future.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS, 1956

(Excerpts from House Speech, July 26, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, these current improvements in our social-security system, as spelled out in this legislation, are in entire accord with our Christian principles and traditions. They are within the capacity of this blessed and bountiful Nation to assume. We have been extremely anxious these last 10 years and extremely generous in providing billions of dollars to aid and assist friendly peoples, and even some enemies, all over the world. Some of those expenditures were and are undoubtedly wise in our self-interest, but the wisdom and practicality of certain others becomes even more and more doubtful.

To those who question our own ability to reasonably participate in a sound social-security system at the Federal level, I suggest they take a look at the staggering and astounding amounts of money that we have spent abroad. I ask them, in all sincerity, what will it profit us to spend abroad if we neglect to the point of discouragement and demoralization the welfare of our own people? I would remind them that the primary duty of this National Legislature is concern for the people of the United States.

This social-security measure is truly in accord with the exhortation of the President to legislate for the good of all Americans, and I now urge its unanimous adoption without further delay.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege from 1947 to 1951 to be a member of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which acted upon the Hoover Commission recommendations. More than half of the first Hoover Commission recommendations have been adopted, with tremendous Government savings resulting, and I am proud to say I voted for them all.

In this Congress, then, it was a pleasant duty for me to urge the adoption of and vote for the enactment of a further recommendation of the second Hoover Commission to modernize our antiquated Government accounting and budgeting methods, which, as reliably estimated, will result in an additional savings to the American taxpayer of approximately $4 billion.

GOVERNMENT BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING IMPROVEMENTS

(Excerpts from House remarks, July 11, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, by enactment of the Budget and Accounting

Procedures Act of 1950, took a significant step forward in providing for the use of program or performance budgets by the executive agencies of the Government. The objective of that law, which I was most happy to support at the time, was to have the Government departments show how they intended to spend their money on the basis of the major programs that the agencies carry out.

Mr. Speaker, if the Congress is to exercise any constitutional degree of effective control over Federal Government spending, it must have clear and concise information on which to exercise an intelligent control action. Effective control over the Government purse is one of the most important devices available to the Congress for protecting the American taxpayer from waste, extravagance, and bankruptcy.

I sincerely hope that we will soon be permitted to enact into law this most important Hoover Commission recommendation to improve the budgeting and accounting methods of the Federal Government. It is reliably estimated that the adoption of these modern accounting methods will result in a saving to the American taxpayer of approximately $4 billion.

MUTUAL SECURITY AND FOREIGN AID

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently been in favor of the basic principle involved in mutual security defense aid, and that is to prevent the necessity for American fathers, sons, and daughters to fight again all over the world. Nevertheless, I stated, at the beginning of this Congress, my firm opinion that we could retain the basic principle of this program but we should also effect sensible retrenchment, in consideration of the American taxpayer, because many friendly allies had already achieved a substantial measure of recovery and rehabilitation, because attempted financial bribery of doubtful allies was proving more and more to be a fruitless and unwise investment, and because our whole foreign-aid and mutual-security program was in dire need of resurvey and revision in accord with changing world conditions.

My legislative actions on this important subject during this Congress have been consistent with my best judgment as outlined above.

MUTUAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS

(Excerpts from House speech, June 8, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, preliminary to our continuing action, it might be well to reflect upon the fact that well over a hundred billion dollars of our people's money in principal and interest has been spent on foreign aid since 1940.

It is true that in the beginning of this program to rehabilitate war shattered and torn countries abroad, the American people were willing to reasonably share of their own weath and resources in Christian generosity and practical wisdom. However, the time has come for the American taxpayer to sensibly ask if the astronomical sums we have been granting to many of these countries is still actually needed. From authoritative statistics here, it is obvious that some of these nations have long reached a point of economic productivity beyond their capacity previous to the war, and therefore substantial reductions, if not total elimination, are in order. Let us be patriotically mindful that this blessed Nation and its generous people are not possessed of inexhaustible resources, and let us remember our primary duty is to them.

In consistent pursuit of such sensible self-interest, the problem confronts us of continuing the laudable aims of our foreign aid and foreign policy in reasonable appropriation retrenchment in accord with what the already overburdened American taxpayer can afford. Mind you, this current authorization is proposed pending the resurvey of the whole program and its policy.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, let us reemphasize that there are appropriations outstanding sufficient to carry on our foreign-aid program for 3 years. There is overwhelming evidence from the highest authorities that the program has been overexpanded by overoptimistic and unrealistic planning. There is, unfortunately, overwhelming, startling evidence that changes in attitudes and reactions are taking place in too many countries all over the world which we have unhappily failed to properly appraise. There is nothing in this measure before us that will in any way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual-security program. Nations that have been and still are friendly to us are being adequately assisted. Those strategic areas where some of our own boys are in danger, such as Korea, are being well equipped militarily. The most desirable point 4 operation is going and will go on. The substantial objectives of our whole foreign-aid program are not being denied.

We can meet our two obligations of reasonably protecting the American taxpayer and providing security from the Communist threat by adopting this measure containing sensible reductions in foreign aid while the whole program is being reevaluated. Let us remember that the Congress can always act promptly in any sudden emergency. I urge your approval of this bill without further delay.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

(Excerpts from House speech, July 11, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I stated here a few weeks ago during the course of debate on the authorization bill for foreign aid, the fundamental purposes of this legislation were, and still are, Christian to our character and practical to our own self-interest.

The only fundamental question presented to us in this appropriation bill is whether or not it provides sufficient money to keep the program in reasonable operation while a thorough resurvey of our whole foreign aid policy and financial commitments to support it is conducted.

The reductions in this bill before us will in no way disrupt the continuation of a reasonable mutual-security program. The most desirable point 4 operation, allies who have demonstrated friendliness, and areas of strategic military importance to us are all adequately provided for.

While we then accept our obligation to provide for this security against communism for ourselves and the free world, let us also accept and concentrate upon our primary obligation to the American people, whom we represent, to take the greatest care of their money and exercise the highest vigilance over the manner in which it is spent. The resources of this great Nation are not limitless and the burdens now being patriotically assumed by each American taxpayer are truly staggering. It will profit us little to extravagantly attempt to buy uncertain friendships if the exorbitant price is the deteriorating morale of the American people and the grave danger of our own economic instability. Let us beware of both of these catastrophes which are more threatening than may appear on the surface. The American taxpayer has put both his faith and his money into our legislative hands. In legislative conscience let us neither betray the one nor dissipate the other.

UNITED STATES LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Speaker, I have continuously, during my tenure here, emphasized my conviction that outside of moral and spiritual strength, no attributes are more vital to national progress and security than the promotion of good health, the advancement of sound education, and the encouragement of peaceful labor-management relations in this Nation.

I reiterated my convictions on these subjects during the discussion of departmental appropriations in this current Congress.

GENERAL WELFARE APPROPRIATIONS

(Excerpts from House speech, March 5, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as I have said over the past several years when this annual appropriation bill for the Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments has come before us, there is perhaps, no measure upon which we act here that more vitally affects the lives of so many of our American citizens.

The appropriation we grant under this measure and the regulatory provisions governing the spending of the appropriation are designed to improve continuously the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriation bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us has the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

In our consideration here, it might be well to emphasize the identification of some of the unit agencies affected by this appropriation bill and almost by their very names, which unfortunately are not as widely publicized for general appreciation as they should be, we realize their beneficial impact upon the country's welfare. First, let me mention just a few that come under the Department of Labor. There are the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Bureau of Employment Security, Bureau of Labor Standards, Bureau of Veterans' Employment Rights, the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, and the Women's Bureau. The value of these bureaus and their divisions to the country in maintaining and encouraging constant improvement in labor conditions and relations in the most productive country in the world is incalculable, both for domestic prosperity and tranquillity, as well as in providing adequate defense against any possible aggressor.

Some of the more vitally important units of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are, the Social Security Administration, the Food and Drug Administration, the United States Office of Education, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, the United States Public Health Service, the Bureau of Medical Services, and the National Institutes of Health. In their various functions these agencies regulate and inspect the distribution and sale of food and drug products to protect the American public from unscrupulous dealers; vocational rehabilitation, a national necessity, is promoted by the Office of Education; the Children's Bureau insures better child and maternal health examination. Under the Institutes of Health, we have the various research programs for continuing work toward the cures for such devastating diseases as heart, cancer, arthritis, rheumatism, as well as mental and dental. These research institutes have been doing and are doing most encouraging work in the fight against the ravages of these terrible afflictions causing, annually, tremendous losses in our economic productivity, not to mention the suffering and unhappiness they visit upon individual lives and families. Progressive discoveries have been made in these recent years prompting us to reasonably feel that a great part of this human misery and economic loss will continue to be greatly alleviated by the wise use of these appropriation funds for persevering research into the health problems of the Nation and

that is the chief reason why I am solidly in favor of increasing these particular appropriations by as much, or even more, than $10 million.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the continuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, while appearing before the United States Committee for Reciprocity Information in Washington, I testified that I was not personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory lying at the basis of our trade-agreements program.

However, I also expressed and emphasized my understanding that the fulfillment of such a program was not intended, either by the Congress or by the President, to promote disintegration of our own essential domestic industries and to generate great segments of sectional unemployment.

Consistent with his legislative activities, to advance the overall national welfare, I conceive it to be a real part of the duties of a United States Representative to exercise every legitimate and conscientious effort to protect and preserve the essential industries, with their associated employment opportunities, within his own district and area. These are the substantial thoughts and convictions that governed my action on the subject of extending trade agreements when it came before this Congress.

I first voted to recommit the bill for the purpose of including additional provisions for preserving essential domestic industries and employment, and then voted for final passage upon the promise of the President himself that Executive action would be taken whenever required to preserve essential domestic industries.

PROTECTING DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES AND EMPLOYMENT

(Excerpts from House speech, February 18, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I have never been, nor am I now, opposed to the basic principles underlying our trade-agreements program. However, there appear to be very serious grounds upon which this bill in its present form should be patriotically questioned.

Certainly it does not completely conform with the sentiment expressed in the President's own statement on trade policy contained in his state of the Union message February 2, 1953, when he declared:

"This objective must not ignore legitimate safeguarding of domestic industries, agriculture and labor standards." Nor does it conform with the statement contained in the report of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy that "American labor should not be subjected to unfair competition as a part of any program to expand our foreign trade."

Even the advocates of this bill admit it will inevitably visit great hardships upon great numbers of employees and many industries in certain sections of the country, such as New England, where textile manufacturing and innumerable other products will be hardest hit. Yet there are no provisions or proposals, nor are we permitted to offer any for adoption, in this measure to prevent the imposition of serious economic suffering upon such American workers and industries.

Therefore a great many of us here, trying to conscientiously represent our people, very deeply feel that the tariff cutting features of this bill should be wisely held in abeyance until, with Government assistance, new industries are encouraged and developed for areas that would be so disastrously affected and proper precautions are taken to safeguard the employment opportunities rightfully belonging to so many patriotic American working people. Toward that objective labor, industry, and all levels of government should sincerely cooperate.

It is truly not a simple or easy problem to solve but it is just as truly our representative responsibility to work out a fair trade program that will be fair to Americans as well as our foreign friends. I earnestly hope the House will vote to recommit this bill for the sole purpose of writing in new provisions designed to prevent great hardships from falling upon many regional industries and workers, not to mention other provisions to retain and preserve essential defense resources that we can ill afford to dissipate in the face of threatening Communist aggression.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, the foremost authorities in the Nation have testified and emphasized to the absolute need of improving the roads and highways of this country, and they have unanimously urged immediate Federal legislative action.

In response to the truth of this overwhelming evidence from the highest sources, if such were needed beyond personal observation and knowledge, I felt it my duty to speak and vote in favor of the Federal highway aid program in the national interest.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

(Excerpts from House speech, April 27, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, there are three fundamentally important factors involved in this overall highway problem—the safety factor, the defense factor, and the economic factor.

With respect to the safety factor, we have already killed more than a million people in 50 years with automobiles. Thirty million more have been injured. Automobile accidents have taken twice as many American lives as we have lost in all our wars. The number injured in traffic accidents is 25 times the number of men wounded in wars since the first Minutemen fell at Lexington, 179 years ago. It would, therefore, be unChristian, uncivilized, and inhuman to continue to disregard the appalling loss of life and limb to American citizens by any further delay in taking steps to prevent this mounting holocaust on the Nation's highways.

With respect to the defense factor, let us dwell for a moment on what would happen if war suddenly broke out. In this age of the H-bomb there is no longer safety in digging in. It would be necessary to evacuate the great industrial cities within range of the Communist air force. How could they possibly be evacuated when even on a normal peacetime day our roadways and highways are jammed?

With respect to the economic factor, a huge and sensibly planned increase in roadbuilding is necessary if the national economy is to continue expansion and if the Nation's living standards are to continue upward.

Future highway construction must be planned to serve an economy which the President has estimated will rise to $500 billion worth of goods and services annually within 10 years. At present it is conservatively estimated by the authorities that the lag in highway construction is costing the Nation about $5 billion a year.

In consideration of our progressing economy and this tremendous financial loss, the obvious answer is that we cannot continue to afford to throw away $5 billion annually by failing to provide safeguarded highways for the more than 70 million motor vehicles that most probably will be on our United States highways by 1965. It is time for action.

MINIMUM WAGE

(Excerpts from House speech, July 19, 1955)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and to urge approval of this bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the present minimum wage to $1 per hour.

In our consideration of this problem, let us never forget the warning lesson of the great depression in the early 1930's that lack of increasing purchasing power in the hands of our lowest income families, who spend the most, brings about terrible unemployment, hardships, and economic stagnation. It profits us nothing to possess the greatest industrial production potential in the world if low wages and low consumer income prevent millions of Americans from buying these products.

I am also intensely concerned about another aspect of this minimum-wage problem affecting so disastrously the textile workers and industries, and other groups, in my own home area of Massachusetts and New England. An increase in the minimum wage would tend to revitalize the textile industry, discriminated against as it is in our so-called reciprocal trade agreements, not only in the establishment of a decent wage structure, but also in market stability, as well as being a just and necessary rebuke to unfair competition. It would discourage the seducement of industry to cheap-labor localities by subsidies. It would compensate the workers for increased productivity, thereby providing more purchasing power which would, of necessity, create a wider demand for textiles.

We are here obligated to enact laws designed to assist, not hinder, all those who are conscientious and trying to be honestly fair and decent. We are here obligated to enact laws primarily designed to advance the general welfare. In compliance with and in the spirit of that high obligation, I urge you to approve now this minimum wage of $1 per hour, while we at the same time pledge ourselves to be continuously and conscientiously concerned with the advancement of American living standards and national prosperity.

PROTECTING THE CIVIL RIGHTS OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, the ideal of equality under law has always been a great and distinctive American goal. The so-called Civil Rights Act of 1956 was designed to assist in the accomplishment of this great goal by strengthening the law-enforcement functions of the Federal Government in the entire area of civil rights.

I was, therefore, very happy to fulfill my legislative obligation in speaking and voting for this measure.

PROTECTING OUR LIBERTIES

(Excerpts from House speech, July 23, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is clear. It is to make more certain that rights guaranteed by the Constitution and laws of the United States will be enjoyed by all, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin.

It is directed at no particular section of America. Certainly no area of the country

can claim achievement of full equality under law. The Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives recognizes its distinct duty to enact wise legislation which will guarantee that the words of promise spoken by the Constitution will be fulfilled in every corner of the Nation. It is also realized that American leadership of the free world is aided greatly by practical demonstrations of our historic commitment to the ideal of equality under law.

I, therefore, sincerely hope that any temporary passions, prejudices, or partisanship will be put aside today in order that we may render a historical legislative accomplishment in our own national interest and also provide a legislative inspiration to all peoples everywhere on this blessed earth.

SLUM CLEARANCE AND DECENT HOUSING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, since being privileged to enter this House in 1947, the advancement of a sensible public housing slum clearance and urban redevelopment program has been of primary legislative concern to me. My concern has been ever based upon the conscientious conviction that the family is the basic unit of our national life, and the greatest encouragement for good family life and good citizenship is living in a decent home with healthful surroundings.

Although the only housing legislation that came before us was extremely limited and falling far short of acknowledged needs, I consider it a clear duty to vote and speak in favor of it in order to keep alive this most beneficial program in the interest of all Americans.

HOUSING BILL OF 1956

(Excerpts from House speech, July 25, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I very deeply regret that the manner in which this legislation is being presented to us today leaves no choice to those conscientious legislators who are vitally interested in trying to help enact a sound and adequate program to enable the multitudinous members of our low- and middle-income groups and the elderly to live in decent homes in accord with our Christian traditions. We have here unfortunately to choose between the most meager housing program that opponents of this objective can devise or no housing program at all.

We all realize that the basic problem of providing public housing cannot be severed from the problems of slum clearance and urban renewal programs. The 1950 census showed there were 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this Nation. Only a full public housing program coupled with a less restricted slum clearance and urban renewal program can eliminate this situation.

If we do not act on this measure before us, the Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance for veterans and home repair will die next September. If we do not accept this bill, the very modest authorized construction of 35,000 public housing units for the next 2 years will perish, along with the slum clearance and urban renewal program that goes hand in hand with it. The college housing program that has been advocated by our leading educators and that has proved so valuable is continued in this watered-down housing bill, as well as authorization for hospital construction that is in urgent need.

The token housing extension provisions of this bill will at least serve to keep the fundamental program alive. I urge you, then, to vote for it for that reason alone, while at the same time we dedicate ourselves to the expansion and improvement of it at the first opportunity in the future.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT

Mr. Speaker, the majority of our people sensibly realize that the best insurance against any misguided reception of false Communist propaganda by our Government employees is to wisely and reasonably extend to them equitable salary, retirement, and annuity treatment.

In that spirit, I urged the adoption of and spoke in favor of the revision of the postal and Federal employees retirement system that was finally approved by the Congress.

(Excerpts from House remarks, July 20, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is only ordinary practical commonsense and recognition of the facts of life that if our faithful postal workers and Government employees are encouraged, by a reasonable salary and retirement system, to meet their family obligations and face the future with a certain confidence, then there will be no doubt of their loyalty as good Americans and their repudiation of Communist propaganda temptation.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is of importance to remind this House that the last major revision of the Federal employees' retirement and annuity system was made in 1948. I do not believe it is necessary to remind the House that the cost of living and major changes in the pension and retirement systems of our commercial and industrial businesses have changed considerably since that date. The comparable systems within Federal Government employment have fallen far behind and are now completely outmoded.

Legislation to sensibly liberalize the retirement benefits and annuities of our postal and Federal employees while at the same time improving the overall financial soundness of the civil-service retirement fund is ready to be acted upon. The present setup is antiquated and far behind similar systems in the competing employment field of private enterprise. Our loyal and faithful Government employees are at the mercy of the Congress, unlike the employees of private business. It is the duty of the Congress to encourage Federal employment of persons of competence and character.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming array of authoritative testimony of factual record, including Presidential recommendation, could leave no question in the mind of a conscientious legislator that this Nation is faced with a dismaying shortage of classrooms and teachers for our schoolchildren. Legislation to grant reasonable Federal assistance to correct this catastrophic situation, which included provisions to prevent any possibility of Federal control of our schools, was presented to the Congress, and I executed my duty in speaking and voting for it.

THE NATION'S CHILDREN AND TEACHERS

(Excerpts from House speech, July 5, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, the astonishing and astounding facts now are that 18 percent of our schools are fire hazards, a third are health and safety hazards, and thousands of school buildings are more than 50 years old. Coupled with these distressing figures is the cold fact that the school enrollment figure in 1955–56 was 1,675,000 over that of the previous year. By 1959 it is reliably reported that the total school enrollment will be more than 38½ million children.

This admitted classroom shortage problem goes beyond and is much deeper than the restriction of facilities and materials. Obviously the root of the problem and the real cause for national concern is that a shortage of classrooms and classroom facilities deprives the Nation's youth of adequate educational opportunities. Limited classroom space and old, unsafe, and unhealthy buildings are not conducive to learning nor are they by any means an inspiration to the faithful teacher. If we ignore this critical problem our greatest asset and investment for the future—the Nation's youth—are continuing to be improperly trained for the tremendous responsibilities of leadership which someday will be theirs.

Associated with this classrom shortage is perhaps even the more important problem of the shortage of teachers. Enactment of a sound Federal aid to school construction bill will at least result, indirectly, in helping to make the teaching profession more attractive. Taking advantage of Federal aid for construction will permit State and communities to allocate more of their education budgets to the increase of teachers' salaries.

I would be the first to protest any unwarranted intrusion, or danger of intrusion, by the Federal Government into the supervision and direction of the schools of this country. I am extremely happy that the committee has seen to it that this legislation carries provisions that preclude any possibility of Federal control of our schools.

I earnestly hope and pray that the majority of this membership can find it in their minds and hearts to support the Constitution while they are supporting the Nation's children and that we can in conscience and in patriotism preserve the Nation and provide for our youth by adopting this Federal school construction measure which is essentially good for all of America.

OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

Mr. Speaker, I have listed above a recitation of my words and actions with respect to the legislation which perhaps achieved the most prominence and publicity in this current Congress. There were other legislative subjects that may have been less publicized but were as equally or more important to the great numbers of American citizens whom they would directly affect.

I feel it is my duty, therefore, to present a résumé of the convictions I expressed on some of these more outstanding issues:

(Excerpts from House remarks, June 28, 1956)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as we move into the last few weeks of this Congress, it is most distressing to me that some very vital and important legislative proposals affecting large segments of our American people remain unacted upon.

ASSISTANCE TO ECONOMICALLY DEPRESSED AREAS

For instance, there is legislation pending to provide assistance to communities, industries, enterprises, and industries in areas needing redevelopment to enable them to expand and adjust their productive activity to alleviate substantial unemployment by providing new employment opportunities for developing and expanding existing facilities and resources without reducing employment in other areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, up in my area where inroads are constantly being made because of cheap foreign importations and sectional competition upon the textile, machinery, and armament manufacturing industries, among others, and their associated employment opportunities, there is vital need of sensible legislation of this type.

I sincerely trust that this Congress will not close without corrective legislative attention being devoted to the solution of this problem affecting my own region, and so many other regions of the country.

Because of the hardships continuously being visited upon the textile industry, I

earnestly hope that the Congress will go on record with an expression of concern over the disintegration of this most essential industry because of increasing foreign cheap importations and also urge the President to use his emergency powers to control the excess of these damaging imports.

IMMIGRATION REVISION

Mr. Speaker, I very earnestly also hope that this Congress will not adjourn without enacting revision and correction of some of the injustices that are contained in our present immigration laws.

I urge the adoption of sensible amendments wihch will permit the pooling of unused immigration quotas and their use by those countries such as Greece, Italy, Poland, and others, whose quotas are vastly oversubscribed and impose abnormal waiting periods of several years' duration upon otherwise qualified and desirable applicants.

It would be an added injustice not to renew the provisions of our outstanding Refugee Relief Act and permit the many qualified thousands of refugee-relief applicants from the Iron Curtain countries to come to the United States who otherwise will have little hope of ever entering America.

Among other injustices that should be corrected are the present exclusion of certain tubercular immigrant applicants who are members of American families and a great many who are barred because of conviction of a felony in another country when the same offense would not be considered a felony in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that this Nation itself was founded almost altogether by refugees and displaced persons. In advancing our position of world leadership in these perilous days, we can speak more convincingly for freedom everywhere when we have done our Christian utmost to give real freedom to those now faced with Communist extinction. Security-screened and qualified refugees are the kind of people in whose behalf the original American tradition of asylum was estabilshed and whose immigration to these shores has enriched our country from its earlies days right up to this hour.

I hope and trust that we will be granted an opportunity to enact sensible legislative amendments to expand and correct our present immigration laws before this Congress terminates.

OUR OBLIGATION TO THE VETERAN AND DEPENDENTS

Mr. Speaker, I and a great many other Members of this House have become deeply disturbed by the increasing publicity and propaganda questioning the continuation and cost-of-living adjustments and other benefits being reasonably accorded our veterans.

It is strikingly noticeable that the sources of these doubts about our obligation to war veterans have no hesitancy or question at all about the wisdom of continuing to provide billions of dollars in subsidies to carry on our faltering foreign-aid program. Some of these people even seem to prefer the vacillating actions of Tito to the loyalty of the American veteran and his family. They seem to think that an astronomical gambling investment in Tito is more valuable than a reasonable investment to fulfill our duty to these American patriots who have been disabled in war and whose families have been visited with extreme material hardship because of military service sacrifices.

I do not believe that the people of this country now wish to turn their backs in forgetfulness of the substantial sacrifices made by our war veterans and their dependents in protecting this Nation from armed enemies. On the contrary, I believe the great majority of the American people realize there is only one safeguard for this Nation in time of emergency, and that is the willingness of American men and women to fight and die to preserve our national security. I am sure they further understand that the efficiency of our fighting men is governed by the morale of their families and dependents. In these tense days of international turmoil, it is not only just but patriotically wise to inspire the veteran of the future with the example of our real concern for the veteran of the past.

Mr. Speaker, there is legislation pending to extend farm, home, and business loan guaranties for our veterans, to continue vocational rehabilitation adjustment assistance, to raise the ratings and pensions of the disabled war veterans and dependent allowances, as well as income limitations, in accord with our increased basic living costs. There is pending legislation to extend simple justice to Spanish-American War veterans and their widows, who are trying to eke out a bare existence on some $54 per month.

These, and other beneficial measures, such as the so-called War Orphans Education Act, should be enacted without delay. Most of the pending bills are substantially sound and beneficial and are intended to discharge our just obligation to the war veteran and his family. I shall continue to work in support of their enactment as the best investment we can make to insure our national security.

SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE PRESERVED

Mr. Speaker, it has always been an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

It is perhaps not surprising that the various department heads in the executive branch have not been overwhelmingly zealous in presenting a program to us to aid the small business of the Nation. That, nevertheless, does not discharge the Congress from its own legislative responsibility.

There are a great many sound measures to grant vitally needed help to small business pending in the Congress, and I sincerely trust that they will not be passed over in the adjournment rush.

It is true that we extended the life of the Small Business Administration last year, and I am proud of the part I had in the original enactment of that beneficial legislation, but thus far that is about all that has been done for small business.

There remain many additional conditions affecting the vitality of small business that can be at least partially removed by applicable legislation.

One of the substantial helps we could give to small business would be to adopt a measure amending the Robinson-Patman Act to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission. It appears the Supreme Court misinterpreted the original intention of Congress, and the objective, therefore, is to reemphasize and make clear that intention. The original purpose, and the purpose of current legislation, is simply to grant small business equality of opportunity and remove present discrimination that is allowed against him. It is designed to prohibit the larger concerns from getting preferential discounts, secret rebates, and under-the-counter deals which are discriminatory against the average merchant. The legislation is meant to apply only where there is interstate commerce, and its end objective is to guarantee to the man who buys his goods for resale that he will get the same price from the supplier that this supplier grants to his competitors under the same terms and conditions. It permits differences in prices in accord with the normal rules of good business practice, but it prevents the good-faith defense where the effect of the discrimination may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly. This is sound legislation in the American tradition and it should be passed by the Congress.

There are other bills pending which recognize problems associated with the suffocation visited upon small business when a few giant corporations control raw materials, processing, and manufacturing segments of industry and a large number of very small business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers are two prime examples. It appears clear from the evidence that legislation is urgently needed to restrict these giant suppliers' freedom to unjustly and summarily cancel dealers' franchises without good cause, and we particularly need to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow certain policies or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by these corporations.

There is a further need for legislation to strengthen our antimerger laws in these days of increasing tendency of great corporate mergers with resultant harmful limitations upon our traditional competitive enterprise system. These laws should be made more strengthened by helpful amendments, and the penalties for criminal violation should be greatly increased.

The Congress should also do all in its power to encourage and request the executive branch to permit small business to participate in defense contracts. It has been authoritatively revealed that in the last 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. Therefore, it is certainly in order for this Congress to enact legislation of stronger intent and requirement for the award of Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids so tha small business will have a better opportunity. The Department of Defense in all fairness should itself initiate a program of negotiating contracts with small business whenever such contracts are suitable.

Another field in which remedial action could be taken is in the tax setup affecting small business. Action should be taken to make the corporate form of business more attractive taxwise to small firms now existing as partnerships so that these units could accumulate retained business earnings at corporate rates and taxes on smaller corporations should be investigated in order to work out a system of graduated or progressive rates similar to that applying to individual income. There is much that can be done to help small business in this tax field and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the subject their prompt and earnest attention.

If we neglect the health of small business in this Nation we are betraying our duty of preserving the economic integrity of the Nation; let us then assume our rightful obligation to grant reasonable assistance to small business by the prompt enactment of suitable legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

Just a few of the problems that still challenge our legislative conscience are the enactment of a civil-rights program, school-construction aid, adequate housing and slum clearance, and flood-disaster insurance. These problems, as well as many others, very deeply affect the general welfare and progress of the country. It is my judgment that we are morally bound to remain in session until these vitally important problems are legislatively solved for the good of all Americans.

BILLS INTRODUCED IN 84TH CONGRESS

Mr. Speaker, limitations of space and time prevent me from further dwelling on multitudinous other bills that were discussed, but I shall personally report to my people on them at length and in detail, during the next several months.

However, this summary would be highly inadequate if I did not list, in part, some of the bills I introduced in the 84th Congress. They follow:

House Concurrent Resolution 5, a concurrent resolution favoring universal disarmament.

House Concurrent Resolution 208, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the loss of the famous Wayside Inn.

House Joint Resolution 468, a joint resolution to establish a Northeastern United States Watershed Development and Flood Protection Commission.

H. R. 355. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue post-high-school education.

H. R. 356, a bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor.

H. R. 357, a bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy.

H. R. 358, a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year.

H. R. 359, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H. R. 360, a bill to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference on their identification tags.

H. R. 361, a bill to provide for emergency Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities urgently needed because of overcrowding, and to encourage full and efficient use of State and local resources in meeting school construction needs.

H. R. 2385, a bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties.

H. R. 2970, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which women may become entitled to benefits thereunder.

H. R. 5110, a bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday.

H. R. 6094, a bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped.

H. R. 7184, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to make temporary provision for making payments in lieu of taxes with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments.

H. R. 7753, a bill to provide that no fee shall be charged by any branch of the Defense Department for furnishing copies of official documents related to a veteran's or a serviceman's military record.

H. R. 8342, a bill to authorize the construction of flood protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extraordinary floods.

H. R. 8343, a bill to authorize the construction of flood protection measures, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have recently occurred as the result of extreme rainfall accompanying hurricane storms.

H. R. 10744, a bill to provide for national flood insurance and reinsurance.

H. R. 10950, a bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits.

H. R. 10995, a bill to establish a sound and comprehepsive national policy with respect to the fisheries; to create and prescribe the functions of the United States Fisheries Commission; to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy.

H. R. 11281, a bill to extend for an additional 6 years the authority to make, guarantee, and insure loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

A NECESSARY PERSONAL NOTE

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago, following my release from active military service, I presented my qualifications to the voters of the Fourth Congressional District in Massachusetts for the honor and privilege of representing them in the United States Congress. They accepted me in November of 1946 and reelected me to each succeeding Congress.

Since the day of assuming the responsibilities of Congressman, I have conscientiously worked to justify that confidence and trust. The full facilities of my office have been energetically and courteously extended, at all times, for personal service to my constituents. I have cooperated, on every occasion, with the community agencies, social, fraternal, and racial organizations of my district in the promotion of their various objectives.

The expressed wishes of the majority of the people I represent, and a thorough study of the issues involved, have been the foundation for my judgment and action on legislation to advance the best interests of my district and the Nation.

In return for the trust and confidence expressed in me, I consider it a major part of my duty to present this summary of my voting record on domestic and foreign legislative issues to the people of my district.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUNSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. * * * Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. * * * Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless.

Accomplishments of 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the 2nd session of the 84th Congress has ended. I would not want the occasion to pass, however, without expressing my views about the accomplishments of this Congress.

This was a very hard-working, constructive Congress. I am extremely proud of the record we have made. There has been no cold war of partisan politics, as the President once predicted there would be if the Democrats gained control of the 84th Congress. Quite the contrary. The Democratic leadership has cooperated with the President at every turn, and the President has the Democrats to thank for putting across many of the vital parts of his legislative program.

Our sole objective in every case was to do what we thought best for the American people. Party considerations were secondary, as they always are with the Democrats in power.

In legislating in the field of foreign affairs, the Democrats were as nonpartisan as it was possible to be. I recall that the first major act in the 1st session of the 84th Congress was to pass a resolution, at the President's request, authorizing him to use American Armed Forces in defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. Many of us felt the President needed no new legislation from Congress to exercise the authority given him by the Constitution, but we, nevertheless, complied with his request.

Subsequently, and over vigorous opposition from many Republicans, we passed legislation extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for 3 years. The Republican-controlled 83d Congress refused to approve this measure despite the recommendation of President Eisenhower. The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress carried out the President's request.

The 84th Congress also gave the President substantially what he asked to continue the foreign-aid program. There were differences over details, but not partisan differences.

In the field of national defense, Congress went even further than the President had requested in making money available for our Armed Forces. We

voted $900 million more than the administration asked for airpower. The Democrats are determined that America shall remain ahead of the Russians in the development of speedy long-range airplanes and ocean-spanning missiles.

The Democratic record in the field of domestic legislation was outstanding in the interests of the American people. We set in motion the greatest road-building program in history, a program providing for 41,000 miles of interstate highways to crisscross the Nation. We increased Federal contribuitons for all forms of roads, primary, secondary, and urban. The American motorist is now assured of having better, safer highways on which to satisfy his urge to go places and see things.

We extended and liberalized the social-security program by reducing the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 and providing for the payment of social insurance benefits to the disabled at age 50. We provided for an increase in old-age assistance payments of at least $5 per month where the States take advantage of the increase in Federal funds available.

I was sorely disappointed when the President vetoed the original farm bill passed by the Democratic Congress. We Democrats felt that by returning to 90-percent price supports on basic commodities, we would be guaranteeing the farmer an immediate increase in his purchasing power. The need for boosting farm income was so apparent that there seemed no justification for the attitude taken by the President and Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson.

However, we finally worked out a soil-bank program which will be beneficial to farmers in the long run, but we had a hard time selling even this program to the administration at the outset. Secretary Benson first rejected it, but he ultimately changed his mind when he saw the seriousness of the farmer revolt against the policies of the Republican administration. While the soil bank alone falls short of the well-rounded program the farmers have a right to expect, and while I am not satisfied with the way it has been administered with respect to the 1956 crop, it will be of some help. I believe it can and will be improved by a later Congress.

We raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour despite administration pressure to hold the line at 90 cents an hour. We provided the Federal authority necessary to aid private enterprise to meet the demand for new homes, and we made the money available to finance distribution of the marvelous new vaccine to combat infantile paralysis.

In the development of the Nation's natural resources, this Congress took many important steps forward. I was proud that we voted the money to get started on the big Arkansas Basin development program, a tremendous undertaking that will mean much in the industrial growth of eastern Oklahoma. Although the administration dragged its feet every inch of the way, we were able to get Congress to vote $1.5 million for getting construction underway on Eufaula Dam on the Canadian River.

As a matter of fact, a record number of public-works projects was approved by Congress for my congressional district in southeastern Oklahoma. I am delighted at the prospects for business activity which are bound to result from approval of these various projects.

The complete record of accomplishments by this Congress is much too long for me to attempt to cover in these remarks. Hundreds of beneficial measures were passed, and I note that even our Republican colleagues have conceded that we accomplished a great deal. I cannot conceive of anyone accusing the 84th Congress of being a do-nothing Congress, or of sustaining the charge that the Democratic Congress did not cooperate with the Republican President.

I personally am extremely disappointed that we failed to get through the 84th Congress the bill providing Federal aid for the construction of schools. I strongly favored this bill, and I regret very much that it became involved in the conflict of views over segregation. I regarded this as a completely extraneous issue, and it proved to be the vehicle through which Republican opponents of Federal aid to schools were able to kill the bill. Without the so-called Powell amendment attached to it, this bill would have been approved by the House and probably enacted into law. Republicans by a large majority voted for the Powell amendment, and then against the bill. They achieved a temporary victory, but I am confident that they will not be able to stymie this constructive legislation for very long.

In spite of what happened on these individual issues, I maintain that the over-all record of this Congress is excellent. I think history will so show. I have no hesitation whatever in predicting that on the basis of the very fine record made by this Congress, Democrats will win control not only of Congress, but the White House, in the election next fall.

A Stronger America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRONGER AMERICA

Mr. President, as the 84th Congress moves into history, the people of our Nation may now assess its progress, measure its failures, and—come November—prepare their own decision on American government for the years ahead.

We are a nation of free peoples, unfailingly determined to maintain our freedom and to advance the cause of a just peace in the world. In exercising that determination, our Federal Government will be judged by our people in varying ways and differing opinions, brought about, I suppose, by different interpretation of facts, by differing capacities to judge, by sectional background, and, sometimes, by narrow partisanship.

But we are all in the same boat together. The problems which face us and our children affect all of us, and will affect all of us, in precisely the same manner, no matter whether or how they may be solved. The gravest menace to free peoples, here and elsewhere, is international communism, and its constant threat of aggression. That threat falls equally on all of us whether we are Republicans or Democrats, and whether we live in New York, Illinois, Florida, or California. That threat remains, despite the change in the Soviet approach which has tended to play down the danger of the Communist menace to freedom and which, alas, has been a narcotic to some Americans.

Earlier this year, the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, warning against the continuing menace of communism, said, "We should not now be lulled into complacency." There, indeed, is the lurking danger to the spirit of our people. The President has referred to the Soviet policy of "zig and zag." So it is. This Nation and all our people must be awake to the dark menace of slave government which frankly confesses that world domination continues to be its goal.

History will give great credit to the 84th Congress for working in almost complete unison with the executive branch of our Government in facilitating a more dynamic approach to our problems in this all-important field.

To be sure, there have been areas of disagreement. Congress and the Executive share this high responsibility. But it is fair to say they have not been partisan in nature. Foreign policy decisions in this body have been registered by bipartisan majorities on the basis of what is best for all the people of the United States.

In the closely related field of American defense, I have approved, with my vote, President Eisenhower's overall program. Carefully continued, it represents the considered opinions of our military leaders, concurred in by the Chief Executive, himself preeminently skilled in this field.

Here is the judgment of Admiral Radford on the 1956 recommendations, who told me, a short while ago, it is precisely his view now:

"I feel as of today that we are better prepared to meet an emergency than we ever have been during my service in the Armed Forces. We have a flexible combination of land, sea, and air forces with a wide variety of weapons and capabilities, including nuclear, which in my opinion is fully adequate for the security of the United States. We have strategic air forces and carrier task forces which are unmatched by any other nation. We have modern jet tactical air forces which can carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending on what the target requires. We have Army and Marine Corps ground forces consisting of well over a million men.

"In fact, the United States forces we plan to maintain are the most powerful, individually by service and collectively as a team, that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war. These forces are fully adequate to perform all essential tasks in the initial stages of a shooting war, global or otherwise, and they constitute an ample base which will permit a rapid and orderly buildup when and if that should become necessary."

Our country enjoys a great prosperity. More people are gainfully employed today than ever before. The total income of American families reached a record high of $288

billion last year. The increase in the number of business concerns last year was larger than any year since 1948. Farm prices have recovered from last winter's low levels. Our Government this past year has lived within its revenues for the first time in several years, despite two tax reductions.

I do not want to paint too rosy a picture. But I can truthfully observe that we're in pretty good shape here at home, and we intend to keep it that way.

OUR NATION STRENGTHENED

Looking at the domestic scene closer, the roots of our American economy have been fertilized and fed by several significant actions of this Congress. The session just ended brightened the prospects for happiness, security, health, and opportunity for the future of generations now alive and others yet to be born.

Although our record of legislative achievement could have been better and more substantial in several respects, the United States is in a stronger position, as a consequence of measures enacted in 1956 to contribute the leadership for which the free world looks to our Nation.

Among the more progressive and constructive pieces of legislation enacted by the 84th Congress in its 2d session are:

The soil-bank program, which will conserve irreplaceable resources while supplying a solid floor under our agriculture.

Generous appropriations for the utilization and protection of other natural resources, including water, timber, minerals, and campgrounds.

The most ambitious and worthwhile highway program ever conceived.

Liberal support for the Armed Forces and their personnel, including new and expanded installations for greater security of America.

More realistic benefits for veterans and the aged, disabled, and needy Americans who must look to the social-security system for much of their sustenance.

Continuation of Federal financial aid to school districts plagued by phenomenal population growth directly due to Federal activities.

Through all of these measures, broad in scope and effect, the constantly growing State of California will be aided and benefited.

In a number of other instances, this administration and this Congress have been of further specific assistance to the State of which I am a native son. Our California people readily and willingly assume their obligations, as a member of our Union, to work in partnership with the National Government and will perform their duties so that a wholesome atmosphere of democracy and opportunity will be waiting for our children and our children's children.

For the very definite advantage of my home State, the Congress voted substantial sums of money and took other actions to rehabilitate both the areas and the unfortunate individuals heavily damaged by last winter's unseasonal and uncontrollable storms. I am grateful, and I assure my colleagues that the people of California feel warm appreciation, that the administration, in response to appeals which I submitted to the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget, realistically increased appropriation requests so that work on authorized projects can be accelerated, long-planned but unstarted projects can be initiated, and surveys and examinations, vital for the safety of mushrooming communities, can be undertaken.

WATER PROBLEMS RECOGNIZED

The recognition by this Congress of the duty to cooperate with State and local agencies in solving water problems—from both excesses and deficits of water—is a major development which will strengthen America. All of the legislation of particular aid to California accords entirely with Federal policy and precedents. In virtually every instance our people will be carrying a considerable burden in the form of cash contributions to eventual realization of long-standing plans. Without hesitation I declare the appropriations made this year will yield hearty dividends through conservation and better use of often-scarce water as well as through averting future tragedy and economic loss from excessive rainfall and snowmelt.

A prime example of the benefits for the Nation, as well as for my State, is given by the Ventura project, now being built under terms of Public Law 423, which I had the opportunity to introduce. Besides authorizing this $26,750,000 undertaking, almost every cent of which will be repaid to the Federal Treasury, the Congress saw the need for speedy construction and provided $6,400,000 to get work going without delay. The schedule, thanks to the very material amount of money now available, will make possible impounding of water beginning in 1959. The project will firm up supplies for a thriving industrial, chemical-producing, and oil-refining city, and will facilitate production in the surrounding area of widely desired specialty crops of fruits, nuts, and vegetables.

The new water pollution law, of which I was a cosponsor, gives valuable added weapons for Federal and other agencies endeavoring to clean up our streams, counter the mounting demand for waste disposal facilities, and offset the occasional deficiencies of nature. I was happy to have this Congress vote promptly money to carry out the program contemplated by the legislation which I participated in framing as a member of the Public Works Committee.

Continuance of the dramatic program of investigating possibilities of influencing weather by chemical and mechanical means is another commendable achievement which can enrich the lives of people across our land. Further potential relief for critical areas of the Nation seems likely from continuing research into methods of converting saline water into fresh. Because I thoroughly appreciate the precious worth of water for farms, for industries, and for homes, I cosponsored the legislation relating to both projects in the confidence that our expenditures will produce a return of real value to agriculture, industry, and many other groups in our society.

The happiness, and I feel sure, the health of Americans in scores of sections will be promoted through the recent appropriation of the largest sum ever provided by Congress to track down and eventually, I trust, extinguish a relatively new menace, smog.

To carry on the research and experimental work being done under the law which I had the honor to author last year, the present Congress has voted an unprecedented $2,740,000 for the current fiscal year. With these funds, chemists, biologists, engineers, and meteorologists, among other scientists, will pursue lines of inquiry which may enable bedeviled communities to cleanse the air our people, their animals, and plants must have for existence.

SMOG MENACE ATTACKED

As a result of the enactment of the Kuchel Air Pollution Act by the first session of this Congress, the United States Public Health Service has initiated a far-reaching program of research, technical assistance, and training in the field of community air pollution. This is the first nationwide attack on the serious and spreading problem of smog, fumes, and irritants. With the $1,785,000 provided for the last fiscal year, inquiry into engineering, physical science, and health aspects of air pollution was started within laboratories of the Health Service, Weather Bureau, Bureau of Mines, and Bureau of Standards. Supplementing these agencies, an increasing number of investigators, supported financially by research grants at universities and scientific institutions throughout the country, are attacking the mysteries and troubles on the local scene.

More than 250 requests for field assistance have been received from State and local air pollution control agencies and the Public Health Service is endeavoring to meet as many of these requests as possible. Technical training courses are now being developed at the Taft Center in Cincinnati for operating personnel of these agencies and a field station is due for Los Angeles in the near future. With the $955,000 increase in appropriations for the current year, expansion of these promising activities is planned, together with the launching of grants-in-aid to States and communities for training and demonstration projects.

With some of the most varied terrain and climatic conditions which can be found on our continent, California lamentably suffers from time to time from excesses of rainfall and snowfall just as some parched regions unceasingly struggle to obtain sufficient water supplies. Therefore, I point out gratefully that this Congress not only moved speedily and promptly to relieve and repair damage inflicted last winter but imaginatively acted to afford long-range protection for our people against floods.

FORCES OF NATURE CHALLENGED

The 1956 omnibus flood-control, rivers and harbors, beach erosion law is a case in point, a cheering illustration of the way forces of Federal, State, and local governments can be marshalled for a concerted attack on a problem too large for the residents of any affected area to solve on their own. I note particularly the authorization for investigations into and reports on the flood danger and means of counteracting it in the Sacramento River basin and on assorted streams such as Pescadero Creek, San Gregorio Creek, Redwood Creek, in South San Francisco, near Burlingame, and in Contra Costa County.

Additional flood-prevention works, safeguarding areas not yet protected by the many structures and controls in existence or under construction, have been authorized for some hard-pressed sections of California. Among worthwhile undertakings now approved for building with Federal funds are Buchanan and Hidden Reservoirs in the San Joaquin Basin, on the Sacramento River between Chico Landing and Red Bluff, on the Eel, Kaweah, Tule, and Feather Rivers. A conspicuous instance of Federal willingness to be partners with the States and local agencies is the projected multipurpose Oroville Dam to be built on the last-named stream. The principle that the National Government should aid with cash contributions measured by the degree of flood protection provided by such structures is sound and should be carried further in succeeding sessions of Congress.

PROTECTION FOR THE FUTURE

I was especially happy to have opportunities to speak and vote for the measure setting up a system of disaster insurance. By this legislation finally approved just before adjournment, Congress took a definite step forward in safeguarding our people against painful losses from forces mankind cannot control. I anticipate this statute will be considered a milestone when the Federal Government joins hands with forward-looking private enterprise and with the States in affording all endangered Americans a chance to indemnify themselves against possible catastrophic losses of homes and other possessions through rampages of nature.

The new law, of which I was a cosponsor, allowing the Army engineers discretionary funds to construct small flood-prevention works, is an undeniable contribution toward a stronger America. We provided a flexible tool with which this alert and determined branch of the Army can supplement the major projects which rightly must be specifically and individually authorized by stat-

ute. Certainly an expenditure of up to $10 million annually for debris basins, retarding dams, and channels on tributary streams and in isolated canyons costing up to $400,000 apiece will be a prudent use of the people's money for the people's welfare. The tremendous benefits from this type of undertaking already have been demonstrated in Los Angeles County, where funds I asked the Senate to approve have financed a number of such developments.

The provision of money to replenish the disaster loan fund and the emergency highway repair fund was another related and necessary move by this Congress. Californians in more than a dozen counties will be aided in rebuilding after the violence wreaked on the northern and central sections of our State only a few months ago.

The philosophy that the National Government must aid the people in tasks which are too heavy for single communities or loosely knit groups has been demonstrated significantly in the increased appropriations for forest-fire suppression and prevention, for which the Senate was notably generous in responding to an appeal I helped present. I cannot even hazard a guess at the number of our citizens who also will be grateful for the increased funds to carry out programs providing more campgrounds, highways, museums, public utilities, and other urgent facilities in our remarkable national parks and national forests.

By voting nearly $10 million over prior year levels, this Congress gave real impetus to the Mission 66 program in the park system, which embraces such a large amount of land in my State. And boosting by nearly $1 million the allotment for national forest facilities, we have started chopping away at the backlog of demands from millions of persons who derive pleasure and inspiration from these spectacular reservations, many of which are in California.

From a materialistic point of view, Californians also feel a debt to this Congress for substantial appropriations for this fiscal year, including more than $8 million to improve rivers and harbors and beaches, well over $55 million to further our irrigation and reclamation projects, and for nearly $32,500,000 to prosecute essential flood-control construction. An item of nearly $800,000 to conduct water surveys in our bountiful central valleys will lay a foundation for planning that in time will mean the most beneficial and fruitful utilization of land and water, the averting of shortages that could seriously retard our growth, and industrial expansion that invigorates the national, as well as the State, economy.

FARMERS, WORKERS, AND INDUSTRIES HELPED

California farmers, like the men and women elsewhere whose livelihood comes from agriculture, agree that the new farm law is a sound move toward a solution of the problem which has perplexed and burdened many segments of our Nation during recent years. The reassurance already is being noted, as witness the reports of tremendous numbers of farmers signing up to participate in this forward-looking program. When the normal influences of supply and demand have maximum latitude to operate and when the soil bank is functioning as intended, we should be able to glimpse an end of price-depressing surpluses that have been such a painful financial drain and deterrent to individual initiative.

One branch of our unique California agriculture will profit in particular from constructive efforts of the Congress to assist our people. By exempting fruits and specialty crops from requirements of the Cargo Preference Act, we have thrown open new doors to potential markets abroad. Although a confirmed believer in the so-called 50–50 law designed to bolster America's indispensable merchant marine, I believe this waiver on behalf of growers of citrus, grapes, and other fruits was a warranted exception from that fundamentally wise requirement that half of our Government-financed surpluses going abroad should move in American-flag vessels.

The farm problem in several respects highlights the importance and effect of our trade policies. I maintain that our trade-relations legislation should not be employed to damage any segment of our economy. That is why I was so determined to have this Congress enact comprehensive fisheries legislation. That is why I have been pressing upon our executive branch the fact that administrative action is imperative to assure our fruitgrowers, particularly those raising figs and dates, a fair share of their home markets.

The fisheries legislation will be regarded in the future as a distinct advance in the way of assuring sound and coordinated policies affecting both a vital industry and millions of Americans who turn to our streams and lakes, our shorelines, and coastal waters for recreation and relaxation. In a commendable spirit of compromise, the Congress recognized the seriousness of the problem affecting our offshore commercial fisheries and composed differences between those who fish for sport and pleasure and those whose sustenance comes from the sea.

The record of this Congress for labor and for education is not too gratifying. I was glad to have a hand in obtaining more funds for railway safety, which will benefit workers and travelers alike on our railroad system and to vote for extension of the law that enables the Federal Government to share the burden of maintaining and building schools in communities where the school population has jumped astoundingly because of Federal activities. The latter assistance is of particular importance to my State, because California has 501 Federal properties officially classified as causing impact on local governments and 326 districts last year obtained aid for operations while 147 were assured funds for new buildings.

The past session saw marked and encouraging progress in launching a coast-to-coast program of urgent Federal construction under the Lease-Purchase Act which I had the opportunity of helping to write and manage in the 83d Congress. Besides assuring California of 3 desperately needed multipurpose structures in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Sacramento and 2 much-wanted post offices in National City and Bellflower, this novel means of providing quarters for Federal agencies will provide a great amount of employment and put tremendous sums of money in circulation in communities all over the Nation. Plans are in preparation for other cities in California and across the country.

The scope of this effort is difficult to conjecture but is hinted by the fact that the Senate Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, approved 120 separate projects costing in excess of $638 million in the session just finished. The 5 California projects will entail an expenditure of nearly $87 million.

The sympathetic understanding of Congress for the troubles and ordeals of a unique American industry which has its roots in California resulted in agreement that the war-inspired admissions tax is punitive to motion-picture exhibitors, producers, and patrons. With owners of approximately 5,000 theaters just keeping heads above water and a shocking number still operating at a loss, it was just and fitting that Congress should waive the 10-percent levy on tickets costing under 90 cents. This relief, as pointed out to the Finance Committee, will mean also greater amusement and entertainment opportunities to immense numbers of families who must figure closely where their dollars are spent.

Another important and distressed California industry—ship building and repair—received encouragement from two actions in this last session; extension for 2 more years of the Emergency Ship Repair Act, which I cosponsored, and enactment of the measures requiring periodic inspection of shipyards to determine their defense capabilities will strengthen an indispensable feature of our fourth line of national defense.

California shipyards were invaluable in creating the bridge of vessels which contributed spectacularly to victory in World War II. They must not be allowed to wither away and expire.

By authorizing further modernization of ships in our mothball fleet, the Congress assured that a nucleus of trained labor can be kept employed at some California establishments. The new statute relating to industrial capability provides for allocation of work in a fashion which will make certain of an adequate mobilization base at strategic points in the country for national defense purposes or in event of a national emergency. Thus, I feel confident, responsible officials in the executive branch of the Government will follow a course designed to maintain the skills and facilities that are essential to the operation of the American merchant marine and the United States Navy.

There was one very distressing action by this Congress, the adoption of the loosely worded and ill-conceived dispersal amendment to the measure extending our Defense Production Act. I resisted this hastily presented deceleration to the best of my ability, although I do not have—nor can any patriotic, thinking American—any objection to a sound policy that makes sure all our defense eggs are not in one vulnerable basket.

I intend to see that California is treated equitably and with understanding, because the industry in existence will be indispensable in event this Nation is assaulted by a hostile power. Authorities in the executive branch have stated this unfortunate legislation will not be interpreted in a manner inimical to our industry and that the application of the policy will not preclude establishment in our State of new enterprises such as the $40 million guided missile plant recently authorized to be erected on the outskirts of San Diego.

The time-tested social-security system has been expanded and improved, as have the laws affecting Federal employees. By raising the floor under old-age assistance, through increased Federal contributions, this Congress assured immediate benefits to elderly citizens grappling with the cost of living, and I was proud to join in pushing the amendment which finally was enacted. I am glad to say that Congress overwhelmingly adopted new proposals providing assistance to the disabled, and enabling women to begin receiving at the age of 62 the pensions toward which they have contributed. The Federal employees retirement benefits law, along with the measure protecting persons in the classified service against salary cuts in cases where jobs are realined through no fault of their own, will make public service more attractive and protect the 230,000 loyal Government workers who reside in California. These benefits bring our Government personnel system closer to what private industry provides for its employees.

BETTER HIGHWAYS IN VIEW

While recognition of the importance and complexity of water problems is a conspicuous achievement, the past session of Congress enacted another salutary and notable measure in launching the 13-year highway construction and modernization program.

On previous occasions I expressed grave concern about costly delay in tackling the pressing problem of inadequate highways. Because I have shuddered repeated at the toll of deaths and injuries and because I cannot tolerate the shameful wastes of time and money due to congestion and outmoded

roads, enactment of the 1956 highway law gives me much satisfaction.

The significance of highway modernization is obvious when one considers that California's area is virtually equivalent to the stretch of Atlantic seaboard between Massachusetts and South Carolina. Our farflung communities, divided into distinct basins by mountains and other topographical features, are linked in hosts of cases only by the paved road and the motor vehicle.

A Federal contribution of $268 million over the next 3 years for our interstate routes will go far toward setting in motion the men and machines which will straighten and widen and otherwise improve essential arteries of communication and transportation. With the increased Federal aid toward the cost of the Interstate System, California will be enabled to channel more of its revenues to other categories of highways that cannot longer be neglected and ignored.

I am convinced the only effective and prudent way to distribute Federal financial aid to the States is on the basis of measured and weighed need. That is why I originally supported President Eisenhower's proposal and why I voted against the Gore bill which, happily, the Congress rejected almost in entirety. The stopgap scheme for apportioning these moneys for the first 3 years can be tolerated because many States will require that much time to complete preliminaries, such as land acquisition and blueprinting. When a subsequent Congress gets this pay-as-you-ride program on the sound principle of demonstrated need, we can expect fast progress toward the kind of highway system our Nation must have for its security, prosperity, and happiness.

The requirement that the States adhere to the prevailing wage for workers on federally assisted projects is a wise precaution. Although some in our population condemn this principle, I enthusiastically joined in pushing the idea of applying the Bacon-Davis Act because I want labor and contractors alike protected against sweatshop working conditions and cutthroat competitors. Just as a laborer is worthy of his hire, so a conscientious contractor is entitled to equality of opportunity and knowledge that his rival must use the same yardstick in estimating costs.

A FEW DISAPPOINTMENTS

While I see much in the record of 1956 legislative achievement to cite with pride and satisfaction, the Congress just concluded must acknowledge it let down the American people in several disheartening instances.

I must and do earnestly deplore the refusal to enact a code of fair procedure for committee investigations and hearings. The resolution which I had the honor of cosponsoring to safeguard witnesses and innocent third parties regrettably died without even a cursory hearing by the Committee on Rules and Administration, despite promises and pledges that such a reform as a set of fair and realistic rules would be one of the first accomplishments of the 84th Congress. I beseech those who have the responsibility of leadership in the 85th Congress to discharge the obligation to provide guaranties against character assassination, destruction of reputations, browbeating, and unjust accusation.

The bottling up of civil-rights legislation, the bald refusal to even take testimony on measures which I and others put forward to promote the interests and maintain the dignity of minority groups of our population, is a great disappointment. Who can deny that the unrestricted right to vote, the privilege of invoking laws which are intended to protect each and every citizen, the sanctity of our democratic traditions should not be bulwarked by measures such as President Eisenhower advocated and numerous of us have introduced?

The continued degrading of Hawaii and Alaska, held forcibly in second-class citizenship because of partisan jealousy, is a cause for shame in looking back over the record of 1955 and 1956. With both parties committed to recognize these Territories as equals with the established States of our Union, there can be no convincing apology for the failure to enact statehood legislation for the loyal, hard-working residents of our mid-Pacific and Arctic possessions.

Realistic appreciation of the dire shortage of educational facilities is an undischarged debt and at the same time an inescapable duty awaiting the next Congress. Refusal to equip heavily burdened communities to supply the opportunity for the finest schooling to which every American child is entitled hardly can be a source of gratification to the membership of the 84th Congress. I sincerely trust that a year hence bipartisanship and true devotion to America and our future citizens will enable the 85th Congress to rise above the pettiness and jealousy that prevented enactment of a worthwhile program for Federal assistance in school construction and instruction.

GOING FORWARD RESOLUTELY

The unprecedented prosperity and the feeling of faith in the future which are America's fortunate lot have been bolstered and sustained by the labors of the 84th Congress. Despite occasional dark spots in our domestic economy and some ominous clouds on the foreign horizon, the conclusion of the 1956 session finds the United States proceeding boldly and confidently toward the objective of stable peace, pursuing the goal of unconquerable democracy, and maintaining a genuine appreciation of man's individuality and innate dignity.

Increasing Rates of, and Liberalizing the Basis for Payment of, Non-Service-Connected Pension and Service-Connected Compensation

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 26, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7886) to amend part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, disability pension awards.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking with much emotion. I have been listening to the debate this afternoon and wondering why always when legislation for veterans of our wars is presented there is raised the cry of economy. There always have been those who would place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger was gone.

It was so many, many years ago when the ragged and hungry veterans of Washington's army marched on the Congress of the Confederation petitioning for the payment of arrears of wages for services during the Revolutionary War. All they sought was money that was due them and that had been earned in battle service, money for clothes to wear against the biting cold and food to keep the spark of life alive.

Three members of that early Congress, resentful that veterans should dare to petition their lawmakers, demanded that the guns of the State militia of Pennsylvania be turned on the petitioners. They were among the first Congressmen in the history of our country to place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the last shot was fired and the danger ended.

Not unrelated is the fact that the leader of the trio, later to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, passed the years from Valley Forge to Yorktown as a member of a committee supervising expenditures. He was far away and safe from the suffering and fighting of campaigns. Sentiment to him was something to be measured by the tables in books of arithmetic, and to gratitude he applied the table of 0×0.

Not unrelated, either, is the fact that in the Constitutional Convention he had advocated "power given to the few to save them from being destroyed by the many" and bitterly opposed the abolition of the foreign slave trade. People who place the termination date of gratitude at the moment the danger is over are that way.

Three voices in that early Congress were raised to give to Washington's veterans not money for food but bullets for liquidation. But only three, Mr. Chairman. It always will be that way as long as our country remains the land of the free and the home of the brave. In the veins of a tiny minority in any generation there may course unnaturally ice water instead of red blood, but the overwhelming majority of our lawmakers and of our people will be responsive to instincts of sentiment and to the impulses of gratitude.

ECONOMY TALK A SMOKESCREEN

There are many places to effect economy. There are many ways of balancing the budget. I suspect that in all the turmoil that always attends the suggestion of something for the veterans is a smokescreen to cover the places where there should be economy and there is none and the ways where the budget should be balanced and is not.

The cruel fact is that there is no balancing the budget in the homes and in the lives that have been affected by war. When we wage war we do not weigh the cost and count pennies. We then do not talk of economy, even in the economy of human lives when military strategy requires the attaining of an objective at any cost. When we wage war instead of balancing the budget we make it a patriotic gesture to knock the budget into a cocked hat.

I know there are people, and good God-fearing men and women, who when the war is over want to forget it and get back to normal lives. There are people who when a tornado is over and their homes have been torn to the ground think in the same vein. It is a workable program when there is another home ready for occupancy, utterly unworkable when there is no other roof to find for protection. How do you get back to normal living when your home has been destroyed and there is no other home to which to go?

Mr. Chairman, let us be realistic. This committee is composed in large part of war veterans, many with outstanding combat records, among them the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], the great chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. We know that no soldier, sailor, or marine with any length of service returns after a war to exactly the same home, the same life, the same normality. War where the training is to kill and to protect against being killed is in violent conflict with the concepts of kindliness that are woven in the training of youth for normal living in a world of peace.

DISABLED VETERANS COME FIRST

First consideration always must be given our disabled veterans. The time I hope never will come when any decent American would deny them anything within our means and power.

But our moral obligation does not end with caring only for our war-connected disabled veterans. That would be the easy way out for those who wish to discharge an obligation with a maximum of economy and a minimum of honor.

Every day that I have been in the Congress, batting my head against the concrete VA wall trying to get for a constituent veteran that which I believe to be his due, I have had less respect for the usage of the term "nonservice connected." Judging from my own experiences, and those related to me by my colleagues, I feel conservatively safe in saying that in a large percentage of the cases where veterans have been turned down as having ailments classified as nonservice connected those same veterans would not now be suffering with the same ailments if they had never been called to war. It seems to me silly and stupid and worse in some many, many cases to try to fix the blame away from the place where ordinary commonsense would place it.

In far too many cases, and every member of this committee knows what I am saying is true, the term "nonservice connected" is used as a device to cheat a veteran who is actually a casualty of war to make a record of economy for someone who holds to the ice-cold rule that the termination date for gratitude is the moment the danger is gone. There are modern prototypes of those early Congressmen who demanded liquidation by bullets of the petitioning veterans of Washington's army.

PENSIONS BASED ON AGE AND NEED

There are other ways of liquidating veterans than by the fire of musketry of the militia. Starvation is one. The veterans of World War I are getting old. Pray, tell me, where can a man or woman at 65 find gainful employment? Everyone knows that it is getting increasingly difficult for a person past 40 to get even an interview in the personnel offices of most large employers. When industry slams the door in the face of a World War I veteran who has to work in order to live I suppose the prototypes of those early American Congressmen I have mentioned with shame would demand that Uncle Sam do likewise.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that the American people ever will take kindly to the suggestion of liquidation of veterans as the proper solution of the veteran problem. When any nation is run on the rule that the termination date of gratitude is the moment the danger is ended something fatal has happened to the moral fiber of the people of that nation and its decline and fall are inevitable.

The argument is advanced by many good and sincere men and women that in fairness to the other aged we cannot give pensions to our war veterans based upon age and need. They point out that the veterans of World War I and the veterans of World War II, who in time will reach the age of 65, constitute a large segment of our population. That is true, and the establishment of veteran pensions based upon age and need will open the door eventually for coverage of all aged persons. War veterans who gave the years of their youth to the defense of the Republic should be the first to be protected against want in their old age. That in honor and in gratitude having been done, the door will be opened for later legislation giving pensions to all citizens who are aged and in need. The first step is to discharge our moral obligation to the veterans. The rest will follow as day the night.

PENSIONS TO WAR DOLLARS

I have listened to much talk in the debate today from my colleagues who oppose liberal pension provisions about the staggering and impossible cost. I have not been impressed. I have not been impressed because I have before me some figures that have not been mentioned in this debate, some figures that are so hush-hush they never are carried even in a bill of appropriation. You will not find them in Public Law 467, the 1957 appropriations for the Treasury and the Post Office, but they are referred to in the report, which of course few of the American people ever see, let alone read. The figures are in what is described as the permanent indefinite appropriations.

These figures show that in 1957 about $7 billion of the taxpayers' money will go, not to paying for services and goods, but to paying interest on the national debt. I have not heard anyone say that $7 billion in meeting the legal obligations of war was fiscally unsound, that it would wreck the country. All the fire has been on the cost of meeting the moral obligations, and that cost would be tiny indeed compared with the $7 billion we pay as pensions to war dollars.

That is exactly what the $7 billion represent—pensions to war dollars. It was the material cost of World War I and World War II that plunged us so badly into debt. When war came we had to have both men and money. The men we drafted or accepted through enlistments; the dollars we borrowed. Inasmuch as both the men and the dollars served the purposes of war in the period of hostilities, both in a very true sense are war veterans. We pay $7 billion a year in pensions to war dollars, and you call it fiscal responsibility. When it is suggested that a very small part of $7 billion be paid in pensions, the charge of fiscal irresponsibility is hurled at those who think human war veterans are no less important than dollar war veterans.

TWO-FACED FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

Sometimes I think fiscal responsibility is a term someone invented to condone follies and condemn virtues. They hurl the charge of fiscal irresponsibility at the supporters of this bill for pensions for veterans, their dependents and their widows. But the providing of pensions for dollars to the tune of seven billion a year they call fiscal responsibility. Funny, is it not, how publicized respectability digs into the dictionary for a big word or two to blind commonsense?

Let us face the facts. Gratitude to veterans reflected in pension legislation is not threatening the Nation with bankruptcy. The cost of all now proposed, and more, would not make a dent in our wealth and our prosperous economy. The danger is in the seven billion a year that goes into paying pensions to war dollars. Someday the Congress will listen more attentively when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], admittedly the foremost authority on money in the Nation, talks on that subject. Meanwhile I hope our consideration of the bill now before us will proceed on a level of commonsense.

PRESERVING PRECIOUS TRADITIONS

Mr. Chairman, I have been speaking with great emotion. In my youth in the Northland were the boys in blue, in the Southland the boys in gray, the aging veterans of a war that ended 17 years before my birth. They were revered and beloved. No one in the North would have wished a veteran of Grant's army, who had given of his youth to preserve this Union, to suffer in his age from a want that in some measure at least could be relieved. In the South in every community and in every State there was similar concern for the veterans of Lee's army who in their youth had fought for the cause in which they believed.

It was in the very air of the world in which I grew up that this country of ours was a land where the virtue of gratitude was implanted in the Government itself as well as in the hearts of the people. I want to go to my grave in the assurance that our United States of America, now in the will of providence grown into world leadership and responsibility, will go on and on and on holding in all its acts of government to the virtues of a good man. And of those virtues that mark all good men and all good governments none is more enriching of character than that of gratitude. Honor and good conscience demand favorable action on the bill reported out by the committee.

WIDOWS OF SPANISH WAR VETERANS

I have spoken from the heart and from the experiences of one who has lived through 3 major wars in 2 of which I have had the privilege of participation. I have spoken for the cause of the veterans of all our wars. But now I wish especially to make some observations on the provision in the pending bill affecting the widows of the Spanish-American War.

The committee amendment providing increased pensions for Spanish War widows is the bill introduced by me at the request of and designation by the national legislative committee of the United

Spanish War Veterans. The Spanish War veterans ask nothing for themselves. Their concern is for the widows of their comrades who have departed this life.

The number of Spanish War widows is small. It is growing smaller every month. Soon there will be none remaining. They are indeed aged. For the most part they receive no social-security coverage. They are called upon to make heroic sacrifice of comforts and necessities to eke out existence on their piteously small pensions. Often they are forced to go without medicine so badly needed in the illnesses and the frailty of age. It is hard, my colleagues, in these days of high prices to find a corner under any roof and to buy the very minimum of food on pensions very slightly over $50 a month. I hope and pray that these widows have not looked in vain to the 84th Congress to vote an increase of their pension to $75 a month.

VA SAYS OLD WOMEN NEVER DIE

Upon what did the Veterans' Administration base its opposition to a pension increase to this handful of aged women? Let me read from VA's letter of disapproval:

> Since it is believed that this pension roll will be basically static for the next several years.

Mr. Chairman, that is plain asininity. Basically static? That is that women 70, 72, 74, 76, 78, some 80 and over need no attention and can wait for several years because, unlike all other human kind including the smart little brain in VA that thought up the idea of "basically static," they will go on just the same today as they were yesterday, the same tomorrow as they are today.

What VA says is that old women never die, never are ill, never have needs, just go rolling along. The fact is that in a few years there will be no Spanish War widows. There is nothing basically static in a pension roll composed of persons past the allotted threescore and ten. The Veterans' Administration owes an apology to the Congress of the United States for maintaining otherwise. I can assure VA there is no one in this or the other body so stupid as to fall for its argument that no relief should be given widows all passed threescore and ten because they constitute a class "basically static." It was an affront to the intelligence of the Congress that VA should have assumed such stupidity, and a public apology should be immediately forthcoming.

I regret that in the substitute bill of the great and beloved chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], there is no provision for Spanish War widows. I know how he feels personally. He has always shown a warm friendship for the Spanish War group and I wish him to know my deep appreciation of the many courtesies and helpful services he has given me. He is a great American and is respected and beloved by all his colleagues. Whatever were the legislative reasons that impelled him to omit the provision from his substitute bill I know if the decision were left to him whether these widows should receive the pension increase to $75 a month the prompt response would be "Yes."

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the great chairman of a great committee.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There were a lot of things in the substitute when it was prepared, which I thought should be in it. But, this is a substitute which I think could become law.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Sometimes for expediency, we barter away principle. Sometimes we trade the shadow for the substance. I should hate to feel that because the bill provides for these old women, these widows of the men who fought in the Spanish-American War more than half a century ago, it if passed would be vetoed or that it would not be passed by the other body.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. As I said earlier today, being chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not an easy job. But do you not think that our veterans' groups should have come in and made their No. 1 project legislation of that kind instead of coming in with a non-service-connected feature which is the least desirable of any kind of legislation that is before our committee? You know and I know that if they came in supporting this thing that you are talking about, it could have gone through without even a whistle. Do you not think that these veterans' groups should have come in before our committee and helped us to decide on the priority of these things and pick out the legislation which was needed the most, regardless of whether it was the smallest group, and try to get that legislation through.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Well, I do know, Mr. Chairman, that the veterans' groups going way back into the history of our country have done a great service for our Republic. Without them there never would have been any pension legislation for any soldier. They have done a great job. They make mistakes now and then, but all during the years they have been fighting for the veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Certainly I recognize the fact, and I know it is true. I think that this particular piece of legislation was not passed by convention. It was decided by a small group. I do not mean the group here in Washington. The group here in Washington represents every veterans' group, and they have a job. But, so far as I am concerned as chairman of the committee, the people representing the American Legion, the DAV, and the AMVETS, and the VFW, all have been fair, and they have done everything they could to be fair to me as chairman of the committee. But I think the American Legion came before our committee with 180 mandates. As far as I am concerned, they took the least desirable of all the mandates for their No. 1 piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, may I have some additional time?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman such time as he may desire.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what has the top priority in the recommendations of the veterans' organizations. I understand that the American Legion has been concerned in getting a pension for veterans of World War I based on age and need. I think that is a perfectly proper position to take. Now, I also believe in the high principles of, and have great respect for the membership of the AVC. I am an active member of that organization, which is doing an outstanding job in good citizenship. I might say that while I understand AVC does not agree with me on the subject, no member of AVC has ever questioned the consistency of my position that as a Spanish-American War veteran, I think the veterans of World War I on reaching 65 should receive the same kind of pension as is received by Spanish-American War veterans.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Am I to accept that as a compliment? Does the gentleman wish to get me an audience?

Mr. LONG. That was the idea.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am very grateful to the gentleman, whose friendship I deeply prize. I have had this thought, Mr. Chairman, that today when we are discussing this legislation for the veterans—and a great majority of the Members of this body are ex-servicemen—that if when we come here we get away from our buddies at home, if we are thinking of those buddies who served with us and to whom fortune may not have been as kind, and who are looking for us to help them, if we have forgotten them. That is my reflection when I look over this Chamber and we are discussing legislation in their behalf, and most of the chairs have no occupants.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Dorn substitute. I am not satisfied with it. I do not think it goes far enough, but it seems to be the best compromise that can be worked out, and it does give some recognition to these old women in the Spanish-American War widow group. I trust that the Dorn substitute will be adopted.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, men in Congress stand out. There are those

who are especially well balanced and handle difficult things well. One of these is my friend, JIM RICHARDS, of South Carolina, who is retiring after many years of fine service to our Nation as chairman and a leader on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

It has been my distinct pleasure to have had the privilege of serving with this gentleman, and I wish every good for him in the coming years.

Water Supply Cut in Half To Avert Shortage for Orange County Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a short time ago, specifically on Thursday, July 19, an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times indicating the continuing and basic problem of an adequate water supply for California. This concerns water supplies in my hometown of Anaheim, Orange County, and neighboring cities, which have been cut back in their use of water. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER SUPPLY CUT IN HALF TO AVERT SHORTAGE FOR ORANGE COUNTY CITIES

GARDEN GROVE, July 18.—Water supplies for Garden Grove, Buena Park, Anaheim, and La Habra were cut back by up to 50 percent today by the Metropolitan Water District in an effort to avert a serious water shortage.

Robert B. Diemer, chief engineer for the MWD, added that Newport Beach and Laguna Beach also face a curtailed supply because of an unequal distribution of coastal district water.

CUTBACKS DISCLOSED

Diemer disclosed these cutbacks, expected to continue through the summer: Garden Grove, 25 percent from the amount it has been getting up to this week; Buena Park, 50 percent from previous supply; Anaheim, 40 percent from former levels; La Habra, 20 percent from normal consumption.

Diemer explained that the cities had been getting more than their share of MWD water and that protection of present supplies required the cutback.

Under MWD regulations, entitling cities to water in proportion to water taxes paid, he said Orange County cities were entitled to only 5.4 percent of the total water delivered but had been getting as high as 22.4 percent. He said the supply of water in MWD area reservoirs had dropped from 215 to 106 acre feet with the hottest part of the summer still ahead.

COSTA MESA UP

While coastal district water is not being curtailed Diemer said Costa Mesa has been using so much water that Newport Beach and Laguna Beach face a severe cutback and the problem for the district was one of distribution.

Santa Ana is in a better position because it maintains its own water supplies in addition to MWD. Fullerton increased pumping from city-owned wells to make up a voluntary one-third decrease in consumption of MWD water amounting to 2 million gallons a day.

The Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith the text of a letter I sent to the New York Times on June 14, 1956, and which subsequently appeared therein:

JUNE 14, 1956.

EDITOR, THE NEW YORK TIMES,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Exhibiting more courage and understanding of the fundamental issues facing the country today than do the other two coordinate branches of Federal Government, the Supreme Court has stood firm in its protection of the constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties and rights of our people. We have reason to be grateful. However, this good guardianship has given rise to much unbridled animosity and has resulted in unwarranted attacks on the integrity of the Court. These thrusts go far. They strike at the very nature of our Government by seeking to make the Court subservient to the political passions of the day.

The extent to which the hostility against the Court has gone is evidenced by bills introduced into the Congress which would damage the independence and authority of the Court. I cite among these the following:

Legislation to limit the term of a Justice of the Supreme Court to 12 years, deleting the lifetime provision;

Legislation to limit appointment to the Supreme Court to a person who (1) is a natural-born citizen of the United States, (2) has attained the age of 35 years, (3) has been 14 years a resident within the United States, (4) has been graduated from a law school approved by the American Bar Association, or has been admitted to the bar of a court of general jurisdiction of any State, Territory, possession of the United States or the District of Columbia, and (5) has practiced law for a total of not less than 5 years after having been admitted to the bar of any court of general jurisdiction or has had a total of not less than 5 years' judicial service;

Legislation to limit appointment to the Supreme Court to persons who have had at least 5 years prior judicial service. Obviously this last piece of legislation was aimed directly at Chief Justice Warren. Had such provisions prevailed in the past, monumental figures such as Chief Justice John Marshall, Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, Justice Louis Brandeis, as well as the present Chief Justice, would have been disqualified from serving.

Paramount among the decisions which have aroused the ire of powerful forces are the school desegregation cases, the decision in *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, announced April 2, 1956, and the decision in *Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor, International Association of Machinists* v. *Robert L. Hanson, Horace A. Cameron, Harold J. Grau, et al.*, announced May 21, 1956. In the Nelson case the Court held that the extensive nature of Federal legislation in the area of subversion indicates an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the entire field of sedition against the Government of the United States. In the last cited case the Court held that a provision in the Railway Labor Act expressly permitting the union shop takes precedence over a provision in the Nebraska constitution prohibiting union-shop agreements.

In the light of article IV, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, no other result in this case is possible. The Supreme Court detractors had better review article IV, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides:

"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, * * * shall be the supreme law of the land, * * * anything in the Constitution or law of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The Railway Labor Act by amendment in 1951 removed the previous bar against the union shop in the railway field. Under the basic Railway Labor Act, any agreement between the railway union and employer shall be binding, "notwithstanding any statute or law of any State." What does this mean? It means that any State law that forbids a union shop is inapplicable to any collective bargaining agreements controlled by the Railway Labor Act. But when the Supreme Court, on May 21, last, did just what Congress said it must do—consider the Federal statute as paramount to State law—there was occasion for cries of anguish and alarm from States Righters in and out of Washington about the usurpation of power by the Supreme Court.

Protests against these decisions have been loud, vigorous, and sustained. Powerful forces, under the banner of States rights, have moved forward to upset these decisions. Together with the bills already mentioned above, legislative proposals are now before the Congress to withdraw from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court cases affecting schools and education. We have proposals to grant the States and the Federal Government concurrent jurisdiction in all areas unless Federal statutes expressly preempt the field. Such proposals would completely Balkanize the Government, leaving in complete confusion all interpretations of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution. National problems would be dealt with by a welter of laws of 48 States. They would contradict and cancel each other out, leaving the Federal Government helpless to resolve the confusion. No one can foresee the effect of such far-reaching proposals.

We have further the proposal stemming directly from the Nelson case to give the States concurrent jurisdiction with the Federal Government in crimes involving subversion against the United States. If we examine the Nelson case we find that the Supreme Court has not challenged the authority of Pennsylvania to act in matters involving the State of Pennsylvania itself. It is most appropriate for the State of Pennsylvania to seek protection against threats directed against the State itself, but where Congress has provided an extensive program to protect the United States Government, it is absurd for the various States to have isolated, separate, and often conflicting programs against threats directed at the United States Government. I consider proposals authorizing State legislation in this area unwise and unwarranted. Protection against national subversion is part of the national defense. Forty-eight State laws on subversion aimed at the advocacy or conspiracy to overthrow the National Government can only lead to "different criteria of substantive offenses and a multiplicity of tribunals and a diversity of procedures" that in the final analysis can only benefit the subversive in our midst. The prevention of subversive activities is so clearly an integral part of national defense that it behooves us to ask those who so strenuously oppose Federal preemption of the field whether they favor an

Army, Navy, or Air Force for each of the 48 States.

I am pleased to note that your editorials have urged caution on all these proposals. The problem of balancing Federal and States rights is not an easy one. In other recent cases the Supreme Court has upheld State action. In the case of *Auto Workers* v. *Wisconsin Employment Relations Board*, decided June 4, 1956, the Court upheld a State ban against mass picketing. In *Black* v. *Cutter Laboratories*, decided June 4, 1956, the Court let stand a decision of the California Supreme Court which resulted in an alleged Communist losing her job. In both cases it was strenuously argued that paramount Federal law required contrary decision. These decisions reflect how unfounded are the charges that the Supreme Court opposes States rights.

It is fervently to be hoped that the Congress will not yield to the pressures of those who under the guise of States rights seek to weaken the balanced structure of our Government both by direct attack on the composition of the Court and indirectly by consistent attack upon its decisions.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the important achievements of this Democratic Congress is the Social Security Act Amendments of 1956. The amendments expanded, increased and improved the Social Security Act, and changed the Federal matching formula to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled and aid to dependent children. The amendments which we passed will provide increased Federal matchable funds. For example the Federal increase for old-age assistance to each eligible person in Missouri will be $5.

Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for the amendments which we passed. However, I regret that my bill H. R. 10076 did not pass. I have always fought for increased benefits for the old-age pensions and aid to the disabled and needy. I submitted a copy of my bill to Proctor N. Carter, director of welfare for the State of Missouri, and the following letter is his comment and opinion of my proposal:

DIVISION OF WELFARE,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND WELFARE,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 5, 1956.

Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MORGAN: I have reviewed H. R. 10076 which you introduced in the House of Representatives on March 20, 1956, which would amend title I of the Social Security Act relating to old-age assistance. This proposal would increase the maximum matchable payment from the present $55 per month to $75 per month, effective July 1, 1956, and would also revise the matching formula making it possible for the States to receive additional Federal funds for old-age assistance.

I am completely in accord with the purpose of this measure since it would substantially increase the level of payment for old-age assistance recipients and consequently relieve to some extent the economic burdens and privations endured by many of the worthy and deserving aged citizens of our Nation. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that assistance payments have not kept pace with the spiraling cost of living during recent years, which has resulted in severe hardships in many cases. Under normal circumstances it is extremely difficult for aged persons to make ends meet at the present level of payment, but when illness strikes or some other emergency arises, it is even more difficult, if not impossible, to live on the inadequate payments which aged recipients receive. In Missouri, a total of 130,000 recipients of old-age assistance receive an average monthly payment of about $50. About 90,000, or more than two-thirds (69.2 percent), receive the maximum payment of $55. Under your proposal it would be possible for Missouri and other States to make payments up to a maximum of $75 per recipient per month, which would do much to lessen the fears of financial insecurity with which many of our aged recipients are faced.

Very truly yours,

PROCTOR N. CARTER,
Director.

Mr. Speaker, we should and must increase old-age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. I believe that the good, loyal, and patriotic American citizens who have fought the battle of life, with the usual ups and downs of success, and who are in need, are entitled to and it is our duty to provide them with sufficient pensions or assistance for a respectable living of their lives. I will continue my work and efforts in Congress to achieve this worthy objective.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a Clevelander and as a longtime friend of the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON, of the 11th District of Ohio, I regret his decision to retire from the Congress of the United States. As fellow members of the Banking and Currency Committee, we had a splendid opportunity to work with one another on the complexing legislative problems which have come before our committee. OLLIE was always on the job with clear, incisive questions relating to pending legislation. He was always cheerful and pleasant, never indicating the great problems which he faced as Congressman from the 11th District of Ohio. Although I am of a different political faith and philosophy, there were always great areas of agreement in our thinking.

OLLIE BOLTON has made a great contribution in his work as a Representative of his people. It is my hope that his withdrawal from public life is only temporary. Government will always need people like the Honorable OLIVER P. BOLTON.

Supping With the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most disturbing phenomena of these confused times is the number of religious leaders whose passionate and proper concern for peace seems to have blunted their sensitiveness to evil. It leads them into the same error that they condemn in the Communists—namely, that the end is so good and so desirable that it justifies any means in order to get it.

The plainest exposure of this moral insensitivity—called neutralism—and the clearest call to abandon it that I have seen has come from the pen of the distinguished Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, for so many years pastor of the leading Methodist church in our Nation's Capital. For this issue of his weekly column in the Washington Sunday Star, our whole Nation, and especially its Christian people, owe Dr. Harris still another debt of gratitude. The article follows:

SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate)

Jibes pointing to flaws in the free world are quite the fashion. This global sport is especially indulged in by nations whose people have been fed and whose economy has been rescued from ruin by a good Samaritan called Uncle Sam. Often, here at home, we are told that our house is made of glass, and so it is well not to throw stones, even at the totalitarian structure. The inference is that, since there are sinners on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the thing to do is to shake hands—that is, when the Communists feel like indulging in that social diversion—instead of crying out against crimes which inwardly disturb us. We are blandly told that there is nothing we can do about the awful things that are going on in the world, and so it is best to be friendly with all concerned, rather than to stand up and to speak out boldly in God's name. This advice is to "Fold the hands and acquiesce." That is the essence of the deadly plague called neutralism, which now is weakening the defenses of a number of nations once alert to threatening danger. Siren voices are saying that, after all, the difference between social systems is just a matter of choice and of opinion. Such an attitude loses sight of the sanctities and decencies of life which can never be a matter of opinion with civilized men. In all this jellyfish neutrality there is a total, and often a willful, disregard of the reality of the heinous thing mankind is facing.

No scripture applies more literally in the present crisis than the injunction: "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate, and touch not the unclean thing." To join it, or even to regard it with complacency, means inevitably our own damnation. For what we are asked to cooperate with—and that is what the camouflaged word "coexistence" really means—is the most damnable thing which has ever appeared on the face of the planet. Hell has broken through the polished veneer of our modern world. Sadistic cruelties have emerged with sharpened instruments of torture. Abominations 7 times more satanic than the so-called Dark Ages ever knew have staged a comeback in this glittering 20th century. The world resounds with the wails of de-

ported people and of hordes of slaves of their own and other nations, who are even now having their lives ground out as their waning physical strength is harnessed to the juggernaut of a godless system out to rule the world. This is the devilish thing whose representatives are now visiting capitals of nations and are being received as equals by those whose most sacred standards and beliefs they brazenly ridicule and deny.

Well did the Vice President of the United States, speaking to all so-called neutral nations now being exposed to the come-into-my-parlor-said-the-spider-to-the-fly refrain, warn that "those who sup with the devil had better have a long spoon." There are moral implications of close association with those guilty of every crime on the calendar which the free world disregards to its peril. The role of true religion in this battle of Armageddon is to face the issue with the moral indignation of the Hebrew prophets and of Jesus of Nazareth. For our own souls' sakes we must do that.

Of course, we must never indulge in an anger that has its roots in selfishness. The trouble is that we often become indignant over trifles. The perversity even of inanimate objects sends us into a tantrum of fury. But there is an anger which we lose by supping with the devil will result in a much of concession and compromise. Let us never forget that while Jesus could be tender He was also terrible in His indignation against those who abused His brother man. When even a friend made an evil suggestion to Him, He blurted out "Get thee behind me, satan." He would not sup with the devil. Whenever He saw cruelty perpetrated on the defenseless His indignation rose to the fury of a tempest. When He contemplated the crime of robbing children of their birthright He uttered burning words which leaped out like a devour flame. Listen to Him: "Whoso shall cause one of these little ones to stumble, it would be better for him that a great millstone be hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk in the depths of the sea."

What can we imagine the Christ would say, as He confronted the crimes of the Soviets and of Red China? For what they are now saying Stalin was and did is a hideous picture of what they are and are doing.

Nothing is more needed in our day than a large capacity for moral indignation. Nothing is so deadening and damning as neutrality. This is true especially when the criminals whose lair is the Kremlin are putting on a new look, and are also offering to the world they have outraged soothing syrup which ought to be labeled "deadly poison." Something has happened, something terrible, to those in the free nations who can contemplate the gigantic outrages of which the Soviet system has been guilty and is still carrying on, and who can yet be as calm as a summer morning.

A willingness to sup with the devil, with a long spoon or a short one, is an indication of indifference to wrong doing, and is always a sign of moral deterioration. And now, let us pray: From the fatal futility of becoming nothing but spineless neutrals, bowing down at the altar of a false tolerance, good Lord, deliver us.

Amending the Immigration Laws

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the closing hour of the 84th Congress is drawing near, and to this minute the House and the Senate have not agreed to iron out differences on legislation that would give relief to minority groups now handicapped from bringing their relatives and friends to the United States.

Early in the first session of this Congress I joined with Senator SALTONSTALL in filing identical bills, H. R. 2558 and S. 519, which would correct many of the inequities in the so-called McCarran-Walter Immigration Act. Our bill provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding year to those waiting lists of quotas 7,000 and under, including the Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, Polish, Lithuanian, and other Eastern European quotas. Our bills would make the immigration laws more fair and workable. The McCarran Act established immigration quotas on the basis of the 1920 rather than the 1950 census. H. R. 2558 and S. 519 would eliminate discrimination against cultural and racial groups, which have become increasingly important parts of our community in the last 36 years, by establishing quotas on the basis of the 1950 census. The bills would bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from this country without the necessity of proving, as is now necessary, that they have advocated the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. In addition, the bill establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in the State Department to review denials of visas and the regulations applying to immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I am very disappointed that amendments such as these have not been made to the McCarran Act. However, the immigration and nationality laws have been modified in various respects by H. R. 6888 which passed the Senate today with amendments. Section 5 of the Dirksen amendment is particularly desirable, for it deals with redistribution of the unused quota numbers at the end of a fiscal year. This is substantially the same provision that we had written into our bills.

It is so late in the session now that it would appear that this is the best bill amending the immigration and nationality laws that we can get through Congress. I urge the House to accept the Senate amendments so that this year, at least, we can start admitting more men, women, and children to our shores from eastern and southern Europe.

Musical Recording: Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1956, the Congress approved House Concurrent Resolution 258, accepting without cost to the United States copies of the musical recording Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, and providing for the distribution of such records, first to radio and TV stations and then to schools and other organizations. Each Member of the House will receive an allotment of 50 records and each Member of the Senate will receive 25 copies. ASCAP has donated these records to the Congress and they should become available within about 2 months. Each record will be packaged for mailing. One side of the record carries the instrumental and vocal arrangement of the United States Air Force Band, conducted by Capt. Robert L. Landers, with the Singing Sergeants participating, which was heard originally in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1955, when Flag Day ceremonies were conducted for the first time. The other side of the record carries the instrumental and vocal arrangement of the United States Marine Band, conducted by Capt. Albert Schoepper, with an Interservice Choral Group accompanying, which was heard in the House of Representatives on Flag Day, June 14, 1956.

In order that the Members of the House might fully appreciate the musical arrangement of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag that was presented so well in this Chamber on Flag Day this year, I am submitting a description of the composition as arranged by S. Sgt. Donald R. Hunsberger, United States Marine Band. Also included are the names of the members of the Marine Band and the Interservice Choral Group, who cannot be praised enough for their rendition of this composition in the House. This arrangement is a reflection of the various conceptions of the flag as held by the American public. It embodies strong patriotic fervor as demonstrated by the rich full sound of the American military band, long an important part of the American way of life along with a feeling of reverence as introduced in the middle of a cappella section. Of special interest to the listener will be the addition of the words "under God" which are heard in the repeated chorus of the Pledge. The extensive use of the military bugle call To the Colors, as used in part as well as in its entirety, further ties in another accepted tribute to the flag.

This bugle call is first introduced in the opening bars in a single trumpet and later is completed by use of a three-part trumpet canon. A fragmentary a cappella choral statement closes the introduction and sets the mood for the baritone soloist. Throughout the verse and chorus, distant trumpet fanfares are heard to sustain the patriotic feeling further. Following the choral version—of the chorus—the full band reenters, alternating with the bugle calls in a modulatory passage. At this point a reverend mood is introduced by the chorus singing a cappella in a much slower tempo. The music was arranged in this section to bring out some of the fine qualities of the Interservice Chorus. At the end of this extended section, chimes bring the listener back from the sacred to a flowing melodious playing of the verse by the trombones. This is then worked up in volume until the full band breaks forth with a strict rhythmical and harmonic bridge, modulating into a strong key for the chorus and band to

present the final version of the chorus in a very grandiose style. A powerful and dramatic coda closes the arrangement in a triumphal manner, deserving of all the impact revealed in the words—a patriotic symbolic interpretation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Following are the list of names of those who participated in the presentation of the Pledge song in the House of Representatives on June 14, 1956:

UNITED STATES MARINE BAND

Leader: Capt. Albert F. Schoepper.
Arranger: S. Sgt. Donald R. Hunsberger.
Recording technician: T. Sgt. Harry H. Ritchie, Jr.
S. Sgt. Leslie E. Sheary, flute.
S. Sgt. Michael A. Hamilton, flute.
M. Sgt. Eugene H. Graham, oboe.
S. Sgt. Theodore C. Heger, oboe.
S. Sgt. Robert Barclay, Jr., E-flat clarinet.
M. Sgt. Harold E. Malah, Jr., B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Joseph Leo, Jr., B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Thomas M. Dykton, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Pasquale Pulvirenti, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Jack T. Kline, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. William Lubis, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. Ronald H. Baltazar, B-flat clarinet.
S. Sgt. Marlan E. Manwiller, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Stanley J. Gaulke, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Raoul P. Querze, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Donald G. Carodiskey, B-flat clarinet.
Sgt. Donald A. Puluse, B-flat clarinet.
T. Sgt. Paul H. Hines, alto clarinet.
S. Sgt. Charles H. Walls, bass clarinet.
M. Sgt. Felix A. EauClaire, alto saxophone.
S. Sgt. Jack C. Carey, alto saxophone.
T. Sgt. Stephen J. Rammer, tenor saxophone.
T. Sgt. Ralph A. Moeller, baritone saxophone.
S. Sgt. Robert P. Koper, bassoon.
M. Sgt. Charles W. Thompson, Jr., bassoon.
M. Sgt. Dougla A. Stevens, French horn.
T. Sgt. George F. Parker, French horn.
T. Sgt. Joseph C. Stoll, French horn.
Sgt. Robert W. Ricks, French horn.
M. Sgt. Robert R. De Hart, cornet.
T. Sgt. Charles P. Erwin, cornet.
S. Sgt. Daniel J. Patrylak, cornet.
S. Sgt. Fredric J. Erdman, Jr., cornet.
T. Sgt. John A. Gosling, trumpet.
T. Sgt. Guy M. McIntosh, trumpet.
T. Sgt. Chester A. Shields, trumpet.
S. Sgt. Glenn A. Dodson, trombone.
S. Sgt. Donald W. Bechtold, trombone.
S. Sgt. William Gray, trombone.
S. Sgt. William A. Scheneman, baritone.
T. Sgt. Angelo L. Saverino, bass.
S. Sgt. Vernon L. Brown, bass.
T. Sgt. Boyd Conway, drum.
M. Sgt. Frank J. Janata, drum.
S. Sgt. John H. Beck, chimes.
S. Sgt. Robert B. Stuart, tympani.

INTERSERVICE CHORAL GROUP

Chorusmaster: William D. Jones, United States Marine Band.
Virginia A. Pickel, publicist, United States Marine Band.

UNITED STATES ARMY BAND

Pfc. Charles R. Cassey, second tenor.
Pfc. George G. Fortune, baritone.
Pfc. John A. Gillaspy, second tenor.
Pfc. James R. Mulvaney, first tenor.
Sp2 Harley E. Rex, baritone.
Sp2 Arnold M. Voketaitis, bass.
Pfc. Donald A. White, first tenor.
Pvt. Donald S. Woods, bass.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Cpl. Richard C. Anderson, baritone, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Pfc. Leroy Clayton, baritone, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Sgt. Kenneth B. Forrey, first tenor, barracks detachment, Marine Base, Washington, D. C.
Cpl. Henri, D. Kahn, Jr., second tenor, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Sgt. Robert C. Knepp, second tenor, barracks detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Cpl. Raymond O. Koch, first tenor, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
Pfc. Martin H. Rogers, bass, MCI detachment, Marine base, Washington, D. C.
M. Sgt. Otis R. Strong, bass, A Company, headquarters, Marine Corps.
Cpl. C. L. Tate, second tenor, H. and S. Company, headquarters, Marine Corps.

UNITED STATES NAVY SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Musn. Robert P. Hope, second tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. James R. Humbert, first tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Roger E. Kirkbride, first tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Bob G. Johnson, bass, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Charles L. Munds, baritone, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Robert A. Schutt, bass, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musa. Richard A. Wellenmann, second tenor, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.
Musn. Samuel E. Wood, baritone, Navy Receiving Station, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

SR. William L. Baker, bass, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Harry C. Forbes, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Alan W. Gingher, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SA. Ralph E. Knorr, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. Fred Marsh, baritone, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. George D. McDaniel, second tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
JO2. Jack D. Richardson, first tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.
SR. James R. Smith, second tenor, receiving station, Cape May, N. J.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

S. Sgt. Richard W. Carlson, baritone, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Raymond J. Fisher, Jr., second tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
T. Sgt. David M. Ingalls, first tenor, headquarters command bank, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A1c. Richard M. Rawson, second tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Richard T. Sanders, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. Norman O. Scott, first tenor, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A1c. John L. Steinecker, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.
A2c. William J. Zajkowski, bass, headquarters command band, Bolling Air Force Base, Washington, D. C.

The Social Security Amendments of 1956

SPEECH
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has just completed action on one of the most significant and humane pieces of legislation in recent history—I refer, of course, to the social security amendments of 1956. The enactment of this landmark legislation is another victory in the long struggle in which my Democratic colleagues and I have engaged, side by side, in providing a degree of self-respecting security for our elderly people, our disabled, and those who have suffered misfortune. I am proud to state that I have for many years worked long and hard to improve and strengthen our social-security program and that the amendments of 1956 achieve many of the objectives which I urged many years ago.

It is therefore appropriate on this occasion for me to review briefly just what has been accomplished by the 1956 social security amendments and indicate those areas where further improvements may yet be made. I am particularly interested in reviewing these accomplishments, Mr. Speaker, because of the vital interest which I have always had in our social-security program and because of the contribution which I am proud to have made, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee and of the Congress, toward enactment of this important legislation.

It will be recalled that in the summer of 1955 the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives originated and passed by an overwhelming majority this basic legislation. Certain changes were made in the bill by the Senate Finance Committee, and further changes were made on the Senate floor. Insofar as the major provisions of the bill are concerned, I still believe the House version was the soundest approach, but I am happy that the bill which has finally been approved does retain most of the improvements recommended by the House.

The five principal features of the 1956 social-security amendments may be summarized as follows:

First, one of the most important provisions of the 1956 amendments was provision for disability insurance protection for the permanently and totally disabled at or after age 50. The inclusion of this provision rounds out the protection of our social-security program and provides one of the most humane actions which could have been taken by the 84th Congress. The gap which existed in our social-security system prior to approval of these amendments was obvious. Previously, a worker who was insured under the system and who became disabled regardless of his age had to wait until age 65 before becoming eligible for any benefits, a situation which unquestionably was unsound and unfair. Certainly, a breadwinner who is unfortunate enough to become permanently and totally disabled at age 50, and who is a fully insured individual under social security, should not be forced to wait for 15 years before receiving benefits.

I am proud to state that the bill passed by the House of Representatives last year by an overwhelming vote included this humane provision and it was with gratification that I noted it was restored to the bill on the floor of the United States Senate, after having been

removed by the Senate committee. It is estimated that some 250,000 individuals may become eligible for benefits during the first year under this provision of the bill, and this basic protection is extended to some 35 million insured persons.

Before leaving this point, Mr. Speaker, I must state that I would have much preferred not to see the age limit of 50 placed in the disability-insurance provision, but I recognized the practical legislative situation which existed. I do intend, however, to work for refinements and improvements in this respect at a later date.

Second, the bill provides for a reduction in the retirement age of widows, workingwomen, and wives, from age 65 to age 62. For a number of years, I have worked for a reduction in the retirement age for women. As the bill passed the House of Representatives last year, the retierment age for all of these categories of women was reduced uniformly from 65 to 62 upon my motion. As the bill came back to us from the Senate, provision was made for reduction in the retirement age to 62 with full benefits for widows, but it provides further for an actuarial reduction in retirement benefits for wives and workingwomen if they choose to retire at age 62 rather and 65. In the case of wives, 75 percent of full benefits may be received by them if they begin receiving them at age 62, and in the case of workingwomen, 80 percent of their full benefits may be received if they retire at 62 rather than 65.

As indicated, under the House version of the bill, all women could retire at age 62 with full benefits. I still think this was by far the better version, but I recognize the practical situation in that the modified version of the bill apparently was the only acceptable version to the Senate during this session.

In this connection I should like to emphasize that it was upon my motion that the Ways and Means Committee in 1955 included the original provision to lower the age limit uniformly for all women to age 62 with full benefits. I repeat that I am very sorry that the version which I recommended in committee and which passed the House was not accepted by the Senate.

Further, in this connection I thing it appropriate for me to indicate that in the 83d Congress I introduced a bill—H. R. 2713, on February 6, 1953—which provided for the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 60. I believe that it is fair for me to state that my record shows my vital interest in this matter, and while I am glad that action has been taken to provide for lowering the retirement age to age 62, I still consider that improvements may be made in this area, and it is my intention to press for and support measures at a future date to make such improvements.

Third, coverage was extended to many additional individuals, so that now our social-security program is nearly universal in its coverage. Some 250,000 persons were added, and perhaps many more, depending upon State and local action. Practically all self-employed professional people are now covered except physicians, who were left out at their request; coverage was made available to more State and local employees; provisions relative to sharefarmers were clarified and amplified; and further additional groups were brought into the system, such as employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Home Loan Banks, and others.

Fourth, provision is made for the payment of benefits after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker of the child has been permanently and totally disabled since before age 18. The mother of the child would also be eligible for benefits under this provision so long as she continues to have the child in her care. I think this provision, which originated in the Ways and Means Committee, is one of the most commendable in the entire bill, although it is of narrower application. The situation faced by those persons who are caring for a mentally or physically handicapped child is sad indeed, and their suffering is greater because of their concern as to what may happen when the family income may be cut off by death or retirement of the wage earner. This provision will help ameloriate, to a degree, this situation.

Fifth, a number of improvements were made with respect to grants-in-aid for public assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. The Federal share for these programs was increased; the program for aid to dependent children was broadened and strengthened; Federal support for research is provided; Federal funds for child welfare are increased; and other changes are made.

I am not entirely satisfied, however, with these changes, important as they are. For the most part, they are a step in the right direction, and will enable our needy aged, blind, disabled, and dependent to have some improvement in their security, but I consider that my own bill on this subject, H. R. 10302, would have been much better. It would have placed these programs on an up-to-date basis, provided even higher assistance levels than is provided in the present amendments, and made other desirable changes. However, the provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1956 do make improvements in the grant-in-aid programs and I am pleased to see this done.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing are some of the major provisions of this important legislation. I regard this bill as one of the most forward-looking enactments which any Congress in recent years has approved. I am proud to emphasize that its basic framework was laid out in the bill originated last year by the Committee on Ways and Means and that I am happy to have had the opportunity of working hard for its enactment. I expect to continue to press for further improvements in our social-security system, which now is reaching a well-rounded program of basic protection, soundly and equitably financed, for all our people.

Aviation Hearings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, the attention of the House should be called to what I regard as an outstanding investigation recently conducted by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee. That subcommittee is under the chairmanship of the Honorable ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, West Virginia, and is composed of the following members: JOHN A. BLATNIK, Democrat, Minnesota; JOE M. KILGORE, Democrat, Texas; MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, Democrat, Michigan; EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania; GEORGE MEADER, Republican, Michigan; J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, California; and WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Republican, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, at my request, on February 22, 1956, the subcommittee voted to undertake an inquiry into the expenditure of Federal funds for the promotion and development of aviation facilities, including both the air navigational system and airports.

The staff of the committee, under the able leadership of our chief counsel, Jerome S. Plapinger, immediately began a preliminary study, including on-the-spot visits to traffic-control centers and extensive discussions with experts in all phases of aviation operations.

Hearings opened June 25, 1956, and were concluded July 20, 1956. We compiled 2,030 pages of stenographic transcript of testimony and received numerous exhibits. The committee heard experts, both in Government and in private industry, on various aspects of aviation problems. Witnesses included:

W. Barclay Harding, chairman, Aviation Facilities Safety Group.

N. E. Halaby, vice chairman, Aviation Facilities Safety Group.

Adm. Chase Rosendahl, retired, executive director, National Air Transport Coordinating Committee.

Clarence Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots Association.

Max Karant, vice president, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

Warren Dickenson, executive engineer, Douglas Aircraft Co.

Matha Miller, supervisor, acoustics group, Douglas Aircraft Co.

M. L. Pennell, chief engineer, transport division, Boeing Aircraft Co.

Don Buck, engineering sales department, Boeing Aircraft Co.

Harry Howell, chief acoustics electrical unit, transport technical staff, Boeing Aircraft Co.

H. M. Conner, Washington representative, Lockheed Aircraft Co.

Carl Schmidt, airline operations engineer, Lockheed Aircraft Co.

J. F. Woodall, engineering department, acoustics, Convair division, General Dynamics.

Milton Arnold, vice president, operations, Air Transport Association.

Col. A. B. McMullen, secretary, National Association of State Aviation Officials.

Charles Parker, executive secretary, National Aviation Transport Association.

Charles J. Lowen, Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

James Pyle, Deputy Administrator, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Herbert Howell, Director, Office of Airports, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Joseph Blatt, director, program planning, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Joseph Tippetts, Director, Office of Federal Airways, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

David Thomas, Director, Office of Air Traffic Control, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Fred Davis, Director, Office of Aviaton Safety, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Robert Gale, Deputy Director, Office of Air Traffic Control, Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth P. Bergquist, Air Force, assisted by Colonels Conklin, Frizen, Dougherty, Kelly, and Lightner, and Elmo Ceconi, and Donald Mack.

Hon. Louis Rothschild, Undersecretary of Commerce for Transportation.

Edward P. Curtis, Special Assistant to the President for Aviation Facilities Planning.

Robert J. Wilson, vice president, Capital Airlines.

William M. Joy, commissioner of aviation, Detroit, Mich.

Cass Hough, former chairman, Michigan Aeronautics Commission.

C. V. Burnett, director, Detroit Aviation Commission.

John P. McElroy, member, Michigan Aeronautics Commission; director of personnel, Wayne County Road Commission.

John Witherspoon, city comptroller, Detroit, Mich.

Robert Miller, president, Airlines National Terminal Service Co., Inc.

Edmund A. Cummiskey, attorney, University of Michigan.

Floyd Wakefield, airport supervisor, University of Michigan.

Karl Cousino, representing Warren Township.

Arthur Miller, representing Warren Township.

Henry Baker, airport consultant, Wayne County Road Commission, Detroit.

Brig. Gen. Lester J. Maitland, counsel, Michigan Aviation Commission.

Paul Morris, Civil Aeronautics Administration member, Airport Use Panel.

Joseph Johnson, secretary, Airport Use Panel.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat, of Michigan.

Cole Morrow, National Business Aircraft Association.

James Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Joseph P. Adams, member, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Joseph Minetti, member, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Franklin Stone, General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board.

Oscar Bakke, Deputy Director, Bureau of Safety Regulation.

Ben Ashmead, Chief of Analysis Division, Bureau of Safety Investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some familiarity with the conduct of congressional investigations, not alone through my service on the Government Operations Committee in three terms in the House of Representatives, but prior to that time as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, from 1943 to 1947, and as counsel for the Fulbright Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1950. It is my considered opinion that the conduct of the hearings of the Mollohan committee on aviation problems and the report which was expeditiously drafted, not only reflect credit on the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives but that the evidence accumulated and the opinions the committee expressed will for some time to come constitute a landmark in aviation history.

Mr. Speaker, my opinion of the quality of those hearings was fortified by the comment of a member of the press who attended every session of the committee's hearings. In noting that he had been following aviation hearings for 23 years, he observed that the hearings of the Mollohan committee were more complete and more impartial and conducted on a higher level than any he had witnessed before.

I want to commend especially my chairman, Mr. MOLLOHAN, who is terminating his service in the House of Representatives, and our counsel, Jerome S. Plapinger, for a job well done. The report of the Mollohan subcommittee on its aviation hearings was unanimously approved by the subcommittee on July 23, 1956, and unanimously adopted as the report of the House Government Operations Committee on July 25, 1956.

Based upon an excellent and complete record of fact and expert opinion, the report of the Mollohan committee expresses a judicious and informed concern over the failure of the Government to provide the leadership and support which our important aviation industry, both military and civilian flying, requires under modern conditions. At this point in my remarks, I insert the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee and the subcommittee's conclusions:

[From the Washington Office of Representative ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, House Government Operations Committee, Friday, July 27, 1956]

A House Government operations subcommittee today called for drastic reorganization of Federal aviation agencies as part of an eight-point program to meet the soaring growth of United States aviation.

Subcommittee Chairman ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, Democrat, of West Virginia, said the recommendations climaxed 4 weeks of hearings, including testimony covering the mid-air collision of 2 airliners over Grand Canyon, June 30, which killed 128 persons.

Other subcommittee recommendations:

A speedup of studies underway by Presidential Aviation Adviser Edward P. Curtis, himself looking into reorganization of Government aviation agencies.

An end to Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership on the Air Coordinating Committee, a body composed of Federal agencies, boards, and commissions created by Presidential order to resolve aviation disputes within the executive branch of Government.

The subcommittee said that "the continued membership in the Air Coordinating Committee by these regulatory bodies represents an undermining by the executive branch of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board."

Clarification of the Air Coordinating Committee's role in aviation policy determination.

An end to military predominance on the ACC.

Acceleration of the so-called 5-year Federal airways plan of the Civil Aeronautics Administration to modernize United States air navigational facilities.

An end to the VOR/DME-TACAN impasse, a dispute between civil and military agencies over two types of navigational aids.

An automatic review of air traffic-control problems before approval of site locations for new airports.

MOLLOHAN said the hearings, held by the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, indicated confusion among Federal agencies administering United States air programs and added: "Direction must be substituted for coordination."

The West Virginia lawmaker said his subcommittee declined at this time to report to the full committee a bill calling for a commission study of United States aviation introduced by Representative GEORGE MEADER, Republican, of Michigan.

The subcommittee indicated approval of congressional and industry participation in such a study and promised to follow closely the progress of the Curtis study. It was MEADER, MOLLOHAN said, who first asked hearings before his subcommittee.

The report expressed concern over what it called the limited budget of $150,000 granted the Curtis study group and urged that the study be accelerated.

Curtis, with a staff of 3 and grants from the Defense and Commerce Departments of $300,000 to pay for study contracts by outside firms and organizations, was appointed as a result of the Harding report to the Budget Bureau which last year counted 75 agencies, boards, bureaus, and committees attempting to administer and control American aviation.

It likened Curtis' limited budget and staff as driving a spike with a tack hammer.

The report pictured growth of American aviation as miraculous and almost beyond human comprehension, and noted that passenger use alone of commercial airlines nearly tripled in the 7-year period between 1947 and 1955.

The subcommittee also took to task membership of the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission on the Air Coordinating Committee, created merely by Executive order in 1946. Its report described their continued membership on the Air Coordinating Committee as representing "an undermining by the executive branch [of the Government] of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board."

Both agencies were established by law as quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative regulatory bodies. Yet a CAB member testified the Board is bound through its membership on the ACC to its decisions and recommendations.

The report noted specifically that the ACC has no statutory authority to make decisions and added:

"Coordination by means of Executive order must not be used to nullify congressional enactment."

Also attacked was apparent predominance of military membership on the Air Coordinating Committee. Noted were appearances on working panels of the ACC of separate representatives of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force as well as the Department of Defense. In the case of the Airport Use Panel of the ACC, said the report, membership was divided 4 for military and 2 for civilian representatives.

But the report noted also that the CAA is not a member of the parent Air Coordinating Committee in its own right.

The subcommittee also commended the President's recent request for appropriation of an additional $68 million to speed up the CAA's 5-year airways plan. It noted CAA officials' testimony that with additional money the 5-year plan could be completed in 3 years.

The VOR/DME-TACAN controversy between two types of navigational aids also was a target of committee fire. Testimony indicated military preference for the TACAN type of aid while the CAA offered continued prefence for the VOR/DME type.

Added the report:

"Valuable time already lost can never be recaptured and little excuse exists for further procrastination in this matter."

The report also recommended automatic review of air-traffic-control problems within the Civil Aeronautics Administration before allocating funds for airports.

A specific example, said the report, was the proposed Northeast Airport at Detroit where, testimony indicated, Detroiters were permitted to continue spending their money on the Northeast site without a determination by the CAA whether traffic-control complications would preclude its maintaining a traffic pattern independent of air traffic of airports in the Detroit metropolitan area.

Detroit officials said they first learned of CAA views on traffic complications during hearings held by the subcommittee.

Federal Role in Aviation—Report of the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee on the Federal Role in Aviation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere I have reported to the House the hearings on aviation conducted by the Mollohan subcommittee. I believe the conclusions of the committee's report should be of interest to every Member of Congress and to the American public generally. They are as follows:

CONCLUSIONS

1. Reorganization of executive agencies required

The hearings of the subcommittee have convinced it that drastic reorganization of agencies in the executive branch of the Government having responsibilities in the field of aviation is urgently required.

The present Federal organization structure in civil aviation is tragic proof that it is not enough to have a forum or bargaining table where conflicts and disagreements can be settled and compromised. There must exist a capacity for leadership and planning in addition to the prompt resolution of differences. Direction must be substituted for coordination. To continue the present Federal organizational structure in aviation matters and thereby perpetuate current interagency conflicts and the lack of planning and leadership would mark Mr. Curtis' study as a futile effort, no matter how outstanding his projections for long-range aviation facilities.

Aviation activities must be administered through organizational machinery capable of dynamic action.

2. Expedition of Mr. Curtis' study required

The subcommittee believes that the responsibilities and functions of aviation agencies are so important, and the organizational relationships between them are so complex and confused, that piecemeal, casual changes might be dangerous. Changes should be made only after careful study. We cannot run the risk of disrupting current aviation operations and creating even more confusion than exists now.

The subcommittee is concerned over the limited budget given Mr. Curtis to achieve his goal. It is difficult to conceive how with a budget of $150,000 (plus $300,000 contributed by the Departments of Defense and Commerce for contracts made in connection with the first phase of his study) and a permanent professional staff of three (to be supplemented by a team of scientists and engineers), no matter how capable, Mr. Curtis can attain his goal with expedition. In this respect, it would seem the tools given Mr. Curtis in his monumental task may be likened to driving a spike with a tack hammer.

The subcommittee questions the timetable of between 1 year and a year and a half (from March 1, 1956) furnished by Mr. Curtis as the period in which his study will be completed. We are not suggesting that speed be substituted for thoroughness—only that with additional money and staff, the pace of the study can and should be quickened. Time is valuable and the Nation can ill afford to continue the current aviation organizational muddle.

3. Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership in Air Coordinating Committee must be terminated

The presence of the Civil Aeronautics Board, an independent, quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, regulatory body on the Air Coordinating Committee should be terminated at once. This is equally applicable to the membership of the Federal Communications Commission.

This is especially significant in view of testimony before the subcommittee by a Civil Aeronautics Board member in which he stated the Board would be bound by air coordinating committee decisions in which the Civil Aeronautics Board member, after consultation with the Board, acquiesced.

The subcommittee believes that the continued membership in the air coordinating committee by these regulatory bodies represents an undermining by the executive branch of the careful standards and safeguards of administrative law procedures prescribed by the Congress in creating both the Federal Communications Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. Whatever benefits may accrue as a result of their present Air Coordinating Committee membership can be obtained through being kept apprised of developments pertinent to their respective operations.

It is an illegal and unwarranted invasion by the executive branch by means of an Executive order to assume, without consent of the Congress, powers the Congress specifically conferred on these independent tribunals.

Participation by regulatory bodies in Air Coordinating Committee matters and according Air Coordinating Committee decisions binding effect, without adherence to procedures prescribed by the Congress represents a flagrant flouting of the will of the Congress.

That participation should be discontinued at once. The reservation contained in the Executive order with respect to regulatory agencies is meaningless—testimony before the subcommittee is ample and disturbing proof of that fact.

The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission are placed in the awkward position of being forced to disregard either an Executive order or the statutes which created them. We believe it is clear they should obey the statutes as superior to an Executive order.

4. Clarification of Air Coordinating Committee authority required

In a statement prepared at the request of the subcommittee, the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics noted that "under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, Congress has vested in the civil agencies of Government, the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board, authority to require all aircraft, military as well as civil, operating anywhere in the airspace of the United States, to conform with our air traffic rules. It would be difficult to enlarge this grant of authority.

"Secondly, in the same law, Congress not only authorized, but directed, the Civil Aeronautics Administration to provide an airways system for the Nation's air traffic and to regulate and protect that air traffic.

"This combination of authority to make rules and to control traffic makes it possible for the civil agencies of Government to control the use made of the airspace of the United States by all types of aircraft, military as well as civil. We believe these controls are adequate and do not need to be enlarged."

The Congress has not delegated this authority to the Air Coordinating Committee nor to any other agency of Government.

Such delegation of authority cannot be accomplished except through legislation or possibly through a reorganization plan subject to congressional approval.

Most certainly a congressional delegation of authority cannot be contravened or otherwise affected by an Executive order.

The authority of the Air Coordinating Committee should be clarified without delay to make abundantly clear that the Air Coordinating Committee has no decision-making authority with respect to any matter in which Congress has vested authority elsewhere.

Coordination by means of an Executive order must not be used to nullify congressional enactment.

5. Predominance of the military on the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigational Development Board must be avoided

Pending completion of the organizational aspects of Mr. Curtis' study, the subcom-

mittee does not make any additional recommendations concerning organizational structure. However, it cannot ignore the predominance of the military services on the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigational Development Board (and their various panels and committees). The subcommittee is impressed by the sheer weight of numbers and is concerned, for instance, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration is not a member in its own right of either body, while the Department of Defense [1] and the three military services are specifically designated.

In addition to the statutory conflict pointed out in 4 above, the subcommittee believes that such military predominance conflicts with our tradition of vesting final authority in civilian rather than in military officials.

6. *The 5-year Federal airway plan must be accelerated*

The subcommittee is heartened by the recent request of the President for appropriation of an additional $68 million to accelerate the 5-year Federal airway plan for navigational aids. That request is in accord with the subcommittee's belief that the 5-year plan must be accelerated.

If acceleration is "just a matter of dollars and cents," as the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics told the subcommittee, then we believe the plan should be further accelerated so that with introduction of commercial jet transport planes in 1959, the Federal airways system will be better able to accept them, and cope with the many problems of air-traffic control that commercial jets will undoubtedly present.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration must obtain grade differentials for controllers. With the added air-traffic-control facilities to be provided under the 5-year plan, the Civil Aeronautics Administration cannot risk loss of any supervisory or other experienced controller personnel. It is, therefore, incumbent upon them to obtain grade differentials for controller personnel based on responsibility. That matter should be actively pursued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission.

7. *TACAN–VOR/DME controversy must be resolved without further delay*

The vacillation that has marked the above problem is symptomatic of the lack of planning and direction in aviation matters within the Federal Government.

The controversy should be resolved no later than October 1, 1956, the date (30 to 40 days after August 20) promised by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation in his appearance before the subcommittee. Valuable time already lost can never be recaptured and little excuse exists for further procrastination in this matter.

8. *Automatic review of air traffic control requirements within the Civil Aeronautics Administration is required before airport aid projects are finally approved*

Internal procedures within the Civil Aeronautics Administration according to testimony before the subcommittee do not provide for automatic review by the Office of Air Traffic Control before final approval of project applications for Federal-aid airport funds to ascertain whether air traffic control difficulties will be experienced.

While the subcommittee was told that such applications are coordinated with the Office of Air Traffic Control, it is believed that procedures providing for automatic review would avoid any possibility of slipup.

Local bodies concerned with plans for construction of airports should thoroughly and constantly explore with the Civil Aeronautics Administration all facets of airport operations, particularly with reference to air traffic control problems. The proposed Detroit Northeast Airport situation is a most unfortunate example of the need for close and continuing liaison between local and Civil Aeronautics Administration officials.

[1] Although not a member of the Air Coordinating Committee, strangely, the Department of Defense is a voting member of the Airport Use Panel in addition to the Departments of Army, Navy, Air Force, Commerce, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Alexander Williams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Paterson, N. J., one of the great industrial communities of our country, has recently suffered a distinct loss in the passing of Alexander Williams, who as a textile labor leader for many decades established an enviable reputation for good citizenship and civic works. I was very proud to know him as a friend and constituent.

Our two fine Paterson newspapers, the Morning Call and the Evening News, have editorialized on Mr. Williams' 71 years of struggle and achievement as follows:

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call]
ALEXANDER WILLIAMS

If at times during the past decade America's labor leadership has had to face the accusation of irresponsibility it would be our firm conviction that such a person as Alex Williams would never be included among those so accused.

Alex Williams had been part of organized labor from the years of his teens, which is to say that he was practically there from the beginning of the movement. Labor as an organized entity in our society was pitifully small and weak at the turn of the century, and that was about the time he took his position.

Older residents will need no reminders about the unhappy days through which Paterson's labor struggled in those years. Alexander Williams knew the hardships that went with the picket lines. He became a conspicuous figure in the long, hard fight for better conditions in the textile industry.

But through it all, good and bad, we never knew anyone to lay a charge of reckless direction to this fine man. Indeed, management seemed as eager to have him at the conference board as workers insisted upon his being there. He knew the weapon of the strike sometimes was necessary, but he vigorously opposed such a method only as a last resort. His was an enlightened leadership, the fruits of which have long been evident in the sensible procedure of Paterson labor during these past many years.

Alex Williams was as much a citizen of the community as he was a leader of workingmen, and as a member of the industrial commission he gave generously of his time and talents. He was, in every meaning of the term, a good citizen and a good neighbor. His death is a distinct loss to Paterson.

[From the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News]
ALEX WILLIAMS

The career of Alex Williams, veteran labor leader who passed away yesterday, was typically American—the boy born of honorable working parents, brought to this country as a child, savoring of all the trials that beset a hard-working family.

Mr. Williams started in the textile industry, as did his father before him, lived through strikes and depressions, struck out for the West in trying periods in the field of silk, and lived through numerous hazards and rich experiences, returning to the home scene and to his first love as a silk worker.

So it was natural that he turned to textile union work, filling numerous important positions which won him the love of his fellow workers and the respect of employers who held him in high regard because of his fairness and integrity.

Thus when in 1955 he was due to retire from the organizing field, hundreds joined in a testimonial dinner in his honor, and prominent speakers joined in tribute to a man who had served his fellow craftsmen so competently and earnestly through the years.

In community life he was equally diligent, as attested by his long service as a member of the Paterson Industrial Commission.

Mr. Williams was an honorable man, straightforward and trustworthy, and his death marks the passing of an era in Paterson history which was so closely interlocked with the city's old glory as the silk city of the world.

The Organization of American Representation Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, Mr. Glenn A. McLain, director, center of international relations, Eastern State College, at Richmond, Ky., has written an article judged as a runnerup in a nationwide contest to secure new ideas on the reorganization of the Foreign Service. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN REPRESENTATION ABROAD

One of the fundamental problems facing the organizers of American representation abroad is the need for recruitment of personnel who will be more fully representative of the best of American youth. The recommendations made in the report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel in June 1954 considered this matter of crucial importance. In this paper there will be an attempt to examine this issue from two points of view; the kind of recruitment needed and the training of the Foreign Service officer candidates.

The role of the professional diplomat has grown in complexity since the end of World War II. Gone are the days when American representatives were only concerned with the negotiating of trade treaties or the helping of American tourists and business representatives abroad. Intimate knowledge of foreign political trends, broad cultural patterns, and changing governmental forms are now required of America's representatives. Specialists in economics, military policy matters, and other practical foreign policy subjects are in steady demand today. The training procedures necessary to develop experts in the many fields are a subject for legitimate controversy in this complex age of both specialization and general education in our professional institutions.

As an organized body the Foreign Service is a product of the 20th century. The professional corps had its first statutory foundation in the Rogers Act of 1924 which merged the diplomatic and consular services of the United States. In 1954, despite the complex foreign policy problems facing the United States, the Foreign Service officer corps numbered only 1,285 officers. This small group of dedicated men staff the 68 embassies, 9 legations, and the 167 consulates the United States maintains in 105 countries. Executing the policies determined by the President and the Secretary of State, this group represents the American people abroad. In the reports made to the American people by the Hoover Commission in 1949, the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee on Personnel in 1950 and the Public Committee Report in 1954, the matter of personnel to staff these vitally important posts has received vigorous attention. The problem of recruitment and training has thus been considered to be of major importance to the successful functioning of American foreign policy abroad. It is urgent that the American people study the recommendations of these advisory task forces. They must help their Government to secure the needed personnel and to train the recruits for future service. The first group of American citizens to be informed of the task at hand would be the educators of America.

One of the best sources available for future personnel candidates in the Foreign Service are the small, independent liberal arts colleges of America. Although many excellent area training study programs are in full operation in the larger colleges and universities, the small liberal arts college is an important source of potential strength for Foreign Service recruiters. Yet, it is in the small college that the needs of the government service seldom are explained to administrators. A nationwide educational campaign needs to be developed to inform the small college presidents, the heads of history, social studies, and language departments that America is searching for talent in every educational nook and cranny in the land. The flow of candidates needed can only be speeded by an intensive campaign in this direction.

One of the most important requisites for the ideal Foreign Service officer should be his broad background in the arts, literary, and sociocultural aspects of foreign policy. It is on the small campuses of America that such training can be developed. We live in an age of bigness, big buildings, big cities, big wars, and big problems in human relations. In order to gain the perspective needed for the tremendously large tasks of our representatives abroad, the confined atmosphere of the small college often is necessary. The lack of attention to mass sport presentations, the lack of necessity to develop the other directed type of personality so characteristic of the modern mass man is conducive to the broadly based, well-rounded type of education needed in our representatives abroad.

Another area of major importance in the recruitment of personnel is the larger college or university. This type of school is of two kinds as far as career potential for the Foreign Service is concerned. The first type is the large university or college which is really a series of smaller colleges joined together by single administrative head. The steady increase in population during the last few years has given rise to this type of educational institution. Including the teachers colleges and State universities, this type of school should be an excellent source for future candidates for the Foreign Service. Once again the problem here is one of salesmanship. The deans and top administrators of this type of school are educational specialists. Curriculum experimenting and development of the mass educational approach is often the rule in these institutions. Contacts need to be made here through the professional educational organizations in America. Any nationwide governmental program needs to be sold to the professional educators first in order for the best results to develop.

The third area for development in the college and university field are those institutions where area training programs are already in operation. Such programs are now functioning at Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, Syracuse, and many other schools. They need to be strengthened and expanded. Such programs have often been considered to be of a rather complex nature by most students in the past. Students in general have been apathetic toward such developments because the larger and more educationally famous institutions have pioneered in this field. That is one of the prime reasons why such colleges or universities maintain their splendid reputations. Foundation support could be developed by an educational task force to further such programs in the smaller State universities and colleges. Trained specialists are at a premium in America today. The area training programs must be progressively developed to help train the type of specialists needed for the Foreign Service. Only through a combination of specialists and broadly trained individuals can the type of American representation be developed that is so sorely needed today and for the future success of United States foreign policy abroad.

While the administrators of America's colleges and universities must of necessity be speedily contacted and approached concerning the needs of the Foreign Service, the students must also be reached by methods other than the academic or official approach. One of the fundamental necessities in America today is to fully explain the needs of the Government service to the college-trained student. Young people in America today are extremely realistic. Few of them are willing to dedicate their services to any organization, government or otherwise, which does not offer security and a chance to grow in professional capacity. The needs of the Foreign Service must be presented by fieldmen who will be in personal contact with the students of America. The best way to make this sort of approach would seem to be to follow the suggestions made in the Report of the Secretary of States Committee on Public Personnel. According to this report, a Foreign Service scholarship training program patterned after the Navy's Reserve Officer Training Corps should be organized. This type of program should prove to be both satisfactory to the students from the point of view of career service and from the point of view of Foreign Service needs on a continuing basis. To further the plan for such a project a number of factors need to be taken into consideration. Method of appointment, type of qualifying examination, and requisites placed upon the candidates entering the program.

One of the important needs of the Foreign Service is a staff which will reflect the national characteristics of the American people. One of the main reasons for the often made criticism of American representatives abroad has been their selection from only a few geographical areas in America. This type of action develops cultural sterility on the part of our diplomatic agents. America is a representative democracy and all kinds of people from our population need to be members of our Nation's Foreign Service. With the excellent precedent established by the West Point, Annapolis, and the new Air Force colleges, such a Foreign Service program should attract the attention of the Nation's college youth.

A Foreign Service training program in the colleges and universities should serve to develop a reservoir of valuable candidates. Such a program must not be conceived just to develop specialists for the Foreign Service. As broad an intellectual background as possible must be sought for among these candidates. The first 2 years of the college students career should be planned by the student and his college advisers with the view toward later specialization after interests are developed through the generalized program for the bachelor of arts degree. This is a matter for proper study by curriculum experts. A note of caution must be advised for governmental specialists who will be charged with development of the curriculum aspects of the program. Flexibility must be maintained in the first 2 years of the potential candidates courses. Every effort must be made to encourage independent thinking, the development of personal interests and special enthusiasms on the part of the student. In brief, such a program should be student centered with the emphasis on the student orientating himself to his own particular desires for later specialization. All of these needs should naturally be met within the usual requirements of each institution which offers the undergraduate degree.

After the first 2 years of the academic program are completed national examinations should be held on a regional basis. These examinations should be offered at several schools within each State so that each student will be able to take them with a minimum of traveling expense. If possible the examinations should be given in the colleges and universities participating in the program so as to establish institutional identity with the plan. State and nationwide publicity should be given to these examinations through personal letter or interview contacts made by members of the Foreign Service Board of Examiners. Publicity should stress the idea that our nation needs the services of its most capably college trained people. Regional apportionment of candidates should be given to the Congressmen in each State as similar appointments are distributed to West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy candidates. There should be no fear that politics would intervene in the selection of qualified candidates if this system is used.

The system of congressional appointment has stood the test of time in America. It would be unwise to remove this power from Congress. The interest which would be stimulated by this method would serve to give the Foreign Service the regional apportionment it so definitely needs today. Past public criticisms concerning the Foreign Service and its intellectual snobbery would tend to disappear through the congressional appointment system.

After the examinations are finished and the scholarships are given the students accepted under the program should agree to serve the needs of the Foreign Service for a 6-year period after graduation. They should be encouraged to specialize after acceptance but the broad, less compartmentalized aspect of their education should not be neglected in any way. In the colleges and universities which maintain area training programs concentrating on special needs, encouragement should be given to administrators who would further develop these programs. While the necessary academic and administrative freedom must be maintained to develop programs according to the needs of each institution, stimulus can be given to the acceleration of all such programs. Close liason through national or regional meetings ought to be speedily developed between the educators administering both generalized and area specialty programs and the Department of State. This program can only be successfully advanced if America's educators and the administrators of American foreign policy can work together on common ground—the

advancement of our needs in the foreign policy field.

It is proper to survey the qualities needed in the individual under the Foreign Service program after the undergraduate courses have been completed. The candidate should have a broad training in the humanities, arts and sciences. His understanding of literature, history, political science, geography, fine arts and general science ought to be only exceeded by his knowledge of at least one foreign language. These qualifications would be in accord with the time-honored needs of the Foreign Service program but to these essential skills and interests another must be added. The candidate must have developed a dedication to the objectives of American democracy and liberal spirit which will give him a spirit of devotion to his duties ahead. If the candidate sees before him a career which has stability and purpose, creativity and financial reward, his future potential to the Nation will be great.

In addition to attention directed to the college or university training program, the organization of the Foreign Service Institute needs to be reexamined and strengthened considerably. In general, the Foreign Service Institute in Washington has maintained three functions in training the candidate for service abroad. It has provided basic orientation for candidates newly appointed in the field; it has developed specialist programs for language needs of the Department; and it has provided distinctive courses for Foreign Service officers who have been selected for advancement. These three functions of the Institute need to be developed and stimulated in order to round out the training of the candidate.

Before the function of the Foreign Service Institute is examined it is important to evaluate the faculty needs of the Institute. Under the terms of the proposed legislation for the Foreign Service in 1946, the Foreign Affairs Committee recommended that the best educational resources of the country should be gathered for the staff. Although this proposal would almost seem to be elementary, these needs have not been met. The Wriston report of 1954 called again for the creation of a top level faculty; for the revision of the pedestrian curriculum and for the hiring of a director of first-class ability. These suggestions have been made again and again and it is time some definite action were forthcoming. In order to speedily implement these suggestions the United States Office of Education under the direction of the President should take the following steps as soon as possible.

1. The presidents of all the leading professional organizations in the fields of history, political science, and the social sciences should be contacted for possible candidates for the Foreign Service Institute.

2. A national conference for all top-level administrative leaders in the various scholarly fields, primarily social science, history, and languages should be held in Washington at the earliest possible date.

The time has arrived to take these important steps to gather the capable faculty needed for the Foreign Service Institute. America's diplomatic corps has never had the necessary faculty to man a Foreign Service Institute where the need has been to train personnel in the planning, functioning, and formulation of American policy abroad. America's professional experts in the fields of foreign policy and diplomacy will rise to the patriotic occasion if properly approached and encouraged to meet this challenge.

The first traditional function of the Foreign Service Institute has been the so-called orientation process. Simply stated this has usually meant a review of governmental procedures followed in the Department of State and the Foreign Service. While such an introductory program necessarily serves a useful educational purpose it would seem that the time spent on this type of indoctrination could be more usefully applied elsewhere. Certainly any candidate coming into the Institute after a 4-year training program should have learned the basic fundamentals of governmental operation. Orientation is always necessary in any new position in these days of rapidly changing job requirements but little time should have to be spent in the future curriculum development of the Institute on this type of activity. In the budget debates for the Department of State appropriations in 1955, Mr. Wilber showed the thinking of the Department in this respect. According to Mr. Wilber the average period of orientation for all new members of the Institute should be approximately 5 months. This lengthy period of indoctrination into governmental procedures could be better applied to other types of educational needs in the Institute. For example, the linguistic needs of the Foreign Service are at present sadly neglected.

The second function of the Foreign Service Institute has been the training in language. Americans are notoriously poor linguists. That is no secret to the world and the blame here cannot be placed upon the Foreign Service Institute entirely. In the past the Institute has worked diligently in the fields of linguistic research. During recent years this important function of the Institute has been neglected until only a few specialists are at present in training. Only 14 different languages are listed as being taught at the Foreign Service Institute for 1955.

Among the many languages missing from the list of those being taught at the Institute during 1955 are Burmese, Tibetan, and the Malay dialects. No specialists are in training for any of the Latin American tongues. While many of the omissions in the curriculum may have been made because of the budgetary requirements or because specialists in sufficient numbers are already available for all other areas of the world it is apparent that not enough attention is being directed to this particular function of the Institute. American needs have never been greater for this type of specialist and there is no doubt that these needs will continue to grow in the future.

Whatever the eventual linguistic needs of the Institute may be the present practice of providing refresher courses for members of the clerical staff and for transient students from the Armed Forces should be changed. The needs of the Institute should come first. Foreign Service candidates and new officers expected under the new program will need the complete services of the language staff at the Institute.

The third and perhaps the most important function of the Institute is the reorientation or retraining of Foreign Service officers who are being promoted or changed from routine duties to new positions of greater importance. As all Foreign Service officers in the field have had to traditionally serve in the more routine type of job for experience this particular function of the Institute is especially important. The future of the Foreign Service virtually rests upon the successful final development of the officer who is to be moved up the ladder of responsibility in the Department.

The role of the Institute here is most important in two respects. At the crucial middle point in the Foreign Service officer's career he should be provided with the proper cultural background in the field of his specialty assignment or in a general area. He should be given a sharper political perspective concerning conditions abroad and in the United States. This is a large assignment for the faculty of any institution, but it can be done if the proper instructors are available to handle these important tasks.

The proper cultural background in the country of the candidates' area or national specialty can only be developed through broad training. If the candidate is especially interested in certain geographical areas or countries, the on-the-spot news from the foreign-language newspapers of the region should be studied with care. The literature, sociocultural trends, and important political developments ought to be studied with regularity. Although the major portion of this type of training will necessarily come in the field for the Foreign Service officer, the Institute should provide the academic overview so essential to well-rounded development of specialty knowledge.

Foreign Service officers, like most other people in this complex society of ours, have little time to study and examine the premises on which they work. A sabbatical leave for officers who have had long experience in the field and a regularly planned series of seminar courses at the Institute for officers who have had short tours of duty would be immensely beneficial. The Foreign Service needs the discipline that comes with the scholarly reexamination of major problems. A basic understanding of the facts of history, the principles of government, and the meaning of cultural traits are essential tools of a nation which attempts to be a world leader. The Foreign Service Institute must provide the intellectual atmosphere which will develop craftsmanship needed to use diplomatic tools for the advancement of America's needs and obligations in the world.

In both the 82d and 83d Congresses legislation was introduced for the establishment of a United States Academy of Foreign Service. This Academy as provided for in H. R. 1870 in the 83d Congress would offer a specialized 4-year course to train promising young men and women for a career in the Foreign Service. Selected on the basis of competitive examinations the students would receive the same pay and allowances as are received by cadets at West Point. This proposal demands further study and attention on the part of the Congress. If the Foreign Service Institute can be revitalized to perform the functions it was organized to perform there will be no need for a Foreign Service Academy. The essential requirements for a vigorous, imaginative and functionally creative Foreign Service have been provided for in the Rogers Act of 1924 and subsequent legislation. Only the will to effect the necessary changes has been lacking on the part of the Congress. If the needed changes are not forthcoming in the next session of Congress the plan for a Foreign Service Academy must be examined again and perhaps legislatively developed to meet the needs of America.

Over and above any examination of the potential for Foreign Service personnel; the method of appointment and the methods of training needed to develop the human resources, one requirement is all important—the development of moral stamina in the corps. This intangible need has never been greater in the history of American diplomacy. It is something which cannot be legislated. Courses cannot be taught examining the nature of moral stamina but such a philosophical orientation can be developed by a Foreign Service program which will provide an intellectual challenge to the youth of America.

A nationwide program needs to be imaginatively created by the Foreign Service Institute and its Advisory Committee to build up support for the reenforcement of the Foreign Service. Such a Committee has already been created but unfortunately it never convenes. The Committee is composed of the Director General of the Foreign Service, 2 Members of the Senate, 2 Members of the House, and 6 members consisting of 3 former or present State Department officials and public citizens. This Committee must be called into action to take immediate steps

to focus national attention on the problems facing our Foreign Service. After a program has been adopted, nationally known educators can be called into consultation. The same kind of press attention often directed to patriotic or charity causes must be directed to the public relations aspect of this program. American youth must be sold on the idea that the Foreign Service needs the young, qualified people of America. Young people must be given assurance that a future is awaiting them in the service of their country. It is a future that cannot be presented without provisions being made for a stable, creative, dynamic Foreign Service offering opportunity, advancement, and challenge. This has not been done in the past. The natural inhibitions of the Foreign Service staff must be dispelled in order to use such a plan of operation. It is not within the traditions of the Department to disturb the elite qualities of the service by selling the American people on the needs of the service. Yet it must be done in spite of this type of reluctance.

Americans in the past have never been led to believe that there were many opportunities in the Foreign Service. The only way the ideas can be changed is to vigorously establish a creative program and then inform the American people. Americans are quick to face as individuals the usual tensions of our society. They will be quick to meet the challenge of staffing our Foreign Service with top personnel. Let us banish this apathy and face these needs in the foreign policy and diplomatic field. Our problems in world affairs cannot wait forever while we patiently study the needs of the Foreign Service at regular intervals and then proceed to forget the issues at stake. The survival of the American way of life in the world and the chance to establish a steadily functioning foreign policy are the major stakes at issue. The time to act is now. The tools have been placed in readiness by the Congress, and by many study groups since 1924. Let's get to work as Americans and build a Foreign Service which will serve American interests.

The More They Profess To Be Unlike Stalin, the More They Prove Themselves To Be Like Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of July 22, 1956:

MISSING IN RUSSIA

On the basis of impressive eye-witness reports from released Soviet prisoners of various types, our Government now has good reason to believe that several American airmen—possibly upward of 20 or more—are being held captive in Russia, some of them since as long ago as April 8, 1950.

These Americans—officers and crewmen of Navy and Air Force planes forced down in or near Soviet territory—have until recently been presumed to be dead. In fact, acting on that official presumption, the "widow" of at least one of them has since remarried. But now, according to the note our Government has just addressed to the Kremlin, reports about their survival have been so persistent, so detailed and so credible that there is very solid and compelling ground for the belief that many of them, if not all, are alive in Russian prisons, being held there as punishment for the most spurious sort of crimes.

If this is true, as it seems to be, then the post-Stalin men of the Kremlin are guilty themselves of the peculiarly heartless kind of cruelty that was so typical of the Stalinist era they now condemn. More than that, they are in violation of international law and practice under which a nation, when it seizes another nation's citizens, makes no secret about the matter. Instead, in keeping with the standards and obligations of civilized conduct and simple human decency, it formally and promptly reveals its action to the interested government or permits the captives to get in touch with their country's official representatives.

It is against this background that our Government has called upon Russia's collective leaders to make an immediate and thorough investigation of the case of the missing airmen and to let us have the findings as soon as possible. The response should constitute an enlightening measure of how much the Kremlin has really de-Stalinized itself.

An Ideological Bomb for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of July 15, 1956:

AN IDEOLOGICAL BOMB FOR POLAND
(By Herbert A. Philbrick)

Last April this column reported that a group of anti-Communists in the United States had fused a bombshell that would have a devastating effect on Communist pretensions of a New Look. It has had just that. I refer to the document prepared by Sol Levitas and others at the New Leader magazine, asking the whereabouts and requesting release of hundreds of Socialists and trade union people imprisoned or vanished without trace in the Soviet "paradise."

The bomb was exploded by Hugh Gaitskell, British Labor Party leader, and its repercussions are still reverberating on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

ANOTHER BOMB

Last week another ideological bomb was dropped, this time into the lap of the comrades who run the Red regime in Poland. It was in the form of a cablegram to Polish Premier Josef Cyrankiewicz. The cablegram was prepared by Dr. Bela Fabian, Jerzy Ptakowsky, and Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, all active members of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and all former fellow prisoners with Cyrankiewicz in the notorious Nazi concentration camp of Auschwitz.

The cablegram reads in part:

"The tragic events that took place in Poznan prompt us to appeal to you, who 12 years ago, shared our sufferings in the Nazi concentration camp of Auschwitz. We presume that the memories of Auschwitz are still alive in your mind; the gas chambers, where daily thousands of our fellow prisoners choked to death; the crematoriums where the bodies were burned, and the cudgels of the SS, which often broke in two on our backs."

The message recalled, for Cyrankiewicz's memory the execution in November 1942, of 200 Poles; he was reminded that in August, 1944, 300 intrepid young men attacked the SS, captured hand grenades, and blew up gas chamber No. 4; and that at 11 o'clock August night, 1,000 youths were put to death in the gas chambers.

DO YOU REMEMBER?

"Do you remember," the former prisoners ask, "their wild shrieks and sobs? * * * Do you remember the words of the young Hungarian boy * * * calling out, 'Don't cry brothers, we are dying for a better world.' Or the words of the young Polish priest to his Lithuanian colleagues before his execution, 'Tell the Lithuanian people that the Poles know how to die for their fatherland!'

"From the concentration camps you, Mr. Cyrankiewicz, returned to Warsaw to seek on the side of the Communists the better world for which so many had died. What happened to this better world?"

Of what happened, of course, Cyrankiewicz is well aware. Poland, where bread has never been a luxury, even under the czars or Nazi occupation, has now, under Communist tyranny, experienced a protest demonstration of workers asking for bread. The unarmed workers and strikers were savagely shot down by Communist henchmen.

"We do not know," the message continues, "the number of the victims. * * * The only thing we know is that people had to die because they had dared to demand bread and freedom.

"Furthermore, we know that military squads are engaged in house-to-house searches; the number of prisoners already exceeds several hundred; and bullets, gallows, and Siberia are in store for them, unless your conscience awakens.

"To awaken your conscience is the very purpose of our telegram.

"Mr. Cyrankiewicz, stop shedding the blood of the heroic Polish workers who demand nothing else but the God-given right of every man—bread and freedom. We appeal, not for clemency but for justice and human rights."

Whether the telegram will, as his former fellow prisoners hope, awaken the conscience of Cyrankiewicz remains to be seen. Copies of the wire are being distributed as widely as possible on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

TIME WILL TELL

Perhaps it will awaken the consciences of others, including the fellow travelers, confused intellectuals, fence straddlers, and neutrals who, like the Premier of Poland, claim to be anti-Fascist when in reality they are supporting, by failing to condemn, the very sort of tyranny they pretend to abhor.

A spokesman for the Assembly of Captive European Nations puts it this way: "A crime committed by totalitarian tyrants who have captured the seats of power and thus call themselves the party, the government, or the state is still a crime. Enslavement has the same effect on human liberty and human dignity whether the lash is in the right or the left hand. The issue today is not between the right and the left; it is between all the decent civilized people of the world and those who would enslave the world, whatever color their shirts, whatever name they call themselves, or whatever insignia they may chose to wear."

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur with my other colleagues in paying high tribute to OLIVER P. BOLTON, who

does not seek reelection to the Congress. He has been an aggressive, fine legislator, and has served his constituents faithfully and well.

When the 19th District of Ohio was redistricted OLIVER BOLTON took over part of Trumbull and all of Ashtabula County, which I had formerly represented. He fully demonstrated his willingness to lend assistance in every possible manner.

It is my fervent prayer that his health will continue to improve and that he will find relaxation, success, and happiness in whatever field of endeavor he might choose.

Time for the Public

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include, by request, a thoughtful editorial entitled "Time for the Public," which appeared in the June issue of Television Age:

TIME FOR THE PUBLIC

In this issue of Age, we report a fact that has been a mystery for too long.

How much time does television give to public service advertising and programing, and what is its value? Our figures show, as you will see by reading the lead article, that television this year will devote $178 million or 18 percent of the predictable total net time revenue of the industry to such broadcasting.

These are new figures, which Television Age has gathered by analyzing not only the national records of the Advertising Council, but also through a survey of the stations throughout the land.

A democracy requires a certain amount of neighborliness among its citizens, whether they reside in a penthouse on Park Avenue or a farmhouse in the dust-ridden flats of Oklahoma.

In a democracy, a man just naturally will put out a fire in his neighbor's house, even if he runs the risk of being accused of breaking and entering.

Broadcasting, operated as it is by people cultivated in this American tradition, has established itself as a good neighbor.

It is there when the stream breaks above the dikes.

It is there to help the crippled and the hurt.

To build a better street; to raise a spire above the church; to restore the homeless to homes and the healthless to health.

And yet there are those who say: "This is not gratuitous. The broadcasters must devote a certain percentage of their time to public-service broadcasting."

Both the proposition and the premise are incorrect.

The proposition errs because no one—legislator or regulator, to name those of authority in such matters—has designated a "percentage" of time for public service broadcasting.

The proposition is incorrect, further, inasmuch as it presumes that broadcast presentations can be classified, in the first place, either as "public service" or something else, thus far undefined.

If a broadcast doesn't serve the public, it doesn't serve at all.

And the premise? There is the implication in such analyses of broadcaster behavior patterns that the average licensee gives time and talent to worthy causes by force rather than election.

He gives to worthy causes because he wants to be worthy—as the citizen does who contributes to the Red Cross, or serves the PTA, or circulates a petition for safer highways and better playgrounds.

The fact is, as established by this survey, that television broadcasters are exceedingly generous in their contributions to the public welfare.

Those who would contend the contrary should give as much.

They should give time, too.

Time to visit the hospitals where the helpless are being helped—because broadcasters found funds to help them.

Time to talk with the destitute—not here alone, but all over the world—who have found hope because a generous nation was told of their plight.

Time, even if leisurely, to comprehend what is happening when a new school or hospital is erected, or a small child learns to walk.

Let them give as generously of their time, and enrich their souls by giving their talent, too.

THE EDITORS.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-six Columbus Day Observances in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARLE C. CLEMENTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to point out to you a very constructive effort being made by a group of citizens in the United States to improve and extend our understanding and appreciation of our Latin American neighbors.

In June 1955, the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day was organized on a nationwide basis as a gesture of friendship and good will toward our neighbors to the south.

From the United States Congress, our revered WALTER F. GEORGE, senior Senator from Georgia, and JAMES P. RICHARDS, distinguished Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina, acted as honorary sponsors of this commendable citizens effort to better inter-American relations.

We are all in agreement that the strength of our free society lies in the strength and vitality of our free institutions. We all know that these freedoms which we cherish depend upon qualities of mind and heart and soul; human qualities if you please, without which there is no substance to our heritage and no hope for our future.

But, because of the encouragement of men like Senator GEORGE and Representative RICHARDS, what was initially a Washington committee soon became a national committee and by October 12, 1955, a remarkable record of accomplishment in person-to-person good will among the nations of the Western Hemisphere had been made.

I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report of the 1955 accomplishments of the National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day together with a résumé of plans for the 1956 observances throughout the United States.

This report is entitled "Columbus Day and You," and is made by Mr. Edgar R. Baker, 1956 Columbus Day chairman. Mr. Baker is the distinguished managing director of Time-Life International, a champion of stronger inter-American ties.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLUMBUS DAY AND YOU

(By Edgar R. Baker, chairman, National Citizens Committee for Columbus Day)

For the first time in our Nation's history, the people of the United States, in 1955, made the observance of Columbus Day, October 12, an occasion for saluting our friends in the other 20 American Republics. Throughout the United States, Columbus Day observances commemorated two great ideas—the discovery of the Western Hemisphere and the historic brotherhood of the Americas.

The success of the 1955 Columbus Day observances where these two ideas were used for the first time leads me to believe the people of the United States welcome an opportunity to express their deep appreciation for the friendship of our Latin American neighbors. For this reason, we want to make the 1956 Columbus Day observances even more widespread than in 1955. We want to set up a permanent Columbus Day organization as a means of working toward greater inter-American friendship and good will.

We hope our Latin American neighbors will use their 1956 Columbus Day celebrations as an opportunity to strengthen their bonds with us in the United States.

The nations of the Western Hemisphere have lived more peacefully together than have the nations in any other geographic area in the world. The Western Hemisphere is in reality the showpiece of democratic ideals and achievements.

The 1956 Columbus Day theme, Americans All, is a symbol of the friendship which unites 340 million Americans of many creeds, languages, and cultures in a manner without precedent the world over.

The significant fact about the work of the National Citizens' Committee for Columbus Day is this: It is a volunteer citizens' organization, without salaried staff. Financial contributions are used only to defray Columbus Day campaign expenses. Each United States citizen who works in Columbus Day programs is rewarded only through the success of his efforts in behalf of stronger bonds of inter-American friendship and good will.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 1955 COLUMBUS DAY CELEBRATION

In the 1955 Columbus Day celebrations came a proclamation from President Dwight D. Eisenhower. From across the Nation came Columbus Day proclamations from the distinguished Governors of 33 States: Alabama, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia.

Many of these governors set up State committees and promoted statewide Columbus Day campaigns. The statewide program developed by the Missouri chairman, John J. Griffin, vice president of the United Bank & Trust Company of St. Louis, achieved unbelievable results in community celebrations throughout the State.

Under the leadership of the Honorable John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston and president of the United States Conference of Mayors, 97 mayors in cities of more than 50,000 population, representing more than three-fourths of our citizens, issued Columbus Day proclamations urging their citizens to stress the importance of the Americas and Western Hemisphere solidarity.

From the Congress of the United States came honorary sponsorship from members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, headed by the revered senior Senator from Georgia, WALTER F. GEORGE, and from the House Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by the distinguished Congressman from the Fifth District of South Carolina, JAMES P. RICHARDS.

From the Latin American countries came cooperation and honorary sponsorship from all the Ambassadors to the United States and to the Organization of American States.

Leaders of 61 national organizations gave direction and guidance to Columbus Day observances and urged their members to participate in State and local celebrations. These organizations included pan-American societies, educators, lawyers, youth groups, businessmen, fraternal groups, churchmen, veterans' organizations, agriculture, labor, men's and women's civic groups, social and patriotic organizations.

Under the leadership of Dr. Merrill F. Hartshorn, executive secretary, National Council for the Social Studies, and Sister Mary Janet, S. C., commission on American citizenship, Catholic University of America, and the other members of the education committee, more than 1,500 public and parochial school systems in the 48 States indicated their interest in the Columbus Day idea as an opportunity to launch a more effective study of the 20 Latin American Republics and their bonds with the United States. Sixty-five major colleges and universities indicated their support of the same idea.

Under the direction of Miss Edna Bowles and Mrs. Constance Zarbo of the Americas Daily, and the other members of the publicity committee, the story of Columbus Day as a celebration of the Americas was told through the press, and the radio and TV stations across the United States.

The top officials of 22 business and industry firms engaged in commerce with the other American Republics contributed generously as national sponsors to bear the expenses of our 1955 citizens committee. A large contribution was given by the National Forum for Good Government, an educational foundation.

National business sponsors of the 1955 Columbus Day observance were:

Sam G. Baggett, vice president, United Fruit Co.

Edgar R. Baker, managing director, Time-Life International.

H. W. Balgooyen, vice president, American & Foreign Power.

Charles E. Beard, president, Braniff International Airways.

Spruille Braden, former Assistant Secretary of State.

Philip Courtney, president, Coty International Corp.

Charles R. Cox, president, Kennecott Copper Co.

John A. Diemand, president, Insurance Company of North America.

Fred M. Farwell, president, Underwood Corp.

W. Latimer Gray, senior vice president, First National Bank of Boston.

Walter Harnischfegar, president, Harnischfegar Corp.

Frederick E. Hasler, director, Chemical Corn Exchange Bank.

Rudolph S. Hecht, chairman of board, Mississippi Shipping Co.

Carl N. Jacobs, president, Hardward Mutual Casualty Co.

John K. Jenney, director, foreign relations department, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Laurence F. Lee, president, Peninsular Life Insurance Co.

Charles A. Meyer, vice president, Sears, Roebuck & Co.

W. M. Miller, vice president, Singer Sewing Machine Co.

Howard M. Packard, executive vice president, S. C. Johnson & Son, Inc.

J. P. Spang, Jr., president, the Gillette Co.

Leo D. Welch, director, Standard Oil Company of New Jersey.

W. S. Youngman, Jr., director, American International Underwriters Corp.

One very important fact shines out of the unexpected success of the 1955 Columbus Day celebrations: There is a great untapped reservoir of friendship in the United States for our neighbors to the south. What we must do is to organize it, make it highly vocal, and recognize distinguished contributions to inter-American friendship.

In 1955, five outstanding United States citizens were awarded citations for their efforts in promoting inter-American friendship. These were:

Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, executive director, National Catholic Rural Life Conference.

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, former president, Pennsylvania State College, now president, Johns Hopkins University.

Hon. John B. Hynes, mayor of Boston, president, United States Conference of Mayors.

Rear Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison, author and historian.

Roy W. Howard, publisher, Scripps-Howard newspapers.

In 1956, similar awards will be made to United States citizens. In addition, plans are underway for similar awards to citizens of the other American Republics.

COLUMBUS DAY AND YOU

The 1956 Columbus Day committee believes Columbus Day observances will continue to generate an enthusiasm to rediscover America. We need the leadership of Senators, Congressmen, governors, and mayors. We need the leadership of businessmen, educators, organization leaders, and churches.

We'd like to see schools and colleges give more emphasis to the study of the Americas. We'd like to see clubs and other organizations give more time and thought to programs on the Americas. We'd like to see more intercultural exchanges from all walks of life. We'd like to see new business horizons bring prosperity and a better way of life to all the people of all the Americas.

Said Dr. José A. Mora, Secretary-General, Organization of American States, at the 1955 Pan American Union celebration:

"America gave to European man the idea of a better destiny on this earth. In no other part of the world as in our plains, our mountains and across our rivers did man, with all his renaissance impetus, create new possibilities for freedom of the human conscience and conceive American destiny as it is today established in the charter of the Organization of the American States, which proclaims that the historic mission of America is to offer man a land of liberty.

"Columbus opened the sea for the expansion of the conquest of occidental civilization. In order to comply with our duties as heirs of Columbus, we must open all ways possible for the expansion of the spiritual values of mankind."

Let America, therefore, be proud of itself. Let our 21 nations stand together as one. The continent of America. The beacon light for the world today.

Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the current headlines have produced a new crisis for the free world in the Middle East.

President Nasser, of Egypt, has seized the Suez Canal in an ominous breach of international agreement. This sets an example for every other Middle East ruler who may also be tempted by the desire for power and plunder.

This is Colonel Nasser's answer to our refusal to help finance the Aswan Dam. It is an answer which vindicates our position for it confirms the view that the Nasser regime cannot be relied upon to keep its commitments. Apparently stunned by our more realistic attitude, Nasser has now taken a desperate measure to retrieve prestige and influence in the Arab world. But this coup should not be dismissed as a capricious act by an immature dictator. It is part of a calculated plan to undermine the influence of the West and to expropriate its assets in the region. Unless Nasser is effectively challenged, he will be emulated by other Arab rulers. Oil wells, mines, refineries, pipelines, air bases, landing fields—none of these will be immune from the grasp of political adventurers seeking to expand domination and wealth.

One may be certain that there will be many on hand to apologize for Nasser and to explain that he was provoked into doing this because our Government and the United Kingdom withdrew the offer to build the Aswan Dam. Those who preach appeasement will argue that we should have continued to coddle Nasser, that we should have closed our eyes to his insults and anti-Western intrigue, that we should have ignored his wasteful and reckless arms purchases. But, I cannot believe that this is wise counsel or that it is widely advocated. To those who still believe that Nasser can be held for the West, I call attention to the speech he made Tuesday in which he cried:

I look at Americans and I say, may you choke to death on your fury.

In addition, the Egyptian press has been printing scandalous and shocking libels against our point 4 mission in Egypt, claiming that we have used the program for espionage and that we had supplied Egypt with diseased poultry and cattle and poisonous methods of espionage intrigue.

Mr. Speaker, this debacle has been long in the making. I have, on a number of occasions, taken the floor in the House to warn against a Middle East policy which does not measure up to reality. Most recently, on June 19, I called attention to the fact that it was the Communists who came to Cairo that week

to celebrate the evacuation of British forces from the Suez Canal. Despite our long and hard pursuit of Nasser, it was Shepilov, the Communist Foreign Minister, who was first at the finish line. That celebration marked the end of a Western base, devoted to the support of Western freedom. Thanks to Nasser, Communist power is being steadily consolidated in the Mediterranean. I concluded that brief statement with these words:

How many more diplomatic defeats shall we suffer in the Near East until we come to appreciate the fundamental principle that democracy will not be able to organize the defense of freedom in the Near East if it continues to capitulate to the pressures and intrigue of rules who have no interest in democracy and who are concerned primarily with the search for power?

Since that statement was made, there has been evidence that our policy has begun to harden into realism. Ambassador Henry A. Byroade, chief proponent of our pro-Egypt mood, is being sent off to the Union of South Africa where he will cease to exercise influence over our Arab-Israel relations. The withdrawal of the offer to build the dam was sharp and unmistabable. These two steps made it clear that the administration's courtship of Nasser had come to an end. Disenchantment with Nasser is now a manifest diplomatic fact.

If there are some who still think we should have let Nasser have the money for the dam, let them look at the contemptuous way in which Nasser tore up the Suez agreement. Under that agreement, private operation of the canal was to continue for another dozen years. just 2 years ago, when the British yielded to the pleas of our own American diplomats and agreed to withdraw from the Suez base, Nasser reaffirmed Egypt's respect for the international agreement which governs the administration of the canal. But now this agreement is a scrap of paper. Can the international community invest faith and confidence in a government which repudiates its word? Should the World Bank lend Nasser $200 million? Should we pour out grants from the United States Treasury as gifts to a man who demagogically whips up hatred against Americans and who rabblerouses the Arab world in a venomous and vindictive cry for the death of Americans.

Let us no longer have illusions about Nasser. Let us understand fully that this man, in the name of neutralism, is organizing opposition to democracy and the West, that he has thrown the Mediterranean open to the Communists, and that he is attempting to undermine and destroy the position of the West in the Mediterranean, in the Middle East, and throughout Africa.

The history of this century should have taught us something about the ways of dictators. It has also taught us, to our great misfortune, how democracies have yielded and retreated before bluff and blackmail. Hitler was able to achieve power for death and destruction, partly because democracy built him up, partly because democracy bowed down before him. Resistance came only when it was very late and at devastating cost.

Once a democratic people yield to pressure and threat, once they surrender or abandon a right in compromise with principle, their defenses begin to crumble and each succeeding concession, each succeeding retreat comes more easily. Five years ago the Western World was confronted by the hard fact that the Egyptian Government was blocking the Suez Canal to Israel-bound shipping on the untenable ground that it was at war with Israel—untenable because no United Nation member may be at war with another. The United Nations Security Council publicly condemned this action as a violation of the United Nations Armistice Agreements. It called on Egypt to stop its blockade, but Egypt defied the United Nations and managed to get away with it. It is still getting away with it. Moreover, it has extended the blockade to include Israel's southern port at Aqaba.

Now if the Egyptians can stop Israel-bound ships one day, they can stop American ships bound for other countries tomorrow, and if Egypt can ignore its international obligation by impeding the free flow of shipping for one nation, there is nothing to prevent Egypt from repudiating its obligations to all other nations.

When the West failed to stand up and to insist upon Israel's rights, it beclouded and endangered its own rights.

I trust that our own Department of State now recognizes the full gravity of the Nasser menace, and if it has finally awakened to the reality of that menace, I pray that we are now taking the measures to strengthen those who are directly in its path. In the light of all that has happened in the last few weeks, it is strange that the State Department should have been turning a deaf ear to Israel's urgent pleas for arms to defend herself. It is tragic that we should have told Israel to go shop elsewhere, because we didn't want to get into an arms race, because we were going to be the impartial peacemaker in the region, because we thought we might hold Egypt on our side.

The Department of State stubbornly refused to make a choice. On the one hand it was confronted by a little Fascist dictator rising to power on the shoulders of a military junta, mortgaging his country's substance on arms purchases from the Communists, deriding and baiting the West, because of the incitement and encouragement of Moscow. On the other side, there was an isolated little democracy, completely identified with the West in spirit, history, and tradition, and the first target of the Cairo-Kremlin threat, pleading vainly for arms.

As between these two, Mr. Dulles continued in a state of immobility, paralyzed by the fear that he might provoke the Arabs into some kind of indignant reprisal. Well, we have now had the reprisal, and, as it finally developed, it had nothing to do with Israel, and it came despite the fact that we did not respond to Israel's plea for arms. If we had met Israel's request for arms last fall when it was first made, we would have suffered no greater disaster than that which has occurred. Indeed, a firm policy at that time might have discouraged and deterred Nasser from the steps he has been emboldened to take by the spectacle of western weakness.

What will Nasser do next? Will he be carried, by the momentum of his own adventurism, into new and bolder assaults against the West? Will his allies now be encouraged to seize oil wells and refineries? Will Nasser step up his campaign to get the French out of Algeria, the British out of Cyprus, the Israelis out of Israel?

Will the Egyptians now launch an offensive into Israel, using their new jet bombers to rain death on Haifa, Tel Aviv, and Jerusalem? Will the Egyptians now roll their Stalin and Centurion tanks across the Sinai Desert and into Israel?

Who can say that they will not? Bear in mind that it was the Egyptians—not the Israelis—who launched the 1948 war when the Arab States tried to put aside the 1947 U. N. resolution by force. Is there any hope that the agreements negotiated by U. N. Secretary General Hammarskjold last spring will preserve the cease fire in the region? If those agreements were so sound and so durable, why was it necessary for the Secretary General to go back for more talks within the last few days?

This is not the time for complacency. If there are some who refuse to believe what Nasser is saying, if there are some who think that his threats against Israel are simply bluffs for domestic consumption, let these complacent prophets ask themselves whether they believed, as late as yesterday and the day before, that Nasser would seize the Suez Canal.

Mr. Speaker, there are some firm conclusions to be drawn from the present crisis.

The administration's policy to propitiate the Arab States has not worked. The Arabs are not impressed by weakness and by appeasement.

The administration has done nothing this year to make it clear that we will not permit a renewal of war in the Near East, that we will stand up against aggression, that we will strengthen those who are threatened. It rejected Israel's request to purchase arms; it made no provision for arms for Israel in the mutual-security program, it did not offer Israel a security treaty. it did not strengthen the tripartite declaration, it did not ask Congress for power to intervene if war broke out. In short, it did nothing, but hope that the illusion of peace could be preserved by a U. N. mission. There is nothing in the record of the administration and Congress to refresh and renew the strength and confidence of those who look to America for leadership in the struggle for freedom.

The time has come for a reappraisal of our Near East policy.

We must draw a line between democracy and dictatorship. We must stand firmly with those who are joined with us in the preservation of freedom and democratic institutions. That is the only way to peace.

Congressional Quarterly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the Congressional Quarterly.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the closing days of the 84th Congress my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], as chairman of the Republican senatorial campaign committee, made certain comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16 and 27 relative to the useful publication known as Congressional Quarterly. While recognizing that "the Congressional Quarterly has accurately reported the votes on specific rollcalls," the Senator from Kansas charged that "there is an editorial bias in interpreting the figures," and that "it slants the explanation of its statistics." The Senator from Kansas, himself a subscriber to Congressional Quarterly, makes it clear that he has not "questioned its value as a ready source of information on the activities of Congress," but he does question "how it presents its facts."

While I realize that no method of listing, compiling, organizing, analyzing, or commenting upon the votes of Members of Congress could ever meet the impossible task imposed by the intense desire of all Members that every comment concerning their votes on all projects should be completely sympathetic with their respective points of view, I am unwilling to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD close this year without inserting these observations regarding Congressional Quarterly.

I have followed this unique and valuable service since it was founded in 1945. I have known its founders, Henrietta and Nelson Poynter, of St. Petersburg, since before I was Governor of Florida. I knew Nelson Poynter's father as a constructive, crusading newspaperman from my earliest days in Florida politics.

Congressional Quarterly has provided a fast, accurate factual service for more than 200 newspapers and other publications with many and varied political viewpoints. It seems to me that the client-editors of these publications, of all conceivable points of view, are able watchdogs against bias or slanting of Congressional Quarterly reports.

This service has made Congress more comprehensible to more people by logging all votes and all bills and presenting them in a form that laymen can understand. In compiling the records of support of Congressmen for President Eisenhower Congressional Quarterly has followed the same methods that it used during the Truman administration.

I believe that many of my colleagues in both Houses are a little more conscious of their records as a result of the nationwide use of Congressional Quarterly material. A box score cannot be devised that will suit every Congressman for every occasion. But Congress is better served and the institution of self-government is better served if more voters have an interest in and working knowledge of what goes on in Congress.

A year ago Congressional Quarterly took pains to show its client-editors how the boxscore was compiled on the support each Congressman has given to the Eisenhower program. At the time it forecast that these records would be the heart of 1956 elections. The fact that many Republicans "like Ike" in an election year, but vote against his program is an embarrassment of their own making and does not justify attacking the integrity of the newspaper service that supplies the data on an impersonal basis.

Since I doubt that many people know how difficult and expensive a job it is to analyze and cover the actions and votes of Congress I would like to quote from Congressional Quarterly's explanation of the process, which it gave to its subscribing newspapers:

"Congressional Quarterly's job of making the record available, so that America's editors could 'take it and give it vitality,' has been the most massive, and probably the most costly, single assignment in the history of American journalism.

"It has required, in a decade of effort, the development of a highly trained staff, the use of complex and expensive electronic equipment, the invention and steady improvement of a whole series of special techniques essential to the task.

"As a research project alone the assignment was so formidable that it had never been attempted, even by the big foundations for the purposes of historians and scholars. In any case American editors knew that this was a job that should be paid for by American newspapers for their own use, not left to government or to charity.

"They also knew that, while it was a newspaper responsibility, the assignment was one that no newspaper or wire service, geared to the fast reporting of spot news, could undertake successfully. * * *

"The job had to be done by a new, separate, specialized organization devoted to the task of collecting and organizing congressional and political information for newspaper use.

"It had to be an organization especially trained to gather, correlate, index, and prepare for the easiest and fastest use of reporters, editors, and editorial writers, all of the essential factual record and background on Congress, and to build a system to keep it always up to date.

"It also had to be capable of anticipating the needs of newspapers and, by planning years ahead, to build a solid factual basis for newspaper coverage of elections 2, 4, 10 years in the future.

"When Congressional Quarterly undertook this task, the full dismensions of the problem were hardly imagined.

"The raw materials consisted of tons of documents, millions of words, yard after yard of CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, stacks of committee and floor calendars, bushels of reports, amendments, speeches, records of junkets, Budget Bureau and White House recommendations by the pound, executive agency and department reports and proposals from floor to ceiling. And the supply kept coming every day.

"All this had to be sifted, sorted, and analyzed, while a system and staff were developed simultaneously to keep the job up to date * * *.

"Here's a case history of two interlocking Congressional Quarterly stories, Eisenhower Support and Eisenhower Boxscore, published during the 84th Congress.

"1. Every Eisenhower message, speech, press conference, and other public statement was examined minutely by a trained Congressional Quarterly staff. Every specific Presidential request or recommendation for legislation, every clear-cut declaration of stands on public issues, was recorded and cataloged. This process required the equivalent of half time for one experienced staff member the year round.

"2. During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, in 1955, the President's legislative program consisted of 207 items. Each was followed painstakingly through the legislative process. Congressional Quarterly recorded exactly what happened to every point of Mr. Eisenhower's program. The boxscore showed which items Congress approved, which were rejected, which sustained setbacks, which progressed part way.

"3. Rollcall votes place Members of Congress on record. During 1955, Congress took 93 rollcalls that tested support of the President's program. On each, his public stands made clear which way he would have voted if he had been Congressman Eisenhower. Most of the 93 votes decided Congress' stand on points of the President's proposals. The balance tested congressional support for his viewpoint on other issues.

"Working from its meticulous record of the President's stands, Congressional Quarterly analyzed each rollcall, pinned down the facts on who was for, who against Mr. Eisenhower.

"The job of logging and analysis for these two stories—Eisenhower Boxscore and Eisenhower Support—took the equivalent of one highly trained staff member's full time, all year.

"4. All information on the 93 Eisenhower-issue rollcalls was entered on IBM punchcards. The final compilations of Eisenhower Support, by parties and by individual Congressmen, were made electronically.

"Operation of the IBM machine for the Eisenhower Support story took the equivalent of about one-third time for one man all year.

"5. Then—and only then—came the writing. Each of the two stories took the time of a topflight writer for approximately 5 days, plus repeated, regular consultation with the research staff throughout the year.

"The result: A smash exclusive story for Congressional Quarterly newspapers; vital information the voter never before could get; a noticeable increase in caution and responsibility on the part of politicians and parties.

"This kind of thorough, exclusive reporting is standard Congressional Quarterly practice."

Henrietta and Nelson Poynter live in Pinellas County, Fla., where he is owner and editor of the St. Petersburg Times. I read his newspaper regularly and frequently disagree with its editorial position. The Republicans are in his debt because his newspaper stanchly supported the two-party system when they were weak in his area in numbers and funds. I mention this because more recently Pinellas County's Republican vote gave that party its first seat in Congress since reconstruction days—which seat we Democrats have high hopes of recapturing this year.

In my years of careful reading of Congressional Quarterly reports, I have found no bias carried over to it from the editorial attitudes of the St. Petersburg Times. In my years of public life I have met many newspaper editors and writers. I place the Poynters among the top of those who have a high and continuing sense of responsibility toward making journalism strengthen our democratic institutions.

Hon. Eugene D. Millikin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON ALLOTT
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem by Milford E. Shields, Colorado's poet laureate. Mr. Shields pays a well-de-

served tribute to our beloved and distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado, who is retiring from the Senate after this session.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU WILL BE MARCHING—SENATOR EUGENE D. MILLIKIN

You've worn the toga rightfully and well,
How well, the voice of history will tell,
As down the ringing corridors of time
Our Nation marches to the light sublime;
For you have helped to set the course aright,
Lay shining highway out of righteous might—
You will be marching until time is done—
Our marching Nation in the golden sun.

—MILFORD E. SHIELDS.

Letter From Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell to High School Graduates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in my 32 years of service on Capitol Hill I have never known a Secretary of Labor who had the confidence and respect of management and labor and all segments of our people exceeding that of Secretary James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey. Everyone who knows Jim takes his hat off to him on his dedication and good works. Recently, the Secretary addressed the following public letter to high-school graduates defining the employment opportunities of our day:

DEAR GRADUATE, EMPHASIS IS ON SKILL, DEMAND IS HIGH

(By James P. Mitchell)

I am writing this letter to acquaint you with the employment opportunities you can expect and to let you know the kind of economy you are entering as a young worker.

There are two factors in your favor. First, the economy is at high levels. Employment this spring is at high marks for almost all sectors of enterprise. Job opportunities, therefore, are excellent. Secondly, there are fewer youths coming of working age now than there will be in the future when the high birth rate of the 1940's begins to be felt in the late teen brackets.

If I had to single out the most important fact concerning your status as workers, I would say it was this: whatever occupational field you enter, you will find that the premium in our modern economy is on skill. The day of the unskilled worker is passing; the day of the highly skilled, flexible, and well-educated worker is already here.

You will find, then, that your education in this sense is just beginning. You will find that training courses will precede many vocations, and that they involve as great an intellectual challenge as many of your school courses. How successfully you meet that challenge is a critical factor in the future success of our economy, and of our country.

Workers who have mastered one of the skilled crafts or who have acquired the skills of a technician generally earn more than the less skilled workers. They possess greater flexibility in making job changes, have more promotional opportunities and job security. It would be extremely unwise to pass up any opportunity for additional training that could very well make the difference between good wages and security and lower wages in your future years.

There are a number of skilled fields in which training opportunities and long-run employment prospects are good. Among these are machine-shop occupations, particularly tool and die makers and machinists. The construction trades, including occupations such as carpenters, electricians, plumbers and pipefitters, and bricklayers make up the largest field of employment for skilled workers. These trades will provide many apprentice openings this year. Another large field of employment for skilled craftsmen is the printing trades, which offer relatively high earnings and steady employment.

Numerous jobs will be open to girls with training in the traditional fields in which they excel. Stenographers and typists, operators of various office machines, such as computers, key-punch machines, and bookkeeping machines are in demand.

The trend in occupations for women workers has been, since World War II, toward greater diversification and latitude. Many kinds of employment now are open to young women workers. In the 1950 census, women workers appeared in 466 occupational groups. The majority of them, however, demand more training than you now have. Nurses, teachers, women scientists, and mathematicians will find good jobs for a long time to come, but more education and more training are needed to qualify for these positions.

Jobs in the clerical field, in selling, in assembly work in many factories are available for the high-school graduate. I would, however, give a great deal of thought to continuing your education toward a higher occupational group where women are now not only accepted but needed.

The wide trend toward mechanization within the factory should continue the rapid growth in employment opportunity for maintenance and repair personnel. Among the most important of these are electronic technicians and maintenance mechanics. The entire electronics field from home television receivers and military and civilian electronic equipment, requires a large staff of maintenance and repairmen.

Those of you about to enter a branch of the military service should investigate the opportunities for specialized training in some of the skilled crafts and technical occupations. The time spent in uniform may afford you a chance to learn a basic trade and gain valuable experience. It can mean greater job opportunity and higher wages when you return to civilian life.

In choosing industries in which to seek employment, the young graduate should consider not only the industries which are currently expanding, such as electronics manufacturing and chemicals, but also the large well-established industries where replacement needs provide thousands of new job opportunities each year. Your school or public library, or your vocational counselor, have copies of Labor Department reports which will show up-to-date information on how many workers are employed in each of the Nation's industries.

The employment picture in your town may be somewhat different from that of the Nation as a whole. I urge you to take the path of wisdom and pay a visit to your local employment service office. There you will find invaluable information on occupational outlook both on a national and local scale. United States Department of Labor publications like The Job Guide for Young Workers, the Occupational Outlook Handbook and the Employment Outlook Bulletins will describe long-range employment prospects for the major industries as well as many important occupations. Many valuable services are also available at your Employment Service. Aptitude tests, guidance and counseling facilities, and occupational directories can help steer you in the right vocational course. Your school counselor may also be able to help you.

As you begin your work career, you will be offered many kinds of advice. The decisions you make, however, will be your own. Now is the time to take stock, decide what kind of job you would like to have, and what kind of training and education you need to obtain it.

Your country needs you. Upon the skills and abilities you possess and will develop depends the American future. I am sure you will meet this challenge and responsibility with the same success that has characterized the generations before you. Best of luck.

Give President All the Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRACIE PFOST
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Idaho Farm Journal of Boise, Idaho, of July 26, 1956, written by one of the State's ablest editors, Mr. Ed Emerine. This editorial is the best summary I have seen of the pressures responsible for the defeat of the Hells Canyon bill—and what that defeat means to Idaho.

The editorial follows:

COMMENTS BY THE EDITOR

GIVE PRESIDENT ALL THE CREDIT

(By Ed Emerine)

The defeat of the Hells Canyon bill was brought about by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and his big-business Cabinet. The President, although still a little weak, stayed in Washington to crack the whip. It was no credit to him that he should give his blessing to the upper Colorado project, then switch and decree a curse on the Snake River. Every Republican in the Senate, except two, did the rubberstamp act. Horse trading with southern Democrats did the rest—all engineered from the White House.

So the Eisenhower administration, faithful to the eastern power corporations, won a victory for Idaho Power Co., of Maine, not Idaho.

But who lost? That's something to stop and think about.

First of all, the taxpayers of all the States lost. Why? Because already the Army engineers are looking for other sites for storage on the Snake. Their reports for 10 years have stated that Hells Canyon is the best place for a flood-control and power dam. They have warned, too, that Idaho Power's inadequate development at Brownlee would make other storage dams necessary. That's why they came up the river and considered flooding out the Opaline project at Marsing in order to get more storage. That's why they're considering Guffey, Pleasant Valley, Mountain Sheep, and others. The taxpayers will have to dig up to build those dams. Hells Canyon was the only one proposed that would pay off in 50 years and cost the taxpayers nothing in the long run. Now, the taxpayers are saddled with a big dam bill, even if it comes in small installments.

Perhaps Idaho lost most of all, for there is little chance now of ever getting low-cost electric power, or enough of it, to bring in needed industries and payrolls. Gone,

too, is the set-aside of power profits to aid reclamation upstream, at Mountain Home, on the north side, in Owyhee County, on the Mountain Home Desert, and elsewhere. Taxpayers will dig up the money—in addition to their high electric bills—if there is any further development of Idaho reclamation.

Those living on the Upper Snake didn't win, because their water rights were never in danger. And if Hells Canyon would have been a danger, what about Guffey, Brownlee, Mountain Sheep, Pleasant Valley, and all the other dams to be built on the Snake? These dams can be no less dangerous; instead, lacking the capacity of Hells Canyon, they may be a far greater threat.

The entire Nation lost when its President, playing politics with a natural resource that has been carefully guarded and held for a century, gave Hells Canyon away to a small group of Eastern investors—for 50 years, and perhaps forever.

LOBBYISTS COST MONEY

Drew Pearson, the Washington columnist, dug up some pertinent information for Idaho and the Northwest last week when he went into the expenses of Idaho Power Co. at its Federal Power Commission hearing.

Idaho Power Co. lists $31,999.95 for legal services, of which $18,348.75 went to Parry, Keenan, Robertson & Daly, of Twin Falls, Idaho, and the balance to ex-Senator Guy Cordon, Republican, of Oregon.

Pearson further revealed that Senator Cordon was also paid by Washington Water Power Co., a "retainer fee for 1955 of $10,000 in equal monthly payments." Portland General Electric, which joined Idaho Power Co. in fighting Hells Canyon, lists ex-Senator Cordon as getting a retainer of $10,000 per year, "commencing January 1955 as per oral agreement."

Now, these fees wouldn't be so bad if it were not that Guy Cordon is a former United States Senater and can go on the Senate floor and mingle with his former colleagues to do his lobbying.

Perhaps the whole story of the lobby against Hells Canyon, and its total cost, may never be known. The public may never know all the tactics used by the Eastern power monopoly to defeat the Hells Canyon bill. And all of us will just have to guess at the hundreds of thousands, or perhaps even millions, of dollars that went to lobbyists, and others, before the vote on the bill.

Confiscated Assets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 22, 1956, makes interesting reading:

CONFISCATED ASSETS

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN is engaged once more in an effort to restore to Germany and Japan the property of their nationals confiscated in this country during the last World War. The Senate Judiciary Committee has voted approval of a bill which would give these aliens an American handout worth between $500 million and $600 million. We believe that this handout is unwarranted. It would have to come out of the pockets of American taxpayers, and it would violate a reparations settlement agreed upon with Germany and Japan by the United States and her allies.

It is argued that the confiscated assets ought to be returned because they were private property. They were, in fact, nothing of the kind. They were property strictly controlled and manipulated by the German and Japanese Governments for the advancement of their nationalistic interests; and it is to those Governments rather than to the United States that the individual German and Japanese owners ought to look for restitution. Indeed, the Bonn convention, signed in 1952, provides explicitly that the German Government should compensate German nationals.

Under the terms of the Paris reparation agreement in 1946, the Allied nations, including the United States, agreed to forego reparations against Germany and, instead of such reparations, to hold German assets seized during the war. A violation of that agreement on the part of the United States at this time would be an injustice and an embarrassment to the other signatory countries which cannot afford such profligate largess. There is no good reason why Americans should pick up this half-billion-dollar tab.

Black Cross at Hells Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Wenatchee World which expresses the feelings of a majority of the people of the State of Washington on the recent adverse vote on the Federal Hells Canyon Dam legislation. As a sponsor of this measure in the House, I was disappointed on this vote this session of Congress. But we who support Hells Canyon Dam have not given up on this fight.

The editorial follows:

BLACK CROSS AT HELLS CANYON

Orderly resource development in the best public interest received a severe blow last week when the Senate voted down Hells Canyon Dam.

Bluntly put: the action was shameful.

There isn't a single Government engineering report in existence that shows the 3 low dams of the Idaho Power Co. for the Hells Canyon area of the Snake even remotely equal in power production capacity and other multipurpose benefits to the Federal storage dam.

Yet the Senate backed this half development of the river.

Not a single Government engineer who made a study under the Democratic administration has altered his figures in support of this potentially great development under the Republican administration. Yet the Senate voted to mutilate one of our great rivers with tremendous loss of resources.

Despite the overwhelming superiority of the high-dam project, backed by the expert calculations of the world's greatest engineers, politicians in the Senate voted down a project as great as Grand Coulee Dam.

The late Rufus Woods was told early in his fight for the Grand Coulee Dam in effect, "you're bucking all the money in the world."

The same thing is true in the battle for Hells Canyon and the full-scale development of water resources of the Pacific Northwest that it represents. The power trust repeated its performance, spending thousands for selfish gain.

What avenues remain open for eventually attaining Hells Canyon Dam, we do not know. But if the battle is lost, it would be appropriate to place high on the rocky walls above Hells Canyon Dam site, a large black cross.

On it should be placed the words:

"Here, lies forever dead, one of the greatest dam sites in the world, killed by the most vicious campaign of falsehoods, politics, selfishness and fraud ever perpetrated on the American people."

Veterans' Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts did not get an opportunity to again state her interest in veterans' affairs. In my opinion, she was on her feet to give another speech pleading the cause of those veterans' groups whose legislation was not enacted into law during the 84th Congress. If they had put increases in compensation for those with service-connected disabilities ahead of increased pensions for those with nonservice-connected disabilities, this Congress would have helped the boys who were shot up while serving their country.

I commend the AMVETS and the Disabled American Veterans, the Blinded Veterans, the Purple Heart Association, and the thinking citizens who fought so hard for that which was right—the enactment of legislation that would give those with service-connected disabilities an increase.

In the future I hope the veterans' groups will get behind a compensation bill. As for what happened this time, I believe the following editorials explain why this legislation was not passed in the 84th Congress:

[From the New York Daily News of July 24, 1956]

TIP TO THE LEGION

The American Legion still stands by its $27 billion bill for old-age pensions for needy World War I veterans regardless of whether they have service-connected disabilities. So Congress, fearing a trick amendment carrying the Legion scheme, hesitates to act on truly worthy proposals to increase benefits for 2 million veterans actually disabled in military service.

Our feeling is that the Legion would be wise to drop its blanket pension plan. Why play dog in the manger with veterans whose war services directly contributed to their need for more help?

[From the Akron Beacon-Journal of July 24, 1956]

IT'S UP TO THE LEGION

With Congress nearing adjournment, a timely warning has been sent the American Legion national officers that if veterans with service-connected disabilities are not given increased allowances at this session, the Legion must accept full responsibility.

The increase in disability compensation has been blocked by the stubborn insistence of the Legion on its program of pensions to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. The House enacted legislation to boost payments for service-connected disabilities, and the same measure undoubtedly will be passed by the Senate, if a fight over the Legion-sponsored pension provision can be avoided. Fear that the Legion will insist on attaching the non-service-connected pensions to the Senate measure has kept it off the floor.

If the Senate does not act before adjournment there will be no upward adjustment of existing compensation schedules this year.

It should be apparent to Legion leaders by this time that their demand for a broader pension base cannot succeed. The rank and file of the organization have not been aroused and the grassroots pressure the leaders hoped for has not materialized.

Over the years the Legion has done an outstanding job on behalf of the disabled servicemen and the widows and orphans of those who lost their lives in service or as a result of service wounds, illness, or injuries.

It is a peculiar position the Legion now finds itself in. If these people who have been its major concern for 38 years fail to get badly needed compensation increases this year, it will be solely because the Legion has gone off on a new pension trail, trying to jam through a bill for which there is little demand and no popular support.

The warning sent the Legion by Representative OLIN TEAGUE, chairman of the House Veterans' Committee, should be heeded by the national officers.

[From the Washington Evening Star of July 25, 1956]

LITTLE CHANCE IS GIVEN WORLD WAR I PENSION BILL

A big pension bill for World War I veterans appeared certain today to die in the Senate Finance Committee as final adjournment of Congress nears.

The American Legion, the Nation's largest veterans' organizations, is putting on an all-out drive for the measure, with telegrams, long-distance calls, letters, and visits to Senators.

But there appeared no chance to dislodge the bill at this late date. The Finance Committee held one brief meeting yesterday to act on minor measures; it has no additional meetings scheduled.

Meanwhile, it appeared likely that another House-passed veterans' bill, to increase payments to disabled veterans of all wars by 10 percent, would go down the drain, too.

PRECEDENT IS FEARED

The latter measure is less costly and less objectionable to Senators handling the legislation. But they fear that if it is sent to the floor, the World War I pensions bill will be offered to it as an amendment and might get through the Senate under election-year pressures.

The pension bill would provide $90-a-month payments at age 65 to all World War I veterans with incomes under certain limits.

Its cost is estimated at $367 million the first year and $613 million by the fifth year. But Senators opposing it say this would be only a small part of the eventual cost, because it would establish a precedent for similar pensions to World War II and Korean war veterans.

The Eisenhower administration is strongly opposed to the bill, which passed the House June 27.

BYRD AWAITS REPORTS

Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Finance Committee, asked various Government agencies, including the Treasury, Defense Department, Veterans' Administration, and Budget Bureau, for reports on the measure as soon as it reached his committee. So far these have not been sent to him.

He has said the bill is of such far-reaching importance that public hearings would have to be held on it before any action could be taken.

The bill to increase payments to disabled veterans would cost about $172 million in the first year.

The administration also has opposed this, but some lawmakers feel it might be accepted if it were passed without the pension bill tied to it.

However, Senator BYRD has said that this bill, too, should be the subject of hearings, since it involves so many millions.

The Hoover Commission Recommendations and the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the Hoover Commission recommendations and the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has now been over a year since the Second Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, the Second Hoover Commission, held its last meeting. After 2 years of intensive examination of the Federal Government, the Hoover Commission reported to the Congress on 20 different areas of governmental activity and made some 314 recommendations for increasing efficiency, economy and rational operation of the Government. Of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, some 167 individual recommendations required action by the Congress before they could be put into effect.

As one who undertook to introduce various bills to implement the Hoover Commission recommendations, I feel it is timely upon the close of the 84th Congress to consider the progress, or lack of it, which Congress has made toward implementing these recommendations. It should be remembered that the scope of the Second Commission's inquiry far exceeded that of the First Hoover Commission and delved into the realm of policy matters by considering whether certain functions should be continued to be performed by the Federal Government at all, rather than just the most efficient manner in which such services could be rendered. As a result many of the Second Commission's recommendations were highly controversial.

Nevertheless, there has been substantial consideration of some of the Commission's recommendations, particularly by the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. Elsewhere in the RECORD, Senator KENNEDY has outlined the endeavors of that Subcommittee with the Hoover Commission recommendations, and the following summary of the positive enactments of the 84th Congress in implementing the Hoover Commission recommendations includes those bills considered by his subcommittee, as well as those of other committees:

ACTION OF 84TH CONGRESS IMPLEMENTING SECOND HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

I. General

A. Extension of President's authority under the Reorganization Act to present reorganization plans to Congress to June 1, 1957. Public Law 16, March 25, 1955.

II. Personnel and civil service

A. Pay increases for heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and independent agencies (recommendation 4). Public Law 854, July 31, 1956.

B. Classification of Postal Employees (recommendation 8B). Public Law 68, June 10, 1955.

III. Paperwork management

A. Simplified computation of charges imposed on departments and agencies for the use of the United States mail (task force recommendation 16). Public Law 705, July 14, 1956.

IV. Federal medical services

A. Establishment of a National Library of Medicine (recommendation 23), S. 3430. Sent to President July 24, 1956.

B. Increased pay and retirement benefits for doctors and dentists in the Armed Forces, reducing need to draft doctors (recommendation 4). Public Law 497, April 30, 1956.

C. Clarification of veterans' privileges for dental care, limiting it to service-connected conditions (recommendation 7). Public Law 83, June 16, 1955.

D. Provision of medical and hospital care for Armed Forces dependents through insurance (recommendation 21). Public Law 569, June 7, 1956.

E. Authorization for Surgeon General to make grants for a program of research on mental illness (recommendation 27, in part). Public Law 182, July 28, 1955.

F. Development of improved methods of care, treatment, and rehabilitation of mentally ill (recommendation 27, in part), S. 3958. Sent to President July 24, 1956.

V. Lending agencies

A. Separation of Home Loan Bank System from the Housing and Home Finance Agency (recommendation 9). Public Law 345, August 11, 1955.

B. Extension of direct loans to veterans for housing until July 25, 1957. Public Law 88, June 21, 1955.

C. Increased rate of retirement of Government capital in certain institutions (including banks for cooperatives) operating under supervision of the Federal Farm Credit System (recommendation 22). Public Law 347, August 11, 1955.

D. Encouragement of liquidation of Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation (recommendation 28, in part). Public Law 55, June 1, 1955.

E. Extension of Small Business Administration for 2 years (recommendation 39b). Public Law 268, August 9, 1955.

F. Merger of Production Credit Corporation in Federal intermediate credit banks and provision for return of the Government's investment in such banks (recommendations 24, 25), H. R. 10285. Sent to President July 16, 1956.

VI. Transportation

A. Authorized the armed services to use private ships wherever possible in transporting people and cargoes (recommendations 7 and 10). Public Law 538, May 28, 1956.

B. Revision of storage provisions for household goods of members of the Armed Forces (recommendation 2). Public Law 245, August 5, 1955.

VII. Surplus property

A. Revision of program of donation or surplus property for educational and public health purposes (recommendations 8a, 8d, and 9). Public Law 61, June 3, 1955.

B. Authorization of donation of surplus property for civil defense purposes (recommendation 9). Public Law 655, July 3, 1956.

C. Extension of authorization to dispose of surplus property by negotiation to July 31, 1958 (recommendation 17), H. R. 7855. Sent to President, July 25, 1956.

VIII. Business enterprises

A. Authorization for leasing of Alaska Railroad (recommendation 13b). Public Law 232, August 4, 1955.

IX. Depot utilization

A. Revision of nontemporary storage of baggage and household effects (recommendation 2a, in part). Public Law 245, August 5, 1955.

X. Research and development

A. Increased compensation for top research personnel in certain Federal agencies (recommendation 1). Incorporated in Public Law 854, July 31, 1956.

XI. Budget and accounting

A. Establishment of cost-based accounting and budgeting in the executive departments (recommendations 2, 4, 5, 6, 13, and 14), S. 3897. Sent to President July 25, 1956.

B. Simplification of accounting and procedures for the settlement of claims against lapsed appropriations. Public Law 798, July 25, 1956.

C. Relief of certain officers of financial liability, not due to fraud or gross negligence, to reduce the volume of claims to the General Accounting Office (recommendation 19, in part). Public Law 365, August 11, 1955; Public Law 334, August 9, 1955.

D. Establishment of a Staff Office of Accounting in the Bureau of the Budget, headed by an Assistant Director of Accounting (recommendation 10). Senate Joint Resolution 199 sent to President July 27, 1956.

XII. Water resources and power

A. Vest primary responsibility for water pollution projects in the States, with Federal effort directed to research, consultation, and control, over interstate problems (recommendations 1c and 1e). Public Law 660, July 9, 1956.

In addition to those measures enacted by the Congress, the Department of Defense, which is so intimately affected by the Hoover recommendations, has announced its concurrence with 85 percent of the Commission's recommendations. Most of these recommendations can be impleted through administrative action. The Department has indicated that it is putting these recommended changes into effect.

Yet there is no justification for complacency in viewing the record of implementing the recommendations of the Second Hoover Commission. Much remains to be done before there can be any real satisfaction. Although the Congress approved certain very important budget and accounting revisions, the House of Representatives stood firm against the inclusion in that legislation of the fundamental revision placing appropriations on an accrued expenditure basis. Approval of that reform in the financial structure of the Government must be obtained during the next Congress. In addition, the establishement of an Assistant Secretary for Research and Development in each of the military departments must be pursued next year. Although the President proposed this change in a reorganization plan, the Congress disapproved of it considering that such an organizational change should be accomplished by positive legislation. The Congress thereby obligated itself to undertake passage of the necessary legislation at the earliest opportunity.

In the field of civil service reform, there has been little accomplished toward implementing the fundamental changes that the Hoover Commission recommended. Establishment of the senior civil service, revision of veterans' preference provisions, and other important matters must be given priority in the next Congress. The Civil Service Commission has, admittedly, had a prodigious task in evaluating the effect and advisability of all the recommendations throughout the divisions of the Federal service, but the Commission should definitely come forth during the early days of the 85th Congress and preesnt its findings and recommendations so that action, already long delayed, can be taken.

I have received a letter from Mr. Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, dated June 21, 1956. In this letter, Mr. Young held forth considerable promise for recommendations from the Civil Service Commission, concerning the Hoover proposals, to be ready for the 85th Congress. I hope that such Civil Service Commission proposals will be forthcoming early in the next session.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 21, 1956.

The Honorable H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: I am glad to reply to your letter of April 26, 1956, concerning the Hoover Commission recommendations, in which I share your great interest. You inquire specifically about S. 2331, S. 2332, S. 2333, S. 2334, S. 2335, S. 2336, and S. 2337, bills to implement some of the more important proposals of the Commission in the area of personnel and civil service.

As you know, the executive branch is giving intensive consideration to the Hoover Commission recommendations not already in effect. There is enclosed a letter from the President expressing his interest in the Hoover Commission proposals on personnel and civil service.

Much has been accomplished already through legislation and administrative action. Public Law 68, establishing a pay and classification system for the postal field service, substantially accomplished recommendation 8 (b). Excellent progress has been made in the improvements in recruiting, examining, and appointment practices proposed by recommendations 9 and 10. Our new Federal service entrance examination program is a great stride forward in this area. The extension of the competitive service overseas (recommendation 14 (a)) has been largely accomplished. Recommendation 14 (c), concerning the transfer of persons between merit systems, has been provided for by Executive Order No. 10577 and is being implemented by the Commission. A directive of January 11, 1955, instructed agencies to carry out the substance with respect to in-service training of recommendation 7.

The bills you inquire about embody some of the most fundamental changes suggested by the Commission. In order to realize the full benefits of these Hoover Commission recommendations, there must be not only general agreement as to the overall aims but also general aceptance of methods on the part of Congress, heads of agencies, and other affected groups. I believe it is of the utmost importance to the ultimate attainment of these objectives that we lay a firm groundwork of acceptance. Following is a brief statement of our progress in considering the bills you mention:

S. 2331 would put into effect recommendation No. 6 of the Report on Personnel and Civil Service. This bill provides for a senior civil service. To be effective, this proposal must have the full support of the Congress, the heads of departments and agencies, and employees. We believe that a far-reaching educational program will be necessary in order to gain the support needed. The executive branch is now exploring ways of accomplishing the objectives of the senior civil service, including a study of those parts of the proposal that could be put into practice immediately by administrative action. We do not believe that a legislative proposal will be ready for submission to the Congress before the next session, however.

S. 2332 would carry out recommendation No. 8 (a), to simplify the grade structure of the Classification Act. Under this bill, grades GS–1 through GS–6 would be regrouped into 3 grades, and grades GS–7 through GS–11 would be regrouped into 3 grades. About 92 percent of the employees covered by the General Schedule are in grades GS–1 through GS–11 and their present pay is in excess of $3 billion a year. A major revision of the grade structure of the Classification Act, as proposed in S. 2332, could result in very substantial changes in payroll costs and could affect the interests of hundreds of thousands of employees, as well as the internal organization of the departments and agencies. Since this bill would have such far-reaching effects, it is extremely controversial. It contains some technical provisions which involve complex administrative problems. Solutions should be determined for all such problems before we submit our comments on this bill. We do not want to report adversely because the bill provisions certainly merit consideration. This specific proposal relates to only one part of a larger set of problems in classification and pay. A plan is now under consideration through which these problems can be attacked. We will report to you within a few months on the progress in carrying out this plan.

S. 2333 would carry out recommendation No. 10 (c) by substituting a "rule of 5" for the present "rule of 3" required by the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. The Commission has made a careful study of this proposal and our report on S. 2333 was transmitted to Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON on May 29, 1956. We recommended enactment with amendment to provide that the Commission may apply a rule of five in certifying to those categories of positions for which it determines such action to be in the interest of the Government. A copy of our report is enclosed.

S. 2334 would put into effect recommendation No. 11, to simplify the performance rating system. We have carefully studied this proposal and hope to have ready early in the next session of the Congress a legislative proposal which would carry out the objectives of this recommendation, although the content of the proposed legislation may differ from that of S. 2334.

S. 2335 would carry out recommendation No. 12 (a), to limit a veteran's right of appeal to the first 5 years after appointment to the service. The Commission staff has just completed a study and reevaluation of the whole appeals program. It will be ready within a few weeks for Commission consideration and for discussion with agencies, employee and veterans' groups, and staffs of congressional committees. These steps will obviously take considerable time. They will be pursued diligently, and a report will be made to you at the earliest possible date.

S. 2336 would put into effect recommendation No. 13, relating to reductions in force. We are presently making an intensive study, not only of the specific recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on this subject, but of the other aspects of the reduction-in-force problem. We have solicited the views of representative agencies and have secured extensive information from them concerning reduction-in-force problems. Because of the far-reaching nature of this proposal, we feel that it is unlikely that a report on S. 2336 can be made during this session.

S. 2337 would carry out recommendation No. 14 (c), providing for the transfer of Federal employees between merit systems.

Our report on this bill was submitted to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee on April 17, 1956. As stated in that report, the Commission has adequate authority under the civil-service rules to carry out this proposal and has developed criteria by which we can identify established merit systems. We are now conducting negotiations with agencies maintaining such systems in order to arrive at agreements for the reciprocal transfer of personnel.

I believe that the Hoover Commission recommendations on personnel and civil service are highly constructive and have already led to significant improvement in personnel management. As indicated above, some of these recommendations have already been put into effect. In the case of some others, work by the executive branch has been completed and is awaiting action by the Congress.

The executive branch has completed work on recommendation No. 4, proposing increased salaries for the Government's top managers. S. 2628 and H. R. 7619 are now pending before the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. General authority for all agencies for training at nongovernment facilities (recommendation No. 7) is contained in H. R. 9510 and S. 3287, resulting from a legislative proposal submitted to the Congress by the Commission. Funds for carrying out recommendations 17 and 18 have been requested of the Congress in our budget request.

We assure you of our deep interest in the remaining proposals and our desire to complete action on them as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG,
Chairman.

The people of the United States have every right to expect that the public business, the business of government, will be conducted as economically and as efficiently as possible, within the objectives laid out for the Government. Although attending to the details of governmental organization, staffing, and financing may not be as exciting or as enthralling as some other matters of policy which require consideration by the Congress, nevertheless, every Member of Congress has a heavy obligation to concern himself with these details. I know that most Members of the Congress realize this fact, and I am hopeful that further substantial progress will be made on the Hoover Commission recommendations during the next Congress.

High Profits Charged in School Lunch Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Irwin Safchik which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 22, 1956, makes interesting reading:

HIGH PROFITS CHARGED IN SCHOOL LUNCH DEAL

(By Irwin Safchik)

House investigators charged yesterday the good friend and political associate of an Illinois GOP official reaped tremendous profits from distributing school lunches in the State.

The charge was made by a Government Operations subcommittee which investigated the contract awarded by Illinois State Superintendent of Public Instruction Vernon L. Nickell to Dunbar & Co., a Springfield trucking firm owned by James W. Dunbar.

From October 1952 to March 1955 Dunbar distributed all surplus commodities donated by the United States Department of Agriculture to schools and institutions in Illinois. The job is now being done by the Cox Transfer Co. of Springfield.

During the 30 months Dunbar had the assignment the subcommittee estimated, it made more than $400,000 out of the deal, although, because of the firm's bookkeeping methods, the investigators were unable to determine the exact amount.

CHARGES HIGH PROFITS

They said they had found financial transactions and other relationships between Dunbar and certain State and local officials whose official actions aided Dunbar to make tremendous profits on the commodity distribution program.

The report added fuel to the political conflagration centering around Illinois Gov. William G. Stratton's administration.

The Illinois State's attorney's office plans to seek a lot of indictments from a grand jury probing a $800,000 check-cashing scandal in the office of former Illinois State Auditor Orville Hodge.

The subcommittee's report said Nickell gave the contract to his good friend and political associate Dunbar without competition, on Dunbar's own terms.

It added: "Nickell accepted Dunbar's high rates without question and made no objection to them. * * * He also allowed his assistant, Harold Wolfe (director of the State school lunch program) to give Dunbar obviously favorable treatment."

OTHERS MENTIONED

The subcommittee said Dunbar once made a political contribution to Nickell and Wolfe's partner, Max Landesman, received $2,400 as an employee of Dunbar & Co. at a time when Landesman was working full-time in the Cook County (Chicago) treasurer's office.

Wolfe's mother-in-law, Augusta Dubois, was reported to have received more than $5,000 from Dunbar although the subcommittee found no evidence she ever did any work for the company and although Wolfe claimed her as a dependent on his income tax returns.

The investigators also accused the Agriculture Department of being lax in seeing that the Illinois school lunch program was being carried out with maximum efficiency and economy.

They charged Nickell, Wolfe, and Dunbar had given inconsistent, misleading, inaccurate or conflicting testimony and recommended a copy of their hearings be submitted to the Justice Department for whatever action it deems appropriate.

Hon. Harold H. Velde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished member of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable HAROLD H. VELDE.

Congressman VELDE not only served his constituents well, but the Nation as a whole, and his activities and investigations as chairman of the Un-American Activities Committee in the 83d Congress will be forever remembered.

Mr. VELDE also made an outstanding contribution to good Government through his activities on the Education and Labor Committee, and having sat next to him in committee in the 83d and 84th Congresses, I will certainly miss him very, very much.

I, like all others, wish for HAROLD great success as he returns to the practice of law and the many other endeavors that will be open to a man of his exceptional ability.

His voluntary retirement from the United States Congress is a great loss to the Congress and to the Nation, and our best wishes go with him and his family.

The President's Own Scandal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Nashville Tennesean of July 15 entitled "The President's Own Scandal."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S OWN SCANDAL

Seldom since Thomas DeQuincy wrote his Confessions of an English Opium Eater has the pen of man produced as astonishing an admission of guilt as the legal brief the Eisenhower administration has now filed in answer to the Dixon-Yates lawsuit.

Having reached the end of its rope after defending the odious Dixon-Yates scheme as long as possible and delaying its answer to the suit four times, the administration that once talked of a great crusade now concedes its sponsorship of a fraud that failed.

Forced into court by Dixon-Yates' claim for damages, the administration is left with no alternative but to confess the truths it steadfastly refused to tell congressional investigators on grounds of executive immunity.

For the President and his fellow crusaders, it is a humiliating experience.

For the American people, it should be a revealing one.

So complete is the administration's reversal that it sounds as if the brief were written by the same critics of the Dixon-Yates deal who in earlier days were indignantly accused—by the President himself, among others—of playing "politics" in their opposition to this sorry scandal.

But is it not the long-time critics of the deal who are talking this time.

It is the administration itself. The administration that was going to clean up Washington. The administration that conceived the Dixon-Yates scheme and moved heaven and earth to push it through. The administration that retreated only after determined congressional investigators finally succeeded in lifting the lid enough to give the whole Nation a whiff of the reeking Dixon-Yates odor.

It is the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower which now admits, in a court of law, that:

"The American people were deliberately misled about the purpose of the contract."

Originally, the Dixon-Yates deal was supposed to relieve TVA of some of its commitments to the Atomic Energy Commission. Later it was rationalized that Dixon-Yates would simply replace some of the TVA power going to the AEC. As it turned out, the Justice Department now confesses, it would have done neither:

"The alleged agreement was not executed in connection with the construction or operation of the Oak Ridge, Paducah, or Portsmouth installations of AEC and did not provide for replacement of electric utility services within the meaning of the law and as contemplated thereby."

The obvious conclusion is that the purpose of the whole affair was to give a private utilities syndicate a big slice of TVA territory and a fat profit at the same time.

"The contract was unlawful, null, and void from the start."

This is the same contract, it should be remembered, that Attorney General Herbert Brownell defended, even after its cancellation, as legal and binding.

"The contract was contrary to public policy."

This is still the Dixon-Yates contract—still the same contract that President Eisenhower angrily insisted was the best plan proposed and good for the country.

"There was a flagrant and illegal conflict of interest in the dual role of Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, the New York investment banker who worked both sides of the street by representing both Dixon-Yates and the Budget Bureau in the contract negotiations."

"Wenzell consulted with and advised plaintiff (Dixon-Yates) with respect to various matters relating to the project and the alleged agreement, which involved to a material extent the same matters concerning which he was employed to consult with, and represent the Government," says the Justice Department.

Could this be the same Mr. Wenzell the President said "was never called in or asked a single thing about the contract"?

It could be and it is. It is also the same person to whom a reporter was referring last July 6 when he asked the President if he still thought Mr. Wenzell's role in the negotiations was proper.

"Indeed, yes," was the Presidential reply—a reply that came 5 months after Senator LISTER HILL had exposed Mr. Wenzell's improper activities in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate.

"The contract violated the Public Utilities Holding Company Act."

This was a consistent contention of opponents of the contract. But the Securities and Exchange Commission, dominated by Eisenhower appointees, ruled otherwise in the days when the goal was to put the deal across at all costs.

"The contract did not receive proper congressional or regulatory agency approval, particularly by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee and the Securities and Exchange Commission."

This again was a consistent contention of opponents of the contract. Especially criticized was the waiver of a 30-day waiting period by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee—a waiver personally requested by President Eisenhower, granted by the committee on a straight party-line vote when it was controlled by the Republicans and rescinded soon after when Democrats had gained control of the committee.

In briefs submitted to the SEC in February of 1955, the Justice Department contended that the committee could not rescind its waiver. Now, however, it insists that the waiver was illegal in the first place because Congress was not then in session and because the contract before the committee was not final.

All of this, and more too, the Eisenhower administration now confesses through its Justice Department.

But as sordid a revelation as it is, even under compulsion the administration does not tell the full story.

For when the Justice Department says that Dixon-Yates knew all along about Mr. Wenzell's dual role, it blithely ignores the fact that the administration's own sponsors of the deal—from the President on down—also knew of that dual role.

Mr. Wenzell himself and other officials of the First Boston Corp. have long since testified before congressional investigators that former Budget Directors Joseph Dodge, Rowland Hughes, and AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss all knew everything about Mr. Wenzell's connections when he was invited down to Washington to help cook up the deal. And Mr. Wenzell has further testified that when he discussed the possibility of embarrassing complications from this situation with Mr. Hughes, the Budget Director appeared not to think the question of possible conflict of interest "was as serious [as] I had."

It is a matter of record, too, that Mr. Wenzell's name was completely omitted in the supposedly complete history of the negotiations released by the Budget Bureau upon instructions of the President.

As for the President's personal knowledge of the situation, there is only one conclusion to be drawn from this exchange during questioning of Mr. Hughes by Senator KEFAUVER during Senate hearings on the deal:

"Question. Mr. Hughes, did you tell the President * * * that you had one of your negotiators * * * working these things up when at the very same time he was employed by the First Boston Corp.?

"Answer. He knows, of course, that we had an expert working on this thing, and he knows his name and his connection and all about him. In fact, he approved him before we got him down here. * * *

"Question. He [the President] thinks that it is all right?

"Answer. Well, it is one of those situations which arise from time to time."

On the basis of equally strong evidence, there is every reason to believe that President Eisenhower was personally aware of all the other shady aspects of the deal.

It was the President, for example, who ordered the contract negotiated—over the objections of the AEC and the TVA—after three alternative proposals (the Dixon-Yates deal, a TVA plan, and a proposal by a competing private syndicate) had been laid before him.

It was the President who requested the waiver by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee that the Justice Department now says was illegal.

It was the President who retorted "politics" after Mr. Wenzell's dual role had been publicly exposed.

It was the President who defended Mr. Wenzell—and the whole deal, in fact—at press conference after press conference right up to the bitter end.

It was the President who fell back on a subterfuge in abandoning the deal, claiming that his action was based on Memphis' plans to build its own steam plant even though Memphis had said flatly more than 6 months earlier that it would follow such a course rather than accept a kilowatt of Dixon-Yates power.

And it was the President who, even after the illegal contract had been canceled, expressed the hope that a cash settlement could be worked out so Dixon-Yates would not be hurt.

In such circumstances as these, nothing can absolve the President from personal responsibility for a deal now admitted to have been illegal, deceptive, and contrary to the public interest.

This is one time when it will be impossible for him to remain aloofly immune to criticism while such fall guys as the hapless Mr. Benson, the bungling Mr. Dulles, and the talkative Mr. Wilson take the rap for the administration.

For even after it was said that President Harding was too busy playing poker to know what his friends were doing to him with the Teapot Dome scandal, the country nonetheless held him responsible—as it properly should have done.

Now in the major scandal of his administration, President Eisenhower is all the more responsible. For despite his devotion to golf and his distaste for reading the newspapers, the indisputable record shows that he not only knew what was going on in the Dixon-Yates deal but had a personal hand in it from start to finish.

And on the basis of what his own Attorney General now is compelled to admit about that deal, President Eisenhower is to be held accountable for a shameful performance that not even his celebrated grin of blissful innocence can obscure or erase.

Agonizing Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention to the following article written by Barbara Ward from London, which appeared in the New York Times magazine of July 22, 1956:

IS OUR REAPPRAISAL AGONIZING ENOUGH?

(By Barbara Ward)

LONDON.—A year has passed since the meeting at the summit brought together the western and Soviet leaders at Geneva. It was forecast at that time that the encounter would mark the beginning of a new phase in international relations. So, indeed, it has—but perhaps not in the expected sense. The last 12 months have been chiefly distinguished by a very great increase in Soviet diplomatic activity while the West has merely marked time—where it has not actually lost ground.

The Soviet year has shown a remarkable diversity of initiative—Tito back in the fold, the Egyptian arms deal, Soviet delegations busy in Asia and Africa, demobilization propaganda, the new economic offensive based on Soviet foreign aid.

Although, this summer, evidence of questioning and unrest inside the Soviet empire has tended to steal the headlines from Soviet diplomatic actitivies, these activities have continued unabated. For the year as a whole, the record sugests a real measure of increased confidence and flexibility in Soviet diplomacy.

The Western year, by contrast, has been barren indeed. Probably no diplomatic topic has been canvassed as much as "the need for new policies" and rarely has so much airing of an issue brought so few tangible results.

Bad luck is part of the reason. Britain and France are beset with colonial problems. Dr. Adenauer's coalition is weaker. President Eisenhower's prolonged ill health has damaged America's essential leadership. But there are deeper hazards than these and they point to a need more "agonizing" than

perhaps the Western partners realize for a reappraisal of their plans.

Why, since Geneva, has Soviet activity burst out all over? If one could analyze the cause for this animation, there might be a clue to the Soviet's present degree of diplomatic initiative.

One stroke of luck must play some part—the death of Stalin. But luck is not the whole story. For decades now, Communist policy has enjoyed one basic advantage.

The 20th century is one of continuous technological and scientific change. Such constant physical revolution implies political and social upheaval, and whatever the symptoms of this unrest—exasperated nationalism, threatened tribalism, agrarian revolt—it can be exploited as an entry point for communism. Communists are therefore forever trying to foment violent change and hence are working with the grain of history.

The Western Powers, on the contrary, are, in the main, contented and well-developed. They are anxious to check change if they can. The century works against them. They are conservatives in a radical epoch. There is, it is true, one exception to this contrast. In one area the Soviet Government seeks not to exploit change but most anxiously to limit and control it. That area is within the frontiers of Russia and among the Soviet satellite states in Eastern Europe and the satellite Communist Parties of the West.

Open revolt against Soviet rule—such as the East German workers' rebellion in 1953 or this year's unrest in Poland—may not be exploited from abroad in the open way used by Communists to fan, for instance, Arab nationalism in north Africa. But if revolt is not instantly repressed—as the German uprising was muffled up—it can be a break in the diplomatic offensive's vital aim, propaganda. The offer of a Communist new heaven and new earth loses its appeal when workers abroad see tanks shooting down the proletarians of Poznan.

Nevertheless, the Western Powers would do well to remember that memories are short, especially the memories of people impatiently chafing at their own crises. The East German revolt in 1953 did not mark a lull in the outward stream of Soviet promises and propaganda, nor, it seems, in the readiness of restless men to listen to them.

Soviet ability in a changing world to stir up other peoples' discontents may account for part of the post-Genevan diplomatic drive. But it cannot account for all of it, since the technique is as old as the Communist revolution. It does not, therefore, explain the increase in activity and confidence since Geneva. The question remains: Why so much more initiative in the last 12 months?

Although analysis of Soviet motivation must remain largely guesswork, there is good reason to suppose that the Soviets' forward policy is grounded in a new confidence in the scale of their economic and technological base. This confidence appears in their estimate that, by sheer, irresistible industrial growth, they will outproduce Western Europe before 1960 and catch up with America in the next decade. But its central core is Soviet ability to manufacture the hydrogen bomb.

It is true that here, as in the Soviet attitude toward change and upheaval, there is an ambiguity of which western policy should be acutely aware. The forced march of economic development necessarily implies continuous radical change inside Russia and its empire. Stalin's rigid, bloody despotism maintained the deprivations by which forced savings were wrung from the people and thrust into the expansion of the Soviet industrial base. That brute phase is over. The work needed now lies more in the direction of productivity and initiative—the attributes not of robots but of men. Can the aim of overtaking America be reached without inducements to the workers which savor of more freedom? In which case, can the appetite for freedom be controlled?

In the satellite empire—and in China—the dilemma of economic progress is more primitive. The phase of early capital accumulation is not passed. But can the workers of Poznan—or Prague or Anshan—be compelled to sacrifice marginal living standards to build up state heavy industry without brutal Stalinian methods of control? Continued economic expansion thus entails the risk of greater demands for freedom inside Russia and of revolt against continued privation among the satellites. These are the contradictions which underlie Soviet economic success and which can, properly interpreted, work to the advantage of western diplomacy.

But, once again, western statesmen would be advised not to relax or gloat over Russia's potential difficulties. The vital aspect of Soviet economic growth in terms of post-Genevan diplomacy is not its possible future contradictions but its actual, solid, present-day capability of producing and delivering the hydrogen bomb.

This is the revolutionary development.

In the past, when radical states sought to exploit change and incite trouble beyond their frontiers, conservative states had, in the last resort, the power to stop them by force. The risk of war remained as a deterrent. The sudden alarming truth which the Western Powers have to face is that this ultimate sanction has almost certainly been struck from their hands.

If, as the Communists stir up trouble and change in the world outside and press on toward the decisive change—the transfer of allegiance to communism—the Western Powers say: "Halt, another step and we drop the hydrogen bomb" (this is the essence of massive retaliation), the Communists can reply: "But is the defense of Mosul or Isfahan or Seoul or whatever outpost it is really worth the obliteration of Chicago?"

The argument for massive retaliation has been answered. The Russians are as well equipped as the West, perhaps better. In fact, one may wonder whether the argument for extermination may not be more comfortably used by the heirs of Ivan the Terrible than by the successors of Woodrow Wilson. The Western Powers are now deprived of the traditional method of checking undesirable change. It is almost impossible to convince either their electorates at home or the uncommitted peoples abroad that any change is as undesirable as the extinction of the human race. In fact, there is no alternative to peace.

This analysis has now reached the point at which it can perhaps suggest more positively the direction of western reappraisal. It is twofold. It must find means short of war to prevent the Soviet Union from exploiting external change and disorder to its own advantage. It must also develop a diplomacy which will allow the changes and contradictions within Soviet society to work for peace and for a steady weakening of the Soviet will to world domination.

The problem of checking the Soviet's exploitation of change beyond its own frontiers can be approached from different starting points. The Western Powers, accepting the inescapable fact that change is the order of this century, can adopt a consistent policy for guiding the inevitable upheavals in a beneficent direction. They can, as it were, intervene at ground level, in competition if necessary with the Soviet Union, and attempt to insure that a hungry and expectant world sees its best hopes in freedom.

But there is another possible approach—to attempt to put some other kind of restraint on Soviet policy to counter and control, not its end results, but its original source in untrammeled Soviet sovereignty. So far, it is only the former policy that has been seriously considered and partially practiced.

All that is summed up in "foreign aid"—Marshall plan, point 4, the Commonwealth Colombo plan, technical assistance—represents an effort, over and above the normal course of trade and investment, to insure disorganized or underdeveloped countries a peaceful passage through the storms of economic change. To measure its success one has only to ask what would have been Europe's fate if, in 1947, the exhaustion of dollar balances had led to a massive curtailment of food and raw materials and the nations had entered the winter crippled with starvation and unemployment.

In the linking of aid to military policy in recent years and the heightening of emotional tension in the cold war, the basic purpose of foreign aid has been somewhat submerged. The Western powers do not always ask the fundamental question whether free nations are, as a result of aid, still free of Communist control and still solving their problems in their own way. Instead, we ask petulantly whether aided nations love the West, are "on our side"—irrelevant questions since certainly we do not love them. The bargain is a cool one of mutual self-interest.

But in the last year it is not only confusion over the aims of foreign aid that has led critics to underestimate its effectiveness. The new Soviet diplomatic offensive has clouded this perspective, too. The Soviet challenge to the West over foreign aid can perhaps be summed up as: "Anything you can do, I can do better." The Aswam Dam? We'll build the whole thing. The World Bank demands 4-percent interest on the capital cost? Oh, have it for 2 percent by all means. You want 10 technicians? Have 20. You can't sell your rice? We'll take all you have.

It is not unreasonable to wonder whether, in competition with a government which can use economic methods of diplomacy without thought of economic cost or the views of domestic consumers and taxpayers, foreign aid, as an instrument, may not turn in Western hands. Yet the vast economic upheavals that make outside aid necessary will not stop, just because we do. On the contrary, a Western withdrawal would leave yet another front wide open to the Communist offensive. How can the dilemma be resolved?

It is at this point that the Western reappraisal reaches the really agonizing stage, for there is an answer to the problem, but it is one that cuts to the core of the deepest, most sensitive concern of all States—their own sovereignty or selfhood. It has been put forward by leading statesmen in America, among them Adlai Stevenson and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr. It has the support of most labor leaders in Britain. It is one of the chief proposals in the international field put forward by the French Foreign Minister. All suggest that much of Western aid should now be channeled through the United Nations and that Russia should be challenged to follow suit.

The proposal has great and obvious advantages. It is genuinely a new approach, a new policy, a restoration of initiative to the Atlantic world. It offers the hope that outside assistance will continue to help steer the world's economic and technical revolution clear of desperate dictatorial solutions. It removes the taint of military side taking. It eliminates colonial memories. It puts an end to the competitive element. Above all, it brings the vigilance of world opinion and the sanction of world condemnation to bear upon any Communist attempt to use aid as an instrument of Soviet imperialist penetration.

But the cost is agonizing. Soviet freedom of action—in other words, Soviet sovereignty—can be controlled, but only at the cost of a corresponding sacrifice of Western power.

Nor does the crucial choice end with the question of foreign aid. Dangerous and

devious as Soviet methods of economic penetration may be, they lie on the outer edge of the menace offered by uncontrolled Soviet power. At its core is the hydrogen bomb.

Nowhere is the need to limit Soviet sovereignty more urgent than in the ultimate sphere of atomic military action. But hitherto most Western approaches to disarmament, like all Soviet offers, appear to be attempts to limit the other side's freedom of action while preserving one's own. The revolutionary newness of President Eisenhower's open-sky proposals of a year ago lay in the American offer to sacrifice sovereignty over its own skies if Russia, in return, would accept the same limit.

The principle, carried to its logical conclusion, would challenge Russia to relinquish its sovereign control over all its independent military forces, including the bomb. But Russia's sovereignty woud thus be limited only if the Western Powers were ready to give the lead in accepting full international control themselves. This is, ultimately, the decision they have to take. In military security, as in foreign aid, Russian imperialism can be checked, but only if the Western Powers accept the same limits.

This is the calculation they have to make—which is more dangerous, which is more likely to lead to Communist domination or world destruction—the establishment of an international community with genuine power over all sovereignties or the continuation of completely unfettered action by a Soviet Government uncontrolled by public opinion at home and unperturbed by the deterrent power of Western nations whose electorates can voice their determination to avoid war at virtually all cost and who even now are imposing a measure of unilateral disarmament.

Like all great decisions in diplomacy, the outcome is a calculated risk. But the year since Geneva has suggested with increasing force that the risk of leaving the Soviets complete freedom of action is now the gravest that the West can run. Moreover, the vital but negative gain of controlling Soviet wilfulness is not the only advantage the West can draw from bolder international action.

There remains the second aim of Western diplomacy—to see that the processes of change inevitably at work within the Soviet system work toward freedom and a peaceful world. There can be no doubt that the dedication of Western statesmanship to economic aid and disarmament within a functioning international community could do more than any alternative policy—of indifference or isolationism or "go-it-aloneism"—to pry open the rifts in Soviet society.

At present, the chief argument for continued privation and police control in satellite Europe is the "aggressiveness" of the West. After the Poznan revolt, the blame was laid on "Western saboteurs and militarists" and, shrewdly, the warning was given that to turn from Russia might mean turning toward a Germany rearmed by the West.

Inside the Soviet Union, fears of "encirclement" and bogies of Western imperialism are a principal means of explaining and condoning failures to extend the areas of freedom for the Soviet citizen. And beyond the actual confines of Communist control, in the uncommitted lands of Asia and Africa, Western armaments and Western attacks on neutrality can be twisted to mean militarism and intervention.

But if Western statesmen were pressing on Communist leaders, in season and out of season, the need for genuine international cooperation and control and were, in the non-Communist areas, ready to accept international supervision of aid and arms programs, the tables could be turned on communism. It would be shown to be what it has become—a profoundly reactionary force, fearful of freedom, fearful of change, fearful of the forward march of humanity which, in the past, it has so often invoked.

In the same measure, the Western powers could hope to recover their moral leadership. That our world is now a physical unity can be measured by the passage of a single intercontinental missile. But this brute physical proximity has yet to be civilized by worldwide political, social and moral loyalties and institutions.

It is the century's task to achieve the process in freedom. If the Western nations boldly shoulder it, theirs can be the release of energy and purpose that comes from moving forward with history's flood tide. Nor can there be much doubt about the alternative. It is to sit, as in this post-Genevan year, holding sovereignty like a time bomb and watching the areas of free action and free creation steadily shrink.

Fund for the Republic's Report on Blacklisting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, a controversy has arisen over the investigation by the Un-American Activities Committee of the report on blacklisting by the Fund for the Republic.

As a member of the committee, I would like to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my letter to the editor of the Cincinnati Enquirer, dealing with this subject.

The letter follows:

SCHERER DEFENDS ENQUIRER EDITORIAL

To the EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER:

As a member of the Un-American Activities Committee, I have listened to the testimony so far adduced before the committee with reference to the Fund for the Republic's report on blacklisting. I thought your editorial in the July 1 Enquirer on this subject was excellent and remarkably consistent with the sworn testimony.

I see in your readers' column a letter from Michael Harrington severely criticizing and condemning the editorial. Now I feel that I must comment so that people will not be misled by Mr. Harrington.

Of course, Michael Harrington is a professional employee of the Fund for the Republic. He is one of those who helped prepare the report. It can be expected, therefore, that he will rise to defend it.

First, let's see whom Robert Hutchins, president of the fund—the man who said before a congressional committee that he would not hesitate to employ a Communist—selected to make the investigation and prepare this report of the fund on blacklisting.

Let's start with Mr. Harrington himself. In the spring of 1956 Mr. Harrington contributed an article entitled "A Marxist Approach to Art" to the magazine known as the New International which lists itself as "the leading Marxist magazine in the United States, nationally recognized as among the foremost organs of Marxist thought and political analysis in the world." Harrington has also written a number of articles for the publication of the youth organization of the Independent Socialist League, which was cited by the Attorney General of the United States as an organization which seeks "to alter the form of the Government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Harrington was one of the group which called upon President Truman to commute the death sentences of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, the atomic spy traitors. As we all know, the attack on the President and the Department of Justice was spearheaded by the National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case. The Un-American Activities Committee has overwhelming evidence that this committee was completely controlled and dominated by the Communist conspiracy. By the way, Harrington was also a member of the War Resisters League.

Now I am not saying that Harrington is a Communist. Mr. John Cogley of the executive staff of the Fund for the Republic, whom Mr. Harrington helped in writing the report, testified before our committee that Harrington was a Socialist.

Before we go any further, let's see who some of Mr. Harrington's associates were in the investigation, preparation, and writing of the fund's report.

There was Dr. Marie Jahoda, who come to this country as late as 1945 from Austria, where she was an active member of the Socialist Democratic Party. She was one of the persons who helped prepare this so-called impartial report for the Fund for the Republic. At the time she was hired, it was known by the Fund for the Republic that she had already issued reports and made studies which attacked loyalty programs of this Government.

And finally there was Elizabeth Poe, a researcher for the fund's staff. Frederick Woltman, writer for the New York World Telegram and Pulitzer prize winner for his articles exposing Communist infiltration, testified before the committee in the blacklisting hearings 2 weeks ago. He said: "Elizabeth Poe was a member of the Communist faction of the Newspaper Guild at Time Magazine for some years and was very active in the Communist group." Woltman then vehemently denounced the report before the committee and in one of his articles he said that the report is a fraud perpetrated against the public with tax-free money and that taxpayers of the United States who do not approve of what is advocated by the report are financing it.

A series of witnesses before the committee, including James F. O'Neil, publisher of the American Legion magazine, Godfrey P. Schmidt, president of AWARE, Inc., and lecturer on constitutional and labor law at Fordham University Law school, Francis J. McNamara, director of the American Sovereignty Campaign of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jack Wren, account executive of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn, Inc., public relations firm of New York City, vehemently denounced the report as biased, slanted and in some instances as not being in accordance with the facts.

Just last week the AFL-CIO News had this to say about the fund for the Republic's blacklisting report:

"Many feel that what should have been a factual, objective study became in its final writing and editing a document seemingly colored by one viewpoint * * *.

"A fund employee who helped draft the document has verbally acknowledged several important errors of fact on one page of volume 1 and has offered to correct them in an affidavit. This makes one wonder if there could be so many factual errors on just one page, how many other such errors are there in the rest of the 312-page report?"

Jack Gould, radio and TV editor of the New York Times, which newspaper has been a supporter of the Fund for the Republic and its objectives, said in substance that the authors of the blacklisting report take recourse to much undocumented and unsubstantiated material. The report makes

damning indictments against people without having gotten their versions.

Time magazine in a recent issue dealing with the committee's hearings on the Fund for the Republic's blacklisting report said that it was poorly catalogued, highly opinionated, and in some instances incomplete. Time says that the hearings of the committee revealed glaring weaknesses in the report. Time further says that the hearings suggested that the report was inept journalism at best. Time supported Woltman's position when he said: "If any newspaper proceeded the way the author did, it would be subject to gravc criticism."

From the testimony already adduced, it is obvious to us on the Un-American Activities Committee that one of the basic reasons for the fund's report was to indirectly and subtly discredit the investigating committees of the Congress and the anti-Communist organizations of this country. The report attempts to show that there is a widespread blacklisting of persons in the radio and television industry as a result of the activities of the investigating committees of Congress and the anti-Communist groups in the Nation.

To accomplish this objective, the report takes cases of individuals who the report says were deprived of employment by reason of their political beliefs. In almost every case, however, the report deliberately and apparently by design conceals the fact that these individuals had been identified under oath as members of the Communist conspiracy or had long records of membership in Communist-front organizations.

The fund and its followers have been highly critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Justice, and congressional investigating committees for the use of what this group calls faceless informers. It is significant that the fund's report on blacklisting uses faceless informers in many instances in an attempt to sustain its findings in the report. It cites case after case of individuals who supplied information merely by referring to these individual's in the report as Mr. X, Mr. M, and Mr. N.

When Mr. John Cogley, the man who with Harrington directed the preparation of this report, was asked by the Un-American Activities Committee to identify these faceless informers on whom he allegedly relied to sustain the findings of the report, he refused to identify them.

It can readily be seen, therefore, from what I have shown herein from the record that, when the Enquirer in its editorial of July 1 called the Fund for the Republic report on blacklisting a whitewash of communism, it was absolutely correct and perhaps was understating rather than ovestating its charge.

Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER.

CINCINNATI.

Over the Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 22, 1956:

OVER THE DAM

No one can take any real satisfaction in the decision to withdraw the offer of American help to Egypt on the Aswan Dam. It is a decision forced by events—by the hostile attitudes and actions of the Nasser government in an arc ranging from Algeria to Jordan, and more pointedly by the extent to which Colonel Nasser has mortgaged his country's resources for Communist arms. There is real doubt whether in present circumstances Egypt would be able to proceed with the $1.3 billion project without far greater help—which would virtually require the underwriting of the whole Egyptian economy.

The denial, which coincided with and perhaps was stimulated by a like decision in Britain, unquestionably is attended by certain risks. One of these is that Egypt will now turn to Russia, and that Russia will find a way to start the dam and will hope to absorb Egypt in the process. Although Egypt is not now friendly toward the West, at least it is not behind the Iron Curtain. Nasser evidently had decided, having "hocked" his future cotton production for Communist arms, that it would be prudent to hedge his liabilities. He may now feel compelled to cast his lot more and more with the Russians.

Against this danger, however, there is considerable opinion that the Russians will never build the dam; that they are overstrained economically, and that when the matter is before them they will denounce the mercenary West but not actually undertake the project. There is the further consideration that for this country to conciliate Nasser now, following months of virulent propaganda against the United States, would be to acquiesce in his game of playing off Washington against Moscow. It would be yielding to a sort of blackmail against which George Kennan warned with his suggested short reply to countries that threaten to go Communist: "Go." Finally, there had been no indication of any proposed quid pro quo from Egypt, in a cessation of incitement in north Africa, or in a serious attempt to make peace with Israel, or in an end to the illegal blockade of the Suez Canal.

In different circumstances construction of the Aswan Dam might be a highly worthwhile international undertaking, provided that difficulties with the Sudan over Nile waters could be adjusted and a concurrent effort made to curb Egypt's fantastically high birth rate. The alleviation of poverty ought always to be a concern of humanity. A different Nasser, one who subordinated external adventuring and dreams of Arab dominion to the practical programs he promised, to raise the standards of his own people and repair the erosion of colonialism, might present new opportunities. But these will have to await a happier day. In any event, the ideal format for a project of the magnitude of the Aswan Dam would be some sort of United Nations economic development program that would tie East and West together in joint responsibility.

You and Your Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech recently given by Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, Chief of Staff, United States Army, at the armed services rally of the National Jewish Welfare Board.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU AND YOUR ARMY

Ladies and gentlemen, I was very happy to accept the invitation to address the national armed services rally of the National Jewish Welfare Board. My pleasure springs from the fact that I have had the opportunity to observe the work of the National Jewish Welfare Board in assisting those members of the Armed Forces for whom I have shared responsibility from time to time. Also, I have had the opportunity to know some of the leaders of the National Jewish Welfare Board—leaders whom I have come to admire for their civic mindedness and for their contribution to the happiness and well-being of Jewish servicemen. As a commander, often responsible for many Jewish soldiers, I have viewed the members of the board as colleagues supplementing and extending the work of military commanders in an endeavor to assure the physical and moral well-being of their troops.

At the outset, as a military man of some 34 years of service, I should like to pay a tribute to the quality of the Jewish soldiers who have served under my command. One is often inclined to think of the Jewish contribution to the Nation in fields other than military. Why this should be I do not exactly know, since most of us grew up in God-fearing families, where we came face to face with the old Jewish warriors on the pages of the family Bible. There, the pictures of Joshua, of David, of Gideon and his men made these sturdy warriors of the past fully as real to us as the soldiers of our contemporary history.

Our American past, in terms of military history, abounds in examples of military contributions to our country by citizens of Jewish origin. It would be impossible to make even an approximate list of the individuals who are responsible for these contributions. I would mention only such historic individuals as Colonel Franks, the friend of Jefferson; Haym Salomon, broker of the Revolution; Simeon Levy, who was the second graduate of West Point; Commodore Uriah Levy of the War of 1812; Sergeant Karpoles, the Medal of Honor man of the Battle of the Wilderness; Judah P. Benjamin, the statesman of the South. These names make up but a token list of Jews who have moved across the pages of our early military history. The work of the Jews in the world wars is fresh in the memory of most of us here. Over half a million Jews served in the United States Armed Forces in World War II gaining some 36,000 awards and citations for gallantry and conspicuous service.

In the course of my military service I have ofen had occasion to remark that courage and devotion to country are the monopoly of no race, no creed, no nation. I have attended many decoration ceremonies during World War II and the Korean conflict, where the individuals to be honored come out in line to receive their awards for gallant service rendered. It has been my privilege to place many medals and ribbons upon the breasts of our brave soldiers. Often, as I faced a line of men about to be decorated, I found myself reflecting upon how different were their origins. By their names I could guess their racial background, and it was always of great interest to try to discover some pattern, or some formula, in the recurrence of racial strains among these men. Is there any racial strain among our people which produces the best soldiers? I have found no simple answer to this question, but I became convinced to my own satisfaction that no racial formula exists. The Anglo-Saxon, the Italian, the Irish, the Latin American, the Jew—all of these composite types which make up the racial pattern of our great Nation have served the United States with equal devotion and have contributed to the final victory essentially in proportion to their numerical strength.

Today, we are fortunately at peace, if we exclude consideration of the armistice which stays the active combat in Korea. Service in battle is no longer required of our men in uniform. However, there is a requirement for a steadfastness and devotion to duty comparable to the requirements of combat. The present generation has not been born to a period of care-free ease, exempt from stern obligations and responsibilities to country. The hard facts are that our Nation has assumed the burdens of world leadership in the most critical period of the earth's history. If we are not headed for another global war with the Soviet power bloc, we face, at a minimum, a long period of watchful readiness during which time we cannot relax our guard, or weaken our defenses. Hence it is that the young men of this period must adjust their lives to the continuing obligations and requirements related to national defense.

As I know that in this gathering, there are many families of servicemen or families with sons facing possible military service, I would like to say a few words about the attitude of the Army toward its responsibility for the young men entrusted to it for training.

The Army, as a part of the national defense organization, recognizes that it has a heavy responsibility for providing adequate leadership to the young men who come to its ranks in these historic times. We rear our officer corps to lead the young men who come—sometimes voluntarily, sometimes involuntarily—to discharge their military obligations within our ranks. I am often concerned by the false impressions of Army life which our young people receive from the movies, from television, and from current literature. I am afraid that the concept of the officer as a snappy martinet and the noncommissioned officer as a hard-boiled taskmaster has often predominated in the minds of the young men as they approached their military service. I can assure you that leaders of this type do not belong in the Army of which I am Chief of Staff. The officer corps as I know it is one dedicated to the welfare of its men, a corps which recognizes that the symbols of rank—the bars, the leaves, and the stars—are not indications of privilege, but rather emblems of servitude, servitude to the men for whom they are responsible in peace and in war. Of necessity, our officers and noncommissioned officers have been taught to exact the essential discipline from their troops, without which armies could not be distinguished from mobs, and without which there is no hope for victory in battle. But the kind of discipline imposed in the United States Army is not the yapping discipline of martinets. It is a form of discipline inscribed on a bronze plaque set in the hard granite walls of West Point where many generations of cadets have paused to read, since in 1878 it was placed there by a former superintendent, General Schofield. This definition of discipline reads as follows:

"The discipline which makes the soldiers of a free country reliable in battle is not to be gained by harsh or tyrannical treatment. On the contrary, such treatment is far more likely to destroy than to make an army. It is possible to impart instruction and to give commands in such manner and such a tone of voice to inspire in the soldier no feeling but an intense desire to obey, while the opposite manner and tone of voice cannot fail to excite strong resentment and a desire to disobey. The one mode or the other of dealing with subordinates springs from a corresponding spirit in the breast of the commander. He who feels the respect which is due to others cannot fail to inspire in them regard for himself, while he who feels, and hence manifests, disrespect toward others, especially his inferiors, cannot fail to inspire hatred against himself."

It is in the spirit of this definition of discipline that the Army trains its young men today. Do not mistake me. This individual training must be hard in order to develop the habits of body and mind necessary for survival in modern combat. Once the individual has the required skills and attitudes then our training stresses team play, recognizing that successful military action depends upon the proper blending in mass action of the initiative, the dash, and the courage which are the natural characteristics of American young men. These individual qualities, however, cannot be commanded by a general order. They are forthcoming only where the spirit of team play animates the members of the military unit. These units fight successfully only when there is that feeling of confidence and reliance developed between the men on the right and the left of the firing line. It is respect for one's fellowmen, and the desire for their reciprocal respect in return, which welds individuals together in great military brotherhood. It is in this spirit that your Army is formed today.

In the course of a young man's service in the Army, we leave no stone unturned to return him to civil life physically, mentally, and morally a better man. On the physical side, the Army gives thorough recognition to the importance of the stomach in developing an effective Army. It is a strange fact that many sons of this rich Nation come to the Army suffering from malnutrition. It is not that their parents have not been able to provide them with adequate food, but rather that many of our young people have acquired unorganized habits of living. We find that upon joining the Army most of our recruits initially lose weight as fat disappears from places where it does not belong. Shortly thereafter, however, muscle starts to form and weight goes upward. The statistics of the Quartermaster show that the average soldier gains in weight in the first few month of his service. Army food is no longer the "bacon and beans" menu of the comic strips. We have a scientifically organized food service that guarantees balance and maximum nutritional benefit. I would invite you parents who have sons in the Army, or who may go into the Army, to visit an Army mess and verify the quantity and quality of food offered to hundreds of thousands of our men each day.

But a soldier does not live to eat—at least that is not the primary purpose of his being in the Army. In addition to a balanced diet, he must have balanced exercise so that his physical condition will constantly improve. There is no place in the modern Army for the soft or for the flabby. The finest mind is useless to the Army if not supported by a sound body, capable of enduring the conditions of battle which are often rigorous to the extreme. Our peacetime training must be adequate to prepare young men for such conditions. The Army must always be combat-ready, never knowing when its units may be called upon to perform under conditions testing endurance to the utmost. Consequently, our recruits are constantly conditioned to better physical performance. We exact nothing unreasonable, and we apply the standards progressively. However, we want our soldiers to be able to run a little faster, jump a little farther, and stand a little straighter, week after week as their service progresses.

Progress is measured not only in physical standards but in mental norms as well. The modern Army is an increasingly complex organization in terms of its equipment and its operational procedures. I have often had occasion to say that it has a place for men of all skills and of all attainments. We need the artisan, the repairman, the scientist, the combat leader, the scholar—yes; even the genius will find a task appropriate to his capacity. Our Army school system is one of the largest educational systems in the world today. We train promising young men in the hundreds of skills required in the Army, many of which are common to the requirements of civilian society as well. Perhaps we train too well, because many of our men after receiving valuable instruction return to civil life much sooner than the Army would desire.

Not only does the Army instruct in military and technical subjects but it has a great concern for the underprivileged man who has never been allowed to complete his basic education. Each year we receive many young men who have never completed fourth-grade primary education. We put these men into classes and as a matter of duty raise their standard so that, as a minimum, they can read and write and thus become better soldiers, and eventually better citizens. I personally have been greatly interested in raising the standards of our noncommissioned officers, many of whom have displayed great leadership potential, yet who have not reached high school. This group the Army singles out to send to school, so that the man who wears the chevrons of a noncommissioned officer will also have minimum educational qualifications. The peacetime Army is a great school, open to all men according to their talents.

Now a word about the moral influences which the Army creates and fosters. The Army is a decent, clean-living, God-fearing society, with no place for loose livers and evildoers. The primary protection for the young men who enter the Army is found in the character of the leaders who command our small units. We carefully select these noncommissioned officers and junior officers, eliminating all those who fail to maintain the required standards of leadership. In the last analysis, it is the company commander who sets the standard of conduct within his company. If he is a man of principle and of character, imbued with the proper concern for his men, there will be no question about the environment in which our soldiers grow. Apart from the command system, we have the Corps of Chaplains, with representatives scattered liberally through our troop units. They are men of all faiths, so that your soldiers of Jewish faith will never be far from the rabbis wearing the Army coat. I often recall the great Passover services which I attended in Korea, services which were often attended by people like Col. Harry Henshel and other representatives of the National Jewish Welfare Board. These meetings were great outpourings of faith on the part of our Jewish soldiers far from home.

There is another way in which the Army contributes importantly to the development of the character of our soldiers. We have what we call the troop information program in which we try to present the important world issues to our men. I am convinced that it is a most important task of our national leadership to develop critical thought on the part of our young people. They cannot be mental and moral fence-sitters in a period when the issues are so important. They must have strong convictions as to what is right and wrong. In order to develop such convictions, our young people must know the issues and the alternatives. Thus, the Army tries to stress to its young soldiers the need for studying world issues. We try to explain to our soldiers the "why" of things, hoping that in this way they will come to question all of the issues and problems which confront our Nation. I am sure that if they leave the military service, understanding both the place of America in modern history, and their place as citizens of this great country, they will carry back to civil life attributes of great worth in developing the future strength of our country.

By the foregoing, I have hoped to explain to the members of this audience, many of whom are vitally concerned with the Armed

Forces, that the Army is not an unfeeling, unthinking, mechanical type of organization in which human values are ignored and in which all men lose their individuality in anonymous serial numbers. We who lead the Army understand American characteristics too well to expect results by stifling individuality. The greatest assets of our American soldiers are their enthusiasm and initiative, springing from their individual characteristics. No man has ever led American soldiers successfully in battle who failed to impress upon them that he regarded them and respected them as men and not as faceless automatons.

The Army will receive and train your Jewish young men who come to its ranks, in the spirit which I have described. Now for my part, as Chief of Staff, I would ask for help from you in preparing these young men for military service. The Army is often held responsible for the conduct of its men to a degree which I do not feel is entirely reasonable. In our national concern over the conduct of a very limited number of soldiers who yielded to Communist propaganda after being taken prisoner of war, many of our citizens have been critical of the Army for not developing men capable of resisting all Communist blandishments. Without seeking to shirk the heavy responsibilities which the Army has for every man in the ranks, I would point out that the conclusion reached by our civil leaders who have studied the prisoner-of-war problem is that the fundamental corrective action should have been taken in the American homes. If, from the cradle, parents instill in our young Americans a sense of responsibility and the importance of service to the Nation, then the work of the Army will be greatly lessened and our young men will be more adaptable to the requirements of military life.

Once your young men are in the Army, please do not forget them. Write to them often, and tell them how proud you are that they are serving their country in uniform. Mail call is a tremendously important moment in any military unit. It is important to the soldier who receives the letter which tells him that he has not been forgotten—that father, mother, brother, and sister are always thinking of him, wishing him well, and are grateful to him for performing an important mission in safeguarding and defending the country. That letter is important also to your soldier's company commander, because, in effect, you are reinforcing all of his efforts to maintain good morale, and a proper attitude toward national service. In combination you two are unacquainted colleagues and allies, performing important service in strengthening the fiber of a distant man in uniform.

You can also help in this important work by taking an interest in the Army as an institution. Your young man is serving in one small unit of a vast enterprise designed to prevent war, or to win a victory if war is undeterred. The Army needs your understanding, support, and interest. I would urge you to visit Army camps and installations in your vicinity and see what is taking place there. I have often had occasion to say that the Army will never be any better than the Nation insists that it be. You can indicate your insistence by interest shown and questions asked. You can indicate your interest by the support given the National Jewish Welfare Board which, in turn sends its representatives throughout the world visiting the Jewish soldiers and ministering to their needs. Such consideration shown to our Armed Forces will give them the feeling of being supported and appreciated. It will reinforce their sense of mission without which their numbers and their weapons are of little value. By your actions and interest on behalf of your men and women in uniform you can strengthen the moral fiber of our fighting men wherever found—fighting men whose one purpose is to deter war and to insure the peaceful existence of the United States.

Crisis in the Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, all the Nation is interested in our Nation's schools—what is going on in them? What are our children being taught? How? Why?

The tremendous growth in active public interest in our schools is highly encouraging, even though some of the actions of today may disturb us greatly.

Since World War I fast changes have occurred in our schools and in schooling. Undoubtedly there has been great improvement in teaching; undoubtedly also many of the newer methods that have been used have given rise to serious questions regarding their worth.

How to teach reading; what to emphasize in history; the development of a better number sense; what is the role of TV today and tommorow in our schools—and hundreds of similar questions are of great interest to all of us today. It is true, that these are basically technical questions, to which the entire teaching profession is giving serious consideration. But, today, the interest in these technical questions is not limited to the trained teacher. Today, every citizen is concerned with the answer to these questions. Properly so; for these are questions of significant community policy. What has happened to our academic standards? What has happened to discipline? Can we have a socially and morally disciplined society without continuous positive emphasis on personal ethical and moral standards? These questions are more important even than the technical questions concerning our schools. I, personally, think that today there is a tremendous need for a reaffirmation of those basic principles which guide all decent men. I believe the schools must, and for the most part do, emphasize these basic values. I believe that the home, the family, each attuned to its own distinct deep-rooted religious convictions, must help set and maintain the general community standard. I mention these obvious facts for it is upon them that we build our school world and our society today.

It is the active and indeed growing interest in the school question which should encourage all of us. There is a widespread serious consideration of educational problems. There is not a good magazine in the country which has not in the last few years carried articles on some phase of education and child development. It is because I believe there lies a great value in these articles that I particularly appreciate the 12 articles which appeared in the Evening Star and the Sunday Star. These 12 articles were done by James Deane, the Star's education editor. These articles represent straight objective reporting. That is why they have value. They point specifically to some of the school problems in Washington. They have a high educational value because they are objective. That is why I ask permission to insert them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then too, living as close to Washington as I do and knowing of the interest of so many of my constituents in the Washington schools, I want to share with them a rereading of these articles which are so well written.

However, I recognize fully the fact that education is distinctly an indigenous community experience. Even the objectives and techniques of a city within a few miles of our own area may have many reasons for developing a philosophy and an approach which is different from ours. Very properly and very wisely, we, as a nation, have held that the administration of education is a State function. But we learn each from the other, both what to achieve and what to avoid.

At the national level, I would say without question that the Federal Government must share with the schools a responsibility for the physical maintenance of the plant. That is why I worked so hard with my colleagues for the adoption of a bill granting Federal aid for school construction.

I am very happy that our Congress has extended the so-called Federal aid for impacted areas. Certain major defense projects are located in our district, and I have thereby been able to justify the asking for and the getting of money for our schools through the Federal aid for impacted areas law.

I am pleased to have played a part in improving the social-security law which now benefits thousands more, including many of our Maryland teachers.

I sincerely hope that our State legislature will try to continue to raise the economic status of our teachers and to improve the opportunities which the schools may offer them.

I return to the concept with which I began, that a knowledge of the school problems is basic to an understanding of how to meet those problems. I believe the Washington Evening Star has done us a great service in these articles and I should welcome serious discussion on their general import by our teachers and parents throughout my district.

The series of articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 4, 1956]

CRISIS IN THE SCHOOLS—1—BASIC LEARNING LAGS APPALL CITY TEACHERS

(By James G. Deane)

A few days ago a Washington junior high school teacher gave a simple English test to 25 ninth-graders, ranging from 13 to 15 years old.

The children, soon slated to go to high school, were asked to tell in a few written sentences some rules for earning good marks.

"If you do the right thing," one of the ninth-graders wrote correctly, except for omitting the period, "you get the right

grades." But few of the 25 did the right thing.

Here are some of the replies from these teen-age children, already supposedly proficient in the rudiments of education.

A boy. Lestin carefully. Try to unstand."

Another boy. "Do not wate to the last minet * * * tride to improde your readeing, spell."

A girl. "Rise your hands when the techer as the class a—(undecipherable) Allways pase in a clean paper."

Another girl. "Don't dpen on other children. Do more work then told to."

A boy. "Do not play doing class peior."

One boy numbered his hints for success:

"1. By studing at lot.

"2. By listing to most of the words the teacher say.

"3. By doing your lessone every night and try to do it by your self."

If these were third or fourth graders, a suggestion like "listing to most" of the teacher's words would be amusing, but the teachers at this junior high school are not laughing.

Seventh graders at the same school were given a test in elementary arithmetic. In the best class, 3 children responded perfectly, but in the second-best class some children got 15 or 16 of the 19 problems wrong and none was perfect. Some incorrectly multiplied 7×9, or wrongly subtracted 14—8. Most were completely stumped when asked to add fractions, such as $\frac{2}{3}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$. Only 8 out of 32 correctly divided $15 by $0.25, for which the rest supplied 15 different wrong answers.

All of these children, according to the mathematics teacher, should be capable of doing these easy, basic computations before finishing sixth grade.

This junior high is accustomed to dealing with educational lags. It is in a low-income neighborhood, where background and cultural opportunity are limited and more problems are thrown onto the school. (The ninth-graders mentioned above are in the next-to-the-lowest of the school's 5 ninth-grade classes, and are rated as slow learners. The seventh-graders, though, are rated as normally intelligent.)

But the school has never before had anything like the present low achievement.

The principal asked this writer, with obvious frustration in his voice:

"What are we going to do with these children?"

The assistant principal, shuffling the test papers, labeled them "appalling."

The school, formerly exclusively for white children, now has a majority of colored children, and like some other integrated schools it has found many of the newcomers have lower educational achievements than the school has been accustomed to.

SCHOOLS SEEM STUMPED

But the classes that took the tests included both white and colored children, and both were at extremes in the results.

This school's problems are not unique. Teachers report they are facing similar problems in many classrooms across the city.

The situation seems to be this:

1. Many children aren't learning enough.

2. The schools—at the moment—apparently can't do much about it, or at least, not enough.

3. Racial integration hasn't caused the situation, but it has greatly complicated it, and made the need for action urgent.

What basis is there for saying Washington schoolchildren aren't learning enough?

Last year's achievement tests showed District pupils at all levels—elementary, junior high and senior high—averaging below par. The average was far below—for ninth-graders, in arithmetic, 2 to 3 years; in reading, 1 to 2 years.

TEST SCORES LOW

Almost 1,800 of the city's 4,000 present tenth-graders, tested a year ago, showed sixth grade level or poorer in arithmetic. In reading, more than 1,000 were as low or lower. (In nearby Arlington and Montgomery Counties, pupils average above par.)

In 1949, a survey showed many Washington schoolchildren also lagged then on standard tests. Some schools, according to the survey, averaged 3 years behind.

In many schools the survey found too many failures and too many overage, maladjusted and unsuccessful children.

It also found great inequality in class sizes, teacher staffs, and teaching facilities among schools and neighborhoods. Negro school conditions in almost every respect were found to compare unfavorably with white.

Since 1949 the school system has made some changes in its operations. Since 1954, when segregation was dropped, schools teachers and other facilities the 1949 survey found unequal. Children have moved, too, and this has brought into focus some noticeable achievement differences between the city's white and colored children.

ACHIEVEMENT GAP SHOWN

The 1949 survey found the achievement of colored children apparently averaging behind white; recent tests show a similar gap. Supt. Hobart M. Corning has told teachers and the Board of Education that the merging achievement levels are a problem, and that unusual action will be required to cope with it.

The big question is the ability of the school system to deal with this problem, and with the whole present situation.

In 1949 the report on the school survey said the schools didn't have enough teachers, money, or many other things. Now, the educators still are saying the same.

Without more help, they say, they can't do the kind of job that is needed.

What proof is there of this?

The first persuasive argument is that the schools apparently haven't been doing the job they should for years and apparently haven't been able to do much about it. The second is the story of the educators themselves.

This is easy enough to dispute or confirm. All it takes is a trip into the city's schools.

SCORES IN TESTS REVEAL LEARNING DEFICIENCIES

Here is how some Washington public school pupils showed up on achievement tests last year. The first table shows the ranking of present 10th graders (beginning high-school students) on the basis of tests given near the end of 9th grade:

Grade	Reading	Arithmetic
12 (3 years ahead)	34	11
11 (2 years ahead)	165	146
10 (1 year ahead)	666	310
9 (where should be)	718	488
8 (1 year behind)	731	558
7 (2 years behind)	837	668
6 (3 years behind)	594	1,102
5 (4 years behind)	333	621
4 (5 years behind)	75	71
3 (6 years behind)	2	4
Total pupils tested	4,155	3,979

The table below shows the ranking of present seventh graders (beginning junior high students) in tests given to them a year ago, near the end of sixth grade:

Grade	Reading	Arithmetic
7 and over (above grade)	1,326	1,291
6 (where should be)	851	1,093
5 (1 year behind)	1,040	1,301
4 (2 years behind)	1,380	1,511
3 (3 years behind)	1,004	707
2 (4 years behind)	318	48
1 (5 years behind)	25	1
Total pupils tested	5,944	5,952

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 5, 1956]

CRISIS IN THE SCHOOLS—2—PUPILS "SHORTCHANGED" IS TEACHERS' LAMENT

(By James G. Deane)

There are classrooms in Washington's public schools where a visiting parent might wonder how any learning ever is accomplished.

The other day this writer walked into a room on the second floor of a large northwest elementary school. The school is in a long-established neighborhood of apartments and row houses which have seen better days but which now seem to have more children in them than ever before.

The classroom reflected this. The children, sixth graders, had their desks scraping against one another. Pupils going to and from the blackboard had to step gingerly.

When the teacher could relinquish a moment she was asked how she felt education in her room was getting along.

"The children are getting shortchanged," she said. "I don't have time for all of them."

If Washington teachers wanted a theme song, this comment could be the refrain.

Washington public-school teachers are discouraged about the job they are having to do. They are even more discouraged about the job being left undone.

At the Francis Scott Key Elementary School in the Northwest the writer recently talked with the teacher of a 39-pupil combined second and third grade. The room had 2 sizes of desks and 3 or 4 ages of children, and the blackboard had two spelling lessons on it, one in second-grade printing, the other in third-grade script.

"I'm trying to cover everything I'm expected to teach," said the teacher, Mrs. Vivian Scull, between instructions to the two halves of her class, "but I feel frustrated. It's like a three-ring circus."

In a nearby big doubled-up third-fourth grade, Mrs. Agnes Kirby, a 27-year teaching veteran, said:

"You just don't have time to stop and help a child who needs help."

At Petworth School, Mrs. Barbara Hardy, teacher of a first-second grade, said she had 3 reading groups in the class "but I should have 4 or maybe 38." She regretted she didn't have more time to work with the slower children.

At Draper School in the southeast, where class sizes range up to 41 pupils, Miss Grace Bush, principal, said:

"I think our curriculum is ideal. I only wish we could carry it out."

BUMPING EVER PRESENT

Why do the city's teachers feel their classes are too big?

The answer of many doesn't have to be spoken. All you have to do is look into the room. As Mrs. Scull put it, "Everybody bumps."

Mrs. Scull described some of the sometimes subtle but, to her, significant differences among her 39 pupils—in age, from 6 to 9 years; in reading achievement, from preprimer to fourth grade; in attitude, from eager to shy and unresponsive. She herself seemed to have track of all 39, but she said the only time she has for the slower ones is at recess or after school.

"Every night when I get home I realize I've left something out and I plan to try to get to it the next day, but I almost never do," she said.

At Truesdell Laboratory School, where future teachers get their training, a teacher with a class of sixth-graders on four different levels in both age and reading said she was having a hard time even though the class enrollment was a comparatively favorable 28. But at another school, where the smallest classes are in the 40's, a sixth-grade teacher said she considered her Truesdell counterpart lucky.

PUPILS AND TIMES CHANGE

Two or three generations ago only a fraction of American children finished high school. Many never even entered it. What has become, at least in theory, universal education was then very largely selective. Teaching was more limited and more rigid, and more help came from the home. And there was less to learn.

Nowadays a high school, as Dr. Carl F. Hansen, assistant Washington school superintendent, noted recently, "is no longer in position to select the strong and discard the weak for membership in its student body. It must, rather, welcome all who come to its doors and provide the kind of curriculum that will make further growth possible." The same could be said of schools at lower levels.

Children also have changed. As one educator put it, "today's children present new problems. * * * The cumulative effects of broken homes, the tension of war, family transiency, lack of parental control, and the overstimulation of moving pictures, radio, and television are being felt in almost every classroom."

Teachers are required to teach more to a wider variety of students. And education has had to turn its focus more and more away from the group to the individual, because of the increasing span of differences among individual children.

But Washington schools still are operating with the same classroom conditions they had years ago.

CLASS IDEAL SET AT 25

How big a class can a teacher properly handle?

A couple of years ago the National Education Association in one of its research publications said the teaching profession "now recognizes that a modern school program, with its variable and complex objectives, cannot be fully achieved when classes enroll more than 25 pupils."

Some teachers have told this writer they think they can handle a few more and still do well. But Washington doesn't look good in NEA terms even if you change the figure to the 30 which teachers here have been trying to get.

The situation here, as of last October:

Only a relative handful of elementary classes were as small as 30. Seven hundred and seventeen classes—almost half—were over the city average of 36. Over 260 classes—with 11,000 children in them—were in the forties and fifties.

Nearly 7,000 of the 19,616 junior high classes—more than one-third—had enrollments in the forties or upper thirties. Homerooms averaged 36.

Almost 550 senior high classes were at least 35.

WORSE AT CLOSE RANGE

Examined more closely, the picture looks even worse. Most of the smaller classes in the junior and senior high schools are small because they have to be, such as shops which have limited space and equipment.

Most of the big classes, on the other hand, are in basic subjects (English, history, math, science), where American children generally are weaker than they should be and Washington children are badly trailing the national average. How can achievement be pulled up if such classes are overloaded? And practically all of the city's junior and senior high-school students have some of these big classes.

What makes a complete mockery of any attempt to maintain high standards—if one is accepting the idea that 25 or 30 is the biggest practical class size—is the situation in the elementary schools, where far more than half of the city's pupils are in classes of from 37 to 50.

Many present Washington students have been in this kind of dead-end situation for years, as others were before them. This helps to explain the low achievement level of many present high-school students. And the situation is not getting any better, or any easier to do anything about. City class-size averages are bigger now than they were 8 years ago, and in grade schools they were bigger then than 8 years before that.

"In a class of 40 with a 43-minute class period, how many minutes will each pupil have to recite?" one junior high-school teacher asked this writer, then supplying his own answer: "He'll be lucky if he gets to talk once a week."

With 5 such classes, the teacher also would be responsible simultaneously for the educational progress, in his particular subject, of 200 children. A mathematics teacher, with 175 or 180, said candidly: "Frankly, I don't spend much time with the individual children." He also said he rarely gets a chance to sit down all day.

SOME PUPILS UNPREPARED

There also was the business teacher who said that at the start of every term she has to stop and teach the alphabet to some children before she can start unraveling the mysteries of her own subject.

At one junior high school, where only 33 of nearly 170 beginning seventh graders were up to grade level in reading last fall and many were unable to write a sentence, teachers also are having to enlighten children on elementary rules of family living, social conduct, hygiene, and morals. Administrators and counselors have to work overtime even getting some children to come to school.

But these things—as "appalling," in the assistant principal's word, as many of them are—aren't the only reasons the city's teachers think the present situation in the city's schools carries serious risks.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 6, 1956]

CRISIS IN THE SCHOOLS—3—MERGING TWO LEVELS DISCLOSES PROBLEMS

(By James G. Deane)

Recently a Washington elementary school set up three special reading classes for its fourth, fifth, and sixth graders.

The first was for fifth and sixth grade reading. The second was for fourth-grade readers. The third was for those still reading on third grade or lower.

When the sixth-grade class sent off its slower readers to the lower groups all 10 of its colored pupils went with them—half to the middle class, half to the lowest.

The teacher of this sixth grade has been discovering in the last 2 years what teachers have been learning in many schools across the city—that Washington children have been on two distinct educational levels, and that merging them brings problems.

An irate colored mother appeared at a junior high school not long ago with a strong objection to having her child "shooting crap." The school had enrolled her boy in a "handicraft" club.

CULTURAL BACKGROUND DIFFERS

"With white children you can be understood," said the principal. "With colored children you don't understand the cultural background."

Last year a class from the school visited the White House, and one of the colored youngsters said he expected to find the king. "These children," said the principal, "have come from homes that haven't had our cultural pattern. In many cases the older brother or sister has managed the home, and adults haven't brought up the children at all. Many times I run into a child staying home and find her taking care of brothers and sisters."

Lagging achievement is only one of the problems. When her room first became integrated, the sixth-grade teacher mentioned above said her new colored pupils were poorly behaved. "They fought and used bad language," she said, adding that they "didn't know what to do with freedom," which was something they apparently hadn't had before. A junior high principal said the effect of integration on some colored children seemed to be to "let the lid off." He complained of noise and disorder. A counselor at one school said there had been an increase in stealing.

More than one principal declared that he never had such wholesale absence or tardiness before, and the Negro assistant principal in one integrated school spent most of his time last year policing truancy and discipline cases among colored youngsters. But the school had its white problem cases, too.

Washington's schools have long had the basic problems that are causing teachers concern. But integration, as one school official put it, has put them in a new light.

"The colored children," a Negro school official with a Ph. D. declared, "have had none of the advantages, and now people are finding it out."

A white principal whose school is now 60 percent Negro said:

"The problem of the colored children is the problem of economic background. The home is just bare. We get them here in school and there's nothing to build on. We have to give them the foundation before we can start."

CLASS SIZE COMPARED

In the opinion of colored teachers, Washington hasn't done too well on trying to head the problem off.

In 1948, here was how median class sizes compared in the city's secondary schools:

	Negro	White
Junior high	36.2	30.5
Senior high	34.0	27.7
Vocational	24.2	13.5

In the same year, white elementary classes averaged 32, and Negro, 38. In the white schools only three-tenths of a percent of classes exceeded 40, but the over-40 total in Negro schols topped 20 percent.

Colored schools also had fewer teachers in special subjects, such as music, and fewer special classes for the mentally retarded.

It was also known then that Negro achievement averages were below white. In 1947 colored 8–B pupils, for example, tested in reading, averaged 3 years below grade. White 7–A's the following year averaged a little ahead of grade, although a school survey found some objectionable lags among white children, too.

PROPHECY BORNE OUT

The conclusion of a 1948 survey—printed and available to the public—was that unless the schools overcame educational lacks, chiefly a need for more teachers, the test lags would get worse. The prophecy has been borne out, and the Negro children show it most.

But Washington's school adequacy isn't the only factor.

The city has also been absorbing many children from the South, as reflected in the steady climb of the Negro enrollment from 44 percent 10 years ago to 64 percent now. Many of these youngsters come from schools which, as an educator recently pointed out at an Atlantic City convention, let them out for an annual "cotton-picking vacation," and they could hardly be expected to be up to par. Tests have shown Washington-born Negro children, even with their own lags, ranking significantly ahead of southern migrants.

Some of these newcomers are at all-Negro Armstrong High School, where teachers are just as worried about doing something for

them as in integrated schools. Armstrong, which a Negro member of the Board of Education recently charged was becoming a "dumping ground" for laggard Negro students, has 18 remedial reading and arithmetic classes, some of which are being taught on the fifth and fourth grade level or lower. Only 11 of the school's present 360 10th-graders were reading on grade level when they enrolled last September, and not one 10th-grade English class is being taught the regular high-schol curriculum.

TROUBLE DIVIDING WORDS

In one Armstrong classroom the writer saw 16-year-old youths drilling on dividing words like "cabbage" and "Friday" into syllables. The teacher later passed out some big-print elementary readers, the first story in which was titled "Who's Afraid of the Big Black Bear?"

In another room students were having difficulty subtracting and dividing. One boy said he couldn't read aloud the number "4,936,587," although he said he could write it. The teacher said he was having trouble getting across the multiplication table.

But regardless of where they come from, there is no doubt underprivileged children are giving teachers educational headaches. And where they are in integrated classrooms, there are plenty of added adjustment problems thrown in.

How well are teachers managing to cope with the situation?

Schools are doing as much grouping as well as special teaching as possible. At Armstrong, the remedial program hasn't shown significant results yet. McKinley High School has set up an unprecedented remedial program, with 14 special classes in reading and a somewhat smaller number in math. The program has already shown encouraging results. Tests of 141 of the reading students showed that between September and January, 15 percent gained a year or more in vocabulary, 24 percent gained the same in speed, and 38 percent gained equally in comprehension.

SOME REACH GRADE LEVEL

In arithmetic, where pupils were given a 100-problem test, the average improvement in one class was 24 points and in another class almost 30, and some of the children pulled themselves up to grade level. Many of the youngsters had perfectly normal reasoning power but just hadn't been using it properly.

At the Jackson Elementary School, in Georgetown, where children of Congressmen and diplomats share classrooms with some whose parents are janitors and cooks, the top three grades have been getting remedial reading and arithmetic instruction daily. Miss Ruth E. Dick, principal, said 1 colored girl from the South made a year's reading progress in 2 months, and 2 different colored mothers said, "My child is learning for the first time."

Jackson has classes smaller than the city average, and Miss Dick said: "We can do an intensive job because we are a very small school." Other schools are less fortunate. At Thomson, in the middle of downtown, for example, Mrs. Frances S. Haas, principal, said pupils come and go so fast teachers hardly can get to know them.

"Children may come to school without breakfast and sit and dream all day. The teacher has to find out what's wrong," she said, adding she was spending 95 percent of her own time on urgent individual problems. Thomson is supposed to be carrying out a maximum benefit project of the Commissioners' Youth Council to show whether classes of 30 help fight delinquency, but Mrs. Haas said the experiment hasn't proved anything because the school hasn't been able to keep classes that low.

Negro children have no monopoly on the city's educational problems. This writer has seen test papers showing white children in just as urgent need of help, and conversely there are schools, including integrated ones, where colored youngsters have made a better showing than white. Dunbar High School, virtually all Negro, had the city's best college-entrance record both last year and the year before, and a big quota of its graduates got scholarships.

BASIC WORRY

There are also many white children who spend time sitting in the principal's office.

But with doubts about the school system's ability to educate well even under ordinary circumstances, it is hardly remarkable if integration has both parents and teachers worried.

The basic worry, teachers say, is the same one apparently at the root of most of the school system's ills—too many pupils per teacher. Whether children are white or colored, not much can be done individually if the class is too big. And integration has spread the range of individuals wider than ever before.

"The biggest mistake this city has made," one of Washington's best principals said, "is to have integration without making classes smaller."

Materials and Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, prior to the end of World War II the industrial revolution had only affected a comparatively small number of the world's 2.6 billion people. With the independence of formerly colonial countries, there has been a tremendous urge by the so-called underdeveloped countries to industrialize. Our foreign aid and technical assistance programs have been directed toward aiding them in raising their people's living standards.

If these efforts meet with success, there will necessarily be an unprecedented demand for raw materials such as copper, lead, zinc, aluminum, and iron, which are the basis of our mechanical civilization. This need can only be met by utilizing entirely new techniques based on applying a tremendous amount of energy to low-grade ores in order to secure ample materials for an expanding industrial world economy.

Dr. Harrison S. Brown, professor of geochemistry at the California Institute of Technology, has peered into the future to see how these needs may be met. In fact, at the laboratories at California Tech he has shown that all of the materials required can actually be obtained by processing ordinary granite with atomic energy.

Dr. Brown's study was recently presented to a group of the country's leading industrialists, who are associates of the California Institute of Technology. The New York Times on May 21 gave prominence to Dr. Brown's report. In accordance with leave previously granted, I am including the New York Times review of Dr. Brown's work as an extension of my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

FACTORY AID SEEN FOR NEW BILLIONS—MACHINE EXPECTED TO SEIZE AIR, SEA WATER, ROCK, AND LIGHT FOR HUMAN USE

Machine civilization will spread over the face of the earth in the next hundred years.

If brain power is available so that machine technology continues to improve, necessities of life for all and luxuries for some could be provided in a century for a world population at least twice the present 2,600,000,000 persons on earth. By 2050 world population may reach 10 billion (or even more). But they could be fed, clothed and housed by factories feeding upon the most common substances available: air, sea water, ordinary rock and sunlight.

This conclusion, more optimistic than many reached by those who have balanced the earth's increasing population against the limited known resources, is the major finding of a new survey titled "Raw Materials, Energy, Population and the Spread of Industrialization." The survey by Dr. Harrison S. Brown, professor of geochemistry, is part of a "speculative projection" into the 21st century made for major American corporations by the California Institute of Technology.

There is a grim hedge in Dr. Brown's projection. It applies only "in the absence of a world catastrophe."

Dr. Brown also points out that machine civilization is very vulnerable. Pieces must fit and work together. There is a "point of no return"—which we are now rapidly nearing, Dr. Brown says—beyond which a disrupted civilization never could be put together again.

The reason: present machines are made from rich metallic ores. These are nearly used up. Machine civilization could not start up without rich ores, although it could keep going without them.

USE OF RAW MATERIALS

Large amounts of raw materials are used by industrial society. In the United States in 1950 the yearly per capita demand for steel reached 1,260 pounds. Demand for copper touched 23 pounds. About 7,300 pounds of stone, sand and gravel were used per capita. Energy equivalent to that contained in 8 tons of coal was used for each person in the country.

The metals can be recycled, Dr. Brown points out. Steel equipment that becomes obsolete can be melted down and re-used. But about 10 percent of the metal so recycled is lost forever.

How high will the per capita demand for raw materials go? Dr. Brown says that in 1975 steel in use in the United States might amount to 15 tons for each person, against 8 now. More and more, he explains, the pattern is for luxuries to become necessities, as did the automobile, the telephone and the electric light. In a century, Dr. Brown estimates, the amount of steel in use in the United States might be 100 tons per capita.

Dr. Brown predicts that the population of the earth in the middle of the 21st century will be between 2½ and 3 times the present population of 2,600 million (it might be as high as 15 times the 1955 population, he suggests).

As machine civilization spreads, the per capita energy requirements of the earth's population and the use of raw materials must be multiplied by the expected population increase. The crux of the problem of survival for a growing world population in the next century is: where will the energy and the raw materials come from?

Dr. Brown's answer is that brainpower can perform the magic multiplication. Technology must use air, sea water, ordinary rock and sunlight. Some techniques are already known. Others must be devised.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

In a century about half the world's energy will come from nuclear reactions, Dr. Brown predicts. By 2050 a world population of 7

billion using energy at the per capita rate of the United States in 1955 would use the equivalent of 70 billion metric tons of coal. At that rate all the world's fossil fuels would last only a few years.

Energy and raw materials, Dr. Brown says, will come from the processing of granite rock in giant factories after present rich ores and fuel beds are used up.

A ton of ordinary granite contains about 4 grams of uranium and 12 grams of thorium. Assuming that the thorium can be used in breeder reactors, that radioactive material is equivalent to the energy released on burning 50 tons of coal. At the laboratories of the California Institute of Technology it has been proved that the actual processing of granite can be done with a fraction of the radioactive energy that it contains, according to Dr. Brown.

Thus it is expected that factories to process rock and create energy-rich radioactive fuels, in addition to extracting metals from the granite, will be the basis of the economy of a industrialized world of 7 billion people.

Water would come from distillation of the seas if plenty of nuclear energy were available. Deuterium in the seas might be used if controlled nuclear fusion could be used to produce energy in addition to that from fission of uranium or plutonium. Other metals could be extracted from sea water.

Liquid fuels and a whole complex of organic chemicals and plastics would come from the carbon of limestone through the power of atomic energy or controlled photosynthesis.

A PERSON'S ANNUAL NEEDS

As an example of how America's material resources are consumed, the table below lists the needs of 1 person in the United States during 1 year, based on 1950 data. The material was gathered from Resources of the World, a study of the California Institute of Technology:

Energy (in terms of coal) (tons)	8
Major metals:	
Steel (in use) (tons)	8
Steel (annual consumption) (pounds)	1,260
Copper (pounds)	23
Lead (pounds)	16
Zinc (pounds)	16
Aluminum (pounds)	13
Chromium (pounds)	13
Manganese (pounds)	8.7
Nickel (pounds)	1.3
Tin (pounds)	1.2
Nonmetallic minerals:	
Stone, sand, and gravel (pounds)	7,300
Cement (pounds)	520
Clays (pounds)	380
Common salt (pounds)	520
Phosphate rock (pounds)	130
Lime (other than for cement) (pounds)	85
Sulfur (pounds)	71
Potassium salts (pounds)	15
Pyrites (pounds)	13
Water:	
Drinking (gallons)	200
Washing, laundering, heating, air conditioning (gallons)	15,000
Industrial use (gallons)	160,000
Agricultural use (gallons)	200,000
Food:	
Consumed (ton)	0.37
Residues[1] (corn and wheat only) (tons)	1.75
Cultivated land (acres)	2.4
Calories produced (a day a cultivated acre)	4,000

[1] For each pound of food consumed, there are several pounds of woody stalks and leaves left over. Corn and wheat residues were cited in terms of their possible conversion to edible foods. By present processes, this conversion is costly. Molasses can be obtained from straw but at a cost roughly 10 times that of molasses from sugar beets or cane.

Other metals consumed in smaller amounts are antimony, magnesium, molybdenum, cadmium, cobalt, tungsten, beryllium, vanadium, nobium, and bismuth.

Civil Defense for National Survival—Report of the Holifield Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Military Operations Subcommittee, under my chairmanship, recently completed an investigation of the civil defense program. This was the most searching and comprehensive inquiry into civil defense ever made by a congressional committee.

Hearings were held in selected major target areas, including New York City and Syracuse, Detroit, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital. Our subcommittee heard more than 200 witnesses prominent in science, engineering, and medicine, and other professions.

The governors of 36 States and mayors of 33 large cities submitted their written statements to the subcommitte and a number of them also appeared in person. The highest military authorities and the chiefs of the Federal agencies responsible for civil-defense planning were heard.

The outcome of our work is a report on civil defense, known as House Report No. 2946, which was presented to the Congress this session.

EVACUATION POLICY "DANGEROUSLY SHORTSIGHTED"

The subcommittee report was sternly critical of the existing civil-defense program. It said that this program, which relies on evacuation, is weak and ineffective, and, indeed, dangerously shortsighted.

The official testimony of Mayor Poulson and the civil-defense director of the city of Los Angeles reflected the commonsense knowledge of our people that evacuation, under conditions of limited warning time which we must expect as weapon technology advances, is impossible. As a civil-defense policy for the Los Angeles area, evacuation is absurd.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD FACE UP TO RESPONSIBILITIES

The subcommittee recommendations, which were endorsed by the full committee with 1 or 2 qualifications, add up to this: The Federal Government should squarely face up to its responsibilities to provide for the common defense by developing a civil-defense program as a vital component of our overall national defense.

We took the position that civil defense must not be neglected any more than our Army, Navy, and Air Force. America is always peace-minded but it dare not let down its defenses against possible aggression. Civil defense is an essential part of these defenses in the nuclear age.

GROUP SHELTER PROTECTION ESSENTIAL

The key measure in this civil-defense program, our report pointed out, was a program of group shelter construction to protect people from the direct blast and heat effects of atomic-hydrogen bombs and the lethal fallout radiation which persists after the explosion.

We did not try to gloss over the difficulties or the costs of building adequate shelters, or the demands which must be made upon the public for supporting an effective civil defense.

CIVIL DEFENSE LEGISLATION MUST BE OVERHAULED

We found that Federal agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission were not giving the full facts on nuclear weapons effects to the public, and that the Federal Civil Defense Administration was built on a faulty legislative structure that made for a diffusion of responsibility and a lack of strong Federal leadership.

Our report proposed that the 1950 civil defense legislation be rewritten to face the realities and meet the needs of the nuclear age. Moreover, it stressed the importance of maintaining civilian control over civil defense rather than let the military "take over."

HOLIFIELD REPORT RECOGNIZED BY PRESS AND PRESIDENT

Many leading newspaper editorial writers and columnists have praised our report highly. I believe that in the days to come it will be the basis for a complete reorganization of the civil-defense program.

President Eisenhower, in fact, recently released a letter to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator, in which he took due note of the work of my subcommittee and promised that in his next budget message to the Congress, he would make recommendations to modernize the civil-defense program based upon our recommendations and others.

I am confident that in 1957 the President who is elected to office must and will take account of our constructive recommendations for the security and continued strength of America against the threat of nuclear attack.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, in these closing days of the 84th Congress, with service on lengthy and involved conferences with the other body on the huge mutual security and first and second supplemental appropriation bills, this is the first opportunity I have had to express my best wishes and Godspeed to the respected chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the dis-

tinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

The people of the Fifth District and of the entire State of South Carolina are confronted with a tremendous problem in trying to replace a man of the stature of DICK RICHARDS in the House of Representatives. The people of the entire Nation suffer a great loss in virile leadership on the subject of foreign affairs in DICK's decision not to offer himself once again for the office of Representative in Congress from South Carolina.

I have had close liaison with DICK RICHARDS for many years. Not only has he been a close and affable friend, but as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of State I have had many occasions to discuss and seek advice on many matters concerning that important branch of our Government with our learned chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. On some subjects, such as abolition of the partition of Ireland and civil rights, we would always disagree. But I am sure we always respected one another's opinions and our right to fully state and defend them.

DICK RICHARDS was truly a powerful leader here in the House on foreign policy. I know that on every issue presented to him as a Member for over 20 years and as chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs his primary concern was always, "What is best for my country?"

Mr. Speaker, one must need feel sad at the departure of one of our most brilliant and capable colleagues after a long and devoted public career. However, I do know that, at the same time, we all wish him many, many years of happiness, good health, and further success in his return to private life and the practice of the law. His charming wife, his sons, and daughter will surely benefit by our great loss in having DICK at home in his beloved hometown of Lancaster.

Agriculture 100 Years From Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the soil bank, established by the Congress in 1956, over the years will pay big dividends to the American people. While we are troubled with agricultural surpluses today, our population and that of the world is rising at such a rapid rate that the retired acres will be needed to feed our people before very many years have passed. As a matter of fact, we will have to increase the productiveness of all cultivated acres if starvation and famine are to be avoided in the next century.

Dr. James F. Bonner, professor of biology at the California Institute of Technology, has peered into the future to assess the problems of feeding the world's population over the next hundred years. He estimates that the world's population will be from 2 to 4 times the present 2.6 billion people. However, Dr. Bonner is confident that with new techniques literally billions of acres of additional cultivated lands could be developed to meet the world's food requirements.

His study was recently presented to industrialists who are associated with the California Institute of Technology. It was reviewed in the New York Times May 21, 1956. I believe it of sufficient interest to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and in accordance with leave previously granted I am including it in the Appendix of the RECORD as an extension of my remarks:

FARMS TODAY SET POPULATION LIMIT—STUDY SHOWS PLANTS YIELD ENOUGH TO FEED FIVE HUNDRED TIMES NUMBER NOW IN WORLD—VAST WASTAGE IS NOTED—BILLION ACRES OF CULTIVATED LAND COULD BE DEVELOPED WITH NEW TECHNIQUES

If the brain power is available, there is no important limitation on the amount of food that the world can produce.

This is the conclusion of a study on The World's Food: Need and Potential. It was made by Dr. James F. Bonner, professor of biology at the California Institute of Technology, as part of a glimpse at the world a century from now made by the institute for leading American corporations.

There is no technological reason why shortage of food should limit the population growth of the earth, Dr. Bonner reported. This is true, he said, despite the fact that more than one-half of the present world population receives barely enough food to maintain life at a minimum level. Another one-fourth of the population is undernourished, he said.

Human food comes directly or indirectly from plants, he said. Plants used as food and the plants fed to animals that produce meat, milk, and eggs take sunlight and combine carbon dioxide from the atmosphere with water to make fibrous tissues.

Each year plants on land and in water produce enough food for 500 times the current world population.

USABLE FOOD NOT USED

But most people eat only cultivated plants, and these comprise only one-fourth of what is available. Also, these other factors reduce the amount of usable food from the plants grown today:

About half the cultivated food is fed to animals. The animal eats only part of the plant. What he does eat is returned to us as animal food with a caloric yield of only about 10 percent.

Man consumes only about 20 percent of the cultivated plant. He eats the wheat seed but does not eat the stems or leaves.

Insects, fungi, rabbits, rats, and so forth, consume one-third of the food grown in the world today.

The amount of land on which to grow food varies throughout the world from 0.2 of a cultivated acre per capita in Japan to 0.6 of an acre in Asia, 0.9 acre in Europe, 2 acres in the Soviet Union and 2.4 acres in the United States.

The number of calories of food produced each day on a cultivated acre varies from a low of 2,300 in Russia to a high of 14,000 in Japan. The figure for the United States is 4,000 calories. Calories measure the energy-producing value of food. There are 100 calories in a tablespoon of honey, for example.

Half the world exists on a low-calory intake. This part of the population lives in most of Asia, Egypt, all of Central America and parts of South America. Individuals there average less than 2,250 calories each day. Another 20 percent of the population, living in most of southern Europe and parts of South America and Africa, eat between 2,250 and 2,750 calories; 20 percent, including al of North America, much of Europe, Oceania, Argentina, and the Soviet Union, eat more than 2,750 calories.

One billion acres of new cultivated land could become available to agriculture if the warm and cold wet areas now neglected were farmed, Dr. Bonner estimated. This land can be farmed by planting new crops and by irrigating with distilled sea water and by other improvements that are feasible now.

POPULATION TO RISE

If this were done, Dr. Bonner said, and the productivity of all the world's cultivated lands raised to the level prevalent in Europe, 3,700,000,000 people could be fed a diet "healthful, adequate, but not exciting." This population is expected for the world in 25 to 50 years, he said. There are now 2,600,000,000 people in the world.

Improvements in food supply will come, Dr. Bonner asserts, in these "nonconventional" steps:

Animals will be used less as food. Diets of plant proteins will supplement animal products. In the United States alone, he estimated, if the population increases to 200 million in 15 years the Nation will have only two-thirds of its present animal food ration.

Grain crops will be replaced by crops in which more of the plant is eaten. Entirely new edible crops are a possibility. A meat beet or a fat plant might be produced.

Woody stalks and leaves might be utilized. They can be converted to edible sugars by methods now known.

Steppes and deserts now cover twice as much of the earth as cultivated land. If sea water could be treated with cheap energy it could be used to irrigate these lands.

Nine-tenths of the photosynthesis that occurs on the earths surface is in the oceans, but little use is made of this. Cultivation of algae might raise food production.

Chemical synthesis of vitamins and of essential meat proteins is possible now.

Hon. Charles Bennett Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present in the House on Monday of this week when the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, my friend, the Honorable CHARLES BENNETT DEANE, delivered his farewell address. At the time, I was engaged in a conference on an appropriation bill regarding matters in disagreement between the House and Senate.

Ever since CHARLIE DEANE was elected to this House of Representatives 10 years ago, I have admired him for his outstanding devotion to public duty. I have known of no harder working Member in the years he has served. He has always had the respect of all of us, not only for his diligence in the best interests of his constituents in the Eighth District of North Carolina, not only for his learned contributions to the deliberations of this body on the great problems of the Nation, but for his gentlemanly

bearing, his affability, his many kindnesses, his true Christian spirit, and, above all, his sincerity.

It has been a high privilege to serve in this House of Representatives and on its great Committee on Appropriations with CHARLIE DEANE. I wish him Godspeed upon his return to the practice of the law. I am confident that I bespeak the wishes of every single Member of this body when I trust that CHARLIE, his lovely wife, his two daughters and son prosper in long good health and happiness.

Holifield Bill for Peacetime Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for the more than 10 years that I have been a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have studied with great care the possibilities for peacetime development of atomic energy.

As part of my official duties on this committee I have become acquained with the technical aspects of atomic-hydrogen weapons development. It is my deep conviction that this tremendous force of nature, if harnessed for peaceful work instead of mass killing, can bring new wonders to the world.

DESTRUCTIVE POWER OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Ever since I served as a member of President Truman's Special Committee on the Atomic Bomb Test at the Bikini atoll in 1946, and saw with my own eyes the enormous destructive power of the atomic bomb, this conviction has become part of my daily thought and action.

In the following years I saw the destructive power of the atomic bomb multiply a thousand times so that a single explosion of a hydrogen bomb could wipe out a whole city and spread lethal radiation over thousands of square miles.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY APPROACH

In 1954, during the 83d Congress which had a Republican majority, the basic legislation governing the atomic energy program was rewritten in an attempt to encourage peacetime development. The main interest of the Republican sponsors of the new legislation was to encourage private industry to get into the atomic-energy field.

As a close observer of atomic energy reactor development, I knew that this development program had a long way to go before private industry could afford to participate on a commercial basis. Reactor designs were experimental. Costs of atomic power production would be exorbitant compared to conventional power production from coal, falling water, or other sources.

In many respects this change in atomic energy legislation was merely a holding operation for private utility companies. They wanted to control the industry's future, but they were not ready to invest in present development. Also they feared atomic power competition from public agencies made possible by Government investment.

I warned the Congress in 1954 that the efforts to turn the peacetime atomic energy program over to private industry were premature, that the legislation had sinister possibilities of monopoly control because only a few giant corporations had atomic know-how as contractors to the Government, and that if the Government slackened its atomic program before industry was ready to step in, a dangerous void would be created.

SLACKENING OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

The developments of the past 2 years have affirmed my prediction about the slackening of Government effort in atomic energy development. Today we are losing the race for peacetime atomic power to other nations. Great Britain is about to produce electricity from atomic reactors, and Soviet Russia has made rapid strides in this field, as I know from personal observation at the World Conference of Scientists held at Geneva, Switzerland, last year.

HOLIFIELD BILL TO SPEED ATOMIC POWER

In an effort to overcome this gap in our national atomic energy program I sponsored legislation in this Congress for the Federal Government to build a number of large reactors to produce power at present atomic energy sites. Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, sponsored similar legislation in the Senate.

The Holifield-Gore bill proposes a $400 million atomic-power program for the next 5 years. The Atomic Energy Commission would be authorized and directed to build large-scale prototypes of atomic-power reactors. The purpose of this program is to advance the art and technology of atomic power by actual operation of large reactors that can convert the enormous energy of splitting atoms into kilowatts of electricity. All discoveries and advancements which are made at Government expense are immediately made available to privately and publicly owned utilities for the benefit of all people.

PROGRAM BLOCKED BY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that the Holifield-Gore legislation failed of passage in this Congress. The failure was due in large part to the vehement opposition of the Republican administration at the behest of private utilities. These companies put their own business affairs ahead of the national interest in maintaining American leadership in the peaceful uses of atomic power.

The defeat of this bill by administration efforts, in which Atomic Energy Commission Chairman Lewis L. Strauss played a conspicuous part, signifies to me that the so-called atoms-for-peace program which the administration professes to support, is little more than an empty gesture, a windy exercise in rhetoric.

HOLIFIELD BILL TO BE ON AGENDA

If the peacetime potentials of atomic energy are to be realized, the Federal Government must proceed boldly and constructively to build reactors and to promote research and development. Therefore, I believe that the Holifield-Gore bill will be a crucial item on the agenda of the next Congress.

Bad News for Sportsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, one of the great problems that beset fishermen is that although a greater number of commercial fishermen are at work now than at any time in the past, the catch remains about static. I have found an interesting treatment of this by Mr. Robert Nesbit and, under unanimous consent, I include his statement in the RECORD. It may be that he has set forth a cure for this problem which faces our American fishermen:

BAD NEWS FOR SPORTSMEN
(By Robert A. Nesbit)

In recent months commercial fishermen from Maine to California and from Alaska to Florida have descended on Congress and the Tariff Commission with bitter complaints and loud demands. Their complaint—fishing is no longer profitable. Their demands—more tariff protection, Government assistance in trade promotion, easier credit for production equipment, and reorganization and upgrading of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The distress of the commercial fishermen is real. But the cauēs of their distress is not, as they allege, inadequate prices, but serious depletion of our fishery resources. That is bad news for sportsmen.

Before the war responsible conservation leaders were greatly disturbed by the evidence of overfishing in many areas. The situation has now become much more serious. Our commercial fishermen are now using twice as many fishing craft as were operated before the war. But this enlarged fleet is producing no more fish than did the smaller fleet in prewar years. The potential profits from the catch of fish is being dissipated by the operating expenses of this unnecessary, wasteful, and destructive expansion of the fishing fleet.

Prior to 1945 about 5,500 vessels and 30,000 motorboats were enough to produce an average annual yield of about 4½ billion pounds of fish, including about 3 billion pounds of food fish. Stimulated by high prices, the number of motorboats increased to 48,000 by 1948 and by 1950, the numbers of vessels (5 net tons or larger) about doubled. The enlarged fleet has now been operating 6 years. During that time it has not added a pound to production or a dollar to the gross value of the catch above what could have been realized from a fleet of normal size. Six years should be long enough to demonstrate that overexpansion of production facilities has not only robbed commercial fishermen of their profits, but that it has impaired the recreational value of our fishery resources as well.

Let us now look at the alleged inadequacy of fish prices. The plain fact is that average prices for food fish are currently about 3.5 times the prewar average while average prices for all other commodities have in-

creased only about 2.2 times. The proceeds of the sale of 100 pounds of fish today will buy about 160 percent as much of other commodities as would the proceeds of a similar sale in 1939.

The commercial fishermen are quite right when they say that the cost per pound of catching fish has gone up. But only part of the increase is due to a rise in the cost of operating a fishing vessel for a year. That part of it may not be out of proportion to the rise in costs and prices in other industries. The other and certainly the most important part, is the decrease in the average catch per vessel per year. For example, if you own a trawler which costs $50,000 a year to operate and which catches a million pounds of fish in 1 year, the cost per pound of catching the fish is 5 cents. But if enough other trawlers enter the fishery to reduce your share of the catch to 600,000 pounds, your cost per pound goes up to 8.3 cents, without any increase in your annual operating expenses.

The postwar newcomers to the industry have forced a division of the total catch among a larger number of operating units. The newcomers themselves got a great deal less out of it than they expected, and in addition, they forced an unnecessary increase in unit production costs on fishermen already in the business.

From the point of view of general public interest, including recreational interests, the effect of this uneconomic expansion has been a general impairment of the resource.

Clearly then, the plight of the commercial fishermen, real as it is, and serious as it is, is not the result of inadequate prices. Actually, the opposite is true. High prices have been the indirect cause of the fishermen's undoing and still higher prices will make the situation worse—worse for the fishermen themselves, worse for the public and worse for recreational interests. For it is the abnormally high price level described above which has stimulated the wasteful and unproductive overexpansion of the fleet. The price rise itself was the result of what is now the demonstrated inadequacy of the domestic resource to supply the needs of a growing population and an expanding economy.

A large part of the effort behind the current demands on Congress is concerned with removing the last restraining influence on the spiral of rising prices, uneconomic expansion, rising unit costs and increased depletion. That restraining influence is the supplement to our own limited resources provided by imports. That supplement has thus far been insufficient to prevent serious damage to the industry and to the resource, but until Congress and the industry can get together on a practical and realistic policy and program to cope with the real causes of distress and depletion, encouragement of imports offers the best opportunity to hold the line.

It is the object of the proponents to provide a stronger spokesman for their protectionist views and to insure that he will be well supplied with data and arguments. It might equally well be argued that the needs of the resource, and the real interests of the commercial fishermen call for a stronger spokesman for conservation, and that such a conservation minded spokesman at the sub-Cabinet level will find that study of imports leads to quite different conclusions than the proponents envisage.

I have referred above to the need for Congress and the fishing industry to get together on a realistic policy and program. The essential feature of such a policy is limitation of the numbers of operating units to somewhere near the minimum necessary to produce the maximum yield.

Proposals embodying this feature were seriously considered by Congress in 1941. The Wallgren bill (S. 1915, 1st sess., 77th Cong.) and the McNary bill (S. 2227, 2d sess., 77th Cong.) both conferred authority on the Secretary of the Interior to limit the numbers of operating units engaged in salmon fishing. The following comment on the Walgren bill is quoted from the Pacific Fisherman, October 1941:

"The Wallgren bill, in all essential points, is said to have the approval of representatives of both packers and labor groups, who have studied it carefully and whose views on practically all of its provisions have been in remarkably close accord. Numerous members of the Fish and Wildlife Service also have pronounced it a very good measure, so that its chances of adoption without radical changes would seem favorable."

In a letter dated March 29, 1949, the Secretary of the Interior recommended to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that with regard to the Alaska salmon fisheries, the Department of the Interior be given "clear authority to limit, where necessary and from a conservation standpoint, the number of units of any type of gear that may be operated in an area during an open fishing season."

More recently, Mr. Seton Thompson, Chief, Division of Alaska Fisheries, testifying before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on March 10, 1955, reiterated the need for direct limitation of numbers of operating units.

Thus it appears that in the case of the salmon fisheries, i. e., in a situation in which the Fish and Wildlife Service has definite responsibility for conservation, and in which the need for restriction of fishing effort is very clear, the Service has repeatedly requested authority to attack the overfishing problem directly and by economically sound measures which are capable of protecting fishermen's profits as well as the resource. Experience with the Walgren bill indicates that such measures if properly drafted and adequately explained will have the support of practical people in the industry. Until recently, the need for such direct measures for the fisheries as a whole was less apparent than in the case of the salmon fisheries. But in the light of 6 years' experience with the economic and biological consequences of overexpansion of the fishing fleet, it is I think high time for sportsmen and commercial fishermen to get together in a common effort to make our fishery resources more profitable without impairment of their recreational value.

TABLE Ia.—*Fishing craft*

[In thousands]

Year	Number of vessels	Vessels net tonnage	Number of motorboats
1936	4.50	99.0	31.6
1937	5.14	110.9	32.9
1938	5.18	109.5	32.6
1939	5.41	112.9	31.9
1940	5.56	112.8	31.1
1941	5.60	112.0	30.1
1942	5.38	99.7	28.9
1943	5.51	94.5	30.0
1944	5.93	103.9	31.3
1945	6.93	131.4	38.5
1946	7.20	134.9	41.4
1947	8.66	169.5	44.3
1948	9.63	189.7	47.1
1949	10.27	205.2	46.7
1950	11.50	220.4	46.1
1951	11.24	223.2	45.7
1952	11.06	220.2	46.3
1953	10.60	203.4	48.1
1954	[1] 11.50	[1] 210.0	[1] 46.0
1955	[1] 11.00	[1] 205.0	[1] 48.0

[1] Preliminary.

TABLE Ib.—*Production*

[Billions of pounds]

	Total production	Production of food fish
1936	4.82	2.86
1937	4.35	2.74
1938	4.25	2.66
1939	4.44	2.74
1940	4.06	2.77
1941	4.90	3.09
1942	3.88	2.54
1943	4.20	2.81
1944	4.50	2.84
1945	4.58	3.14
1946	4.46	3.05
1947	4.34	3.04
1948	4.50	3.18
1949	4.79	3.35
1950	4.89	3.37
1951	4.41	3.10
1952	4.42	2.87
1953	4.47	2.62
1954	[1] 4.65	[1] 2.71
1955	[1] 4.60	[1] 2.58

[1] Preliminary.

TABLE II.—*Fish price index, 1938–40=100*

Year	Food fish		Fish used for reduction	
	Unadjusted index	Adjusted for purchasing power of the dollar, 1939=100	Unadjusted index	Adjusted for purchase power of the dollar, 1939=100
1938	99	----------	102	----------
1939	98	98	103	103
1940	103	101	94	92
1941	117	103	128	113
1942	190	149	203	160
1943	201	150	195	146
1944	212	157	193	143
1945	248	181	198	145
1946	298	189	222	140
1947	296	154	231	120
1948	332	160	233	112
1949	301	152	212	107
1950	298	145	212	103
1951	340	149	231	101
1952	363	163	203	93
1953	388	176	228	104
1954	[1] 366	[1] 165	[1] 228	[1] 103
1955	[1] 360	[1] 163	[1] 228	[1] 103

[1] Preliminary.

Hon. Irwin D. Davidson

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this House of Representatives is going to lose the services of a most capable hard-working Member when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DAVIDSON] leaves this body to become a judge of the court of general sessions of the county of New York. IRWIN DAVIDSON came to us from the bench of the court of special sessions of New York City after a brilliant 6 years of judicial service. Previously, he had been a member of Assembly of the State of New York for 12 years. While in Albany he justly earned a reputation for great legislative ability, serving as acting Democratic leader of that body.

Not only does our friend IRWIN DAVIDSON possess great legislative and judicial

ability, he is above all a sterling gentleman of high and affable character, possessing a keen sense of humor along with kindness, uniform courtesy, and a humane heart.

While IRWIN DAVIDSON has been with us for but one Congress, he will long be remembered by the many friends he has made here. His record and his service on the Committee on the Judiciary, the Banking and Currency Committee, and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will long be remembered.

It has been my great personal privilege to have made a good and close friend during these past 2 years. IRWIN has been a delightful companion and will certainly be missed at the future meetings of the New York delegation in Congress. I am confident I bespeak the thoughts of all of us in wishing him Godspeed, good health, and success upon his return to the bench. We know that he will grace the court of general sessions of the county of New York with dignity, great ability, courtesy, and humaneness.

The Supreme Court Decision Versus States Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter which I have received from a noted Texas jurist, Hon. Wright Morrow, of Houston, which I think should be read by every American worthy of the name. Much is said about respecting the decision of the United States Supreme Court. Yet when a strong court says black is black and a later Court says it is white, which decision are we to respect? After all a Supreme Court decision is man's opinion, supposedly based on law, but when that opinion flies in the face of a decision of an older, stronger court, why should we be scolded if we are unable to hold such opinion sacred? I would not advocate disrespect of the court or its findings, but it is hard for a layman to go along with a Supreme Court opinion that is directly contradictory to a former decision of a stronger Supreme Court. But read Mr. Morrow's letter. It splendidly shows the invasion of States rights by the Supreme Court in its recent disrespect for the former opinion of the very same Court. When was the Court right?

HOUSTON, TEX., *July 26, 1956.*

Mr. FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress from Alabama,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I have noticed where you placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18, 1956, under the heading "Desegregation in Public Schools" a very interesting and authoritative historical statement fully documented, of the events leading up to the ratification of the 14th amendment to our Constitution, the recent interpretation of which has caused so much turmoil and unnecessary division of our people. This statement very plainly shows that the ratification of the 14th amendment was literally forced on the States of the South by a radical congressional bitterness. I have read these articles with interest and instruction to me and I believe everybody, no matter whether they live in the north, south, east, or west of this country, should have this information. I recommend to you to see if you cannot get it to them—at least that part beginning on page 12176 to the middle of page 12178. It could profit all of us, indeed, to read the whole thing carefully.

In view of recent decisions of the Supreme Court, not only on the segregation question, but on other matters dealing with the rights of States, it seems to me another thing might be highly desirable to go to the people. I illustrate it by referring to certain former decisions of our Supreme Court interpreting the application of the 14th amendment.

First, however, it is elementary to remember that the law is the embodiment of usage; that is to say the customs common to mankind and the principles of action evolved by reason and experience. Tradition, custom, habits, and rules of conduct common to all people in a given area of the world are the things which make up the basis of the law and the law comes into being by virtue of these common attributes and common privileges and duties. The stability of our Government depends on law; this is, indeed, a government of law and not of man. Fixed law upon which people can rely is a necessary part of our system. Things adjudicated—res judicata—or matters once litigated and determined by competent authorities, by courts of last resort particularly, become a part of the life of the community or of the country involved. Judgments of the courts necessarily involve the decision of a legal question and direct the people in their conduct with relation to that question.

Better stated, perhaps, it is the doctrine of stare decisis, which is simply saying that under our legal system when a point of law has been once settled by a decision of the highest Court, it becomes a precedent which is not afterward to be departed from. This is not based on res judicata but is based on a public policy which requires that the courts observe respect for prior decisions. A rule once deliberately declared and uniformly followed becomes the law.

In the light of these rules, I think it would be profitable for people in their discussions nowadays to recall the language and the source of such language from former decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

As early as the year 1877, soon after the adoption of the 14th amendment, the Supreme Court in *Hall* v. *Decuir* (95 U. S. 585), in connection with the statute of Louisiana providing for enforced commingling of the races, said this:

"We think this statute * * * is unconstitutional," and further:

"Substantial equality of right is the law of the State and of the United States; but 'equality' does not mean 'identity,' as in the nature of things identity,' as in the nature of things identity in the accommodation afforded to passengers, whether colored or white, is impossible."

Again the court says: "* * * and it is settled law that the (school) board may assign a particular school for colored children and exclude them from schools assigned for white children, and that such regulation is not in violation of the 14th amendment."

Later in 1896, in the *Plessy* v. *Ferguson case* (163 U. S. 537), in passing on a later Louisiana statute requiring separate accommodations for colored and white passengers on common carriers, the court uses this very significant language:

"The object of the 14th amendment was undoubtedly to enforce the absolute equality of the two races before the law but in the nature of things it could not have been intended to abolish distinctions based upon color or to enforce social, as distinguished from political, equality, or a commingling of the two races under terms unsatisfactory to either. Laws permitting, and even requiring, their separation * * * do not necessarily imply the inferiority of either race to the other and have been generally, if not universally, recognized as within the competency of the State legislatures."

The Court further said:

"The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power of the States."

And again, this decision points out the fallacy of the philosophy or psychological discussions in the recent decision of the Court in this language:

"The underlying fallacy * * * consists in the assumption that the enforced separation of the two races stamps the colored race with a badge of inferiority. If this be so, it is not by reason of anything found in the act but solely because the colored race chooses to put that construction upon it. The argument also assumes that social prejudices may be overcome by legislation and that equal rights cannot be secured to the Negro except by an enforced commingling of the two races. We cannot accept this proposition."

In that case there was a dissent by Mr. Justice Harlan who, I believe, is a grandfather of one of the present justices, but in a later case, in 1899, *Cummings* v. *Board of Education* (175 U. S. 262), the Court was considering an injunction compelling a board of education to withhold assistance from a white high school for failure to provide a high school for colored students. The same Justice Harlan who dissented in the Plessy case, wrote this language for the Court in the Cummings case:

"We may add that while all admit that benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, that education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States."

Again in 1914, in the case of *McCabe* v. *Santa Fe Railway Co.* (225 U. S. 151), dealing with the statute requiring separation of white and colored races in Oklahoma, the Court used this language, expressly approving the holding of the circuit court:

"It has been decided by this Court, so that the question could no longer be considered an open one, that it was not an infraction of the 14th amendment for a State to require separate but equal accommodations for the races."

In 1927, a former Republican President of the United States and greatly beloved, Chief Justice Taft in a case (*Gong Lum* v. *Rice* (275 U. S. 78)), involving a Chinese girl being denied admission to a white school used this language:

"The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear."

Then Chief Justice Taft adopted the language from the *Plessy* case, stating that the most common instance of this right is connected with the establishment of separate school for white and colored children. He used this most significant language based on the statement I made in the beginning of this letter, that tradition, customs, things decided and precedent establish a stability of law upon which the people have a right to depend.

As stated, the question as to whether a Chinese girl was denied equal protection of the law when furnished equal facilities, but separate from the white, the Chief Justice said:

"We think this is the same question which has been many times decided to be within

the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

Then further:

"The decision is within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th amendment."

It is important and significant to note that the Justice who wrote the opinion in the *Plessy* case (in 1896) was born in Massachusetts, educated at Yale and among his former fellow classmates was Chauncey M. Depew and his later associates on the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Brewer and Mr. Justice Shiras. Justice Brown was later a citizen of Michigan and was appointed by a Republican President, Benjamin Harrison.

One more Supreme Court case should be mentioned here to show the stare decisis applicable to what confronted the Supreme Court when they wrote the opinion in 1954, upsetting 90 years of tradition and law. This is the case of *Missouri ex rel. Gaines* v. *Canada* (305 U. S. 337)), where an action was brought by a Negro to compel admission to the school of law at the Missouri State University.

This opinion was by Chief Justice Hughes, a Republican candidate for President and a very distinguished jurist. The Missouri constitution provided that separate free public schools should be established for the education of African descent. It was contended that this was a discrimination and a denial of constitutional right. Mr. Chief Justice Hughes said this:

"The State court has fully recognized the obligation of the State to provide Negroes with advantages for higher education substantially equal to the advantages afforded to white students. The State has sought to fulfill that obligation by furnishing equal facilities in separate schools, a method the validity of which has been sustained by our decisions."

Over all these years these decisions have constituted an adjudication of this question which amounts to a way of life upon which people have a right to depend. These decisions were not written by southerners, but in the main by northern people—Republicans or those who lived in the Northern States; and in 2 instances by the Chief Justices, 1 of whom had been President and the other a candidate for President on the Republican ticket.

During all this course of time dozens and dozens of decisions in other Federal and State courts have been based on these decisions—this way of life established for 90 years by the fixed law of the land. Any number of State decisions were in the Northern States. A few years ago the Encyclopædia Britannica stated that 85 percent of the Negroes in the United States with college degrees have received them from colleges specifically for Negroes in the South.

Judges of the courts of all States, when confronted with this problem relied upon these decisions as fixed law and it seems that the present members of the Court do not have the restraint of judicial process that their predecessors have had, many of whom are the most distinguished men in our American history.

The present decision is based on a philosophy or theory and not on any previous decision of the Court. It deliberately avoids the recognition of the philosophy or the fixed rules of the former decisions and disavows every precedent on the subject.

It just seems to me that these quotations from the Supreme Court's former decisions can well be added to the history of the manner by which the 14th amendment became a part of our Constitution.

While the decisions of the Supreme Court become the law, it is hardly possible for most of us who have practiced law for years to comprehend how the Court could have wiped away 90 years of fixed rules established by that Court's previous decisions. As Mr. Chief Justice Taft said in dealing with one of the cases, "This is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without the intervention of Federal courts under the Federal Constitution."

With best personal wishes,

Yours sincerely,

WRIGHT MORROW.

Fourth Anniversary of the Puerto Rican Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, July 25 was the fourth anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution and as such it was observed in Puerto Rico and in many parts of the country as Puerto Rican Constitution Day. I composed some remarks on that day which I broadcast to Puerto Rico.

I ask unanimous consent that this comment on the significance of Puerto Rican Constitution Day be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON THE FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE PUERTO RICAN CONSTITUTION

It is with genuine pleasure that I join with the many other friends of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in extending greetings on this, the fouth anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution.

As we look back over the years since July 25, 1952, we can feel a justifiable sense of pride in the way in which the people of this new commonwealth have assumed the responsibilities of self-government with maturity, confidence, and wisdom. Its actions during this period justify in full the faith reposed in the people of Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States in 1950 when the legislation which brought about this changed status was enacted. As we watch the course charted by the Puerto Rican Commonwealth, those of us who supported the enabling legislation in Congress—and I am proud to have been one of them—get the same feeling that comes to a person who finds a friend in whom he has reposed trust and confidence has justified that trust.

So it is with Puerto Rico. The Commonwealth has been blessed with able, vigorous and imaginative leadership, a leadership which has helped to steer the ship of state past the many difficulties which have confronted it. But the greatest credit is due, I believe, to the people of Puerto Rico who have been responsive to their leadership and who have above all shown a native stability, a fundamental good sense, and an inherent understanding of both the dangers and the possibilities of their new status.

As the pople of Puerto Rico well know, their status as a Commonwealth is a novel one in American history. The relationship which was worked out is unprecedented. It was an experiment. It is a continuing experiment. Thus far the experiment has been a grand success.

For the most part the Commonwealth has wisely refrained from putting too great a strain on the new ties which bind Puerto Rico to and separate it from the mainland. A distinctiveness has been achieved without endangering the intimacy of the connection and association with the rest of the United States. It is a delicate relationship and has been delicately handled.

There are many hurdles yet to be overcome and many problems to be resolved. In my judgment, one of the goals of first importance is the elimination of the inequities and inequalities which still exist in the treatment accorded Puerto Rico by the Federal Government. I belive that the goal should be the treatment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico on a par with the States in every respect. We are all American citizens and as such are equal before the law. The Federal law should make no distinction in the manner it treats American citizens, whether they live in Pennsylvania or Puerto Rico.

We must work to remove these inequities and discriminations. I am aware that this involves the solution of some very profound problems which will take time. It surely will require patience, good will, and cooperation among all of us.

I believe that we recently took a very significant step forward in this direction in our social-security legislation. The Congress is at the point of completing consideration of amendments to the Social Security Act. These amendments will, among other things, raise the limit of Federal contributions for public-assistance payments to Puerto Rico. This increase is in the neighborhood of a million dollars. The principle is as important as the amount of money. It represents progress toward the goal of equality.

This goal of equality must beckon us onward on this anniversary of the adoption of the Puerto Rican Constitution. Nor may we forget the broader goal—the advancement of the happiness and well-being of the people of Puerto Rico along with the similar advancement of their fellow American citizens on the mainland, and the dedication of all our common efforts to the achievement of a world order based on justice, security, and peace.

Accomplishments in the 84th Congress of Hon. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I would like to extend in the RECORD the accomplishments I have been able to achieve during the past 2 years in the 84th Congress beginning January 1, 1955.

I have served in the United States Congress for 12 years and I am now the second ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The following is not an account of what I have accomplished in my own words, but it is a detailed statement composed exclusively of quotations from the Nation's leading weeklies and dailies, completely unedited and in their original form:

In recognition of POWELL's continuous vigorous fight for civil rights and de-

mocracy, the New York Times on July 4, 1956, stated:

Fighter for civil rights—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR. The country's most vocal crusader for Negro rights is a Protestant minister * * * (who) is making his voice heard these days on every aspect of the controversy over racial segregation. He averages a telegram to President Eisenhower every week or two. On the floor of Congress, in articles and statements, and in numerous public speeches he denounces segregation and all its works. His language seldom is mild. * * *

Nowadays Mr. POWELL is taken seriously indeed (by his colleagues in the House of Representatives). * * * Mr. POWELL is not a partisan Democrat on questions of Negro rights.

"Civil rights is the most important issue in this country and the key to our winning the world," Mr. POWELL said recently.

Mr. POWELL has been minister of the Abyssinian Baptist Church at 132 West 138th Street (New York) since 1937. He gives a sermon to an audience of 2,000 twice every Sunday. * * *

Representative POWELL has degrees from several universities including a doctor of laws from Virginia Union University, where his father was graduated in 1893. He got his bachelor of arts at Colgate, his master of arts at Columbia, and doctor of divinity at Shaw University.

Noting the forthrightness of POWELL'S incessant activity in the whole area of civil rights, the Washington Evening Star on January 6, 1955 reported:

Representative POWELL, Democrat of New York, deposited 11 civil rights bills in the hopper at the opening session of the 84th Congress.

The Boston Guardian, July 30, 1955 approvingly editorialized:

ADAM POWELL is still in the United States Congress literally taking it on the chin for democracy. With the possible exception of former Representative Oscar DePriest, the fiery Republican from Illinois; Congressman POWELL is certainly the most courageous and outspoken champion for equal rights Washington has seen in many a decade. He belongs with the roster of Sam Adams, Patrick Henry, and others who dared to stand alone.

Similarly, the Denver Post, March 25, 1956 wrote:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is the Nation's full-time battler against racial bias.

The New York Amsterdam News in an editorial of June 30, 1956, proclaimed POWELL "one of the greatest advocates of civil rights in the States. If ADAM CLAYTON POWELL is nothing else, he is a constant fighter for the civil rights of his race."

SECTION 1. FUNDS FOR TRAINING SCIENTISTS IN ORDER TO EQUAL RUSSIA'S OUTPUT

The New York Times, January 14, 1955:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat of Manhattan, proposed an emergency program today to train more scientists and engineers.

He called at the White House, addressed the House of Representatives and introduced a bill in pursuit of his proposal to finance 25,000 scholarships a year at $2,000 each. The cost to the Federal Government would be $50 million a year for 4 years.

SECTION 2. FORCED PROBE OF THE LAG OF FEDERAL HOUSING IN HARLEM AREA

The New York Daily News, February 9, 1955:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL yesterday said he will demand an immediate congressional investigation into abuses of housing projects.

The New York Times, April 7, 1955:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, said yesterday he had received assurances from Robert Moses that living conditions would be improved in buildings that had been taken over on the sites of housing projects here.

SECTION 3. ON SUPPORT OF SALARY INCREASES FOR CIVIL SERVICE AND POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES

The Government Standard, official organ of the American Federation of Government Employees, February 25, 1955:

ADAM POWELL testified personally supporting salary increases for classified and post office workers.

SECTION 4. INTEGRATION IN THE FIRE DEPARTMENT OF WASHINGTON D. C.

The Washington Evening Star, February 25, 1955:

Full racial integration in the Fire Department from top to bottom, instead of scattering only 1 or 2 Negroes in some companies, will be urged on the District Commissioners by Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

SECTION 5. INVESTIGATION OF DENIALS OF MORTGAGES TO PROPERTY OWNERS IN HARLEM RESULTING IN A MORE LIBERALIZED APPROACH BY THE BANKS AND THE PASSAGE OF A LAW BY THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE

The New York Age-Defender, March 19, 1955: In reference to POWELL'S "Probe of Harlem mortgage snub" it was reported that POWELL had "just concluded a conference with the top brass of the Department of Banking of New York State"—and that he—"received a firm pledge that the Department of Banking would immediately go into the whole problem."

SECTION 6. ABOLITION OF THE USE OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS FOR SEGREGATED BOYS CLUBS

The Washington Daily News, March 23, 1955:

The Metropolitan Police Boys Club was on notice today that unless it abolishes its segregation policy it will have to vacate the Anacostia Park clubhouse.

This was revealed by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of New York, who had a letter to that effect from Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service.

Mr. Wirth wrote Representative POWELL that National Park Service has "no intention of permitting the matter to drag indefinitely through a temporizing procedure."

SECTION 7. MY TRIP TO BANDUNG, INDONESIA, THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE, AND SUBSEQUENT WORK IN THE FIELD OF ANTICOLONIALISM

Parade magazine, November 6, 1955:

One of the most publicized trips—the unauthorized and self-financed visit of Harlem's Congressman ADAM POWELL to the Bandung Conferences of 29 Asiatic and African countries—was the direct cause of our gaining face in that area. POWELL created a sensation with his remarks at a press conference embarrassing China's Red dictator, Chou En-lai.

The Chicago Defender, April 2, 1955, reported:

POWELL to attend Afro-Asia meet despite ban on the conference by the United States Department of State and other western powers.

The Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, April 18, 1955:

Mr. POWELL held a handful of high cards, and he played them with masterly skill. He forged a new link in the chain of freedom at Bandung yesterday, and all peace-loving men should applaud him for it.

The New York Daily Mirror, April 22, 1955:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL disclosed today he has appealed directly to Red China's Premier Chou En-lai to discuss with him personally the case of 11 American fliers held as "spies" in Chinese prisons.

The Kansas City Plaindealer, May 20, 1955:

"President Eisenhower has directed that an effort be made to appoint a number of colored persons to top positions in American embassies throughout Asia," said Representative ADAM POWELL.

The Toledo Times, October 25, 1955:

"The United States may become a second-rate power unless it realizes the significance of far-reaching decisions made at the Asian-African Conference in Bandung, this year," warned Representative ADAM POWELL.

The Washington Afro-American, July 19, 1955:

Congressman ADAM POWELL * * * fights for a new bill of rights which will give autonomy to the native inhabitants (Virgin Islands) and a right to elect their own governmental officials.

The New York Times, December 5, 1955:

POWELL proposes freer Puerto Rico.

SECTION 8. LEADS FIGHT TO ABOLISH SEGREGATION IN THE NATIONAL GUARD UNITS OF THE 48 STATES

Drew Pearson writing in his column, The Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, May 29, 1955:

It is not often that Representative CARL VINSON, of Georgia, astute chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, suffers a defeat. He is a tough legislative battler and most colleagues are afraid to tangle with him.

VINSON took a drubbing on the universal military service or Reserve Act, however, and the man who defeated him was New York's brainy Negro Congressman, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. In a David and Goliath struggle which had the House galleries on edge, POWELL outmaneuvered and outtalked his powerful Georgia colleague for 2 hectic days.

The New York Daily News, May 19, 1955:

The House today voted 126 to 87 to bar segregation, or any discrimination because of race, creed or color, in the big new proposed military reserve program.

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., who sponsored the antibias amendment, hailed it as the first civil-rights measure adopted by the House since the days immediately after the Civil War.

The New York Times, June 6, 1955:

The Reserve plan fell into thus far insoluble difficulties because Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., Democrat, of Manhattan, was able to attach to it a proviso that Reservists could not be attached to units practicing segregation. This was unacceptable to the southerners and at length the bill had to be put aside.

The Detroit Times, May 31, 1955:

The occasion, but not the cause, for sidetracking this vital legislation was the demand, a proper one in our opinion, on the part of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL * * * for safeguards against racial discrimination which has already been wiped out in the regular services.

The Pittsburgh Courier, June 18, 1955:

Instead of being extraneous, we believe the Powell amendment to be essential to the manpower reserve bill.

We believe the President should train his guns on the foes of the Powell amendment—those who would keep America from being a living demonstration of the concept that here equality of opportunity for any one citizen is far more valuable for our internal and external strength than a carload of hydrogen bombs.

Walter Millis, writing to the editor of the New York Times, July 3, 1955:

Representative POWELL * * * did a genuine service by forcing the Nation to stand and take thought in a matter which does reach close to all issues of individual liberty and civil right in a democratic society.

The Minneapolis Spokesman, July 29, 1955:

POWELL makes masterful defense of his proposal against Reserve Jim Crow.

SECTION 9. URGES SPECIAL SESSION OF CONGRESS TO ENACT ANTILYNCHING LAW FOLLOWING THE MURDER OF 14-YEAR-OLD EMMEIT TILL IN MISSISSIPPI

The New York Post, September 27, 1955:

Representative POWELL today called for an emergency session of Congress to enact antilynching laws following the acquittal of two white Mississippians in the murder of Emmett Louis Till, 14, of Chicago.

The New York Age-Defender, October 22, 1955:

At a meeting in his office Sunday, the Congressman announced that on Wednesday of this week he would confer with officials from the Department of Justice in his office, and on the following day, Thursday, he will confer with Vice President NIXON in the latter's office. At both meetings, he said, the entire Mississippi situation, not just the Till case, will be discussed.

SECTION 10. ON HOW TO COPE WITH ILLEGAL SALE OF NARCOTICS

The New York World-Telegram, November 7, 1955:

Congressman POWELL meeting with the House subcommittee on narcotics "advanced this five-point program: Establishment here of a pilot project to test the controversial proposal by some members of the medical profession that dope addicts get free narcotics; mandatory Federal prison sentences for dope peddlers who are first offenders * * *; establishment of at least six United States addict-treatment centers; a federally aided education program on the perils of drugs, and passage of State laws matching Congress' antidope statutes."

It should be noted in this connection that subsequent legislation was passed by the Congress.

SECTION 11. DEPARTMENT OF STATE ACCEPTS PROPOSAL TO SEND AMERICAN MUSIC AS PART OF ITS CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

The New York Times, November 18, 1955:

Before long, jazz will become an arm of this country's foreign policy in such places as the Far East, Middle East, and Africa.

This was revealed today by Representative ADAM POWELL, Democrat, of New York. He said the State Department had advised him yesterday that it would go along with his proposal to send fewer ballets and symphonies abroad, and put more emphasis on what he called real Americana.

This resulted in the sending of Dizzy Gillespie on a very successful tour of the Middle East and the Far East.

SECTION 12. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CIVIL-RIGHTS BLOC

The Pittsburgh Courier, December 24, 1955:

Disclosure that 15 Congressmen had agreed to serve as regional leaders of the bipartisan civil-rights bloc which was recently organized to seek passage of liberal racial legislation was made by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL in a public statement.

The Knickerbocker News, Albany, N. Y., January 16, 1956:

Representative POWELL reported that "he had organized a bloc of 201 Democratic and Republican legislators to press for Department of Justice power to investigate all civil-rights violations."

SECTION 13. RIGHT TO VOTE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Washington Evening Star, January 6, 1956:

As if in anticipation of a part of the President's recommendation, Representative POWELL, Democrat, of New York, yesterday introduced the new session's first bill calling for giving the District a vote for President and Vice President.

SECTION 14. CASTIGATED JOHN FOSTER DULLES FOR HIS BUNGLING OF OUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE FAR EAST

The Akron Beacon Journal, January 24, 1956:

POWELL lashes Dulles for rank stupidity, blunders. * * * He further charged that Dulles bungled badly by supporting Portugal's claim to the Province of Goa which India also claims. His stupidity virtually turned India against the United States.

The New Haven Journal-Courier, February 28, 1956:

Representative ADAM POWELL continued his attack on American foreign policy when he told a capacity audience in the Yale Law School auditorium: "The future of the United States as a major power is being decided tonight behind the dark curtain in Montgomery, Ala. * * * Unless we recapture the principles on which the United States was founded, communism will have won its final battle, and this country will be spiraling its way down into second class nationhood."

SECTION 15. SPONSORED BILL TO GRANT PROTECTION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FROM BODILY HARM

The Chicago Defender, January 28, 1956:

The House of Representatives last week unanimously passed a bill prohibiting attack upon all members of the Armed Forces.

SECTION 16. FORCED ARMY AND PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO PROBE THE PROSEGREGATION TALK OF MAJ. GEN. EUGENE CAFFEY, ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE, BEFORE THE GEORGIA STATE LEGISLATURE

Labor's Daily, February 3, 1956:

The Army today is formally investigating remarks made before the Georgia State Legislature by Maj. Gen. Eugene M. Caffey, Army Judge Advocate.

The inquiry was ordered after Representative ADAM POWELL demanded in a telegram to President Eisenhower that Caffey be relieved for reportedly praising a speech denouncing the United States Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation.

SECTION 17. CALLS ON ATTORNEY GENERAL BROWNELL TO LIST AS SUBVERSIVE WHITE CITIZENS' COUNCILS

The Washington Evening Star, March 2, 1956:

Representative POWELL * * * called on Attorney General Brownell today to list as "subversive" the White Citizens' Councils which are active in the fight against desegregation in the South * * * (and) "subverting the law of our land, who are disloyal to the Constitution of the United States, who refuse to accept the decision of the Supreme Court, who are scoring day after day great victories for communism against our democracies."

SECTION 18. ORGANIZED AND LED THE NATIONAL DELIVERANCE DAY OF PRAYER IN THE INTEREST OF THE MONTGOMERY, ALA., BUS BOYCOTT

The Pittsburgh Courier, April 7, 1956:

In New York City, 5,000 persons turned out at a giant rally held in Manhattan Center where the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who originally geared the Prayer Day proposal, led services. An overflow from this crowd took seats in the ballroom of the Hotel New Yorker.

The New York Age-Defender, April 7, 1956:

Millions pray all over the world. The Cabinet and the President of the Republic of Indonesia—groups of freedom-loving people in Stockholm, Sweden; Amsterdam, Holland; Antwerp, Belgium; and Honolulu, Hawaii, were among the estimated 10 million persons throughout the world who offered prayers on Wednesday, March 28, for deliverance from the evils of race prejudice.

The March 28 prayer-protest observance was formulated by the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, clergyman-Congressman of New York, immediately after nearly 100 Negroes were arrested in Montgomery, Ala., for their leadership of a mass protest against mistreatment on city buses last month.

The Washington Evening Star, May 25, 1956:

SECTION 19. CALLS ON PRESIDENT AND ARMY SECRETARY TO HALT THE DRIFT IN THE ARMY BACK TO SEGREGATION AND AWAY FROM THE POLICY OF INTEGRATION

The Pittsburgh Courier, April 28, 1956:

Mr. POWELL raised what he called five specific points: 1. The designation of overseas levy of "for Caucasians only" on official orders signed by the various commanders in various military installations within the United States. 2. The designation of colored on all forms used in compiling the morning reports in the Army. 3. The fact that only 1 percent of the people employed in the special services of the Army are Negro. 4. That less than 1 percent of those employed in educational staffs of schools for dependents in the Army were Negro. 5. That the USO had established in one military installation 2 canteens, 1 for colored, 1 for white.

Mr. POWELL also asked, "Is it true or not that clerk Negro personnel in the Pentagon are frozen at grade 4 or grade 5?"

Mr. POWELL revealed that Mr. Brucker (Secretary of the Army) has pledged a prompt investigation of these charges. He wrote Mr. Brucker a letter of thanks for his wholehearted cooperation.

The Washington Evening Star, May 25, 1956:

In continuing to point up the trend away from integration in the Army POWELL asserted: "The forces of reaction, obstruction, White Citizens' Councils, Eastlandism, have reached out with the tentacles of his (Eisenhower) own palace guard and stopped his progress.

"The leaders of our Armed Forces are guilty tonight of treason. Completely disregarding their powerless Commander in Chief, ignoring the Secretaries of the three branches, they have actually restored segregation to the Armed Forces.

"If we were to be attacked by Russia tonight, we would have no unified command to meet this attack. Our strategy is chaos. Our ammunition is confusion. Our Commander in Chief is completely disregarded."

SECTION 20. HOW EISENHOWER PRESSED DESEGREGATION DUE TO POWELL

The New York Herald Tribune, page 1, Tuesday, May 1, 1956, an article entitled "Eisenhower in the White House," by Robert J. Donovan.

SECTION 21. WAS ABLE TO GET THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD TO ISSUE A NEW POLICY TO PREVENT THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS TO FURTHER RACIAL SEGREGATION IN AIRPORT BUILDINGS

The Washington Post and Times Herald, May 5, 1956:

The CAA released the memorandum (denying Federal funds to airports for construction or remodeling of segregated facilities) when Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL revealed to reporters that the policy was formulated October 1 and issued in an April memorandum to CAA field personnel.

SECTION 22. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS RECEIVED DURING THE 84TH CONGRESS

House Resolution 236 and House Resolution 239, introduced by the Honorable JOHN DINGELL and the Honorable EUGENE KEOGH, respectively, in the House of Representatives on May 9, 1955:

Resolved, That the Member of Congress from the 16th District of the State of New York, ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, is hereby commended for the statesmanship, patriotism, and forthright courage displayed by him at the recent Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung, where, as a delegate at his own expense, he forcefully and eloquently voiced the opinion of millions of Americans who not only advocate democracy but condemn and disavow communism and colonialism wherever and in whatever form it exists.

A citation by the members of the 336th Infantry AMVET Post 128, Boston, Mass., conferred in June 1955:

In recognition of the high statesmanship exemplified in Bandung, Indonesia, and the continuous vigorous leadership in the Halls of Congress.

The outstanding man of the year award presented by Equality Post, No. 7289, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, February 4, 1956, as a "token of their respect and esteem for Congressman POWELL, outstanding leader, who by his exemplary activities and fearless fight has contributed greatly to the welfare of the Nation."

The citation of merit by the Utility Club, Inc., of New York, as the man of the year, June 2, 1956, in recognition of POWELL as "champion of liberty, equality, justice, security and peace, advocate of the better life for millions, unselfish, tireless crusade that mankind everymay live in peace and freedom in one world under God."

The 1956 Rheingold award presented for "meritorious services in the cause of unity and progress" sponsored by I. B. P. O. E. of W. and the Liebmann Breweries, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The 1956 award "for loyalty to the cause of civil rights in the Congress of the United States" presented by the Maryland State Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

SECTION 23. THE POWELL AMENDMENT BANNING THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR EDUCATION FOR THOSE STATES WHICH ARE DEFIANT OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT DECISION AGAINST SEGREGATION IN EDUCATION

The Washington Post and Times Herald, January 5, 1956:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL predicted yesterday "we got the votes" to attach an antisegregation amendment to proposed Federal aid to school-construction legislation, due for early House action.

The New York Amsterdam News editorial of February 4, 1956:

If the South wants good schools let them get them in the right way. We stand with Mr. POWELL on his amendment. We hope he stands fast.

The New York Times, June 30, 1956:

POWELL presses school-aid rider. He urges withholding funds from segregation areas—scoffs at filibuster.

The Washington Afro-American, July 7, 1956, front page editorial:

Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., was given the opportunity last week to speak for his amendment to the Federal aid to school construction bill.

He urged fellow Members in the House of Representatives to approve his amendment permitting the expenditure of Federal funds only to those school districts where progress toward integration was being made.

It was a great speech for human rights.

His argument was logical, unemotional, and sound morally and legally.

The Washington Post and Times Herald, July 4, 1956:

The Chamber voted 164 to 116 to adopt an amendment by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democratic Negro Congressman from New York, to bar aid to States which do not comply with the Supreme Court's 1954 school integration order.

The Washington Evening Star, July 5, 1956:

So Mr. POWELL carries the day.

Mr. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, NAACP, in a telegram of July 12, 1956:

Please accept thanks and congratulations of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People for the valiant and successful fight you made to prevent Federal subsidies for the construction of segregated schools. Not only the NAACP but all others who really believe in democratic education applaud your efforts.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that my good friend and colleague OLLIE BOLTON is not seeking reelection. We all hope the best of everything for him and look forward to the day when he will return to public life.

Speaking as one whose district adjoins his, I am confident I express the feeling of his constituents when I say, "You did a good job, OLLIE; we appreciate your efforts in our behalf."

We can all be thankful, however, that the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON is still with us. Congress without a Bolton would be like a carriage without a horse. The contributions this family has made to America will never be forgotten.

Against Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, it was a source of great satisfaction to me, as well as to the American people, to have the Senate approve, on July 26, a resolution condemning discriminatory practices against American citizens on the basis of their religious faith. The Nation most notoriously practicing such discrimination at the present time is Saudi Arabia.

I hope that the State Department is proceeding to heed the sentiment of the Senate, as expressed in the Senate resolution which reflects the overwhelming sentiment of the American people. I look forward to hearing what action the State Department has taken consistent with this resolution.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the July 6 issue of the Hebrew language periodical published in New York, Hadoar, dealing with this subject, be printed, in translation, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This editorial was obviously printed before the Senate had considered and acted on my resolution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Hadoar, New York, N. Y., July 6, 1956]

AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

The diplomacy of fear which Dulles conducts in the name of the United States achieved a most humiliating expression with the agreement of the American State Department to the discriminatory demands of Saudi Arabia. This Arab country not only bars entry to its domain, and even brief passage through it, to Jews of American citizenship and directs a boycott against American business firms operated by Jews, but even stipulates unequivocally, in its dealings with the State Department in Washington that it will also forbid entry of Jewish enlisted men and officers to the American base in Saudi Arabia over which the flag of the United States flies. Our State Department took it under advisement and accepted and Dulles, in his appearance before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, brushed it aside as a mere quirk over which one needn't get worked up. Senators LEHMAN, of New York, DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and LANGER, of North Dakota, have become aroused at this mistreatment of American Jews on the part of Saudi Arabia, and at this evasion of responsibility on the part of America to defend, at all times and places, the rights of its citizens without regard to creed, and they have introduced in the Senate a proposed resolution that obligates the President to declare before the world that the Government of the United States will brook no discrimination against its citizens, by other states, just as it does not discriminate against citizens of other states; forbids discrimination by United States institutions at the behest of a foreign government against persons sent overseas; and stipulates that every treaty and agreement, signed with a foreign government, contain a condition that no citizen of the United States be discriminated against on the basis of creed or place of origin.

The United States is currently engaged in negotiations with Saudi Arabia in connection with renewal of base rights in that land. The proposed resolution under discussion here is certainly timely then. The administration contention that it inherited the agreement accepting Saudi Arabian discrimination from the Truman era is no excuse. An injustice which has persisted for some time is not thereby remedied. And by the way, the matter is not as clear cut as all that. Senator LEHMAN, in his speech to the Senate, noted in this regard: "It is possible that some of the restrictions considered in this resolution were in effect before the inauguration of the Eisenhower government and received the approval of prior administrations. I don't know. I have no proof that such was indeed the case. All evidence that has reached me pertains to the period from about a year ago at the earliest." There is nothing to add to the remainder of Senator LEHMAN'S speech in which he proved how much America injures itself, how much it lowers its prestige in the world at large and in the eyes of those very states, to whose strange demands it submits with trembling knees. Nor can anything be added to his demand that at the very least mighty America negotiate with Saudi Arabia as an equal, not as a feeble state begging favors.

In press conferences Dulles boasts of his victory and of his prowess, but in negotiating with foreign states he bows his head and nods in agreement to any of the rulers' quirks, even when they violate the fundamental rights of American citizens, upon which all the spiritual and material greatness of the United States is based. This proposed resolution will serve to test whether that spirit yet survives which brought it, the American Senate, to decide in 1911 to abrogate the treaty of friendship between America and Czarist Russia as a result of discrimination of this sort. The American electorate must, without doubt, remind its representatives of that.

Hon. Brady Gentry

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a popular article which appears from time to time in a national magazine is entitled "The Most Interesting Person I Have Ever Met." I think if I had to name a Member of Congress whom I have known during the 14 years I have served here who more nearly fits into that description I would name BRADY GENTRY, of Texas.

It is my desire to pay a brief tribute to him. After serving here for only 4 years he is retiring voluntarily this year. Indeed an unusually large number of the most able and outstanding Members of this body are retiring, and that certainly constitutes a great loss to the Nation.

BRADY GENTRY is one of those. He has become recognized as one of the very best informed and one of the hardest working Members of the House. Being a prolific reader and a lifelong student of government, his intimate knowledge of historic events and their true significance is almost uncanny. And that is true not only in regard to government. It is true of a wide variety of subjects that deal with practically every phase of life.

BRADY is a native of Van Zandt County, Tex. As a Texan, he is endowed with many of the fine qualities which characterized the great patriots who preceded him in the Lone Star State. He graduated from Cumberland University Law School, Tennessee. His yen for politics and public service was shown early in life. At the age of 19 he was serving as city secretary-treasurer of his hometown of Tyler. He was a prosecutor for 4 years, county judge for 8 years, and then by appointment from the Governor was chairman of the State highway commission for 6 years.

It is said that during those 6 years he traveled, mostly at his own expense, into every one of the 254 counties of Texas and over practically every mile of its vast highway network. In that background of intimate knowledge of roads and the transportation needs, he put to use his vast storehouse of knowledge gained from his studies and travels and became a guiding factor in triggering the expansion of a vast interstate roadbuilding program which has become one of the very best highway systems in America.

During his tenure on the State highway commission, GENTRY was elected president of the American Association of State Highway Officials. In that capacity he traveled into nearly every State in the Union, met and counseled with local, State, and regional groups everywhere—people interested in better roads and better planning. In that manner he qualified himself for transcontinental road planning and became widely recognized as an authority on that subject.

In a recent conversation with Mr. C. D. Curtiss, Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, the Commissioner reminded me of the great contribution which GENTRY made to the cause of good roads in America. It was pointed out to me that then, in 1944, GENTRY plugged hard for the initiation of a comprehensive interstate system which, if begun then, would have been a very timely and proper forerunner of the more recent action by Congress in approving a huge construction program. GENTRY foresaw the vast development of transportation needs in the march of our Nation's economy, with more and more of it geared to trucks and automobiles.

That serves as a tribute to GENTRY'S vision and wisdom. If his advice had been followed then the Nation would have had a more orderly and gradual development, and at a much lower cost. Many billions of dollars would have been saved and perhaps with better roads thousands of lives would have been spared by reduced highway accidents. Moreover, the earlier initiation of the highway-construction program, on a scale envisioned by GENTRY, would have stimulated the Nation's industrial progress and economic well-being.

I believe it fair to say that while serving in Congress BRADY has made more personal friends, both Democrats and Republicans, than most any other single Member. As a member of the Public Works Committee he was a principal architect of the better features of the highway construction bill, recently enacted. He fought hard for certain improvements, some of which were adopted, some defeated. What is certain is that whatever he advocated was the result of careful study and was based upon a sincere desire to better serve the Nation's welfare.

BRADY GENTRY has not been a party hack or a narrow party-liner. He has always put the country first and political considerations have always been secondary with him. What greater tribute can be paid to any man? As a true patriot, a brilliant student of government and of public affairs, an uncompromising defender of the philosophy of free enterprise, BRADY has, with becoming modesty and humility, performed his job in the Congress well.

May his future be blessed with good health, happiness, and the realization of those things in life and in government which are so dear to his heart.

A Report to the People by Hon. Chet Holifield, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is customary at the close of a Congress for Members to report to the people back home. I have one of the largest constituencies in the country and, I may say, one of the most informed.

Among the people of my district—the 19th District of the great State of California—there is a broad base of liberalism and understanding and goodwill. These qualities are strong foundations of our democracy, which most of us recognize whether we are Democrats or Republicans.

In the seven Congresses, from 1943 to date, in which I have served continuously as Representative of the 19th District of California, I have learned a great deal about the intricacies of the legislative process.

As a charter member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and chairman of its Legislative Authorization Subcommittee, as a member of the House Committee on Government Operations, and chairman of its Military Operations Subcommittee, and as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it has been my privilege and opportunity to sponsor important legislation and to become intimately acquainted with a wide range of Government affairs.

To this I may add the additional honor conferred on me by you, Mr. Speaker, of serving as a member of the Hoover Commission. In this capacity, as you may know, I supported constructive measures for economy and efficiency in government, but I opposed with all the power at my command any efforts to cut down essential services or to jeopardize governmental programs for the welfare of homeowners, consumers, small business,

veterans, working people, small farmers, and other groups important to the Nation's economy.

In each Congress many thousands of bills are introduced. The hard-working committees of the Congress can consider only a few hundred of them. Among those that finally survive to get consideration on the floor of the House, some may be voted down, others may die in the Senate. Those that pass both Houses may be vetoed by the President.

Our system of government is one of checks and balances against unwise legislation. Sometimes, however, good legislation gets blocked along with the bad. Therefore, it is difficult, in the final analysis, to measure congressional achievement simply by the number of bills passed or the legislative votes cast under parliamentary procedures.

This I can say sincerely. I vote my convictions based on the broad and enduring principles of our democracy. The great majority of people in my district understand and endorse these principles.

Now for a brief summary of the successes and failures of the 84th Congress, which has just come to a close.

In many ways this has been one of the most hard-working and constructive Congresses. In other ways it failed to pass important legislation, either because of party differences that could not be overcome, or because the President has been too far removed from the daily scene to give sure and vigorous direction to his own legislative program.

While it is not my purpose here to dwell on the party positions on each individual measure, I believe the record will show that the Democratic Party has been a responsible and constructive party. In fact, it has been more responsive to the President's legislative program in many instances than has the President's own party, the Republicans.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Social security now is an accepted feature of American life. Hardly more than 20 years ago, under the guiding hand of Franklin D. Roosevelt, social security became part of the law of the land. In the following years the legislation has been improved by various amendments.

It has been my constant endeavor in the years I have served in this House, to improve the social-security program by working for expanded coverage, increased benefit payments, and other valuable measures.

In this Congress I was happy to vote for an amendment to the Social Security Act which provides that benefits for women will begin at age 62 and to disabled persons at age 50. Previously benefits for both could not begin until age 65. Under this new law, 30,700 disabled persons in California will be eligible immediately for benefits. Reduction of the retirement age for women will enable 15,000 additional women to be eligible immediately for retirement benefits and an additional 64,000 women for the reduced benefits available for those who retire earlier.

The law also extends coverage to lawyers, dentists and other professionals except doctors, and to certain farmers. Aid grants to the States are increased for the needy, blind, and dependent children.

VETERANS' AND SERVICEMEN'S LEGISLATION

Of the 22 million veterans in civilian life, almost 5 million served during the Korean conflict. The Veterans' Administration which serves the veterans' needs, is one of the largest and most important agencies of the Federal Government. A great deal of legislation concerns the activities of this agency.

During the 84th Congress I voted for bills to provide educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in the line of duty during the Korean and past wars; extending educational benefits to veterans, extending the veterans' home-loan program and various other measures which were enacted into law. I voted also to increase benefits and disability payments to veterans.

Legislation which I introduced was accepted is an omnibus amendment bill which restored to a veteran his original housing privileges, where his property was condemned for public use, such as freeway rights-of-way or was destroyed by flood or other natural causes. My legislation also extended the GI home financing privilege from July 1957 to January 1965, to World War II veterans.

Various laws were passed to help servicemen, including the placing of military personnel under social security and increasing benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; provision for medical care of dependents of members of the Armed Forces; and increased pay of 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act from $50 to $78 a month.

INCREASE IN MINIMUM WAGE

Apart from assistance to Federal employees including those in the postal service, the most important labor legislation passed by the present Congress was a bill to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents an hour to $1 an hour.

The Eisenhower administration tried to limit the amount to 90 cents an hour. The Democratic Congress, however, passed a bill at the $1 level and it became law.

This wage applies to low-paid workers who produce goods which are shipped in interstate commerce.

Our relatively high wage levels in California make such legislation of great interest to our State; the economic advantage it brings generally is obvious. The light manufacturing industry of our State must compete with the low wages of the States in the South. We prefer such competition to take place on a level which guarantees that every American worker will at least have the minimum necessities.

WATER AND FLOOD CONTROL

The Eisenhower administration does not favor large Federal power projects unless the private utilities can control the revenue-producing features, mainly the output of electricity from the water falling over large dams.

Two projects sponsored by the Republican administration, namely, the Upper Colorado River Basin storage project and the so-called Fryingpan-Arkansas project, would threaten the southern California water supply from the Colorado River. Consequently, I opposed those projects.

Federal flood-control appropriations, which I supported in the Congress, will bring several million dollars' worth of assistance to Los Angeles basin flood-control projects.

SMALL BUSINESS

Many small businesses are closing their doors. Since 1953 small-business failures have increased 21 percent. Tight money and difficulties in getting Government loans are primary causes. A Small Business Administration was established ostensibly to grant such loans and its revolving fund was increased to a total of $175 million.

However, I am advised that since 1953 some 300,000 individuals and companies have applied for small-business loans, and of this number, only 7,000 have received favorable action.

The Small Business Administration is only a shadow agency because it does not have any real support by the Eisenhower administration.

CLASSROOM NEEDS

Our achievements in social security and highway improvement were not matched in the case of legislation to aid education. A bill authorizing $1.6 billion in Federal aid to States to build more classrooms over a 4-year program failed to pass the House by a small margin of votes.

The State of California, which has about 3 million children aged 5 to 17, would have received an annual allotment of more than $32 million, or about $130 million from this program.

If approved, this legislation would have helped greatly to relieve serious shortages of classrooms. The funds were to be allocated to the States on the basis of school-age population. The States would have been assured, however, that there would be no Federal Government interference with local school systems.

In this case, I am convinced the President could have obtained passage of the legislation, if the White House had taken a firm stand and had exercised positive leadership over the Republicans in Congress. Many of these Republicans, after maneuvering hamstrung the legislation by supporting the Powell amendment, which would have insured the defeat of the bill by raising national issues, turned around and voted against the bill when the Powell amendment was attached to the bill.

The Congress did succeed however in passing a law which authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, maintenance, and operating costs in areas where Federal activities have caused the school-age population to be expanded. This legislation dates back to 1939, when defense and—later—war industries threw heavy additional burdens on many communities in educating children. Last year California received about $15 million under this program and will receive slightly more under the new rate of Federal assistance.

BETTER HIGHWAYS

One of the outstanding achievements of this Congress was the enactment of

the $33.4 billion highway-construction program for a 13-year period. This law includes a Federal 90-percent share of the cost of completing a 41,000-mile interstate highway system and increased regular aid for State highways through 1959. This will furnish $367,500,000 of Federal moneys for California roads.

The financing for this huge highway program which will help to modernize America's highways and add greatly to the safety and convenience of motoring, is to be financed by increased excise taxes on motor fuels, trucks, trailers, and tires to yield $14.8 billion in the next 16 years. The Republican administration originally had proposed a different financing scheme which would have involved bond issues and extra profit to bankers and bondholders without any discernible advantage to the average motorist. The Democratic majority took a different, and, in my opinion, a more equitable approach raising the necessary revenues through taxes on major commercial and other users of the highways. The congressional majority prevailed and the President accepted our views in the matter.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

I voted for appropriations for our national defense and aid to other nations of the free world in order to keep us strong against the threat of communistic aggression. We should not fall into the trap of allowing our military defenses to be weakened, because of the new smile approach of the Soviet leaders. Deeds, which prove their real attitude should be our standard of judgment, not deceitful smiles and hypocritical words.

The foreign-aid bill that passed the Congress was increased some over last year. Many Members of Congress are concerned that there has been too much emphasis on strictly military appropriations and not enough on economic and technical aid to help underdeveloped countries that seek to improve their standard of living and who, in the absence of such help, are a natural prey for Soviet aims. We should take every wise and prudent step that is possible to establish world peace.

TAXES

No tax legislation was passed to help the average family of moderate income. Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey succeeded in forcing through the Congress the so-called rich man's tax bill which gives 73 percent of long run tax relief to corporations and only 9 percent to people with incomes of $5,000. I voted against this bill. The fact concern this unfair tax legislation revealed that 80 percent of the American taxpayers received only 9 percent of the reductions in this Republican tax bill.

The Democratic Members of Congress, including myself, voted to enact a tax bill giving an across-the-board $20 tax reduction credit to each and every taxpayer. Republican opposition defeated this legislation. Today our national debt is at an all-time high, and interest rates on this debt have been increased for the benefit of the money lenders.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Civil rights legislation was not enacted by the Congress, although action was taken in the House of Representatives, which I supported. The purpose of this legislation was to afford greater protection to personal liberties and voting rights of all citizens regardless of race, color, or creed.

Civil rights, unfortunately, represent a neglected field. The administration has made only perfunctory supporting gestures, sectional differences in the Congress make it an extremely difficult area of legislation.

As always, I shall continue to fight for the constitutional rights of every American citizen and for full opportunity to develop and use their talents according to the American heritage of freedom.

NATURAL GAS PRICE RAISE BILL

There was considerable debate in the Congress concerning the natural gas bill and the influence of lobbyists in attempting to get this legislation enacted. I voted against the bill because it would have removed Federal regulation of the price of gas at the wellhead which is shipped in interstate commerce, and would have raised the price of gas to consumers.

Notwithstanding a strong vote against the bill, it was passed by the House and Senate, but later vetoed by the President on the grounds that improper lobbying influence had been used. The President indicated that he favored the legislation otherwise.

Had this bill become law, it would have cost every user of natural gas in California $1 more per month.

POST OFFICE LEGISLATION

As a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I assisted in the enactment of legislation which brought better pay to post-office employees, both in office and supervisory positions and in the postal field service. Increased pay and opportunities for advancement were provided, and also payment of time and a half for overtime and holiday work for some grades, and compensatory time for other grades. A 10-percent bonus is allowed for night work.

However, I voted against Republican-sponsored legislation to increase the cost of sending first-class letters from 3 cents to 4 cents and airmail letters from 6 cents to 7 cents. A majority of the Republican Members and a few Democratic Members passed this bill in the House; it failed in the Senate.

The proposed increase was intended to fasten on the ordinary sender of first-class letters, the burden of the present subsidy which the Government gives to magazines, books, catalogs, and newspapers. I shall continue to oppose such unfair legislation.

BETTER HOUSING

Homeowners, homeseekers, and people who now live in slum areas, will benefit from the housing legislation of the 84th Congress. Needless to say, as a long-time supporter of improved Federal housing legislation, I voted for the housing bill, although some of its desirable amendments were defeated.

The housing bill will provide another $3 billion of mortgage insurance authority and will extend the VA home-loan program for another year.

Loans to finance repairs can be made over 5-year period instead of the present 3-year maximum. This will allow smaller monthly payments. It has been estimated that 1 million more American families will improve their homes because of this legislation. The program extended to September 30, 1959, would allow the Federal Housing Administration Commissioner to waive requirement of 6 months occupancy before an owner can qualify for a loan. The housing legislation also would allow the Federal Housing Administration to insure new long-term mortgage loans for persons whose property is damaged by floods, hurricanes or other disaster; authorizes construction of 70,000 units of federally subsidized low-rent housing for low-income groups in 2 years; authorizes Federal loans and capital grants for slum clearance and urban renewal projects to improve blighted areas, makes added provision for housing for military personnel, college students, farmers, and farm labor camps.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Among the important legislation passed by the 84th Congress in the health and welfare fields are the authorization of $30 million in Federal funds to assist States in providing Salk polio vaccine for needy children and expectant mothers; more effective control of narcotics, including drastic penalties for illicit drug peddlers who sell to children; authorization of $30 million of Federal aid each year for 3 years for the construction of non-Federal research facilities related to various crippling and killing diseases, such as cancer and heart afflictions. I voted for these bills.

BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

One of the disturbing features of our national economy is the fact that the cost of living is at an all-time high. The pay raises granted by Congress last year, amounting to 7.15 percent increases for regular civil-service workers and 8.6 percent for postal workers, certainly were justified.

This year the 84th Congress enacted several laws to improve civil-service employment and liberalized the retirement benefits of Federal workers. Increased benefits upon retirement will amount to 20 to 25 percent under the new legislation. Family survivorship benefits have been increased by as much as 150 percent and all other phases of retirement and survivorship benefits have been made more liberal.

Political Chameleons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the devious methods of Soviet propaganda are no better shown up than in relation to the German problem. From denouncing the Germans collectively as a criminal people beyond redemption, the Rus-

sians have now turned somersault and have hailed the "new Germany" which is arising in the Soviet zone. In my opinion, no organization has done more to expose the Russian turnabouts than has the Society for the Prevention of World War III. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article, Political Chameleons, which analyzes the current Russian propaganda line toward Germany. This article appeared in the No. 48 issue—summer, 1956—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., a nonprofit educational organization, 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL CHAMELEONS

During the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit to Britain a little boy, aged 5, approached Bulganin and asked, "Are you Father Christmas?" Bulganin shook his head in the negative. Whether it was Bulganin's goatee which prompted the lad to put the question, is not of direct concern to us. Yet, with or without the beard, the team of Bulganin-Krushchev has given good cause for people to believe that Santa Claus may not be a myth, after all.

Wherever they go, B & K have only kind words and smiling faces. Regardless of the ulterior motives involved, the diplomacy seems to say "something for everyone." It is a lavish kind of gesture and seems to apply to all peoples—even those who in recent times were regarded as their mortal enemies.

Ten years ago leading Russian propagandists were denouncing the Germans in the most violent uncompromising language. Ilya Ehrenburg, one of their most prolific propagandists, wrote: "Some people think that beaten Germans are less harmful. They are mistaken. Germans remain true to themselves. * * * The Germans have not changed much. It is senseless to hope to bring them to reason, to shame them, and then to reform them." On another occasion, Mr. Ehrenburg said: "That is the most terrible thing about the atrocities of the Germans: They slaughtered millions of fine people for nothing at all. And among the millions of Germans there was not to be found a handful of men of science to cry 'halt'."

The theme that the German people, as a whole, were responsible for Hitler's aggressions and the crimes resulting from them, was constantly emphasized by the Soviets. The well-known writer and war correspondent, Alexei Tolstoy, declared: "We will never believe that Germany was deceived and fooled by a gang of Nazis; that she did not want it, poor thing, but was dragged into a predatory war." In less dramatic terms one of Russia's leading jurists, Prof. A. Trainin, wrote: "Who must shoulder the responsibility for war crimes? The answer is perfectly clear, the German state and the German people must certainly bear, and will bear the political and material consequences of Hitlerite aggression and the Hitlerite system of militarized banditry." (Information Bulletin of the Soviet Union, June 30, 1945.)

However, in this year of 1956, the "something for everyone" diplomacy has changed the Soviet tune. In the Soviet publication New Times (January 12, 1956) we read an account of a visit by Russian educators to the East Zone of Germany. The writer of this piece describes in rapturous language what great progress has been achieved in "democratizing" German youth. He tells the story of a western journalist asking some children at a school in Berlin if they did not want to take revenge on those who had defeated Germany. The children replied: "The war was not caused by the German people; it was launched and lost by the Nazis." The writer confessed that this answer deeply impressed him. It left him with the conviction that democracy in Germany is growing in strength and self-awareness. The writer did not bother to tell his readers that the children's reply is the favorite alibi of Germans, whether they be concealed Hitlerites or professed Democrats. Why should this threadbare excuse carry more weight just because it is mouthed by those who are indoctrinated with Communist ideology? Ten years ago this reply would have been denounced by Soviet propagandists—today it is an indication that the so-called German Democratic Republic is pulsating with life.

The cynicism displayed by Soviet leaders with regard to Germany's war crimes was illustrated last year when Adenauer paid homage to the Kremlin. In his very first public statement the Chancellor pleaded for the return of those Germans who were still in Russian prison camps. The press reported that Bulganin replied with great indignation that there were no longer any German prisoners of war in Russia; the only Germans held were war criminals. These criminals, Bulganin stated, "must be kept in confinement." They are people "who have lost all human vision. They are guilty of violence, arson, murder of women, children, and old people." The Russian people, Bulganin shouted, will "never forget" the crimes perpetrated by these "murderers." A few months later, these very same "murderers" were on their way back to Germany. In December 1955 a contingent of these "murderers," returning from a Russian prison camp, raised their right hands and publicly swore "by our dead and the dead of the Soviet Union and by the children who will one day pass judgment on us, we swear that we have not murdered, that we have not raped, that we have not burned, and we have not pillaged. If we brought misery and suffering to that land (the Soviet Union) we did so under the law of war and mindful of our soldier's oath." (New York Times, December 14, 1955.) The Times reported that German officials were disturbed lest this public demonstration offend the Soviets. Actually, the Germans had no cause for fear because the "something for everyone" diplomacy is so generous in concept and execution that even the memories of the Russian war dead can be sacrificed, if necessary. The Germans as well as the Russians would call this realpolitik.

The attitude toward the revival of German militarism is another example of the new diplomacy. Last year the satellite government in the Soviet zone announced a program for the reconstruction of Potsdam, the hallowed shrine of Prussian militarism. Communist spokesmen attributed the destruction of Potsdam to unnecessary United States air raids. (New York Times, February 7, 1955.) The East German Government's newspaper, the Tägliche Rundschau, devoted a number of editorials which recalled the days when Prussia and Russia were friends. The Germans were reminded how Prussian generals, like Clausewitz, Scharnhorst, and Yorck cooperated with Russian military leaders. The Times dispatch noted that the Russians and the German Communist regime hope to build up a firm alliance through the reawakening of the Prussian pro-Russian spirit. In this connection it is now reported that the East German regime intends to restore the state of Prussia which had been abolished at the end of World War II because it was deemed to be the sinister symbol of German militarism. The Communists hope that the revival of the state of Prussia will have a favorable propaganda effect especially in rightist circles in Western Germany. (Bulletin on German Questions, March 1, 1956.)

Soviet publications are devoting a lot of space these days to the past glories of Russo-German friendship. The Soviet magazine International Affairs (August 1955) carried a detailed article extolling the virtues of Rapallo. Rapallo, of course, refers to the treaty between Russia and Germany in 1922 which formed the basis of close military, political, and economic collaboration between the Soviet Government and the Weimar Republic. The German General Staff and leading industrialists gave this treaty special support. The writer of this article points out that by 1921 German political leaders began to veer toward friendship with Communist Russia. Thus, the signing of the Rapallo Treaty, according to this writer, "bore witness to the existence within Germany's ruling classes of forces with a realistic approach to the solution of foreign policy programs." He recalls how the Rapallo Treaty strengthened the ties between Germany and the Soviet Union. He quotes one German writer who alleged that it was through the aid of Soviet orders that the German engineering and electrical industries were able to keep going during the crisis years of 1930–33. The article constantly refers to the imperialist pressures of the Western Powers against Germany which the Germans were able to offset, thanks to the Rapallo Treaty.

According to the writer in International Affairs it would appear that no matter how hard the Western Powers tried to turn the Germans away from the Rapallo Treaty, "interest in the strengthening of relations with the U. S. S. R. mounted * * * among Germany's ruling classes." He cannot conceal his pleasure over the former ties between the bigwigs in German industry and the Soviets. To underline his point he quotes a passage from the Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung which, he tells the reader, was the "voice of the German monopolies." The Deutsche Allegmeine urged the Germans to maintain close cooperation with the U. S. S. R. and oppose the attempts of the Western Powers to incite Germany against Russia. In concluding this study, the writer refers to the famous statement by Stalin who said that the people of Germany and Russia have "the greatest potentialities in Europe for carrying out great acts of world importance."

The October 1955 issue of International Affairs carries a leading editorial entitled "The Soviet Union and Germany." Here again, many paragraphs are devoted to the wonderful future which lies ahead for friendship between Germany and Russia. "The Soviet Union and Germany," the editorial states, "are the biggest industrial countries in Europe with high economic potentials. It naturally follows that good relations between the German and Soviet peoples are the firm guaranty of universal peace in Europe and throughout the world."

In line with the theme that the German people were also victims of the Nazis, the editorial characterizes the Red army as their liberator. The editorial further states that the Soviet Union was always in favor of a strong Germany. The Soviet Government opposed those who spread hatred against the German people and in this connection the editorial roundly denounces Lord Vansittart, the English diplomat who warned the West of the German danger. Only the Soviet Union, the editorial tells us, fought against the dismemberment of Germany, and it is only the Soviet Union which can solve "the problem of finding markets for West German industrial products." This point, the editorial declares with confidence, is bound to interest West German industrialists.

The February 1956 issue of International Affairs discusses the value of the Eastern markets for the industrial war lords of the

Ruhr. The Industriekurier which, according to the Soviet publication, expresses the opinions of the big German industrials and exporters, is bitterly opposed to Allied trade policy vis-à-vis the Soviet bloc. The complaints of the Industriekurier are generally aired and the Soviet publication is happy to be able to report that German publications are also agitating for a new approach. Summing up these developments, International Affairs dangles the bait: "West German business circles cannot help noticing that the GDR (German Communist regime) is very successful in trade with the countries of the democratic camp, while the trade balance of the GFR (German Federal Republic) clearly shows the disadvantages of the one-sided Bonn policy for the country's economy."

A rather clear cut example of the 180 degree switch in Soviet policy toward Germany may be seen in two articles written by a Russian professor A. Yerusalimsky. Writing in the New Times (September 19, 1953), the professor warned the peoples of Europe of the German danger. "Furthermore," he wrote, "history has shown that it is not Germany, but her neighbors that need guaranties of security, they having been the victims of German aggression twice in the course of a half century. * * * It is upon Germany that the maintenance of peace in Europe mostly depends; for this she has only to renounce her suicidal policy of stirring up wars and armed conflicts." Writing for the New Times about 2 years later (January 26, 1956) Professor Yerusalimsky weeps over the "hard" peace which the Allies planned for Germany. The professor cries that it was the Morgenthau Plan, "sponsored by influential American monopolists" which tried to destroy Germany, but thanks to the Soviet Union this insidious plot of American "imperialists" was unmasked and rendered harmless.

The new Russian propaganda line shows that nothing will be left to chance insofar as relations with Germany are concerned. The Soviets do not intend to be one inch behind the Western powers in the scramble for the hand of the former enemy. We can free a Sepp Dietrich; they too can release German war criminals. We can build up a German army led by former members of Hitler's General Staff; they are doing likewise. Indeed, there seems to be no end to this spectacle. In the process of bidding higher and higher, the moral principles for which millions gave their lives are cast into the shadows. The Bismarckian idea that moral principle is no substitute for brute force and political expediency, seems to have gripped the minds of many statesmen who, only a short while ago, exhorted their peoples to destroy every vestige of German militarism.

Decision of the Supreme Court of Texas on the Validity of Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the RECORD for July 24 the argument of the attorney general of Texas, Hon. John Ben Sheppard, before the State supreme court in support of the validity of a right-to-work law. Since that time the court rendered its opinion. In order that the fullest information can be available on the subject involved, I believe it would be in the public interest for the decision in that case to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS, NO. A-5061—M. E. SANDSBERRY, JR., ET AL., AND GULF, COLORADO & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO. ET AL., PETITIONERS, *v.* INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS ET AL., RESPONDENTS—FROM POTTER COUNTY, SEVENTH DISTRICT

Certain employees of petitioner, railway company, instituted this suit for themselves and on behalf of all other employees similarly situated against Santa Fe Railway Co. and 16 nonoperating railway labor unions to restrain them from entering into a union shop agreement, and to restrain and enjoin the unions from striking or using other economic force to compel Santa Fe to enter into such contract.

Santa Fe answered, consenting to the relief sought, and by cross action against the unions, itself sought an injunction against the unions to restrain them from using economic force to compel a union shop contract. Judgment in the trial court resulted in favor of petitioner employees and Santa Fe, and the relief prayed for was granted. On appeal the Amarillo Court of Civil Appeals reversed and dissolved the injunction (277 S. W. 2d 776).

The trial court concluded that section 2 eleventh of the Railway Labor Act as amended (64 Stat. 1238, 45 U. S. C., sec. 152 eleventh),[1] known as the union shop statute is unconstitutional and void and therefore the right-to-work statute, article 5207-a, Vernon's Annotated Civilian Statute, is applicable within the the State of Texas forbidding the execution of any union shop contract that makes membership in a union a condition of employment between the parties. The United States Supreme Court in the recent case of *Railway Employes' Dept. et al.* v. *Hanson et al.* has held to the contrary.

In their supplemental brief petitioners assert that under the issues and facts in this case the Hanson decision requires an affirmance of the trial court's judgment enjoining the execution of a union shop contract compelling full union membership and that the record here presents the constitutional issues which the court did not decide in the Hanson case for the reason that they were not brought before the court in that record.

The contract proposed by respondent unions to the Santa Fe was worded substantially in terms of the union shop statute and apparently similar in all respects to the contract under attack in Hanson. The nature of that contract is described by the court as follows:

"This is a suit brought in the Nebraska courts by employees of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. against that company and labor organizations representing various groups of employees of the railroad to enjoin the application and enforcement of a union shop agreement entered into between the railroad company aid the labor organizations. Plaintiffs are not members of any of the defendant labor organizations and desire not to join. Under the terms of the union shop agreement all employees of the railroad, as a condition of their continued employment, must become members of the specified union within 60 days and thereafter maintain that membership. It is alleged that failure on their part to join the union will mean the loss of their employment together with seniority, retirement, pension, and other rights."

Petitioners vigorously urge that the proposed contract makes the absolute requirement that nonunion employees become full union members. But it no more requires full union membership than does the contract in Hanson and as expressly held in that case the contract does not compel full union membership.

The petitioners principally argue here that the record in our case shows many facts and circumstances that were not contained in the Hanson record, all of which bear, they say, on the practices of the unions, the requirements laid down in their constitutions and bylaws for membership, the disciplinary control exercised by the unions over their members, the obligations a member must assume and the unions' interpretation of the statutory requirements.

While this record does contain probably more factual data, for the most part, it would seem to be cumulative and amplified rather than distinctive. Basically, we think, evidence of the same facts was before the court in the Hanson case for that decision quotes liberally in footnotes from the constitutions and bylaws of a number of the respondent unions that place certain restrictions upon the freedom of activity and expression of its members and provide, among other things, for compulsory dues and assessments to finance insurance and death-benefit plans. A large part of petitioner's supplemental brief is devoted to a discussion of the provisions of these same constitutions and bylaws that were in the Hanson record and noted by the court.

The legislative history of the union-shop amendment indicates an intention on the part of Congress only to eliminate the so-called free-rider problem. It was asserted in debate that the strife and dissatisfaction existed among the rank of the union members because of the fact that nonmembers received the benefit of representation without constributing their pro rata share of the bargaining expense (96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 16374, et seq). Mr. Justice Douglas made this point in quoting from the remarks of Senator HILL who managed the bill on the floor of the Senate: "The question in

---

[1] Eleventh. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, or any other statute or law of the United States, or Territory thereof, or of any State, any carrier or carriers as defined in this chapter and a labor organization or labor organizations duly designated and authorized to represent employees in accordance with the requirements of this chapter shall be permitted—

(a) to make agreements, requiring, as a condition of continued employment, that within 60 days following the beginning of such employment, or the effective date of such agreements, whichever is the later, all employees shall become members of the labor organization representing their craft or class: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall require such condition of employment with respect to employees to whom membership is not available upon the same terms and conditions as are generally applicable to any other member or with respect to employees to whom membership was denied or terminated for any reason other than the failure of the employees to render the periodic dues, initiation fees, and assessments (not including fines and penalties) uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership.

(b) to make agreements providing for the deduction by such carrier or carriers from the wages of its or their employees in a craft or class and payment to the labor organization representing the craft or class of such employees, of any periodic dues, initiation fees, and assessments (not including fines and penalties) uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership: *Provided*, That no such agreement shall be effective with respect to any individual employee until he shall have furnished the employer with a written assignment to the labor organization of such membership dues, initiation fees, and assessments, which shall be revocable in writing after the expiration of 1 year or upon the termination date of the applicable collective agreement, whichever occurs sooner.

this instance is whether those who enjoy the fruits and benefits of the union should make a fair contribution to the support of the unions" (id. p. 16279).

Additionally, in our case it was shown that the union committee after making demand for a union-shop contract, refused to discuss or consider changes to provide only for the payment of fees or charges to defray the permanent cost of collective bargaining. But a misconception on the part of the unions as to the effect of the union-shop contract would not warrant us in upholding an injunction against the execution of that contract.

The testimony also reveals that in the past other railroads after the execution of a similar union-shop agreement, lost hundreds of employees by discharge or resignation. Some 5 or 6 witnesses testified that they had been discharged, 2 of them for refusing to take the oath of union membership. But regardless of any conditions for membership set forth in any union constitution or bylaws, or any discharges or resignations that have taken place as a result of the union-shop contract on any other railroad lines, the membership requirements of this contract and of the union-shop statute are merely formal and fictional aside from the financial obligation. Of course all of the resignations and discharges referred to above occurred before the Hanson decision and may have resulted as a misinterpretation of the legal effect of the contract. Both the statute and the contract expressly provide that the requirement of membership as a condition of employment shall not apply "to employees to whom membership was denied or terminated for any reason other than the failure of the employee to render the periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments (not including fines and penalties) uniformly acquired as a condition of acquiring and retaining membership."

The Hanson opinion holds that "the enactment of the Federal statute authorizing union-shop agreements in the governmental action on which the constitution operates." It also observes "that Congress endeavored to safeguard against that possibility (i. e., that compulsory membership will be used to impair freedom of expression) by making explicit that no conditions to membership may be imposed except as respect 'periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments.'" The unwilling employee need assume no pledge of conformity nor promise of obedience, nor even make application for membership to retain employment under the union-shop contract.

Although the Supreme Court in Hanson only held "that the requirement for financial support of the collective bargaining agency by all who received the benefits of its work is within the power of Congress under the commerce clause and does not violate either the first or fifth amendments," it upheld the union shop agreement theretofore entered into between the unions and the railroads, and left open the question as to any objection that may be raised to the use by the unions of these funds.

As to the matter of financial support petitioners say: "Perhaps the most decisive fact leading the Supreme Court of the United States to conclude that violation of the first and fifth amendments was not shown in the Hanson case was its inability to find upon the record in that case that the members' funds may be used to carry on political activities imposed by them." They cite from the record before us one or more instances of political assessments made by one of the defendant unions and discuss generally the political activity of union labor. They quote from union organs statements by union leaders of their intention, past and present, to support measures and candidates deemed favorable to their cause and the necessary implication is drawn that some union funds are and will be devoted to political activity.

We think a political assessment was not contemplated by the Congress in using the term "assessments" in the union shop statute, nor that the failure to pay a political assessment would be a valid ground for discharge. But the contract has not been signed, no one has been discharged for refusal to pay any dues or assessments. Surely the United States Supreme Court in consideration of the Hanson case, if not otherwise, judicially knew of union political activity and that funds to carry on that activity are essential. We are of course bound by that decision and can say no more than "if the exaction of dues, initiation fees, or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the first amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case."

The judgment of the court of civil appeals dissolving the injunction must be affirmed.

Opinion delivered July 25, 1956.

Associates Griffin, Smith, and McCall dissenting.

FRANK P. CULVER, Jr.,
Associate Justice.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS, No. A-5061—M. E. SANDSBERRY, JR., ET AL., AND GULF, COLORADO & SANTE FE RAILWAY COMPANY ET AL., PETITIONERS v. INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS ET AL., RESPONDENTS—FROM POTTER COUNTY, SEVENTH DISTRICT

CONCURRING OPINION

My purpose in filing this opinion is to express my apprehension concerning those portions of the majority opinion which undertake at this time to interpret an unexecuted contract and to define judicially, in advance, certain rights of the parties under the contract. I refer specifically to the following statements: "* * * the membership requirement of this contract and of the union-shop statute are merely formal and fictional aside from the financial obligation. * * * The unwilling employee need assume no pledge of conformity nor promise of obedience, nor even make application for membership to retain employment under the union-shop contract. * * * We think a political assessment was not contemplated by the Congress in using the term 'assessments' in the union-shop statute, nor that the failure to pay a political assessment would be a ground for discharge."

It is my view that the foregoing issues are prematurely raised and prematurely decided. A question certain to be raised hereafter is whether the quoted rulings are pure obiter dicta or whether they are res adjudicata of the matters there decided. I do not mean to indicate that I would disagree with most of what has been said on the issues if they were here; I simply disagree that they are here.

In passing I point out that what has been said with respect to the rights of the parties to a contract made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 2, eleventh, leaves little, if any, difference in the meaning of that paragraph and paragraph (b) of section 2, eleventh. (See footnote, majority opinion.) Now obviously these paragraphs were not intended to have the same meaning.

I particularly do not wish to be bound by the holding that an employee may not be required to make application for membership in the union in order to obtain or retain employment. If a contract be executed requiring union membership as a condition of retaining employment, some means must be afforded nonunion employees for indicating to the unions their wish to become members. The unions could hardly be expected to admit to membership those who were unwilling to apply therefor. The tendered contract requires, in the terms of the statute, that all employees shall, within 60 days from the date of the agreement, become members of the union as a condition of their continued employment It seems to me that an application for membership may well be a necessary part of the mechanics for determining whether an employee wishes and is granted union membership. This is not to say that unions could include in an application, against the wish of the signing employees, pledges of conformity and promises of obedience.

ROBERT W. CALVERT.
Associate Justice.

Opinion delivered June 25, 1956.

Hitler's Echo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in the last few years certain elements among German expellee groups have tried to influence American public opinion in order to further the cause of pan-Germanism in Eastern Europe. These elements which include individuals who have collaborated with the Nazis, would like to return to the days of Munich when Hitler was given carte blanche in his drive to subjugate the peoples of Eastern Europe. The propaganda of these chauvinistic Germans can only create great fears among the peoples of Eastern Europe who have suffered under the Nazi heel. While these people are seeking their freedom from their present Communist masters, they certainly do not want to be thrown again into the arms of the pan-Germans. In my opinion, the United States would help the cause of freedom in Eastern Europe by publicly disowning and rejecting the activities of the Sudeten Germans and other pan-German groups.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article "Hitler's Echo" which appeared in the No. 48 issue—summer 1956—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITLER'S ECHO

A favorite pastime of the Nazis was the annual Nuremberg rally—scene of Hitler's hysterical harangues. With Teutonic fervor the cry for blood would echo through the ranks of the faithful as the Fuehrer shook his fist at the world. It was a moment when the Nazi brass was able to whip up a frenzied hatred which spread fear and terror throughout Europe. Our thoughts return to that spectacle as we read about the annual celebrations of the German expellee groups. These rallies have provided the platform for those unregenerate elements who talk about Germany's rights in the same tones of terror as their Nazi forebears. It is also an occasion for the more respectable elements among the Germans to let their hair down, so to speak.

The most recent of these get-togethers was held in May of this year and the top

leaders of the German Government participated enthusiastically. Chancellor Adenaur sent a message of greetings. He expressed the hope that the expellees would soon be able to resume their historic task. Von Brentano, Bonn's Foreign Minister, declared that the Germans would never give up their lost territories. Theodor Oberlaender, Federal Minister for Refugees (a former Nazi), noted with great satisfaction that the agitation of the expellees was a great service to Europe. Even the leader of the Social Democrats, Erich Ollenhauer, put in his two cents by sending a message of greeting to the Sudetan Germans. He assured them that the Social Democratic Party would support their cause to the end. The Federal Minister for All German Affairs, Jacob Kaiser, promised the Sudetens that the German Government would never abandon their rights. Speaking about German rights, it was the same Herr Kaiser who once said: "No real Europe can be formed until the German bloc is reconstituted. I remind you that this bloc includes in addition to Germany, Austria, a part of Switzerland, the Saar of course, and Alsace-Lorraine. When I think of the Strasbourg Cathedral my heart hurts."

The voice of Pan-Germanism with its chauvinistic sneers has not been stilled despite the Nazi defeat. Of course, the respectable leaders try to mislead world public opinion by pretending that the expulsion of the Germans from the Sudetenland and from other areas was merely the result of arbitrary decisions by the Allied Powers. Apparently, they hope that memories are so short that we no longer recall the fifth column work of the Sudetens and other German minority groups which paved the way for Nazi conquests (see Prevent World War III, No. 47, "Pan-Germanism Rides Again," p. 39).

In this connection, the same respectable Germans gloss over the fact that the leadership of these expellee groups is infested with pro-Nazi elements. For example, the leader of the Sudeten Germans, Lodgman von Auen, was a notorious Nazi collaborator and was arested for war crimes. However, under mysterious circumstances he escaped punishment and now is a celebrated figure in Germany. Indeed, the President of the Bonn Government, Theodor Heuss, awarded von Auen the Great Service Cross of the Federal Republic on the occasion of his 75th birthday. It is interesting to recall that it was Herr Heuss who sent the infamous wire to the war criminal Von Neurath, acclaiming his martyrdom, the same von Neurath who was found guilty in the persecution of the Czechs under Hitler. Thus, while the so-called respectable leaders, such as Heuss, pose as tried and true friends of democracy, they take advantage of every opportunity to give aid and comfort to the Pan-German ravings of the expellees.

The aims and objectives of the expellees may be couched in anti-Communist slogans, but behind the facade they strive tirelessly to carry out the dream of a Pan-German Europe. They pretend to be friends of the Western Allies but they smear Radio Free Europe; they pretend to be democratic, but they associate and make common cause with other fascistic elements; they pretend to be against the present satellite setup in Eastern Europe but they dream of the day when the Poles and the Czechs and other peoples of Eastern Europe will be satellites of a fourth Reich.

These expellee groups are endeavoring in every possible way to exploit the cold war to achieve their nefarious goal. They are trying to whip up American public opinion. In this connection mention must be made of their public relations expert in the United States, Dr. Richard Sallet. His background was referred to briefly in the issue of Prevent World War III mentioned above. Additional facts show that at one time he was Goebbels' representative in the German Embassy in Washington and subsequently an official in Ribbentrop's Foreign Office. Among his tasks was to coordinate pro-Nazi activities in the United States. The aim of this work was to drum up anti-Semitism, to disunite the American people, and to create animosity between the United States of America and her most reliable allies. In this work he had the assistance of a top Nazi agent, Stallforth, who took advantage of his privileges as an American citizen. It may be that it was under Sallet's direction that the German Embassy in Washington recently circulated a map and an accompanying letter among Members of Congress and newspaper editors designed to justify the Pan-German activities of the expellee groups.

It is noteworthy that while the expellees try to curry favor with the United States of America, they smear Western Allied leaders. Winston Churchill received a taste of this medicine when he visited Germany in May. The violent attacks launched against Churchill made it necessary for the authorities to adopt rigid security precautions so as to protect Churchill's life. One of the leaflets circulated by these expellee gangs, when Churchill spoke at Aachen, read: "Citizens of Achen, avoid the ceremony at the market place tomorrow. Keep your windows shut. Don't wave flags. Come instead to the protest demonstration at the war memorial."

This type of agitation is just a foretaste of what is in store for the Allies should the German expellee groups really break loose. All sincere democrats who are just as opposed to communism as they are to neo-nazism and pan-Germanism, should take heed of this development which is a definite threat to security and peace.

Congressman Hagen Reports to the People—The Work of the 1956 Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, in reporting on the work of the Congress I will deal principally with those subjects which are of most immediate interest to Kern, Kings, and Tulare Counties, and my people. I feel that such a report is a necessary aspect of my job. Almost everyone has decisions important to his or her welfare which depend on additions to, or changes of, some Federal statute or the action of some administrator. In the space of time allowed to me I will touch upon the most important of these matters and hold myself available for information to my constituents with respect to matters which are not touched on in this speech.

I will first deal with those projects and actions which have a purely local impact. They are the following: Success and Terminus Dams, Lemoore Naval Air Station, Terra Bella Irrigation District, Desert area FHA housing, Federal aid to local school districts, Isabella Lake, the so-called barley bill, the San Luis project, and related problems.

SUCCESS AND TERMINUS DAMS

For the first time in their legislative history Success Dam on the Tule River and Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River received an appropriation for commencement of construction. As quickly as the work demands it additional sums will be secured to build a structure on the Kaweah—Terminus, near McKays Point, which will store up 145,000 acre-feet of water—and a structure on the Tule, Success, just above Worth Bridge, which will store 75,000 acre-feet of water. In each case flood control is the principal benefit but there will be some reregulation of irrigation water. In addition, in some years, additional irrigation water will be available by reason of the capture and storage of floodwater which would normally go into Tulare Lake. Discounting the loss of storage capacity attributable to water already owned the amount of new water made available on Kaweah would be 34,000 acre-feet and 10,000 acre-feet on the Tule and, of necessity, this is not a year-in and year-out supply. The Corps of Engineers will control the flood-control aspects of the dams but the local people will direct the use for irrigation to the end that the best use is made of water and no person's water rights adversely affected.

I have acted on behalf of each of these projects each year during my 4 years in Congress, and I am proud that final success was achieved during my tenure in office.

These projects have a history antedating 1944 but were not authorized until that date by Congress and, with the exception of periodic appropriations of planning money, no money was provided for them until 1956. Such delay is attributable to the fact that Federal authorizations and appropriations are difficult to secure, with the decision often being made by the President and the Budget Bureau. In addition, in the case of Success and Terminus, added factors were involved. From time to time they were clouded with local controversies. Changes in plans occurred which delayed action. In some years they lacked the approval of State water agencies. Fortunately these delays are behind us.

I cite these facts to clear the atmosphere of political charges made regarding them. It should be noted that during the long history of slow progress since 1944 and prior thereto the district has been represented by Congressmen Alfred Elliott and Thomas Werdel and myself in that order and by Senators Sheridan Downey, Hiram Johnson, William Knowland, Richard Nixon, and Thomas Kuchel, respectively. The record of accomplishment speaks for itself. In this connection it should be noted that the people of Tulare County have, over the years, almost unanimously supported these projects. Whatever opposition has existed has been understandable and forgiveable if not acceptable to the great mass of the people.

Upstream areas have an acute interest in development of flood control and water-conservation problems which are not reached by the major storage structures. I have pledged myself to help them and have received assurances from

their neighbors downstream that they will support the development of additional plans. The Army engineers can be put to work developing upstream flood-control plans by a resolution of the Public Works Committee of either the House or the Senate. I intend to seeks such approval and anticipate no difficulty with it.

Finally, Tulare and Kings County people should investigate plans for provision of recreational bodies of water back of each dam site. This action was taken in Kern County on Isabella Lake by the action of the board of supervisors in purchasing surplus Central Valley project water which could be exchanged for water to be stored the year-round at Isabella. I secured the consent of the Army engineers to such storage right.

LEMOORE NAVAL AIR STATION

The establishment of an $80 million air station at Lemoore is a reality. It will bring a tremendous payroll into Kings and Tulare Counties. Over $10 million for it was appropriated this year and the dirt should fly in 1957. I worked closely with the Navy and the local community on this and was commended by the Navy for my help before the committees of Congress.

There will be problems arising from the project but they can be solved and the overall value is so great that the problems become minor. The Government is not unaware of problems arising from such a major Federal activity. Federal aid is available for schools, planning, and other activities complicated by the Federal impact. The ultimate size of the station is a matter of speculation until the Navy submits its final land-acquisition plans to the House and Senate military committees in January 1957.

TERRA BELLA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

Responding to telegrams from the Terra Bella area I acted to secure inclusion of funds for the irrigation district distribution system loan in this year's appropriations. I succeeded in securing language in an appropriation bill, in the face of opposition from the Budget Bureau, which makes money available for such loan. Similar efforts by me on behalf of the Porterville irrigation district were not successful because of opposition from both the Budget Bureau and the Bureau of Reclamation on the basis that negotiations were not far enough advanced to indicate an immediate appropriation. In any event the Porterville district can go ahead with its proposed contract and dispose of all preliminary actions with the assurance that in January or February of 1957 the money will be provided.

DESERT AREA FHA HOUSING

The communities of Ridgecrest, Mojave, Rosamond, and Boron have had difficulty securing the usual FHA loan guarantees for private housing. Part of their difficulties were resolved though a conference I arranged with top-level FHA and Veterans' Administration officials.

The Congress provided added relief in legislation I worked on with Senator SPARKMAN and Congressman RAINS, of Alabama. Nineteen hundred and fifty-six legislation establishes a new category of guaranties of building loans and purchase loans for essential employees of military research or development facilities which would be used when the usual FHA programs were denied. The communities mentioned will have a new avenue of private housing loans open to them.

FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

For several years the Federal Government has been furnishing construction funds under Public Law 815 and operation funds under Public Law 874 to school districts which have increased pupil loads arising from military and related installations. A defect of the program has been that operation payments matched the previous year's attendance to the disadvantage of districts with steadily increasing enrollments—a category into which fall the schools on and about the Naval Ordnance Test Station, the Mojave Marine Air Station, and Edwards Air Force Base. I have worked with Jesse Stockton, Dr. Earl Murray, Theron McCuen, and Robert Ulrich, and others concerned with this problem. I can report that the 1956 version of Public Law 874 conforms to our requests.

I was also pleased to be of assistance to these educators in opening a new door to solution of the Burroughs High School problem. The present facility is inadequate to serve both off-station and on-station students. Without a change in the law the Federal construction entitlement attributable to these two categories of students could not be combined in the expansion of the existing facility or the erection of a new one. With the help of the named educators and others I secured the necessary change which would permit the combination of both entitlements in a single location. It is proposed that the present high-school site be devoted to elementary-school purposes and a new high-school plant be erected on a more central location to be donated by the Navy. This site would be open to students and parents without the necessity of going through a security gate. Under the amendment of law secured, over $800,000 of Federal money would be available. It should be emphasized that all decisions in this matter rest with the local people. The change in the law merely opens a new avenue of approach.

ISABELLA LAKE

A minimum recreational lake has been established at Isabella. This is the result of the cooperative efforts of local groups and myself and other officials. The Board of Supervisors of Kern County are to be congratulated for their many actions, including the provision of the necessary water supply.

The same fine cooperation resulted in the establishment of an office of the Federal-State Market News Service at Visalia. This office has proved a boon to local dairy, cattle, sheep, and hog farmers in getting the best sale prices for their livestock.

BARLEY BILL

I successfully opposed H. R. 9650, the barley bill introduced by HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. In this effort I had the reported unanimous support of the Republican side of the committee and majority support from the Democratic side. I was joined in opposition by the Department of Agriculture, the California Supervisors Association, the Kings and Fresno County Boards of Supervisors, local Grange and Farm Bureau officials, and other groups and individuals.

This proposal deserves comment because some people do not understand it and it may come up again at the Federal level. The commonest method of supporting the prices of selected farm commodities, including barley, is the nonrecourse CCC loan at an established parity level. Under this method, the grower of the supported crop places it in Government-approved storage and borrows its parity value from the Government under a contract which includes delivery of a warehouse receipt to the Government as a deposit of security. The loan establishes an extended time of repayment, as do all loans. During this time the grower can recover his commodity and sell it at a profit. In addition, if its value at the time the Government takes title—arrival of loan maturity date without redemption—is greater than the loan value he receives an equity payment. This loan procedure is not only designed to keep the farmer in the open market for his own benefit but also to lessen the possibility of commodities going into Government hands at a loss to the taxpayers.

The Cooley bill would have permitted a barley grower to pass his ownership to the Government at any time at his option thereby evading local property taxes and shifting storage costs to the Government. I am convinced that this legislation stems in part from the efforts of certain large barley growers in Kings and Tulare Counties to evade local personal-property taxation. In fact, I was asked by one of their representatives to sponsor such legislation. I refused.

Creation of a favored class of farm taxpayers merely results in a shifting of taxes to other farmers and to town people—a case of robbing Peter to pay Paul. In Kings County the barley growers, by and large, are corporation farms which are best able to pay taxes and the victims would be the other taxpayers least able to pay. The growers of fruits and nuts and dairy operators have borne, in terms of ability to pay in recent years, an undue burden of taxes and any shifting of barley taxes to them would only aggravate a present injustice. In any event it is not the proper function of the Federal Government to assist avoidance of local taxes. This is a matter of major consequence in Corcoran, for example, where the local schools and the city have a limited tax base greatly affected by any exemptions.

If the growers of price-supported crops in storage have a valid argument for exemption their proper forum is with the local and State tax authorities who can fairly evaluate the local situation case by case. Discussion, such as was had about 3 years ago, of a proper method of taxing farm commodities should be renewed.

SAN LUIS PROJECT

The conflict over the San Luis versus the Feather River project as the best method of increasing San Joaquin Valley water supplies spotlights the need for intense thought and activity on the part not only of those water deficient areas which will receive water from one or the other or both but also those water-deficient areas which will receive no benefits from either as presently proposed.

If it is a reasonable assumption that there is need for more water in almost every area of Kings, Kern, and Tulare Counties there has been a serious lack of organized expression from areas lying east of the valley floor.

The initial features of the San Luis project, which have the best chance of Federal authorization, would make water deliveries only about as far south as the Blakeley Canal in Kings County. It would not be very difficult to extend those deliveries into the lower reaches of the Kings River service area to permit an exchange of Kings River waters farther upstream. It should be recalled also that there have been proposals to use the Delta-Mendota pool and canal as a source of supplemental supply for the Kings and San Joaquin Rivers service areas. It should be noted that the San Luis project will preempt the last low-cost power in the Central Valley project as well as some or all of the remaining unused capacity of the Tracy pumps and the Delta-Mendota Canal without contribution to the capital cost of those facilities.

It seems unlikely to me that the Secretary of the Interior will accept State proposals for dedication of Federal power and CVP facilities to, and the initial expenditure of Federal money for construction of, a project to be turned over to the State of California.

The feasibility of the Feather River project is an economic question which must be decided by majority opinion. I am hopeful that all water-deficient areas will organize and hire the best expert opinion on possible water developments in order that the widest possible participation in Federal or State project benefits can be secured.

End of an Illusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in recent times international affairs have become more complicated. Yet, the people must be kept well informed as to the meaning of current developments if they are to form intelligent judgments. In this connection, I should like to draw attention to a penetrating analysis of our foreign relations problems in Europe by a noted authority on international affairs, Mr. T. H. Tetens. Several years ago Mr. Tetens wrote a provocative book entitled "Germany Plots With the Kremlin." His article to which I refer, appeared in the No. 48 issue—summer 1956—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF AN ILLUSION

(By T. H. Tetens)

The world is stunned by the unprecedented rapid change on the stage of international affairs. Since the new Soviet team, Bulganin and Khrushchev, took over the reigns from Malenkov and Molotov in February 1955, the frozen fronts of the cold war have steadily melted away. Topping Stalin's traditional peace offensive with the warm sunshine of Operation Smile, the Soviet leaders have scored impressive gains with their strategy to end the cold war.

There is general agreement in the capitals of the world that during the last year the East-West tension has been considerably diminished. The eagerness in London and Paris to settle the differences with Moscow and to end the costly armament race, has led to hectic diplomatic counter moves by Bonn aiming at the continuation of the cold war. During his recent visit to Washington, Dr. Adenauer once again asserted that the Soviet Union should prove its peaceful intention by agreeing to the reunification of Germany. President Eisenhower, in a message to German Bundespresident Dr. Heuss, expressed his "very great hope that action could be taken which would promote the liberation of 17 million Germans that are now under Soviet Communist rule."

The Adenauer-Dulles policy statement produced a sour note in Britain. New York Times Correspondent Drew Middleton reported (June 16, 1956) that the British are "aggravated over the results of the United States-West German policy discussions" and that "the references to the liberation of East Germany have an air of singular unreality." The British, Middleton reported, "would like to know who is going to do the liberating." British leaders, says the report, were not moved by Dr. Adenauer's "insistence that Germany's 1937 frontiers must be restored." Then, the Times correspondent summed up Britain's bitter reaction: "The conclusions reached by Britons is that the West Germans expect someone else to do the liberating just as they expect someone else to defend their frontiers. * * * Many Britons in positions of influence think the United States, if not Chancellor Adenauer, should realize that 'cold war' theories on German unity must be discarded. * * * The blessing given the West German dreams by Washington is what really worries the British. They see them as damaging diplomatic efforts to establish greater economic and later political influence in East Europe and as symbolyzing an outdated approach to the Soviet problem."

There is an irreconcilable difference in the diplomatic evaluation of international affairs between London and Paris on the one hand and Bonn on the other. The British and French statesmen have openly acknowledged far-reaching changes in Soviet foreign policies, whereas Dr. Adenauer and Secretary Dulles have shouted from the housetops in recent weeks that no fundamental changes have taken place. Adenauer maintains that Moscow's diplomatic maneuvers are only a device to lull the West into complacency. It is understandable that Dr. Adenauer has taken such a position, because his only hope lies in the continuation of the cold war until a situation arises where he himself can strike a bargain with Moscow at the expense of the other Western Powers.

DR. ADENAUER'S DIFFICULTIES

There is little doubt that the German Chancellor is on the spot. It is of paramount importance to Dr. Adenauer how the political situation will look in the election year of 1957. The public mood in West Germany has undergone a considerable change since his election triumph in 1953. Adenauer's coalition is crumbling and he faces a strong opposition even within his own party. Times correspondent M. S. Handler recently reported (June 10, 1956) that the Social Democratic leader Ollenhauer "has a good chance to become the next Chancellor."

The hopes of the German people in the "miracles" of Dr. Adenauer have vanished. There is a widespread apathy toward rearmament and an irrepressible desire to make up with the Soviets. The Germans have become more and more disillusioned with the Chancellor's policies and the press has taken a critical stand against Adenauer's attitude toward the cold war. Times correspondent Handler reported (June 17, 1956) that during Adenauer's visit in Washington, German newspapers "took a line that Mr. Dulles and Dr. Adenauer were alone in refusing to accept a relaxation of tensions."

In order to regain prestige, Dr. Adenauer must either show a substantial progress in his policy of European integration or he must strive to reach an agreement with Moscow and the East German Government on the issue of reunification. The outlook for better relations with Moscow is not very good at the moment. The Frankfurter Allgemeine (May 25, 1956) headlined a dispatch from Bonn "Icy Atmosphere Between Bonn-Moscow."

Under these circumstances Dr. Adenauer is desperately engaged in trying to give a new impetus to the cold war and thus to undo the easing of tension which has resulted in the improvement of Anglo-Soviet and Franco-Soviet relations. If the Chancellor succeeds in bringing the present efforts towards better East-West understanding to an abrupt halt, he will have scored a tremendous diplomatic feat. He would gain time for adroit diplomatic maneuvers in order to bring himself back into a promising bargaining position vis-a-vis Moscow. All he has to do is to intensify the cold war and create a situation in which Moscow would lose confidence in the usefulness of further diplomatic talks with London. Therefore, Adenauer's diplomatic strategy is directed to put—via Washington—pressure on London in order to prevent the British from "going it alone." It is for this reason that, according to the Christian Science Monitor (June 14, 1956), "the stern and venerable German Chancellor was out-Dullesing Mr. Dulles in his suspicion of Soviet intentions." The Chancellor has emphasized again and again that this was not the time for the West to negotiate with Moscow. The Chancellor's urgent demand was for a synchronized foreign policy of all NATO powers whereby he himself would become the leading policy shaper for the West. In that case he could show the Russians that "der Alte" is still the strong leader of the western coalition to whom they must turn if they wish to settle the cold war.

What if London and Paris failed to go along or if Washington dragged its feet? In such a case, says Time correspondent M. S. Handler, Bonn has given warning to the West that reunification must have absolute priority:

"It is the implied notice to the Western Powers not to downgrade reunification. It is an implied warning that if pushed to the wall the Germans have an out. They can negotiate with the Russians as well as any of the Western Powers. (New York Times, April 29, 1956.)

THE CHANCELLOR'S NIGHTMARE

The basic concept of the western cold war strategy was to create a world coalition of free nations, and isolate the Soviet bloc countries as much as possible economically and politically. The chief requirement in the diplomatic strategy was that none of the Western Powers should carry substantial trade with the eastern bloc nor negotiate directly with Moscow. This solid cold war coalition of the West has been broken apart. The British and French decided to negotiate with Moscow on their own.

The Anglo-Soviet talk in London and the Mollet-Pineau visit in Moscow had a rather irritating effect on West Germany. Contrary to American opinion, the German press admitted that the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit in London was highly successful. It is the German belief that the Soviet talks with Eden brought essentially an agreement of peaceful coexistence with the exclusion of the German question or, as the German press bitterly complains, a Soviet-British friendship at the expense of Western Germany.

In order to understand why Adenauer is pressing so hard to go back into all-out cold war, it is worthwhile to take a second good look at the Anglo-Soviet talks in London.

American newspapers and commentators have almost unanimously interpreted the Bulganin-Khrushchev visit as a futile diplomatic venture. The New York Times termed it "failure of a mission." The New York Herald Tribune spoke of "a fruitless journey" and stated that no commitment on any important issue was to be found among the diplomatic platitudes. Time magazine called the London talk one of the great flops in modern diplomacy, and William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, cabled from London that the Soviet leaders fell flat on their faces. In a roundup on the London talks, the New York Times of April 29 quoted an official Washington spokesman as saying: "The British handled this beautifully. The Russians made no hay."

The plain fact is that the British and Soviet leaders agreed to use common efforts in order to bring the 10-year-old postwar crisis to an end. The British and Soviet statesmen charted a diplomatic roadmap which, as Eden expressed it, might be the beginning of a beginning to end the cold war. Looking at their formula for peace, we find that the negotiating parties in London established themselves as a close partnership in the undertaking to prevent war and to secure worldwide stability.

The joint communique makes it quite clear that the negotiations were determined by one overriding desire: to secure peace and tranquillity even if it would move in sidetracking the German question and to develop an international climate in which different social and political systems can coexist in peaceful competition.

A large part of the joint communication deals with specific plans to improve Anglo-Soviet relations. The new spirit is reflected in the following statement: "The representatives of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom recognize that the strengthening of the Anglo-Soviet relations in political, trade, scientific, cultural, and other fields would be in the interests of the peoples of both countries. They were also convinced that this would help to consolidate general peace and security."

The Soviet offer of extensive long-term trade relations in the amount of $560 million annually is doubly valuable now in view of Britain's competitive difficulties in exports (New York Times, April 29, 1956). The British believe that much will develop from further negotiations and from Eden's planned visit to Moscow. There was great relief in London that the Soviet leaders are backing the British peace efforts in the Middle East. William Randolph Hearst reported from London that supporters of Prime Minister Eden were jubilant that B & K had bailed Great Britain out of its perilously exposed position in the Middle East. Russia's consent to abide by the U. N. decision was interpreted as a great diplomatic success. At the end of the visit Eden was reported as very optimistic. He stated in his radio address that the talks had ended in "an encouraging measure of agreements, greater than I expected when they began." In his farewell message to the Soviet leaders, Eden said: "I warmly reciprocate your wish that our friendship and work together will develop and further the common cause of peace and good relations throughout the world."

There is little doubt that Eden intended to have his very exact words well understood, not only in Britain but also in Bonn and in Washington. When the joint communique was published, the Germans immediately sensed the danger. They saw clearly that the London agreement had created an absolutely novel situation in the struggle between East and West.

The Anglo-Soviet agreement must be regarded as an important turning point in the cold war. The nightmare which Dr. Adenauer has suffered for many years has finally come true. For the first time the British have sidestepped the diplomatic stumbling block of the German question in their search for a new solution.

THE OLD SCHEME: A UNITED EUROPE

Chancellor Adenauer has tried to counter the Anglo-Soviet agreement. He and Mr. Dulles insist that NATO should be firmly anchored around a unified Europe. That means a new try with an idea that once has failed under the hard realities of deep-rooted European traditions.

A united Europe is an old pan-German dream which was widely propagated before World War I, revived during the Weimar Republic, preached as a gospel by the Nazis, and is now again advocated by the industrialists of Rhine and Ruhr. In 2 world wars, the Kaiser and Hitler tried to conquer Europe as "Lebensraum" for the master race, but failed. After the Second World War, Dr. Adenauer, an oldtime politician and spokesman for German industry, tried to realize Germany's shattered imperialistic dream by applying the art of diplomatic finesse. With the help of Mr. Dulles, Adenauer hoped to force France into a shotgun wedding with Germany. It was Mr. Dulles who proposed as early as 1947 a West European union around a strong German economy as the best solution for Europe. The clear objective was to reverse the military decision of World War II, the United States has invested billions of dollars in the efforts to realize Mr. Dulles' pet idea.

The German master planners came near their goal with the EDC (European Defense Community) which was finally killed by a vote in the French Assembly in 1954. Since then Chancellor Adenauer and his advisors have blueprinted a new plan and have devised a strategy for the long pull. The objective is the old scheme: a German dominated Europe as a third power bloc exploiting its balance of power position between the East and the West.

How far has Dr. Adenauer succeeded in his new drive for European unification? In recent years he has held successful negotiations with Greece and Turkey. In Austria there are some pan-German politicians willing to play the game along the line of the old Berlin-Bagdad project. The Chancellor has also negotiated with Italy and Spain, the two former Axis collaborators in the Arab and Africa scheme. The Africa project has the support of certain industrialists and Vichy collaborators in France. Above all, Dr. Adenauer has the all-out backing of Mr. Dulles for his pet project.

The evidence shows that Dr. Adenauer's long-range objective is still the old dream of a German dominated Europe, tackled from a new angle. Instead of infusing military strength into a dying NATO, the Chancellor with the support of Mr. Dulles, has embarked on the establishment of a gigantic economic and political combine under the pretext of European unity. This time it runs under the name of "Euratom" and "Euromarket," two projects for which Mr. Dulles is expected to raise billions of dollars under the heading of "foreign aid."

After long and secret planning, the new Europe plan was first publicly launched in the fall of 1955. On November 13, 1955, Dr. Adenauer conferred lengthily with Belgian Foreign Minister Paul-Henri Spaak, who is praised as a dynamic leader and a strong advocate of European union. Together with Jean Monnet, the leader of a European action committee, they have formed a group to push united Europe (New York Herald Tribune, October 14, 1955). New York Times correspondent Sulzberger reported (November 19, 1955) that the aim is to reinvigorate the European movement, that Dr. Adenaur has long sought to breathe life into the European dream and that he carries the blessings of Secretary Dulles. The Times dispatch adds that in the new European union Bonn would play a dominant role.

Here are a few recent statements from leading West German newspapers: The Frankfurter Allgemeine (May 15, 1956) quotes the Vice President of the European Union (a German propaganda outfit), Dr. W. Beutler, as saying that the common European trading area is an urgent necessity and the last chance for the unification of Europe.

Demonstrating the diplomacy of the carrot and the big stick, the Frankfurter Zeitung (May 26, 1956) declares, "the United States offers effective financial aid for the atomic energy development in Europe only if the various countries are willing to join in a common project."

The Hamburg weekly Die Zeit (June 7, 1956) says in an article, New Step Toward a United Europe, that the start will be made with a complete economic integration which consequently will bring about political unification as well as the incorporation of territories outside of Europe. This last statement refers to Africa which Dr. Adenauer and his geopolitical advisers have frequently termed "the hinterland of Europe." Dr. Paul Henri Spaak is described as the motor in a new great drive to influence public opinion and to win over leading organizations in Western Europe.

FACTS ON INTEGRATION

The often advanced argument for unification is that the small countries in Europe need larger markets and that Europe needs a strong integrated defense. Both arguments hold no water. The theory that small countries cannot exist as national entities has no basis in fact as was shown by a recent GATT survey published in the New York Times (June 11, 1956). It was disclosed in this report that the smaller countries, such as Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belguim, Luxembourg and Switzerland had a more satisfactory standard of living and were more vigorous trade competitors than the larger European countries. These small countries specialize in a few export products, they import from the cheapest sources and they all have low tariffs. Switzerland and Sweden, for instance, rather want to keep "their smallness and their freedom of action." The same would hold true with Belgium and Luxembourg.

The alleged necessity of an integrated European defense was from the beginning used as a pretext to push the scheme for a comeback of Germany. Dr. Adenauer's mouthpiece, the Rheinische Merkur (July 23, 1954) admitted bluntly that EDC was "only a means to serve the great end of unification." Evidence shows that even Dulles used the EDC only as a means to help in the estab-

lishment of a German-dominated Europe. An article in the well informed U. S. News & World Report (December 25, 1953) stated the following:

"There are signs that the United States will be willing to wait a while for a German Army if France and others will move faster to create a United States of Europe. * * * The United States has informed French leaders privately that it considers a political reconciliation of France and Germany more important to the defense of Europe through the coming years of tension with Russia than the rearming of German troops. French leaders have been told that the United States is prepared to accept a six-nation United States of Europe first and a European army later. * * * This means that the door now is wide open to the French and other Europeans to postpone German rearmament with the consent of the United States if they can speed creation of the political community."

The real purpose of the European scheme was revealed by Dr. Adenauer himself. On December 13, 1950, he stated in a speech: "Our chief reason for wanting to enter the European army is to be able to recover our eastern territories." On another speech at Essen in July 1951, the Chancellor declared: "The creation of a Europe which is politically and economically strong is the only path leading to the recovery of German's Eastern territories, which remains one of the essential goals of our activities."

The real reasons behind the present unification scheme are exactly the same as those once advanced by Hitler, General Haushofer, and the German industrialists. Dr. Adenauer even uses the same terms and concepts. In a recent speech before leading German industrialists in Frankfort, Dr. Adenauer declared: "The more we can increase our economic strength, the stronger, gentlemen, will be become in our foreign policy." The Chancellor furthermore emphasized the urgency of coordination in NATO, and in this connection he used the well-known Nazi term "Gleichschaltung." (Frankfurter Zeitung, May 30, 1956.)

In a recent article about the relationship of "foreign policy and economic power," Dr. W. Beutler explained in the Frankfurter Allgemeine (May 24, 1956): "A strong economic potential constitutes a high armament potential and this, in turn, gives increased military strength and a great influence in world power politics." Therefore, "World power today requires in the first place economic potential." To acquire this, Germany needs "a common European market and a common nuclear-based industrialization as precondition for a united Europe." Thus, the German aim is stated with brutal frankness: Military power, Machtopolitik, and Gleichschaltung of Europe. Did not the free world fight two wars to defeat this German objective?

GEOPOLITICS OF THE MIDDLE EAST

European unification is in German eyes only the necessary first step on the way to a larger goal. The continent of Europe is too small and could by far not satisfy German geopolitical aspirations. The German master planners have set their eyes on Africa and the whole oil-rich Middle East.

The German press is gloating over the difficulties which the French and British encounter in North Africa and the Middle East. There is ample evidence to show how German agents have played a key role during the postwar years in Egypt and other Arab countries and how they have contributed in preparing the present explosive situation.

Whole books could be filled with evidence testifying to Germany's long-range plans to bring Africa, the hinterland, under direct control of the big industrial combines of Rhine and Ruhr. Behind these aspirations are Dr. Adenauer's closest friends, the leaders of industry and finance, such as Dr. Fritz Berg, Dr. Pohle, Herman Abs, and Dr. Pferdmengest—the men who dream of Europe, Africa, and the Arab world as a potential market with more than 700 million people forming a third power bloc in the world. It was Dr. Adenauer himself who pointed out in the Rheinische Merkur (May 20, 1950) that the Schuman plan would be the beginning of a long-range economic venture in Africa which would realize the German dream.

The German scheme for the industrial exploitation of Africa is as old as the pan-German movement which started 70 years ago. Well remembered are the aspirations of the big Mannesmann concern in Morocco where it wanted to grab the rich iron-ore deposits and which nearly led to war both in 1905 and 1911. It was the Kaiser who then provoked the Western World with saber-rattling speeches and suggested that Germany should act as the protector of all Arabs. These aspirations came even sharper into focus when the Germans showed great interest in the oil regions around the Persian Gulf as soon as they were discovered. German imperialism was identified closely with the so-called Berlin-Baghdad project. Since then the Germans have consistently pursued the same line: the penetration of the Middle East.

Global political earthquakes do not erupt suddenly. They are prepared in long years of subtle plotting and subversion. This is especially true with the present condition in the Arab world. The whole Near and Middle East is loaded with political dynamite ready to blow into the faces of the French, the British, and the Americans. Only the Germans are regarded as the true friends of the Arabs. The reason for this strange relationship can be found in the history of more than 60 years of intimate German-Arab plotting against the Western Powers. Right after World War II some of the Arab countries, especially Egypt, became a haven for Nazis who had escaped the dragnet of the victorious allies. Most of them have had important positions in the Nazi hierarchy and they were welcomed in Egypt as elsewhere as advisors and experts. These German conspirators employed every trick of infiltration and propaganda, trade rivalries, and private contracts in order to stir hatred against the Anglo-Americans who were responsible for the creation of the State of Israel.

There is a long list of names of former Nazis who, sometimes in close contact with the Bonn Foreign Office, have played important roles in the anti-Western conspiracy. In the early postwar years, Hitler's daring SS Colonel Skorzeny laid the groundwork for new contacts between Germany and the Arabs. He and other Nazis collaborated with the notorious Grand Mufti of Jerusalem in spreading the propaganda against "the terror regimes of the French and British imperialists." Hundreds of German officers and diplomats who were hired in Egypt as key advisors and experts, have worked systematically to create difficulties for Britain in Suez and the Middle East. The news magazine Der Spiegel (October 26, 1955) told the story of Dr. Wilhelm Voss (under Hitler president of the Skoda works) who was the main figure in the armanent's deal between Czechoslovakia and Egypt. Dr. Voss is described as "head of the Central Planning Board in the War Ministry in Egypt" under whose command "were employed more than 50 German military and armament experts."

Among the geopolitical experts pushing the Africa and Middle East projects are such former Nazis as Dr. Klaus Mehnert, Anton Zischka, and Werner Otto von Hentig, the last one and old hand in Arab conspiracies who, 2 years ago, changed his diplomatic post from the Bonn Foreign Office to become top advisor of King Saud of Saudi Arabia.

Dr. Klaus Mehnert negotiated in 1952 with French industrialists for a combined French-German Africa project. His idea was that "the Germans assist with experts, the French furnish the territory and the Americans do the financing." (Der Spiegel, October 8, 1952.)

In the Middle East the Germans have won a decisive victory, even if the Western World sees only the Russians in the headlines. The Germans do not appear to be disturbed by the present Soviet drive in Egypt which they helped to precipitate. It all works toward the deterioration of the Western position in Egypt and secures that country as an operational base for the Germans. The Germans will continue to undermine the western position in the Arab world by a combination of skillfully directed intrigues, by Communist armament shipments and by a widespread propaganda on the Israeli issue. The Germans believe that the day is not far off when the French and the British will be pushed out for good. Countless articles in the West German press testify to the interests in the regions of Afrca and the Middle East. Behind this interest is solid German Realpolitik. Once the British are out, the American oil companies will also be forced to give up. This will be the day when the Germans move in as "the friends of the Arabs." With 60 percent of the world oil reserves in their control, with the Arabs as allies and with Africa as Hinterland, the German dream of a third power bloc will come true.

DISTRUST IN FRANCE AND BRITAIN

Dr. Adenauer's thesis that increased economic power gives added strength in world politics has been made painfully clear to France and Britain. Western Europe is alarmed by Germany's economic offensive. Take, for instance, the case of Germany's armament combine, the Krupp works: Once convicted as a war criminal, Mr. Krupp is back in business and has launched tremendous projects in India, Indonesia, Egypt, in South Africa, Brazil, Morocco, and many other places. Recently Krupp proposed a gigantic Asia-Africa plan for industrial development in which the United States will be allowed to participate with huge loans at low interest rates (New York Times, March 3, 1956). Add to this the tremendous expansion by other German firms and we have the picture of a worldwide trade offensive similar to that of the Soviets.

The fact that Dr. Adenauer and West Germany are treated as the darling in Washington has stirred bitter feelings among our principal allies. Leading French papers have repeatedly spoken of a "Bonn-Washington axis." They see with apprehension how German blackmail tactics have constantly paid off in Washington. When the second drive for European union was launched in November 1955, Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, president of the Pan-Europe movement, wrote an impudent letter to the New York Herald Tribune (November 13, 1955) which demanded either "a Franco-German union" and western support for the "revision of the Oder-Neisse border" or "Germany's temptation to decide against the West will be strong." With amazing bluntness, Coudenhove-Kalergi hinted that a Germany disappointed by the West "is bound to pay the Russian price for revision; to break with NATO, the Western European Union, and the West altogether, thus preparing for a future axis, Berlin-Moscow-Peking."

Ten years of cold war and the constant irritation by German threats have had a deep effect on the British and French peoples. They wonder what they have to expect from a reunified Germany of 70 millions. Insecurity in Europe will grow rapidly as soon as Germany is free to follow its time-proven pattern of geopolitical dynamics. France will be forced into a collaborating role similar to the Petain-Vichy regime, and England will feel the full threat of a revived Greater German Reich. It is this feeling of uneasiness that compels the French and the British to negotiate with Moscow by side-

stepping the German question. Why could Germany not remain divided if the smaller European states can exist comfortably? Two world wars were fought to make the world safe against future German aggression. Why, then, create conditions which inevitably must lead to another try for German world supremacy?

When Mr. Dulles insisted that Germany must be the No. 1 issue at Geneva, New York Times correspondent Drew Middleton reported (July 10, 1955) that "France believes that some deal over Germany can be made with the Soviet Union. * * * Neither the Government nor the people would weep if Germany were to remain divided."

From the second Geneva Conference the New York Times reported that diplomatic observers wonder why Germany should be reunified at all: "German unity of any kind does not wholly appeal either to the French, who still fear a strong Germany, or to the British, who already feel that effects of German competition in world markets and would feel it far more if Germany were united." (New York Times, November 3, 1955.)

De Gaulle and the neutralist Le Monde have pointed out for years that the security of an independent France can only be obtained through a firm Franco-Soviet defense pact. The fear that the French and the British might seek a settlement at German expense has disturbed the Adenauer press. The weekly Die Zeit (March 12, 1956) declares that "wide circles in the West, especially in France, have long come to the conclusion that the partition of Germany is not a threat to the peace of the world but to the contrary, a stabilizing factor to guarantee the status quo."

The specter of German reunification also spreads fear in Eastern Europe and Austria. In the April 1956 issue of Die Oesterreichische Nation, Dr. Karl Winter discusses the impact a reunited Reich will have on Austria's neutrality: "At the moment the existence of two Germanies paralyzes the tendencies of German expansion. A reunited Reich, however, stretching from the Rhine to the Vistula River, would become even without an imperialistic program, a menace of greatest magnitude to Austrian independence and also a threat to the other nations in the Danube Basin. * * * Therefore, the division of Germany, not its reunification, must be regarded as a real blessing to central Europe. Austria has no interest at all to see the two Germanies united. If, however, reunification becomes a reality, then Austria, in order to protect her neutrality, would be compelled to take precautionary measures in cooperation with her neighbors along the Danube."

In Britain the feeling also prevails that a reunited Reich might upset European stability. At the end of the Anglo-Soviet talks in London, the conservative Daily Express wrote in an editorial: "The Russians, it seems, maintain their attitude that Germany should remain divided. They would prefer her to stay disarmed as well. * * * The Russians may believe that, in time, British opinion will come to accept the position and even rejoice in it. The Daily Express rejoices in it now. For us this is no disappointment."

Here in the United States a few voices, such as Walter Lippmann and James Warburg, have warned for a long time that Washington's cold-war policy will fail. The Europeans will not buy unification in a package of camouflaged Gleichschaltung. If, as the British say, the German problem cannot be solved, neither by diplomatic negotiations nor by war, then the only commonsense solution is the recognition of the status quo. Such a solution would be in the best interest of all European peoples.

Alaska Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the application of Federal income taxes to individuals living in Alaska and to businesses operating there has been a matter of increasing concern as the cost of living has gone up and as the cost of doing business has gone up. Attention has been even more closely focused on this subject since there has been a determination that the cost-of-living allowance paid to Federal employees there—and elsewhere outside the continental limits of the United States—is not subject to income taxes. Comparisons are made between Alaska and Hawaii, where all Federal taxes and all other Federal laws apply, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, to which the United States Federal income tax has never been extended. It has been urged by some that Federal taxes should be abolished insofar as Alaska is concerned. Others have argued that there ought to be treatment for non-Federal workers—and businesses—comparable to that accorded Federal employees. Still others, including Gov. B. Frank Heintzleman, have advocated a Federal tax holiday. To the best of my knowledge, it has never been exactly spelled out how this would operate.

It is understood, of course, that Alaskans are not alone in having to hand over to the tax collector so much of the income they derive from wages or salaries, or profits they make from business. Everyone in the 48 States and in our sister Territory of Hawaii is required to pay to the Federal Government much, much more than before World War II. The difference is one of degree. That is to say, the Alaska wage earner is required to earn much more than he would in the States for living based upon minimum standards; yet to attain this living he is projected into an income-tax bracket the effect of which is to take from him much more than would be the case if he were living in an area of lower cost.

I am writing this report to give my fellow Alaskans the benefit of the knowledge I have been able to acquire on the subject. It is one which may be made to lend itself, and very easily, to an emotional approach. This is an election year. In the heat of a campaign it is easy enough for a candidate to promise the voters that if he is elected he will do away with taxes and provide at the same time more services; it is just as easy to promise the moon and the stars. It has not been my habit to make empty promises, and I do not intend to start now. I only intend to report.

It has been said in Alaska that there should not be taxation without representation. I believe there should not be. There should not be taxation without representation anywhere under the American flag. It is contrary to the very concepts upon which this Government was founded. Too long continued, it becomes not only offensive but in my opinion downright immoral. But here again I must warn myself that emotionalism must not be substituted for the factual. It was over 6 years ago that I requested from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress an opinion on the constitutionality of Federal taxes as applied to Alaska. That opinion, written in the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service, had this to say upon the proposition of taxation without representation:

> The further contention that lack of representation invalidates a tax was laid at rest in *Heald* v. *District of Columbia* ((1922) 259 U. S. 114), when the Supreme Court stated:
>
> "Finally it is earnestly contended that the act is void, because it subjects the residents of the District to taxation without representation. Residents of the District lack the suffrage and have politically no voice in the expenditure of the money raised by taxation. Money so raised is paid into the Treasury of the United States, where it is held, not as a separate fund for the District, but subject to the disposal of Congress, like other revenues raised by Federal taxation. The objection that the tax is void because of these facts is fundamental and comprehensive. It is not limited in application to the tax on intangibles, but goes to the validity of all taxation of residents of the District. If sound, it would seem to apply not only to taxes levied upon residents of the District for the support of the government of the District; but also to those taxes which are levied upon them for the support generally of the Government of the United States. It is sufficient to say that the objection is not sound. There is no constitutional provision which so limits the power of Congress that taxes can be imposed only upon those who have political representation."

Mr. Speaker, it was in the spring of 1954 that the late Delegate Joseph R. Farrington, of Hawaii, and I joined in a proposal made to the Treasury Department that the same treatment given Federal employees in respect to cost-of-living allowances be granted to those in private employment in Hawaii and Alaska. Hon. M. B. Folsom, then Under Secretary of the Treasury and now Secretary of the Department of Health, Welfare, and Education, rejected our proposal on behalf of the Treasury Department.

In the autumn of 1954 Mayor Cyril A. Coyne, of Skagway, Alaska, came to Washington to renew the effort to convince Treasury officials that they should support tax exemption for Alaska. This was after the Central Labor Council of Skagway had decided to seek action. Mayor Coyne, a group of interested men in Washington, D. C., and I met with Under Secretary Folsom and one of his principal advisers. Early in 1955 the Treasury Department, through Mr. Folsom, again declined to take affirmative action. In writing Mayor Coyne, the Treasury Under Secretary said:

I appreciate the point which your group raised with reference to your higher cost of living but there are, of course, also great differences in the cost of living within the 48 States. A differential tax treatment based on cost of living would appear to open the way to really immense complications and new and different sorts of discriminations between different sections and regions.

In writing to me on the same subject, Under Secretary Folsom said in part:

The tax exemption of certain Government cost-of-living allowances does perhaps create an awkward precedent and I can understand your feeling and that of Mayor Coyne and his associates. However, I believe that the tax exemption of the Government allowances was adopted as an alternative to higher gross allowances. For most people it seems likely that pay scales over the years have come to reflect the living cost. Special tax exemptions under such circumstances would thus not seem to be called for.

In the fall of 1955 Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, in a speech made in Portland, Oreg., proposed that Alaska be given a 20-year moratorium on Federal income taxation. Later it was reported from Washington that this idea had not been cleared with the Eisenhower administration.

Indeed, then Secretary of the Interior, Douglas McKay, dismissed the Governor's proposal with the comment:

I think that was just Frank's idea.

The Secretary was reported to have also definitely stated the suggestion had not even been discussed with him, much less cleared with the Eisenhower administration. The newspaper article to which I refer added:

McKay went on to indicate that while it might be a fine thing for Alaska, a tax moratorium for Alaska has about as much chance of passing by Congress as a bill to replace the stars and stripes on the American flag with the hammer and sickle.

In a special dispatch to the Anchorage Daily News Washington Correspondent David Fernsler reported:

Involved also in doubts over the Heintzleman proposal is the well-recognized fact that one Congress cannot bind another. Legislation by this Congress to grant a tax holiday would not be binding upon the next Congress. Any succeeding Congress could change the order of things.

In the case of Alaska where investments in business would be sought, this would be most important. Investors might hesitate to embark on a long-range program without more binding assurance than this that they would escape United States taxes.

For my part, Mr. Speaker, I called attention to all this in a letter written to Acting Secretary of the Interior Davis on May 17 of this year, and stated in part:

It would be most helpful to me if I could learn from you first if Governor Heintzleman has ever taken up with the Department of the Interior this proposal for a Federal tax incentive or holiday relating to Alaska. If he has, can you inform me if the Department proposes to seek legislative action in harmony with Governor Heintzleman's suggestion? Likewise, I should be most appreciative if you will let me know if generally the Department of the Interior is sympathetic with Governor Heintzleman's plan to take industry to Alaska by decreasing or abolishing the Federal taxes and if the Department believes that such a proposition is sound legally in view of the fact that Alaska is an incorporated Territory.

The reply, dated June 11, came to me from Assistant Secretary of the Interior D'Ewart, which said in part:

Governor Heintzleman on several occasions has discussed with officials of the Department his views with respect to encouraging the industrial development of the Territory. We are in complete and whole-hearted agreement with the Governor that mining and other industries in Alaska should be expanded. However, we have requested Governor Heintzleman to submit to us a more detailed and specific proposal embodying his views on the subject so that this Department may give it formal consideration. For this reason we have not looked into the legal aspects of the matter. Without question incentives of the type apparently contemplated by the Governor could be put into effect only as a result of congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, even then I did not stop. My next letter was addressed to Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey on June 22 in which I reviewed the history of the subject and then said:

There are wide differences, of course, between living costs in New York City or Washington, D. C., for example, and a small town in Mississippi. Nevertheless, this argument fails to satisfy. The "wide difference" to which Mr. Folsom alluded is not sufficient to require the Federal Government to grant a cost-of-living allowance to the Federal employees in Washington, D. C., or New York City. Yet the Federal Government must grant the allowance in Alaska not only as a matter of simple justice but to keep personnel there. An accurate cost-of-living survey has not been made for several years but since the cost of living has not decreased notably anywhere, the latest available figures will not, I am confident, be too far out of line. When the last survey was conducted the cost of living in Anchorage, Alaska, was something on the order of 41 percent more than in Washington, D. C., and in Fairbanks, Alaska, it was something like 48 percent more. That is the essential factor, I suggest, which ought to permit the Treasury Department to give sympathetic consideration to a tax adjustment for Alaska without being accused of favoring one section of the country.

Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, has proposed repeatedly in public statements and in speeches that tax exemptions (whether total or partial is not clear) be allowed by the Federal Government for a period of 20 years. This, he has stated, would, more than anything else, attract capital to Alaska and permit constructive development of the Territory's wealth of natural resources. I must assume that in some measure or other Governor Heintzleman speaks for the administration in this, since as the chief executive official of the Territory and an appointee of the President he is the administration's spokesman in matters relating to Alaska.

After receiving Mr. Folsom's letter I judged it would be a mere gesture and a fruitless effort if I were to introduce legislation in the Congress bearing on this subject. And it is not my intention to do so at this time. Rather, it occurred to me that it would be far preferable to write this letter to you explaining the situation and the need in the hope that instead of receiving the formal views of the Treasury Department by way of report on any bill which might be introduced, I might have a prior expression from you. Therefore, I respectfully request that Federal taxation policies, as they relate to the welfare of individual Alaskans and the development of that great Territory, be carefully examined with a view to determining if we could not jointly correct that which certainly has the surface appearance of being discriminatory and of being hurtful to the best interests of the United States in that it hinders growth of business and industry and employment of labor.

Secretary Humphrey was kind in replying to me without delay. But he held out no hope for tax relief in his letter of July 3 when he said:

I regret that I cannot give you any encouragement for Treasury Department support for such legislation. Under Secretary Folsom's letter of February 3 to you indicated the problem which the Treasury has in dealing with the numerous requests for special tax treatment and allowances for different purposes. You recognize in your letter that substantial differences in the cost-of-living also exist within the 48 States. The fact that certain cost-of-living allowances to Federal employees were made nontaxable by the Congress was presumably an alternative to a higher direct adjustment in pay. As Mr. Folsom pointed out, the practice regarding Federal compensation cannot be presumed to reflect a general practice, since in most cases it seems likely that regular compensation will have come to reflect the living cost. A general increase in exemptions or a cost-of-living deduction would give a special tax benefit even to those whose compensation has already been adjusted to reflect any cost-of-living differences on the normal taxable basis.

Not yet persuaded, Mr. Speaker, I wrote Secretary Humphrey once more, elaborating on the point previously made and making specific reference to the possibility of a tax holiday for business, to which the Treasury Secretary replied on July 12:

I am afraid that I would have about the same reaction to a proposal for a tax holiday for business income in Alaska. There are so many proposals for special relief of one sort and another. They would all add up to a really tremendous revenue loss that would prevent any reduction in general tax rates for many years to come. It is so important for the whole country to get all the rates down as soon as we can that I could not agree to starting on a series of special exemptions that would prevent general tax relief.

I do appreciate very much the spirit in which you have written me and I wish that I might be more encouraging to you. I have had to disagree with so many other similar suggestions for other good purposes that I do not see how I could make an exception in the special situation which you describe in Alaska, important though it is.

Next I thought it would be appropriate to consult with our esteemed colleague, Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas. I took this matter up with Mr. MILLS because he had recently been appointed chairman of the Ways and Means Subcommittee to study income-tax matters. In a letter which he wrote me Mr. MILLS held out no more hope for special consideration for Alaska than had Secretary Humphrey. I present his letter here:

I have read your letters to the Honorable George M. Humphrey of June 22 and July 6, 1956, with considerable interest. As an attorney, I must confess that I am somewhat startled by your suggestions that some tax preference should be provided for resident individuals and businesses of the Territory of Alaska.

As I recall, the organic act governing Alaska provides that the Constitution of the United States and all of the laws thereof shall have the same force and effect within the Territory of Alaska as elsewhere in the United States. In other words, it would appear that the uniformity clause of the Constitution requires that all Federal tax laws

apply uniformly to Alaska, just as to any other part of the United States.

In saying this, I am not unaware of the doubts expressed by some as to whether the Federal income tax qualifies as a duty, impost or excise within the meaning of the uniformity clause. However, I remember the case of *Stratton's Independence* v. *Howbert* held a Federal corporate income tax to be an excise tax, measured by income, on the privilege of doing business as a corporation.

It has also been argued that Congress' power to enact legislation governing the Territories is derived from article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution, and that this power is independent of the prohibition contained in the uniformity clause. This question has never been decided by the courts. However, I am inclined to think that if and when it arises, the courts will decide that the mandate of the uniformity clause must prevail.

Aside from the constitutional doubts that I have about your suggestion that Alaska be accorded some tax preference, I am also concerned about the economic basis and justification for such a preference. Both of us are aware that the cost of living is not uniform throughout the United States. Granting a tax preference for Alaska would set a precedent which would compel like treatment for other high-cost areas within the United States and eventually lead to unbearable complexity in the Internal Revenue Code.

In closing, let me suggest that it is possible that a tax preference for resident individuals or businesses of Alaska could do irreparable harm to the Territory's chances of becoming a State of the Union. Severe though the economic problems of the Territory may be, nevertheless, I do not believe that the answer to them lies in a tax holiday for the Territory.

I then talked with the ranking minority member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED. Mr. REED told me, "I can readily appreciate the reasons you have set forth with regard to the application of a lower Federal income tax in Alaska. On the other hand, I should think that Alaskans generally would wish to avoid being treated differently from the residents of the States. Moreover, I believe that you will agree that practically all of the reasons for a differential tax treatment with regard to Alaska also apply, although perhaps with lesser force, in many of the States. The difference is really largely one of degree. I really think that adoption of such a plan might start us along a very dangerous road."

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that administration support for the elimination or reduction of Federal income taxes in Alaska cannot be expected. Secretary Humphrey has made that clear. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic member of the House Ways and Means Committee, junior in service only to Chairman COOPER, has indicated the substantial doubt of relief which he entertained. Mr. Speaker, the esteemed ranking minority member, Mr. REED, has not been persuaded that Alaskans should enjoy a special tax treatment.

In the face of all this, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to delude or betray my fellow Alaskans by telling them that tax relief can be arranged simply and without too much effort. All the evidence—and it is massive—points to the contrary. Constitutional considerations, a seeming fear that special benefits for Alaskans might create a chain reaction, and considerations of practical application—these are the high barriers to tax relief in the Territory.

Government Must Be Limited to Its Legitimate Constitutional Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by Mr. Willis Stone delivered before the Congress of Freedom at Dallas, Tex., last April 7.

This speech contained figures which may seem incredible. But a check has been made and I find that included in the principal statistical sources drawn upon for facts were such authentic publications as our own United States Government Manual, the Federal budgets for recent years, the audit reports of the Comptroller General on Government-owned corporations, the annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the reports and task force reports of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the statistical abstracts of the United States, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Stone has developed the thesis that the misuse of the taxing power is making us captives of the Federal bureaucracy. I cannot resist, therefore, supporting Mr. Stone's thesis by again pointing out the legitimate functions of Government to which its activities should be limited. Moral wrongs, whether by Government or by individuals, cannot long be tolerated.

We do have legitimate areas laid down in the Constitution within which Government can function. All others are illegitimate. These illegitimate functions I hate as much as anyone.

There is just one legitimate area, and only one, where the Central Government is honorable and, indeed, admirable, and, on the whole, honest. That area has to do with the defense of the people's rights and property, the maintenance of law and order, and the sacrifice having to do with national defense.

These are legitimate functions of Government not merely because the Constitution or the contract with Government says so. They are proper functions because the moral and natural law made them so, long before the Constitution. They are in the nature of things. The individual has the same rights and powers with the same limitations imposed on him by the moral and natural law. He can use force to defend himself and his property. And that is the only time he can use force on another person without his consent. He can transfer that right and power to Government as his agent. And since all rights and powers come from the Creator to the individual, he can convey no different or higher right or power to Government than he himself possesses.

Even if people should vote by a majority to give more power to Government than they themselves possess as individuals, the transfer would be no good. When Satan offered to Jesus, in the hour of His greatest temptation, the powers and privileges of the kingdoms of the world, Jesus rejected them utterly. Satan had no such power as he pretended to have to transfer to Jesus. He had simply assumed to have an immoral and illegal power over the people which he had no right to convey.

When the Government goes beyond that restricted area which is the only natural and moral area possible for Government to occupy, then without exception it becomes dishonorable, full of misrepresentation and corruption. It exploits the people to do special favors for special groups in return for their votes. It pretends to be able to manage people and their property better than they can manage for themselves. It attempts to play God in the lives of the people.

GOVERNMENT IS MORALLY WRONG

It is beginning to dawn upon us that using the force of Government to take other people's property to do good according to Government's notion of what is good is all dead wrong. The fact that the whole world is morally wrong by taking people's private property and making it Government-owned emphasizes the extent of the world collapse of morals. And, of course, what is morally wrong is contrary to the laws of God. The world violates them with contempt. When Government violates the laws of God by doing what no individual can morally do, then it is just as guilty of wrong as the individual would be guilty. What we have been doing has always been regarded economically wrong. It is indeed both economically and morally wrong.

For example, a lot of our old neighbors, some of our children, fell in love with the mountains and deserts of the great West. They knew before they went West that there was no water in the deserts. They went anyway. They never dreamed of tapping every eastern family $25 for every billion dollars needed for water. Yet when they organized themselves into political groups they said to their Congressmen, "You go back there and take $25 on the average from every family in the East, or we will not reelect you to Congress." So, the Congressmen have done very well. They have already collected about $150 from each family, or about $6 billion altogether for that purpose.

ANOTHER MORAL WRONG

As another example of the immoral and ridiculous, take a look at TVA in Tennessee. That was our first planting of a Socialist rose in a patch of weeds, otherwise called the free economy. All competition was killed off for its benefit. The rose has had to be artificially fed ever since 1922. And the feeding has cost us in recent years $190 million per year, a total of over $2 billion. That is another $50 per family Government has outrageously presumed to have the power to take from us. It sells power below cost so that 110,000 families heat their houses with electricity at your expense. TVA never can earn a surplus at such

rates to build new facilities for a growing population. And Government can never raise the rates and keep the votes of the people. There will always be a shortage of power so long as TVA has to depend on Congress for its life. Industry will not move into Tennessee because they cannot depend on Congress to continue to carry such a weakling. Congress cannot depend on itself either in that regard. TVA does not pay a dime toward the national defense—it is exempt from all taxes. It has been a blight on the State of Tennessee. It has constantly fallen behind all the other 11 southeastern private power-producing States in agricultural products, in manufacturing, in retail sales, in growth of new business, in postal receipts. All this is in accordance to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States survey in 1953.

On all of our Socialist projects above described, the Government spends $10 billion annually, and loses most of it. That is $250 annually per famiy. And it is growing much worse. There is no restraint or reversal of the trend in sight.

WHO CAN STOP ALL THIS?—THE PRESIDENT CAN'T

Clearly the President cannot stop it. When he runs for reelection this fall, he will be met by a committee at nearly every State line asking, one after the other, "How much, Mr. President, will you take from others to give to us for more power this year?"

CONGRESS CAN'T STOP IT

Congress certainly cannot stop it. Congress has tried and failed.

THE REMEDY IS CONSTITUTIONAL, NOT LEGISLATIVE

We are now in somewhat the same position as that of our ancestors just prior to 1789. We, the people, must, as they did then, reassert and redefine, so that even the Supreme Court cannot misinterpret, the constitutional limitations on the functions of government. The taxing and spending powers of Congress must be limited again. We must first of all correct the dreadful mistake made in 1913, called the 16th amendment, which gave unlimited power to Congress to tax and spend. We must chain the politicians, as Jefferson said, to the limitations of the Constitution so they cannot break away from them.

We should make of ourselves a true example of freedom again in the world. It does not exist today. Thus we might hope to repeat the contribution which we made in the past against the police states of the world. Thus we could hope to reestablish peace at home and in the world.

Mrs. Wojcik, of Wilkes-Barre, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader Evening News on Thursday, July 26, 1956, which pays tribute to Mrs. Sophie Wojcik, of Wilkes-Barre, for the outstanding work which she has performed in the community through her activities in the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance:

In paying tribute to Mrs. Sophie Wojcik, of Wilkes-Barre, group 2,800 of the Polish National Alliance singled out a woman who has contributed a great deal to country and community through her activities in the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, both of which, incidentally, are headed by Attorney Charles Rozmarek, of Chicago, formerly of Wilkes-Barre. The Polish American Congress is the voice of 6 million Americans of Polish extraction and the Polish National Alliance is the largest of the Polish fraternal bodies.

Mrs. Wojcik recently was elected a director of the Polish American Congress, an unusual distinction. For more than a decade, she has played a leading role in the organization, locally and nationally, so it was not at all surprising to those familiar with her career when she was honored at the quadrennial convention in Philadelphia.

Mrs. Wojcik's impressive record of achievement with the Polish National Alliance was recognized a year ago when she received its highest award—the gold medal for distinguished service.

Among Americans of Polish extraction, who approximate a fifth of Luzerne County's population, Mrs. Wojcik's name is a household word. Whenever an important gathering is to be held or there is a worthy cause to support, she will be found on the scene, ready to lend a helping hand or to furnish leadership, should that be needed.

In every organization and movement, there are a few individuals whose zeal, industry, and ability are essential to success, Mrs. Wojcik occupies such a position among her countrymen through whose veins flows Polish blood. In a world beset with so many perils because of the excesses of evildoers, it is both reassuring and refreshing to know there are idealists like Mrs. Wojcik, laboring unselfishly for humanity by promoting freedom, neighborliness, good will, and the better things of life.

Foreign Aid Policies Have Invited Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for much too long the United States has been made the victim of international blackmail as a result of our lavish foreign aid program. This fact is emphasized in the following editorial from the Waterloo (Iowa) Daily Courier:

Why did Egypt seize the Suez Canal, a privately owned facility controlled by an international group of stockholders?

Was it done because the United States and Britain were threatening the security and sovereignty of Egypt?

Was it done because western nations were discriminating against Egyptian trade?

Was it done because legitimate Egyptian aspirations were being thwarted?

No. None of these factors caused the seizure.

The canal was seized in a vindictive reprisal for the refusal of the United States and Britain to provide funds for the construction of a $1,400,000,000 dam on the upper Nile River.

In other words, the seizure is plain, unvarnished blackmail. "Unless you give us money," Egypt is saying, "we will seize any of your assets that are within our grasp."

The affair demonstrates the appalling fallacies of the American foreign aid program since the end of World War II. Much of that aid has been based on the assumption that the friendship of people and nations can be purchased. That policy has led us straight to the pits of futility and rancor in Egypt. It is hardly possible to doubt that Egypt would be more friendly toward us today if not a dime of aid had been given. The millions so far spent have only created a voracious appetite for more.

American military and economic aid to those with an unwavering record of opposition to communism is fully justified. The demonstrated stupidity of aid to countries like India, Yugoslavia, and Egypt should not cause American opinion to react against the whole foreign aid program.

But the policy of giving aid as bait to draw the so-called uncommitted nations to our side has only given them the opportunity for blackmail which Egypt is now exploiting. They take the aid and then announce that they are still uncommitted and will go the other way unless more aid is forthcoming. Not being committed to an anti-Communist position, they are free to threaten reprisals unless ever increasing financial assistance is granted. The naive "do-gooders" in the American State Department failed to comprehend the utter cynicism of leaders in the uncommitted nations.

American aid should only be granted after a nation is morally and politically committed to an anti-Communist stand. It should never be granted in the hope of enticing an uncommitted nation into taking such a stand. The Egyptian experience has established the validity of numerous warnings which have been voiced in the United States for years.

Skin Off Your Nose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention an editorial that appeared on July 21 in the Zanesville (Ohio) Times Recorder. The inequitable situation that is described in this editorial can be corrected, both competitively and to the financial advantage of the Treasury, by the adoption of a bill like my H. R. 43, which has been before the 84th Congress and will be presented to the 85th Congress. And may I add that it is time—and past time—that the matter is taken care of.

SKIN OFF YOUR NOSE

A cooperative is a perversion of business that benefits a few at the cost of all. The original idea of a group of customers banding together to finance a business from which they could purchase at bargain price seems innocent enough. It's rather like taking in each other's washing, but at least it seems perfectly clean. And the co-op, as originally devised in Europe and before income taxes, was probably quite moral.

But as an example of how today's co-ops work in the United States, let us consider the flourishing credit unions. These are cooperative savings and lending institutions organization among employees of a company, an industry, or the Government, a residental or associational group. Funds are raised by selling shares to members, and these funds, together with subsidies furnished by private business organization, are loaned to borrowers. Since the Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934, they have grown from 2,450 to 16,001, and their assets from $40 million to nearly $3 billion.

In the past 10 years their number has doubled, and their assets multiplied seven times. And at the expense of all the rest of us. For some mysterious reason they pay no Federal or State incomes taxes whatever, and are also exempt from other forms of business taxation. Further, they are usually subsidized by firms whose employees are members, and receive free rent, light, heat—often free management and clerical help, free advertising, and free check-off of savings and loan payments from payrolls.

A recent study of the National Tax Equality Association showed the credit unions enjoyed a tax subsidy of nearly 5 percent on outstanding loans. To get some idea of the tax burden this one type of cooperative is shoving off on the rest of us, you might apply that figure to their 1955 loans—$1,907,153,999. On our abacus, this is about $95 million Uncle has to tag someone else for.

Guess who?

The Future of the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call to the attention of the House an editorial published by the New York Times on July 23 of this year. The editorial follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE FARM

Less and less has been heard in recent weeks concerning the farm problem around which such a noisy controversy had been swirling for about a year. One reason for this, of course, is that Congress and the administration finally reached agreement on a compromise bill in May; another is that the trend of farm prices has been upward since the beginning of 1955.

Quite apart from the figures that show an improving trend in the farm situation are statistics, appearing from time to time, that sharply challenge the more extreme statements that the professional friends of the farmers have a habit of making about the latter's adversities. Figures released by the Department of Agriculture showing the trend of farm real-estate values provide a typical case in point. Between March 1, 1955, and March 1, 1956, farm real-state values rose from $98.5 billion to $102.4 billion.

This is no trick statistic. It doesn't reflect a sudden sporadic movement of prices. As a matter of fact, on the basis of the most recent calendar year figures farmland values have been moving up for something over 2 years. Between the end of 1953 and March 1, 1956, they have risen from $89.1 billion to $102.4 billion, which is $13.3 billion, or nearly 15 percent.

When farmland values rise steadily for more than 2 years, not only without benefit of inflation but in a period in which farm prices and income are declining it would seem to suggest that, however black the farm politician paints the future of American farming, there is one person, at least, who isn't selling that future short. And he is a pretty important and pretty intelligent man where farm matters are concerned. He is the farmer himself.

Results of Harden Poll Show Wide Interest in Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of the House to the results of my 1956 legislative questionnaires.

During the months of February through May I conducted a series of four opinion polls among residents of the Sixth Indiana District on legislative issues before the Congress. I have made it a practice to take such polls ever since coming to Congress in 1949, but this year's effort was the most extensive, since it involved four individual polls mailed out at 1-month intervals.

Needless to say, I find surveys of this type interesting, informative, and helpful to me in my efforts to represent the 300,000 residents of the Sixth Indiana District. While poll taking cannot substitute for personal contact, it is impossible while Congress is in session for Members of this body representing districts hundreds of miles away from Washington to maintain sufficient personal contact with residents of their districts. Thus the poll helps to bridge the gap by keeping me in touch with the thinking of my constituents on the important legislative problems which we face here in Washington.

Approximately 50,000 ballots were mailed over a 4-month period to persons listed in the telephone directories of most of the communities in the 10 counties which make up the Sixth Indiana District. Slightly more than 8,000 ballots were returned, for a percentage of roughly 16 percent. I am grateful for this response, which I am told is considered exceptionally good for surveys of this type. It indicates that the people of west-central Indiana are interested in legislative affairs, and the results, I am sure you will agree, indicate a broad understanding by the poll participants of these affairs.

Some of the questions were used in more than one poll, but new issues were raised each month so that most of the major matters before the Congress were covered during the 4 months of polling. Here is a summary of the results; with combined totals being used on questions asked on more than one occasion:

AGRICULTURE

Five agricultural questions were asked:

First. Greater aid to agriculture to help farmers gain a larger share of the national prosperity? Yes, 1,728; no, 993; not voting, 157. Congress approved new soil-bank plan and President Eisenhower announced higher price-support levels.

Second. Sale of United States surplus farm goods to unfriendly Communist nations? Yes, 1,554; no, 1,969; not voting, 179. No action by Congress.

Third. Food-stamp plan, utilizing surplus farm goods to feed needy people? Yes, 1,851; no, 360; not voting, 91. No action by Congress.

Fourth. Large-scale research program aimed at finding new industrial uses for farm product? Yes, 1,757; no, 420; not voting, 125. My bill, H. R. 10123, would establish such a program. Hearings have been held but no final action taken.

Fifth. Soil-bank plan urged by President Eisenhower. Yes, 952; No. 364; not voting, 84. Congress approved soil bank.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

This question was asked twice. The combined vote was 1,920 for, and 2,220 against, with 156 expressing no opinion. The House defeated a school-construction bill.

TAXES—BUDGET

Four questions were used, one on each of the polls. Voters were asked whether they agreed with President Eisenhower that Federal income taxes should not be reduced until the budget could be balanced and a reduction made on the national debt. Here are the month-by-month results:

February: Agree, 2,599; do not agree, 220; not voting, 59.

March: Agree, 1,252; do not agree, 166; not voting, 18.

April: Agree, 1,798; do not agree, 413; not voting, 86.

May: Agree, 1,064; do not agree, 280; not voting, 56.

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey announced in mid-July that the Federal budget has been balanced and that the Government wound up its fiscal year July 1 with a surplus of $1¾ billion. Congress did not approve a tax cut, so the budget surplus has been applied to reduction of the national debt.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Voters in the February and March polls approved the new highway construction program by a combined vote of 3,113 to 1,095, with 106 not answering the question. Congress passed the highway bill and it was signed into law by the President.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

Two questions assessing confidence of sixth district voters in President Eisenhower were asked.

February: Do you, in general, approve of the 3-year record of the Eisenhower administration? Yes, 2,475; no, 269; not voting, 134.

March, April: Do you, in general, approve of President Eisenhower's direction of United States foreign policy? Question asked twice. Yes, 2,983; no, 454; not voting, 265.

VETERANS' PENSION

Because of widespread interest in bills granting a pension to World War I veterans, the following question was asked in the February poll: "Should Congress approve a $100-a-month pension to

World War I veterans at age 65?" (a) Regardless of need, 553; (b) only on proof of need, 1,570; (c) opposed to either, 684; not answering, 71. The House passed a bill which would grant pensions to World War I veterans at age 65 on an income limitation basis. The bill did not come to a vote in the Senate.

POSTAGE RATES

Voters showed consistent support of the administration bill to increase postage rates as a means of easing the annual deficit in United States postal operations. Here are the combined answers from the March, April, and May polls:

Question: The Postmaster General thinks postage rates should be increased to meet the $500 million annual deficit incurred in handling the mail. Opponents maintain these losses should be made up from general tax revenues and that rates should not be increased. Do you favor a rate increase? Yes, 3,197; no, 1,754; not voting, 187. The House passed a postage rate increase bill but it was not taken up by the Senate, so failed of enactment.

FOREIGN AID

One of the most controversial issues before the Congress, the foreign-aid questions proved controversial among residents of the Sixth Indiana District. Here are the three questions used in my polls, along with the answers:

March poll: The President has asked Congress to appropriate more than $4 billion for foreign military and economic aid this year. Should Congress (a) approve the amount requested? 438; (b) reduce the amount? 565; (c) discontinue all foreign aid? 390; not answering question, 43.

April poll: Should Congress reduce the amount of our foreign economic and military aid spending this year? Yes, 1,158; no, 879; not voting, 109.

May poll: Should Congress reduce the amount of our foreign economic and military aid spending this year? Yes, 658; no, 630; not voting, 112.

Summary: The preponderance of opinion in the three polls seemed to be favorable to a moderate decrease in foreign aid spending. Congress, after spending many months arriving at a decision, finally came to the same conclusion by reducing the President's requests approximately $1 billion.

ARABS-ISRAELI

The Eisenhower administration has been following a cautious policy in regard to the dispute between the Arabs and Israel. In my May poll I found strong support among the Sixth District voters for this policy of caution. Here is the question, with the results:

Question: Would you favor the granting of United States arms aid to Israel in the present Arab-Israeli dispute? Yes, 329; no, 924; not voting, 147.

Mr. Speaker, I believe you will agree after studying the results of the polls I have taken that I am fortunate in having an extremely intelligent constituency. I can assure you it is a privilege and a pleasure to represent the Sixth Indiana District.

A Brief Survey of the Western European Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to submit an interesting report developed by Mr. Norman Brassler, executive vice president of the County Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson, N. J., following his recent tour of Europe, where he made a comprehensive survey of economic and political conditions. He reports as follows:

A BRIEF SURVEY OF THE WESTERN EUROPEAN ECONOMY

During the past 4 weeks I was very fortunate in again having the opportunity to conduct a firsthand survey of Western European economic and political conditions. Interviewed were leading bankers, economists, and business executives; the countries visited were Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, France, and England.

Italy, I found to be surprisingly prosperous. Only the textile industry appears in some degree of trouble; the balance of the economy is booming, and progress has been made in diversifying industry. The southern portion of the country is being slowly rehabilitated by irrigation and agricultural improvement programs designed to aid the very poor peasants. This program is being supplemented by United States assistance. Furthermore, Sicily, having independent laws, is beginning to develop as a sort of American Puerto Rico, giving preferential tax rates to new industries settling there. The discovery of oil on this island will also be of material assistance not only to Sicily but to all Italy, since up to this point oil has had to be imported into the country.

Inflation has thus far been kept fairly well in hand, but it is slowly becoming more acute.

International affairs are discussed at greater length in Italy than elsewhere. The dangers to the West in the loss of Cyprus were particularly emphasized since this would leave only Malta as a base for the United States or British Fleet to use in protecting the Suez and the entire eastern Mediterranean.

Switzerland still continues to be the paradise of Western Europe. The currency is stable, prices are not out of hand, and bank loans have advanced less than the rise in incomes or the productivity of the country. There is every indication that stable operations on a high level will continue over the near term future.

Germany must be considered the wonder child of Europe. The major problem facing Western Germany is continued inflation.

Germany is importing coal at the rate of about a million tons a month. The higher price of this commodity has increased the use of oil by leaps and bounds. Exports are still doing very well, but the general feeling is that with spiralling wage costs, prices of export goods may get too high, thus reducing the export surplus and possibly resulting in Germany's loss of position to other industrialized nations where prices may have been better maintained. Spending by United States tourists and members of the Armed Forces has also aided Germany materially in creating dollar reserves. Import duties are being reduced and there are virtually no restrictions on the volume of such imports except on certain farm products.

Politically, all Western Germany thinks about is reunification with the eastern sector. Adenauer is being criticized more and more for not acting sufficiently independently of the West. Some feel that negotiations should be inaugurated directly with Russia to find out her price for releasing East Germany. This, of course, is part of Russia's policy to split the West, and I gather it is having some effect in Germany.

My next stop was Holland. Holland is now very friendly with Germany, as indeed she must be, since many of Germany's exports flow down the Rhine to Dutch ports. The country is not resorting to deficit financing and bank rates, while rising, are still low as compared with the rest of Europe. The Dutch, as usual, are most internationally minded and still pursue all sorts of triangular trades involving all types of currencies and/or commodities.

The loss of Indonesia hurt The Netherlands, and business with this area is still virtually at a standstill. The Dutch feel the new Indonesian Republic is not too stable and cannot be trusted.

France has problems peculiar to itself. It is only lately that France has become export minded. It is still heavily dependent upon agricultural exports for foreign balance. It is a difficult problem to overcome, however, since costs are some 10 to 15 percent higher in France than elsewhere and the competitive position is not good.

Heavy expenditures for war in Algeria, running over a billion dollars a year, and the continued socialistic programs fostered by a left-wing government continue to create heavy deficits which are financed primarily through the nationalized banking system, taxes, and lotteries. There is no unemployment and wages have been rising very sharply.

The French Government continues to be a model of inefficiency. It is trying to carry on a war calling for stern economic policies, but because of its left-wing policies, grants more and more social benefits at the same time. Nor can the administration decide what to do about Algeria: Whether to get tough and fight a real war or turn soft and conciliatory to placate the Algerians as best it can. As a result, with no real policy, it follows the middle course and accomplishes little or nothing.

My final stop on this tour was England. England has not enjoyed the price stability witnessed in the United States and France. Prices have been advancing constantly, and with more jobs available than people to fill them, wages are also going up rather consistently. The export problem is becoming more and more acute. Gold reserves suffered a rather sharp decline last year, and the current recovery rate is not sufficient to warrant confidence in a sustained buildup. The loss of gold has so far been due to excessive imports which show no particular sign of abating. About 30 percent of the English Government's expenditures are for defense. Taxes are a killing burden, running about 50 percent to the individual with income of approximately 400 pounds sterling. There are all types of sales taxes so that while there is no longer any rationing, people are still not living particularly well.

As a result of this brief survey of conditions in Western Europe, it is very easy to see that the whole Continent is suffering from a severe dose of inflation with no end in sight. All of the major countries are attempting to introduce measures both quantitative and qualitative in nature to stop the spread of the disease. The evidence of this inflation is easy to see and finds expression in figures on full employment; rising wage rates; rising prices of all types of commodities, in-

cluding finished goods; and the inability to increase output by any substantial extent.

While no one was willing to commit themselves too far ahead, those who did express an opinion as to the outlook for the United States beyond the next year or so, felt that sometime in the future the administration will be faced with the prospect of introducing measures to combat a rather serious economic decline which will be caused by the very high level of consumer and mortgage debts outstanding and our tremendous productive capacity. It is felt that the huge expenditures for new plant and equipment that have taken place in the past and are still taking place, are the finest anti-inflation medicine the country could have, but while this medicine may be helpful in curing the present disease, it carries with it certain dangers, the most important of which is possibly the inability of America and the rest of the world to consume the output of our factories indefinitely. To insure present prosperity, therefore, it would seem necessary for the United States to continue measures to prevent excessive production. This requires the United States maintaining its international mindedness, but continuing to strive for lower tariffs, as well as aiding backward countries economically through loans or direct grants. It also implies the continuation of proper monetary controls. Some commentators in Europe are of the opinion that thus far the Federal Reserve bank has not taken sufficiently strong steps quickly enough. It is pointed out that the building industry has exerted too much influence in securing easy mortgage terms at low interest rates. Furthermore, the stability of price level indices is deceptive, since the substantial rise in the price of industrial products has been offset by a drop in prices of farm commodities. By inference, additional tightening of money rates is felt to be essential for continued economic stability, since economic crises in the future as in the recent past probably will be caused by overproduction of capital goods and not commodity production excesses.

Farewell to Retiring Members of Congress

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, my State of Michigan is suffering a serious loss in the retirement from Congress, after this session of two of her most respected and ablest public servants, Congressman JESSE WOLCOTT, of Port Huron, representing the 7th Congressional District, and Congressman GEORGE DONDERO, of Royal Oak, representing the 18th district.

JESSE WOLCOTT, the dean of our congressional delegation, is known as one of the most brilliant men in the House of Representatives. In the field of his specialty, the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency, his reputation was outstanding. JESSE rarely spoke on the House floor except in connection with his own committee's legislation and when he did, he was recognized as an expert on his own pet subject. To the newer Members of the House, especially those of us from Michigan, he freely gave of his time, his wise counsel, and patient assistance. He will leave a very large and very real gap here on Capitol Hill.

GEORGE DONDERO is one of the kindliest and most warm-hearted persons it has ever been my good fortune to know. His qualities as a gentleman were only rivaled by those as a patriot. His love for and knowledge of history and traditions of our great country were always a constant source of inspiration. In his own Public Works Committee, his years of tireless work were finally capped by the approval of the St. Lawrence seaway which promises to mean much to Michigan and which reflects so much deserved credit upon him. GEORGE was regarded by many of us with real affection and his retirement will also mean the loss of a devoted public servant.

It is a very real blow to the National Government and to the State of Michigan to lose at the same time two men of the caliber of Congressmen WOLCOTT and DONDERO. I join my colleagues in wishing for them both a long and well-deserved retirement and a hope that all the good and rich things of life may be theirs for many years.

Science at State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, not long ago I twice took occasion to direct the Senate's attention to the collapse of the State Department's scientist attaché program. The Washington Post and Times Herald of June 4, 1956, contained an editorial on this same subject. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCIENCE AT STATE

The science adviser's office in the State Department is now down to one man, the acting director, who is an able economist. The 10 science attachés who were assigned to American Embassies overseas have all come home, and none has been replaced. This deterioration in the Department's scientific effort has taken place at a time when the Soviet Union and many other countries have been strengthening their scientific representation abroad. Britain, Canada, Australia, and India have science attachés in their Washington Embassies. Sweden, Norway, France, Germany, Austria, Japan, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Israel, Egypt, South Africa, and Yugoslavia are among the countries with scientific observers of some kind in Washington.

American scientists strongly recommended the inauguration of the State Department's science program in 1949. Those in a position to know have said that the program which was put into operation was useful and successful. At its recent annual meeting, the National Academy of Sciences urged the Department to revive the program that had been started with so much hope. But the Department has ignored the scientists since Secretary Dulles took office, and at the present time it is studying the question in some high-level office that no one seems to know anything about.

Senator HUMPHREY told the Senate a few days ago that "at a time when we are deeply concerned about the scientific progress of the Soviet Union and the vast amounts of money which are hidden away in the Soviet Union's budget for science the presence of scientific attachés in our Embassies in the major capitals of the world might be very desirable." He properly pointed out that they could do much to seek cooperation among scientists of the free nations and to correlate some of the more important scientific work that has been done and that needs to be done. It seems to us elemental in a scientific age that the State Department should take the lead in the collection and dissemination of scientific information. Those able scientist-diplomats, Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, understood the relationship between science and diplomacy. Now many other nations recognize the importance of science representatives abroad, but the United States adopts an ostrich-in-the-sand attitude.

"The time has come," says John Lear, science editor of the Saturday Review, "for the Department of State to grant recognition to a global brotherhood. * * * There is no need to organize a vast new and expensive bureaucracy. All that is required is understanding and a sympathetic relationship with thousands of existing sources of discovery. A handful of respected elder statesmen of science could transform our position in the world, if only they might serve as ambassadors of knowledge. Francis Bacon would have called them Merchants of Light."

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, During the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, during the 84th Congress the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives had one of its busiest and most productive two sessions. During this Congress 655 House bills and resolutions and 30 Senate bills were referred to the House Post Office and Civil Sevice Committee. The committee recommended favorably 26 House bills and 18 Senate bills. Thirty-five bills acted on by the committee became law. Six bills recommended by the committee and passed by the House are pending in the Senate.

The committee approved the following reports:

House Report No. 434: The General Accounting Office's Report on Leave Practices in Post Offices, April 21, 1955.

House Report No. 435: The General Accounting Office's Report on Financial Management of the Post Office Department, April 21, 1955.

House Report No. 1740: Study of Manpower Management in the Federal Government, February 2, 1956.

House Report No. 1741: General and Financial Management, Decentralization and Reorganization of the Post Office Department, February 2, 1956.

House Report No. 1744: Leave Administration in the Departments and Agencies, February 6, 1956.

House Report No. 1844: United States Civil Service Commission, March 1, 1956.

House Report No. 2109: Personnel Programs and Policies of the Federal Government in Overseas Operations, May 3, 1956.

House Report No. 2961: Study of Manpower Utilization and Personnel Management in the Federal Government—Interim Report—August 6, 1956.

MAJOR LEGISLATION NOW PUBLIC LAW—SALARY INCREASES FOR 1,573,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The committee held extensive hearings on legislation to increase the salaries and classify the positions of officers and employees of the postal field service. Deliberations of the committee on this extremely complex and difficult subject resulted in approval of a committee bill which was passed by the House. Virtually all of the principles of this bill are included in Public Law 68, 84th Congress, which provides salary increases averaging 8.1 percent for all postal field service employees and establishing a modern, realistic system for the classification of their positions on the basis of the relationships of the various positions and the levels of the duties and responsibilities thereof.

The committee also held complete hearings and recommended legislation with respect to salary increases for classified Federal employees, resulting in enactment of Public Law 94, which gave each employee a 7½-percent increase.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR 328,000 RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The third of a series of increases for Federal employees already retired was approved in the first session of this Congress. Under this legislation, Public Law 369, 84th Congress, the annuities of those on the retirement rolls June 30, 1955, were increased by 12 percent on the first $1,500 and 8 percent on all over $1,500. Annuities of those who retired after that date but before January 1, 1958, will be increased but lesser percentages on a gradually declining scale.

IMPROVED FEDERAL CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT 2,400,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Title IV of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, completely rewrites the Civil Service Retirement Act. Under its provisions the average annuity benefit for Federal employees is increased by 25 percent and this increase affects the annuities of the surviving spouses. The average increase in annuities of surviving children is 150 percent. Other important features of the law are: First, an annuity is provided in case of involuntary separation after 50 years of age with 20 years of service; second, there is a minimum annuity of 40 percent assured for those retiring for disability; third, there is a cut of 50 percent in the amount an individual's annuity is reduced in cases where an employee retires when less than 60 years of age; fourth, an employee may provide an annuity for his widow by taking a reduction in his annuity of only 2½ percent for the first $2,400 and 10 percent for the remainder. This compares to the present reduction of 5 percent for the first $1,500 and 10 percent for the remainder.

This law also provides for a more realistic approach to handling the civil service retirement fund. It establishes as a goal the normal cost plus interest representing the Government's contribution to the fund and provides that each department and agency will contribute to the fund at a payroll cost of 6½ percent an amount equivalent to that contributed by the employees.

MERIT SYSTEM EXTENDED TO 60,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Public Law 380, 84th Congress, authorized the granting of career-type appointments for indefinite Federal employees who were in positions in the competitive civil service on January 23, 1955, who had passed competitive qualifying examinations or who would pass such examinations within 1 year and who had 3 years of satisfactory service in the competitive civil service.

Public Law 836, 84th Congress, provided the same benefits for postal employees.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The merit system of Federal employment is improved and strengthened through the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission. This reorganization was recommended in House Report No. 1844 and is provided in title II of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, which establishes 6-year staggered terms of office for United States Civil Service Commissioners.

The President will designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission and the line of succession to the chairmanship is established through the Commissioners rather than through the executive director, who is not a Presidential appointee.

REVISION OF SALARIES IN EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

The pay in executive positions—primarily Presidential appointees—had lagged behind that of Federal employees generally. Title I of Public Law 854, 84th Congress, provides top salaries of $25,000 for Cabinet officers and salaries of $22,500, $22,000, $21,000, $20,500, $20,000, $19,000, $18,000, $17,500, and $17,000 for other executive officers and heads of independent departments, agencies, commissions, and boards. It spells out the individual positions and sets specific salaries. It also authorizes and fixes the compensation of certain secretarial, executive, and administrative staff assistants to the President.

This title also adjusts certain salaries of specialized professional and technical personnel so as to bring them in conformity with the executive salaries established under the bill. The top two grades of the general schedule and the three top grades of the postal field service schedule are also adjusted with the top salary limitation being established at $16,000.

SALARIES PROTECTED WHEN POSITIONS ARE DOWNGRADED

Public Law 594, 84th Congress, protects the salary of an officer or employee subject to the Classification Act of 1949 who, on and after the effective date, is in a position paid under the general service schedule and whose position has been placed in a lower grade due to reclassification subsequent to July 1, 1954, provided that such officer or employee has held this position continuously and that the duties and responsibilities of such position have not been materially changed.

It also provides that when such position becomes vacant the rate of compensation of any individual subsequently appointed to fill the vacancy shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949. The provisions of this act do not apply to grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule.

OVER ONE-HALF MILLION FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BONDED WITHOUT CHARGE

Public Law 323 of the 84th Congress authorized the procurement by the Government of blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds, suitable for the numbers and types of employees involved, for Federal and military personnel required to be bonded.

For many years Federal employees have complained that they were required to purchase their bonds because they happened to be in a position that required that they be bonded. This was particularly true of postal employees. Postmasters and supervisors in large post offices were required to carry heavy bonds at a substantial personal cost to them.

ENFORCEMENT OF POSTAL LAWS STRENGTHENED

Public Law 821, 84th Congress, which permits the impounding of mail matter for a 20-day period will greatly strengthen the arm of the Postmaster General in enforcement of the postal laws prohibiting the perpetrating of fraud and the sending of obscene matter through the mails. This has become an increasing problem with the Post Office Department. The sending of obscene matter has been listed as one of the major causes for the increase in juvenile delinquency.

Under Public Law 821 the Postmaster General will be able to act promptly in preventing law breakers from harvesting thousands of dollars in ill-gotten gains.

HIGHWAY POSTAL SERVICE

Public Law 862, 84th Congress, establishes a basic act governing the Highway Postal Service. Up to this time the Highway Postal Service has been operating under the laws relating to star routes. The growth of this service as the result of the discontinuance of branch railway lines and the need for more substantial and modern equipment made it necessary to provide legislation which would be designed specifiaclly for the Highway Postal Service. This legislation is contained in Public Law 862, 84th Congress.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCE FOR 200,000 FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Public Law 37 extended the benefits of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act to all Government employees required to wear uniforms.

POSTAL-RATE REVISION

While legislation revising postal rates recommended by the committee did not become law, it is of such importance that

it should not go without mention. Failure to increase postal rates leaves the postal service facing one of the largest rates of deficit in its history.

In the first place the committee held extensive hearings and recommended legislation which would have increased postal revenues by $430 million annually. This legislation passed the House by a substantial margin. Hearings were begun in the Senate but were not completed by the end of the Congress. It is expected that action will be taken early next year on this very important problem.

In recommending this legislation the committee pointed out that the real reason for the postal deficit was increased costs over which the Department had no control. The most important of these increased costs were increased employee benefits. These benefits since 1945 and counting the recent retirement legislation amount to $1,500,000,000 a year.

In recommending the legislation to the House, the committee emphasized that first-class letter mail was still being carried at the 1933 rate—3 cents an ounce—and the users of first-class letter mail had not had a single increase to meet the increased cost of these benefits.

The main provisions of postal-rate increase bill were: First, increasing the first-class letter rate from 3 cents to 4 cents an ounce and the domestic airmail rate from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce; and, second, increasing the newspapers and magazines on the portion sent outside the county of publication by 30 percent on the reading portion and 120 percent on the advertising portion.

The principal increases in third-class mail were from 2 cents to 3 cents for individual mailings and a minimum rate per piece of from 1½ cents to 2 cents.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Subcommittee hearings held under the authority of House Resolution 304 were as follows: Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization and Departmental Personnel Management, November 2, 3, 4, 1955; June 25, 27, July 2, 1956; Subcommittee on Post Office and Postal Operations held hearings on the subject of the sending of unordered merchandise and obscene matter through the mail on February 28, 29, March 2, 5, 1956.

The Subcommittee on Civil Service Commission and Personnel Programs helds hearings at overseas installations during the fall of 1955 under the authority of the Legislative Reorganization Act—Public Law 601, 79th Congress.

SPECIAL REPORT

The Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel, which was appointed pursuant to section 2 of Public Law 555, 82d Congress, submitted the fiifth and final part of its report to Congress on June 29, 1954. This 1,155-page report contains detailed analyses of all retirement and pension systems applicable to Federal civilian and military personnel, certain recommendations with respect thereto, and other pertinent data.

Because of the volume and exceptionally broad scope of this report, a brief summary thereof was prepared and printed as a committee print for ready reference by the Members. The summary sets forth the principal recommendations of the Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel and related comments.

COMMITTEE STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Under the authority of House Resolution 304, the committee has conducted extensive investigations and studies into three general categories and problems coming under the committee jurisdiction as follows: First, the Federal civil service; second, postal operations; and third, the utilization of manpower throughout the Federal Government.

THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

The committee issued House Report No. 1844, covering the Federal civil service. This is generally considered to be one of the most far-reaching reports on the Federal civil-service system, recommending a completely new and modern approach to personnel management. Among other things, the report recommended completely rewriting the old Civil Service Act of 1883. Many of the recommendations of this report have already been placed into effect.

Among some of the major recommendations which have been approved are a reorganization of the Civil Service Commission whereby the Commissioners are placed on a 6-year-term basis. The Commission will continue to be bipartisan, 1 term expiring every 2 years. At the same time, it was recommended that the operations of the Civil Service Commission, as well as policy matters, be directed by the Civil Service Commissioners and that a regular succession to the acting chairmanship be established. These provisions were written into Public Law 854.

The report also recommended that the civil-service retirement fund be placed on a sounder basis by requiring that the employee contributions be matched by a like contribution from each Government agency. Thus, a major part of the retirement cost would become a payroll cost and the retirement fund would be assured of a more constant Government contribution. Also, the general principle of the normal plus interest basis of funding was recommended. Public Law 854 provides for the normal plus interest basis for the retirement fund and for the payroll contribution as recommended by the committee.

The report suggested that the Civil Service Commission should take a more aggressive attitude in conducting its audits to determine whether or not job levels are being inflated by many devious administrative processes, primarily reorganizations. The Civil Service Commisson has agreed between now and January to conduct such inquiries and legislation has been introduced which will provide it on a permanent basis.

Nearly 50 percent of the recommendations made by this report have already been placed into effect, including most of the major recommendations.

Under authority of the Legislative Reorganization Act—Public Law 601, 79th Congress—a subcommittee of the committee held extensive hearings in the European area covering problems of Federal employees overseas. A report was issued, House Report No. 2109. Legislation was drafted and introduced—H. R. 12193 and H. R. 12194—which will improve and provide uniformity in the leave, home leave, health and medical services, educational benefits, and other related benefits for Federal employees serving outside the United States.

POSTAL OPERATIONS

A discerning report covering the reorganization of the postal service was filed as House Report No. 1741. This report analyzes the effect of the reorganization and decentralization of the Post Office Department and made the following recommendations:

(a) That the Postmaster General consider the proposal to organize the 15 regional headquarters under the general direction of the regional operations manager;

(b) That more authority be delegated to the postmasters who should report directly to the regional office;

(c) That the plan of describing the district manager as the supervisor of postmasters would lead to empire building and place 23,000 postmasters in rather unimportant positions and should be reviewed;

(d) That consideration be given to a reduction in the staff assigned to the regional personnel units;

(e) That the industrial engineer organization be centralized in the headquarters at Washington, D. C.;

(f) That the appointment of postmasters of all classes and the authority to establish and discontinue post offices be centralized in the Post Office Department in Washington.

The Subcommittee on Postal Operations also examined into the closing of fourth-class post offices and, by an interim agreement, this program has been substantially slowed down, based upon this investigation. The Postmaster General has reported to the committee he is adopting the following program:

(a) When a vacancy occurs in the position of postmaster in a small office, a specific survey will be made to determine whether the office should be continued and a new appointment made.

(b) As part of the regular annual inspection of post offices, consideration will continue to be given to the question of the need for each office, and such information will be recorded. However, pending the receipt of the report and recommendations of our committee, such offices recommended for closing will be closed only if opposition is not significant or if the closing is accompanied by the contracting of a rural station in the same community.

Hearings were held covering complaints concerning the receipt of unordered merchandise and obscence matter going through the mail. Legislation was introduced and is now Public Law 821 which strengthens the arm of the Postmaster General in enforcing laws prohibiting the sending of obscene material through the mail.

The subcommittee also suggested to the Postmaster General that both second- and third-class mailers should be required to separate their mail by zones in the 110 cities where postal zones are in effect. Some second-class mailers are presently doing this—third-class

mailers perform this service in the city where mailed only. This will result in a substantial manpower savings for the postal service and, at the same time, the mailers will need to zone their mail only one time.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

An extensive study was made of manpower utilization throughout the Federal Government. The program, initiated in the 83d Congress, has been continued and expanded. As a result of this program there are today 35,000 less positions in the Federal Government than were planned by the departments and agencies.

Detailed reports have been filed—House Report No. 1740, February 2, 1956, and House Report No. 2961, August 6, 1956—demonstrating how a better manpower-utilization program has been established throughout the Federal Government and the groundwork laid for a permanent program of this type.

Legislation was drafted and introduced and is now Public Law 801 which will assist in the control of manpower on new projects. It does this by requiring that where any new projects are recommended by the executive branch estimates will include an estimate of the total number of personnel required to carry it out.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I speak of the retirement of my good frend, Congressman OLIVER BOLTON, of Ohio, from Congress at the close of the current session.

OLLIE and I have been close personal acquaintances since we both came to Washington as freshman Congressmen in January of 1953. Our contacts were both on and off Capitol Hill and were uniformly pleasant and interesting. They were strengthened by the fact that we were both members of the same group of young Republican Congressmen who met weekly to consider and discuss problems of mutual legislative interest.

Congressman BOLTON was one of the most conscientious workers on Capitol Hill. His close attention to the many problems of his district and the long hours he cheerfully contributed to their solution undoubtedly helped to bring about his untimely illness last year from which we are all so grateful that he has recovered so splendidly. I should also say that, in addition to the duties of his constituency, his obligations arising from membership on two of the most important House committees were also fully complied with.

It is the hope of many of us that OLLIE BOLTON will be able, in the near future, to reenter public service. I know of no one in Congress of our age group that is more fully qualified for such a career. I join with his many friends on Captiol Hill in sorrow at his departure but in confidence that our good wishes go with him and that he will have a long and successful life, no matter in what direction he turns his talents.

How Israel Revitalizes Its Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article speaks volumes. It tells about one of the many places I visited in Israel last year.

WHEAT GROWS WHERE A SWAMP HAD BRED MOSQUITOES AND DISEASE—THE DRAMATIC STORY OF A NEW PROJECT UNDERTAKEN ON THE HEELS OF THE HULA SWAMP DRAINAGE BY THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND

(By Paula Arnold, Jerusalem)

The jeep turns off the highway into a sandy, rutted track. We get out much in the middle of nowhere between fields, and walk toward a thicket, lying low and filled with birdsong. Presently the ground begins to suck at our feet and we walk cautiously. There are reeds, papyrus bushes—the plant association known from the Hula—with pink knotgrass, speedwell and sage, and, in addition, thick clumps of the beautiful purple iris which does not grow in the north. The shrubs and trees are willows and, astonishingly, ricinus—it seems this has wandered here from some spot further north where it was cultivated, to run wild and plague the engineers of the Jewish national fund which cleared the area. At a muddy spot without vegetative cover we come on the huge, deeply imprinted spoor of a wild bear, quite a sensation for me.

This pleasant little jungle of 50 dunam is all that is left of the redoubtable swamp formed by the Wadi Falik. The Falik owes its existence only in a very small part to springs. In the main it consists of winter waters that rush down from the hills, from as far away as Tulkerem, augmented by what runs off the slopes of Ra'anana to the east and Herziyah to the southwest, bringing with it sand and earth, stopping its own way and flooding the land. Thousands of years ago it must have been a lake, not a swamp, but the Romans cut through a sandstone hill, 10 meters deep, so that the Falik could run through and continue its way to the coast south of Natanya—I mean what is now Natanya—I should say well north of Appolonia.

The Roman Gate, so called by the Bedouin who formerly roamed the region, is a romantic spot, and it speaks ill for our photographers that I have to date not seen a picture postcard of it. The lake has gone, but the swamp remained. The Israel Government has sold it to the Jewish National Fund.

In the summer of 1954 the engineers began to work on the draining of the swamp. Engineer Hammer in charge, with Mr. Sofrin as his second in command, both obviously had their hearts in the work. They are mournful about having to make do—the funds are limited. All in all, the local authority (Mo'etzet Hof HaSharon) participating on a 50–50 basis. Two hundred thousand pounds have been spent on this clearing and draining the Falik Swamps, and 4,600 dunams of newly won, excellent land have been won.

Apart from deepening and, to the east, broadening the channel where the winter water comes down in spats, the land had to be cleared of the deep, matted roots on the thickly growing surface jungle described in the beginning; bulldozers did most of that. The area is hilly and the rising ground is light soil, but where the swamp stood for thousands of years, the soil is now marvelously black earth bearing record harvests. Last year, vegetables were produced in unheard of quantities, and the green fodder and other growths I saw now are as lush as anything I have seen; the mixed oats and vetch already standing man high.

In one place peat is being cut, but, as in the Hula, not for fuel, but to be used as fertilizer. There is a simple processing plant for the purpose. The land under the peat will probably be used for fishponds at first, before it is fit for agriculture.

The channel of the Wadi Falik proper is only 6 kilometers long, but above a point near B'nai Zion there are almost 4 kilometers more, called Wadi Khabel.

This channel has been widened 12 meters—in some places up to 20 meters—so that the flow should lose impetus and carry less soil. Apart from these approximately 10 kilometers of main channel, 20 kilometers of new, wide channels or ditches have been cut, to carry off the surplus water.

Seven neighboring moshavim and four kibbutzim (towns and villages), some new, some old, are cultivating the newly won land. Going from north to south, there are Kfar Netter, Even Yehuda, Beit Yehoshua, Udim, Tel Yitzhak, Yakum, Ga'ash, Bnei Zion, Gan Shalomoh, Basra, Shephaiim. The new coastal railway line goes through the region and it lies between the two great north-south roads. Hadassim, the children's village, lies within it, and a new school, Mossad Wingate, is just going up there.

Here is a drainage undertaking which in importance is second only to that of the great Hula Swamp region. It is another great achievement of the Jewish national fund in changing the configuration of the land and rendering the soil of Israel more fertile and prepared for the large settlement of the new immigrants who are now pouring into the Jewish homeland.

The Giveaway of Federal Power by Past Administrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I have just a few remarks to make about Federal electric power and this bill (S. 3338) which was considered originally by the Senate Committee on Public Works. The bill passed the Senate and then was referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs where it was given a brief hearing and then, subsequently, reported to the House with some amendments. I will support the bill as amended.

The effect of this bill in the form passed by the Senate would be to freeze all of the rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for the electric power generated at all Federal projects throughout the United States for a period of 18 months. The reason behind this bill was to head off an application that has been made by the Interior De-

partment to the Federal Power Commission to increase by approximately 2.2 mills the rates charged these consumers for public power in the Southwest Power Administration. The Interior Department has made no application and contemplates no such action in any project at the present time with the exception of this project under the jurisdiction of the Southwest Power Administration. For that reason then, the House Interior Committee saw fit to amend S. 3338 so that it would apply only to the Southwest Power Administration where this rate increase is threatened. It is limited in time to June 30, 1957.

Now, why should the Interior Department be concerned about power rates in the SPA? Why should they try to increase these rates without making a similar application for the other great power projects in America? The existing SPA rate schedule was developed by the Department of the Interior in 1946. It was submitted, according to law, to the Federal Power Commission and approved in February 1947. The Federal Power Commission recognized at the time of this approval that some of the projects were not completed and the exact costs of these projects were not known. For that reason the Federal Power Commission wisely inserted in its order fixing SPA rates a provision that they should apply for a period of not more than 6 years, and after this 6-year period the Interior Department should review the projects, the costs, and the other factors that should go into determining power rates so that an adjustment could be made if it was found necessary.

It developed subsequently that the estimates for the cost of the seven integrated projects of the Southwest Power Administration were grossly understated by around $158 million, as determined by the Department of the Army as late as 1954. Clearly an adjustment and a reexamination of this rate schedule should have been made. In all of the multiple-purpose projects throughout the country, electric power is the one factor that is relied on to repay its own costs, including interest, and this should be kept in mind in all cases. In the original estimates of costs of the Southwest Power Administration projects, the amount allocated to power was $109,200,000. A few years later, in 1946, the costs allocated to power were established at $111,200,000 and this is the cost allocation that was used by the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission in arriving at the rates that were made applicable; and now, nearly 10 years later, we find that the total construction costs that should be allocated to power are nearly twice that much or $200,200,000.

It should be kept in mind that this SPA area, which covers several States, is a part of a large drought section at this time. Since it is a drought area and there has been some bungling in past years of their contracts for electricity, there seems to be some reason to freeze the rates until June 30, 1957. I want to repeat, however, that the continued freezing of the rates, which at the present time build up a $2.5 million a year deficit, cannot go on indefinitely. This area, like others, should either stand on its own feet or the rates should be adjusted to reflect sound business principles. The Department of the Interior is not able under their present contracts to meet a sound payout schedule. Part of this is due to additional cost. To recover this additional cost the Department has proposed to increase the rates charged the REA's, co-ops, and other public bodies in the Southwest Power Administration areas by an additional 2.2 mills.

There are some things in this bill and in the power situation in SPA that bother me. First, I believe that the principle of selling power at a rate sufficient to recover the cost of that portion of a multiple-purpose project is sound. Under this principle, it is apparent and obvious that a rate increase is not only justified but it should be demanded by the Congress. However, which power rates should be raised? Should we raise only the REA's, co-ops, and the public bodies, or should we look at he whole picture? A great block of SPA power is being sold to private groups at approximately 2 mills, which is less than the cost of production.

The thing that disturbs me greatly is the fact that under the Truman-Strauss-Chapman period a private industry, the Aluminum Co., was able to enter into a contract for 30 million kilowatt-hours of electricity per month at less than cost. Some of it is secondary power that sells for 1.25 mills per kilowatt. I realize that this may be considered dump power, but it certainly is not used in that manner by the Aluminum Co. They get a large block of power at less than 2 mills under the same circumstances. I would point out at this time that the REA's must pay about 5.5 mills per kilowatt and they are in need of more power. The proposed increase would boost them to approximately 7.5 mills per kilowatt. It would not disturb the contract of the Aluminum Co. The REA's and the cooperatives need this power. They are being treated differently than the private aluminum company. I would point out further that the selling of Federal power to private industries at around 2 mills, and less than the cost of production, goes on in all of the valley authorities.

Now, to my friends on the other side of the aisle, who have a special group to investigate and attempt to prove that our administration is guilty of giving away the Nation's resources, I would say that some of these contracts for power in the SPA would be a good place for you to start. I know, however, that you would not dig up these contracts. Do you know why? Because they were entered into in 1947 to 1952 when Mr. Truman was in the White House and Mr. Strauss and Mr. Chapman were running the affairs of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior. But, in all fairness, my friends, while you are on the subject of giveaway, here is one of the best examples you can get. If some people do not know what a giveaway is, you might hold some of these contracts up so they can see and make the comparison.

There are also some splendid giveaways for you in the Bonneville Power Administration and for some reason or other most of these involve aluminum companies. Now, we are all aware of the importance and the tremendous value of the contributions that the aluminum industry has made to the defense and the progress of our country, and we know that the aluminum companies must have a ready and reasonable supply of electrical power or they could not operate. The great Northwest has developed tremendously in the recent years primarily because there was an available source of power to attract many aluminum and other metals companies.

On May 21, 1956, the manager of the Bonneville Power Administration's Washington office, in reply to a letter directed to him from the senior Senator from Utah, analyzed the power sales made by the Bonneville Power Administration. This analysis appears at page 12253 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1956. This is the same Bonneville Power Administration which would have handled the sale of power to be generated from the late Federal Hells Canyon Dam. If you are interested in giveaway, you would be interested in this analysis because it shows that approximately one-half of the total power sales made by Bonneville Power Administration were made to industry, private industry, that has been attracted to the Pacific Northwest by the 2-mill electric power from the Columbia River power dams. The defenders of this situation will argue that this rate is made because the companies are paying for dump power. Yes, they may be paying a dump-power rate, but they are getting firm power. These aluminum companies do not know the difference between dump and firm power, except in the cost. They use dump power, just as well as they can use firm power, to operate all of their electrical facilities. Last year I inserted some remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the amount of power that was being sold to one of the private aluminum companies in the Pacific Northwest from the Bonneville Power Administration. This company was receiving millions of kilowatt-hours at less than a 2-mill rate which is, as I said before, considerably under the cost of production. After these remarks appeared in the RECORD, I received a letter from an official of this company in reply. He did not deny the truth of this article but he said in effect, "why pick on us? Here is a list of 12 or 13 more companies who are in the same boat, who are getting the same treatment we are."

If you will look a little further into the operations of the Bonneville Power Administration, you will find that approximately one-fifth of the Bonneville power is being sold to private utilities in the Pacific Northwest; so when you add together the power that is being sold to the private utilities for resale to their customers, you discover that more than two-thirds of the power generated by these Government projects, public power projects, built by the Nation's taxpayers, is being sold to nonpublic sources and about one-half is being sold to private

companies for less than it costs the Government to produce it. You don't have to be very smart to figure out that someone is paying the bill. Maybe the REA's, co-ops, the State agencies, the municipalities and the other public bodies who buy the balance of the power are paying all they should. But if the rates being charged the private utilities and the private industries were raised so as to pay their share of the costs, it would follow that the other customers would have to bear a proportionately smaller share of the burden. As things stand now, the biggest contribution that must be made to make up this deficit comes from the taxpayers all over the country. The taxpayers in every State in the Union are being asked all the time to pay the money it takes to subsidize private metals companies. The REA's pay about 5.5 mills per kilowatt.

Southwest Power is not paying its way. Last year, I am informed, the revenues from the sale of power fell $2.5 million short of paying the interest charges on the facilities. This has to be made up by the taxpayers. No, it is not the cooperatives or the REA's or the municipalities who are getting the big benefits out of the Southwest Power Administration. These groups have been paying about 5.5 mills for their power. It is the aluminum company sitting there with a 30-year contract for millions of kilowatthours of electricity that is getting the big bite out of the taxpayer. They get it at less than the cost of production. This contract with the aluminum company probably cannot be changed and it may not include any provision for review by the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission, as the other contracts do. It may be that the contracts that were let under the Truman-Strauss-Chapman administration to the aluminum companies of the Pacific Northwest are not subject to review. But if they are, the Government should undertake the review immediately. These are subjects that ought to be carefully reviewed by the proper committees of Congress. There seems to be a big "giveaway" of public power to private groups. This cheap power cannot be had by the REA's. It helps produce a big deficit in the SPA.

So, I would say again to my friends on the other side of the aisle that while you are going about your business of trying to brand this administration as a giveaway administration you will not know what a giveaway is until you have looked carefully at some of the contracts for power made during the heyday of the Truman-Strauss-Chapman team. I shall support S. 3338, as amended, with the hope that the sharp spotlight of public opinion will be focused on some of these power contracts. I do feel the time is here when all Federal projects should pay their own way. There would be no deficit of $2.5 million in interest alone if these private groups paid a better share of the cost of electric power in the SPA. All of these power contracts should be reviewed. It should not be necessary for the taxpayers of the country to subsidize the power in the great Pacific Northwest. The record will show that nearly half of the power marketed by the Bonneville Administration is sold at less than the cost of production. I just hope the next Congress will take a hold of this situation in a firm manner and try to correct this great "giveaway" of Federal power to private companies.

Modern Miracles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is an object lesson to the Arab peoples. They, too, can work miracles, if they turn their minds to peaceful pursuits.

EIN GEDI: THE MIRACLE OF THE DEAD SEA SETTLEMENT COME TO LIFE—SITUATED NEAR SODOM, BIBLICAL CITY OF SIN AND DESTRUCTION, IT HAS WAITED 2,000 YEARS FOR THE MAGIC TOUCH OF THE JEWISH NATIONAL FUND TO BE REVIVED FROM ITS LETHARGY

(By Ida Slavan, Jerusalem)

"Yam Hamavet Hai" (The Dead Sea Lives) in giant letters made of gunny sacks twisted around wires, these words are strung between two poles on a height overlooking Ein Gedi, pioneer outpost on the Dead Sea.

To one who thinks of Ein Gedi as a place mentioned in the Bible—captured by Joshua; where David sought refuge from Saul's wrath; and where Shulamit sang of her shepherd lover, "My beloved is unto me as a cluster of camphire in the vineyards of Ein Gedi"—it's becoming a modern settlement full of the sounds of people and animals, the noise of tractors and trucks, and the movement of daily life, is close to miraculous. And, indeed, the recent ceremony celebrating Ein Gedi's inclusion in the Ihud Ha'Kvutzot Vehakibbutzim (Union of Cooperative Settlements) as a full-fledged cooperative agricultural settlement is, indeed, a miracle.

The wonder of turning dead land into living, fruitful soil is due to the foresight and perseverance of the Jewish National Fund. Eight years ago the Israel defense army captured Ein Gedi as part of the last mopping-up expeditions of the war of independence. For centuries the land had lain waste, the ancient terraces crumbling, and the soil that had been so fruitful was slowly covered by rocks and boulders which had been swept down the hills by the winter rains. Gradually the dense brush and other hardy desert bushes covered all signs of occupation.

And then came the miracle. Where private enterprise feared to tread, for the initial investment would be large, the venture hazardous, and the profits far off in the future, the Jewish national fund undertook the task of reclaiming the land of Ein Gedi. A group of NAHAL (pioneering youth who spend part of their period of military service in agricultural work) were established at the foot of the hill. Almost immediately, bunkhouses, a messhall, shower houses, all whitewashed and shining, sprang up, and the young men and women of NAHAL began clearing the stones from the fields. Directed by the JNF, 80 dunams were reclaimed the first year and experimental planting was begun.

Why was this inaccessible point in the desert chosen for such great investment of money and labor? Firstly, there is the strategic importance of the place. Lying about 50 kilometers north of Sodom, it is Israel's northernmost outpost on the Dead Sea. Just as important a reason is Ein Gedi's special character. It is an oasis, fed by 3 springs which flow down in 2 waterfalls at the rate of 440 cubic meters of water an hour. These fabulous quantities of water have been pouring down unexploited for centuries. Their mineral content has formed fantastic stalactites and stalagmites which line the famous cave under the upper waterfall. In Biblical times Ein Gedi was a flourishing oasis where dates and figs and grapes grew in abundance. The caves in the mountainside were a favorite haunt of the Essenes, who sought to establish at Ein Gedi a rule of simplicity, equality, modesty, and purity. In early Christian times hermits lived there and manufactured healing balms from the various leaves and berries which abound. The plentiful water made Ein Gedi an important stopping place for caravans crossing the desert, and up until the war of independence a few families of Arab peasants eked out their existence by scratching the soil with their primitive tools. In modern times, intrepid travelers with a taste for antiquities made the difficult and dangerous journey and then returned to their countries to write in glowing terms of this mirage in the desert.

It is these evidences of a fruitful past which gives the young kibbutz its hopes for the future. During its second year, Jewish National Fund reclamation increased the cultivable area to 400 dunams. A pipeline was laid from the waterfall and carries a tiny fraction of the springs' water down to the fields. Plans are in progress for the reclamation of an additional 1,000 dunams to be irrigated by more and wider pipelines. Almost all the experimental plants flourished; during its first year of existence Ein Gedi sold 70 tons of prize quality tomatoes at very high prices in the large city markets, for they ripen when there are no tomatoes anywhere else in Israel. This year there were cucumbers, squash, grapes, and bananas as well. There will be special attempts made to grow exotic subtropical fruits such as mangoes, papayas, pineapples, etc. Another important enterprise will be the growing of flowers to be shipped by air to all parts of the world.

The young kibbutznicks replacing NAHAL, who have finished their term of service, have accepted their new roles eagerly, with no doubts of their ability to make good. They hope to make their kibbutz a health and tourist center. They have hot sulphur springs, the salt waters of the Dead Sea, lovely scenery, and delightfully warm weather in the winter season. All they need now is good means of transportation, for the rough paths along the coastline makes for a dusty, bumpy journey. They recently purchased a boat to bring tourists from Sodom.

In his congratulations to the new kibbutz, Prime Minister Ben-Gurion said: "There is perhaps no other place in the country blessed with such rare and precious qualities as Ein Gedi. * * * Once again from the vineyards of Ein Gedi will be heard the song of songs of redeeming labor." It is this labor which reclaims the soil, and the vision of the Jewish National Fund, which have brought about the miracle of the Dead Sea.

Hon. Shepard J. Crumpacker

SPEECH
OF
HON. CECIL M. HARDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to a distinguished colleague, the Honorable SHEP-

ARD J. CRUMPACKER, of Indiana's Third Congressional District, who is retiring at the close of this Congress.

It has been a real pleasure serving with Congressman CRUMPACKER during the past 6 years, and I have greatly appreciated the many courtesies he has extended to me, especially his helpfulness when I had legislation before the House Judiciary Committee, of which he is an honored and valued member.

We shall miss Mr. CRUMPACKER here in Congress but I know God will continue to bless and direct him in all his future endeavors, and I join with his many friends in wishing him well as he returns to the practice of law in South Bend.

A New Look in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 84th Congress, I believe it is time to take stock of the many changes and improvements that have been made during the past few years in our Federal civil service. The unanimous approval by Congress, in the closing days of this session, of greatly liberalized retirement benefits, is a fitting climax to a long series of legislative actions granting employee benefits and strengthening the merit system in the Government.

As often is the case, the full value of these changes and improvements may not be realized and appreciated because of the many legislative and administrative actions that have brought them about over a period of time. The true picture is presented only by noting the sum total of the advances made in recent years. Never in our history has so short a span of time marked such great strides for Federal employees as those taken in the past half decade.

Now, this did not just happen. It has taken long, hard, and constant work by the Congress and its committees that are charged with civil-service responsibility. I believe it is now time to spread on the record the major changes and improvements that have brought us to a firm and effective basis for personnel management in the Government and an immeasurably more attractive career service for Federal employees.

POSTWAR ADJUSTMENT

As a ready gage to our progress, we need only recall the years after World War II. The aftermath of that war, the innumerable problems of Government seeking a return to normalcy after tremendous expansion, had not yet been cleared up when the Korean conflict brought further disruption. Government payrolls were topheavy with emergency workers. Countless temporary and indefinite employees had no protection against sudden dismissal, regardless of efficiency and loyal service. There was no strong career system of Government employment. Morale of workers was at a low ebb, and its state was matched by the public regard for its servants.

The severe dislocations of those war emergencies had an equally adverse effect on efficiency and economy throughout the Government. Under the pressures and demands of critical emergencies and readjustments that followed, officials were unable to devote adequate time and attention to maintaining a strong civil service, must less to improvements needed to keep pace with modern practices and the growing complexity of the Government. The results were almost chaotic. Frankly, after World War II we faced a seemingly hopeless task. It is with some sense of gratification, therefore, that this record is presented as a review of the steps which have brought order out of chaos.

INCREASED SALARIES

High on the list of employee interests, of course, is the matter of salaries. The proper levels of salaries and the relationships of positions in our mammoth Government has no counterpart in private industry. The problem is not only of size, but of limitless complexity. It is a real task to keep abreast of the needs of the Government and its employees, let alone make up ground lost in periods of national emergency.

Consideration of the Government's salary and position classification structure occupied a major share of the time of your Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the first session of the 84th Congress. This Congress brought the salaries of our half million postal employees and of all other Federal employees into line with those in private industry and with increased costs of living due to the great expansion in the national economy.

POSTAL EMPLOYEES SALARY INCREASES

The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is a great milestone in postal activities. This law gave postal field service employees an average salary increase in excess of 8 percent. More important, it established for the first time a salary structure with the proper relationship between the various positions in the postal service based on the actual level of duties and responsibilities. It replaced an archaic jumble of laws and special provisions that was incomprehensible to any but experts—an uncoordinated hodgepodge that gave only dissatisfaction to employees and management alike.

Other Federal employees also were given generous salary increases and the laws relating to their compensation and position classification were clarified and brought up to date by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955. Unnecessary and unrealistic variances in treatment of groups and classes of employees were eliminated. These employees now are in a position to know what they can count on in the way of salaries, working conditions, retention rights, and other benefits.

INCREASED ANNUITIES FOR RETIRED EMPLOYEES

Retirement benefits are one of the key factors in building and maintaining a strong and efficient personnel program, whether in Government or private industry. Our civil service retirement plan, established in 1920, had had no major revision since 1948 until the present Congress. Piecemeal legislation over the years had had a number of benefits without making provision for adequate financing. Moreover, retirement benefits had become far out of balance as between retired employees and present employees. Three liberal increases were granted retired employees in the past 8 years, while no major change had been made in the basic retirement law as it affected active employees.

IMPROVED CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

This situation was corrected by Public Law 854, 84th Congress, giving $340 million in added retirement benefits to Federal employees. The Government will bear $295 million of the cost.

The average annuity benefit is increased by 25 percent, and this increase extends to annuities of the surviving spouses. The average increase in annuities of surviving children is 150 percent. A retiring employee may elect to provide survivor benefits after only 5 years of service, instead of 15 years under the previous law.

An annuity is provided in case of involuntary separation after age 50 with 20 years of service. The rights to an annuity on involuntary separation at any age with 25 years' service, and to optional retirement at age 55 after 30 years of service, are continued.

When an employee retires before reaching 60, the reduction in his annuity will be about one-half of the reduction he previously had to take. If he dies, his widow will receive an immediate annuity regardless of whether there are surviving children, and there will no longer be any reduction in the widow's annuity if she is under age 60.

An employee retired for disability will have a guaranteed minimum annuity of 40 percent of his average salary or the annuity he would have earned had he worked until age 60, whichever is the lesser.

An annuitant reemployed because of special skill or ability, who works one full year before final separation, will have his original annuity plus an annuity based on the reemployed service.

These are just the major new benefits of this legislation, which completely rewrites the civil-service retirement law in clear and readily understood terms. A great deal of surplus language and almost incomprehensible provisions of past piecemeal legislation is eliminated.

BETTER FINANCING OF RETIREMENT FUND

Although this legislation greatly liberalizes retirement benefits, in the judgment of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee one of its most important results is the establishment, for the first time, of a sound method of financing the civil-service retirement fund. Beginning in 1952, with the creation of a Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel under Public Law 555, 82d Congress, our committee has made an exhaustive study of the financing of the fund. This has become an increasingly serious problem—so

much so that failure to take immediate action to strengthen the financing might have threatened the entire retirement structure. The deficit in the fund had grown to astronomical proportions, reaching $13.5 billion a year ago. Potential obligations of the fund so far exceeded its assets as to cast grave doubt on any guaranty that present and future employees could be assured of the retirement benefits for which they pay and which, in effect, the Government has underwritten as at least a moral obligation.

The committee recommendations for the financing of our retirement system to insure its soundness were printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress. The three essential principles are written into Public Law 854. First of all, employees' contributions to the fund must be on a part with the benefits they receive. Second, the Government must contribute equally with the employees as a part of its payroll cost, to be paid into the fund by each department and agency. Third, the Congress should appropriate to the fund each year an additional amount, over and above payroll contributions by the departments and agencies, to cover interest on the past deficit and any further cost of the fund not met by employee contributions and matching contributions by the departments and agencies. This method of financing, known as the normal cost plus interest method, is approved by retirement and actuarial authorities. It will maintain the retirement system on a sound financial basis and prevent further increase in the deficit.

IMPROVED CAREER OPPORTUNITIES

The current shortage of qualified scientific, professional, and technical personnel highlights the unsatisfactory conditions of Federal employment that stem from the war periods and the readjustments that followed. There is little doubt that past lack of career opportunity laid the foundation for loss of potentially valuable workers today.

Just a few years ago, for example, only 65 percent of all Federal employees could regard their positions as permanent in nature. Now, more than 90 percent are in career-type appointments. The true career civil service benefits both employees and the Government. Uncertainty of tenure is removed, and each individual can devote his best efforts to the service.

The establishment of a strong career system of employment was worked out in cooperation between the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Civil Service Commission. The basic principles of the program are set forth in the statement of managers on the part of the House on the conference agreement that became Public Law 763, 83d Congress. This legislation also places a necessary ceiling on the total number of permanent Federal employees and provides guidance for maintaining a proper level of permanent Federal employment in case of emergency expansion in the future and return to normal operations thereafter.

EXTENSION OF MERIT SYSTEM

Some 200,000 employees were made eligible for career appointments by Public Law 380, 84th Congress, and an additional large number of temporary but long-time postal employees were given similar opportunity by Public Law 836, 84th Congress.

INCREASED NUMBER OF SCIENTIFIC POSITIONS

In a further step to relieve the present shortage of scientific, professional, and administrative personnel, your committee reported, and the House in its wisdom approved H. R. 11040 in the present Congress, to create a total of 685 such positions. The other body did not act on this bill, but included a lesser number of these positions in legislation (H. R. 7619) to provide needed salary adjustments for Cabinet members and other top executives of the Government along with an increase from $14,800 to $16,000 in the maximum Classification Act salary, which passed the House last year. It is believed that the Congress will want to review the requirements for additional scientific, professional, and high administrative positions early in the next Congress. Such additional positions were urgently requested in the presentations made to our committee by officials charged with the responsibility for maintaining a national defense capable of meeting the threat of any potential enemy.

REPORT OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has conducted a penetrating study of the Civil Service Commission in the present Congress. Its findings and recommendations are printed in House Report No. 1844, 84th Congress. This study was directed at methods of strengthening the Commission and thereby enabling it to assume and exercise effective leadership in the field of personnel management in the Government.

As noted previously, the committee's recommendations in this report with respect to retirement financing are now part of Public Law 854. Likewise, its recommendation in the same report for top-level reorganization of the Civil Service Commission is part of Public Law 854. This law provides for 6-year, staggered terms for the Civil Service Commissioners, for the appointment of a Vice Chairman as well as a Chairman of the Commission, and for a line of succession to the duties and responsibilities of the Chairman through the Vice Chairman and the third member of the Commission. This will greatly strengthen the Commission, in both internal operations and dealings with other parts of the Government. It gives assurance of continuity of top-level leadership for the Commission—a must if this central personnel agency of the Government is to pull its weight and carry out the responsibility vested in it by Congress.

EMPLOYEE GROUP INSURANCE

Another weakness that had developed over the years with respect to the Federal civil service was the lack of a Government-sponsored insurance program for its employees. Private industry for many years has taken the lead in such programs, often contributing a major part or all of the cost, and it has become a desirable and accepted part of the fringe benefits of employees throughout the United States. The Congress, working in cooperation with the Civil Service Commission, established a new low-cost group life insurance program for civilian employees of the Government on a voluntary participation basis, providing coverage for term life in amounts equal to each employee's salary raised to the next higher $1,000 level and double indemnity and dismemberment insurance. The cost to each employee is not to exceed 25 cents biweekly for each $1,000 and the Government contributes 12½ cents. Certain inequities and gaps in this legislation were corrected in the present Congress, extending the coverage to well over 130,000 employees not previously covered and allowing continued coverage in case of an employee who is disabled and receives disability benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. These provisions bring the Government up-to-date and place its employees on a par with those in private industry in the matter of insurance benefits.

SALARIES SAVED IF JOB DOWNGRADED

The repeated fluctuations in employment levels and requirements of the Government for many years have created severe hardship and inequities because of backlogs in the classification of positions. The Classification Act of 1949 makes the level of every classified position subject to review by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission fell far behind in its tremendous classification audit workload. Then, as positions were reviewed many were placed at lower levels with consequent reduction in salaries of incumbents through no fault of their own. This condition became an extremely serious morale problem, since the employees quite justifiably felt that they had no protection whatever from downgradings and loss of salary which might prevent them from taking care of obligations they had assumed on the basis of the salaries of their positions before downgrading. The committee study of this situation demonstrated the need for legislative action to correct it, which was confirmed by the Comptroller General of the United States. Corrective action is authorized by Public Law 594, 84th Congress. This law provides that an employee will suffer no loss in salary if his position is placed at a lower grade level. It does not, of course save an employee's salary if he is demoted for cause.

During the past two Congresses a large number of bills have been introduced to provide various fringe benefits for Federal employees, that is, specific types of benefits which do not fall within the ambit of major legislation previously discussed. The committee made a thorough study of all of these proposals, and those found desirable were incorporated in a single general Fringe Benefits Act. This act for the first time provided for an em-

ployees' uniform allowance of $100 a year. This allowance was extended by the 84th Congress to apply on an equitable basis to all employees required to wear uniforms in the performance of official duties. In addition, it established a greatly broadened and far more attractive incentive-awards program for Federal employees which already has proved its worth through tremendous increases in employee participation in suggestion programs and millions of dollars of savings to the Government.

BETTER OVERTIME PAY

The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955, and the Fringe Benefits Act of 1954 also provided new and liberalized systems of premium compensation for overtime, night, and holiday work for Federal employees so that all such employees now are on a generally uniform basis for such work.

FREE BONDS

Each Federal employee in a position requiring bonding was required, until the present Congress, to pay the premium of his own bond, even though it was primarily for the protection of the Government. The same was true of any employee who must obtain a notary-public commission for use in his official duties. In effect, therefore, the salary of such an employee was reduced by the amount of his bond premium or the cost of the notary commission, as the case might be, in comparison to the salaries of other employees performing work at the same level of responsibility. The discriminatory effect of this situation long has been recognized, but previous efforts to obtain corrective legislation have been unsuccessful. The 84th Congress approved Public Law 323, authorizing the Government to purchase these bonds at no expense to the employees, and Public Law 681, authorizing an allowance to cover the cost of a notarial commission obtained for official purposes. The first report of the Secretary of the Treasury on operations under the bonding law was received on the last day of this session, and shows that the new system not only has given a definite boost to the morale of the employees concerned but, also, will accomplish real savings for the Government.

THE NEW LOOK IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, I can probably best summarize this statement by saying that the condition of Federal employment today is entirely different from that of a decade ago. Today's employee has security in his job. He has had salary increases amounting to over 60 percent. His retirement annuity has been directly increased by over 25 percent with new and much more liberal provisions for his surviving widow and children. The actual increases are much more than this when considered in connection with the salary increases. If he dies his beneficiaries receive a year's salary as a result of the low cost life insurance which has been provided. He has opportunity for both honorary and monetary awards up to $25,000 for outstanding service or improvements in Government operations. He has protection against reduction in his salary in cases where his position has been downgraded as a result of reclassification. He has better opportunity for recognition of his qualifications and effort through improved classification systems and promotion programs. He has reemployment and priority placement rights in cases where he is separated due to reduction in force in his agency. He has greatly improved appeals rights through betterments in the appeals procedure and system. Compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work has been greatly increased and standardized. His annual and sick leave privileges have been extended and improved. If he is required to wear a uniform this uniform is now furnished by way of an allowance. If his duty requires that he be bonded he no longer is required to furnish his own bond. In cases where a notary's commission is required authority has been granted to the department and agency to defray the expenses formerly paid by the employee.

In my judgment, in no other employment, whether it be private or governmental, does the employee have as many benefits as he does in the Federal Government. These benefits are in the main the result of recommendations made to the executive branch and legislation approved by this committee over the past few years.

Let's End It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 13, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Hearst newspapers which appeared throughout the country on July 13, 1956, makes interesting reading:

LET'S END IT

The people in our Government who have the power to continue bolstering the Tito regime in Yugoslavia with American money have now announced the release of $13 million dollars in counterpart funds for the support of housing projects in 11 Yugoslavian cities.

The so-called counterpart funds come into being through the complicated financial hocus-pocus, whereby the money of countries receiving American assistance, gifts or loans is set aside for our use within those countries.

No matter how the thing is juggled, the money comes out of the resources of the American taxpayers, and the hole it leaves is in their pockets.

It apparently means nothing to the people who have done this thing that the Tito Government is once more in full alliance with Soviet Russia, and will be on the Communist side in any future war.

It apparently means less to them that the $1 billion we have already given Tito will be used against us in such a war, and that any additional American funds put in his hands will go the same way.

It would be interesting to know who these people are, and we think the American people are entiled to know. The announcement that the American Government has done such a thing is too broad.

Who is it in the Government that has such power, and such unconcern and even open contempt for American security that the power is used to the detriment and peril of our country?

The Congress has substantially cut the new authorizations for foreign aid, largely in consequence of its disapproval of past aid to Yugoslavia, with particular expression of its disapproval of any additional aid.

The American people are shocked and outraged that we have pursued our folly in this matter so far and at such cost in the past, and that we continue to persist in the same folly.

Neither the Congress nor the people should any longer be content with broad announcements in this field that are little better than concealment.

Let there be a naming of names, and a placing of responsibility, to the immediate end that the country may know who is to be held accountable for this disservice to America, and to the ultimate end that our pursuit of folly will terminate.

The Defeat of H. R. 12061 Was a Victory for Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

A STEP TOWARD SOCIALISM

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on July 24 the House considered at length and refused to pass H. R. 12061, known as the Gore-Holifield bill, to put the Federal Government into the atomic-power business. This bill, had it been passed, would have had far-reaching and adverse effects on the survival of our country, and on the American freedom as we have known it. It would have been a long step toward complete socialization of American industry. The history of the embracement of socialism has been a history of the downfall of nations and the loss of personal freedoms. Surely we in America, where the private-enterprise system has given us the highest standard of living in the world today, will not tolerate turning to a system which has been a failure throughout history, and which has destroyed other nations.

THE DANGER TO OUR COUNTRY

The passage of H. R. 12061 would have authorized and directed actions that honorable, competent, and patriotic witnesses testified would adversely affect military and defense activities of the United States.

The testimony of the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Strauss, and of his scientist associate, Dr. Libby, as well as that of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford, was that the shortage of competent scientific personnel is the most serious problem today.

The bill provided for construction, by the Federal Government, of an unspecified number of large-scale atomic powerplants, and of an unknown number of smaller scale atomic powerplants. These plants would have been uneconomic. They would have been obsolete almost

as soon as they were constructed. Their operation would have required large Federal subsidies, possibly in excess of $100 million annually.

It would be unthinkable and the height of folly to jeopardize our defense position, even our Nation's existence, by spreading the layer of competent scientific and technical personnel thinner, as we would have done, by embarking on this "crash" program.

WHY?

In view of the potential threat to the security of our Nation, a logical question is, Why were we being asked to take this step down the road toward socialism? What were the purported reasons given by the proponents?

A look at the record discloses quite clearly that the reasons advanced were without foundation in fact. It is the same old, old story of trying to use a somewhat plausible basis of action to hide the thinly disguised, real purpose of the bill.

The proponents of this "crash" program of Federal construction at atomic powerplants claimed this program was necessary because no one is building the various designs of nuclear reactors. The record does not bear this out. On page 49, of part I, of the hearings on the second supplemental bill for 1957, Mr. Strauss, AEC Chairman, was asked whether the Federal Government should build more plants. The answer was:

I think the Federal Government should only build plants in the event we have a design for a reactor that we think should be built and where private industry won't build it. Then I think we should.

Mr. Strauss then said:

We have no reactor as of the moment which we feel is ready to go into large-scale construction that has not been contracted for or negotiated for by private industry.

To which Mr. W. K. Davis, Director of the Division of Reactor Development, added:

That is absolutely correct.

Again on page 40 of part I of the hearings, Mr. Strauss said:

Every type that is promising in the opinion of the Commission is either today building or projected as a prototype or full-scale plant or is in active investigation in one of the laboratories of the Commission.

Various spokesmen for private industry have testified or issued statements to the effect that they propose to continue to take a leading part in the research and development of nuclear power reactors with the ultimate aim of economic power production. It has been estimated that their present expenditures are at a rate of $30 million a year and plans are now outstanding for expending several hundred millions of dollars for nuclear powerplants.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was passed less than 2 years ago. It was not until the passage of this act that private industry, and public bodies and cooperatives, were permitted to take an active interest in the development of nuclear powerplants. Any reasonable person, without a preconceived desire to ignore the facts in order to make a case for the crash Federal program, will be astounded at the progress that has been made in a little over a year after the first round of proposals were received, in the spring of 1955.

Table II on page 98 of part II of the House hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957, indicates the magnitude of the program, now underway or contemplated.

In view of the progress that has been made in a little over a year since AEC opened the gate for private, cooperative, and publicly owned groups to participate in atomic power development, one must wonder why this urgency to get the Federal Government involved in constructing and operating full-scale atomic powerplants.

The proposal for the crash Federal program was introduced in the other body on July 30, 1955, just 11 months after the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 was signed and only a few months after the last date of filing proposals with the Atomic Energy Commission for the first round of non-Federal participation in reactor development. Can anyone doubt or deny that initially the Gore bill was a public power proposal pure and simple?

Even though H. R. 12061 represented some changes from the original Gore bill, the basic design was still there, and to confirm this, the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, July 18, 1956, quoted the author of the bill, in the other body, as saying with respect to the present bill:

He regards its provisions for governmental construction of atomic-power plants as one of the keystones of a four-point public-power program he expects the Democrats to spell out in their platform at the party's Chicago convention.

Can anything be clearer?

With all the ballyhoo about getting something started, there was no definite information in the bill, nor the accompanying report, as to the number, size, type, or location of the nuclear reactors to be constructed. The basis for the estimated cost was, and still is, a mystery.

The Nation should be thankful for the House's refusal to commit the taxpayers to spending $400 million—it is admitted that this is a general overall estimate—or maybe several times that amount, for uneconomic nuclear-power plants of unknown types, size, and safety characteristics. There can be little question, had H. R. 12061 passed, that it would have received a deserved veto.

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, our friend and colleague, THURMOND CHATHAM, who has so well and ably represented the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina from the 81st Congress up to the present, will be missed by all those who had an opportunity to work with him during these years.

The distinguished gentleman served his country with honor in World War I and World War II. His work in Congress has been characterized by that same dedication to duty and support of the highest ideals of public life.

A few years ago, I requested the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina to assist me in resolving a problem presented by one of my constituents. He readily responded to my request for help and brought a happy resolution to a very human problem involving one of my constituents. This is but one example of the public spirit of our colleague and his readiness to help any and all who sought his wise counsel. I will miss our colleague, THURMOND CHATHAM, as will every other Member of this House. We all hope he comes back to visit us frequently.

The U. N. and the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Israel delegation to the United Nations on July 17, 1956, forwarded a letter to the President of the Security Council emphasizing the deterioration of the Israel-Jordan border situation. The text of the letter follows:

On instructions from the Government of Israel I have the honor to bring to the notice of the Security Council the serious deterioration of the security situation along the Israel-Jordan border since the date of the unconditional cease-fire assurance given by the Government of Jordan to the Secretary General of the United Nations on April 26, 1956.

Since that date a total of 101 violations of the general armistice agreement have occurred, all of which have been communicated to the Mixed Armistice Commission. Israel casualties during this period have been 7 killed and 6 wounded.

The following is a list of the incidents which have resulted in casualties:

On May 15, 1956, a motorcycle carrying two riders hit a mine on the Wadi Ara Road near Megiddo. The stalled vehicle was fired at and hit by a grenade. Both riders were wounded.

On May 23 Jordanian soldiers opened fire on Israel police guards on Mount Scopus. One policeman was wounded.

On May 24 a tractor was ambushed and its driver killed near Kubeiba, 9 miles west of the Israel-Jordan border.

One June 3 Jordanian soldiers opened fire on the Pagi quarter in Jerusalem, killing one of the residents. The shots were fired from Jordan Army positions adjacent to the building occupied by the offices of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

On June 5, fire was opened on workers near Yad Hana, two of whom were wounded.

On June 24, Jordanians opened fire on workers near Sde Eliahu and on vehicles passing nearby. Two soldiers were killed and one civilian was wounded.

On July 9, a police car was mined near Afula. One person was wounded.

On the same day, a passenger car was attacked by seven armed men on the Beer-

sheba-Hatseva Road. Two persons were killed.

On the night of July 13, four infiltrators attacked a passenger car on the road between Yahud and Wilhelma. The driver was killed.

On July 15, a worker was wounded by a mine at Kastel. Shots were fired at him from Jordan army positions.

The Mixed Armistice Commission, convened in emergency meetings, on five occasions condemned Jordan for its violations during that period:

On May 9, Jordan was condemned for shots fired from the Old City Wall of May 7.

On May 14, Jordan was condemned for the attack of May 9 on a vehicle near Kfar Saba.

On May 19, Jordan was condemned for the attack of May 15 in Wadi Ara.

On July 10, Jordan was condemned for mining a police car near Afula on July 9.

On July 15, Jordan was condemned for the attack on July 9 on a civilian vehicle near Hatseva. (In the resolution adopted on that date, the Mixed Armistice Commission issued a strong call to Jordan authorities to take into consideration its continuous exhortations to terminate such repeated incursions into Israel in violation of the General Armistice Agreement, and called upon the Jordanian authorities to adopt immediate and efficient measures to enforce the provisions of art. IV, par. 3, and art. III, par. 3, of the General Armistice Agreement.

It is evident from the nature, frequency and attendant circumstances of the attacks described above, the majority of which have been directed against Israel's main arteries of communication, that they are either the result of deliberate planning by the Jordan authorities or that they are organized and executed with their knowledge and connivance.

These attacks have coincided with renewed activity of Fedayeen gangs based in Jordan, who are recruited, trained and equipped by the Jordan military authorities and operate under their direction.

The conduct of the Jordan Government, together with the fact that no effective measures have been taken by it to prevent such outbreaks must inevitably raise the question of whether this Government still considers itself bound by the unconditional cease-fire assurance given to the Secretary General, and by the General Armistice Agreement of which the cease-fire pledge is an indissoluble part.

Negro's Declaration of Intention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the Negro's Declaration of Intention, written by the Rev. Dr. J. H. Jackson, pastor of the Olivet Baptist Church, of Chicago, and president of the National Baptist Convention, United States of America, Inc., as follows:

PREFACE

After conferring with Negro citizens from all walks of life in all parts of the country, the writer has put together in his own words the impressions gained in the form of this declaration of intention. There have been interviews of college presidents and professors, high school principals and teachers, and ministers of religion in the different denominations of the country. Doctors, lawyers, labor leaders, and students in high school and college are also included. Farmers, day laborers, and the men on the street have expressed their opinions.

There has been an attempt on the part of the Gallup poll to gather data as to the thoughts and reactions of Negroes to the present struggles that they face. In recent days, many questions have been raised about the new wave of terror sweeping the Southland.

Many people in Europe, including Russia, as well as those in Africa and South America, and the isles of the sea, are concerned about the basic reaction of the Negro population. Will they remain loyal, or will they turn Communist?

It was the writer's opinion that some kind of expression of outlook, aims, and purpose would be of untold value. Hence, this declaration of intention.

DECLARATION

1. At all times, we intend to support the Federal Constitution, to obey the laws of the land, to avoid contempt of courts, and to respect the judgments and decrees of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, and to always abide by the same.

2. Whatever is said or done against the United States of America by enemies, foreign or domestic, we will ever oppose with all of our heart, mind, body, soul, and strength.

3. We intend to continue to teach our children that this Nation is a great free Republic of law and order, with a system of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. And any person who disobeys the laws of the land and teaches others to do so, is a declared enemy of this Nation, and is working for its overthrow; and hence, does not deserve the right of free participation in the Nation's life, and is unworthy of the security that the country gives, and is subject to the penalties of the law. We shall also teach our children that this Nation, under God, was founded in the spirit of justice, freedom, and due regard for moral law, and cannot survive without remaining true to its foundation principles.

4. We intend to participate in the total cultural life of the Nation, both for personal growth and development, and for the further progress of the country itself.

5. We intend always to cherish and to give thanks for those natural endowments and special gifts that have made our race great; and pledge all of our talents and resources in the building of a better social order and a more democratic world.

6. In spite of the doctrine of the segregationist, we shall always believe that the basic quality of real distinction is character, not color; and the stature of a person is determined by the power of his mind, the purity of his heart, and the highest possible dedication of his life.

7. We intend to crusade against all the evils in our society that are designed to poison creative human relationships, and to crush the constructive growth of human personality, and to fight against the false doctrine which claims that some men are by origin, birth, and nature superior to others.

8. While we shall recognize a need for the patience that accompanies growth, we intend at all times to reject that doctrine of gradualism which implies that the established laws of the land should be gradually applied, and gradually obeyed, in order to respect the unjust traditions of men, and to give free reign and honor to destructive prejudices.

9. We intend to take every legal step to employ every constructive measure, and to cooperate with every group of loyal Americans in the struggle to preserve all of the Nation's ideals, and to overcome every economic, political, and cultural stumbling block that hinders the further progress of this great Republic.

10. With love for our Nation, good will toward all, utter devotion to the Federal Constitution, and undying faith in God; we intend to continue our struggle for the complete victory of freedom on every front, and the preservation of the soul of the Nation, whatever the cost. And if we are slain by the forces of oppression before our high purpose is achieved, we pray that we shall sleep under the shadows of the flag that we love, and that our flowing blood shall help to wash from the Nation's life, every blot of shame; and our bleached bones shall help to fertilize our hallowed soil for those who come after us; and our sacred dust shall be a silent testimony and a lasting memorial to our eternal quest for justice, peace, and good will.

The Poznan Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, an articulate and effective foe of communism representing free elements in exile of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Romania, is convinced that the Poznan uprising should be brought to the attention of the United Nations Security Council. Important psychological gains could be made by the free world if Polish resistance to Red tyranny were made a matter of official record in the U. N.

Everything possible should be done to focus world attention on the plight of the brave patriots of Poland. Bringing the Polish question before the U. N. would serve this purpose and perhaps even make Communist leaders hesitant about starting another reign of terror.

Under leave granted, I insert statements of the Assembly of Captive European Nations concerning the Poznan situation:

ACEN STATEMENT ON THE EVENTS IN POZNAN

The shots fired into the demonstrating workers' crowds in Poznan constituted one of the clearest and most eloquent statements on the political, social, and economic situation behind the Iron Curtain. They belied the assertions of certain fraternizers and neutralists that the Iron Curtain was disappearing and that genuine process of gradual democratization and economic improvement was spreading throughout the Soviet Empire. They tore to pieces the fallacious slogans and titles of "people's states" and "social justice" with which the Soviet puppet governments adorn themselves.

For it was the people of Poland who marched on the streets of Poznan, and it was the agents of a foreign power who ordered the police squads and the tanks to open fire. It was the people asking for naught but bread and freedom—a demand which echoes throughout the history of all suppressions and dictatorships. It was a popular demonstration against a group of oppressors who took away both bread and freedom from the Polish people. And the outcry of the demonstrators for removal of the armed forces of a foreign power should meet with sympathy and understanding of all freedom-loving peoples of the world.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations salutes the workers of Poznan who rose against their exploitation, which enables the Soviets to advance their economic expansion in the entire world. The Assembly assures the people of Poland that their brethren in suffering in the other central and eastern European countries are fully participating in their grief for the heroic men and women felled by the tanks and guns of their enslavers. Without any incitement from abroad they have given voice to the feeling of 100 million people in the captive nations. We hope that their sacrifice will not be in vain and that the West will be able to read its meaning.

We hope, first of all, that the free world will not confine its reaction to expressions of sympathy, as was the case in 1953, but will avail itself of all means of international action to condemn the regime responsible for the crimes perpetrated in Poznan, to institute an international investigation of Soviet aggression, domination, and colonial exploitation, which are at the root of these and many other crimes against the captive nations, and to bring about the restoration of the God-given rights of these nations to freedom and genuine national independence.

We further hope that the free world will now realize that the Communist propaganda about liberalization and improvements behind the Iron Curtain has no other objective than to lull the West into a sense of complacency and false security.

We trust that workers of the West whom the Soviets and their agents are strenuously trying to win over in the name of workers' unity will understand more than ever that Moscow and its puppets are brutal oppressors and exploiters of the working class and as such deserve only the enmity of workers everywhere.

We finally hope that the free nations accepting so-called Soviet economic assistance or engaging in large-scale East-West trade will now understand that whatever they receive from the Soviet Union and the captive countries is, in the final analysis, torn from the mouths of hungry workers behind the Iron Curtain.

THE WORKERS OF POZNAN

Speaking of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary, Sir Winston Churchill told the Commons some 2 years ago that "no solution is in sight for those subjugated states, but time may find remedies which this generation cannot command." Thus, the liberation of central and eastern Europe was left to future generations. Former Ambassador George F. Kennan went even further when, a few weeks ago, he expressed the view that, "There is a finality, for better or for worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe." Now, the workers of Poznan have refused to subscribe to Sir Winston's and Mr. Kennan's pessimistic words and, for better or worse, took their own fate into their own hands. In a single day they destroyed the myth of a finality about Communist dictatorship and Soviet enslavement in central and eastern Europe.

They destroyed many other myths. They destroyed the myth of a possibility, or even desirability, of a gradual transformation from the Russian brand of communism via the Yugoslav brand of communism toward a full-fledged democracy. There are no shortcuts of this kind. The workers of Poznan stood up against both the Communist economic exploitation and the Communist political oppression. They demanded both: Bread and freedom.

They destroyed the myth of a second revolution, a new spring, or a thaw occurring in Poland. There is no "thaw" where the workers are forbidden to air their industrial grievances. There is no new spring where streams of blood of innocent people are flowing in the streets. There is no revolution where machineguns, tanks, and jets are thrown against defenseless workers; rather it is a counterrevolution. The first one was staged in August 1944, when Marshal Rokossowski looked while German bombers and artillery razed Warsaw to the ground, the second one was staged in June 1956, when Marshal Rokossowski's armed forces got the order to crush the workers of Poznan.

They destroyed the myth that the émigrées from Poland and adjacent countries have lost touch with realities and ceased to understand what has been going on behind the Iron Curtain, whereas foreign journalists who spend a couple of days in Poland went on describing at length and with gusto (as did Mrs. Flora Lewis in the New York Times Magazine of June 24, 1956) that on the part of the Communists in Poland the direction now is clear enough: It is toward a greater freedom of speech, more contact with the West, an easier life. Which, a few days later, was demonstrated ad oculos in Poznan, but not in the manner Mrs. Lewis expected.

They destroyed, first of all, the myth that the dictatorship of the Communist Party has been based on and backed by the industrial workers. The most striking and politically the most important feature of the events in Poznan was that the whole of the industrial workers of Poznan (not a section of them, not even a majority of them, but 100 percent of them) was against the Communist Party. The usual cliché of the Communist Party being the organized expression of the minorite consciente of the nation, i. e., of the proletariat, was torn to pieces. The Communist Party, as unmasked in Poznan, is an organized and armed conspiracy against the workers. If it were not for the Communist militia and the army, which is commanded by a Russian marshal and where practically every officer from the grade of a captain up is a Russian—nothing would be left of the "proletarian dictatorship" of Ochab and Cyrankiewicz in Poland.

Day after day the Communist government repeated that it had the situation firmly in hand. Nothing is farther from the truth, in spite the wave of Communist terror in Poznan which followed the workers demonstrations. Day after day the Communist government repeated charges against agents of foreign powers as responsible for events in Poznan. However, agents from abroad, should there ever be any, would never succeed in leading the workers of a city like Poznan to a general strike. Day after day the Communist government repeated charges against the reactionary underground. However, there is no organized underground movement in present-day Poland. Or, if there is any, the whole nation belongs to it. How else could one explain 50,000 people taking part in an anti-Communist demonstration (this figure was given by the New York Daily Worker of July 3, 1956) in a city of 365,000 inhabitants?

Again and again in the past people of Poland looked in vain to the West for help in their ordeals. In vain they asked for help during the siege of Warsaw in September 1939. In vain they asked for help during the battle of the Warsaw ghetto in April 1943. In vain they asked for help during the Warsaw insurrection in August 1944. This time they couldn't be left in the lurch.

The primordial task is to protect and defend the heroic people of Poznan who are now falling victims to Communist vengeance. Their case should be taken up by noble souls, writers and artists, political and humanitarian movements, churches and religious leaders. Time is running short; immediate and forceful action is essential.

Then the wider political issue should be dealt with. Communist terror in Poland spells a danger to general security and peace, and, therefore, the events in Poland should be a matter of concern for the United Nations Security Council. Would the Soviet Union dare to make use of the veto right in a period when Moscow assures of her will to coexist peacefully? Do Ochab and Cyrankiewicz and Rokossowski talk peace in Poznan?

Since September 1, 1939, Poland is essentially an international problem and will never cease to be one until she is free and independent again. Hence the idea of an international conference, to be convened jointly by the United States of America, Great Britain, and France in order to restore Poland's independence and to insure a free expression of the Polish Nation's will in conditions guaranteeing the freedom of such an expression. It goes without saying that genuine Polish representatives both from Poland and in exile shall participate in such a conference.

It is untrue that the Communists are an invincible force. They are not, and events in Poznan testify to that. It is unrealistic that the Communists cannot be driven from power in Poland. They can, if the democrats in the west have the same courage and vision as the workers of Poznan. This time mere words of admiration and compassion will not do. Only a resolute political action undertaken by western capitals would be equal to the determination of the workers of Poznan.

Steel Scrap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Waste Trade Journal of July 21, 1956, makes interesting reading:

SQUEEZED BY HIGH SCRAP IRON PRICE, POOR STEEL MILLS MANAGE TO INCREASE PROFITS BY ONLY 300 PERCENT

The thinking of steel mill officials, when it comes to scrap iron, is sometimes beyond understanding.

On July 12, Lukens Steel Co., of Coatesville, Pa., issued its 6-month statement which showed a net profit jump of over 300 percent. The net income for the first 6 months of this year was $3,542,133, or $11.14 per share, as against $849,290, or $2.67 a share for the comparable period in 1955.

But in issuing this remarkable profit statement, a company spokesman declared that "the increased earnings this year were partly due to a fall in scrap prices which last year were at a high level, and this contributed considerably to improved earnings." Lukens has no blast furnace and makes its steel from scrap.

In seeking to explain why the company's earnings increased 300 percent, the Lukens official had to resort to fiction rather than fact because any scrutiny of price records for the comparable periods of January-June 1955 versus January-June 1956 would have proven how spurious such as explanation was.

The facts, of course, are quite different. During the first 6 months of 1955, the price of No. 1 steel scrap in the Philadelphia market moved within a range of $31 to a high of $38. In this same period in 1956, the price of steel scrap at Philadelphia ranged from $46 to $54. In fact, the $54 price was held during most of the 6 months and the price only started to drop around June and it is well known that steel mill buying of scrap in June would be for delivery within 30 to 60 days.

Lukens Steel, therefore, paid roughly $15 to $20 a ton more for its purchased scrap this year in the first 6 months than it did a year ago. And yet, despite this added $15 to $20

a ton over its 1955 price it was able to show a net income of 300 percent over the 1955 period. What is the Lukens spokesman trying to do? Kid the public into believing that the scrap trade is oppressing the small steel mills?

If the smaller steel mills are suffering in this painful manner, they are going to get very little sympathy from the public and even less from congressional committees.

Spokesmen for the smaller steel mills have been habitual breastbeaters before congressional committees whenever the question of scrap prices have come up but they certainly don't point to their own fabulous profits which are made even at a time when scrap prices are relatively high.

Only a few months ago, in March, Robert W. Wolcott, chairman of the board of Lukens Steel Co., at a hearing of the House Banking and Currency Committee on scrap exports stated:

"Skyrocketing scrap prices of the past year have resulted in limiting the earnings of small companies. * * * Mind you, during the upsweep of scrap prices, the prices of steel products remained reasonably stable. The small steel companies were caught in an economic squeeze and they are still in that squeeze."

Our heart bleeds for those companies that are in this economic squeeze, especially the one that shows that 300 percent increase in profits.

When Mr. Wolcott made the statement at the House Banking Committee, we called attention to the fact that it was misleading and that, in fact, the small steel mills were showing tremendous increases in profits despite higher scrap prices and that none of the steel mills were suffering financially as a result of the rise in the price of scrap, which was long overdue. What was true in March is certainly doubly true in July, particularly in view of such financial statements as those shown by Lukens.

It is not too difficult to see what is behind these constant attacks on scrap prices by steel mill spokesmen who have taken on a crusade against the exportation of scrap. They want no export restrictions on pig iron or steel products, but they do want to create an oversupply of scrap in the United States so that they can buy material at much lower prices. Motivated by the profit angle, they do not actually care about the existence of the scrap industry or its need to sell its product at a reasonable price. If the price of scrap were $15 a ton, these steel mill spokesmen would still yell their heads off that the price was too high and that it was necessary to stop exports, so that they might be able to buy scrap at $10 a ton.

In the face of the Lukens Steel 6-month financial statement showing a 300 percent increase in net profits despite higher scrap prices, the statement by the company spokesman that lower prices of scrap enabled them to make more profits sounds extremely ludicrous. It is clear evidence that the profit motive is the determining influence behind the steel mills' attacks on scrap exports.

Hon. Victor Wickersham

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, VICTOR WICKERSHAM, will be missed by his many friends in Congress. I came to know him very well in the days immediately following World War II. We were members of a special committee which visited a great many of the war-torn countries in order to see first-hand the magnitude of the task of rebuilding a world so gravely wounded by all-out war. The able gentleman from Oklahoma is a confirmed enthusiast, optimist, and a believer that all things turn out for the best in the end. VICTOR WICKERSHAM well represented the people of the Sixth District of Oklahoma during the years he served them in Congress. He is sure to succeed in whatever he chooses to take up as his work in the future. He carries the good wishes of his colleagues, and I shall miss his pleasant smile and the warmth of his friendship.

Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to add my voice to those of my fellow Members and friends in Government who are applauding the significant and pioneering report on Defense Essentiality and Foreign Economic Policy which has been produced by the House-Senate Committee on Foreign Economic Policy, and ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I wish to point out that this report constitutes the first realistic congressional study of the intimate relationship between healthy American competition and our defense mobilization base. This subcommittee has ably demonstrated that it would be a self-defeating policy to impose restrictions on foreign trade in an attempt to protect domestic industries considered essential to our defense. Instead of providing an expanding arsenal of recision tools and skills, the committee showed that the stifling of foreign competition tends to foster industrial complacency, technological stagnation, higher prices, diminishing consumption, and, consequently, a smaller reserve of essential equipment and skills.

The watchmaking industry, which happened to be the subject of this case study, proved an excellent example of the weakness of protectionist arguments that high tariffs necessarily contribute to the welfare of defense-essential industries. The committee warned that, in the first place, "Every industry feels itself essential to defense because it knows that its facilities would be employed in an all-out emergency." While respecting the possibility that there may be industries for which defense essentiality can be argued, the committee demonstrated that artificially created monopolies could only further weaken those domestic industries, as well as the total national security.

As the committee stated, "Freezing neither industrial capacity nor skilled manpower in set patterns is a wise approach to insuring national security even in the narrow sense of continental defense in an age of accelerated technological change."

The committee rightly suggests that if there are products for which it is possible to forecast long-range defense essentiality they should be aided through devices which do not disrupt international trade and thereby weaken our friends abroad. Stockpiling or direct subsidies, for example, have the virtue of placing the cost in the defense budget, where it belongs, instead of on the backs of American consumers in the form of prohibitive prices for the goods we require.

This unanimous report, Mr. President, marks a significant forward step in solving the complex problems involved in creating a realistic mobilization base. The findings of this committee should, hereafter, be considered a basic document for the executive branch whenever it is called upon to consider pleas for tariff protection on grounds of defense essentiality.

The Vice Presidential Situation in the Republican Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have long felt that I should publicly express regret for having supported Harold Stassen in the 1948 presidential campaign. Stassen's unsavory attempt to dump Vice President NIXON is only the last in a long series of actions that, in my opinion, qualify Stassen as one of the most contemptible politicians of our era. His recent career has been such that I have had to oppose Stassen at nearly every turn since 1952, but the NIXON episode is final proof that anyone who ever thought well of Stassen was sadly deluded.

I call Stassen's attack on NIXON unsavory, not because he is opposing a man who I happen to think has done a good job; but because the attack obviously has the single purpose of promoting Harold Stassen's personal political fortunes—whatever may be the cost to the Republican Party and to the Nation. Harold Stassen is obsessed by an overpowering ambition to become President. As for his methods—anything goes that promises to place Stassen's name in the limelight.

STASSEN'S SECRET POLL

Take, for example, the so-called secret poll that, according to Stassen, showed that the Republican ticket would run 6 percent stronger with Gov. Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, as the vice presidential candidate than with NIXON. It is impossible to believe that Stassen was telling the truth about this poll. Whether the poll was never taken, or Stassen lied about the results of it, I do not know. But it is inconceivable that Governor Herter, whom a vast majority of Americans had never heard of, would have run ahead of a man who is known by all Americans and well-liked by most of them. Other polls bear out this conclusion. For example, a Roper poll, taken about the time of Stassen's alleged poll, asked the question: "If Eisenhower decides not to run, whom would you like to see as the Repub-

lican presidential candidate?" NIXON was selected by 12 percent of those who indicated a choice; Herter by barely 1 percent.

A REPUTATION FOR UNTRUTHFULNESS

There were other reasons that prompted Washington observers to conclude that Stassen's poll was a phony. Stassen had been known to falisfy the facts before. He falsified the facts, both in his officials reports to Congress and in his testimony before a Senate committee, in an effort to cover up the fact that the United States was permitting its allies to ship strategic war materials to Communist nations. I quote from the Senate investigations committee's official report on East-West trade (p. 46):

"The Battle Act Administrator, Mr. Stassen, in 1954 misstated the facts in his Fifth Battle Act Report, when he reported: 'Minerals and metals of basic importance to the Soviet military power, such as aluminum, copper, nickel, moylbdenum, cobalt, magnesium, tungsten, and titanium remain on the embargo list.' In this and other portions of the Fifth Battle Act Report, Mr. Stassen misrepresented facts, which thus misled the Congress and the American people. Moreover, when he testified before this subcommittee, Mr. Stassen appeared to be an arrogant, evasive, and uncandid witness. The subcommittee feels that Mr. Stassen is to be severely criticized for his conduct in this matter."

It is no wonder, in the light of his record, that the motives for Stassen's attack on NIXON have been suspect. Moreover, Stassen's pose of martyrdom, in the face of almost universal criticism of his actions, fools no one. Those who know Harold Stassen know that he has never been a martyr to any "cause" except his own.

STASSEN'S REAL MOTIVATIONS

What, then, does Stassen hope to gain for himself? For one thing, Stassen believes that if he should succeed in dumping NIXON, there is a good possibility that the Vice Presidential nomination will be his. He knows that the leftwing of the Republican Party wants desperately to get rid of NIXON, and he believes that if NIXON is dumped, the triumphant leftwingers will be in a mood to reward the man who led the dumping campaign. The fact that the Herter-for-Vice-President campaign is, in reality, a Stassen-for-Vice-President campaign is amply demonstrated in the following news item. Referring to the Herter headquarters set up by Stassen, a Washington newspaper reported: "Heading up the volunteer crew at the Ike and Chris headquarters is H. Brooks Baker * * * who also serves as chairman of Young Americans for Eisenhower First, and Stassen Second."

(I should add, in case there are any doubts about it, that this organization was set up several months ago, under Stassen's auspices, to drum up support for making Stassen the vice presidential candidate.)

Actually, however, Stassen is not placing all of his bets on getting the vice presidential nomination this year. He is probably playing for much higher stakes. Stassen knows that at the present time there is no heir apparent to President Eisenhower as the leader of the leftwing of the GOP. There are many who aspire to that title besides Stassen—Sherman Adams, Milton Eisenhower, Tom Dewey, Paul Hoffman, to name a few. But none has yet definitely emerged as the man who will be the leftwing's leader when President Eisenhower leaves office. Stassen believes that his attack on NIXON will give him a large head start over his rivals. Stassen believes, moreover, that the leftwingers will control the Republican Party in the future, and that in 1960 or in 1964, they will be disposed to make the hero of the anti-NIXON campaign the GOP presidential candidate. Stassen figures there is no better way to ingratiate himself with the leftwingers than to lead a fight against NIXON, a man whom the leftwingers fear and dislike. His chances will be especially good, Stassen believes, if an Eisenhower-NIXON ticket should be defeated in November. In that event, the leftwingers will place the blame for a Republican defeat on NIXON, and Stassen will be hailed as the man who called the turn, and thus the man who should be nominated for President in 1960.

These, I firmly believe, are Harold Stassen's real motivations. It is likely, however, that Stassen will fall victim to his own overpowering ambition. I think that the Republican Party and the American people will reward his dump NIXON efforts by dumping Stassen himself into political oblivion, which is where he has belonged for some time.

Resolution of Second World War Veterans of the Polish Armed Forces in Exile, Cleveland, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on July 15, 1956, the Cleveland chapter of the Second World War Veterans of the Polish Armed Forces in Exile passed a very significant resolution. That resolution resulted from a desire to see our Government take some practical action in response to the heroic uprising of the Polish patriots at Poznan. It calls for the United States to take the leadership in bringing about free elections in Communist-occupied Poland. This resolution carries a message which I believe enjoys the warm support of the overwhelming majority of the American people. Under leave granted, I insert this resolution in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION BY SECOND WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE POLISH ARMED FORCES IN EXILE, CLEVELAND, OHIO

In connection with the bloody incidents which occurred in Poznan during the last days of June 1956 and which are the consequences of terror of the Communist regime in the entire Poland, we, the Polish soldiers of World War II being forced into exile, and united in Cleveland, Ohio, as Second World War Veterans, at the last meeting which took place on the 8th of July in the Polish Women's Hall do hereby manifest our thoughts by accepting this resolution of protest.

We express our deepest sympathy to all the families of our brother soldiers who have been killed innocently or wounded in the bread and freedom riots.

We find these barbarous acts perpetrated by the Communists as shocking to all humanity, and therefore, we condemn with the utmost indignation, and contempt the bloody ruling hand of the Communist Party in Poland. This hand had slain countless numbers of our brethren and confined innocent Poles to concentration camps, who are never heard from again with the exception of a few who sacrifice untold vigors to make an escape.

We also condemn the second brutal crime of Communist regime, namely, the rejection of an offer to send food to our hungry Polish people by the American Red Cross.

We condemn most emphatically the beastly and humiliating methods to which the Polish people were subject by the Kremlin's representatives during the last 10 years.

We protest strongly against the continuing tyranny of the Communist regime in Poland, and sustaining Yalta status by the Western Powers.

We appeal for humane treatment of the Polish people whose chaotic status was brought about through the Yalta agreements. Also the treason accorded the faithful aliens from this ignoble agreement.

We welcome with gratitude the action of Government of Australia demanding free election in Poland and the restoration of complete freedom.

We also appeal to the Government of the United States as one of those signing the Yalta Pact to cancel it, and to restore freedom for Poland and the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The opinion of the eyewitnesses of the bloody riot in Poznan confirms our demands that only a free election and the rights of existence can bring to an end the crimes inflicted upon the Polish people.

Our prayers appeal to God to end this perfidious misdeeds of the Communists. Our voices appeal to the people of the free world to help our cause, which is a noble one. It is a simple one; to live beside his fellow man and not under him as a slave. Abraham Lincoln fought a similar cause, but despots continue through history, and men of Lincoln's stature are few and far between.

The grains of sand run coarse through the hour glass and so does the precious blood of Polish people, and as the sand runs out the blood will run out, unless thoughts are translated into action.

SECOND WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE POLISH ARMED FORCES IN EXILE.
CLEVELAND, OHIO.

War Incitement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 21, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item from the Israel Digest of July 20, 1956:

WAR INCITEMENT CAMPAIGN SCORED IN COMPLAINTS TO MAC

JERUSALEM.—On July 18, Israel submitted separate complaints to the Israel-Jordan and the Israel-Egyptian Mixed Armistice Commissions charging Egypt and Jordan with continued breaches of article I of the general armistice agreements by persisting in warlike propaganda against Israel.

The Israel complaint against Egypt cited two examples of such propaganda in broadcasts by the Cairo-controlled Voice of the Arabs on July 2, 1956. These broadcasts said:

EGYPTIAN THREATS

1. "The duty of holy war not only falls upon those situated near the armistice lines and the border but upon all Palestine Arabs. A new era was opened with the establishment of a Palestine Army which will bring about the realization of our cherished hopes. We promise an honorable return to Palestine. Only if we sacrifice all that is dear to us for the homeland shall we be worthy of this. We shall be soldiers of an army of which we can be proud and which will bring us honor: That is the Palestine Army."

2. "From day to day, bonds of friendship and cooperation between the Arab peoples have become more numerous and stronger.

From the Atlantic to the Arab ocean everyone is aware of the fist that deals blows to the remnants of imperialism and Zionist bands."

Such pronouncements, the complaint by Israel stressed, coming from official Egyptian organizations, constitute a threat against the government and the people of Israel and are part and parcel of a general policy of noncompliance by the Egyptian Government with the General Armistice Agreement and more specifically of article I thereof.

JORDAN PROPAGANDA

A similar complaint was submitted against Jordan. It referred to a broadcast on Radio Ramallah on July 6 which said:

"Israel has begun to deny that she is concentrating troops. Israel ought to know that the Arabs have decided to clip nails and are bringing closer the day of her elimination."

The Israel Foreign Ministry spokesman, announcing the submission of the complaints to the Mixed Armistice Commissions, added that Israel regards article I which proscribes hostile actions and threats, as a fundamental provision of the armistice agreements. Implementation of this article, and particularly the termination of all hostile incitement against Israel by governmental media, are essential if the cease-fire pledges given last April to U. N. Secretary-General Hammarskjold, are not to fall apart completely.

Rearmament and Nuclear Weapons Tests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the annual meeting of the United States section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom occurred on July 14–18 at Oberlin College, Ohio.

Among the resolutions adopted at this meeting were one concerning disarmament and nuclear weapons tests and one concerning planning for a peacetime economy. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two resolutions be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL
LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C.

To: The President; the Secretary of State; the Honorable Harold Stassen, Special Assistant to the President on Disarmament; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, Special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

From: Mrs. Alexander Stewart, legislative secretary, United States section.

Resolution re disarmament and nuclear weapons tests.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at its annual meeting in Oberlin, Ohio, June 14–18, 1956, noting the continued stalemate in disarmament negotiations in the face of the threat posed by the spread of atomic technology, reaffirms its belief that the only basis for security—and indeed survival—is total universal disarmament. This goal should be pressed by moving forward from the important areas of agreement already reached on limited objectives in the United Nations Disarmament Commission to a comprehensive plan looking toward total universal disarmament. It should be based on the maximum possible controls and safeguards, but should recognize that perfect certainty in inspection is a physical impossibility, and that some risks must be taken for peace in order to avoid the far greater risks of a continued arms race. In the interim pending comprehensive agreements the United States might take some unilateral steps to encourage reciprocal steps by other countries. We especially urge the immediate cessation of test explosions of nuclear weapons. The legality of these explosions under international law is questionable. The resulting radiation and fallout threaten the health of the present generation and of future generations through genetic damage of unpredictable amount. Moreover, they hold a present danger to the people in the immediate area and are an affront to world opinion.

We also urge the United States to seek agreement with other leading powers for a ban on the development of ballistic missiles and for a United Nations control organ to assure the observance of this ban.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL
LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Washington, D. C.

To: The President; Hon. Harrold E. Stassen, Special Assistant to the President on Disarmament; Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, chairman, Special Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Committeee on Foreign Relations.

From: Mrs. Alexander Stewart, legislative secretary, United States section.

Resolution re planning for a peacetime economy.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at its annual meeting, Oberlin, Ohio, June 14–18, 1956, realizing that over a 10th of all jobs in the United States are dependent on military spending, calls upon leaders in the executive and legislative branches of Government to develop and present plans for the transition to an economy based on production for civilian uses. A wider public understanding is needed of the possibilities which will be opened by the diversion of resources and manpower from military to constructive peacetime purposes. Such planning would evidence the sincerity of the efforts of the United States to halt the arms race and would help develop public support for steps toward total universal disarmament.

Jets to Kremlin-Hugging Tito

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 16, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by William R. Hearst, Jr., which appeared in newspapers throughout the country on July 15, 1956, makes interesting reading:

UNITED STATES SENDING 380 JETS TO KREMLIN-HUGGING TITO

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief, Hearst Newspapers)

Hold your hats, everybody.

If you've been unhappy over the news that the administration still insists on sending aid to Tito despite his big kiss-and-make-up scene with the Kremlin, get ready for a real shocker—

Good old Uncle Sap plans to make available about 380 jet planes to the man who recently stood by without saying a word in contradiction when Marshal Zhukov declared "Russia and Yugoslavia would march shoulder to shoulder" in any future war.

This is the big story of last week's secret meeting between congressional leaders and Government spokesmen on the red-hot political subject of additional American aid to the Communist dictator.

Senators and Representatives sat aghast as it slowly dawned on them that this new United States assistance to Yugoslavia contemplates the dispatch of modern jet aircraft. In fact, some have already gone.

The rest will eventually find their way to the Balkans—unless an aroused public protest and congressional opposition stymies the deal—without any guaranty that someday they might not be turned against America.

This despite the fact that some of our own National Guard units don't have the jet planes they need.

I have learned these facts from excellent sources, from people in a position to know what transpired at last week's huddle between Secretary Dulles and members of Congress' Armed Forces Committees.

Yugoslavia has received well over $1 billion in economic and military aid from the United States since 1948.

The administration has failed to prove its case in asking that further funds should be voted for this so-called neutral nation whose Communist dictator has become publicly reconciled with Russia's rulers.

It made sense to shore up Tito while he continued to be an ulcer in Stalin's flank, but this realistic if unpleasant approach became outdated the moment Khrushchev embraced Tito again with no apparent protest from the Yugoslavian dictator.

Secretary Dulles is asking for freedom of action in a sensitive area. This skilled statesman should realize that the granting of further aid to Tito in the face of his reconciliation with Moscow is bound to have serious repercussions among our allies and the so-called uncommitted nations.

Neutralism will be encouraged as a paying proposition; our allies will wonder if Uncle Sam is more concerned about placating the neutrals than about the continuation of their friendship.

Let's stop this spending of American taxpayers' money someplace—sometime. Why not now—and in Yugoslavia?

IKE RUNS AGAIN

The casual disclosure that President Eisenhower will seek reelection came as no surprise to the overwhelming majority of Americans, who all along accepted the medical verdict of the foremost physicians in the country that his intestinal ailment would not incapacitate him for a second term.

Right until the last, however, certain columnists and commentators sought to maintain an artificial tension over the situation, trying to create a suspense that actually never existed. It is quite apparent now that Ike viewed his present illness as a temporary stomach disorder, and did not place it in the same category as his heart attack of last September. The moment he felt his recovery had reached the proper stage, he passed the word along to his chief lieutenants.

And the President showed shrewd political judgment in arranging that Senator KNOWLAND would be the one to make the first announcement. Ike and the strong-minded California Senator have not always seen eye to eye on some projects, so it was sound strategy to indicate to the voters that they were united on the subject of the President's reelection.

As long ago as January 1, 1956, your favorite editor went out on a limb with the flat prediction, based on some solid inside information, that the Republican ticket in 1956

would again be Eisenhower and NIXON. Now I feel calmer.

ALCOHOLIC WARD

Komrade Khrushchev is quite a character. If he is not denouncing the murderer Stalin who made him what he is today, he is publicly losing his temper or getting boisterously drunk at some diplomatic function.

The latest instance of Khrushchev's vodka venom (at the Moscow Aviation Day party) might well cost him his job as one of the top men in the Communist hierarchy.

According to the reports, Khrushchev got so loaded at the lawn party that he engaged in a shouting argument with Premier Bulganin, who also appears to have a weakness for vodka. He insulted Nigel Birch, British Air Minister, and then made some far-from-diplomatic remarks to other foreign airmen about the methods and accomplishments of their countries.

So embarrassed was Marshal Zhukov, the Soviet Defense Minister and wartime hero of the Red army, that he personally apologized to his Western guests.

Now whether this sort of situation will lead to the political purging of Khrushchev remains to be seen. The possibility cannot, of course, be excluded.

Following our trip to London last April to cover the visit of Khrushchev and Bulganin, I was invited to address the International Trade Fair in Seattle. In the course of that speech I made the following comment:

"To me, a very significant aspect of the Communist leaders' visit to Britain was Khrushchev's bad temper.

"He lost it at the Birmingham Industrial Fair, speaking before a completely respectful audience of industrialists. He threatened them and the free world with mass destruction through the use of already developed guided missiles.

"* * * He got away a little with his drunkenness and antics in Yugoslavia and he was quite successful with his lamp-for-a-hat trick in India.

"* * * [But] drinking and losing his temper may have a great deal more significance than appears on the surface today."

Again in the Editor's Report of May 27, I wrote:

"It would not surprise me at all if the unbelievably bad show he put on in England might not be the cause of his receding some in power in their top ruling group—the Presidium."

Whether Khrushchev can be unseated depends, of course, on how much power he possesses.

As first secretary of the party, he controls the political machine with its 6 million members. Malenkov did not have this political power when he lost his job. Nor, obviously, did he have the support of the army, the other major instrument of power in the Soviet Union today.

Whether he can behave like a Tartar and continue to maintain his position as one of Russia's top rulers is questionable.

I don't think so.

The Great Pretense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 17, 1956, it was my privilege to participate in the Georgetown University Television Forum of the Air. The question discussed on that forum was The Great Pretense. Also participating in this forum were the Honorable Edward M. O'Connor, former Commissioner of Displaced Persons, and now consultant to the Director of the United States Information Agency, and Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, who was substituting for our colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

The Great Pretense refers to the present efforts of the masters of the Kremlin to cloak themselves with respectability in order to deceive the unsuspecting into believing that the Communists have abandoned their goal of world conquest by subversion, infiltration and force when necessary. Because of the great interest so many people have in getting all the facts about the latest tactical maneuver of the Russian Communists, under leave granted I insert in the RECORD the transcript of that forum meeting The Great Pretense:

THE GREAT PRETENSE, JUNE 17, 1956

(Participants: Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the Ad Hoc Committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting for the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD; Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director of the United States Information Agency. Moderator: Mr. Matthew Warren.)

Mr. WARREN. The Great Pretense is the topic for the 500th consecutive broadcast of the Georgetown University Radio Forum, another in a series of educational and informative programs from Washington. The Georgetown University Forum was founded in 1946.

This is Matthew Warren speaking by transcription from the Raymond Reiss Studio, on the campus of Georgetown University, historic Jesuit seat of learning in the Nation's Capital.

Today's discussion will be The Great Pretense. The participants are James J. McTigue, consultant to the Ad Hoc Committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting for the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, who is ill; Mr. DODD is a Member of Congress from Connecticut. The Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director, United States Information Agency. All three of our speakers were members of the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression in the 83d Congress.

Transcripts of today's broadcast are available. Send 10 cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing, with your name and address to the Georgetown University Forum, Washington 7, D. C. Please mention also the subject matter of the transcript desired.

Today's Forum takes its title from a significant document issued on May 19. The document was published by the House Un-American Committee and is a symposium on the anti-Stalinism now current in the Soviet Union. We of the Forum feel obligated to alert Americans to the current changes in Soviet strategy and at the same time to remind all of us of basic objectives of the world of communism. So we of the Georgetown University have asked three most competent analysts of Soviet behavior to give you their evaluation of recent Soviet changes. Mr. O'Connor, what is the great pretense?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Matthew, as you have described it, in one sense is is a publication of a symposium on anti-Stalinism in the 20th Congress of the Communist Party which was held in February of this year.

I thought I might, as a beginner, give my impression of the main points established in this printed symposium. I think the first thing would be that the anti-Stalin campaign is an effort of the present Communist leaders to remove from themselves all guilt for the long list of crimes against humanity committeed in the name of communism. The second thing is that the anti-Stalin campaign is but a part of the larger Russian offensive to get the free world to accept peaceful coexistence, that is, the creation of the illusion that human freedom and tyranny can live side by side in safety and at peace with one another. The third point is that this anti-Stalin campaign in no way signifies a change in any of the basic policy of the Communist conspiracy but merely heralds a significant change in tactics. Therefore, the word of caution. We ought to remember that this symposium is a contribution indeed to the thinking and to the alerting of the American people to the dangers in this change in tactics. But we ought not to consider this symposium as the end all, because the tactics of the Russians, the Communists, are very changing and there will be many more in the months and years ahead.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. O'Connor, this is a very vital publication, The Great Pretense, a symposium on anti-Stalinism and the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Many of our Americans across the Nation are familiar with the publications of our Congress; and the United States Government Printing Office has added this to their long list, and very many do not read these articles as much as they should. Can you tell us how they can get hold of this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. They can get this publication by writing to the Government Printing Office and for the payment of 25 cents, I believe anyone can secure this publication.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You mentioned, Mr. O'Connor, that this new approach heralded no change in Communist tactics. I think in that connection it would be informative to refer to The Great Pretense for a moment in an article by Whittaker Chambers. The article is entitled "Is Stalin's Russia Weakening?" In that article, Whittaker Chambers says on the subject of tactics, among other things, as follows: "In brief, communism's great change dating from the 20th Congress is a change of tactics not of intentions. Communism is cleaning house in order to make its personnel, its formations, its tactics more acceptable, efficient, up to date, and thus to hasten its project of dividing, wooing, and of winning the West preparatory to overrunning the West. That Communist purpose never changes."

Mr. O'CONNOR. I agree completely in that statement by Whittaker Chambers. I believe he is an eminent authority and one who has lived close to the conspiracy for years. I think he is a real student of its twists and turns.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might add, Mr. Warren, Mr. William Henry Chamberlain also in his analysis showed very clearly that this Russian Communist change is one of tactics only. He said that there has been no change in Russia in such basic Stalinite methods as the forced regimentation of the peasants in collective farms, the denial of such basic human rights as freedom of speech, press, voting, and trade union organization. Nor is there any apparent willingness on the part of the new Soviet leaders to relinquish their grip on the vast territories in Eastern and Central Europe which Stalin took by force and held in violation of sound pledges to respect the self-determination of peoples. It is quite obvious that if the Russians were sincere that they would do away with the slave labor camps throughout their vast empire. They would give freedom to the people, such as freedom of religion, press and speech, and the right to vote, the right of self-determination.

They would give enough for these enslaved nations to be free. But in their enunciations they only talk about freedom, but they will not give the people an opportunity to have an expression of freedom by a ballot or in any other manner.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Congressman FEIGHAN, that theme runs through this report by the House Un-American Activities. I would like to cite another such quotation as the Congressman has given us, by the professor of international relations at Syracuse University, contributed to this symposium under the title of, "Risks of Anti-Stalinism." Here is what he says on this subject, speaking, of course, of the effort of the Russian leaders to wash their hands of these crimes: "Can they successfully wash off their hands the responsibility for the Socialist purges and the forced labor camps which they have not abolished after his death? Can they claim his succession while degrading their former master who they publicly extolled at the previous 19th Congress." That is a fundamental question which runs as a central theme throughout this report. How can these people from Khrushchev on down possibly purge themselves of these tremendous crimes when the very offenses and crimes against humanity which were committed by Stalin and at his direction are continued within the vast empire of the Communists. This, it seems to me, is a very basic question.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I might add there that Khrushchev, the present Secretary of the Communist Party, was known in the Ukraine as the hangman of the Ukraine, because he was the one who perpetrated and carried out the man-made famine and many of the massacres, not only in the Ukraine but in many other nations in the U. S. S. R.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Right along those lines, Congressman FEIGHAN, and in line with what Mr. O'Connor has just discussed, I would like to make reference to Mr. William C. Bullitt's article in The Great Pretense. Mr. Bullitt is our former Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936. The article by Mr. Bullitt is entitled, "A Talk With Voroshilov." Voroshilov is at present the chairman of the Communist Party Presidium. In this article, in a conversation with Voroshilov, Mr. Bullitt reports as follows. He is talking about the murders of the Czarist officers and their wives and children in Kiev. He says, "What did you do then after the men were shot?" "Oh," said Voroshilov, "after we shot the men and boys we put all women and girls into brothels for our Army." "Do you think," asked Mr. Bullittt, "that was a very decent thing to do?" "My army needed women," said Voroshilov, "and I was concerned with my army's health and not with the health of those women, and it didn't make any difference anyhow because they were all dead within 3 months." So, this is the type of leadership, Mr. O'Connor, which is trying now to disassociate itself with Stalin's crime; is that correct?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, indeed it is. I don't think, Mr. McTigue, that this description which has been given by Bill Bullitt, a great patriot and a great American statesman, is limited only to Voroshilov. I think, as Congressman FEIGHAN has pointed out, Khrushchev gained the title of hangman of the Ukraine. He got that title only because he was the majordomo in the forced famine and thereby the starvation of over 5 million people, plus the liquidations in the Ukraine and in Byelorussia, following World War II. I heard he also had a hand in the death of over 2 million Moslems in Turkistan between 1925 and 1927, and a whole lot of other crimes have been attributed to him. Let's take Zhukov, as another example. These days we hear him being extolled as the possible guardian of the peace. We must remember that Zhukov is fundamentally, by his own admission, a hard-rock Communist. The story is going around that while he was supposed to have been in exile in Odessa he was master-minding the take-over of China. There is also some reason to believe that Zhukov was the master mind behind the Communist aggression in China. We could go on down the list of these people who are the major characters in the Communist central authority, and I think every one of the records would be very similar, if not identical, to those which we have described.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. McTigue, as a consultant to the ad hoc committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, you will recall perhaps there was some difficulty in interpreting this term "ad hoc" at a recent congressional hearing. Would you explain that to me?

Mr. MCTIGUE. I recall that, Mr. Warren. "Ad hoc," if I recall my Latin as I learned it from the good Jesuits of Georgetown University, means, "for this purpose." Consequently, an ad hoc committee is a committee for a particular purpose, let us say, a special temporary committee.

The ad hoc committee of the Foreign Affairs Committee is presided over by Chairman THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut. The committee's jurisdiction, which was voted by motion of the full House Foreign Affairs Committee, directs the ad hoc committee to investigate the treatment of American civilians and American military personnel who were detained or who were imprisoned in Red China. Mr. DODD, I am sure, has no intention in pursuance of this investigation of taking an account, a dreary reaccount, if you will, of the experiences, the terrifying experiences undergone by these prisoners and civilians in the forms of beatings, and so forth, and so on; rather, Mr. DODD has in mind that this investigation will bring home forcibly to the American people the psychological warfare that the Red Chinese are now conducting. Among other questions we will seek to determine is whether these international bandits are holding these 11 civilian prisoners of war as ransom for their eventual, that is, Red China's eventual admission into the U. N. I could go on at some length about this, Mr. Warren, but I know our time is short. I do, however, want to make this observation, if I may: It is a great honor and privilege to substitute for Congressman DODD on this program. It occurs to me that a substitute for Mr. DODD on a subject like this is somewhat like sending in a substitute to hit for Mickey Mantle. However, let me say this: The world knows of Congressman DODD's record at Nuremberg. He knew the enemy then; he knows the enemy now.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman FEIGHAN, you have a long and outstanding record in Congress alerting the people of America to the facts of communism. Are you now convinced that this new look in Communist Russia is really a great pretense?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I really think it could better be described as the master fakery of the ages. There is absolutely no air of sincerity in their new tactical maneuvers whatever. They are fully devoted to the idea of world conquest, the destruction of nations, and nationhood. Any idea that we could coexist with them is, in my opinion, utter foolishness. In fact, I have been opposed even to the meetings at the so-called summit, because, in my opinion, the greatest accomplishment, if you could call it such, of the so-called meetings at the summit was to humanize the evil little despots of the Kremlin and to wipe off the blood, the guilty blood of many millions of martyrs and nations from the hands of Khrushchev and Bulganin. I think it is about time that we recognize that there is no sincerity, no change of policy of world conquest by the Russians, and consequently we should endeavor to engage in a political offensive in which we will eventually bring about the destruction of this ogre of world communism which deprives people of their freedom and keeps so many people and nations under the yoke of Communist bondage and slavery.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Warren, I concur with Mr. FEIGHAN in the belief that the Russians attended the Geneva summit conferences strictly for the purpose of furthering their campaign of peaceful coexistence. Whatever the purposes of the leaders of the West may have been, there is no denying that central fact. The Russians went to Geneva with the clear purpose of laying the foundation for the worldwide offensive in which they are now engaged. It is significant, in my considered judgment, to note that when the foreign ministers met several months after the meeting at the summit to bring into specific point and action the rather generalized thinking that took place at the summit conference, it is noted that they fell into complete disagreement and indeed Mr. Molotov broke up the meeting by issuing ultimatum after ultimatum, which, of course, the leaders of the West could not accept. Then this was followed by a visit to South Asia by Khrushchev and Bulganin where they did nothing but belabor the West. They belabored the British and the French and accused the United States as being the biggest imperialist power in the world.

This brings me to the point of a quotation from The Great Pretense. Harry Schwartz, a very able newspaperman who writes for the New York Times, had this to say on the subject: "The Soviet Union of the 20th Congress had posed before it the great enemy of colonialism. Here is our opportunity to expose the Soviet Union as the major colonial power on earth today. The riots in Georgia in March testified more to the continuing strength of Georgia national feeling than to love of Stalinist dictatorship. If freedom is good for Indian and Burma, why is it not good for Uzbekistan, for Armenia, for the Ukraine and Latvia, and for all the people whose freedom has been taken from them by the czars or their Communist successors." Here they are, the biggest colonial imperial power in all of history, calling us, the lovers of independence and the ones who have fought for the rights of nations, the imperial power. I think we could do something about that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. O'Connor, I notice from the newspapers yesterday Shepilov, the new Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union, was over in Cairo condemning the United States and the West as a great colonial power. I think it is essential that truth be brought to the world. I think one of the mediums by which this can be done is through the United Nations. Mr. Dodd and four other Congressmen and myself introduced a House concurrent resolution last year calling up on the Secretary of State to send to each member nation of the U. N. a copy of the committee report of the Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, in which we had eye-witness testimony of over 300 witnesses which exposed the imperialism and colonialism and the terrible tyranny of the Russians.

We also requested that the Secretary of State draw up a resolution to be introduced by our Ambassador to the U. N., setting forth that the Russians were a threat to the peace and that they have been guilty of aggression. Unfortunately, that bill which passed the Foreign Affairs Committee, 17 to 5, was stalled in the House Rules Committee. It was certainly my hope that that will be acted on now, because I think truth is one of the biggest factors that will be effective in the cause of true peace.

Mr. WARREN. Congressman, as reported in this symposium on anti-Stalinism, as reported in The Great Pretense, Khrushchev, speaking at the opening of the 20th Congress of the party in Moscow gave the free world an ultimatum: Choose between coexistence

and war. He offered no other choice in the relationship between the free and the regimented world. What do we do about this? What is the alternative? Congressman FEIGHAN, must we accept this ultimatum?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Absolutely not. Constantine Brown in the article in The Great Pretense brings up this subject of coexistence. Our committee 2 years ago in its report recognized that the Kremlin was engaged in an all-out propaganda offensive as the advocates of peaceful coexistence between the Communist empire and the free world in oredr to gain time, to delude the free world as to its real intentions, to divide and destroy the free-world alliances, and to prepare the way for world war III. It seems there has been a dangerous oversimplification of the courses of action open to us in this present world crisis, either preventive war or a peaceful coexistence. Our committee very flatly rejected both of these courses of action as alien to the national interest. Instead, we recommended that we undertake——

Mr. MCTIGUE. May I interrupt, Congressman FEIGHAN?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes.

Mr. MCTIGUE. To ask you, I think that the committee that we were all associated with rejected after hearing the eye-witness testimony of the victims of this system, and very much the symposium that we have, The Great Pretense, merely extends the proof, the more current proof of the judgments that were made at the time. Would you agree with that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, a reaffirmation of our findings.

Mr. MCTIGUE. And hopefully this will continue, the good judgment of people in authoritative positions like this recognizing the threat. As I recall it, some other recommendations were made by the committee, were they not, Congressman, to defeat this coexistence?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, indeed. We recommended that the President get all the free countries of the world together and set forth their determination that all nations should have the right of national self-determination and be free. We also recommended that there be a severance by the free nations of both diplomatic and trade relations with the Communist-controlled countries.

Mr. MCTIGUE. At this juncture, is it an illusion to think that we can do business with the Soviets, the Communists?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I think it is because history shows very conclusively that whenever any nation has done business with the Russians they have always come out on the short end.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I concur completely in that. I would like at this point, Mr. Warren —you have asked me what we can do about this. I would like to make a couple of suggestions. The first is that Mr. FEIGHAN last year, as I recollect it, Congressman, correct me if I am wrong, introduced in the Congress a resolution to create a joint committee of the Congress on overseas information programs, conducted by the United States Government in order to carry on a real campaign of truth, to tell the people of the world where we stand and expose the Russians for what they really are. I think that is a practical step in a political offensive against communism.

The second one is this, recommended by Tom Dodd, that an international juridical commission be established within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization so as to record the crimes against humanity of communism; in other words, to establsh a permanent record. If such a record were established, as he recommended, there would be no ducking on the part of the leaders in the Kremlin because they would be strictly on the hook. Therefore, it seems to me that we ought in these days continue to record these crimes by the eyewitnesses because the masters in the Kremlin will continue to try and get off the hook and escape guilt for these terrible crimes.

Mr. MCTIGUE. When there comes a final accounting, Mr. O'Connor, there will be no evading the charges or the terrible atrocities which were committed by these Communists during the period of occupation and conquests, and so forth. That was on the basis of Mr. Dodd's experience at Nurenberg.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Exactly. I think in addition to that, Mr. McTigue, such a record would stand as a warning to all free peoples to be on guard against anyone who attempts to impose a totalitarian rule and to be determined to free those who are held in bondage of such rule.

Mr. MCTIGUE. Serving notice, in other words.

Mr. WARREN. Gentlemen, can we accept this as a fact, that first the Communist Party has changed its strategy radically; secondly, that the Soviet Union has launched a new type aggression; and in the third place, that we must be aware of this and fight back to the best of our ability?

Mr. MCTIGUE. If we don't, we are going to lose, Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. Thank you very much, gentlemen. I am sorry, our time is up for further discussion of the The Great Pretense. The participants in today's program, Mr. James J. McTigue, consultant to the Ad Hoc Committee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, substituting today for the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, who is ill; the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Member of Congress from Ohio; Mr. Edward M. O'Connor, consultant to the Director, United States Information Agency.

ILO Convention on Forced Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I have prepared a short statement concerning the position taken by the United States Government at the recent International Labor Conference in Geneva on the issue of an international convention on forced labor. Senators will remember that I have been concerned with this issue throughout the 2d session of the 84th Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON AN ILO CONVENTION ON FORCED LABOR

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the position of the United States Government on the question of an ILO convention on forced labor.

The Senate will remember that I have been somewhat critical of the timid position the United States Government appeared to be taking on this important issue. As a consequence, I introduced Senate Resolution 248, Senate Joint Resolution 117, and Senate Concurrent Resolution 75. The effect of these resolutions would be for the Senate to express its view that the Government of the United States should exercise leadership in the ILO to develop and adopt an international convention which will effectively outlaw forced labor for political and economic purposes.

The United States delegation recently returned from the International Labor Conference which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, from June 6 to June 28. I am pleased to state that the delegation voted in favor of placing on the agenda of the next International Labor Conference in June 1957, the question of forced labor for a second discussion, with a view to a final decision on a convention on the subject. To the extent that a change in policy has been reflected in these actions, I have been considerably encouraged.

The United States delegation at the International Labor Conference introduced an amendment to the text suggested by the International Labor Office, which governments had studied for many months. This amendment would provide that international trade and commerce in goods produced by any forced or compulsory labor should be prohibited.

While many of the delegations at the Conference agreed in principle with or expressed sympathetic interest in the United States proposal, they considered that they had not had sufficient opportunity to study the proposal in all of its implications, the governments having been advised of it only a week or two before the opening of the conference. It was, therefore, agreed by the conference committee on forced labor that the United States proposal would be given consideration next year.

I quote the following from the report of that committee:

"In view of the fact that the United States proposal was submitted only at this session of the conference, and not earlier, a number of governments felt that more time for study was needed before a decision could be taken on this proposal. The employers' and workers' members indicated that they were not at this stage expressing any views either for or against the United States amendment. The committee decided that the amendment proposed by the United States would be appropriate for consideration by the governments during the ensuing year, along with the conclusions directed toward a convention. The committee, therefore, adopted a proposal that governments should be afforded time for further study of the amendment in connection with the final draft of the convention to be prepared during the year and that the International Labor Office be requested to send the United States amendment to the governments along with the conclusions, on the understanding that governments would consider it and that it would be taken up in connection with the final draft of the convention at the next session of the conference. It was pointed out that since at this session it was the first discussion stage, no delay need be caused by the action taken by the committee."

This report was approved unanimously by the conference.

As a consequence of the action taken by the 39th International Labor Conference, the United States proposal will be contained in the further documentation prepared by the International Labor Office and distributed to governments prior to the 1956 conference, and will be considered by governments in connection with their preparations for that conference. It will be taken up again in June 1957.

There is, of course, no way of telling at this time what attitudes governments will take toward the numerous amendments which were introduced, including that of the United States Government and the text of a convention which will finally emerge. Governments will wish to study all these amendments with great care during the ensuing year. I am encouraged, however, by this more constructive approach of the United States Government on the matter of an ILO Convention relating to forced labor, and I wish to commend it for its position.

Why I Love America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a very significant feature article appeared on the editorial page of the Cleveland Press a short time ago, titled "Why I Love America." It was written by the editor of the Cleveland Press, Louis B. Seltzer. That article points up the resurgence of faith in the future of America by our citizens and the growing conviction that the freedoms as practiced in America are more precious than anywhere else on earth. I recommend its reading to all Members of Congress as I believe it carries a timely and inspiring message.

Under leave granted, I insert the article on Why I Love America:

WHY I LOVE AMERICA

(By Louis B. Selzer)

Never before have I held so much love for the United States of America as at this very moment.

From the time I was a small boy, the United States of America has held magic, excitement, something different, something wonderful for me.

Today, after 40 years as a newspaperman, after a lifetime of traveling across the face of the earth, after unlimited opportunities to observe the conditions under which people elsewhere live—after these years and these experiences, I now speak with awe, reverence, and profound admiration for the United States of America.

It is the greatest country man has ever put together since he has lived on this earth in his present form. The United States of America is both an old and a new story. It is the kind of story which grows greater in the retelling of it.

Has ever before in the world's history a country literally exploded from a continental wilderness within several centuries to become the undisputed destiny builder of the world?

Has ever before a country accorded to its people so many rights, so many privileges, so many opportunities, so much latitude in which to express themselves as individual personalities?

Has ever before a country brought its standard of life to such unprecedented heights, made available to its people in such abundance so many physical comforts and conveniences, shared so liberally and equitably so much of its created and produced wealth?

Has ever before a country in mankind's history furnished so profusely for its people educational advantages, industrial opportunities, so many homes, so many recreational places, so many of science's means for entertaining, stimulating, educating us all?

Has any nation ever before brought together so vast a panorama of industrial might, such phenomenal diversity of manufacture, so infinite a variety of research activity, so forward an advance in controlling human diseases and lengthening life itself?

We are today 165 million Americans. We have come to America from all places on earth. We live where we wish. We work where we will. We worship as we please. We speak freely what we think. We travel wherever and whenever the spirit moves us.

In no other country at no other time have its people had so much of everything, such unlimited freedom, such unlimited opportunity.

Sometimes we have not fully appreciated all of this. There was a time when some literary smart alecks thought to make it fashionable to ridicule democracy and debunk our heroes. Some of us fell for such pseudo-intellectual nonsense.

We learned how misguided they were. We learned, as did Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and other American greats, that it is a rare privilege to be a citizen of the United States—a land which has woven together all of the races of man, all of the religions of man, all of the cultures of man, and made of them a combined and mighty land of freedom and opportunity.

In our everyday existence, struggling, meeting problems, disagreeing with one another on politics or wages or policies, going into court on a traffic case, sued or being sued about something, we may momentarily forget these things. But we remember quickly. Something always brings it back to mind.

I have set foot on every State in America. I have set foot on most of the other countries of the earth. I have seen men and women with fear in their eyes, their voices stilled, their families starving, their huts pathetically inadequate, their futures bleak.

I have then come back to America. I have thanked the divine providence which makes me a citizen of this great and wonderful land of the free.

To be sure, we have laws. They are the laws made by our elected officials for the benefit of all of us. They are the laws which protect all of us from those things and those acts which might jeopardize our safety and our lives. These must be. We know this. We respect this—we respect it more because we know we have had a hand somewhere in the making of them.

An immigrant Italian boy can become the mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, one of the great industrial cities of America. The son of immigrant Slovenian parents can become the Governor of one of the great States—Ohio—and aspire even further.

It is happening not alone in Government. It is happening in every profession, in every business, in every aspect of life in America. We blend together the cultures of all people, the opportunities of America, the unlimited horizons of freedom—and we get America, the unique, the distinctive, the only nation of its kind in all of mankind's history.

Something unusual is happening in America today. Perhaps the threat of another war may be responsible. Perhaps the ability to get from one place to another so easily is responsible. Perhaps something in the spirit of the modern America is responsible.

But whatever reason, more people today are visiting the historic shrines of America, visting the birthplaces of America's great, searching out of libraries and bookstores more of the history of our country and its leaders, than at any other time. There is a great thirst, a great yearning to know more about America—to drink at its fountain of inspiration, and hope, and future.

This great resurgence of faith and belief in America has happened especially since the end of World War II—since the explosion of the first A-bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki—since the locking together in cold-war combat the two diametrically opposite philosophies of government.

We now sense what we have. We have now reappraised the worth of our own freedoms. We now more highly prize our own opportunities and privileges. We now match more graphically what we possess in such singular measure against what others do not have.

All over America we are building homes. More of them than ever before are going up. That means faith in America—belief in our future. More industry is being created, more plants being built, more investment being made. That means faith in America—belief in its future. More research is being made—more laboratories created—more experts being educated and trained. That means faith in America—belief in the future—and the will to protect this Nation against the unknown and the as-yet-unforeseen contingencies of a world which is changing in character and form almost literally overnight.

We are going to church in greater numbers than ever before. We realize in America that there is an influence far greater than any we, as mortals, can exercise over our collective and individual destinies. We have lessened in some degree at least our inflated notions that as human beings we know more about the world than anybody else and can do more with it. We know now—in an age of atom and cobalt bombs, of powers known and powers imagined—that anything can happen far beyond the ability of the average mortal to control. And we, therefore, seek sanctuary in a Providence upon which we of the 20th century have not always either depended or sought out for guidance.

Thus, economically, industrially, spiritually, morally, historically, we are gaining strenght in America—our faith and belief in America has undergone a great resurgence—our conviction that freedoms as practiced in America are more precious than anywhere else on earth has risen sharply in the last dozen years. Our faith in our Nation's future, our will to help it become greater, our determination to do what we can as individuals to make this come about has increased.

Some years ago I was troubled in my mind and heart about America. I believed that its people were too preoccupied with strictly material blessings and had subverted or forgotten the very things that made all of these possible—the freedoms, the opportunities. I have seen, more particularly since the end of World War II, a great, visible, substantial change in the attitudes of people, a reevaluation of spiritual and moral and civic values. And these, together with homes, churches, industry, communities, and facing up more courageously to the basic issues of our time, induce from me more respect for, more affection toward, and more devotion to the greatest country on the face of this earth, the United States of America.

I would not trade one small thimbleful of its free soil for any other country or any other place in the world.

Statement on the Report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I had hoped to deliver on the Senate floor during the last days of the session. The statement concerns a constructive report recently released by the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I do not want this session to end without briefly paying tribute to our

distinguished colleagues, serving as members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of the most able Representative from Missouri, Mr. BOLLING, who have recently turned out such a brilliant and stimulating report on the relationships between our foreign economic policy and the national security.

It seems to me that the report of this five-man subcommittee, which included Senators DOUGLAS, FULBRIGHT, and FLANDERS, has paved the way for a clarification of congressional and executive approaches to the vital question of industrial preparedness, and that the members and staff of this subcommittee deserve sincere congratulations.

I might say, Mr. President, that I have been disturbed to see the reaction to this report which was voiced in recent days by a few of my colleagues on the Senate floor. These comments were addressed specifically to those aspects of the subcommittee's report pertaining to the watch industry, and no doubt they reflected a sincere attempt to defend the position that the four domestic jeweled watch manufacturers are so essential to national defense as to justify the abandonment of our policy for the expansion of foreign trade.

I submit, however, that these efforts to perpetuate the impression that we must curtail watch imports in order to preserve our national security will not prove of genuine benefit to the domestic watch manufacturers, and will certainly lead to a weakening of our national security.

History clearly demonstrates, Mr. President, that whenever old concepts have outlived their usefulness, many of those who have committed themselves to those propositions have found it difficult to adjust to the new realities. Instead, they have reacted by increasing their efforts to defend these old concepts.

This is only human nature, and it has been reflected in the attacks which the domestic watch manufacturers have inspired against the subcommittee's findings. Despite these efforts to minimize the value of the committee's work, however, the undeniable logic of the report is certain to shine through. It seems to me, Mr. President, that any impartial, unprejudiced study of this report is certain to penetrate the smoke-screen which has been put forth by those who oppose it.

It should be understood, Mr. President, that the report did not deny that the domestic watch manufacturers can produce items which are useful to defense, although it pointed out that many other industries are capable of producing the same types of defense products. More important, however, was the very convincing presentation by the subcommittee that, even if it is decided that the watch manufacturers are important to defense, it would be most harmful public policy to attempt to aid them through techniques which are merely aimed at curtailing and suppressing their competitors. The heart of the report lies in the finding that our total national security is impaired, rather than helped, when we impose barriers to international trade in an attempt to protect isolated industries under the guise of national defense.

I might add, Mr. President, that the members of this subcommittee were undoubtedly fully aware of all of the allegations that have recently been raised on the Senate floor. As a matter of fact, the report discusses each of them in detail, and, indeed, points out the error of these arguments. It should be clearly understood that the domestic watch manufacturers had a full opportunity to present their views before the subcommittee, as did other segments of the watch industry and many distinguished, qualified witnesses who had no self-interest in the watch dispute.

In my opinion, the report of this subcommittee is, in every respect, a thorough, objective, and masterful job. It is one of the truly outstanding achievements of the current Congress, and I sincerely believe that those few people who are criticizing the document have not thought through the full implications of their narrow attacks.

In my opinion, the members of this subcommittee and its staff are to be sincerely commended for providing guidelines to the executive branch concerning methods of maintaining maximum national security without disrupting our friends and allies overseas and without penalizing the American consumer by forcing him to pay higher prices because of unwarranted trade restrictions. It is my fervent hope, Mr. President, that the President and the Office of Defense Mobilization will give this report the consideration which it so richly deserves, as they consider appeals from various industries for tariff relief on grounds of alleged defense essentiality.

National Publication Views on Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there was recently reproduced in the Jackson County Sentinel, Scottsboro, Ala., a very thought-provoking article from the Christian Science Monitor on the subject of segregation.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PUBLICATION VIEWS ON SEGREGATION

(Reprinted from the Christian Science Monitor)

It is surprising how many Americans believe their principal racial problem is confined to the South. For the fact is that nearly one-third of the Negroes in the United States now live in the North. They are largely concentrated in "cities" within cities, 12 having a population of 100,000 each and 3 nearly 1 million each. And adjustments are by no means always easy or peaceful, as recurrent disturbances prove.

There is no legal segregation in the North but segregation forms the general pattern wherever large groups of Negroes are found. Their own desires to live among their own kind plus economic pressures tend to restrict them to certain crowded and deteriorating neighborhoods. And since children normally attend schools nearest their homes segregation naturally governs there too as a general practice.

Such segregation, although never touching the experience of millions of northerners, greatly concerns many city and school officials. In some cases they are attempting to force a mixing of races—even going across normal school zones to do it. The theory is that mixing is itself educational. Directly involved is the old concept of the "melting pot" as an adjunct of democracy. And there is insistence on the right of equal opportunity.

Considering the official and political efforts to combat segregation in the North it has proved remarkably persistent. In several respects it resembles a phenomenon American cities have long known—immigrants from abroad forming their own racial or national enclaves, maintaining their own customs and languages, even their own newspapers. Often the forces making for such clannishness come as much from within as from without.

So it is with the American Negro—in the North and the South. Too often it is assumed that segregation is a wholly artificial pattern enforced by unworthy prejudice. Some of it is like that. But much segregation comes about naturally through the same processes of selection which cause individuals to choose like-minded associates or families to seek congenial neighborhoods. And white resistance to Negro migrations within cities arises partly from the fact that such movements are usually in groups—due in turn to Negro desires to have friends or relatives as neighbors.

Officials in the North who are trying to force a mixing in the face of such forces of natural selection should be able better to understand why desegregation moves slowly in the South. So, too, should northern whites who object to their neighborhoods being changed either by racial migration, by industrialization, or by any social force causing deterioration. And possibly also Negroes who prefer not to live alone in white neighborhoods, a preference which reduces the opportunity for them to be treated as individuals and centers attention on race.

All of us can deal more wisely with this situation if we recognize that here there are two rights in conflict. One is the right to equal opportunity. The other is the right of the individual to choose his associates. Both are closely related to the democratic ideal. To enforce either against the other by law takes something away from that ideal. To seek accommodation of the one to the other by voluntary action supports the democratic ideal and is likely to bring the most practicable and enduring solution.

Hands of United States Tied in Asia Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Robert Alden for the New York Times on Monday, June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANDS OF UNITED STATES TIED IN ASIA COLD WAR—FAILS TO EXPLOIT ITS BEST WEAPONS, MOVIES AND JAZZ, OFFICIALS THERE SAY

(By Robert Alden)

SINGAPORE, June 10.—The United States is fighting the cold war in southeast Asia with its hands tied behind its back, according to many of the officers charged with conducting the propaganda war in this part of the world.

A careful student of the subject soon learns that the United States most potent weapons in winning the goodwill of the Asians are its motion pictures and its jazz.

Even in remote regions of such countries as Indonesia, Cambodia, or Burma crowds line up to see American movies. As in the

United States, it is not too unusual for Asian children to dress like an American cowboy.

The American cowboy is idolized here. Even today, a year after his movie first played in Bangkok, the cowboy Shane is a hero in Thailand. Thai children at play shout out in English, "Come back, Shane!" quoting from the closing scene.

In the same way American jazz has as great a grip on southeast Asia as it has in Europe. Jazz comes blaring out from phonographs on the most Oriental-looking streets. The people, particularly the young, love it.

UNMATCHED BY REDS

What makes these two weapons so potentially effective in the cold war is that the Communists cannot match them. The Communists are trying, particularly the Chinese, by showing films made in Communist China.

But they are so far behind American movies in general and American cowboys in particular that at present it is no contest.

One United States public affairs officer remarked that if an American jazz band opened across the street from a Chinese cultural show the jazz concert would be jammed and the cultural show deserted.

But the sad part of the story is that the United States Government, although it has sent tennis stars and track athletes, symphony orchestras and harpsichord players (most of whom have done well) on goodwill missions, it has not sent a jazz group into southeast Asia.

Nor has the United States sent out movie stars, whose faces are so well known they could draw tremendous crowds.

Danny Kaye, the comedian, came to southeast Asia a couple of years ago under the auspices of the United Nations Children's Fund. His visit has not yet been forgotten.

Sending jazz to southeast Asia, it is said, would be economical, also, compared with other ventures that have been undertaken.

A jazz group of 5 or 6 men, particularly of mixed white and colored musicians, would fill the bill nicely in the opinion of those who have studied the situation.

By contrast, on a recent night in Bangkok the Los Angeles Symphony Orchestra and the United States Air Force Band, each with more than 100 musicians, crossed paths. Shipping these large units by air is expensive.

On the following night, under the sponsorship of the United States Ambassador, the Air Force Band gave a symphonic band concert before a half-filled auditorium of unenthusiastic, formally attired invited guests.

By chance on the same night five not very skillful Thai jazz musicians playing on the street before a local theater attracted a far greater crowd and a far more enthusiastic one.

My Record on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I had intended on the evening of Friday, July 27, when I addressed the Senate on the subject of civil rights, to include in my remarks a brief review of my own record in this field during the past session. I have assembled specific items which delineate my activity in the field of civil-rights legislation in the 84th Congress. They include:

First. A summary of the civil-rights bills introduced at the beginning of the 84th Congress by myself and several cosponsors, and contained in a press release which I issued on February 1, 1955.

Second. My appeal to all of the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee for action on S. 900, S. 902, and S. 903, civil-rights bills of mine which were favorably reported from the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. The text of letters which I sent to members of the Senate Judiciary Committee is contained in a release from my office dated April 9, 1956.

Third. When it became clear that 4 Democratic Senators on the Judiciary Committee were prepared to support the civil-rights proposals and that if they were joined by 4 Republican colleagues, a sufficient number would be present to report these bills to the Senate floor, I asked the Republican members on the committee to join in this endeavor. On April 19, 1956, I issued a press release summarizing the situation facing the Judiciary Committee in the effort to line up bipartisan support.

Fourth. On Tuesday, April 24, 1956, I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee summarizing my own position on civil-rights legislation and urging bipartisan support in the committee.

Fifth. On May 24, 1956, I made public my response to a civil-rights questionnaire sent to me from the Pittsburgh Courier. My answers contain an up-to-date statement of my own position on each of these positions raised.

I ask unanimous consent that each of these 5 items—the 4 press releases, and testimony before the Judiciary Committee—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[News release of February 1, 1955]

SENATOR HUMPHREY LEADS RENEWED FIGHT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS BILLS

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, appealed for "an end to discrimination against our Americans because of their race, religion, color or national origin" today in renewing his continuing fight for an improved legislative program on human rights.

Together with a group of his colleagues, Senator HUMPHREY introduced in the Senate a package program of 11 civil rights bills and declared enactment of any part of the package at this session would be striking a blow for freedom all over the world.

Calling attention to conflict and bitterness over civil rights legislation in the past, he said he and his colleagues were presenting the proposals again "with a prayer that the 84th Congress will crystallize and symbolize instead a feeling of good will and brotherhood and consensus in consideration of this vital legislative program."

The series of bills and cosponsors include:

1. A bill to establish equal opportunity in employment. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, IVES, LEHMAN, CASE, DOUGLAS, DUFF, KENNEDY, LANGER, MAGNUSON, MARTIN, MCNAMARA, PURTELL, MORSE, SALTONSTALL, MURRAY, SMITH of New Jersey, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

2. A bill to establish a Commission on Civil Rights in the Executive Branch of the Government. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

3. A bill to protect persons within the United States against lynching. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

4. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

5. A bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation. Sponsors: Senators MAGNUSON, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

6. A bill to strengthen existing civil rights statutes. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

7. A bill to protect the right to political participation and make it a crime to intimidate or coerce or otherwise interfere with a right to vote. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

8. A bill to create a joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

9. A bill to reorganize in the Department of Justice by establishing a civil rights division in the Department under an Assistant Attorney General. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

10. A bill to strengthen the current laws with regard to peonage, convict labor, slavery, and involuntary servitude. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

11. The omnibus civil rights bill to strengthen existing civil rights statutes. Sponsors: Senators HUMPHREY, DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEELY, and NEUBERGER.

[News release of April 9, 1956]

SENATOR HUMPHREY OPENS NEW DRIVE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, announced today new steps in his continuing fight for civil rights action by the current Congress, seeking organized support behind a determined effort to gain action on "a minimum basic package of civil-rights legislation."

Calling attention to action of the Senate's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights on reporting three of his civil rights bills favorably to the full Senate Judiciary Committee, Senator HUMPHREY wrote all members of the Senate Judiciary Committee Friday saying, in part:

"I am confident that most Americans would agree that these three bills constitute a minimum basic package of civil-right legislation for the current session of Congress. May I respectfully invite your early and earnest consideration of this matter?"

The three bills are:

1. S. 900, which he said "would guarantee certain basic rights to all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and would involve a special protection against lynching";

2. S. 902, which he said "would reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights by providing for an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a new Civil Rights Division"; and

3. S. 903, which he said "would protect the right to political participation by all American citizens in Federal elections, would establish the right to qualify to vote and to vote, and would set criminal penalties against interference with these rights."

At the same time, Senator HUMPHREY also wrote to Senators DOUGLAS, LEHMAN, MCNAMARA, MAGNUSON, MORSE, MURRAY, NEU-

BERGER, LANGER, and NEELY, who cosponsored the bills with him when they were introduced along with other civil rights legislation on February 1, 1955, urging their help in gaining the earliest possible attention of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Senators LANGER and NEELY are both members of that committee.

In his letter to the cosponsors, Senator HUMPHREY commented: "I have reason to believe that a major stumbling block may be the lack of a quorum of eight at Judiciary Committee sessions. I am convinced that there are at least 4 Democrats and 4 Republican members of the Judiciary Committee who would support this legislation if present." He urged his colleague to help expedite action by the Judiciary Committee by seeking bipartisan cooperation in getting a favorable majority to attend committee sessions.

In a third and related step, Senator HUMPHREY also wrote to Senator HENNINGS, chairman of the subcommittee which had reported favorably on the three civil-rights bills, commending him for that action in the interest of democracy.

In his letter to Senator HENNINGS, Senator HUMPHREY also called attention to another of his pending measures, S. 906, calling for establishment of a Commission on Civil Rights.

"In view of administration announcements calling for such a Commission, I would like to suggest that your subcommittee may wish to give further consideration to this legislation already before you to accomplish the very purpose the President now seeks," Senator HUMPHREY wrote.

In commenting on the new drive for action, Senator HUMPHREY declared he would welcome bipartisan support.

"If the Republicans are sincere in wanting to do something about civil rights, they should now give their wholehearted support to these long-pending measures which have already been cleared to the full committee with subcommittee approval.

"There is no need to talk about proposing new legislation, when legislation to accomplish the same purposes has long been pending and has already completed important steps in the legislative process toward final enactment," Senator HUMPHREY said.

[News release of April 19, 1956]

SENATOR HUMPHREY CHALLENGES REPUBLICANS TO SUPPORT CIVIL-RIGHTS ACTION

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, today termed Attorney General Brownell's request for new civil-rights legislation "more evidence of lipservice by leap-year liberals" and challenged the administration to prove its sincerity by supporting Democratic legislation to achieve the same objectives and more already pending before the Senate.

"What is the use of making a grandstand play about proposing new legislation, when such legislation is already pending and part way through the legislative process?" Senator HUMPHREY asked.

"If Attorney General Brownell and the President are sincere about wanting civil-rights action, instead of just building a political record of lipservice, why don't they support the legislation that has been before the Senate since February of 1955?"

Senator HUMPHREY said such pending legislation could be brought before the Senate for action any time as many Republicans as Democrats will stand up and be counted in favor of action in the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Commenting further on Brownell's recommendations, Senator HUMPHREY said:

"The Republican platform calls for Federal action on antilynching, antipoll tax, and fair-employment-practices legislation. I notice a complete absence of any reference to these topics in the administration's recommendations.

"All they do propose is a bipartisan commission, a new Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department, tightening of protection against interference with the right to vote, and improving laws designed to prevent conspiracy to interfere with the right to vote.

"If they really want a commission, why have they not supported the pending bill for such a commission introduced a year ago by myself and a group of my colleagues?

"If they really want a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice why don't they support the Humphrey bill for that purpose already favorably reported by the Hennings Subcommitteee on Constitutional Rights?

"If they really want to protect the right to vote, why don't they support the Humphrey bill for that purpose—a bill with more teeth, providing criminal prosecution instead of civil action for violations—already favorably reported by the Hennings Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights?

"If they want to live up to their own party's platform, why don't they also now join us in support of the Humphrey antilynching bill also reported favorably by the Hennings subcommittee?"

Senator HUMPHREY emphasized he would welcome bipartisan support for such objectives, but added that lack of support heretofore has blocked progress that could have been made earlier and indicates the new administration move may just be more gestures of leap-year liberals.

He reiterated his challenge to the administration first voiced when he launched a renewed drive for civil-rights action last weekend prior to the Brownell recommendations, saying:

"If the Republican administration will assure us matching our votes in the Judiciary Committee—if they will get us 4 votes out of the 7 members they have on that committee—we can get action, instead of talk. If they don't the responsibility for this shameful failure to act rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Republican Party and the Republican administration," Senator HUMPHREY said.

[News release of May 24, 1956]

REPLIES BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY TO CIVIL RIGHTS QUESTIONS FROM THE PITTSBURGH COURIER

On May 3, 1956, the editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Courier addressed a letter to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, excerpts of which follow:

"DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Inasmuch as you are being mentioned more and more, by your many friends and supporters, as a prospective candidate for the Democratic Party nomination for the Presidency, readers of the Pittsburgh Courier, the largest nationally circulated Negro newspaper, would like to have directly from you a frank expression of your views on certain matters which are of direct interest to them as Americans. * * * Your answers will be published exactly as you send them. * * * Thank you for your time and consideration.

"Your very truly,

"P. L. PRATTIS,
"Executive Editor,
"The Pittsburgh Courier."

Senator HUMPHREY in reply answered the questions of the Courier in the order listed. The complete text of Senator HUMPHREY's reply is as follows:

"On July 14, 1948, before the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia, I said:

" 'There are those who say to you—we are rushing the issue of civil rights. I say we are 172 years late.

" 'There are those who say—this issue of civil rights is an infringement on States rights. The time has arrived for the Democratic Party to get out of the shadow of States rights and walk forthrightly into the bright sunshine of human rights.'

"Nothing that has happened during the ensuing 8 years has caused me to retreat or equivocate on the position I held then. Much that has happened during these 8 years renders action on civil rights inescapably urgent now. While I am not a candidate this year for any office, most emphatically including the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, I welcome this opportunity to state my views for the hundreds of thousands of persons who read the Pittsburgh Courier.

"Here are my answers to your question:

"1. Question: Do you believe that leadership in all our States should take action to comply with the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, on segregation, as soon as practical (taking into account local conditions), and give some affirmative indication of intention to work for compliance?

"Answer: I believe that no State or civic leader is exempt anywhere in our country from taking action in compliance with the Supreme Court's desegregation decision of May 17, 1954. Admittedly local conditions in some parts of the country will require that this compliance be more gradual than elsewhere. Nevertheless, no State, subdivision, or school district in the United States is legally absolved from its obligation under the Court decision to comply with all 'deliberate speed.'

"2. Question: If elected President, would you use the power of that great office, positively and firmly, to induce the leadership in so-called recalcitrant States to support a steady and progressive program of compliance, rather than defiance?

"Answer: The power of the Presidency should be used positively and firmly to supplant defiance with compliance throughout America. Within his constitutional limitations, the President is in a unique position to influence public behavior favorably on the issue of desegregation. I regret to say that President Eisenhower, however well-meaning, has not exhibited the kind of leadership which the situation requires.

"3. Question: Would you, if elected President, favor the creation by Congress of a permanent bipartisan, interracial Commission on Civil Rights with power to subpena witnesses and conduct necessary investigations?

"Answer: The creation by Congress of a permanent bipartisan interracial Commission on Civil Rights, equipped with the essential subpena and investigatory powers, would be an important instrument of further progress. I have continually advocated such a commission ever since 1948 when I came to the Senate. During the current session, I am the sponsor of S. 906 and S. 907, either of which bills would provide for the establishment of such a Commission.

"4. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of the creation of a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights?

"Answer: Likewise, ever since 1948 I have sponsored legislation to create a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights. In the present Congress I have sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 and S. 907, measures which would create a Joint Congressional Committee which would consist of 14 members, 7 from each House. The committee would be given broad investigatory, consultative, and advisory jurisdiction.

"5. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of the creation of a Division of Civil Rights in the Department of Justice?

"Answer: The creation of a Division on Civil Rights in the Department of Justice would also, I believe, spur the executive branch of the Government to greater action in the civil-rights field. I am currently the sponsor of S. 902 and S. 907, either of which would elevate the existing civil-rights unit

in the Department of Justice to the status of a division under an assistant attorney general, and would strengthen the FBI's capacity to investigate civil-rights violations.

"6. Question: Would you, if elected President, be in favor of strengthening existing civil-rights statutes to the extent that a citizen, denied a civil right (to vote, for example) might seek remedy through the Federal courts whether the offender was the State (or its representative), or a citizen, or citizens, who, by threats or intimidation, denied or abridged the right of another citizen to vote?

"Answer: It is essential that we strengthen existing civil-rights statutes. S. 905 is a bill which I have sponsored for the specific purpose of amending and supplementing existing civil-rights statutes. It was designed to carry out recommendations made by the Department of Justice as long ago as 1952. I am also the sponsor of S. 901, a bill to outlaw the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other elections for national offices; of S. 903, a bill to protect the right to political participation, including the right to vote, by providing for criminal penalties against infringement of this right; and of S. 904, a bill to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery, and involuntary servitude.

"I favor legislation to allow an aggrieved citizen to seek a remedy through the Federal courts against the denial or abridgment of his right to vote from any source. I would also include specific authority for the Attorney General to seek an injunction against any person who denies or interferes with the right of another citizen to exercise his voting privileges. The right to vote must be free and unfettered. It must be zealously guarded. It is the duty of the Federal Government to safeguard it.

"7. Question: Would you, if elected President, other measures having failed, favor invoking the provisions of the second section of the 14th amendment which expressly require that the representation of a State in Congress should be cut down in proportion as the right to vote of citizens 21 years of age and over is denied or abridged?

"Answer: I have always felt that it was more consonant with our democratic processes to work for the extension of suffrage rather than the restriction of representation. Hence, I would prefer an affirmative increase in suffrage to an invocation of the neglected 2d section of the 14th amendment which would reduce a State's congressional delegation in Congress proportionate to that State's denial of the right to vote. Practical and legal difficulties would inevitably handicap the enforcement of this provision, and I would rely upon it only as a last resort.

"8. Question: Would you, if elected President, be willing to use the powers of your great office to encourage, positively and firmly, fair employment practices throughout the Nation and would you create such devices as might be necessary to help secure to every American the right to work at the calling for which he is best fitted?

"Answer: The President's discretionary powers to promote fair-employment practices should be used by him to their fullest extent. As mayor of Minneapolis I organized the Mayor's Council on Human Relations and proposed a municipal fair employment practices ordinance with powers of enforcement, a proposal which was adopted and is now a working law administered by a municipal fair employment practices commission. Following these successful achievements, I have been convinced of the importance of governmental action toward obtaining equal opportunity for employment regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin. Fair-employment practices are more important today than ever before. We need all available talents and skills if we are to maintain a dynamic economy and to meet the challange of Soviet competition in the field of scientific research, technology, and engineering. In S. 899, the Federal Equality of Opportunity in Employment Act, I have again proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry.

"9. Question: Would you, if elected President, favor Federal aid to education to all school districts which indicated, affirmatively, that they intended to work toward compliance with the Supreme Court decision on segregation? Would you favor denying Federal aid to school districts which indicated, by evasion or indirection, that they intended to defy the Supreme Court decision?

"Answer: The desperate need for new school construction, the clear guidelines which the Supreme Court has set down for judicial policing of the segregation decision, and the possibility of fruitless jurisdictional tangles if those guidelines are not maintained, have inclined me to take the following position on Federal aid to education. Funds under any Federal school construction bill should be made available to all States unless an appropriate Federal court following due process of law has found such State, school district, or political subdivision to be in contempt of the Supreme Court's decision and implementation order, or unless the State legislature or a school board has by official action refused to comply and openly defies the court order. Prior to the court ruling or official action on the part of a State legislature, school board, or State political subdivision, there would be a presumption of compliance. In other words, it is to be presumed that the States are observing the law unless there is court or legislative action that demonstrates to the contrary. Following an adverse court ruling or action of a legislature or political subdivision defying the court order, I would propose that funds otherwise allocable to the contemptuous State, school district, or political subdivision be held in escrow until such time as the State, school district, or political subdivision has purged itself of contempt.

"10. Question: Would you, if elected President, use the powers of that great office, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, to see that all men and women in our armed services had the same chance to fight and work for our country in nonsegregated units and the same opportunities for advancement?

"Answer: I have long favored the complete desegregation in all units of our Armed Forces. It has been my privilege to work with the Department of Defense, in close cooperation with the former Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army General Collins, and other military officials, during the years 1950 through 1952, to promote speedy desegregation in the the Armed Forces. I have continued to urge the President to persevere in his duty to insure equal opportunity and advancement to all of the men and women in our armed services without regard to race, color, creed, or national origin.

"Discrimination has been a lingering and stubborn infection sapping the strength of our democratic system. We convict ourselves of hypocrisy to the extent that we refuse to eradicate this infection. There is no aspect of my life as a public servant which I consider to be of greater importance than my efforts in and outside the Senate to hasten the day when discrimination is dead and democracy is fully alive."

Civil Rights Testimony by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey Before Senate Judiciary Committee on Tuesday, April 24, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend you for your fairness in calling this hearing on an issue of vital concern to all America, knowing of its deep emotional impact in your own home State.

All of us in the Congress must find a reasoned balance between the interests of our own States which we are privileged to represent, and the entire United States which we represent together.

All of us in the Congress share common responsibilities that go beyond the needs, the desires, and yes, even the views of our own States.

The question of human rights is one of those common responsibilities.

It goes beyond any partisanship. It involves fundamental concepts of our democracy that must be of grave concern to all of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, whether our geographical background happens to be from the North or the South. It involves problems we must squarely face with reason rather than emotion, with a spirit of tolerance rather than a spirit of recrimination.

Perhaps this occasion can be a historical milestone, of responsible men reasoning together as Americans all, not as hostile blocs arrayed in bitterness against each other.

My views on "human rights"—and that is the term I prefer, for it is the rights of fellow human beings we are talking about when we discuss civil rights—are well-known to this committee.

They are nothing new, and they are not politically inspired.

They are the result of deeply held convictions, spiritual convictions, that it is a blemish on our democracy to permit in our midst any discrimination against fellow Americans because of their race, religion, color, or national origin.

The struggle for civil rights has been a continual one since the beginning of our Nation, paralleling our country's growth as an expanding democracy.

Our Nation stands today as the freest and most democratic power in the world.

We are justly proud of the progress that we have made as a country in expanding opportunity, security, and human welfare of our citizens.

There is no area of our life which has not developed toward greater democracy.

To be proud of our Nation and its progress, however, is not to be blind to the imperfections that still remain within our society.

The most evident of those imperfections, and the one which cries loudest for immediate remedy, is in the area of civil rights.

Discrimination based upon bias and prejudice still exists, and so long as it is alive, we must be vigilant to eliminate the cancer from our body politic.

Democracy is more than achievement, more than material progress, more than elections and government.

Democracy is essentially a faith of freedom, of equality, of human dignity and brotherhood.

This is the beacon of hope we now have to offer a troubled world. This is the lesson which we must now strive to get accepted in the world, if our Nation is to avoid war and preserve its liberty.

The struggle against the totalitarian forces of communism is not merely of a military character, as recent events have made even more clear than ever before.

It is political and ideological in nature as well.

We stand opposed to the doctrines which enslave men and reduce men to mere automatons.

We believe in the inherent dignity and worth of man; that man is an end in himself; that only in a genuinely free society can man attain his true nature.

We believe that, given equality of opportunity, each individual, irrespective of color, religion, national origin, or race, can realize his true self.

These are the great values for which we are currently engaged in the struggle against communism, values which we must preserve

from within our society as well as safeguard against attack from without.

Those of us who strive for the enactment of civil-rights legislation by the Congress do so because we are convinced that the enactment of such legislation will help us as a nation in the world struggle against communism.

We do so also, however, because we must constantly strive to strengthen the spirit and fabric of democracy itself. We do so because we believe that, even if there were no Communists in the world, the discrimination which exists within our country must be eliminated if our democracy is to survive and be true to itself.

With democracy now on trial in the world, it ill behooves us to leave any chinks in our armor.

We must never forget that the image we as a nation cast abroad is mightily affected by what we do at home. One of the best criteria for predicting how a nation will behave in its international relations is its record of achievement among its own people. We judge the Soviets in this manner and part of our skepticism about their sincerity on world issues is grounded in our awareness of how brutally the Kremlin has conducted its domestic policies, how little regard it has had for human rights.

We should consider our own behavior from the same perspective.

At times we have forgotten that we shall not enhance freedom by aping the enemies of freedom.

Democratic institutions are not safeguarded by totalitarian techniques.

The central principles on which America was founded are now being considered by others in their evaluation of us.

Brotherhood and equality of opportunity have now become central aspects of America's national image as it is seen abroad. Just as Lincoln decided upon emancipation of the Negro slaves not only as an act of justice but also as a military necessity, so the achievement in America of racial equality is now urgently needed on both these grounds.

Gandhi asked of the whole Anglo-Saxon world, "What can conquer your unpardonable pride of race?"

We must answer him. We must answer him soon. We should answer him now that the true spirit of democracy is bigger than racial pride—and prove we mean it.

Our responsibilities and the requirements of our national security no longer permit us the luxury of temporizing and evasion on civil rights here in the United States.

Communist propaganda has recognized that issue clearly, and has effectively gone to work against us with it.

You can rest assured that the Kremlin will not permit even these hearings to go unnoticed, and will gleefully exploit any failure on our part to truly exemplify the democracy we preach to the rest of the world.

You can rest assured the eyes of millions of uncommitted peoples throughout the world—people who may sway the balance between a world of freedom and a world of totalitarian oppression—are upon this issue in the United States and upon what we do about it; upon what we do about it at this very hearing and in this very Congress.

Our proper response, both to the Kremlin waiting for us to falter and to the other vast areas of the world looking desperately to us as mankind's greatest beacon of hope for universal recognition of the dignity of man, is to do what we should have done anyway, to do what is right and just; to do what we eventually must do, regardless of external threats, to fulfill the vision of our Founding Fathers for creating a nation fully respecting the individual dignity of man as an inalienable, inherent right under God.

Communism and the atom have only heightened our age-old dilemma of good and evil and raised the stakes of moral choice.

Ever since I have been in the Senate, I have consistently and continually sought greater fulfillment of human rights by legislative action aimed at eliminating discrimination.

Three years ago, at the start of a new Republican administration, I again introduced a series of bills aimed at my continuing objective. At that time, in the hope of bipartisan action for a cause that should be above partisanship, I declared:

"We have just completed a national election. Both political parties came to the American people and said that they were champions of civil rights. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusions of these remarks excerpts from the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties. The President-elect came to the American people and on many occasions stated his opposition to discrimination and his convictions in favor of equal opportunity. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of these remarks, excerpts from some of his statements.

It remains for the Congress to act in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the American people.

In addition to reintroducing, for the third time, the Humphrey-Ives bill for a Fair Employment Practices Commission to guarantee equal opportunity of employment, I introduced at that time nine other measures covering legislative improvements needed for adequate civil-rights protection.

Unfortunately, despite the campaign pledges of the Republican Party, no action was taken on any of these measures by the Republican 83d Congress.

Included among my measures introduced on January 16, 1953, was a new and more moderate approach that I hoped would at least be accepted as a minimum step in the right direction.

It was a bill to create a Federal Commission on Civil Rights, providing for a commission to study continuously the problem of civil rights and discrimination and measures being taken to deal with the problem.

At that time I declared:

"I have never believed in an all-or-nothing approach to any of the major social, economic, or political problems which face our Nation.

"I, therefore, urge the Senate to find a middle approach, and take some steps to spell progress. * * * It is my belief that a Commission on Civil Rights would provide a constructive and factual approach to a problem which is torn with emotionalism. It is not a substitute for other legislative proposals, but it may in fact turn out to be a preliminary step which must be taken to bridge the gap between divergent opinions and establish a foundation for a more constructive, positive legislative program. I shall, in fact, continue to devote my efforts to the enactment of a full program which I have presented to the Senate."

That was 3 years ago, but I stand by those words today. They are even more meaningful today.

Regrettably, no attempt was made by the Republican administration and Republican Congress to act on even such a minimum approach to a crucial national problem.

When the Democrats regained control of the Congress in 1955, I again introduced a civil-rights package program of 11 basic bills, including the same commission proposal.

For a year, I am told, this committee has been awaiting administration views on such a program.

Now, at long last, the administration has recommended enactment of such a commission, along with some other minimum steps all covered in long-pending legislation.

As belated as it has been, I welcome this administration support. I hope sincerely it is offered in good faith, in sincere intent that will be backed by concerted efforts for Republicans to vote side by side with Democrats for enactment of such legislation. If they do, we can make progress of which all of us can be proud. If they do not, America's conscience will have a continued burden upon it.

When I introduced this group of legislative measures a year ago, I declared enactment of any part of them would be striking a blow for freedom all over the world.

I reiterate that statement today.

Instead of conflict and bitterness, my hope and prayer is that the 84th Congress can earn a place in history by symbolizing instead a feeling of good will and brotherhood in consideration of this vital program, with mutual respect and mutual tolerance for deeply held convictions however opposite they may be.

Already favorably reported to this committee by your Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights are measures I have sponsored with some of my colleagues to protect the right to political participation and make it a crime to intimidate or coerce or otherwise interfere with the right to vote; to create a new Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice under an Assistant Attorney General; and to protect persons in the United States against lynching.

These, together with the proposed commission which the President has now joined in supporting after 3 years, should provide a basic minimum of positive action, going a long way toward eliminating the injustices of discrimination.

I appeal for this committee's favorable action in the name of democracy, in the name of humanity, in the name of morality.

If the Republicans will match the Democrats vote for vote on this committee, this legislation can be approved by the committee and readied for floor action.

Surely, if the administration is really behind its civil-rights program, it can muster four Republican votes favorable to such action on this committee.

In their 1952 platform, the Republicans promised that they would not "mislead, exploit, or attempt to confuse minority groups for political purposes." The Republican Party now has an opportunity to live up to that promise. The Democratic Party will welcome their support.

Together we can build a stronger America, and brighten the beacon of hope for the rest of the world.

Eisenhower Let Aides Stick His Neck Out on Dixon-Yates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, we have heard much of the Dixon-Yates fiasco. Undoubtedly we shall hear much more before final disposition is made of it.

Recently James Marlow, AP news analyst, wrote a very factual and objective statement entitled "Eisenhower Let Aides Stick His Neck Out on Dixon-Yates."

I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EISENHOWER LET AIDES STICK HIS NECK OUT ON DIXON-YATES

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower—getting his information from aides—said too much too fast about the Dixon-Yates contract. He stuck his neck out, and now he's had it chopped off.

He had praised the contract repeatedly. Now his Justice Department says it was no good. He defended the role of banker Adolphe Wenzell in this contract. Now the Justice Department says Wenzell's role makes the contract "null and void."

Right in its early days the Eisenhower administration faced a problem—and a choice—in the Government's Tennessee Valley Authority, which supplies a wide southern area with power.

The Atomic Energy Commission needed a lot of that power. But what of the needs of TVA's regular users, particularly the city of Memphis, Tenn.? The administration could have expanded TVA with new plants.

Instead, on the advice of the AEC and the Budget Bureau, it decided a private power firm should do the job by building a plant near the TVA area. Democrats protested, predicting this meant eventual wreckage of TVA.

In November 1954 Eisenhower ordered a contract signed with a private utility group called Dixon-Yates. Then the Democrats began to dig into the role of Wenzell.

He was vice president of the First Boston Corp. of New York City, which became the Dixon-Yates financial agent, and had also been adviser to the Budget Bureau on TVA problems.

The Democrats raised a question: Was Wenzell serving conflicting interests—the Government's and a private company's? The Democrats talked of "deceit and concealment" by the administration.

Eisenhower, stil listening to his advisers, defended Wenzell at a news conference June 29, 1955. But the next day he ordered the whole problem restudied.

The reason given was that the city of Memphis, refusing to accept Dixon-Yates power, said it was going to build its own plant. At his July 6 news conference Eisenhower again backed Wenzell, calling his role in the contract indeed proper.

Then these things happened:

July 7: A Senate Judiciary subcommittee headed by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, foreseeing the end of the contract, said it was invalid anyway and advised the Government to hold up any cancellation fees which Dixon-Yates might claim in return for money spent preparing to build its plant.

July 8: Wenzell told KEFAUVER's subcommittee that while he was advising the Budget Bureau on TVA matters he met with AEC officials as a representative of his bank—which became the Dixon-Yates financial agent—while the contract was under consideration.

Eisenhower canceled the contract July 11 on the grounds that, since Memphis was building its own plant, the Dixon-Yates plant wasn't needed.

Attorney General Brownell said he looked for a negotiated settlement, of any claims Dixon-Yates might make. And on July 12 Eisenhower called the canceled contract "good and fair."

Then on November 23, 1955, the AEC said it would pay Dixon-Yates nothing for the money it had spent. The AEC said Wenzell had been mixed up in a conflict of interests in this contract.

Last December 13 Dixon-Yates sued the Government for $3,534,778 for its expenses. Yesterday Brownell's Justice Department, defending the Government against this suit in the Court of Claims, said the contract was one-sided in favor of Dixon-Yates and had other faults. But it asked the judge to dismiss the suit mainly because of Wenzell.

It said he had played a triple role: He was advising and representing the Government, his own bank, and the Dixon-Yates group. That left Eisenhower high and dry on a rock.

World Views on Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the British newspaper, the Manchester Guardian Weekly, entitled "World Views on Cyprus" on April 12, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD VIEWS ON CYPRUS—BRITISH LOSS OF MORAL STATURE

(By Salvador de Madariaga)

The British Government may not have fully realized the impact of their Cyprus policy on world public opinion nor the issues involved in such an impact. The Cyprus episode stands at the intersection between two currents of world import; one is the evolution of the British Commonwealth from an imperialistic institution with a merely national scope to a feature of the world landscape in which every world citizen is directly or indirectly concerned; and the other one is the present plight of the world owing to the standing menace of communism.

The British Government have kept a stiff upper lip about American reactions and ignored the rest. This is much to be deplored. The present political world situation demands that the two Anglo-Saxon powers keep intact both their unity and their moral authority. The sad, the tragic fact is that ever since 1945, when this twofold asset was at its peak, Britain and the United States have been going downhill fast in point of moral authority and unity, and the Cyprus episode will add a further serious push to the process.

Hence the importance of world public opinion, which no one, especially in Britain or the United States, should underestimate. The fact is—for it is a fact—that the big powers are responsible for their policy to the public opinion of the free world. Some may rejoice, some may regret, some may exalt, some may jeer, but the fact is there, and not even the biggest powers can overlook it without serious risk; proof of it being the considerable efforts they all devote to propaganda, prestige, and such poor substitutes for genuine success.

When Britain stood alone before a sea of dangers—alone, by the way, with the one and only company of Greece—she needed no center of information, no British council, no propaganda. Her stand was her aura; her silent struggle was her trumpet of fame. Those days have not been forgotten when the whole world breathed through the mighty chest of Britain's war leader. But the world has not forgotten, either, that in the struggle a number of nations such as Holland, Norway, Poland, and many more had to endure untold hardships. The upshot of it all is that no nation today, not even the most powerful, can save herself without the help and sacrifice of other nations. It follows that the era of fully sovereign national policy is over.

It is against this background that the Cyprus episode must be seen, and that British opinion should consider the effect of British policy on world opinion. No attempt is made here to sit in judgment on British deeds; the aim of this article is much more modest. It consists in an endeavor to put before British public opinion an outline of the opinion of those outside who, friendly though they are to Britain, indeed convinced of their material and moral solidarity with Britain within the common destinies of the West, are to their great regret unable to agree with her present Cyprus policy.

This section of world opinion has not failed to notice a contradiction in the British official stand on Cyprus: On the one hand, we are told that Britain in Cyprus is discharging defense responsibilities which, in the present state of world danger, are not merely British but worldwide; on the other, the British Government claims the Cyprus issue to be one of internal jurisdiction. The two valves of this double contention would appear to be incompatible. Britain is not defending the free world any more than the free world is defending Britain; and if Cyprus is to be a British base in the defense of the free world the free world should have a say on the moral and political conditions of the base in question.

Indeed, Dr. Adenauer may well have voiced the best opinion of the free world when he pointed out that military collaboration, such as NATO provides for, must imply political collaboration. Collective security has no meaning without collective policy, and Britain cannot expect to enlist nations to fight together for their common good in NATO while reserving for herself an unlimited sovereignty allowing her to wreck the allegiance to NATO of a nation such as Greece.

Then there is the question of the settlement of differences by free discussion. Some of us have been maintaining for years that the true essence of the East-West conflict is not communism versus capitalism (since there are many Marxists in the western camp) but the irreducible opposition between free discussion and knocking down your opponents. What becomes of this contention, so far substantially true, if Britain, liberal, enlightened, civilized, generous Britain, transports her interlocutor and puts the leaderless island under martial law? The arguments invoked to justify this grave decision do not sound as convincing to the outsider as they do to the British average Tory. It seems plain that the archbishop meant to come to an agreement, provided he got a genuine representative assembly and a time limit for the delay in deciding the issue of self-determination.

There remains the matter of violence. This is perhaps the most delicate point of all. British lives are in danger, are lost; and one must bow with respect before the emotional consequences of this regrettable state of affairs. To understand it, however, demands on objective analysis of the situation and in particular of the origin of the violence unchained in Cyprus. The Governor and the archbishop were negotiating but, to borrow from Sir Anthony Eden's vocabulary in another context, the Governor was negotiating from strength. Not the archbishop. Now, what is strength? It is potential violence. Even if we accepted that the archbishop had been in direct control of terrorism, he would then be the head of actual violence negotiating with the head of potential violence. The arguments of the British Government in this connection rest on the assumption that the British force in Cyprus is as legitimate as, say, in Wales or in Yorkshire. But even if this were the case, it is not admitted by the other side, and therefore cannot be legitimately argued against the archbishop.

In assuming the monopoly of regular violence in the island the governor drives

the archbishop to the dire necessity of using irregular violence. This is always the case when a public force does not rest on public consent. It is the nemesis of the disregard of the principle that government must rest on the consent of the governed. Britain heartily collaborated with irregulars in all the countries occupied by the Germans during the war. The position of the Cypriots today is by no means identical, but it is similar to that of the resistants of half of Europe in those days. And it is a sad reflection on the inexorable logic of events that the governor has felt bound to apply repressive methods as unsavory as collective punishment and collective fines.

Such happenings would in any case have caused deplorable effects on world opinion. Coming from Britain they produce consternation. Of late Britain had time and again given the world examples of the skill and wisdom with which she was solving in the 20th century problems of a colonial order inherited from a somewhat spirited but unwise 19th. It is precisely because of these repeated successes that the Cyprus failure stands out in such a violent contrast. Public opinion outside Britain finds it difficult and painful to associate repression, jamming of broadcasts, collective fines, and forced evacuation of homes, with a government led by such enlightened liberal-minded men as Sir Anthony Eden, Mr. Butler, and Mr. Macmillan. The moral aspect of the cold war, by far its most important, is considerably weakened. The hope remains that the episode may be but an eclipse of short duration. But it would appear that the return of light depends on recognition of the fact that the hydrogen bomb era has altogether superseded the era of splendid isolation.

Serious Problem Confronting Our Textile Mills

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by William F. Sullivan, Northern Textile Association, 80 Federal Street, Boston, Mass., to Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover, Jr., under date of June 22, 1956, which underscores the serious problems that our textile mills are enduring.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTHERN TEXTILE ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 22, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT HOOVER, JR.,
Under Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I regret that it was not possible for you to attend the conference on Thursday arranged by Mr. Hill and Congressman MARTIN to discuss the problems caused by imports of Japanese cotton textiles and apparel on New England mills. Mr. Seabury Stanton, chairman of the executive committee and Mr. Malcolm G. Chase, Jr., president of Berkshire Hathaway, Inc., operators of mills employing 14,000 in New England, explained the very serious situation with which they are confronted as a result of these imports.

Briefly stated, our problem is this:

1. The policy of the Federal Government regarding the importation of textile products is a matter of survival for our mills. The ability of Japanese manufacturers to produce at vastly lower cost makes it impossible for us to compete in any market to which they have access and which they choose to take over.

2. A clarification of administration policy on the question of whether Japanese textile imports will be permitted to increase is essential because of the present confusion on this matter.

The President wrote to Congressman MARTIN last year in connection with the passage of H. R. 1 to the effect that no American industry would be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Shortly after, duties on most cotton textile items were reduced by an average of 25 percent, and in some cases by as much as 50 percent. Japanese imports have been increasing at an accelerated rate since that time.

While every attempt to secure relief by executive action has been rebuffed and our efforts to secure legislative action have met the strongest opposition from the administration, representatives of the Department of State, Commerce, and Agriculture, have told us that they recognized that a problem does exist. Even the Japanese have indicated an awareness of the situation by announcing voluntary quotas for a limited period on certain types of cotton goods.

A clarification of the United States position is necessary to avoid further demoralization and confusion and to permit the industry to plan realistically for the future.

3. Although Japanese imports of cotton textiles are about 2 percent of the total United States production, these imports tend to concentrate on certain types of fabrics and create problems far greater than the overall figures would indicate. For example, fine combed cotton goods, although made throughout the country, are a type of goods which New England mills make almost exclusively. In the case of velveteens, Japanese imports in 1955 equaled 71 percent of the United States production. In the case of ginghams, Japanese imports, during the first quarter of this year, equaled 47 percent of United States production.

This uneven distribution of Japanese imports at prices below United States mill costs coupled with the uncertainty as to the total amount of Japanese fabrics and apparel deliveries aggravates an already serious condition. Some mills are in the process of liquidation and many others are operating on short time. Extended shutdowns during the summer have been announced.

4. Tariff Commission proceedings under the escape clause are frankly to cumbersome and uncertain to be a basis for sound business decisions. In the first place, injury is usually inflicted before a recommendation for relief (which may or may not be adequate) can be obtained. Secondly, there is no assurance that the Commission's recommendations, if favorable, will be adopted. Past experience, and the absence of a clear administration statement, would indicate that such recommendations are more apt to be declined than accepted.

5. The voluntary quotas established by the Japanese do not provide the kind of assurances upon which the mills can rely. The Japanese industry has specifically reserved the right to change such quotas. Furthermore, in the absence of a firm United States policy and regardless of the sincerity of the Japanese, the enforcement of such quotas by the Japanese alone is probably impossible. Transshipment of Japanese goods from third countries is a simple method of evasion.

Even if we assume, however, that the present voluntary quotas are maintained and enforced in the future, two serious objections still remain. First, the Japanese quota on cotton textiles is fixed in an overall amount and permits concentration on certain types of fabrics with consequent unemployment and hardship. Secondly, Japanese quotas have not been announced on many types of fabricated cotton textiles such as apparel and, therefore, there is no limitation on the amounts which may be landed in the United States market.

Although this problem is serious, we believe that its solution does not necessarily involve a conflict with State Repartment policies. We do not seek to exclude Japanese textiles from the United States market. Indeed the industry has suggested that imports 50 percent greater than the average imports of 1953–54 be accepted. This has been done despite great losses in our export markets. The industry has approached this problem with an appreciation of the importance of Japan to the free nations.

We are, however, fully aware of the fact that in the absence of remedial action or a clear, firm, and lasting understanding, Japanese textile manufacturers are in a position to cause unemployment and liquidations of American mills or any segment of the tetxile industry. This, we believe, can be avoided. We earnestly solicit your help in finding a solution.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM F. SULLIVAN.

Investigation of the Rehabilitation of Narcotic Addicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have prepared a statement commenting on a resolution which I have introduced proposing an investigation into ways and means of rehabilitating narcotic addicts who are some of the most pitiable and unfortunate people in the world.

I do not expect that any action will be taken on this resolution at this session but I hope to see that it is introduced as soon as Congress convenes next year. This is a most appealing problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared in support of Senate Resolution 322 and certain attachments thereto, consisting of letters from some of my constituents, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT H. LEHMAN ON SENATE RESOLUTION 322 PROPOSING AN INVESTIGATION OF THE REHABILITATION OF NARCOTIC ADDICTS

Mr. President, during this session of the Congress, we have enacted legislation drastically increasing the penalties for the violation of the Federal narcotics laws. However, this legislation was of the police type and dealt only with the detection, apprehension and sentencing of those engaged in the illicit drug traffic. We have enacted no legislation specifically dealing with the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts and the preventive measures needed to prevent their recidivism.

The Senate will recall that when the Narcotics Control Act was being debated on the Senate floor, I pointed out at length that if we wanted to get at the roots of this problem of narcotic addiction, we should focus our attention on the rehabilitative phases of the problem.

The Narcotics Control Act was a result of extensive hearings on the illicit narcotics traffic conducted by the Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. This subcommittee conducted its investigations under the able leadership of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas. That subcommittee quite properly oriented its investigation in the direction of ascertaining those areas of the Federal judicial system and machinery as well as of the enforcement agencies of the executive branch that needed strengthening. It heard some witnesses who discussed some of the problems attendant upon the rehabilitation of drug addicts, but its central focus was upon the detection, apprehension, prosecution and sentencing of persons dealing in illicit narcotic drugs. It did issue a report dealing with some aspects of the treatment of rehabilitation and the role of the United States Public Health Service in treatment. The report did not deal with the role of the United States Office of Education and the various State and local educational agencies in educating our youth to the dangers of narcotic drugs—and how such educational processes might be safely carried on. The report did not deal with the role of the United States Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and the State vocational rehabilitation agencies, of which there is one in each State, in the aftercare of narcotic addicts who no longer need hospitalization. The report did not deal with the possibilities of setting up some sort of regional hospital system for the care of narcotic addicts. These are all important areas. If we are to make a start toward the rehabilitation of these addicts, we must give them our earnest and thorough attention.

Now I hasten to assure the junior Senator from Texas that I mention these areas not covered in his report without the slightest intention of criticising the fine work which he and the other members of that subcommittee have done in their investigations. For I know—as the Senate knows full well also—that the subcommittee deliberately limited its areas of activity because it did not want to impinge in any way upon the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. For his zeal in so doing, I heartily commend the junior Senator from Texas and his colleagues. And to make certain that the rehabilitative features of the problem of narcotic addiction were not overlooked, the chairman of that subcommittee directed copies of the testimony received to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama. In commenting on the floor of the Senate upon his action in doing so, the junior Senator from Texas stated it to be his belief that both the law enforcement and the rehabilitative aspects of the problem were equally important, but should be handled in separate bills after consideration by separate committees.

And so, the mandate to act is clearly upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As a member of that committee, I am most anxious that it act—that it act in an intelligent way by making legislative proposals only after a thorough exploration not only of what is being done, but also what it is possible to do to bring about the successful rehabilitation of narcotic adicts. To achieve such an exploration, I introduced a few days ago Senate Resolution 322 calling upon the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct such an investigation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, from my own experience here in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as my experience as Governor of the State of New York, I have been made well aware of and have become increasingly concerned with the problems attendant upon the growing problem of drug addiction, especially among our young persons.

The answer, Mr. President, to this problem is not bigger and bigger prisons, jails, and reformatories. The answer lies in prevention and treatment at the arliest posible moment, while there is still time to save these unfortunate addicts. The answer lies in finding out what facilities and services are needed for their successful rehabilitation and making certain that those facilities are there when needed.

Now, Mr. President, disregarding for a moment the social values involved—and I do not concede that we can ever lose sight of them even for a moment—consider the proposal simply from a dollar-and-cents point of view. It is far cheaper to provide the services a young narcotic addict needs for his rehabilitation than to confine him in a Federal penal institution at an annual cost—a recurring cost, I remind you—of almost $2,000.

What good does it do to lock this young addict up in prison without making the attempt—the real, sincere, fortified attempt to achieve his rehabilitation? Rather than contenting ourselves with his confinement, we should dedicate whatever is needed for our resources to apply every bit of skill and knowledge we have to transforming this young narcotic offender from a taxpayer into a tax consumer.

I realize that it is late in the session and that there is little chance for action on my resolution. I introduced it as an indication of the direction and the manner in which I think this problem can be attacked. In doing so, I wish to make it abundantly clear that I do not foreclose, but, rather, expect action in certain areas in the meantime. There are doubtless certain things which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare could recommend immediately. I am hopeful it will do so. There are other areas in which certain additional investigations must be made, certain additional data gathered, certain additional testimony adduced before the exact direction in which we should move can be formulated.

Mr. President, I have received numerous communications from agencies, organizations, and individuals supporting the stand I have taken that the approach we should take to the drug-addiction problem should be rehabilitative rather than punitive. I ask unanimous consent that some of these letters be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I hope, Mr. President, that early in the next session of the Congress favorable action will be taken along the lines of Senate Resolution 322 and that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will proceed as expeditiously as possible in its investigation so that it can with all possible dispatch recommend to the Congress legislative measures which will deal with the problems of the rehabilitation of drug addicts in a sound and constructive manner.

Senate Resolution 322

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation, special attention shall be given to (1) determining the nature and extent of the facilities and services available and needed for the successful rehabilitation of narcotic addicts; (2) the adequacy of existing laws providing for the treatment of youthful and juvenile addicts; (3) the extent and effectiveness of the cooperation and coordination of the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government both among themselves and with the various State and local agencies concerned with the rehabilitation of drug addicts; and (4) the efficacy of the Nation's present approach to the rehabilitation of drug addicts with special emphasis upon youthful and juvenile addicts.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1957.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

JULY 13, 1956.

Dr. DANIEL BLAIN,
Medical Director, American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. BLAIN: Thank you for your letter enclosing a statement critical of legislative proposals concerning narcotic drug addiction.

I am, of course, in general agreement with the approach you take to this problem—the treatment rather than the punitive one. I also am in accord with your position that what is needed is more treatment, more rehabilitation, more research, and the personnel and facilities to make these all possible. As you know, when the Narcotics Control Act was being considered in the Senate, I took the floor to speak out against the approach being taken.

Thank you for writing as you did and sending me the views of your organization. I appreciate greatly receiving them.

Yours very sincerely.

AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I am enclosing a statement critical of legislative proposals concerning drug addiction now pending before the Congress. We shall certainly appreciate any attention you may give to it.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL BLAIN, M. D.,
Medical Director.

The enclosed statement critical of current legislative proposals in Congress regarding drug addiction has been prepared by the American Psychiatric Association for public release. The statement makes the following major points with reference to the effects of S. 3760, S. 3901, and H. R. 11106:

1. From a medical point of view, the bills represent backward, rather than constructive, approaches to a national attack on drug addiction.

2. They are based on misconceptions of the nature of drug addiction as a psychiatric illness, and appear to proceed mistakenly on the assumption that drug addicts are especially responsible for a substantial number of crimes of violence.

3. The bills discourage or abolish previous flexible provision for parole, probation, and assignment of drug addicts to Federal hospitals, and thus will impede medical progress that has been initiated under existing legislation.

The statement contends that further progress against drug addiction lies in the direction of expanding the medical attack on the problem. It is possible to envisage the gradual development of a medical program that would not only reduce drug addiction but would, at the same time, take the profits out of the illicit drug trade. New legislation should proceed in this general direction.

A STATEMENT CRITICAL OF CURRENT LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS DEALING WITH THE NATIONAL PROBLEM OF DRUG ADDICTION

(Prepared by the American Psychiatric Association for public release, June 12, 1956)

In the opinion of psychiatrists, several legislative proposals now before Congress to tighten control of illicit traffic in drugs, chiefly by increasing penalties for possessing and selling them, represent backward steps in attacking this national problem. It is noted that public hearings on these particular bills (S. 3901, S. 3760 and H. R. 11106) have not been held, thereby giving professional opinion an opportunity to take exception to them. Although these bills differ in many details, considered as a composite they have the following effects:

They drastically increase penalties attached to possessing and selling the drugs, in one case providing the death penalty for a third conviction.

They provide for mandatory jail sentences, and in doing so substantially discourage or abolish previous flexible provisions for parole, probation, and assignment of offenders to Federal hospitals for treatment and rehabilitation.

They discourage the seeking of voluntary treatment by addicts by making it mandatory for a physician in a Federal hospital, including VA hospitals, to report such patients to public authorities, thus violating medical confidence. This would apply even to those who become addicted accidentally in connection with a prolonged physical illness.

The bills in establishing punitive measures do not distinguish between pushers, peddlers, and high-level operators in the illicit drug trade.

The bills tend to substitute extreme punishment and police power for a constructive medical program for treatment and rehabilitation of drug addicts that has slowly developed over the years in the Federal hospitals at Fort Worth, Tex., and Lexington, Ky., and also in State and city hospitals.

Such legislative proposals apparently arise out of widespread public misconceptions about the nature of drug addiction, drug addicts, and what constitutes a long term constructive approach to the problem from a medical point of view.

The main point to be made is that drug addiction is due to a psychiatric illness, in the nature of a personality and character disorder. The drug addict has approximately the same mental characteristics as the alcoholic and the barbiturate addict.

There are some 60,000 drug addicts in the United States. This is an alarming figure, but from a psychiatric point of view, it suffers by comparison with an estimated 3 million confirmed alcoholics, not to mention some 750,000 mentally ill people found in our mental hospitals on any day of the week.

The notion that a drug addict is in fact a criminal is false. He is made a criminal by law, rather than because of the effects of the drug. Opium and its derivatives, heroin and morphine, do not as such have the effect of motivating a person to commit crimes. On the contrary, they have a sedative effect and give the addict a sense of being at peace with the world.

It is during the withdrawal phase, when the drugs wears off, that the addict is impelled to criminal behavior. His motivation is simple and direct: to get money to purchase more of the drug, without which he suffers extreme pain and discomfort. His crimes are not generally crimes of violence such as rape and murder. Rather, they are crimes of stealth, petty thievery, picking pockets, breaking and entering, and the like.

Alcohol, on the other hand, does have some crime-producing qualities, notably by way of stimulating people to socially irresponsible action. It is estimated that 7 out of 100 fatal automobile accidents, for example, are due to the influence of alcohol. It is commonly believed that criminals become "hopped up" on the drugs to commit crimes. This is not so. They are far more apt to take alcohol to work up courage and confidence to commit the crime.

Marihuana, taken in sufficient quantity, may have certain crime-producing qualities. Studies, however, indicate that crimes committed as a result of taking marihuana are relatively rare, and usually occur when the drug is used in conjunction with alcohol.

There is also wide misunderstanding about terms used in connection with drug addiction and the traffic in drugs, notably the terms "peddlers" and "pushers." The peddler is himself usually a drug addict. He obtains and sells the drug to other addicts as a means of obtaining his own supply. Most peddlers are not concerned with selling drugs to nonaddicts or with promoting drug addiction.

The pushers, however, for the most part are nonaddicts who are key agents in the network of criminals who seek to promote drug addiction among the population for the profits that are in it. Some drug addicts, it is true, become pushers, but the bulk of them do not.

It is also common knowledge that there is a select group of big-time operators at the top of the drug-trade hierarchy who make huge profits yearly out of supplying the drugs to sick addicts and in promoting drug addiction generally. They are the arch criminals of the trade, and Federal legislation to date has been notably unsuccessful in putthing them out of business.

By not distinguishing among peddlers, pushers, and big-time operators in prescribing punishment, these legislative bills make it impossible to provide treatment and rehabilitation for the peddler addict.

It seems clear the root of the evil lies in the profits that are available in the illicit-drug trade. The situation is somewhat similar to the kind of profiteering and gangsterism that characterized the illicit-liquor trade in the 1920's. In the long run a method must be found to remove the profits. There is no reason to believe that extreme punishment for peddler addicts will help. Indeed, to the extent that such legislation discourages further treatment and rehabilitation for them, it may be expected to worsen the situation.

A sound medical program designed to make substantial inroads against drug addiction calls for the same essential ingredients as any other medical program; more treatment, more rehabilitation, more research, and the personnel and facilities to make these possible. Considerable progress has been made in recent years in Federal, State, and city hospitals in treating and rehabilitating addicts. The incidence of drug addiction has decreased over the past 30 years. This progress has been made under rigorous existing legislation and procedures (the Harrison Act). The medical assumption may be made, therefore, that further headway can be made by elaborating the treatment and rehabilitation programs that have already been started.

Much more, of course, remains to be done; but progress lies in the direction of expanding the medical attack on the problem. It is possible to envisage the gradual development of a medical approach that would not only become increasingly effective in reducing drug addiction, but would at the same time take the profits out of the illicit-drug traffic. Many proposals for making possible the prescribing of drugs for addicts under medically controlled conditions have been considered and recommended in medical circles. These proposals should be subjected to careful investigation and experiment.

Additional legislation concerning drug addiction should be directed to making further medical progress possible, rather than discouraging it. The legislative proposals now under consideration would undermine the progress that has been made and impede further progress. Thus, they are not in the public interest.

JULY 14, 1956.

MR. GEORGE STRAUSS,
Chairman, American Civil Liberties Union, Buffalo, N. Y.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Thank you for your letter urging my opposition to the inclusion of the death penalty and wiretapping provisions in the Narcotics Control Act.

As you know, when this bill was being debated in the Senate, I took the floor to speak out against the approach being taken and to urge greater facilities and services for the rehabilitation of drug addicts. I also cosponsored two amendments to delete the death penalty and wiretapping provisions. While we were successful in obtaining the adoption of the latter amendment, the former amendment was rejected.

Thank you for writing as you did and bringing to my attention the views of your organization.

Yours very sincerely.

AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION,
NIAGARA FRONTIER BRANCH,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 13, 1956.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: On behalf of the Niagara Frontier Branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, I would like to call your attention to certain provisions of the so-called narcotics control bill which are objectionable from a civil-liberties point of view.

It is our feeling that the extension of the death penalty to narcotic peddling is primitive, retributive, and highly inappropriate at a time when the rest of the civilized world, for instance England, is abandoning it. We feel that if this penalty is used at all it should be reserved only for the areas in which it has been traditionally used, such as murder and rape.

We also object to the wiretapping provisions which were wisely deleted from the bill when it passed the Senate. We feel that wiretapping in any form is an unjustified invasion of the individual's right to privacy.

Although we realize that the bill has already passed the Senate, we urge you to remain vigilant that these sections do not pass if the bill is returned to your body.

Sincerely,

GEORGE STRAUSS,
Chairman.

JULY 13, 1956.

MR. ERNEST F. WITTE,
Executive Director,
Council on Social Work Education, Inc., New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WITTE: Thank you for the kind remarks contained in your letter with respect to my comments concerning the letter

from George Washington to the Newport Hebrew Congregation, and on the narcotics control bill.

It was considerate of you to write me as you did and to take the time and effort to comment on my remarks. I appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Yours very sincerely.

COUNCIL ON SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 13, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have read with great interest the excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD you so kindly sent me, in which were quoted your remarks concerning the letter from George Washington to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, R. I. I found this a most inspiring document and, as you say, one that the Nation could profitably review at frequent intervals.

I have also read your remarks on the pending narcotics bill, S. 3760, and confess that in my judgment it is one of the few rational speeches made on this bill which I have been privileged to read. I hope that your views will prevail and that something constructive can be added to this measure in line with modern knowledge, which will be more effective in removing the causes for the sale and use of narcotics and in the rehabilitation of those victims who have become addicted.

Would that we had more Senator LEHMANS in the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST F. WITTE.

THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., June 26, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Your office was good enough to send me a copy of the floor remarks which you made on the narcotics bill, S. 3760, on May 25.

I write to congratulate you on this forthright and incisive statement which seems to me entirely sound.

I hope your hand can be strengthened in taking the emphasis away from punitive control measures and placing them on prevention and rehabilitation.

Faithfully yours,

REGINALD M. ATWATER, M. D.,
Executive Secretary.

MAY 31, 1956.

Dr. HERBERT BERGER, M. D.,
The Berger Clinic,
Tottenville, Staten Island, N. Y.

DEAR DR. BERGER: Thank you for your letter enclosing a reprint of your article on narcotic addiction, and for your telephone call to Mr. Edelstein explaining the academy's position on the Daniel bill.

I am enclosing a copy of the remarks I made on the floor of the Senate when this bill was taken up for consideration. You will note that I relied heavily upon your views and those of the academy.

I do appreciate your making your views known to me.

Yours very sincerely.

THE BERGER CLINIC,
Tottenville, Staten Island, N. Y.,
April 7, 1956.

Senator H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Enclosed please find a reprint of an article on narcotic addiction which appeared in our State medical journal.

I hope that when the Daniels committee recommendtion reaches the floor of the Senate that you may feel yourself in a position to support the medical rather than the punitive management of these sick people.

These principles have been adopted by the State medical society. I should be happy to have the opportunity to discuss this matter with you in person.

Yours very truly,

HERBERT BERGER, M. D.

THE RICHMOND COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY'S PLAN FOR THE CONTROL OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

(By Herbert Berger, M. D., F. A. C. P., Staten Island, N. Y.)

In January 1953 the Medical Society of the County of Richmond in New York after considerable study passed the following resolution:

"1. Whereas the medical profession in its traditional role as guardian of the public health has been distressed by the narcotic problem and its apparent increase; and

"2. Whereas the average user of narcotics must spend from $15 to $100 per day to keep himself supplied with drugs; and

"3. Whereas the crime in drug addiction stems from the inability of persons of moderate means to purchase drugs at present illegal prices; and

"4. Whereas the most serious of these crimes is the conversion of each addict into a salesman with consequent formation of new addicts; and

"5. Whereas the use of morphine and heroin in themselves do not incite these unfortunate people to crime, as both drugs are depressants; and

"6. Whereas the narcotic trade exists only because of the huge profits involved (for example, 2 pounds of heroin can be bought for $10 in China and sold after cutting and packaging for $80,000 or more): Then therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Medical Society of the County of Richmond favors the legalizing of the distribution of narcotics free of charge with proper safeguards, hereinafter to wit:

"1. Establish narcotics clinics in all cities as the need appears under the aegis of the United States Public Health Service.

"2. Register and fingerprint all who apply to prevent reregistering in other clinics.

"3. Do not demand that they be enforcibly confined, as they are now.

"4. Determine the smallest amount of pure drug that will relieve the patient of his symptoms.

"5. Administer this uncut material by the doctor or under his supervision and under sterile precautions.

"6. Keep accurate records of dosages.

"7. No supply ever to be given to the addict, dosage to be given only at the clinic.

"8. Nominal charge for the actual cost of the drug, possibly 15 to 30 cents.

"9. Make an effort to effect a cure, where possible, using hospitalization if the patient acquiesces."

The passage of this resolution excited the enthusiasm of the public press and has been followed in turn by a not inconsiderable degree of interest among social workers, psychologists, psychiatrists, the clergy, and addicts themselves. Those who are seeking a solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency, as well as a number of organizations devoted to the study of criminology, have seen fit to comment favorably on these suggestions. After appropriate action by the coordinating council of the five counties comprising the city of New York, this resolution was presented to the house of delegates of the Medical Society of the State of New York. It was referred to the council committee on public health and education and studied for an entire year. In May 1954 the house of delegates of our State society passed this resolution and referred it to the American Medical Association. The problem is now before a committee of the American Medical Association. Therefore, it seems proper that the resolution be called to the attention of physicians throughou the United States who may now have an opportunity to understand the background and the thinking that went into the preparation of these thoughts. Similar joint resolutions have been introduced into Congress. If some of the material that follows seems elementary, it is written so only because by Federal fiat the medical profession has been separated from the care of these sick people, the narcotic addicts. It is quite possible that many physicians have neither seen, recognized, nor treated a person afflicted with addiction.

THE NARCOTIC ADDICT AS A PERSON

There are few people in this enlightened country of our who are so badly misunderstood and maligned as these unfortunates. Our novelists and some of our less well-informed sources of general information have pictured him as a fiend, and a devil, subhuman, and possessed of none of the gentler civilized attributes. Since most physicians are inexperienced with the votaries of opium, even we, who of all people should be aware of this faulty characterization, know little about these individuals. I was utterly amazed to meet a veritable Casper Milquetoast, my first experience with a long-addicted person. Perhaps as this story unfolds, the reasons for our lack of authoritative information in this important medical area may become apparent.

There are no individuals who do not at times experience periods of depression or elation. A mature personality recognizes these alterations in his mood as normal. Most of us have learned that blue days are temporary and will ultimately be followed by better ones. We overcome our despair with patience or sometimes by the finding of a new hobby, a vacation, a new job or home, or perhaps a new interest. The narcotic addict, however, cannot tolerate these depressions and valleys in his daily living. He is incapable of using his own native talents for overcoming these unpleasant episodes. He wants to reach and stay at the heights of elation and happiness constantly. This is a perfectly normal, human desire shared by all of us. Our narcotic patient, however, differs in that he seeks to attain this plateau of joy chemically rather than from the use of his own inner strength and convictions. Even this small introduction to a large and involved subject should make it apparent that drug addiction isn't even a disease. It is merely a symptom of one.

What then is wrong with the euphoria that these people seek to achieve endlessly? The fault lies not with the pleasant state of mind which they hope to perpetuate, but rather with their lack of insight into themselves and their lack of understanding of reality. A problem deferred with narcotics remains unsolved. It persists tomorrow or the next day so that these individuals, like so many of the rest of us, are procrastinators of the worst sort. Whatever strength of character they may once have possessed is lost as they everlastingly retreat from life and the making of decisions. Without going into this subject to a length interesting only to the serious student of psychiatry, it becomes apparent that these are sick individuals, suffering not from narcotic addiction but from lack of will power and strength of personality. They differ little from those of us who eat too much and hardly at all from the alcoholic who seeks as well to solve life's problems chemically.

THE NATURE OF ADDICTING DRUGS

We physicians have been using narcotics for thousands of years, and we know full well the effect of these medicaments on our patients. They are sedatives, inducing sleep or relieving anxiety. With them our patients may achieve surcease from pain or worry. Their larger problems may become smaller or even insignificant to them. Can the lurid

articles in the daily press make us, who have a grounding in pharmacology, believe that narcotics do anything else for an addict? Under the influence of opiates the addict like our other patients becomes relaxed and at ease. He is incapable of violent crime while under the influence of these drugs and cares nothing for sex. He is incapable of sex. Many of them tell me that their entire interest in this subject disappears when they are so sedated. In fact, many of these individuals are better citizens with narcotics than they are without. Please do not interpret this as a suggestion that they be used in the treatment of certain psychogenic states. An observation that those of us who are interested in this subject make, time and time again, is that the individual who has been using these materials as self-treatment for anxiety demonstrates all of his symptoms as he is removed ever further and further from the addicting material. Many calm and quiet individuals who are able to work steadily while using narcotics find themselves becoming antisocial, belligerent, and endlessly difficult without these substances.

This, then should introduce us to a new concept of these patients because actually every reader of this paper probably has met, and knows now, a narcotic addict who may hold a position of responsibility in his own community extending from bank presidents to doctors to locomotive engineers. These people perform their work perfectly without detection until for some reason they run afoul of the law in their efforts to gratify their habit. Compare our addict, if you will, with a diabetic. The latter is able to lead a normal life as long as he gets all of life's necessities and insulin. The drug addict, similarly, is able to function adequately as long as he receives the same necessities of life that our diabetic needs, but he, in addition, needs not insulin but narcotics.

There are two features which are ascribed to narcotics as though they exhibited these pharmacologic characteristics alone. These drugs produce both tolerance and dependence. By the former we mean that it takes ever-increasing doses to produce the same effect. Your self-treated constipated patient tends to use ever larger and larger doses of his favorite laxative in order to produce the same effect on his bowels. Dependence is some characteristic of the nerve cell which demands these materials in order to function properly. Such dependence appears in many other diseases, for example, the use of vitamin B_{12} in the treatment of pernicious anemia.

Let us picture for a moment a potential narcotic addict who has never met a peddler. He might be the antisocial person who throws a stone through the stained glass window of the church to which he does not belong or who sets fire to his school when he has been disciplined therein. Perhaps he is a member of one of our numerous lunatic fringe societies, or he may be found in our jails or in our underworld because some of his antisocial behavior has made him a criminal. Not too long ago such a person came to my attention who, after experiencing many difficulties in adolescence, became a moderate user of narcotics. For the past 45 years he has operated a railroad switch tower at a busy junction. He has been praised by his supervisor as a diligent, conscientious worker who "never misses a day" and on whom he "can depend utterly." This individual unfortunately acquired tuberculosis and came to my attention only when he was admitted to a sanitorium, thereby being separated from his usual sources of supply. In summary, then, these materials are used as self-treatment by certain mentally sick individuals. They do not incite the user to violence. In fact, the very opposite is true.

CRIME AND DRUG ADDICTION

If these drugs do not promulgate criminal tendencies, why are crime and narcotic addiction so closely allied in our minds? In the United States the addict is not recognized officially as a psychopath but rather as a criminal. Now this is an entirely man-made situation. We could make our diabetics criminals just as quickly were we to forbid them insulin. Similarly, our experience with prohibition proved to us that we could make criminals out of devotees of alcohol. We recognized this error in our thinking when the 18th amendment was repealed. Now, by the ukase of the Bureau of Narcotics, we have divorced the addict from a legitimate source of drugs. He may not obtain these materials from his physician, nor can he obtain them through his pharmacist. To him they have become a way of life. They are, in his warped reasoning, necessary for his very existence. Therefore, he obtains them through the underworld or by stealth. The peddler, like the bootlegger of the 1920's, was happy to have this artificial opportunity created for him by our legislative efforts.

Narcotics are not very expensive, costing little more than aspirin to produce. There is a rather large tax on these materials, but even so, 20 or 30 cents would supply the daily needs of most addicts. Actually, however, since the price of these materials has been artificially heightened by the nature of their source, many of these people spend from $15 to $100 a day to gratify their addiction. This, then, is the source of crime. How many individuals do any of us know who can spend $100 per day on drugs in addition to all the other expenses of living. It becomes apparent that few could hope to do this by legitimate means. Actually the situation is compounded even further by additional factors. The narcotic addict must keep his illness secret to avoid the censure of his neighbors, so that he can stay out of the clutches of the law. As we have pointed out before, the materials are sedatives so that every capacity which he may have once had for earning large sums has been lost by this action of narcotics. Therefore, as one addict described the situation, each day is spent in a frequently futile effort to acquire sufficient money to gratify the habit.

The type of crime to which these individuals turn is interesting. Since many of these people are rather meek, their methods of acquiring money are rarely violent. They are shoplifters, policy slip runners, bookies, pilferers, and the like. Murder is a rare crime among them. Females practice prostitution. Married women have been known to sell the furnishings from their homes to obtain moneys which should have been spent for food and other necessities. Many prostitutes have never seen the money their efforts have earned. Instead their procurer or madam pays them in narcotics. This tends to keep them from leaving the house. In some cities of the United States as many as 86 percent of all apprehended prostitutes were narcotic addicts.

Actually these are the least of their crimes. The most serious is the introduction of neophytes to addiction. The narcotic peddler us usually an addict. In New York City he is given 25 percent of all the narcotics he can sell. Therefore, the addict is the largest single cause of the spread of this symptom complex. Who are these initiates? In most instances they are children of high school age who are easily induced to take narcotics as a new adventure. They want desperately to be one of the crowd and intensely fear criticism of being "chicken."

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEM

Because the sale and distribution of narcotics is illegal in the United States, we have no accurate figures as to the number of addicts in this country. Actually we know only of those individuals who run afoul of the law. This amount seems to be increasing. An estimate made in 1918 by a commission appointed by the then Secretary of the Treasury estimated that we had a million addicts. This was about 4 or 5 times the number of sufferers prior to the passage of our first law of control, the Harrison Act. None of the figures from any course, whether it be the Commissioner of Narcotics, our courts of law, the Federal hospitals for the care of narcotic addicts, our prison population, or the Bureau of Customs who seize a certain amount of narcotics each year, are accurate. The United Nations estimates that no more than 10 percent of all of the material smuggled into the United States is ever seized. In 1952, 4,000 ounces were so acquired by the Government, and if this were 10 percent of the total, then 40,000 ounces were smuggled into the country, which should be sufficient to supply 180,000 addicts. The number of individuals who have been apprehended for narcotic violations has increased 1,200 percent in the last 7 years. The adoption of our resolution will lead to the acquisition of some accurate information as to the nature of this problem and its magnitude.

THE CAUSE OF OUR PRESENT SITUATION

Most of the narcotics introduced into the United States in the latter part of the 19th century and the 1st 14 years of the 20th reached this country through Chinese tongs. A good deal of the material so introduced was powdered crude opium which was smoked in parlors, very much as liquor is consumed in saloons. An occasional non-Chinese member of our community used this substance. Perhaps even larger numbers of individuals had become accustomed to various proprietary medications, which were sold across drugstore counters without prescriptions, which contained more or less narcotics. Querulous children were treated with nostrums containing paregoric. This was a well-recognized remedy for teething. Women used such substances for the relief of menstrual cramps and discomfort. A great number of apprehensive people used patent medicines containing opiates rather regularly to reduce their nervous tension.

In an effort to cope with this situation which had become a matter for concern in the press of the early 20th century, there was passed the Harrison Stamp Act. The purpose of this piece of legislation was to control the sale of these materials and to tax them. Since that time each vial of narcotics carries a stamp very much like that found on bottles of liquor. It is obvious that the Congress expected that this would be a tax measure because its enforcement was placed in the Treasury Department. The term "narcotic addict" does not even appear in the act. As a result of rulings by the Chief of the Bureau of Narcotics and by subsequent interpretations of these decrees by the Supreme Court, it has become illegal for practicing physicians to administer narcotics to addicts. The legal machinations by which we in medicine were separated from these unfortunates is a story in itself. It has been told very well by Mr. Rufus King (1) recently in the Yale Law Review. Remember, the regulations were made by the Bureau and not by Congress.

All of the legislation, Federal, State, and municipal, is punitive in nature. The net result of this type of control has been to make the acquisition of narcotics ever more difficult and consequently ever more expensive. It follows then that each new measure actually incites new crime. In every instance this observation has been borne out. I am

sure that those who have profited enormously from the sale of these substances welcome every new legal effort at control. There is no need to question why there are so many who are interested in "pushing" narcotics. The profits are beyond all realization. Five or $10 spent for narcotics in the Orient easily secreted under the shirt of a seaman can be smuggled into this country and sold for over $100,000 after being properly cut, diluted, and peddled. When one considers how impossible it was to prevent the smuggling of alcohol, which is thousands of times more bulky and with a considerably smaller profit involved, one can readily sense the futility of legally controlling narcotic addiction by such means.

Senator Royal S. Copeland, a physician from New York, recognized that many addicts would be left without any legitimate source of supply after the enactment of the Harrison Act. He suggested, therefore, that clinics be made available for these individuals so that they might be able to gratify their needs at small prices without recourse to the underworld. These clinics followed none of the regulatory devices which are suggested in our resolution. Nonetheless, they were attended by thousands of patients throughout the country. They were not well conceived, but they were an attempt in the right direction. They might ultimately have been made to work properly, had they been given the opportunity to correct their own errors. They were closed by a decree from the Bureau following a report by a committee of the American Medical Association in 1919 which suggested that narcotic addiction could best be cured within an institution. While the Bureau of Narcotics acted rapidly on the AMA suggestion, closing the clinics at once, it was not until 1935 before proper Government-controlled institutions were inaugurated, first at Lexington, Ky., and later in Fort Worth, Tex., in an effort to handle this problem.

At the present time the United States has become a vast game preserve stocked with hundreds of thousands of narcotic addicts, a few of whom can be apprehended at will by our enforcement officers. The apprehension of an occasional smuggler or of some user or peddler (and the latter two terms are frequently synonymous) receives newspaper headlines, and we, who may not be interested in the subject, might then feel that the problem is being solved.

PRESENT METHODS OF TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION

Narcotic addicts who are not convicted of a crime and, therefore, incarcerated in jails may either by their own volition or on recommendation of appropriate penal, social, or medical authorities be recommended for admission to either of the Federal hospitals. Only one of these accepts females. Treatment in these institutions is excellent, there being brought to bear on the problem not only medical but religious, social, and vocational guidance. The treatment is long, from 4 to 12 months, and costs on an average $4,000 per patient.

The relapse rate of these patients in unknown. It is probably extremely high. Authorities in the institutions speak of 69 or 75 percent in various articles. Addicts give us the impression that the relapse rate is practically 100 percent. One addict that I interviewed received his first dose of heroin, after leaving the hospital at Lexington, in Pittsburgh as he changed trains to New York City. It would seem that only 5 percent of these patients stay completely well. If this figure is true, and it is probably quite accurate, then each cure costs the taxpayers of the United States $100,000. We in medicine would never accept so poor a record in the treatment of any disease. It becomes very difficult to say much in favor of a program of therapy with so enormous a rate of failure.

Yet our Government is committed to this utterly untenable policy. Perhaps the degree of ineptitude of our methods can best be exemplified by studying the situation in England where addicts may be treated by their own physicians and where there are reported for the year 1953 311 addicts, and there may be, according to the British authorities 50 or 75 more in the entire British Isles, an area with a population of 40 million.

There is some light to be found in this picture in that in Detroit, Chicago, and New York City some followup methods are now being utilized. The report of the Provident Hospital under Dr. Walter Adams (2) in Chicago makes excellent reading, and I commend it to those of you who are interested. In New York City where the problem is most acute, particularly in our underprivileged areas, we have some facilities for the hospitalization and followup to juvenile patients, but nothing for adults.

In the therapy of so complex an individual as a narcotic addict, embracing as it does every class of human being, it becomes apparent that some, perhaps many, patients are incurably addicted. For such an individual there remains only three possibilities: (1) Incarcerate him for life, (2) put him to death, or (3) grant him some narcotics legally under proper regulation.

The first of these is too costly and would take many valuable citizens out of circulation. In addition, the addicts themselves would not voluntarily enter hospitals. They rarely go to Lexington or Fort Worth now of their own volition and then it is not to break the habit but to "kick it down" to a price they can afford.

The second has been tried at various times in dictatorships in the Orient. It hasn't worked there, and it is not likely to be enacted in any civilized country like the United States.

The third represents to us the only likely approach.

THE RICHMOND COUNTY PLAN A PRACTICAL REMEDY

The plan which has been described in the original resolution is as simple as it is direct. It embraces really only two steps:

1. Recognize the addict for what he is, a mentally sick person whose prime symptom of illness is addiction.

2. Let us bring to bear on this unfortunate psychopath the whole weight of our great knowledge in medicine, sociology, psychiatry, religion, and humanity so that this sick individual may again be made well and to rehabilitate him so that he can live without narcotics if this can possibly be done. If this is not possible with our present state of knowledge, then let us carry him on narcotics under our control until we learn enough about this subject to effect eventually a permanent cure.

What can we expect from this program?

1. To learn the magnitude of the problem.

2. To stop crimes committed by addicts in order to obtain the price of drugs.

3. To stop the introduction of addiction to new people by the present users who are trying to guarantee their own sources of supply.

4. To prevent death and disaster to those addicted individuals who inject impure, dirty, infected materials into themselves. Many lose their lives from overdosage or from "hot shots" which contain poison. This is the way the underworld disposes of a dangerous addict who has no money to purchase drugs or who informs on the higher ups.

5. To empty our jails of these noncriminals or those people who have become criminals only through our own inept legislation.

6. To give us the opportunity to study addiction so that we may eventually discover a real cure for this disease.

Naturally such a program will require careful safeguards:

1. It will demand the establishment of clinics in our larger cities and individual physicians (3) in smaller localities.

2. Narcotics should be administered only at the clinic. The addict will never be given a supply of medications.

3. He must be fingerprinted and properly identified, registered, and photographed. Only those who are actually addicts can be treated. These can be readily recognized either by incarcerating them and withdrawing them from the narcotics after strict seclusion or by the administration of narcotic antagonists such as nalline.

4. Hospitalize those patients who the medical personnel at the clinics feel can best be served by inpatient techniques. These should be individuals who request hospitalization after being so advised by the clinic physicians. They should not be forcibly incarcerated unless their physical or mental condition is so critical as to make them a menace to society.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PLAN

This plan is opposed by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics. I believe these gentlemen to be entirely sincere in their concept of narcotic addiction as a wholly criminal matter. I can only cite in rebuttal the existence of the problem after 40 years of such methods and its apparent growth under this technique. They feel that pride would keep addicts from registering in such clinics, and it is quite true that some might not, but 1,500 registered in the early clinics of 1918 on the first day. At the present time all addicts are cheats since they will do practically anything to secure the drugs they so urgently need. Under our plan some may continue to be dishonest, but that number ought to be a great deal smaller than it is now.

We hear a great deal about the contagious nature of addiction and that clinics, by bringing addicts together, will increase their numbers. Actually the necessity to sell drugs on the part of one addict to another in an effort to guarantee his own sources of supply is the most common cause of the spread of this condition. The disease itself is not contagious. There seems little reason to believe that an individual would continue to steal and commit crimes in order to obtain drugs when they can be obtained free.

Since some individuals use drugs frequently during the course of a day, we hear the objection that it will be inconvenient for them to return to the clinics as often as necessary. Pharmaceutical chemists [1] tell me that any time that the need arises they can prepare a repository narcotic that will have a 24-hour or longer effect.

CONCLUSION

It seems that narctoic addicts, like the rest of us, by normal attrition tend to reach the termination of their span on this earth. By such natural means many of our present incurable addicts will in time disappear. Should the pusher no longer find it necessary to induce our youth to become addicts to gratify his own narcotic needs, then it would seem that time alone under our technic will solve this problem even if we acquire no new information from our experience with these people when we have the opportunity to treat them. In view of the medical professions' extraordinary record of accomplishment in the past with the management of so-called incurable diseases, it seems probable, God willing, that we might find the answer to this one as well.

Rereferences:

1. King, R.: Yale Law Rev. 62: 736 (Apr.) 1953.

2. Adams, W.: Narcotic Drug Addiction and Outpatient Treatment, privately published by the Provident Hospital, 426 East 51st Street, Chicago, Ill.

3. Howe, H. S.: New York State J. Med. 55: 341 (Feb. 1) 1955.

[1] Merck & Co., Inc., Rahway, N. J.

JUNE 15, 1956.

Miss MARY FLEMING,
Flushing, N. Y.

DEAR MISS FLEMING: Thank you for your communication with respect to the drug addiction problem.

I have for some time now been concerned with the growing amount of drug addiction in this country, particularly among our young people. The very factor of their youth makes the chances for their successful rehabilitation so much better that I feel we should do all we can to increase available facilities and services to attain that end.

I think you might be interested in reading the remarks on this topic that I made on the floor of the Senate recently. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Thank you for writing me as you did, setting forth your views on this problem.

Yours very sincerely,

FLUSHING, N. Y., *May 15, 1956.*

Hon. Senator HERBERT F. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I was glad to read today of the approval of the bill cracking down on the drug traffic and heroin selling especially. Several months ago I read an excellent proposal to wipe out illegal narcotics traffic. This suggestion was originally made by a group of doctors in New York State. They recommended, I believe, that any drug addict be supplied with the drug he craves free of charge by his physician. The drugs could be paid for by the Government. This would wipe out the profits of the drug racketeer and make it worthless to smuggle drugs into the United States. It would encourage addicts to seek legal treatment and encourage them to try to be cured. I believe it would make addiction easier to cure because the addict would never be forced to steal to procure the drug, and would know he could be given it as medicine. This should lessen the desperation of many addicts.

I think this would be an excellent provision to add to this narcotics bill.

Sincerely yours,

MARY FLEMING.

JUNE 15, 1956.

Mr. MICHAEL ALEXANDER,
New Hyde Park, N. Y.

DEAR MR. ALEXANDER: Thank you for your communication with respect to the drug-addiction problem.

I have for some time now been concerned with the growing amount of drug addiction in this country, particularly among our young people. The very factor of their youth makes the chances for their successful rehabilitation so much better that I feel we should do all we can to increase available facilities and services to attain that end.

I think you might be interested in reading the remarks on this topic that I made on the floor of the Senate recently. I am enclosing a copy for your information.

Thank you for writing me as you did, setting forth your views on this problem.

Yours very sincerely.

NEW HYDE PARK, N. Y., *May 13, 1956.*

Senator HERBERT LEHMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After hearing today's Town Meeting debate between Congressman BAKER and Dr. Berger on the drug-addiction problem, I am greatly moved to urge you to support the so-called clinic plan for the treatment of drug addiction.

I am convinced that the spread of addiction among our young people is largely due to the necessity of drug addicts to themselves become sellers of narcotics in order to get the money to satisfy their needs.

The clinic plan would remove the economic basis for the spread of addiction, and would substitute treatment for punitive methods. Experience has shown that neither legal nor any other kind of punishment will solve the problem.

Yours truly,

MICHAEL ALEXANDER.

Resolution Memorializing the Congress of the United States Relative to the Issuance of a Commemorative Postage Stamp Depicting the Adams National Historic Site

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonweath of Massachusettts on July 19, 1956.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO THE ISSUANCE OF A COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMP DEPICTING THE ADAMS NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE

Whereas the Adams mansion in Quincy, Mass., the home of John Adams and John Quincy Adams, an illustrious father and an illustrious son, both Presidents of the United States of America, has been established as a national historic site in honor of the Adams family and the great contributions of that family to the United States and to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; and

Whereas visitors from all parts of the country pay homage to the Adamses by visiting the old Adams home, now a historic shrine, thereby keeping alive the memory of the two distinguished leaders of our country who fought courageously to acquire and to retain the freedom and rights enjoyed by Americans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the Postmaster General of the United States to issue a special commemorative postage stamp depicting the Adams National Historic Site; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Postmaster General of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Adopted: Senate, July 19, 1956.

THOMAS A. CHADWICK,
Assistant Clerk, Acting Clerk.

A true copy. Attest:

EDWARD J. CRONIN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

A Year Since Geneva

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the Washington Daily News recently there appeared a well-prepared discussion by R. H. Shackford entitled "A Year Since Geneva—A Minus for the West." It is thought provoking and informative.

I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A YEAR SINCE GENEVA—A MINUS FOR THE WEST

(By R. H. Shackford)

A year ago this week the leaders of the 4 great powers met for the first time in 10 years at Geneva in a mood of optimism. One year later that optimism is badly tarnished.

But the debate over who gained or lost from that summit conference still goes on.

Some argue it was a major setback for the West—that the Bolsheviks accomplished a major objective by encouraging the Western World to relax—which it has—and thus become easier prey.

Others argue that the Geneva meeting was a major gain for the West—that it relaxed international tensions and diminished the danger of war.

The record supports the claim that the Geneva Conference was a plus for the Soviets and a minus for the West:

The Reds have made alarming headway with expanded influence in south Asia and the Middle East, and have increased the danger of an Arab-Israeli war.

Western alliances have been creaking and the West in general, basking in the afterglow of the phony Geneva spirit, is letting down its guard and indulging in the luxury of intrafamily squabbles.

The new Soviet leaders have managed—by changing only their manners—to mislead many people into believing that the Kremlin is sanctioning fundamental changes, though the Soviet leaders themselves have stated that their fundamentals will not change.

On specific subjects discussed at Geneva, the conference and all subsequent negotiations have proved complete flops. The East and West are just as divided as they were at Geneva.

The foreign ministers' conference which followed the summit meeting was, according to the President, to be the acid test of Soviet intentions. It was a greater flop.

Mr. Eisenhower suggested that the test of Soviet cooperation pledges to him at Geneva would come "in the language and terminology in which we will find speeches and diplomatic exchange couched."

Last week Soviet delegate Andrei Gromyko bitterly denounced the United States before the United Nations, provoking the American delegate to describe the speech as "in the worst traditions of Stalinism."

A few days earlier a Soviet note absurdly accused the United States Air Force of espionage in flights over Soviet cities.

Pravda's new spirit of conciliation and cooperation is displayed by blaming Secretary of State John Foster Dulles wholly for Poland's bread riots.

The easy answer is the one used by President Eisenhower in his recent letter to Chiang Kai-shek:

"International communism alters its tactics from time to time but we have as yet no evidence of any change in its objectives."

Nevertheless, it has been the change in Soviet tactics—looked at uncritically by much of the world—which has given the Soviet Union the advantages it has reaped in the past year by merely playing on world gullibility.

How superficial those changes are is evident in a summary of the year's highlights:

The Soviets keep at high tempo their pious professions of peace, but they leapfrogged into the Middle East with a Czech-Egyptian arms deal, provoking an arms race which could lead to war.

West Germany established diplomatic relations with Russia after a Soviet promise to return prisoners of war held more than 10 years. All the POW's were not returned, and now the Soviet leaders have recalled their Ambassador in Bonn.

Khrushchev and Bulganin toured India, Burma, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, indulging in international demagogery on a grand scale and promising the moon to all who would believe them.

Russia vetoed Japan's admission to the United Nations.

The East German Army formally was incorporated in the Soviet Warsaw Pact, but the Kremlin still demands dissolution of all Western military alliances.

The Soviet leaders painted Stalin as a maniacal despot so far as most of internal evils are concerned, but haven't mentioned any of his international crimes except his blunder with Tito.

There is much talk about a better deal for the Soviet people, but the new 5-year plan is just Stalin's old forced-industrialization policy. Emphasis is overwhelming on heavy and military industry—only crumbs for the consumer.

The Kremlin's anti-Stalin and kiss-and-make-up-with-Tito campaigns seemed to encourage the satellites to be more independent. But when Polish workers demanded more bread and freedom they were shot down by the army.

The Cominform was dissolved and foreign Communist parties enjoyed a couple of weeks of criticizing the Kremlin's handling of the anti-Stalin campaign. But the foreign Reds have now all swung into line—and are no longer asking Khrushchev what he was doing when Stalin was rampaging.

The U. S. S. R. claims it cut its armed forces by 640,000 men last year and will make another reduction of 1,200,000 this year—and demands the West do the same. But it steadfastly refuses to accept any arms reduction plan which would provide inspection. The same is true of Soviet atomic-armaments proposals.

The unhappy facts are that on the really important issues—Germany, the satellites, disarmament, the Far East, etc.—the new Soviet regime's policy has hardened.

Changes may be occurring inside the Soviet Empire. It is probably true that the Soviet leaders would like to avoid a major war—as did Stalin—if objectives can be attained by other means.

But nothing has happened since the Geneva Conference to encourage hope for even a change of tactics—except for the worse—on the issues that could spell the difference between war and peace.

The Fund and the Films

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the July 14, 1956, issue of the Pilot, Boston, Mass.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUND AND THE FILMS

The Fund for the Republic has become in many circles a bad word, and in some others at least a suspicious one. This unfortunate climate makes it difficult for large numbers of people to judge on the merits of its various products in an objective manner, since they have, almost unconsciously, prejudged the whole matter. Among many projects, the fund is now in the public eye with a report on blacklisting prepared by John Cogley, formerly of Commonweal, which discusses in two volumes, blacklisting in the movies (I) and radio-television (II). This week Mr. Cogley, as a result of the report, was summoned before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Limiting our remarks, at this time, to the volume on the movies, we find it hard to understand just what all the excitement is about. Mr. Cogley, with his staff, has assembled material on the Hollywood hearings, communism in the film colony, labor problems in the industry, outside pressures—with special emphasis on the American Legion, clearance techniques—and all of these in relation to the central problem of blacklisting. This last word refers to certain lists, from many sources, which contained the names of those charged with Communist membership or Communist affiliations through front organizations. People on these lists found employment impossible in these last years, except where they showed a willingness to make a solemn declaration of loyalty to their country and acknowledge former errors and indiscretions. There were other lists, apparently smaller and never quite so formally kept, of anti-Communists, and they too lost employment because of assistance given congressional committees or the FBI.

Mr. Cogley has told the story in convincing fashion with a minimum of editorial comment, but with that necessary selection of detail which makes a pattern out of a mere mass of facts. Surely the text betrays no bias in favor of either the acknowledged Communists or those who made use of the fifth amendment though it shows an understandable concern over any innocent people who might conceivably have been caught up in the machinery intended to catch the Reds. Some reviewers have suggested that Mr. Cogley has not exposed the Communist menance or any remaining traces of its power in Hollywood. This is hardly strange when we consider that he set out to make a report on blacklisting, not infiltration. He should not be condemned for failing to write the book he never even intended to write.

It is also possible that Mr. Cogley's text may contain some errors. His staff was limited and the prestige of the fund may have closed some avenues of information quite as readily as it opened some others. Undoubtedly many sturdy volumes could have been filled with facts not mentioned in the present report, but then we might have had an overexhausting as well as overexhaustive study. Judging what we actually have before us, only the captious will attempt to impugn the honesty, the ability, and the integrity which characterizes what has been done.

We do not share, then, the views (expressed elsewhere in this paper) of Mr. William Mooring who considers the whole business "old hat," "colossal waste," and merely confirming "the anti-anti-Communist stand" of the fund. This last surely makes the mistake of confusing the work of the fund with the remarks of its controversial president, Robert Hutchins. Mr. Cogley has been careful to separate the elements in the Hollywood mixture and with considered justice he has striven to give each his due as he judged it; if his judgment has differed from Mr. Mooring's, it has not, for that reason, been an unjust or faulty emphasis.

This week Mr. Cogley's former paper, Commonweal, in its lead editorial shows itself in a rare mood of excited, almost rumpled indignation. It resents the discourtesy of tha House Un-American Activities Committee which subpenaed Mr. Cogley instead of inviting him to testify, and it then proceeds to express anxiety over the freedom of the press. For us the argument is unimpressive, and we feel the committee is certainly within its rights in summoning Mr. Cogley, who can have nothing to fear from such an appearance. Journalists are not a class above investigation, even if certain of their confidences must be respected. Mr. Cogley, moreover, has nothing to hide from the Congress or even its most intemperate Members.

Certainly one among the many good results of the fund is its ability to bring before the American public controversial issues, which in their discussion make a clearer focus for some of us and make the pursuit of truth easier for all of us.

Address by Brig. Gen. William W. Stickney, United States Marine Corps Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Brig. Gen. William W. Stickney, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Deputy Director, Marine Corps Reserve, before the general session of the national convention, Reserve Officers' Association, in New Orleans, La., on Thursday, June 21, 1956.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM W. STICKNEY, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS RESERVE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS RESERVE, BEFORE THE GENERAL SESSION OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION, RESERVE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES, ROOSEVELT HOTEL, NEW ORLEANS, LA., THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 1956

It is a very great pleasure and honor for me to be here with you this afternoon. It is particularly pleasing as I regard your association as a vital asset to our national security. You have every reason to be proud of your continuing efforts to focus attention on the responsibilities of citizenship in connection with national defense. I speak for all marines when I express our gratitude to your achievements in promoting public understanding of security requirements, in building public confidence in our leaders, and encouraging public support of the defense program.

As veterans of military service and as experienced judges of past and present practices in the important realm of national security, you do not need to be reminded of the vital urgency of an adequate military posture in these times of global tension. We must be so strong and so ready in every department that it is obvious to the entire world, to friend and foe alike, that we cannot be defeated on any battlefield—in a big war or a little war, in a global war or a peripheral war—by sneak attack or in the long pull.

This is our task today and it will be our task for a long time to come. Our aim is to prevent war by our obvious ability to win it—at least to deny victory to the enemy.

Last year when I talked with you in reference to the overall national security picture I stated: "Never have we, as a people, talked so much about equity and privileges and so little about responsibilities, obligations, and duties." I stated, among other things, that the words "equity" and "privilege" have, to many, become synonymous. I reminded you that the building up in peacetime of a strong national character is of supreme importance. I made these references in relation to the overall picture. However, the thoughts are just as meaningful and every bit as much a warning in any detail of that overall program to which we may address ourselves.

Today I wish to discuss with you a subject which, while only a detail of our overall requirements, is of paramount importance, particularly to the Marine Corps. This subject is the Marine Corps recruit training procedures. Before I discuss this matter, however, I would like to comment briefly on the Marine Corps' general position within the National Defense Establishment.

The Congress and the people of the United States have placed great confidence in the Marine Corps in assigning to the corps the mission of maintaining a force in readiness to meet such emergencies as may be presented. This mission, along with collateral requirements, has established implicit and sobering responsibilities. To meet these responsibilities is, in and of itself, a task of major dimensions—one which demands the energetic and full effort and support of every officer and man in the corps. The mission envisioned by the Congress requires that the Marine Corps will at all times maintain a posture of dependability and readiness for combat. To maintain this posture we must devote ourselves to the principles which recognize the fact that the Marine Corps is primarily a fighting organization. Our function in the national security organization is in an important but specialized field. In this amphibious field our functions and future therein are closely and intimately linked to those of the United States Navy. To be constantly ready as a fighting force requires our every effort and literally leaves us no time to do anything but mind our own business, and this we propose to do. However, matters do, and will continue to, arise that need answering. When such an occasion presents itself, you may rest assured the Marine Corps will speak forthrightly and with candor.

Our only hope is that our concept will always be, logic and sound reasoning commensurate with our mission and directed toward the greatest good for our country. The emotional factor has been ever present and has, unfortunately, been substituted for logic in some discussions. Surely in such critical times, and under such conditions, we cannot afford the luxury of substituting emotion for logic, or prejudice for patriotism.

If we are to meaningfully discuss a subject, such as is now before us, we must have a definite understanding in terms, as it is only when we have reached agreement on names and concepts that we can hope to progress with clearness and ease in the examination of a given topic, and be assured of finding ourselves on the same platform with our listeners.

For instance, the meaning of the word "discipline," when used by a military man, and the interpretation thereof by the average civilian are purely coincidental. When we speak of discipline, we speak of the spirit of the team—when the average citizen hears the word he invariably thinks of fear, chastisement, to whip or scourge in order to mortify or subjugate will or passions—this has nothing to do with true military discipline.

Without the proper spirit there can be no such thing as discipline in any organization. We may have the outward semblance, the symptoms, so to speak, but that is all. We may have obedience, compliance with regulations, even cooperation of a kind, as long as the fear of disciplinary correction is present, but these symptoms last only while the one in authority is present. We have only the discipline enforced upon schoolchildren who begin to throw things and misbehave the moment the teacher's back is turned.

The discipline upon which a successful Marine unit must be built is of a different kind, a kind that endures when every semblance of authority has vanished, when the leader has fallen, when the members of the team are dropping out one by one, and when the only driving power that remains is the strong and unconquerable spirit of the team. This is the working definition of military discipline—the spirit of the team.

Experience has shown that obedience of a single will is required for success in battle. This obedience should not be the blind obedience of an automaton; it must be reasoning and intelligent, loyal and enthusiastic, positive and immediate. This type of loyal and intelligent obedience we call discipline. While intelligence can be stimulated, initiative fostered, loyalty encouraged, obedience must be taught.

When recruiting young men into the Marine Corps, we emphasize the fact that we want fighting men, and that if they become marines they will have to condition themselves for combat. It has been this way in the corps for 180 years. Men who join the marines usually realize the necesity of combat efficiency, are interested in training, and are eager to learn and increase that efficiency wherever possible.

To some it may appear that we stress some of the ancient virtues in our system of training and indoctrinating men for service with the corps. We teach the recruit that he should be proud to be a marine; that there is no more honorable profession in any field of endeavor; and that when he wears the uniform of a United States marine he is a member of an organization that is recognized and respected throughout the world. We firmly believe that what made a good marine in any war in which we have engaged still makes a good marine. We believe that he must have leadership qualities; he must be well disciplined; he must be well trained; he must be loyal, and he must have the will to fight. With such men, we know we cannot fail.

Discipline in our recruit depots has always been strict, but never of the Prussian variety, a blind obedience to superiors. Rather, we define it as the cheerful and willing obedience to all orders. Obviously discipline of this type requires a healthy, wholesome, and reverent respect for the person giving the orders. For this reason, men who are assigned to duty with recruits are especially chosen for this assignment.

Since, primarily, a marine receives orders in combat from his noncommissioned officers, the Marine Corps considers it mandatory that the recruit be indoctrinated from the outset in willing and unhesitating obedience to noncommissioned officers. For this reason, the recruit is supervised by and receives most of his training from noncommissioned officer drill instructors, under the direction of commissioned officers.

During this training, the drill instuctor's word is law. Training is rigorous and thorough. We do not think of marines as file jackets or a group of numbers. Rather, we know them to be warm, living men who deserve—and must have—all the leadership, guidance, support, and consideration that we are capable of rendering. We also believe, and teach, that loyalty goes down the chain of command as well as up. Each recruit learns to take care of himself and function as a part of the team. He quickly learns that his personal wishes and desires are secondary to what is best for the unit of which he is a member.

Without doubt, there are very few recruits who do not—at some time during their training—curse what they, at that time, consider onerous discipline. Yet, upon completion of the training, all are very proud of the fact that they proved to themselves that they could take it.

What we strive to accomplish in our recruit, as well as in all marine training, is to impress on all marines the true meaning of, value in, and imperative requirement for, discipline; that well-disciplined outfits rarely break in combat; that there is safety in discipline; that there is pride and respect in discipline. Discipline as we develop it does not develop wooden men who freeze up, who falter, or who fail.

In the Marine Corps there is a very definite sense of a brotherhood in arms—a mutual understanding between officers, noncommissioned officers, and all ranks. This does not break down discipline but rather begets respect, loyalty, and confidence.

One of the most important aims in all of our training is the development of an esprit de corps. This spirit of the group is somewhat difficult to explain, yet it has many outward manifestations. Your gathering here in New Orleans for this convention is an outgrowth of that spirit. The problem is somewhat akin to the young man who, when asked to define a cavity, answered, "I have it in my head, but I can't explain it."

The feeling of one marine for another is not the same as the love within a family. Rather, it is a mixture of pride, fidelity, loyalty, spirit, unselfishness, and mutual respect that defies definition or measure. Admiral Nelson indoctrinated his officers with the concept that they were a "band of brothers" and in a similar sense it might be said that the Marine Corps is a great brotherhood.

Esprit de corps is developed in our recruits during their initial training in several ways. It begins to take root when the recruit learns respect for the men he is serving under. It develops and flourishes as he learns self-confidence, how to take care of himself in any situation, and, above and beyond all, as he proves himself to himself.

Admittedly, our training and indoctrination program has always been rugged. The tough and vital mission of the Marine Corps demands that it must be so.

Today, as ever, we feel that this training program is the very heart and foundation of the esprit de corps which has characterized the conduct of marines throughout the history of our country. It has met the acid of time and battle. It has proven to be the decisive factor in many of the toughest military engagements in which this country has been involved.

We all know full well that countless men, veterans of the most ferocious campaigns of World War II and Korea, are alive today solely because of their thorough indoctrination for the toughest type of combat. Marines who have experienced the rigors of combat can fully appreciate the value of their training.

The Marine Corps has built a tremendous and justified confidence in our objective approach to training.

Unfortunately, as a direct result of the recent tragedy at Parris Island, a very unpleasant and somewhat distorted picture of our training system was created in the mind of the public and of the Congress. Certain news stories painted our recruit depots as camps of callousness and brutality condoned and perhaps encouraged by those responsible for this operation.

From your appreciation of public opinion, you gentlemen know that it was our duty, if we were to preserve our system of training, to correct this perspective. A thorough study and reevaluation of our entire system of recruit training has reaffirmed that this system is basically sound.

Certain shortcomings which had crept into the system dictated that the Marine Corps reorganize, to a degree, the supervision of training at the recruit depots. However, the essential features of our tried and true methods will be retained.

The most essential—our method of entrusting the daily conduct of training to our NCO drill instructors—will not be changed. This, because the Marine Corps considers our noncommissioned officers are the backbone of the corps. They provide the intimate and personal leadership of the smaller units. At this level, they provide a vital link in the chain of command. They are trained to know their jobs and to recognize and accept responsibility.

Those NCO's assigned as drill instructors have a very important job, and we have and are placing great trust in them to fulfill these heavy responsibilities. As a group they have always demonstrated their ability and determination to carry out their duties in a manner of which they and the entire Marine Corps may well be proud.

It was the commandant's determination to preserve the present method of recruit instruction that caused him to act immediately following the investigation of the Parris Island tragedy.

In the reorganization that has taken place, there has been established a separate recruit training command at each recruit depot. The new commanders at Parris Island and San Diego are directly responsible to the commandant on all matters having to do with the conduct of recruit training.

Maj. Gen. David M. Shoup, a Medal of Honor winner, has been named as inspector general of all recruit training and as such is responsible to the commandant for close inspection of the recruit training commands. Brig. Gen. Wallace M. Greene is the commanding general recruit training command, Parris Island, and Brig. Gen. Alan Shapley is the commanding general of the like command at San Diego.

Training at our recruit depots will be standardized insofar as is possible. Additional officers have been assigned as supervisors of recruit training but will in no way supplant the drill instructors. In fact, it is our intent that they be of assistance to the drill instructors. The supervision that these officers will exercise is not to be such as to come between the drill instructor and his platoon. The noncommissioned officers will remain the fountain of authority and knowledge of the recruit.

The recruit training course has been extended from 10 weeks to 12 weeks. This will allow more time to accomplish all that the syllabus demands and it will relieve many of the pressures connected with a too tight time schedule. However, dillydallying and aimless leisure time for the recruit will not become the order of the day.

We have taken action to assure a continued high regard for the dignity of the recruit. Acts of personal humiliation and indignity have no place in a system intended to produce a prideful and self-respecting marine. Hazing as a relief for anger and frustration may have its place in certain walks of life—we shall make every effort to stamp it out whenever found in the Marine Corps.

By no means do I wish to imply that our training camps will be conducted in the manner of a fraternity picnic. Every recruit will still recognize that he has stepped into another walk of life—a walk of life characterized by instant, willing obedience, and by an unrelenting requirement for perfection in the execution of duties. The day of a recruit platoon will be filled with purposeful instruction and action—even leisure time will have a definite purpose.

Our training will still have as its basic purpose the inculcation in each marine of that sense of his own responsibility to do his part in battle so that his comrades do not bear his burden, or suffer from his failure. We will continue to develop in every marine the shared confidence in the members of his squad and platoon which sustains the unit in battle.

As before, we will continue to impress upon each individual his responsibilities to his unit, we will by no means tolerate mass punishment in any form.

The objective of all training will continue to be that of producing individual marines who are smartly disciplined, physically fit, technically well trained in the basic knowledge of a marine, and thoroughly indoctrinated in the love of corps and country.

It is our full intention to preserve, protect, and improve the basic elements of the system of recruit training which has served us so well for lo these many years.

We will continue to recognize our responsibility to each boy who becomes a marine recruit. We know that the vast majority of these boys are in the formative period of their lives. Because of this we feel that we owe to them, to their parents, and to the Nation the guaranty that after having completed marine training they will be far better men physically, mentally, and morally.

Most of the communications we have received as a result of the Parris Island tragedy have urged us not to weaken our training system. We are indeed grateful to the vast majority of the American public and to our country's leaders for their clear understanding of the mission we are called upon to perform and for the many splendid tributes they have paid the Marine Corps over the years.

I firmly believe that in the years ahead we will retain the great confidence and esteem of our country, and that the United States Marine Corps will continue to serve our Nation with the same degree of efficiency, fidelity, and high sense of purpose which has become our tradition.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

JULY 17, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
John J. Heimburger	Counsel	$7,358.87
Francis M. LeMay	Staff consultant	6,808.86
Mabel C. Downey	Clerk	7,399.98
Geo. L. Reid, Jr.	Assistant clerk	7,399.98
Lydia Vacin	Staff assistant	3,843.54
Pauline E. Graves	do	3,483.90
Betty M. Prezioso	do	3,124.26
Gladys Ondarcho	do	2,824.50
iane Johnston	do	302.34

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	15,870.30
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	13,081.68
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	28,951.98
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	21,048.02

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
George Y. Harvey	Clerk and staff director	$6,166.65
Corhal D. Orescan	do	7,399.98
Kenneth Sprankle	do	7,399.98
Paul M. Wilson	do	7,399.98
Jay B. Howe	Staff assistant	6,808.86
Ross P. Pope	do	6,808.86
Robert M. Moyer	do	6,808.86
Carson W. Culp	do	6,808.86
Samuel W. Crosby	do	6,808.86
Harris H. Huston	do	6,808.86
Frank Sanders	do	6,288.66
Eugene B. Wilhelm	do	6,288.66
George S. Green	Clerk to minority	6,282.46
Robert P. Williams	Editor	5,917.14
E. L. Eckloff	Clerk to majority	5,824.20
Robert L. Michaels	Staff assistant	5,322.60
G. Homer Skarin	do	4,727.94
Earl C. Silsby	Staff assistant	4,564.44
Lawrence C. Miller	Assistant editor	3,723.66
Francis G. Merrill	Staff assistant	3,552.42
Samuel R. Preston	Junior staff assistant	3,124.26
Donald R. Bridges	Clerical assistant	2,353.50
Donald F. Berens	do	1,889.90
John C. Pugh	Consultant	1,461.00
Randolph Thomas	Janitor-messenger	1,601.52
Delores Cropper	Clerk-stenographer to the chairman	2,610.42

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julia M. Elliott	Clerk-stenographer	$2,610.42
Rose Ann Nimitz	do	2,175.35
Mary A. Vaughn	do	2,610.42
Phyllis N. Troy	do	2,610.42
William J. Neary	do	2,610.42
Ann R. Davis	do	2,175.35
Shirley Rae Colley	do	2,610.42
Catherine D. Norrell	do	2,610.42
Mildred Burnham	do	2,610.42
Barbara Grey	do	2,610.42
Molly O'Day Saguto	do	2,353.50
Donald L. Bernard	do	2,610.42
David P. Doyle	do	1,740.28
Edwin A. Sheehan	do	1,479.24
Margie H. Trew	do	2,610.42
James W. Dudley	do	2,610.42
John G. Clevenger	do	2,610.42
Charles C. Andersen	do	2,610.42
Gladys Kofmehl	do	2,610.42
Frank B. Melchior	do	2,507.64
Monica Smith	Clerk-stenographer to the ranking minority member.	2,524.80
Frank Mentillo	Clerk-stenographer	2,353.50
Elaine M. Hopkins	do	1,961.25
Barbara J. Groves	do	2,353.50
Baert Devos Brand	do	1,939.63
Roma E. Jaques	do	1,396.68
Wilburn L. McClure	Clerical assistant	296.40
Glenna L. Taylor	Clerk-stenographer	435.07
Helen B. Rogers	do	392.25
Agnes Norton	do	870.14
Ruth M. Young	do	435.07
Luman H. Long	do	435.07

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$405,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	187,992.90
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	199,123.13
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	387,116.03
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	17,883.97

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it.

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Haynes	Director of surveys and investigations.	$5,991.42
Richard F. McIlwain	Assistant director of surveys and investigations.	5,991.42
Ralph W. Horton	Investigator	5,805.66
Rose Marie Borda	Stenographer	2,567.64
Ethel P. Powers	do	2,216.52
John J. Donnelly	Consultant	1,500.00
Marion N. Hardesty	do	1,050.00
Charles W. Hart	do	4,275.00
Frank R. Joslyn	do	700.00
Alvin C. Loewer, Jr.	do	487.50
Joseph M. O'Connor	do	640.00

REIMBURSEMENTS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Agriculture, Department of:		
Jerome P. Anthony	Editorial assistant	$448.35
Melvin N. Culp	Investigator	1,933.29
Central Intelligence Agency:		
Edward C. Gauvreau	do	2,285.69
Defense, Department of:		
Hickey, Edward J.	do	1,052.16
Federal Bureau of Investigation:		
Carl L. Bennett	do	1,563.52
Harold H. Hair	do	1,339.20
Richard A. Miller	do	4,315.22
Robert W. Murphy	do	4,291.23
James E. Nugent	do	3,297.65
Robert E. Reiser	do	578.13
Robert E. Rightmyer.	do	611.20
John A. Ruhl	do	236.21
Andrew John Shannon.	do	1,194.80
Glenn Arthur Trofast.	do	770.84
General Services Administration:		
George E. Desjardine.	do	1,330.00
J. W. Flatley	do	2,050.76
John J. Holmead, Jr.	do	1,515.40
W. Trigg Miller	do	1,992.71
Billie Jean Powell	Stenographer	282.11
Mary Winifred Poynton.	do	923.36
Health, Education, and Welfare, Department of:		
Lois P. Flower	do	44.55
Mary Lou Hesko	do	216.71
Violet E. Haislip	do	26.34
Kathryn F. Jyllka	do	27.62
Elisabeth J. Miller	do	25.89
Interstate Commerce Commission:		
Alexis P. Bukovsky	Investigator	2,819.54
Navy, Department of:		
Wilkenloh, Charles E.	do	2,461.52
Post Office Department:		
Janet Baden	Stenographer	138.76
Aletha Bonnette	do	89.76
Robert W. Morris	Editorial assistant	1,815.52
Adeline Schubert	Stenographer	36.64
State, Department of:		
Donald F. Berens	Clerical assistant	1,423.66
Franklin W. Reinhold.	Editorial assistant	214.56
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		16,644.16

EXPENDITURES IN PREVIOUS PERIOD NOT REPORTED AGAINST 1955 APPROPRIATION

Reimbursements to Government agencies:		
Atomic Energy Commission:		
James Rorer	Editorial assistant	$508.08
Department of State:		
Franklin W. Reinhold.	do	1,248.80
Travel and miscellaneous expense.		29.70

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	209,825.06
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	89,222.22
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	299,047.28
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	200,952.72

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JULY 5, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert W. Smart	Chief counsel	$7,400.00
John R. Blandford	Counsel	7,366.00
Charles F. Ducander	do	7,310.45
Philip W. Kelleher	do	7,310.45
Janice G. Angell	Clerical staff	3,209.88
Berniece Kalinowski	do	3,209.88
Oneta L. Stockstill	do	2,811.67
L. Louise Ellis	do	2,811.67
Mary M. Abbott	do	2,262.89
James A. Deakins	do	2,610.43
John J. Courtney	Special counsel	7,399.98
Edward T. Fogo	Investigator	5,050.14
Lloyd R. Kuhn	do	4,014.84
Dorothy Britton	Secretary	2,781.72
Dorothea Clore	do	231.81
Adeline Tolerton	Clerk	2,610.42
Ethel L. Mott	do	2,610.42
James Woolls	Staff assistant	306.62

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	59,208.65
Amount expended from Jan. 4 to June 30, 1956	32,096.52
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to June 30, 1956	91,305.17
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	58,694.83

CARL VINSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

JUNE 30, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Robert L. Cardon	Clerk and counsel	$7,399.98
Orman S. Fink	Professional staff	7,399.98
John E. Barriere	do	7,399.98
Elsie G. Whitney	Deputy clerk	4,951.08
Helen E. Long	Assistant clerk	3,723.66
Mary W. Layton	Secretary	3,723.66
Employees pursuant to H. Res. 203, Subcommittee on Housing:		
William Costello	Clerk-messenger	1,661.55
Eleanor Hamilton	Research assistant	3,939.18
Alberta Masuman	Secretary	2,534.68
John J. McEwan, Jr.	Housing economist	6,182.16
Robert R. Poston	Chief counsel	6,952.76
Betty B. Ridgell	Clerk	3,227.00
Allen H. Dropkin	Assistant counsel (Jan. 1, 1956, through April 30, 1956).	2,805.20

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$150,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	24,316.42

Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	$38,931.99
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	63,248.41
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	86,751.59

BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 15, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 70th Congress, approved August 2, 194 , as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
W. N. McLeod, Jr.	Clerk	$7,399.98
Wendell E. Cable	Minority clerk	6,258.96
George R. Stewart	Attorney	6,808.86
Ruth Butterworth	Assistant clerk	4,031.94
Margaret S. Rogers	do	2,473.44
Dixon D. Davis	do	1,851.68

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$2,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	52.33
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	21.75
Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955, to June 30, 1956	74.08
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	1,925.92

JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

JULY 13, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Fred G. Hussey	Chief clerk	$7,399.98
Russell C. Derrickson	Chief investigator	7,399.98
James M. Brewbaker	General counsel	4,933.32
John O. Graham	Minority clerk	7,399.98
Kennedy W. Ward	Assistant general counsel	6,166.65
Kathryn Kivett	Assistant clerk	3,226.98
Jeanne Thomson	Assistant clerk, minority	3,226.98
Gloria Ann Baysden	Assistant clerk	3,226.98
Marion O. Riddiford	do	3,226.98
Mary Lynn Venuto	do	3,226.98

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$125,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	10,897.23
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	25,127.90
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	36,025.13
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	88,974.87

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

JULY 7, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Boyd Crawford	Staff administrator and committee clerk	$7,399.98
Roy J. Bullock	Staff consultant	7,106.10
Albert C. F. Westphal	do	7,106.10
Sheldon Z. Kaplan	do	7,106.10
June Nigh	Staff assistant	3,723.66
Winifred G. Osborne	do	3,638.04
Helen C. Mattas	do	3,638.04
Myrtie M. Melvin	do	3,638.04
Helen L. Hashagen	do	3,638.04
Mary L. O'Brien	do	[1] 1,000.72
Roosevelt Taylor	Messenger	1,678.02

[1] For period Apr. 30, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	4,573.76
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	6,009.53
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	10,583.29
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	64,416.71

JAS. P. RICHARDS,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JULY 9, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:	
Orville S. Poland, general counsel	$6,853.98
Christine Ray Davis, staff director	7,399.98
William Pincus, associate general counsel	6,932.70
Martha C. Roland, staff member	5,694.18
J. Robert Brown, staff member	5,322.60
Dolores Fel'Dotto, clerk-stenographer	3,937.80
Earle J. Wade, staff member	3,496.74
Mona Keating, clerk-stenographer, Feb. 1–June 30, 1956	1,840.20
Catherine Hartke, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1–9, 1956	131.62
Margaret B. O'Connor, clerk-stenographer, Feb. 1–29, 1956	417.94
Helen M. Boyer, minority professional staff member	6,189.60
John P. Carlson, minority counsel, Mar. 19–June 30, 1956	3,226.70
Esther Breeze, minority clerical staff, Jan. 1–18, 1956	569.41
Cecil Ray Broy, minority clerical staff, Jan. 19–Feb. 27, 1956	1,153.23
Expenses, full committee	3,733.10
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. William L. Dawson, chairman:	
Elmer W. Henderson, associate counsel	5,359.76
William A. Young, professional staff member	5,694.18
David Glick, investigator, Mar. 21–June 30, 1956	2,363.23
Ann E. McLachlan, staff member	3,226.98
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	
Clara K. Armstrong, minority staff-clerical, Mar. 1–June 30, 1956	$1,797.36
Expenses	342.90
Total	18,784.41
Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Chet Holifield, chairman:	
Michael P. Balwan, staff director	6,808.86
Herbert Roback, director of investigations	6,808.86
James Eckhart, assistant counsel	4,355.56
Earl J. Morgan, investigator	4,355.56
Robert J. McElroy, investigator	3,509.58
Sylvia Swartzel, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Mollie Jo Hughes, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Expenses	11,907.97
Total	44,208.87
Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. Fountain, chairman:	
James R. Naughton, professional staff member	4,795.23
Francis X McLaughlin, investigator	3,295.50
Delphis C. Goldberg, professional staff member, Apr. 1–June 30, 1956	2,382.66
Eileen M. Anderson, clerk-stenographer	3,010.04
Expenses	536.48
Total	14,019.91
Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. Earl Chudoff, chairman:	
Arthur Perlman, staff director	6,808.86
James A. Lanigan, counsel	6,511.62
John B. O'Brien, Jr., investigator	4,951.08
Miles Q. Romney, professional staff member, Apr. 16–June 30, 1956	1,874.62
Inge Kaiser, consultant, Jan. 1–Feb. 10, 1956	837.00
Irene Manning, clerk-stenographer	2,917.29
Joan D. Heinly clerk-stenographer	2,235.79
Melba Lou Cook, stenographer, Jan. 5–9, 1956	69.66
Expenses	2,571.27
Total	28,777.19
International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. Porter Hardy, Jr., chairman:	
Maurice J. Mountain, professional staff member	6,511.62
Walton Woods, investigator	4,876.74
Charles Rothenberg, special counsel, Feb. 15–June 30, 1956	3,991.95
Phyllis Seymour, clerk-stenographer	3,231.24
Mary E. Davis, clerk-stenographer, May 28–June 30, 1956	431.47
Expenses	915.66
Total	19,958.68
Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. Robert H. Mollohan, chairman:	
Curtis E. Johnson, staff director	6,808.86
Jerome S. Plapinger, counsel	6,808.86
Stanley T. Fisher, accountant-investigator	4,660.50
Hal M. Christensen, associate counsel	4,009.47
John L. Anderson, investigator	3,987.67
A. Carl Carey, Jr., assistant counsel, May 29–June 30, 1956	802.74
Elizabeth D. Heater, clerk-stenographer	2,961.54
Barbara L. Tork, stenographer	2,096.64
Expenses	1,630.91
Total	33,767.19
Special Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. Jack Brooks, chairman:	
Vernon McDaniel, staff director	6,808.86
William Huskey, investigator	4,194.66
John E. Moore, investigator, Mar. 17–June 30, 1956	2,099.51
Irma Reel, clerk-stenographer	2,559.03
William Townsley, counsel	5,055.12
Chesley Prioleau, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1–Feb. 29, 1956	898.68
Expenses	1,155.00
Total	22,770.86
Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. John W. McCormack, chairman:	
Ray Ward, staff director	6,737.02
Margaret O'Connor, clerk-stenographer, Mar. 1–June 30, 1956	1,754.56
Expenses	39.15
Total	8,530.73
Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. John E. Moss, chairman:	
Samuel J. Archibald, staff director	6,140.04
John J. Mitchell, chief counsel, Feb. 9–June 30, 1956	4,929.26
J. Lacey Reynolds, senior consultant	5,471.25
Helen K. Beasley, clerk-stenographer	2,856.63
Catherine Hartke, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 10–June 30, 1956	2,829.92

Special Government Information Subcommittee	
William Fairfield, investigator, Apr. 19-June 30, 1956	$2,099.33
Wallace Parks, associate counsel, Jan. 1-Mar. 31, 1956	2,698.47
Bernard Schwartz, consultant, June 4-9, 1956	200.00
Jacob Scher, consultant, Feb. 8-Mar. 19, 1956	1,040.15
Juanita V. Haddock, secretary, Feb. 11, 1956	293.93
Expenses	2,897.63
Total	31,456.61
Special Subcommittee on Water Resources and Power, Hon. Robert E. Jones, chairman:	
William C. Wise, staff director	6,344.41
William L. Sturdevant, Jr., professional staff member, Jan. 1-Apr. 30, 1956	4,038.88
Roy F. Bessey, consultant	4,750.00
Ann A. Dominek, clerk-stenographer	2,550.46
Margaret McFerren, clerk-stenographer, Jan. 1-Feb. 23, 1956	738.36
Expenses	3,692.58
Total	22,114.69
Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$995,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	373,643.94
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	248,122.24
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955, to June 30, 1956	621,766.18
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	373,233.82

WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

JULY 2, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Julian P. Langston	Clerk and staff director.	$6,808.86
Marjorie Savage	Clerk in charge of	6,437.28
Jack W. Watson	Assistant clerk	5,322.60
Lura Cannon	do	4,564.44
Staff employed to conduct an investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services, pursuant to H. Res. 262 and H. Res. 306, 84th Cong.:		
Philip B. Billings	Legal counsel	5,606.84
Susan Agnes Fodor	Research analyst	2,867.34
John F. Haley	Staff director	6,065.76
Julian H. McWhorter.	Technical advisor	5,219.66
Assella S. Poore	Research analyst	3,295.50
Marjorie A. Prout	do	406.53

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures:	
H. Res. 306	$65,000.00
H. Res. 359	10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	8,525.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30	25,302.46
Total amount expended from July 1, 1955 to June 30, 1956	33,827.81
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	41,172.19

OMAR BURLESON,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

JULY 11, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Professional staff:		
Sidney L. McFarland.	Engineering consultant.	$6,262.68
George W. Abbott	Counsel	6,262.68
John L. Taylor	Territories consultant.	6,262.68
George H. Soule, Jr.	Minerals and lands consultant.	6,262.68
Clerical staff:		
Nancy J. Arnold	Chief clerk	5,545.56
Gertrude S. Harris	Clerk	3,552.42
Nelda Boding	do	3,552.42
Laura Ann Moran	do	3,209.88
Eve Fatzinick	do	3,209.88
Linda Glavey (Jan. 1 to Mar. 31, inclusive).	do	1,433.67
Geraldine W. Eaker (Apr. 1 to June 30, inclusive).	do	1,433.67

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	31,296.34
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	[1] 6,981.77
Total amount expended from Feb. 24, 1955, to June 30, 1956	38,278.11
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	11,721.89

[1] Includes $3,131.34 paid to Eugene D. Eaton, research consultant, in salary for period Feb. 1 to Apr. 30, 1956, inclusive.

CLAIR ENGLE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

JULY 2, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Clerical staff:		
Elton J. Layton	Clerk	$7,400.00
Kenneth J. Painter	First assistant clerk	5,396.94
Herman C. Beasley	Assistant clerk	4,597.15
Georgia G. Glasmann.	Assistant clerk-stenographer.	3,295.50
Helen A. Grickis	do	3,295.50
Roy P. Wilkinson	Assistant clerk	2,781.70
Margaret J. Beach	Clerk-typist (H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117).	2,610.43
Pauline Chaternuck	Assistant clerk-stenographer (from June 1, 1956; H. Res. 105, H. Res. 117).	472.18
Professional staff:		
Andrew Stevenson	Expert	7,400.00
Kurt Borchardt	Legal counsel	7,400.00
Sam G. Spal	Research specialist	7,400.00
Martin W. Cunningham.	Aviation consultant	7,005.90

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$60,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	$10,852.85
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	9,142.51
Total amount expended from Jan. 3, 1955, to June 30, 1956	19,995.36
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956 (approximate)	40,004.64

J. PERCY PRIEST,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JULY 13, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Bess E. Dick	Staff director	$7,399.98
Bessie M. Orcutt	Administrative assistant.	6,808.86
William R. Foley	General counsel	7,399.98
Walter M. Besterman	Legislative assistant	7,399.98
Thomas F. Broden	Counsel	6,065.76
Walter R. Lee	Legislative assistant	7,399.98
Velma Smedley	Clerical staff	4,564.44
Violet Benn	do	4,237.50
Anne J. Berger	do	4,237.50
Lola Bikul	do	3,723.66
Frances Christy	do	4,151.88
Helen Goldsmith	do	3,980.58
Mary D. Weil	do	3,295.50

SALARIES PAID FROM JANUARY 1, 1956, TO JUNE 30, 1956, PURSUANT TO H. RES. 98 AND H. RES. 355

Herbert N. Maletz	Counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	$6,437.28
Kenneth R. Harkins	Cocounsel Antitrust Subcommittee.	6,065.76
Samuel R. Pierce, Jr.	Associate counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	909.86
Leonard Appel	Assistant counsel, Antitrust Subcommittee.	4,819.91
Thomas H. McGrail	do	4,564.44
Julian H. Singman	do	1,521.48
William M. Milligan	do	1,775.06
Lucille Brooks	Clerical staff	3,980.58
Gertrude C. Burak	do	3,381.12
Roberta Eisenberg	do	2,867.34
Elizabeth Meekins	do	2,867.34
Mike Kelemonick	do	2,696.04
Marianne Higgs	do	110.91
Robert E. Bauman	Messenger	1,472.92

Funds for preparation of United States Code, District of Columbia Code, and revision of the laws:		
A. Preparation of new edition of United States Code (no year):		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		$107,232.50
Expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1956		23,953.48
Balance, June 30, 1956		83,279.02
B. Revision of the laws:		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		6,398.54
Supplemental appropriation		2,800.00
Total		9,198.54
Expended, Jan. 1-June 30, 1956		8,899.98
Balance, June 30, 1956		298.56
C. Preparation of new edition of District of Columbia Code (no year):		
Unexpended balance, Dec. 31, 1955		2,764.01
Expended		0.00
Balance, June 30, 1956		2,764.01

EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

JULY 26, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Ralph E. Casey	Chief counsel	$4,933.32
Bernard J. Zincke	Counsel	6,808.86
John M. Drewry	do	6,808.86
Frances Still	Chief clerk	5,471.22
Charles F. Warren	Assistant counsel	4,564.44
William B. Winfield	Assistant clerk	4,066.20
Ruth Brookshire	do	3,266.98
Vera Barker	Secretary	3,167.04
Edith Gordon	do	2,742.93
Shirley Schwartz	Minority clerk	4,066.20
		45,856.05

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	31,013.05
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	9,141.34
Total amount expended from Feb. 2, 1955 to June 30, 1956	40,154.39
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1956	9,845.61

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JULY 17, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Frederick C. Belen	Chief counsel	$7,399.98
Charles E. Johnson	Counsel	7,143.24
Henry C. Cassell	Clerk	6,455.88
Weldon T. Ellis, Jr.	Professional staff member (Feb. 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956).	5,379.90
John B. Price	Assistant clerk	3,869.34
Lillian Hopkins	do	3,723.66
Lucy K. Daley	do	3,552.42
Elsie Thornton	Stenographer	2,824.50
Blanche Simons	do	2,824.50

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$75,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,604.35
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	8,984.25
Total amount expended from Aug. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	16,588.60
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	58,411.40

TOM MURRAY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JULY 15, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Charles G. Tierney	Chief counsel	$7,400.00
Robert F. McConnell	Counsel	7,400.00
Joseph H. McGann, Sr.	Consultant	6,808.86
Margaret R. Beiter	Assistant chief clerk	5,322.60
Helen M. Dooley	Staff assistant	4,564.44
S. Philip Cohen	do	3,809.34
Helen A. Thompson	do	3,766.50
Louise B. Cullen	do	3,766.50
Herman J. Sloves	do	3,723.66
Estes Saunders	Clerk-messenger	1,839.72

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	7,865.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	16,511.27
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	24,377.00
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	25,623.00

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

JULY 7, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Thomas M. Carruthers.	Clerk	$4,817.16
Jane W. Snader	Minority clerk	3,866.40
Barbara M. Thornton	Assistant clerk	2,771.11
Agnes R. Hanford	Assistant clerk (January).	543.54

HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JULY 10, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Standing committee:		
Donald T. Appell	Investigator (transferred to investigating committee Apr. 30).	$4,093.36
Richard Arens	Director (appointed May 1).	2,466.66
Thomas W. Beale, Sr.	Chief clerk (resigned Mar. 31).	3,699.99
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer (transferred from investigating committee May 31).	549.25
Courtney E. Owens	Investigator	5,694.18
Juliette P. Joray	Clerk	4,724.34
Rosella Purdy	Secretary to counsel	3,963.48
Carolyn Roberts	Assistant chief of reference section.	3,723.66
Thelma I. Scearce	Secretary to investigators.	3,963.48
Frank S. Tavenner, Jr.	Counsel	7,399.98
William A. Wheeler	Investigator	5,991.42
Anne D. Turner	Chief of reference section.	4,727.94
Investigating committee:		
Alice W. Anderson	Information analyst	3,124.26
Donald T. Appell	Investigator (transferred Apr. 30).	2,046.68
Karl Baarslag	Consultant (appointed Jan. 3).	5,341.08
Kay Baird	Clerk-stenographer (appointed Apr. 1).	1,497.90
Margaret Bentz	Information specialist.	2,467.72
Suanne Blair	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	132.87
Frank Bonora	Investigator	3,894.96
John W. Carrington	Assistant to the clerk (resigned May 31).	3,245.80
Raymond T. Collins	Investigator	3,723.66
Patricia Crovato	Clerk-typist (appointed June 19).	122.65
Anniel Cunningham	Information analyst	3,038.58
John G. Davies	Clerk-typist (appointed June 20).	112.43
Barbara H. Edelschein.	Editor	2,696.04
Elizabeth L. Edinger.	Clerk-stenographer	3,124.26
Ann C. Goldsmith	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	119.50
Kathleen Hagenbuch.	Clerk-typist (resigned May 31).	1,818.55
Joan Haletsky	Clerk-typist (appointed June 25).	61.32
Lillian Howard	Research analyst	3,552.42
W. Jackson Jones	Investigator	4,951.08
Olive M. King	Editor	3,226.98
Stephen V. Kopunek.	Clerk-typist	2,096.64
Kathleen M. Lucious.	Clerk-typist (resigned Jan. 31).	282.91
Helen I. Mattson	Research analyst	3,702.97
Isabel B. Nagel	Clerk-stenographer (transferred to standing committee June 1).	2,746.25
Kay Phillips	Switchboard-operator.	2,053.80
Maureen Roselle	Clerk-stenographer	2,439.18
Dolores F. Scotti	Investigator	3,723.66
Josephine Sheetz	Clerk-typist	2,439.18
Lela Stiles	do	2,439.18
Cele Sweeney	do	2,267.88
Ruth K. Tansill	Information analyst	3,124.26
Pauline Umberson	Clerk-typist (appointed June 18).	132.87
Max O. Truitt, Jr.	Assistant to the clerk (appointed June 8).	278.84
Lorraine M. Veley	Clerk-stenographer	3,124.26
Richard S. Weil	Research analyst	3,852.12
George C. Williams	Investigator	4,951.08
Billie Wheeler	Clerk-stenographer (Apr. 1-30; reappointed June 18).	725.88

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$500,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	222,870.13
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	120,511.47
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to June 30, 1956	343,381.60
Balance unexpended as of July 1, 1956	156,618.40

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JUNE 30, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Full committee:		
Oliver E. Meadows	Staff director	$6,808.86
Edwin B. Patterson	Counsel	6,808.86
Harold A. L. Lawrence	Professional aid, minority.	6,808.86
J. Buford Jenkins	Professional aid	6,511.62
George Fisher	Clerk	6,808.86
Ida Rowan	Administrative aid, minority.	6,808.86
Paul K. Jones	Assistant clerk	5,322.60
Helen A. Biondi	do	4,151.88
Alice V. Matthews	Clerk-stenographer	3,546.70
George Turner	Assistant clerk	3,509.58
Investigating staff:		
Adin M. Downer	Staff member	4,187.80
Joanne Doyle	Clerk-stenographer	2,182.26
Jean Johnson	do	561.07
Sam Hardy	Investigator	787.99

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$50,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	27,894.88
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	12,304.65
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	40,199.53
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	9,800.47

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

JULY 31, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Leo H. Irwin	Clerk (C)	$7,399.98
Russell E. Train	Minority adviser (P).	7,399.98
Thomas A. Martin	Professional assistant (P).	7,106.10
James W. Riddell	do	5,684.28
John M. Martin, Jr.	do[1]	2,086.32
Frances C. Russell	Staff assistant (C)	$4,515.42
Susan Alice Taylor	do	4,066.20
Anne Gordon	do	3,338.34
Virginia M. Butler	do	3,338.34
Grace G. Kagan	do	3,338.34
Irene Wade	do	3,279.82
Virginia Brannock	do[2]	990.37
Frances Donovan	do[3]	553.94
June A. Kendall	do[4]	313.87
Hughlon Greene	Messenger	2,247.91
Walter B. Little	do	2,247.91

[1] From May 1, 1956.
[2] From May 2, 1956.
[3] From May 28, 1956.
[4] From Jan. 15, 1956.

JERE COOPER,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SURVIVOR BENEFITS

JULY 6, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Carnes & Co.	Consultants	$1,200.00

NOTE.—The firm of Carnes & Co. is retained by the committee under contract to provide all staff personnel required for the committee's study. Those serving with the committee are on the payroll of Carnes & Co.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$35,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	32,836.50
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	1,531.54
Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1955, to June 30, 1956	34,368.04
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	631.96

PORTER HARDY, JR.,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT AN INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE FINANCIAL POSITION OF THE WHITE COUNTY BRIDGE COMMISSION

JULY 6, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

NOTE.—No funds have been expended by the select committee for staff salaries.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$10,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	2,106.85
Amount expended from Jan. 1, to June 30, 1956	2,228.06
Total amount expended from July 21, 1955, to June 30, 1956	4,334.91
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	5,665.09

WINFIELD K. DENTON,
Chairman.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

JULY 12, 1956.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from January 1, 1956, to June 30, 1956, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee	Profession	Total gross salary during 6-month period
Everette MacIntyre	Staff director and general counsel.	$7,399.98
Wm. Summers Johnson	Chief economist and assistant staff director.	6,808.86
Marie M. Stewart	Clerk	3,552.42
Jane M. Deem	Administrative assistant-clerk.	3,552.42
George L. Arnold	Assistant counsel and investigator.	4,492.07
Harry S. Weidberg	do	1,322.24
Irving Maness	do	5,173.98
Justinus Gould	do	5,173.98
Warren Biscailuz	do	1,819.02
Lois E. Allison	Economist	2,833.02
Eunice V. Hutton	Research analyst-secretary.	3,552.42
Katherine C. Blackburn.	Research analyst	3,423.96
Clarence D. Everett	Investigator	3,552.42
Milton S. Fairfax	Secretary	2,914.89
Ila D. Coe	Stenographer	2,632.30
Clara G. Romero	do	2,504.82
Alice Fay Ebert	do	1,942.50
William F. Vall	Stenographer-typist	2,167.26
Margaret Fallon Palmer.	Research analyst	3,295.50
Pauline Chaternuck	Stenographer	2,080.42
Samuel Moment	Consulting economists.	1,062.97
Victor P. Dalmas	Assistant to minority.	4,534.32
Mildred C. Darrow	Secretary-stenographer to minority.	2,653.26

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures	$330,000.00
Amount of expenditures previously reported	129,256.73
Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30, 1956	81,655.83
Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1955 to June 30, 1956	210,912.56
Balance unexpended as of June 30, 1956	119,087.44

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

Footnotes at end of table.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 13, 1956 No. 134

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Monday, August 20, 1956. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Questions and Answers on the Dividend Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which provide a modest amount of relief from the double taxation of dividends have been the subject of much misunderstanding and, I am afraid, deliberate misrepresentation. Inasmuch as I sponsored the new tax law, I feel a personal responsibility for setting the record straight.

I have collected some typical questions which I have received concerning the dividend provisions, and have prepared answers which I believe will help in achieving a true understanding of these meritorious amendments:

Question. What is meant by the "double taxation" of dividends?

Answer. The double taxation of dividends exists because dividends are subject to income tax twice—once in the hands of the corporation which earns them and then in the hands of the stockholders to whom they are paid. Of course, a dividend is simply an amount which a corporation pays out of its earnings to its owners—that is, its stockholders—as a return on their investment.

The double tax effect is illustrated clearly if for the moment we ignore the modest relief now accorded by the revised tax law. Since corporations pay a 52 percent income tax, the earnings available for distribution to their owners are more than cut in half before they can be distributed as dividends. Then, when the stockholders receive what is left—and, of course, the company must keep some of its earnings itself in order to finance its operations—those stockholders themselves must pay an income tax of from 20 to 91 percent, depending on their individual incomes, on these same earnings which have already been more than cut in half by taxes. As a result of this double taxation, the combined tax burden on the distributed earnings of a corporation ranges from a little over 61 percent for persons in the lowest income-tax bracket (such as a widow living on a $2,000 income) to a little over 95 percent for persons in the highest bracket. Of course, this double burden hits the person of small means the hardest. The combined corporate and individual income-tax load borne by the dividends received by such a person from his savings is over 3 times the 20-percent rate which he pays on any other type of income, including wages.

I should also point out that it is only corporation earnings which are subject to this discriminatory double taxation. Individuals who operate their business as a partnership rather than as a corporation pay only one tax, their individual income tax. The partnership is not taxed first on its earnings before they are distributed to its partners. Furthermore, if a person operates a business, such as a grocery store, as an individual proprietor, he too is taxed only once.

Question. Aren't wages subject to the same double taxation?

Answer. Absolutely not. When a business figures its income for tax purposes, it first deducts out any wages it pays its employees. Therefore, it pays no income tax at all on this amount. The only income tax paid on wages is the tax paid by the employees themselves.

Just suppose that wages were subject to the same unfair tax treatment as dividends have been today—here's what would happen: A corporation would have to pay a 52 percent tax on its employees' wages before they were even paid. Such a tax would reduce by more than half the amount which the corporation could pay out in wages. In other words, payrolls in this country would be cut by more than half. I think that you would agree that such a tax system would be indefensible and disastrous. Yet that is exactly what was happening to dividends. All the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 did was to remove a small portion of this unjust discrimination.

Question. Does the new tax law give the same type of relief to interest on bank deposits, savings bonds, and other forms of interest?

Answer. No, it does not—for a very simple reason. Interest is not subject to double taxation. Just like wages, a bank can deduct the interest it pays before figuring its income tax. In fact, any taxpayer is entitled to deduct his interest payments. Of course, the Government pays no income tax so the interest on its bonds is also free from double taxation.

Question. Do you think it right that dividends pay a lower income tax than wages?

Answer. Of course not. The Internal Revenue Code of 1954 does not result in dividends getting a better tax break than wages. I have already pointed out that in the absence of the new provision the lowest combined corporation and individual income-tax burden on dividends would be 61 percent, while that on wages is only 20 percent. Therefore, the average taxpayer, the man with a small income, would bear over three times the tax burden on dividends that he does on wages. Thus, dividends already have been bearing a much higher tax load than wages. All the new tax law does is cut down this extra burden by a very small amount. The 4-percent dividend tax credit which it provides merely cuts from 61 percent to 57 percent the combined tax burden on dividends. Even so, these dividends are still taxed almost three times as much as wages. Moreover, the first $50 of dividend receipts, which the new law excludes from individual income tax, continue to be taxed at the cor-

porate level at 52 percent as compared to the 20 percent tax which applies to wages in the first individual income tax bracket.

Question. How does the new law relieve double taxation of dividends?

Answer. Very simply. First, every taxpayer can completely exclude from his income up to $50 of dividends. This does not mean that he can exclude any dividend payment which is $50 or less, but merely that out of his total dividend receipts he can exclude a total of up to $50. Therefore, a taxpayer whose total dividends from all sources do not exceed $50 pays no tax whatever on his dividends. This will be a tremendous benefit to small stockholders, to individuals who have invested a small portion of their savings in stocks.

Second, in addition to the $50 exclusion, a taxpayer is given a tax credit equal to 4 percent of any dividends in excess of the exclusion. Here's how it works: Take as an example a widow with a total income of $2,000, of which $150 consists of dividends. First, she completely excludes $50, as I have already explained. Then she figures her income tax on the remaining $1,950 just as usual, including the $100 of her dividends still subject to tax. Let's say that her tax on this whole amount comes to $120. Then she figures 4 percent of her taxable dividends of $100. That comes to $4. She simply deducts that $4 from the $120 tax she has computed. Her final tax will be $116. This reflects a total tax reduction of $14 in this case as a result of the new provisions, $4 due to the tax credit and a $10 on account of the exclusion; that is, 20 percent of $50.

Question. Why does the new law provide a credit which comes off the tax rather than a simple deduction to be taken in computing taxable income? Doesn't this method favor well-to-do taxpayers?

Answer. Just the contrary is true. The deduction method would favor wealthy taxpayers. For example, a $100 deduction would mean a tax saving of only $20 to a person in the first bracket but it would mean a saving of up to $91 for individuals in the upper brackets.

The tax-credit method adopted in the new law means that every taxpayer, no matter what his income, receives exactly the same amount of tax relief with respect to the same amount of dividends. For example, the 4-percent tax credit gives a person in the first bracket a $4 tax cut on $100 in dividends. A person in the top bracket receives exactly the same $4 tax cut, and no more.

As a matter of fact, the method contained in the new law gives proportionately much more relief to lower-bracket individuals than to upper-bracket taxpayers. Without the credit an individual in the first bracket would pay a $20 tax on $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit cuts that $20 tax to $16—a 20-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends. On the other hand, a top-bracket taxpayer without the credit would pay a $91 tax on the same $100 in dividends. The 4-percent tax credit reduces that $91 tax to $87—only about a 4-percent reduction in his tax on those dividends, instead of 20 percent.

Question. Why doesn't the new law reduce double taxation by allowing a corporation to deduct all or part of its dividends in figuring its tax, just as it can wages?

Answer. This is undoubtedly one method by which double taxation of dividends could be reduced or even eliminated, and it was given careful study. The trouble is that, if you give a corporation a deduction for dividends you create a tremendous pressure on management to distribute earnings. Therefore, it was felt that such a tax system would interfere with sound business judgment as to how much of a corporation's earnings can safely be distributed and how much should be retained in the business. It was also felt that such a system would discriminate particularly against small, new companies who are most dependent upon retained earnings to finance their growth.

These reasons, plus our previous unfortunate experience with an undistributed profits tax, led to the decision to give relief at the individual shareholder level.

Question. Do any other countries in the world give relief from double taxation of dividends?

Answer. They certainly do. England has given such relief for well over 100 years. Under the British system, a taxpayer can claim a credit for the amount of tax actually paid by the corporation on his dividends. The fact that England has given such relief for over a century is significant in view of the fact that we usually think of the British income tax as especially heavy.

Canada already gives a 20-percent tax credit for dividends. This is exactly the same method contained in our new tax law except that our credit is only 4 percent. Thus, Canada already gives five times the dividend tax relief that we provide. Of course, our new law also gives a complete exclusion of up to $50 of dividends in order to help small stockholders. Canada does not do this.

Sweden, which is usually considered to be one of the most progressive countries in Europe, also gives relief from double taxation of dividends.

In fact, not only is the new dividend provision not something revolutionary, but it is actually simple equity which other countries have recognized years ago. The truth is that the United States has been extremely backward in this regard.

Question. Even assuming that other countries have given relief from the double taxation of dividends, isn't such a proposal still pretty revolutionary in the United States?

Answer. Just the contrary. Our income tax was first adopted in 1913. It was provided then that dividends should not be subject to higher tax than other sources of income. To accomplish this, dividends were exempt from the normal tax in the hands of individuals. Since initially the corporate tax and the individual normal tax were at the same rate, this meant in effect that dividends did not bear the burden of double taxation. While these rate relationships were not maintained, dividends were consistently exempt from the individual normal tax, and in 1918 the exemption was as high as 12 percent on some income. The exemption from normal tax continued for 23 years, right up to 1936. It is interesting to note that the exemption in 1936 was 4 percent—exactly the same amount of relief which the new tax-revision law provides.

In 1936, President Roosevelt recommended the complete elimination of double taxation by exempting from the corporate income tax any earnings which were distributed in dividends. In his message accompanying this recommendation that the corporate income tax only be imposed on undistributed income, the President stated that his proposal "would constitute distinct progress in tax reform."

Since that time, prominent individuals from all parts of the country, both Democrats and Republicans alike, have recommended immediate steps to remove double taxation of dividends.

In 1944, for example, a special committee of the then Democratic Congress, made the following recommendation:

"Consideration should be given to the elimination of the present double taxation of dividend income, either by treating the tax on corporate income as a withholding tax and exempting dividends from the personal normal tax, or by some equivalent provision."

The chairman of that group was Representative JERE COOPER, of Tennessee, now ranking Democratic member and chairman of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee.

In 1947, all 10 Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee strongly criticized the Republican majority for not taking up the question of double taxation of dividends.

Therefore, you can see that not only is this type of provision not unusual in other countries, it represents a concept which is far from new in our own country.

Question. Is it true that most of the tax relief contained in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 went to stockholders?

Answer. This is absolutely not true. The 1954 tax law gave $827 million tax relief in 1954 to individual taxpayers and $536 million tax relief to business. Of this total tax relief of $1,363 million, stockholders received $204 million—or only about one-seventh of the total—because of the partial relief from double taxation. Moreover, more liberal deductions for dependents, deductions allowed working mothers for the expense of child care, bigger allowances for medical expenses, and tax reduction for retired people—these alone added up to well over $400 million relief for individual taxpayers, more than twice the relief given from double taxation of dividends.

One other fact is frequently overlooked and that is that the new law extended for 1 year the 52 percent corporate income tax which would otherwise have gone down to 47 percent April 1, 1954. This meant an additional $1.2 billion tax burden which had to be borne indirectly by corporation stockholders—a tax load which was approximately six times the relief these same individuals received from the double taxation of dividends.

Question. Who are the stockholders who will benefit from the new provision? Aren't stockholders the wealthiest group in the country?

Answer. There are some 6,500,000 stockholders in publicly held corporations. Certainly, some of them are wealthy, and some of them are poor. However, on the whole, they represent a pretty fair cross section of our people.

Let's take a look at some figures which show who the stockholders of this country are:

Four and three-tenths percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $2,000 a year.

Almost 10 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

Almost 20 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $4,000 a year.

Over 30 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

Finally, over 75 percent of American stockholders have combined family incomes of less than $10,000 a year.

Thus, the great majority of the stockholders of this country are in the low- and middle-income groups.

One of the biggest companies in the country is the United States Steel Corp. I think it safe to assume that its stockholders are fairly typical. Here are some facts about United States Steel's stockholders which a recent survey brought out:

Only 10 percent of its stockholders had incomes over $25,000.

Nearly three-fifths of them—56 percent—had incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

It had as many stockholders with incomes below $4,300 as there were with incomes above that amount.

Finally—and this is the most interesting figure of all—53 percent of United States Steel's stockholders had incomes below the average wage paid to the company's steelworkers.

Now, let's take a look at the number of tax returns which show dividend income. For 1952, the latest year for which the figures are available, 4,219,000 returns were filed which showed dividends as part of the taxpayer's income; 1,896,000 of those returns—about 45 percent of the total—report adjusted gross income from all sources of less than $5,000.

Therefore, those who try to tell you that the dividend provision helps only the rich either do not know the facts, or they are trying deliberately to mislead you.

Hundreds of thousands of housewives are stockholders. Many thousands of elderly retired people depend upon their small stockholdings for their livelihood. Most important of all, let us not overlook the many thousands of thrifty workers who every day, more and more, are purchasing small amounts of stock in their employer's business through payroll deductions. This wholesome trend means that a growing proportion of our country's wage earners are acquiring a direct stake in our free-enterprise system through stock ownership.

Question. Why should we encourage people to buy stocks?

Answer. The answer is simple—in order to create jobs for the American people. To put a man to work, there must be a plant for him to work in. There must be tools and machinery for him to work with. It takes money to provide those things. It is estimated that it takes between ten and fifteen thousand dollars of new capital to create one new job. When you realize that upward of 700,000 young people come into the labor market and seek employment for the first time every year, you get an idea of the tremendous amount of new capital investment that we need every year if we are to provide the job opportunities these young Americans deserve. There is only one fundamental source of this new capital and that is the earnings of our people. The savings from those earnings must provide the capital out of which new jobs and a higher standard of living can be created. When a thrifty individual saves a part of his earnings and invests those savings, he is not only providing for his own security but he is helping to build a strong future for America.

Question. Why can't corporations raise new capital by borrowing instead of by selling stock?

Answer. They can—at least large, well-established businesses can.

Of course, small businesses, especially those just being started, frequently are not in a position to borrow. Just because their businesses are new and not yet established, they are usually considered too risky for bank loans. Therefore, new business must depend to a very large extent upon capital raised through the sale of stocks. This is of great significance, because it is these new and relatively small concerns of today which will provide the strength of our economy tomorrow.

Big business usually can borrow to meet its capital requirements. In fact, it is advantageous for it to borrow because the interest is deductible for tax purposes, while if it raises capital through the sale of stock it gets no deduction for any dividends it pays. This present discriminatory treatment of equity (stock) financing is one reason why business generally has become more and more dependent on debt financing. For every dollar raised since the last war by new stock issues, industry has raised almost $3 by bond issues, mortgages, and bank loans and supplied $9 from retained earnings and depreciation reserves. To provide capital funds, industry found it necessary to double its debt and to reduce the percentage of earnings paid out in dividends. The result has been that total corporate debt at the end of 1953 was $211 billion, more than double what it was at the end of World War II.

This is a very unhealthy situation. Borrowed money has to be used in relatively safe undertakings. It cannot be used ordinarily for experimentation, for carrying out new methods and processes, for developing new products. These things take "risk" capital, capital which is willing to take a chance. If we were perfectly satisfied to let this country stand still, then it might be all right to have business depend on borrowed money in this manner. But if we want our American economy to expand and to provide a steadily rising standard of living for our people, then we must encourage the raising of capital through the sale of stock rather than through borrowing.

These therefore are the two major objectives of the dividend provision contained in the new tax law:

First, to give some relief from discriminatory double taxation; and

Second, to encourage the development of risk capital—capital which is willing to take a chance on the future of America.

Gray Reports His Record in Congress

SPEECH
OF

HON. KENNETH J. GRAY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the gavel will fall tonight, signaling the end of the 84th Congress. I want to take this time to thank you and all of my colleagues for your great assistance and kindness to me in the 20 months I have been a Member of this great body. Without your help and the help of my colleagues, it would not have been possible for me to make this report of my achievements in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in making my report I want to express my heartfelt thanks to the good people in southern Illinois for giving me the opportunity to stand up in the Halls of Congress and speak out in behalf of their wants and needs. It has truly been the busiest 20 months of my life, experiencing both heartaches and joys. I have tried with every ounce of energy to sell southern Illinois to the Congress and the rest of the Nation. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have notified every Member of Congress and the national administration that southern Illinois has wonderful people, good schools, churches, and fine communities in which to live. I have made it clear that we were tired of the lack of recognition of our problems by past administrations.

In an effort to focus attention on our needs, I have appeared before every committee in Congress having under consideration legislation which I felt would benefit the people of my congressional district. I introduced a score of my own bills designed to help our people and made numerous speeches on the floor in an effort to have the legislation passed.

Mr. Speaker, during my 20 months in office, I made over 200 speeches in southern Illinois; had several television appearances; and called a mass "sink or swim" rally at West Frankfort on December 31, 1955, to which I invited everyone, including President Eisenhower. The meeting was a huge success and has helped focus national attention to our problems. In addition, I paid for ads in southern Illinois newspapers, asking my folks to write letters to Members of Congress in support of certain pieces of legislation under consideration at the time, and sent out over 100,000 letters to organizations and individuals, asking them to write letters supporting certain legislation. With all the valuable support from you, my colleagues, and the good people back home, I was able to get through Congress in my first term a program I believe will be of great assistance to the social and economic welfare of our people in southern Illinois. I shall not attempt to list all the bills I supported, nor mention my full 20 months' work in this report; however, I do take pride in listing some of my accomplishments, which were made possible through your cooperation and the cooperation of the people of my congressional district:

First. Helped pass the gigantic highway construction program: As a member of the House Committee on Public Works, helped write the Federal Highway Construction Act of 1956 and worked for its passage. The bill provides 41,000 miles of new superhighways throughout the United States and specifically a new 4-lane expressway through my congressional district in southern Illinois. This will be the largest public works program in the history of this country. In addition to a wonderful road system, it will provide many jobs for our unemployed people in southern Illinois. I was featured in the May 14 issue of Newsweek for my work on this bill.

Second. Helped liberalize social security benefits: Introduced a companion measure to H. R. 7225, and worked for its final passage. This bill liberalizes social security benefits by lowering the retirement age to 62 for women, 50 for totally disabled persons, and extends coverage to thousands of people who were heretofore not covered.

Third. Helped pass veterans' benefits bill in House: Introduced H. R. 6153, granting all World War I veterans $100 per month pension. A companion measure passed the House, allowing a pension for World War I veterans and increasing by 10 percent the amount of compensation being paid to service-connected disability veterans. Due to lack of support by the Senate, and the rush for adjournment, the House-passed measure did not reach the floor of the Senate for vote. We are hopeful it can be taken up early in January. We were successful in getting enacted into law a bill allowing increased benefits to widows of deceased veterans and other fringe benefits.

Fourth. Secured approval of $4,300,000 for Devil's Kitchen Dam project: This includes the construction of the dam, public beach, boat dock, a complete network of access roads, picnic areas, parking facilities, and the long-sought leasing of cabin sites. Obtained $2 million in cash with which to start the project with the announcement for competitive bids on September 1. This is the first action on this project in 14 years.

Fifth. Secured $50,000 for flood control survey of the Cache River and tributaries: Thousands of acres of farmland is being inundated during each rainfall. The people residing in the Cache River Basin had been trying for years to obtain funds with which to make this study.

Sixth. Secured $75,000 for a full-scale study of the canalization of the Big Muddy and tributaries: If a study proves feasible, this project would open up new prospects for future industrialization of southern Illinois by providing cheap transportation rates for our coal deposits and raw materials for prospective industries that might locate on the banks of the canal.

Seventh. Secured through Congress $3 million for flood control work in the 25th District for fiscal year 1956–57: Construction work will provide many jobs.

Eighth. Secured $25,000 for a flood-control study in the Harrisonville and Ivy Landing and Drainage District No. 2, Monroe County, Ill.: Several thousand acres of land have been inundated by water up and down the Illinois side of the Mississippi River levee due to internal drainage during floods. This survey is a test case to find out what measures are needed in order to stop large loss in crops and land damages.

Ninth. Secured approval of Congress authorizing an expenditure of $5,970,000 for flood control improvements on the Saline River and tributaries: United States Army Corps of Engineers requested $930,000 local contribution. I was successful in having eliminated 75 percent of this amount, saving the local taxpayers $697,500.

Tenth. Secured purchase order for 100,000 tons of Illinois coal last year for overseas shipment by the Foreign Operations Administration.

Eleventh. Secured congressional approval of $1,100,000 for a Federal building at Benton, Ill: In 1937, Congress designated Benton, Ill., as a place to hold Federal court, and since that time efforts have been made to have this much needed facility built. This is the first concrete action since that date.

Twelfth. Secured a civil-defense warehouse at Ordill on Crab Orchard Lake where $4,500,000 worth of medical supplies are authorized to be stored for use in a national emergency with an authorized employee strength of 13.

Thirteenth. Helped pass the antipollution bill: As a member of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, I worked for the passage of H. R. 9540, a bill designed to assist in clearing up our streams and rivers by aiding municipalities to build adequate sewage-disposal plants. Also worked to help secure $50 million in appropriations with which to carry out the program for the first year. Illinois cities will receive $1,734,200 for the first year with the program to run for a 10-year period.

Fourteenth. Secured passage of the fluorspar bill: Introduced H. R. 11622, a companion measure to S. 3982, which provides for the stockpiling of 250,000 tons of acid-grade fluorspar at $53 per ton. Also spurred action from the Office of Defense Mobilization to stockpile metallurgical grade fluorspar at a premium price. Helped to obtain $19 million appropriation with which to carry out the provisions of the bill. These two programs should stabilize and revitalize the entire fluorspar industry in southern Illinois.

Fifteenth. Secured thousands of dollars' worth of Government surplus property for municipalities, hospitals, and schools throughout southern Illinois, including nine Army surplus fire engines.

Sixteenth. Secured tentative approval for new armory at Marion: If a suitable site can be located, an armory to house a 200-man Army Reserve training center will be built costing approximately $184,000.

Seventeenth. Supported farm program: Voted for soil-bank plan and worked for an increase in both corn and wheat acreage allotments. Since agriculture is one of the vital segments of our American economy, I have voted for all legislation I felt would be beneficial to the farmer, particularly the family-size farmer.

Eighteenth. Secured passage of bill giving flour and cornmeal to recipients of Government surplus food: Cosponsored H. R. 2851, a bill directing the Commodity Credit Corporation to grind up wheat and corn into wheat and cornmeal for distribution to needy persons receiving Government surplus food. In addition to providing food for thousands of jobless people, it is helping the farmer by getting rid of surplus wheat and corn which has been depressing the market.

Nineteenth. Voted for additional funds for school-lunch program: $3,153,000 for Illinois schools was allowed for fiscal year 1957. Many southern Illinois schools had run out of school-lunch funds before the end of the school year, forcing a hardship on schoolchildren. An increase of $625,000 over last year was allowed.

Twentieth. Fought successfully against proposed sale of land at Marion Veterans' Administration Hospital by the Administration in Washington.

Twenty-first. Helped secure $250,000 appropriation with which to select a site for a new $9,500,000 Federal penitentiary: As soon as a site committee is selected, I intend to see that southern Illinois is considered, and if we meet all the necessary requirements, I am hopeful the prison can be located somewhere in my district.

Twenty-second. Conferred with President Eisenhower and every Government agency and bureau in Washington, telling them of the wants and needs of the people of southern Illinois, and soliciting assistance for various projects.

Twenty-third. Contacted over 300 individuals and concerns in an effort to locate industry in southern Illinois.

Twenty-fourth. Secured Government loans for three industries in southern Illinois.

Twenty-fifth. Requested an investigation of the accidental drownings on Crab Orchard Lake, in an effort to attempt to better safety regulations and obtain rescue equipment.

Twenty-sixth. Supported passage of a bill to aid retired railroad pension recipients.

Twenty-seventh. Worked for the passage of a bill granting postal employees an increase in salary: Was featured in National Postal magazine for 100 percent voting record for postal employees.

Twenty-eighth. Worked for passage of bill granting civil-service employees an increase in retirement benefits and liberalizing eligibility for retirement.

Twenty-ninth. Am supporting Rend Lake in Franklin County, and have urged Governor Stratton to speed up survey report by Illinois Division of Waterways in order that some proposal can be made to the Federal Government from the information derived from the survey.

Thirtieth. Secured additional appropriations for Shawnee National Forest and the forest-research center at Carbondale: Urged United States Forest Service to adopt Comte proposal, which offers a forest-development program to provide many jobs and improve our natural timber resources.

Thirty-first. Helped obtain Federal funds for hospital construction in my district.

Thirty-second. Helped secure approval of loans to various rural-electrification cooperatives in my district, amounting to several hundred thousands of dollars to extend lines to rural areas in need of electricity.

Thirty-third. Helped secure Federal loans under Federal Housing Authority in order to ease the critical housing shortage for students at the fast-growing Southern Illinois University.

Thirty-fourth. Worked for passage of bill establishing minimum wage of $1 per hour.

Thirty-fifth. Have worked diligently for legislation affecting the coal industry: Introduced legislation, made numerous speeches, and held several conferences with the administration in an effort to curb the foreign importation of residual oil which has drastically curtailed coal production and resulted in the loss of jobs in the coal mines. United Mine Workers Journal has written articles concerning my work in behalf of the coal industry.

Thirty-seventh. Helped secure approval of Federal grants for five airports in my district totaling several hundred thousand dollars.

Thirty-eighth. Supported successfully the passage of S. 3879, a bill enabling automobile dealers to bring suit in Federal district courts against manufacturers not acting in good faith in complying with terms of franchises.

Thirty-ninth. Supported successfully the passage of H. R. 8780, a bill exempting farmers from paying 2 cents per gallon Federal tax on farm used gasoline.

Fortieth. Served on three important committees—the full Public Works Committee, the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, and the Subcommittee on Flood Control. By serving on these important committees, I was able to work for legislation not only beneficial to southern Illinois, but was able to vote for projects beneficial to citizens throughout the United States, and particularly those who have suffered loss of life and property through floods.

Forty-first. Maintained a full-time district office: For the first time in southern Illinois, we have maintained a full-time, fully staffed office where the citizens may come with their problems. We have received several thousand visitors in the offices during my 20 months in Congress.

Forty-second. Have received and personally answered over 75,000 letters, telegrams, telephone calls during my 20 months in office: These included all types of requests too numerous and varied to mention. I read all incoming mail and gave each one my prompt and personal attention.

In addition to supporting the above measures, I have worked just as diligently in opposing measures which were not in the best interest of the people of southern Illinois. Many bills were introduced which I felt were not in the best interest of the good people whom I have the honor of representing. They are too numerous to mention. I will give the foreign-aid bill as an example. There has been $60 billion given out to foreign countries since the start of the program and only $1 out of every 100 has been repaid. I do not feel that we can buy friendship, and I think this feeling is borne out by the fact that over 700 million people have come under Communist domination in the last 4 years. The money we now send to foreign countries may some day come back in bullets. I am for giving hungry people our surplus food, but I am opposed to sending dollars that can very easily get into Communist hands and be used against us.

Mr. Speaker, in closing may I again say how delighted I am to have served in this great body and express my warm personal regards and heartfelt thanks to you and my colleagues for the assistance you have rendered in my efforts to help southern Illinois.

The Congressional Session in Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has adjourned, and its achievements and shortcomings now are being appraised. The record of the Congress is being evaluated by its Members, and by nonmembers, of all shades of political coloration.

I shall not presume to "rate" the Congress but shall restrict myself to brief mentions of the principal legislative actions.

How much will the activities of the session just concluded cost the taxpayers? A summary placed in the RECORD by Chairman CANNON of the House Appropriations Committee shows that the Congress sent to the White House appropriation bills providing a total of approximately $60,573,000,000 as against about $61,143,000,000 requested by President Eisenhower in his original budget and supplemental estimates. This indicates that Congress shaved $570,000,000 from Mr. Eisenhower's figures on an overall basis.

According to Mr. CANNON's accompanying statement, "rescissions of prior appropriations included in the several bills aggregate approximately $900 million, bringing the total reduction in spending authority to about $1,470,000,000."

This refers, of course, to the overall total of appropriations. In some of the appropriation bills, Congress voted more money than requested. In the Department of Defense bill, for example, the tabulation shows that the President wanted $34,147,000,000 to run the Armed Forces in the year which began July 1. Congress voted $509,000,000 more than that. This does not mean that the Congress approved every defense expense item and then some. It cut down in some places but increased by $900 million the appropriation for bomber and fighter aircraft and related weapons of the Air Force.

Although Secretary of Defense Wilson insisted he did not want this extra money, and would not use it if he got it, the testimony of high Air Force officers that Russia had been catching up with us rapidly in air developments weighed heavily with members of congressional committees handling the defense appropriations.

It is clear that we shall continue to spend huge amounts for our national safety as the tension and uncertainty in world affairs persists.

Among the costly new items related to defense are expansion of the early-warning radar system which it is hoped would give us a chance of avoiding being crushed by a sneak air attack. This calls for at least $72 million.

The Navy is ready to spend upward of $1,400,000 building and modernizing warships. Another supersized aircraft carrier and a cruiser to be powered by atomic energy are scheduled. Many ships are to be adapted to carry atomic weapons.

Expansion of base facilities of the Armed Forces, both at home and overseas, is figured to cost about $2,100,000,000.

It is a grim and depressing thing to contemplate—this tremendous expenditure of our wealth on weapons, countermeasures, and the training and maintenance of personnel to operate the equipment of warfare—but few citizens would contend that we should reduce our defenses sharply and take a chance on the sincerity of occasional Russian smiles.

Our national debt, meanwhile, stands approximately $6,600,000,000 higher than 3 years ago. In 3 successive years, the President has asked and received from Congress temporary increases in the legal limit of the national debt. For 2 years, the request was to raise it from $275 billion to $281 billion. This year, in the light of an apparent budget surplus of approximately $1,700,000,000 as of June 30, Mr. Eisenhower asked for authority to exceed the legal limit by only $3 billion. The discouraging aspect of the debt-reduction problem is that, even if the $1,700,000,000 apparent surplus were credited against the debt, the Federal Government still would be mortgaged to an appreciably higher extent than 3 years ago.

In fiscal year 1956, which ended June 30, we spent approximately $42,100,000,000 on national security, as against about $48,200,000,000 for national defense in fiscal year 1954, when we still were paying big bills attributable to the Korean war.

Sad to relate, economy in nondefense Federal spending has not made progress. The costs of Government, apart from national security, totaled about $19,600,000,000 in fiscal year 1954. In fiscal year 1956, just ended, they amounted to an estimated $24,300,000,000—an increase of about 24 percent.

Although Congress did not give Mr. Eisenhower all the money he asked for foreign aid, it nevertheless made available, including unexpended balances from prior appropriations, more than $4 billion for military, economic and technical aid to foreign countries which we consider friendly, or hope are friendly. That means 4,000 millions of American tax dollars may be sent abroad this fiscal year in the continuing effort to bolster the free world in the contest with international Communist aggression.

As other defense-related items, we might note authorization of substantial additional expenditures on research projects of the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; renewal, for 2 years, of the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities, and the strengthening of penalties against seditious conspiracy and advocacy of overthrow of the Government.

In the field of international relations, congressional actions included extension for 2 years of Presidential authority to impose export controls; simplification of the customs laws; reemphasis of the position of Congress that Communist China should not be admitted to the United Nations; authorization of loan of naval vessels to West Germany, Brazil, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and friendly Far Eastern nations, and ratification by the Senate of the International Wheat Agreement.

In veterans' and servicemen's legislation, the Congress authorized a special program of educational assistance for the sons and daughters of those who died in service in World War II and the Korean war. Following a study by a special committee headed by Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia, a new schedule of benefits for survivors of servicemen and veterans was approved, and all military personnel were provided social-security coverage.

A new plan of medical care for dependents of servicemen was voted.

The GI home loan guaranty program for World War II veterans was extended to July 25, 1958, and other actions included an increase from $50 to $78 a month in the pay of the 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act; provision of a lump-sum readjustment payment for reservists released from active duty involuntarily; extension to July 15, 1957, of the payment of pay of servicemen missing or captured in Korea; provision

for burial in Arlington National Cemetery of an unknown soldier of the Korean war; and setting up an income-tax credit for retirement income of members of the armed services.

The House voted increases in the service-connected disability pensions of all veterans; the pensions of Spanish-American War widows, and the non-service-connected pensions of World War I veterans, but further congressional action was not had on these bills.

Legislation affecting natural resources included approval, at the request of the President, of a huge dam-and-reservoir project in the West known as the upper Colorado River storage project, with an estimated initial cost of $760 million and the expectation that the ultimate bill will be much higher.

If the actual appropriations, as needed, follow the authorizations voted, numerous other big dam projects in the West will be built at a cost of many millions. The cost of just one of these many projects could give us a complete program of flood control and soil conservation in this section of Virginia if we concentrated on the smaller, upstream measures instead of the big dams. A total of $1,300,000,000 was authorized for river and harbor improvements and flood and beach-erosion projects of the Army engineers.

One of the most controversial pieces of legislation was a measure to exempt independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. It was vetoed by the President.

Although opposed by many, including the State Water Control Board of Virginia, as an unjustified extension of Federal influence over State and community problems, use of Federal funds to assist in construction of sewage-treatment plants was approved—$50 million a year for 5 years.

Congress directed a new survey to determine whether it is practical to harness for power the tremendous tides of the Passamaquoddy region of the Maine-Canada border as a joint project of the United States and Canada.

Probably the most far-reaching pieces of domestic legislation were the Soil Bank Act, the Highway Act, and the social-security amendments.

The first, representing the major farm legislation of the session, is a $1,200,000,000 experiment in reducing the domestic surplus of farm commodities by payments intended to encourage farmers to take a portion of their lands out of production.

The soil bank has two parts—the acreage reserve, in which farmers are paid to underplant their acreage allotments of certain basic crops, leaving part of the land idle, and the conservation reserve, in which the Federal Government will "rent" a portion of the farmer's land, provided he agrees to plant it in trees or other soil-conserving cover and refrain from grazing it or harvesting the growth.

In somewhat varying forms, the soil bank idea was urged by the President, the congressional leaderships of both political parties, and all major farm organizations. The bill which authorized it followed one vetoed by the President, in which high rigid price supports on certain basic farm commodities had been included. The measure eventually signed by Mr. Eisenhower did include fixed feed-grain price supports at 76 percent of parity, and provisions intended to encourage disposal of our agricultural surpluses abroad.

The Highway Act authorizes $33,400,000,000 over a 13-year period for an expanded program of road-building with emphasis on the so-called 41,000-mile National Interstate System of through highways. The present Federal-State cost-sharing programs for other highways also will be continued.

Control of projects in the National Interstate System will be left to the State highway authorities, subject to Federal approval of route layouts, width of right-of-way, steepness of grade, materials to be used, and so forth. This differs from the original proposal of Mr. Eisenhower, which would have set up a special Federal corporation, with authority to condemn land and sell bonds to pay for the work, which bonds were not be be counted as part of the public debt, although sold by an agency of Uncle Sam.

To help pay for the road-building, it was deemed necessary to raise the Federal excise taxes on motor fuels, tires, trucks and trailers.

The social security changes provide for starting benefits to women at 62—although at a somewhat reduced rate than if they wait until 65—and to totally and permanently disabled persons at 50. Social security coverage is extended to lawyers, dentists, and virtually all other self-employed persons except physicians and osteopaths.

The Congress continued FHA housing loan insurance, authorized some more Government-built housing in the cities for subsidized rental; provided FHA loans for repair of homes damaged by floods and other major disasters; set up a flood insurance program; extended the Salk polio vaccine distribution to needy families for a year; extended and broadened the school lunch program; voted use of $7,500,000 a year for 5 years to help provide library services for rural areas; set up a training program to relieve the nurse shortage; authorized expanded research in crippling and killing diseases and chronic illnesses; tightened penalties, including provision of a discretionary death penalty, for narcotics peddlers, and extended the vocational rehabilitation program.

It also authorized the FBI to enter kidnaping cases when the victim has not been recovered in 24 hours; liberalized civil service retirement benefits; adopted certain Hoover Commission recommendations on budget and accounting procedures; established "In God We Trust" as the official motto of the United States; authorized research in atomic-powered merchant vessels; exempted farmers from the Federal gas and oil taxes on fuel and lubricants used off the highways; liberalized certain farm loan programs; again increased borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation and expanded the watershed protection program.

Many of the legislative enactments carried out recommendations of President Eisenhower. Others originated within the Congress. Some of the proposals of President Eisenhower failed of approval, among them the so-called civil rights bill, relaxation of immigration restrictions, statehood for Hawaii, and federally-supervised school construction program.

Promotions: A New Slant?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in view of the many letters I have recently received from Washington and Oregon members of the National Postal Transport Association protesting the so-called 1,000-point promotional plan that was inaugurated this spring at the Spokane Terminal and which these members believe will be imposed at other terminals, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the February 19, 1955, issue of Business Week dealing with the importance of seniority as a primary factor in promotion. The principle of seniority, the members of the National Postal Transport Association fear, is thrown out the window by the plan now being used in Spokane. This article, Mr. President, lends support to the validity of these letters which they have written me demanding a thorough investigation of the application of the new system, before it becomes a pattern followed in other places.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROMOTIONS: A NEW SLANT?—AN ARBITRATOR'S CHALLENGE TO MANAGEMENT'S GENERALLY DIM VIEW OF SENIORITY PROMOTIONS STIRS SOME GRUMBLING AND WORRY—IT'S ALL BASED ON A HARVARD RESEARCH STUDY

An innocent-looking paper—on the question of seniority as a basis for promotion—was delivered early this month at a meeting of the National Academy of Arbitrators in Boston. It precipitated immediate rumbling in industrial relations circles.

There are two reasons for the worry on the part of management:

The paper itself, presented by James J. Healy, associate professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Business, disputed the common management conviction that union insistence on promotion according to seniority is one of the evils of our time, and one of the causes of inefficiency in production.

The setting, at a meeting of arbitrators, brought into play the lingering feelings of distrust still felt by some management men toward arbitrators: the fear that arbitrators will arrogate to themselves too much power.

Attitudes: The national academy is a self-organized association made up primarily of professional arbitrators. Its annual sessions, devoted to reports and discussion, usually bring together many of the top men who sit in final judgment on disputes arising between unions and employers on the interpretation and application of contract terms.

The largest and most important section of management has now accepted arbitration, and arbitrators, as the best available device for maintaining industrial peace in the face of differences of opinion over a contract's meaning. But a residue of distrust remains toward these outside fellows, as some businessmen think of arbitrators, a fear that at times they have ideas of their own on how the parties that have to live with each other should conduct themselves.

Wider use of arbitration has overcome much of this suspicion, and many arbitrators have made valuable contributions to employer-employee relations. Nevertheless, a feeling of uneasiness remains about what the arbitrators will do.

When this is expressed, it is usually put in terms of fear that these men, given final authority in cases on which they sit, will take over too great power. The management men who distrust arbitrators are afraid that they will impose on the parties their own ideas or, and this is perhaps the most frequent complaint, that they will be unfamiliar with and unsympathetic to management's problems.

I. WHO IS QUALIFIED?

It is out of this attitude that management's worry developed over the Healy paper, which called into question some management opinions on seniority.

The common management view that promotion by seniority is all to the bad arises from the belief that it:

"Deprives managers of the opportunity to exercise some of their most important skills," as Harvard economist Sumner Slichter puts it.

Destroys employee initiative by making it difficult, if not impossible, for a good young man to move ahead rapidly on the basis of merit or performance.

Reduces a company's efficiency and, as the practice becomes general, puts a brake on the United States economy.

These charges are based on an underlying assumption: that seniority requirements (though they usually include a proviso that the worker must be qualified for the higher rated job) actually result in more promotions of poorly qualified employees than managers would otherwise make.

Challenge: Healy's findings challenged the whole assumption. Healy, an experienced labor arbitrator, told the NAA that there's no scientific evidence for the management view.

He reported that the research project which he has conducted tends to establish the opposite conclusion—that promotions based on seniority, at union insistence and over employers' objections, usually result in giving the job to the right man—even in the opinion of the employers themselves.

Healy tacked on a qualification, though. He emphasized that he did not yet have enough evidence to establish this conclusion firmly.

Data: Healy's group at Harvard looked into 58 arbitration awards in which the arbitrator had set aside management's decision to promote a junior over a senior employee on the basis of superior ability. The awards had all been made at least 3 years before the study. Each company was asked for a work history of the senior employee who got the promotion, and for an objective statement of the ability he showed in the higher position.

Of the 46 responses received, the reports listed 29 senior employees who had proved themselves able on the new job either immediately or within a very short period. And 16 of the 29 had advanced later to still higher rated jobs. In only 10 of the 46 cases did the company assert that the arbitrator's award had been unsound. In the seven remaining cases, the company could make no judgment because the promoted employee had either quit voluntarily or been demoted in lieu of layoff shortly after the award.

Results: Thus, in three-fourths of the cases on which management could express an opinion (29 out of 39), management found that promotion by seniority worked out well, despite its own objections.

Even more significant, said Healy, was the frank statement in 22 cases that supervisors doubted "whether the junior employee originally favored by management would have done any better on the job."

II. DOES EXPERIENCE COUNT?

The Harvard research study suggests that (1) there is in fact a good correlation between length of service and ability, and (2) the preference by management for a junior employee because of supposedly superior ability may often be based on other factors.

Obviously these conclusions have not yet been proved. But if for the word "seniority" you substitute "experience," you'd probably find most United States employers agreeing that experience and ability usually go hand in hand. Proof for this may be found in the want ads employers write. And it's hardly a new discovery that promotion may sometimes be influenced more by the candidate's sycophancy or the superior's favoritism than by ability—which, in any case, is frequently difficult to evaluate fairly.

Employers themselves, without any union pressure, often make seniority a key factor in promotion. Healy reported the case of three metal-trades firms of about the same size. In the two firms that were unionized, 81 percent and 86 percent of the persons promoted were the senior bidders for the job. In the third firm, which had no union, the figure was 83 percent.

Question: While the Harvard study isn't conclusive, it does raise serious questions, which can only be answered by additional research on the relation of seniority to ability.

The arbitrators at the Boston meeting considered Healy's paper the most interesting and important they heard. So do management men who are just now beginning to learn about it. But the management men raise their own set of questions, too. None of them has yet openly expressed any quarrel with Healy's ideas. But some are grumbling about what they take as evidence that arbitrators are seeking to justify themselves as infallible.

Changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, Which I Shall Reintroduce in the 85th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, during the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I worked out a legislative measure designed to take care of certain emergent situations which had arisen in the field of immigration and nationality under both the Immigration and Nationality Act and the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. My proposals constituted a comprehensive immigration bill, the effect of which, if enacted into law, would be to alleviate certain hardships affecting immigrants and citizens of this country without destroying the basis of our immigration laws.

Briefly, my proposals would—

First. Liberalize the restrictions applicable to immigrants who have committed petty offenses, although such offenses could be classified as felonies under foreign law;

Second. Wipe out the "mortgages" imposed on certain small immigration quotas by the Displaced Persons Acts of 1948 and of 1950, under which this country has admitted over 400,000 immigrants;

Third. Forgive the refugees the misrepresentations made while applying for immigration visas if such misrepresentations were prompted by their fear to be forcibly repatriated to countries under Communist domination;

Fourth. Permit the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to waive in their discretion and on a basis of reciprocity the fingerprinting requirements of our immigration laws in the interest of facilitating foreign travel and exchange of visitors, students, artists, and so forth;

Fifth. Admit under proper safeguards up to 1,200 immigrants afflicted with tuberculosis in order to prevent separation or families;

Sixth. Permit expeditious naturalization of alien children adopted by citizens of the United States who are stationed abroad either in the service or in the employment of the Government of the United States or an American institution, firm, corporation, religious organization, and so forth;

Seventh. Permit the entry of an additional 5,000 war orphans adopted by citizens of this country, and to raise the maximum age of those orphans from 10 years to 14 years;

Eighth. Give the illegitimate child the same status under immigration laws—relating to the mother of such child—as the legitimate child has under existing law;

Ninth. Enable the immigrant's family to come to the United States in the same preferential status regardless of whether the family is accompanying the breadwinner or following to join him at some later time;

Tenth. Permit the issuance of around 40,000 nonquota visas to refugees and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain without additional restrictions provided in the 1953 law and without "cutting off" the visas at any particular time, thus opening the doors to the United States to those refugees who might even in the future dare their Communist oppressors and cross the Iron Curtain; and

Eleventh. Help the American wool growing industry by admitting an additional 350 skilled sheepherders from Spain.

To this carefully worked out program, the Senate added a provision which, in permitting the redistribution of immigration quotas, represents a most drastic departure from the principles of our immigration laws. The House of Representatives was faced with this wholly unexpected basic change of the foundation upon which our immigration policy has stood for over 30 years just 5 hours before the adjournment of the 84th Congress. No hearings were held on this provision. The House was totally unprepared to vote for it in the last minute

rush, the Committee on the Judiciary never had this proposal before them, and the hard-working 5-member subcommittee in charge of legislation affecting immigration and nationality had similarly no opportunity to even read the Senate amendment available to the membership of the House in but 1 mimeographed copy.

This hastily conceived Senate amendment was attached to my 11-point immigration and refugee relief program, thus dooming this urgently needed and carefully worked out—with the full participation of the leadership of both parties—proposal.

Under the circumstances, it is my intention to reintroduce in the 85th Congress, on the day it convenes, my emergency proposal and shortly after the Committee on the Judiciary is organized to commence hearings at which every interested party will have an opportunity to bring before us the accusations, the grievances, the alleged inequities, and the proposed amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

In my opinion, that law has worked very well and to the benefit of the United States in the 4 years that passed since it was placed on our statute books. I am familiar with the need of certain technical changes but before I submit my own proposals, I want the Congress and the public opinion at large to be given an opportunity to acquaint themselves fully with the problem and to ascertain how much of the propaganda leveled against the Immigration and Nationality Act is prompted by purely political consideration, how much of it stems from those who would sacrifice the security, the welfare, and the economy of this country on the altar of foreign interests, and how much of it is based on humanitarian and justifiable legal grounds.

I believe that extensive public hearings will permit us to write a set of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act if the case for such amendments is made.

Democrats Work for Continuous Improvement and Modernization of Social Security Over Constant Opposition of Republicans—New Amendments Represent Outstanding Achievements

SPEECH
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

The House had under consideration the conference report on H. R. 7225, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for a continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill is self-explanatory—it is, in effect, a bill to modernize the whole social security program in keeping with the policies which we on the Democratic side have been supporting and promoting ever since the original Social Security Act was passed.

This bill does many things to help many people—women approaching retirement age whose wait before collecting benefits will now be shortened in a great many cases; people on public assistance and aid to the blind and aid to dependent children who can look for a larger Federal contribution to their monthly benefits; and the sick and ill among the indigent who can look for Federal assistance toward medical and hospital expenses. Furthermore, practically all professional groups except medical doctors are now to be covered by social security. And the disabled have had opened to them under this bill a great new program for receiving social security benefits at or after the age of 50.

On this occasion, as we prepare to pass this bill, I cannot help but think back a few years.

Mr. Speaker, as you drove down the Boulevard of the Allies, or down Bigelow Boulevard, towards Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle during those autoumn days and into the late fall, the billboards called down at you a frightening message that the workers of our country were being victimized by a cruel hoax.

The billboards were Republican Party billboards; the cruel hoax to which they referred was social security—the social-security law which Franklin Delano Roosevelt had signed into law the year before but which had not yet gone into effect regarding the payroll deductions and benefits under the old age and survivors insurance program.

The Republican Party was shedding immense — and expensive — billboard tears over the consequences of this terrible New Deal law—and was promising to repeal it.

Now I grant, Mr. Speaker, that all this may sound like ancient history to some. After all, it did happen 20 years ago. To the new voters of today, 20 years may appear to be an eternity—for certainly to their way of thinking it is a lifetime, at least.

OUTSTANDING NEW FEATURES IN 1956 SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

But the voter of any age today—whether he lived through the days I speak of 20 years ago and was aware of their signifance, or whether he just heard about them at the family dinner table as the parents reminisced about the exciting and eventful area when this country was pulled from the depths of depression—each such voter knows that we have experienced in the United States in this interval of one generation a great change, actually a social revolution.

And, of course, social security—the social-security law which 20 years ago the Republicans were promising to repeal—has been a cornerstone of the structure of our society and economy.

During these past 20 years, there have been periodic changes and improvements in the social-security law. The improvements, in nearly all cases, have been proposed, supported, and enacted primarily by Democrats and opposed, in most instances, by Republicans. So the billboards of 20 years ago are not entirely obsolete, although, of course, it would take a brave Republican, indeed, to campaign for office today on a promise to repeal social security. Rather, we find the Republican Party giving much lip-service to the social-security laws, but going in for backstage maneuvers to weaken, if not destroy, the program.

EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION OBJECTED TO CHANGES

The new benefits are a case in point. The social-security bill which is now before us for final action is, in many respects, a truly outstanding one. It incorporates some great new improvements, particularly the principle of paying retirement benefits at age 50 to workers who become totally and permanently disabled. Also incorporated into the bill is a long-overdue provision to permit widows to receive their survivorship benefits at age 62; for workingwomen to retire at 62; and for wives of retired workers to begin collecting their supplementary benefits at age 62. The Republican administration and its supporters in Congress sought desperately to block these improvements.

This marks the first time since the original social security bill was enacted in 1935 that there has been any break in the 65-year minimum age for retirement benefits. It establishes a new principle, and sets a precedent which, no doubt, will be expanded in the future. I foresee the removal of any age minimum for payment of benefits to the totally disabled who are eligible by reason of their previous employment and earnings and contributions to the fund.

Now that we have established the precedent of permitting retirement for women at age 62, I foresee further reductions in the future of that age minimum for women, and probably some reduction, too, in the present 65-year minimum retirement age for men under the program.

In addition to these advanced features of the new bill, we have widened the coverage of the program to include lawyers, dentists, optometrists, veterinarians, osteopaths, and others. These groups heretofore had not been sure they wanted to be covered but finally became aware of the tremendous value to them and to their families of social security coverage—particularly in survivo.ship benefits should the breadwinner die. Throughout our Nation now families are held together through social security which would in other years have been forced to separate upon the father's death. It has been a great, great thing for America.

REPUBLICAN OPPOSITION TO LOWERED RETIREMENT AGE

While the bill is an outstanding legislative achievement, it has in it some features which are unfair to those women between the ages of 62 and 65 who elect to take advantage of their new opportunity to retire before 65. As a result of Republican opposition to the whole principle of early retirement benefits, a Sen-

ate compromise had to be accepted which penalizes working women by deducting from their retirement benefits a certain percentage for each month they lack of being 65 at the time they apply for benefits. This penalty is then supposed to remain in effect even after the woman reaches 65. That is too severe.

A working woman who wants to retire at age 62, as this bill permits, would receive only 80 percent of the monthly benefits that she would be eligible for at age 65. For each month that she delays retirement after 62, until she is 65, the benefit will be increased by five-ninths of 1 percent. And while wives of retired workers can now apply for supplementary retirement benefits at age 62, if they do, they receive only 75 percent as much as they would be eligible for at age 65, and so on.

INTEND TO SEEK REPEAL OF PENALTY CLAUSE

These penalty provisions were not in the bill which passed in the House of Representatives last year. Nor were they in the bill which my committee, the Committee on Ways and Means, reported out last year. They were inserted in the bill in the Senate, as the price exacted by conservative Republican elements in the narrowly divided Senate in getting through the principle of retirement for women before 65. I think this limitation was unfair, and I intend next year to seek its repeal. I hope we have a sufficiently large Democratic majority in the Senate, as well as the House, next year, to enable us to overcome such tactics as occurred in the Senate this year on this provision of the social security bill. The House bill would have paid full benefits to all eligible women at 62, with no penalty clause. That is what I am for.

Going back to those billboards of 20 years ago, Mr. Speaker—the billboards along the Boulevard of the Allies overlooking the Monongahela River, and on Bigelow Boulevard overlooking the Allegheny, and across Liberty Bridge and up the Mount Washington roadway, and all over the city of Pittsburgh and the county of Allegheny 20 years ago—billboards proclaiming that the Republican Party would repeal social security because it was a cruel hoax on the worker, a tax on your pay envelope, a drag on recovery from the depression, interference with the private insurance business, a crushing burden on the economy, and so on—going back to those days, Mr. Speaker, we find that they were really not too far back, at that. For in this bill now before us, we experienced a straight out political battle between the two parties over liberalizing and improving the social security law.

THE FIGHT OVER DISABILITY BENEFITS

It is clear from the debate and votes on the bill that the principle of improving social security to provide more generous retirement benefits at an earlier age is primarily still a Democratic principle, and opposition to that idea is primarily still a Republican principle, and a Republican administration concept.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the disability provision of the new bill, which is its most outstanding single new feature from the standpoint of social insurance against personal disaster, was put into the bill originally by my committee and by the House over the violent objections of the Eisenhower administration and the Republican leadership. It was retained in the bill in the Senate by the very narrowest of margins, on what turned out to be an almost solid party line vote—the overwhelming majority of the Democrats voting for it and the overwhelming majority of the Republicans voting against it. And the Eisenhower administration, as I said, was 100 percent opposed to it and used every conceivable device to line up Republican votes against it.

The Republicans were saying, in effect, that a 50-year-old worker who is totally and permanently disabled should be required to sit around for 15 years and wait until he is 65 before collecting any of the social security benefits he had earned during his working career. How indifferent can one be to human needs—to the needs of the average family and worker?

REPUBLICAN PARTY UNAWARE OF PEOPLE'S REAL NEEDS

But we do not have to depend upon the social security debates and votes alone to see how the amazing attitude displayed by the Republican Party 20 years ago over the "cruel hoax" of social security still dominates that party when it comes to human needs and human problems. We have concrete evidence of the vast differences between the two political parties on all social issues and on human needs each time Congress takes up any important legislation affecting the people generally.

The 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in the Light of the Czechoslovak Experiences

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on June 21, Dr. Petr Zenkl, the former mayor of Prague, Czechoslovakia, and former first Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, delivered a speech at the 30th meeting of the plenary assembly of the Assembly of Captive European Nations. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE 20TH CONGRESS OF THE SOVIET COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE LIGHT OF CZECHOSLOVAK EXPERIENCES

(By Petr Zenkl, former mayor of Prague and First Deputy Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia, at the 30th meeting of the plenary assembly, Assembly of Captive European Nations, June 21, 1956)

First of all I would like to recommend to all the members of the ACEN to read the excellent study which Philip E. Mosely, director of the Council of Foreign Relations, just published in Foreign Affairs, July 1956, under the title "Soviet Foreign Policy: New Goals or New Manners?"

And now I would like to point out what the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party means in the light of Czechoslovak experiences.

In his report which he made on February 14, 1956, at the Congress, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU Nikita S. Khrushchev stated that in present world conditions, "by rallying around itself a toiling peasantry, the intelligentsia and all the patriotic forces, and by meting out a determined rebuff to opportunistic elements incapable of abandoning a policy of conciliation with the capitalists and the landowners, the working class has the possibility of inflicting a defeat on the reactionary antipopular forces and gaining a firm majority in Parliament, and converting it from an organ of bourgeois democracy into an instrument of genuinely popular will."

He also spoke of a "stable parliamentary majority, based on the mass revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the working people" which "would bring about for the working class of a number of capitalists and former colonial countries conditions insuring the implementation of fundamental social transformations."

At the same time he was careful enough to assure his listeners at the Congress and the world at large that "we, Leninists * * * recognize the necessity for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into Socialist society" and that "this is what distinguished revolutionary Marxists from reformists and opportunists." He finally emphasized that "the political leadership of the working class, headed by its advance detachment (by which he meant the Communist parties) is the indispensable and decisive factor for all the forms of the transition to socialism. Without this the transition to socialism is impossible."

These formulations should be clear enough to show the nations of the free world, particularly also the members of the Socialist Parties who are adherents of parliamentary democracy, in which cases Comrade Khrushchev thinks that "force is not inevitable." He has in mind those countries where the Communists would succeed to reduce the resistance "put up by the exploiters" by "welding under (their) * * * leadership the overwhelming majority of the people and of insuring the transition of the principal means of production into the hands of the people." In other words, force or rather violence can be avoided by the Communists when they have a chance of repeating Hitler's feat of 1933 by winning a parliamentary majority. Once such a goal is achieved there is no turning back, there are no democratic free elections any more and the process of converting the Parliament, "this institution, traditional for many highly developed capitalist countries" into an "organ of genuine democracy, of democracy for the working people" is quickly carried out. The Parliament becomes a Soviet, dominated by one party, is elected in single list elections submitted by the party and with majorities of 99 percent up.

In pondering these transparent fraudulent statements of the Soviet Communist First Secretary, a Czechoslovak who has lived through the Communist seizure of power from 1945 to 1948, remembers his experiences and realizes that Comrade Khrushchev's new story is an old story indeed. This is the more important, that "A. Mikoyan, addressing the 20th Congress shortly after Khrushchev had spoken, cited the coup d'état in Prague as a model for the peaceful and parliamentary seizure of power." "Thanks to the favorable situation which took shape in Czechoslovakia after the war," he said, "the Socialist revolution was ac-

complished peacefully; the Communists came to power after having concluded an alliance not only with the working people's parties that stood close to them, but also with the bourgeois parties which supported the common national front. The people of Czechoslovakia have been victorious in a peaceful revolution." (Quoted from Foreign Affairs, July 1956, Again the Popular Front, by J. M. Domenach.)

In postwar Czechoslovakia conditions for a parliamentary victory of the Communists were almost ideal. The country which had suffered the consequences of the betrayal by her allies through the Munich dictate of September 29, 1938, and had been a victim of many years of cruel Nazi occupation had been liberated and occupied by the Red army. The United States force which had an opportunity of liberating the whole of Bohemia with the capital of Prague refrained from further advance and remained on the western fringes of Czechoslovakia.

The administration of the country was taken over by revolutionary national committees in the shadow of the Red army and consequently the Communists gained an overwhelming influence in many of these bodies. Under the pressure of Soviet occupation and this overwhelming Communist influence, the National Front Cabinet and the President reluctantly agreed to far-reaching nationalization measures which covered all banking and insurance businesses, many of the key industries, and approximately two-thirds of the remaining industries.

The western allies demobilized their armies with great speed, while the Red army remained intact and even after its withdrawal from Czechoslovak territory at the end of November 1945 it still occupied all countries surrounding Czechoslovakia with the exception of a part of Austria and of West Germany.

If ever was a chance for the working class of gaining a firm majority in Parliament this was the ideal case. However, despite these most favorable preconditions the Communist Party gained only 38 percent of the votes at the May 26, 1946, elections to the Constituent National Assembly, although the Red army had attempted to subdue the voters by initiating considerable troop movements from Austria to the north over Czechoslovak territory at the time of the elections.

After the elections the influence and power of the Communists steadily declined. This decline was by no means a result of exterior forces. On the contrary, the countries of the free world did their very best to show their indifference and disinterestedness in the fate of Czechoslovakia by continuing their demobilization operations and by making it clear that in the case of Soviet direct or indirect intervention in Czechoslovakia's affair no support would be forthcoming from the West.

The Constituent National Assembly had a 2-year term of office which was to end in June 1948. Elections in the early spring of 1948 were therefore unavoidable. The non-Communist parties were looking forward to them being sure that they would bring about a considerable strengthening of their ranks and a corresponding weakening of Communist representation and influence.

The Communists were well aware of this situation and availed themselves of their tenure in the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of National Defense (the Defense Minister was a pro-Communist stooge who joined the Communist Party subsequently) to pack the police corps and the army with their members. When the non-Communist majority of the Cabinet protested against these measures majority resolutions of the Cabinet were ignored by the Communist ministers including the Premier. This led to the resignation of 12 non-Communist ministers in February 1948. This mass resignation would have entailed a resignation of the entire Cabinet and the proclamation of new elections to the National Assembly in any parliamentary democracy.

However, the Communists knew that such new elections would mean their defeat and most probably the loss of the premiership and a number of key ministeries. They therefore arranged a violent coup and Valerian Zorin, Deputy S. S. S. R. Foreign Minister and former Ambassador in Czechoslovakia (now in Bonn), came from Moscow to Prague to help in intimidating the anti-Communists and in accomplishing the violent putsch. The Communists concentrated strong Communist-commanded police forces in and around the capital, armed the Communist-dominated factory militias, arranged mob demonstrations in the streets of Prague, invaded the secretariats of the non-Communist parties and the ministries of the non-Communist members of the government and terrorized all existing political, administrative, and economic institutions through self-appointed action committees. Full-fledged persecution started and the ailing President, Dr. Eduard Benes, was put under the pressure of the mob.

The National Assembly was prevented from meeting and finally the President was forced to accept the resignations of the 12 ministries and to appoint a Communist-dominated Cabinet in which only fellow-traveling members of the non-Communist parties were given posts. This happened on February 25, 1948.

When the National Assembly finally met on March 10, 1948, the day of Jan Masaryk's mysterious death, many of its members had already been forced to flee the country in order to avoid arrest, others had been arrested or were theatened by arrest. Between March 11 and May 6, 1948, the number of deputies who attended the meetings of the National Assembly was between 153 and 209 of 300 elected members. A considerable number of deputies were deprived of their immunity, extradited, and prosecuted.

This was the method by which the Communists in Czechoslovakia won a stable parliamentary majority and this was also the stable parliamentary majority which adopted the new law concerning the single-list elections of May 30, 1948, and which approved the Soviet-modeled new constitution of May 9, 1948. President Benes refused to sign the constitution and resigned on June 7, 1948.

In the new National Assembly which had been elected on the basis of a single list of the regenerated National Front the Communists and the pro-Communist wing of the Social Democratic Party which merged with the Communist Party on June 27, 1948, were given 80 percent of the seats. This then was the new instrument of genuinely popular will, the organ of genuine democracy, of democracy of the working people. It remained in office for over 6 years because in May 1954 its term was extended by a special act. The Communists were even after 6 years of their dictatorial rule reluctant to hold new elections.

When they finally decided to elect a new quasi-parliament they concocted an election law which provided for a travesty of true elections. No political parties were permitted to take part in the elections. There were only National Front candidates put up by the Communist-dominated national groups in the individual election districts. These candidates were registered by the National Front, only they were allowed to campaign and there was only one candidate in each district.

When election day came along on November 28, 1954, the voters were herded into the election booths and given open single lists of candidates with no envelopes provided. They were expected to insert these lists into the ballot boxes in front of the Communist-controlled election commissions. In this manner a renewed version of the "organ of genuine democracy" has been secured which is to remain in office until 1960.

Needless to say, that its members are mere figureheads who have no influence whatever on the exercise of legislative power in the country, who have no possibility of controlling the administration and of criticizing and remedying encroachments upon the rights of their voters. All they are permitted to do is to point out minor deficiencies on lower levels and to praise and approve the Communist leadership by passing or rather rubberstamping all legislative and other measures which are submitted to the National Assembly. Their main task lies, however, elsewhere. They are expected to be in permanent close touch with the citizens of their election districts and to see to it that economic plans and directives emanating from the party leadership are consciously fulfilled and obeyed.

The real opinion of the people of Czechoslovakia was eloquently proved by the uprising in Pilsen and in other workers' centers in Czechoslovakia in June 1953 which were followed by rioting in Berlin, in Poland, and elsewhere, and by many other resistance phenomena from the last time.

If there are any members in the parliaments of the free countries today who are in favor of negotiations with the Communists and of establishing common fronts with them, they should study the history of Czechoslovak parliamentarian developments between 1948 and 1954. Unless they are themselves Communists and totalitarians at heart they still may profit from such study and thus avoid the pitfalls of Comrade Khrushchev's old "new" theories of the peaceful transition to socialism.

Hon. John Phillips

SPEECH
OF

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, JOHN PHILLIPS and I came to Congress together in January 1943. Mr. PHILLIPS was a member of the 78th Club, made up of Republican Members of Congress, and he served as one of its early presidents. We became closely associated in the affairs of the club and in our work as Members of the House of Representatives. A rich friendship developed between us.

I deeply regret that JOHN PHILLIPS is leaving the House of Representatives. He is the kind of an individual who is sorely needed in our legislative halls. JOHN PHILLIPS is a man of honor and integrity and his word is as good as his bond. He is a student of government, and whenever JOHN PHILLIPS spoke on the floor of the House he was given close attention because Members had great confidence in his opinion on legislative matters.

JOHN was admired and respected by his colleagues and we shall all miss him in the days that lie ahead. He is indeed a Christian gentleman, and my best wishes go with him in all of his future endeavors. He deserves life's richest blessings.

The Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the bill (S. 2167), to clarify and reaffirm congressional intent in the last major revision of the Canal Zone Code of 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is with a great deal of disappointment that I take note at this time of the inaction by the Senate on the legislation having to do with a number of necessary changes in the operation of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone Government.

This legislation (S. 2167) has been 3 years in the making and represents studied views of the steamship industry, and to a substantial degree of the General Accounting Office and employee groups as how best to clarify and reaffirm congressional intent expressed in the last major revision of the Canal Zone Code in 1950 (Public Law 841).

But while the proponents of this legislation have spent a long time working out a fair solution to an obvious inequity in the present management of the Canal and Zone Government, the Senate itself has only received the bill for consideration within the past 3 weeks. Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient time to properly bring the bill before the Members of the Senate in order that certain misunderstandings can be clarified concerning its purpose.

While I am disappointed at the inaction by the Senate this year, it shall not deter me in the future in pursuing this matter. My interest is, of course, primarily in seeing that all forms of transportation receive equity before the law, and S. 2167 concerns itself with accounting reforms, judicial review of tolls rates and other aspects of canal management, which bear upon the users of the canal facilities, both tolls payers and employees. At the same time, I am equally concerned with the defense considerations which are involved and there is no intent in my legislation, nor does it so provide, that the control by the Military Establishment over the canal in time of emergency is in the slightest degree changed from its present status.

S. 2167, of course, has my support and was favorably reported unanimously by my committee. This affirmation by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the principles that I have so long urged convinces me that in the long run the full membership of this Senate will realize the logic and equity underlined in this legislation.

I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Pacific Shipper:

"YOU CAN'T SUE THE SOVEREIGN

"A United States district court has agreed with a Justice Department attorney that the old axiom 'The King Can Do No Wrong!' still is true—at least legally.

"This oldest legal sidestep in the lawbooks was used to get the wheezing Panama Canal Company off the hook on a $38,350,000 legal suit brought against it by 37 steamship companies for alleged excess toll charges since 1951.

"Nobody has really disputed the basic truth of the steamship operators' complaints, and recent action by the powerful Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee heavily underscored their probable righteousness.

"This committee, under the chairmanship of Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, unanimously recommended that the Senate pass legislation transferring management of the Panama Canal from the Army to the Department of Commerce.

"In addition, the committee urged that the Government agencies in the Canal Zone reimburse the zone government for providing certain functions such as immigration, customs, prisons, etc., and that the canal income be arranged so that steamship lines do not subsidize, through the tolls they pay, many of the activities attendant upon maintenance of the Canal Zone, Panama Canal Company, and the Army in that area, but having nothing whatever to do with the actual operation of the canal.

"The Magnuson committee also asked that procedure be established for toll hearings to be held so that users' complaints might be heard, and also that allowances be made for court review of the tolls when the occasion required.

"Senator MAGNUSON commented that it seemed the Canal Company was a commercial enterprise which ought to be run as such, and not as a military operation. In this opinion he followed the lead of the General Accounting Office which came to the same conclusion some time ago.

"So it looks very much as though the days of the Colonel Blimps are nearing an end so far as the Panama Canal Company is concerned. Doubtless the $38,350,000 suit of the 37 steamship companies, while it may have been technically lost, like the Battle of Bunker Hill, will prove to have been a factor of some weight in getting the Army out of the canal business (if one may count such chickens before they are hatched).

"The defeat of the steamship companies reminds us very much of a French monarch of dubious distinction who said, 'L'etat, c'est moi!' That was the gentleman whose royal neck shortly thereafter was given to the mercies of Madame Guillotine.

"Apparently, something of this nature is now in the works in Washington for the brass-bound leaders of the Panama Canal Company, and when they go, as some day they must, we can only hope that the Department of Commerce will not be infected with the same germs of kingly pretensions but will strive to remember that the Panama Canal was dug to link the east and west coasts of the United States and aid commercial shipping—not to increase the empires of bureaucrats, be they military or civilian."

Hon. Woodrow W. Jones

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say a few words concerning a fine colleague, Congressman WOODROW JONES, of North Carolina, though I regret the occasion that prompts my saying them, for his voluntary withdrawal from this body has saddened us all. He is a loyal American who loves good government and who has served his district and his Nation well. I feel that our country can ill afford to lose such Members of Congress. He has by his outstanding and distinguished record in the Congress brought honor to his great State of North Carolina.

I join with his many friends and colleagues in paying tribute to him for his unselfish devotion to duty in rendering valuable service to our Nation. I wish for him continued success and happiness in the future as he returns to his beloved State. I consider it an honor to have served with WOODROW JONES in this Congress.

Private Enterprise Can Provide Best Form of Aid for Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the statement by me in aiding underdeveloped areas.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps the strongest single current running throughout the world today is the deeply rooted desire of hundreds of millions of people in undeveloped countries for improved standards of living. It underlies the revolutionary tides which have swept over large parts of the globe, and it poses a major problem for the so-called have nations with respect to their relations with the have-nots. Every consideration of our western tradition based upon the brotherhood of man urges us to lend our assistance to the efforts of those less fortunate than ourselves to improve their lot.

Mr. Harvey S. Firestone recently proposed in Hamburg, Germany, a constructive and relatively little used approach to the solution of this problem. His attitude is in direct keeping with the basic American view that private capital should be encouraged to initiate and to develop enterprises designed to lift the economic, social, and cultural life of underdeveloped nations. I am inserting into the RECORD this report of his talk as printed in the Journal of Commerce of June 18, 1956:

"BUSINESS URGED TO TAKE LEAD IN AIDING UNDEVELOPED AREAS

"HAMBURG.—'Private business and private capital should shoulder the task of providing financial and technical aid for development projects—especially in the less developed areas of the world.'

"This clarion call for the free enterprise system on the international plane was sounded here recently by 2 top businessmen, 1 American and 1 German. Before an impressive gathering of the German business community, come together in honor of the 100th anniversary of the Phoenix Gummiwerke AG of Hamburg-Harburg, Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. of Akron, Ohio, and Herman J. Abs, chief executive of the Sueddeutsche Bank of Frankfurt, warned against entrusting governments and government agencies with development plans.

"Eschew special privilege

"Both speakers agreed that private capital is willing, as it has been in the past, to assume the risks inherent in such projects, provided adequate guaranties exist for its protection in foreign countries, and it is not discriminated against. Stating that private

capital does not seek special privilege, Mr. Firestone said that it will not go where it is uncertain of fair and friendly treatment.

"He urged that the treatymaking power of individual nations be used to create a climate beneficial to foreign investments, but that such treaties should be limited to establishing protection for foreign investments and should not interfere with foreign investments themselves.

"Mr. Abs, who recently became the first president of the newly formed Society To Promote the Protection of Foreign Investments, noted that German business must henceforth take a more active part in developing foreign national economies, particularly everseas, even though available funds are much smaller than those of the United States and the United Kingdom. So far German firms have rather hesitated to undertake such risks, mindful of considerable losses suffered in the past by confiscation and expropriation.

"As Mr. Firestone pointed out, there are strong incentives for both West German and American business to invest money in other nations, as both countries must rely on imports of countless vital raw materials, and many of these necessities come from the same nations now anxious to obtain aid.

The Firestone Corp. itself showed its willingness to assume risks when 6 years ago it concluded a comprehensive agreement with the Phoenix Co. of Hamburg, the first American tire company to do so. The Hamburg firm was headed then as it still is, by Otto A. Friedrich, one of West Germany's outstanding businessmen and a frequent adviser of his government in raw material and related matters.

"Urged magna carta

"Mr. Abs proposed that the Western nations conclude a multilateral treaty under which the signatory nations would provide equal treatment and protection to foreign investors. Such a magna carta of foreign investments would help stop the trend towards government planning and pave the way for economic development by private capital.

"Praising American economic aid and German-American economic cooperation he expressed particular satisfaction over a recent amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1954, introduced by Congressman THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut, and passed unanimously by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which stresses the need for 'equitable treatment and protection of private investments of nations participating in the program under this act.'"

Harold McGrath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the retirement of Harold McGrath, Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery in the Capitol.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Within a few days Mr. Harold McGrath, Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery, will retire and return to his home in Walla Walla, Wash. Mr. McGrath has served in his present position since February 1940. Prior to that time he was Secretary to Senator Lewis B. Schwellenbach, of Washington State.

During the incumbency of Mr. McGrath as Superintendent of the Radio-Television Gallery the service has been tremendously expanded and the number of accredited members has increased more than tenfold.

I am sure that I reflect the sentiments of all my colleagues in the Senate when I say that Mr. McGrath will be greatly missed.

During the 7 years that I have served in the Senate I have frequently come into contact with Mr. McGrath. I found him not only uniformly conscientious and courteous but invariably friendly and cooperative. Mrs. Lehman has always shared my regard and affection for Mr. McGrath. I also had the pleasure of knowing Mrs. McGrath. I have rarely seen devotion equal to that shown by Mr. McGrath toward his wife, who passed away after a long illness less than a year ago.

I will always remember Mr. McGrath for his friendliness, his patience, and his understanding of the needs of the Members of the Senate. I wish Mr. McGrath many more years of good health, contentment, and service, and I hope that he will frequently visit his many friends in Congress.

The Record of the 84th Congress on the Administration's Program in the Fields of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the record of the 84th Congress on the administration's program in the fields of labor, health, education, and welfare.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to review the accomplishments of this Congress in the field of labor and public welfare legislation referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Unfortunately, the accomplishments are few, in comparison with the program proposed by the President over the past 2 years.

This report clearly indicates to what extent this Congress has supported the Eisenhower program and to what extent it has not.

Before presenting this analysis, I wish to emphasize an important development in the committee itself during the 84th Congress, and especially the 2d session. Senator HILL and I as the respective ranking members of the committee have directed the Democratic and Republican staff members of the committee to work together as much as possible on legislation which both parties were supporting. Partially as a result of this cooperation such legislation that has been agreed upon has been reported by practically unanimous votes of the committee and has in nearly all cases received prompt action on the floor of the Senate. It is to be regretted that we could not handle the full program of the administration by this procedure. I refer especially to the committee's failure to consider and act upon the school-construction bill.

At the outset I want to make it clear that the order in which I discuss particular items does not necessarily reflect the importance of each one.

I. IN THE FIELD OF LABOR

The President, in his state of the Union messages of 1955 and 1956, recommended a number of labor measures which he deemed vital to the welfare of the American people and especially to the workers. Three of the most important items recommended were: Improvements in the Fair Labor Standards Act; legislation to improve the safety of workers on their jobs; and a proposal to protect the beneficiaries of union health and welfare plans. In addition, there is the continuing problem of improving the Taft-Hartley Act.

The President's 1956 state of the Union message said "legislation to improve the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act is still needed." This is one area of labor legislation in which Congress has acted. S. 2280, cosponsored by 23 Senators from both sides of the aisle was enacted after hearings on a number of bills sponsored separately by leading Senators from both parties. This enactment substantially raised the far too low benefit level and improved other features of the workmen's compensation law applicable to longshoremen and harbor workers throughout the country and to all types of workers located in the District of Columbia. This is a substantial accomplishment which has been long overdue.

Occupational safety

I regret that two very important occupational safety measures which the administration has urged have not been enacted. One measure is designed to improve occupational safety in the Federal Government. The Federal Government as the largest single employer in the United States has a special responsibility in protecting the safety of its own employees. In recognition of this obligation, the President, in his 1956 budget message, stated: "To encourage precautionary safety measures, the administration will propose legislation which will provide, in conformity with the best business practices, that employing agencies shall bear the cost of [workmen's compensation] benefits paid for their employees."

At present, all costs of workmen's compensation for all Federal agencies are charged against one central fund administered by the Department of Labor. It is believed that each agency will become more safety conscious if workmen's compensation costs are charged to each agency rather than to one central fund.

S. 1309 and S. 3582 were introduced in 1955 and 1956, respectively, by myself and the distinguished senior Senators from New Hampshire and Massachusetts, in an effort to accomplish this purpose. No action has been reported on these bills, but hearings have been held on a measure, S. 3517, introduced by the junior Senator from Minnesota and 12 of his colleagues from the other side of the aisle, which would reorganize the safety functions of the Federal Government. The purpose of this bill, to improve the job safety of Federal employees, is the same as that of the administration bills. It does not, however, include the administration's charge-back provision. In his comments on S. 3517, the Secretary of Labor has urged that favorable consideration be given to such a provision as embodied in S. 3582 and to other improvements in the proposal which would make it more effective in accomplishing its purpose. As an example, the bill should be amended to place in the Secretary of Labor, who now is charged with safety responsibilities for Federal employment, rather than in some subordinate official of his Department, the added powers and functions in the area of Federal safety which the bill would provide.

The President called attention to another occupational safety measure this year in both his state of the Union and budget messages. This is a program for grants to the States to aid them in establishing more vigorous and effective occupational safety programs. Such a measure, he stated, is a matter of great importance demanding immediate attention. To carry out this recommendation, S. 1091 has been introduced by the senior Senators from New York, Massachussets, Connecticut, and Minnesota, the junior Senators from Pennsylvania and Ohio, and myself. We consider this measure to be of the greatest importance. More than 2 million industrial accidents occur each year with untold hours of wasted manpower, needless human suffering, and financial loss running into billions of dollars. Over 85 percent of these injuries can be prevented if effective programs are instituted. Yet the present Congress has taken no action on this vital item.

It is tragic, indeed, that such safety measures, designed to protect the workers of the Nation, are passed over.

Temporary insurance benefits to certain workers in the District of Columbia

The wage loss workers suffer during periods of idleness forced upon them through no fault of their own can cause great hardship. This country has recognized this in such income-insurance programs as workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and old-age and survivors insurance. Little has been provided, however, to protect the worker against wage losses due to illness and injury that is not work connected. Recognizing the responsibility of the Federal Government for legislation in the District of Columbia, the President's 1956 state of the Union message recommended appropriate legislation, and S. 2753 was introduced, cosponsored by my esteemed colleagues, the senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from New Jersey. This bill would provide insurance benefits, for a temporary period, to workers in the District of Columbia who suffer loss of income due to nonoccupational disabilities. Several States have adopted laws of this type and it was hoped that the Congress would meet its responsibility for legislation for the District of Columbia and provide this much-needed protection. To date, it has failed to do so, however.

Labor relations legislation

The President has reiterated in his 1955 and 1956 state of the Union messages the recommendation he made in his special labor message in 1954 for amending the Taft-Hartley Act. He stressed particularly amendments dealing with the rights of economic strikers to vote and the need for equalizing the obligation under the act to file disclaimers of Communist affiliation. To date no action has been taken on any such amendments.

A new proposal in the field of labor relations which the President considers of great importance is legislation to protect the beneficiaries of union welfare and benefit plans by adequate disclosure of the financial affairs of such plans. S. 3051, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from Colorado at the request of the administration, is designed to accomplish this purpose. The registration and full disclosure required by this bill should act as a strong deterrent to malpractice, mismanagement, and waste of these funds. Another bill, S. 3872, to accomplish much the same purpose has been introduced by the senior Senators from Illinois and Montana, who were joined by the distinguished senior Senator from New York. This latter bill, however, places handling of registration of the plans in the Securities and Exchange Commission whereas the administration believes the Department of Labor is the appropriate agency for this function. Again, the Congress has not acted on this important legislation.

There were two major administration proposals regarding the Federal minimum-wage law. In his 1955 and 1956 state of the Union messages, the President recommended both an increased minimum wage and extended coverage of the law. The first of his recommendations has been enacted into law. The recommendation for extended coverage, however, has not been acted upon, although Secretary Mitchell is prepared to testify and give specific recommendations to Congress on this item. The many millions of workers who are in need of such legislation are thus still without its benefits, and this Congress has again failed to be responsible to the needs of workers of this country.

The President has also requested in his past two state of the Union messages that "legislation be passed to clarify and strengthen the 8-hour laws for the benefit of workers who are subject to Federal wage standards on Federal and federally assisted construction and other public work." To accomplish this purpose, S. 1204 was introduced by the senior Senator from New York, myself, and the junior Senators from New Jersey, Ohio, Colorado, and Connecticut. This bill was intended to revise the three separate 8-hour laws into a single law. It would simplify the provisions, include a 40-hour week—a provision long needed in this particular field—and would extend coverage of this act to comply more fully with the original intention of these various 8-hour laws. Again, as with so many of these proposals, there has been no action taken upon this measure.

Area development

We all know that there are some sectors of our essentially productive and healthy economy in which substantial and persistent unemployment prevail and that these areas need help to revitalize themselves. The President recognized this when he said in his 1956 state of the Union message, "We must help deal with the pockets of chronic unemployment that here and there mar the Nation's general industrial prosperity. Economic changes in recent years have been often so rapid and far-reaching that areas committed to a single local resource or industrial activity have found themselves temporarily deprived of their markets and their livelihood. Such conditions mean severe hardship for thousands of people as the slow process of adaptation to new circumstances goes on. This process can be speeded up * * * improving such communities must, of course, remain the primary responsibility of the people living there and their States. But a soundly conceived Federal partnership program can be of real assistance to them in their efforts."

Early in this session I introduced a bill, S. 2892, embodying what are believed to be essential principles for such legislation. Twenty-two of my distinguished colleagues from this side of the aisle joined me in sponsoring this measure. The principles we have embodied in this legislation were set down by President Eisenhower in his 1956 Economic Report, as follows:

1. Emphasis on lasting improvement rather than temporary relief, in aid of distressed areas but not at the expense of others.

2. Recognition of primary responsibility in the States and local communities.

3. Federal assistance only through appropriate State and local channels, and only as a participant with State and local organizations.

There has been no action in the Senate on this important bill. Hearings have not even been held. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported out another bill, S. 2663, which was introduced by the senior Senator from Illinois and 7 of his colleagues from the other side of the aisle. A similar bill has been reported in the House.

Minority members of the committee worked closely with the majority members on S. 2663 in an effort to improve its provisions. When S. 2663 was reported from committee, it was with two exceptions a fairly reasonable bill and, while it went further than the administration bill, it did embody most of the provisions and protections of that administration measure.

However, sweeping amendments from the Democratic side to S. 2663 were offered and approved on the floor. These amendments removed from the bill the "runaway shop" protections, thereby encouraging the creation of new depressed areas and endangering the livelihood of many numbers in highly industrialized areas.

In its amended form S. 2663 passed the Senate, but was not acted upon by the House.

Equal pay for equal work

Another area of labor legislation to which President Eisenhower referred in his recent state of the Union message is that of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex. This is a matter of simple justice. With the large number of women in the labor force, in many cases engaged in work done previously by men or working alongside men, it is only reasonable that these women be paid according to their work and not according to their sex. And yet, S. 3352, introduced by the senior Senator from New York, the junior Senators from Colorado, Ohio, and Maine, and the two Senators from Connecticut, has been ignored since its introduction in March of this year.

Other important legislation

There is an important measure which would extend the protection of our laws relating to assaults and homicides against officers and employees of the United States to those persons enforcing the Federal labor statutes which has not been acted upon. Most Federal employees who perform law enforcement duties are covered by provisions of the Federal Criminal Code relating to the protection of Federal officers and employees. This protection does not extend, however, to Labor Department employees. To cover these employees, the distinguished senior Senator from Utah has introduced S. 1150. H. R. 6997, a comparable measure, has been passed by the House, but action is still pending in the Senate. This proposal should be acted upon.

The Puerto Rican Legislative Assembly by concurrent resolution of February 18, 1955, expressed its desire for the extension of the provisions of title III of the Social Security Act and the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This would enable the Federal-State unemployment insurance system, which does not presently extend to Puerto Rico, to be put into effect there. There is a high rate of unemployment persistent in Puerto Rico and the need for this application of the unemployment insurance system is great. My esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from New York, introduced S. 2183 on June 10, 1955, to accomplish this purpose. But, this bill, too, has been shelved.

Another unemployment-insurance measure has failed of enactment. The President in his state of the Union and economic messages of 1955 recommended improvement of the District of Columbia unemployment-insurance law to provide a uniform maximum duration of 26 weeks for benefits and improvement of the disqualification provisions. S. 1163 was introduced by the junior Senators from Maryland, Maine, and Montana, and the senior Senator from West Virginia to carry out this recommendation. The sponsors of this bill were joined by the junior Senators from New Jersey and Michigan and the senior Senator from Oregon in sponsoring a substitute measure, S. 1835. This bill

has passed the Senate and been referred to the House District Committee. No further action has taken place.

In all jurisdictions, except the District of Columbia, the State or Territory handles both the public employment services and the unemployment-insurance functions, thus being enabled to operate them as a coordinated system. This insures a maximum offer of jobs to unemployed claimants as well as an efficient and economical administration of the two programs. At the present time, the public employment service for the District is operated by the Federal Government while the unemployment-insurance law is administered by the District government. To remedy this situation, my esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey, introduced S. 3642, a bill to transfer the District of Columbia public employment service from the United States Department of Labor to the Government of the District of Columbia. This legislation had the backing of the administration. Yet it, too, has not been acted upon by this Congress.

I wish to call attention to one final measure which, I am happy to note, has been passed by both the Senate and the House and has been signed by the President. I refer to S. 3391, a bill designed to protect migrant workers by authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate their interstate transportation by motor vehicle. Over the past 50 years the migration of large numbers of workers for temporary farm employment has presented problems regarding their safe transportation from place to place about the country. This legislation is designed to do something constructive to help alleviate this problem.

II. IN THE FIELD OF HEALTH

Although many important parts of President Eisenhower's health program were not given consideration, a fair amount of progress in this field was made.

The President, in his health message of January 31, 1955, stated that "the Congress should take steps to strengthen the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps by improving its status." S. 2587 was introduced to reach this objective. The bill, which is now public law, amended the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to declare the Commissioned Corps to be a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense as well as in time of war.

The committee also considered and favorably reported two other vitally important administration health bills. One, S. 1948, provided grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955. The second bill, S. 2940, extends the time limit on availability of funds through June 30, 1957.

S. 886, the omnibus health bill, which embodied health recommendations made in the President's health messages of 1955 and 1956, and in his state of the Union message of 1955, received brief hearings, but no action was taken on the bill as a whole.

Of the six titled in the bill, Title I, Reinsurance; Title II, Mortgage Loan Insurance for Construction of Health Facilities; and Title V, Public Health Grants, which would replace the present separate authorizations with an authorization for grants for support of public-health services generally and for extension and improvement of such services and grants for special projects, received no action in the 1956 session.

However, Title III, Practical Nurse Training; Title IV, Graduate Training of Professional Nurses and Public Health Personnel; and Title VI, Mental Health Grants, were considered and in modified form included in the Health Amendments Act of 1956, S. 3958, which has been passed by both House and Senate.

Also embodied in S. 3958 was the principal objective of S. 3075, an administration bill which had been recommended by the President in his 1956 health message. While S. 3075, which provided for the extension of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, received no action as such, it was essentially the same as S. 3958 which has passed both the House and Senate.

Another phase of the President's program favorably reported by the committee and enacted into law during this Congress was S. 3076. This bill provided for a continuing national survey on disease and illness and other special supplementary studies. This program will provide statistical estimates on the extent of the major diseases, injuries, and impairments, on the nature and duration of the resulting disability, and on the amount and type of medical and related services received.

Although the committee was successful in enacting into law part of the President's health proposals, it has failed in some very important areas of the administration's program. S. 3252 was introduced to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a 5-year program of Federal construction grants to assist medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and to assist other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical and dental research to expand their research facilities.

The President, in his health message of January 26, 1956, said: "I recommend that Congress enact legislation authorizing $250 million for a 5-year program to assist in construction of research and teaching facilities for schools of medicine, osteopathy, public health, and dentistry, and other research institutions. These institutions would be required to supply at least equal amounts in matching funds."

S. 849, which the Congress approved, is a modified version of S. 3252, but it does not contain one of the most significant provisions of S. 3252. There is no provision for construction of medical and dental training facilities. The information we received at the hearings indicates the vital need for these facilities. We have only to read the figures of the large number of potential doctors and dentists turned away from our schools for lack of training facilities, to know that the need for this legislation is acute. If our ever-growing population is to have a well-trained and sufficiently large medical and dental profession, this legislation must be passed.

Another vital piece of health legislation which received no action by the committee was S. 4172. This bill would authorize approval of voluntary agreements between private insurance organizations for pooling their resources in developing plans or policies designated to meet current needs for adequate health prepayment protection.

The list of health bills proposed by the administration, which will die for want of action by the committee, grows as we add S. 4132. This bill, introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut, Senator PURTELL, to implement the recommendation of the President in his 1956 budget message, provides for the transfer of Freedmen's Hospital to Howard University. The bill was designed to carry out the recommendations of the Freedmen's Hospital Study Commission. This proposed legislation is based on recognition of (1) continuing and increasing needs for medical, nursing, and allied professional personnel; (2) the need for new substantive law which would establish the long-term mission of Freedmen's Hospital; (3) Howard University's expanding medical training program; and (4) hospital service needs of the greater Washington community.

III. IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

Although the President has succeeded in getting action on part of his health program, his recommendations in the field of education did not fare so well. The greatest single failure of this committee has been its failure to take action on the President's school construction proposal. At the beginning of the 84th Congress extensive hearings were held by the committee on several school construction bills. Members of the committee heard from witnesses who reemphasized the seriousness of the problem. The shortage of schools for the children of America has created a critical and ever-growing problem in our educational system. Certainly every member of the committee is aware of this crisis.

Yet as quickly as the interest of the majority members of the committee in school construction had arisen, so did it die. Hearings were held on the first administration bill, S. 968, on February 16, 17, 18, and 21, 1955. Hearings were also held on the Democratic-sponsored bill on January 27, 28, and 31, 1955. The first administration bill was revised and introduced as S. 2905 in the second session, but no hearings were held on the revised bill or on any other school construction bill throughout the second session. S. 2905 contained the following substantive titles (there is a fifth title with definitions and miscellaneous provisions): Title I, authorized Federal purchases of obligations of local educational agencies where such obligations cannot otherwise be marketed at reasonable rates of interest; title II, authorized Federal advances of funds to reserves established by States; title III, authorized grants to States to assist them in helping local educational agencies; title IV, authorized grants to States to assist them in meeting the administrative costs of developing State programs.

Action on school construction was one of the first orders of business and in the first session appeared to be of paramount importance to the members of the committee. However, in the second session, while the interest of the Republican members remained great, all action and the previous interest displayed by the Democratic membership seemed to lessen considerably. No amount of urging on the part of members of the minority could rekindle the interest displayed by the Democrats at the beginning of the 84th Congress. The efforts of the ranking Republican on the committee to reach an agreeable compromise with the majority members were to no avail. Today we are without a school construction bill and without a cure for the cancer that is eating away at our educational system.

One of the few bills in the area of education to escape this inactivity was the extension of Public Law 815. Although the bill, H. R. 11695, which passed both Houses was not the exact administration version, it was an acceptable one. Among other things, it extends Public Law 815, 81st Congress, which provides for school construction assistance to local educational agencies in areas that had been burdened with substantial increases in school attendance as a result of defense and related Federal activities.

Because of the need to provide immediate stimulus to the initiation of widespread planning, studies, and action by the States and localities in the field of higher education, the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School recommended the appropriation of one-time grants to the States to encourage and assist each State in establishing a State Committee on Education Beyond the High School. These State counterparts to the national committee are essential not only for coordination of study and planning activities in the States but also to provide a nationwide mechanism for liaison with the national committee.

Legislation introduced to implement this recommendation would have provided $800,000 to the States. An additional $300,000 was asked for to support the President's committee.

Unfortunately no funds were appropriated by the Congress for the State committees, and only $150,000 was appropriated for the President's committee.

One important education measure urged by the President in his 1956 state of the

Union message which recently passed the Senate but failed to get House action is S. 3620. This bill provides for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded. Enactment of this legislation would insure substantial progress toward achieving the following objectives: (a) Reducing the number of the mentally retarded who need and require institutional care; (b) reducing the degree of dependency of the mentally retarded who live at home; (c) making the mentally retarded more nearly self-supporting; (d) reducing, by grouping the mentally retarded into special classes for special instruction, the disproportionate amount of time and attention which the mentally retarded inevitably require in the average classroom; (e) increasing the significance of life for mentally retarded children; (f) bringing added satisfaction to those families of which mentally retarded children are a part.

IV. IN THE FIELD OF WELFARE

The President recognized a long-sought objective of persons associated with the arts when, in his 1955 state of the Union message, he recommended establishing a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts. The purpose of the Commission as set forth in S. 3054 is to undertake studies of, and make recommendations related to, appropriate methods for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Hearings were held on S. 3054 and similar bills, and the committee then favorably reported S. 3419. While the bill which finally passed the Senate was not identical to S. 3054, it contained many of the principal proposals of the administration and was considered an acceptable compromise. Unfortunately this bill was not acted upon by the House.

In the closing days of the second session the committee acted upon a juvenile delinquency bill. The administration bill, S. 894, authorized a 5-year program of Federal grants to assist States and localities in strengthening and improving their programs for the control of juvenile delinquency. Particular emphasis was given to effectuating coordination of programs of various States and local agencies concerned with the control of juvenile delinquency. The bill which finally emerged from the committee, S. 4267, did contain some of the provisions of the administration bill. Certain provisions of the bill reported out of the committee were based on studies and investigations made by a committee headed by Senator HENDRICKSON in the 83d Congress.

I have briefly here attempted to review the course of many of the administration's labor, health, education, and welfare proposals referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during this 84th Congress. The list is by no means complete. Yet it can be seen that little has been done by this Congress with all too many of the proposals of the administration in these fields. I feel that this is a serious failure to meet our obligations in these important areas.

Taft-Hartley Law Amended by Administrative Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress the following address which I recently delivered before the New England Convention of the Carpenters Brotherhood Union on the occasion of their 75th anniversary:

It is a pleasure for me to meet with the New England representatives of the carpenters union. We have a double reason for celebration today. This is your first regional meeting as part of the united AFL–CIO, and it is also the 75th anniversary of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners. Few organizations that are now active in the Nation can point to as rich a tradition and as dynamic a program for the future as does your brotherhood.

It was your first president, Peter J. McGuire, who gave us Labor Day which has become virtually a national holiday.

The direct accomplishments of your union are a matter of record. A union carpenter earns today in 1 hour as much as Pete McGuire earned in a whole day, and McGuire had to work 12 hours or more to get his day's pay. Your union was in the vanguard to make the 8-hour day a reality.

Membership in the carpenters union as in all other unions has paid off. This is true not only in terms of the human dignity and security that the union provides, but in terms of day-to-day experience here in Boston and all over the United States. I was very much interested to read in last month's issue of your publication, the Carpenter, that official Government statistics support the fact that union dues pay off. The Bureau of Labor Statistics data prove that the average hourly union-wage rate is from 10 to 20 cents higher than the pay received by nonunion members.

But a union program is not purely a selfish one. Your organization could not have flourished over three-quarters of a century, if its program were not identified with the common good. The fact clearly is: What is good for America is good for the carpenters.

You favor an expanded housing program. This might appear to be a selfish interest, since you are in the business of building, but again your interests coincide with the needs of the country. Despite the great prosperity and the rising standard of living over the past few decades, millions in our Nation are still ill housed; and many hundreds of thousands of children are living in dilapidated dwellings which should be torn down or which require major overhaul to make them fit places in which Americans may live.

I believe that the Government has a very real role to play in this area, and I wholeheartedly support the bill recently introduced in the Congress which offers a realistic housing program for our Federal Government.

In brief, this program provides for:

First. The building of 200,000 public-housing units for low-income families. This program is to last for 3 years, during which 600,000 units would be built.

Second. The setting aside of 10 percent of these housing units for elderly persons.

Third. The establishment of a national mortgage corporation with lending authority of $1 billion to stimulate the construction of housing for the middle-income man, the forgotten man of this era, in my opinion.

I believe that the provision to help finance housing for middle-income groups is just as important as the construction of public-housing units. There is no present effective Federal program for the building of middle-income housing, for which there is a crying need, and I am fully confident that the Federal sponsorship of middle-income housing is not going to be any burden to the taxpayer. Given conditions of prosperity and high wages, there will be sufficient potential customers to take advantage of the federally sponsored program, and these customers will have the ability to repay the loans on their houses.

It is important, however, that the federally sponsored construction program should be based on a fair wage system. The extension of coverage of the Davis-Bacon Act to include all construction programs which are sponsored with Federal funds is clearly necessary. As you know, the Davis-Bacon Act has helped construction workers by assuring that the prevailing rates which they have been receiving in their communities would be paid on jobs to which the Federal Government is a party. I believe that these provisions should be extended to all programs which are sponsored by the Federal Government. It would be a mistake, however, to believe that these provisions help only workers in the building trades. They also help the contractors by providing a means by which they can ascertain the approximate labor costs on Government contracts prior to submission of their bids. This helps in the stabilization of the construction industry and the achieving of better labor-management relations in the construction industry.

The application of Davis-Bacon provisions has helped all segments of the community. Unscrupulous contractors who bring in low-cost labor where higher wage rates prevail tend to deteriorate the wage standards in the community. Furthermore, workers who are imported to new areas by these contractors frequently become drags on the community when the temporary construction jobs are completed.

The Federal Government must not become a party to undermining wage standards.

The Government also, in my opinion, has a duty not to be a party to creating strife and undermining labor-management relations. Along this line, as a former member of the NLRB, I find the application of the act to the construction industry particularly unrealistic in many instances. The construction industry has its own special problems and a tradition of good labor-management relations. Many practices listed in the Taft-Hartley Act as unfair are not easily applied to the building industry.

In this field I draw particular attention to the secondary boycott section of the act. Provision should be made to permit an employer to sign a union agreement on a construction job without going through the present cumbersome obstacles which, in many cases, result in the construction job being finished before an agreement can be signed.

Further, the section of the Taft-Hartley Act which places restrictive State law above Federal law in the miscalled right-to-work laws should be removed.

For that matter, I feel that due to the unique nature of your industry it would not be at all unusual if an exception were made of the industry as a whole—as was done when our Federal Government recognized your unique problems in the days of wage controls and a separate construction industry board was set up to deal with your problems.

While on the subject of the Taft-Hartley Act, I have heard many people say that the act should be repealed or changed. Well, I have news for these people, the act has been so changed that you might say it has been repealed—

By whom, you ask? Well, not by the Members of Congress.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been changed, and changed drastically. It has been changed by the recent appointees to the National Labor Relations Board. Even though sworn to uphold the law which Congress enacted, it would seem that these members have searched it from stem to stern with the purpose of making it a more antilabor statute, and of reversing wherever possible each rule of interpretation and application established in the administration of the act from 1947 through 1952.

Those who voted for the Taft-Hartley Act said that it was two-sided legislation, that it equalized the rights of management and labor, without submerging the rights of either side. Whatever the merits of that position—I think that there can be little doubt that the changes in the administration of the act since 1953 have been almost exclusively against labor.

First, it is clear that almost all of the innumerable changes in doctrine and interpretation have been changes which reduced the protections of labor. With respect to each charge it could perhaps be argued that the old Board was wrong and the new Board is right. But when all of these changes are looked at together it is discovered that the total result is injury to labor.

Those who would justify their decisions say that the Board is fair and has moved in an antilabor direction only because the earlier Board was excessively prolabor, and that the present Board is simply correcting the prolabor mistakes of the Truman board.

Fortunately, we have a yardstick against which to measure these arguments.

When the Taft-Hartley Act was passed in 1947, its sponsors were afraid that it would not be fairly administered. The statute was complex and many of its provisions were so unclear that maladministration could easily defeat the intent of Congress. To guard against such maladministration, Congress provided, in title 5 of the act, the creation of a joint committee of both Houses to conduct an investigation in the 2d session of the 80th Congress, of the Board's administration of the act. That committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Ball, concluded in its report that the act was being administered in accordance with its terms and with the intention of the Congress as revealed by the legislative history of the provisions.

So we start with the established premise that the Taft-Hartley Act was, on the whole, fairly administered in its early years with neither a prolabor nor a promanagement bias in the Labor Board's decision.

But the past 2 years have seen a rising chorus of protest, objection, and complaint, that the National Labor Relations Board is biased and prejudiced against labor organizations, that it is utilizing its powers to thwart self-organization among employees. It is thwarting unionization both by withholding the act's remedies against violations by employers and by distorting the terms of the act so as to exclude illegal conduct by employers from the prohibitions of the act. At the same time, it is charged, the Board is narrowing the area of lawful protection which Congress extended to employee activity in the field of self-organization and that it is imposing upon the right to strike, restrictions which Congress rejected under our present system of collective bargaining.

We all know how important it is, in a field as delicate a labor-management relations, where the very lives and livelihood of many citizens are at stake, that the agency which we Members of the Congress have entrusted, with the duty of administering the law of the land, should be unbiased and unprejudiced.

Surely, it is clearly important to the Board, that it should avoid the appearance of any unfairness in any individual case, and it is of much greater importance to the Congress and the Nation that this agency not act in a fashion which might produce a deep-seated feeling, that by deliberate design it is unfair to an entire class of litigants.

These charges of bias, prejudice, maladministration, and distortion of the statute does not come from defeated litigants alone. These charges have been confirmed by informed students and competent lawyers who specialize in this field of labor-management relations. Prof. Willard Wirtz, of Northwestern University, in a carefully documented study of the new Board's free-speech decisions, concluded that the Board has recently emasculated the protection which Congress guaranteed to employees against employer coercion in the exercise of rights to form and join labor organizations by placing upon section 8 (c), the free-speech provision of the amended act, a construction far broader than Congress intended. How does the Board operate to change the law? Well, we all know of the appointments to the Board itself of Beeson, the labor management consultant, etc., who have made it apparent that they are using the powers of their office to substitute for the labor relations policy which Congress enacted in 1947 a policy of their own. The sweeping character of the policy changes which the Board has made during the past year, taken together, amount, in my opinion, to amendment of the statute in a manner far more drastic than anything this administration has proposed to Congress. The antilabor amendments which the new Board has accomplished by interpretation exceed, in some respects, even the antilabor proposals of the Hartley wing of the Republican Party, which were rejected by the Congress in 1947.

Equally as important, however, in my opinion, but not as noticeable to the public or perhaps even to labor officials, is the Office of General Counsel, which is charged with the duty of determining whether a complaint of unfair labor practices shall issue on all charges filed with the agency. This office was recently filled with a lawyer whose private practice background was exclusively as a representative of employers in the labor-management relation field. Soon after taking office this General Counsel removed his Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations. In his place was appointed a young man who first came to the Board in 1954, a man who had less than 4 months' experience with the Board's field operations and whose only experience in the labor-relations field prior to 1954 was in the capacity of attorney for a division of the United States Steel Co. in San Francisco. The field operations boss is the man who determines, more than any other, the impact of the Board's policies on actual labor relations day to day. In this office lodges power and responsibility for the supervision of the operation of all of the Board's field offices with their many regional directors, dozens of field examiners, and attorneys who, in their dealings with both labor and management, are to all intents and purposes the Board itself.

Under the Office of Associate General Counsel in charge of field operations are several Assistant General Counsels whose responsibility it is to directly supervise the operations of the National Labor Relations Board regional offices. The General Counsel, as you know, has the power to decide which cases shall and which shall not reach the Board for decision. He determines whether the evidence presented in support of a charge is adequate to warrant prosecution.

By fragmenting the evidence instead of viewing it as a whole, the clearest case of unfair labor practice can sometimes be reduced to a series of meaningless and trivial incidents. Of course, no fair or rational administration of the act can result. In one case which illustrates the whole picture, which is identified by the present General Counsel as case No. K–42, he refused to issue a complaint on charges alleging that the company violated section 8 (a) (1), (3), and (5) of the act, although five employees who had gone on strike testified, independently of each other, that the company had offered each of them benefits to abandon the strike and return to work, on the ground that there was no corroboration of their testimony.

How could there be corroboration of separate conversations at which only two parties—the employer and the employee—were present? It is not the business of the general counsel, but of the trial examiner and the Board, to weigh the evidence and decide whether, if the employer denies making the statements attributed to him, he or the employees are telling the truth. But there is something even more shocking in this case.

The employer did not deny making the statements to the employees. Their testimony stood uncontradicted by any witness to the conversation. On what basis then did the General Counsel act? He accepted an affidavit of the employer's attorney, who, although not present, denied that the statements were made, as proof that the employer had not actually made them. Even if the burden of proof in these unfair labor practice cases was as heavy as in a criminal case, which certainly is not, I have no hesitancy in saying, that in my time at the NLRB the General Counsel would have proceeded in this case forthwith and that statement includes the action of the General Counsel who hired me, who was a strong Robert A. Taft Republican and who, before his death, practiced labor law on management's side, the late Mr. Robert Denham.

Maybe these gentlemen who form the hard core of the NLRB are neutral but, from where I sit—and from the decisions I read, they appear to me to be about as neutral as a loyal and enthusiastic Yale man refereeing a Harvard-Yale football game.

In closing, may I say that few organizations can claim the vigor and dynamic program that you are displaying on your diamond jubilee. May your next 75 years be as helpful to the American carpenters, as well as to the community at large, as your program has been during the previous three-quarters of a century.

Labor Vote Drive Started by GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Friday, July 27, there appeared in the New York Times an interesting article by Joseph A. Loftus entitled "Labor Vote Drive Started by GOP."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR VOTE DRIVE STARTED BY GOP—STAFF ESTABLISHED TO OFFSET INFLUENCE OF AFL–CIO POLITICAL ACTION UNIT

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, July 26.—The Republican Party has begun a carefully planned campaign to obtain the votes of organized labor for all Republican candidates for Federal office.

Instead of adopting the old practice of putting a national labor leader's name on a letterhead and forgetting about it, the Republican National Committee has set up a working staff, including two union members, with a specific course and objective in mind.

While the party will, of course, seek the votes of all working people, this plan was designed particularly to offset the influence of the Committee on Political Education, the united labor movement's political arm.

"We are making no big claims," a national committee official said today. "We don't know what we are going to accomplish, but anything we do will be more than has been done in the last 20 years. We have something to sell and we're going to sell it."

Preparations were begun nearly 2 years ago when a postelection analysis, including some poll taking, convinced Republican organization leaders that organized labor was winning senatorial and congressional elections in some States. The union political committees, with few exceptions, supported Democrats for Federal office.

The idea of making an aggressive drive for organized labor votes was laid before State chairmen at the Republican campaign school last September. They were almost unanimously enthusiastic. Newsmen were briefed daily on most of the events at the campaign school, but the labor vote drive was kept a secret.

PRESIDENT INFORMED

Chairman Leonard W. Hall and the State chairmen traveled to Denver to tell President Eisenhower about it. James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, was privy to the plan from the beginning.

It is no coincidence that some criticism of unions by Republican officeholders has been soft-pedaled lately.

The plan consists mainly of hard organization work. Robert Humphreys, the campaign director, plans to make literature and press releases a subordinate part of it.

He hired Tom Colosimo of Gary, Ind., and Robert Gormley of Niagara Falls, N. Y. They have backgrounds in the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the American Federation of Labor, respectively. Then he brought in Roy James from the staff of the Senate Labor Committee to head the division.

Their job is to assist State chairmen in setting up a functioning organization to secure labor votes. The State chairmen are being persuaded wherever possible to appoint a bona fide union member to their staffs. In some States the chairmen prefer to set up a committee of union officers. It is expected that this will be done in New York.

Emphasis is being placed on the industrial States and the marginal districts where a switch of 5 percent of the votes or less, would change the result in a congressional election.

Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has completed its 2d session and, unless it should unexpectedly be called back for a special session, has completed its record for the period since its election in November 1954. The record is one of substantial achievement, I think.

The great highway construction program has been correctly called the largest public works project of all recorded history. We made major improvements in the social-security system despite the intense opposition of the Eisenhower administration. We raised the minimum wage for workers engaged in production for interstate commerce from 75 cents to $1 an hour—again, against the administration's opposition.

There were things we did not do. We failed to pass a desperately needed school-aid bill, and it was a serious failure. The House passed but the Senate failed to pass a minimum civil-rights bill. These are subjects that must be urgently considered by the 85th Congress meeting next January.

We are going into a new presidential and congressional campaign, and the nominating conventions will meet shortly in Chicago and San Francisco.

It is appropriate to emphasize again, as I did last year, how wrong President Eisenhower was in 1954 in predicting a political cold war unless the people followed his desires and elected a Republican-controlled Congress.

The people elected a Democratic Congress instead—and there has been no political cold war.

On foreign policy, Democrats in Congress this year as last gave the President essential support at critical moments when he could not depend upon his own Republicans. Bipartisanship in foreign policy—initiated as a modern approach under President Roosevelt and successfully maintained under President Truman's leadership—has remained the keynote of our Democratic program.

When leading Republican Congressmen were trying to force the President into rash actions in Indochina, along the China coast and in other areas, we Democrats filed no ugly charges of "appeasement" when he refused. We gave him the essential legislative backing he needed. It was a Democrat, the retiring veteran Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, who took the lead in building a climate of opinion that made it possible for the President to meet the Russians in Geneva.

The GOP campaign orators will talk a lot in the next 3 months about "peace" as their party's issue. But without Senator GEORGE and the remainder of congressional Democrats, General Eisenhower would never have dared go to Geneva. The attitude of many Republicans toward their own President is indicated by a Senate vote almost on the eve of adjournment. Mr. Eisenhower nominated Paul G. Hoffman as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and his own Republicans violently attacked him. Senate Democrats voted 39 to 6 to express their confidence in the President's judgment and confirm the nomination. But the minority Republicans, with their bitter-end massive right-wing, threw 16 votes against Hoffman.

It was the right-wing Republicans, all through the sessions, who waged "political cold war" on the President. On foreign policy, when we Democrats believed on principle that he was right, we upheld and sustained him without a thought of partisanship.

We believe that American foreign policy has been bungled and mangled by the almost incredible contradictions on "neutralism" and "neutrals," for example, by the President, Vice President NIXON, and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. These contradictions and this bungling will be part of the forthcoming political campaign. But not a single responsible Democratic leader has waged "political cold war."

In the field of domestic policy, Democrats changed, corrected, revised, and sometimes defeated Eisenhower proposals—and for that we have no apologies.

We heard a lot, from time to time, about how the President wanted to be "conservative in economic affairs, liberal toward people." Let us see how this slogan has been dishonored in practice, and how Democrats have had to force through "liberalism toward people" against administrative opposition. There are notable examples.

When legislation to increase the minimum wage was pending in 1955, the administration fought to hold the higher rate to 90 cents an hour. Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell testified formally that an increase to $1 an hour would throw industry into bankruptcy, create unemployment, and do more harm than good.

We Democrats refused to accept this advice, because the facts based on the Government's own statistical data did not support it. We insisted that a minimum of $1 an hour was equitable and we did not believe it would cause bankruptcies and joblessness. Well, a few months after the $1 minimum became effective last March 1, Mitchell acknowledged that business had absorbed it, that it had not caused bankruptcy, that it had not thrown people out of jobs.

Who was liberal toward people and sensible in the economic field—the Eisenhower administration or the Democrats?

Look at social security. The House passed a bill in 1955 to provide disability benefits for the totally and permanently disabled at age 50, to lower the pension-eligibility age of women, to grant assistance for disabled children beyond the age of 18. The Senate this year revised the program somewhat and added higher Federal grants to the States for old-age assistance. The bill on this compromise basis was accepted by both Houses and sent to the White House.

This was liberalism toward people in a practical sense. Disability insurance has long been needed; higher old-age grants have been needed; a lower retirement age for women is justified on the basis of the age differential between most husbands and wives.

Yet the administration fought these proposals. It was understandable that the departed Secretary Oveta Culp Hobby—the Cabinet member who bungled the Salk polio vaccine program—should have opposed them. But so did her successor this year, Secretary Marion B. Folsom. He actually opposed programs as an Eisenhower official that he had advocated, years earlier, as a private citizen and member of the chamber of commerce. We Democrats had to pass the social security bill in the teeth of administration hostility and in the face of the President's power to veto.

Liberalism toward people? How about the tax bill? Democrats in the House last year passed a bill, against Republican opposition, to raise exemptions for Federal income-tax purposes from $600 to $700 per person. The effect would have been to reduce the income-tax bill of the average family of 5 by $100. But the administration fought it, and even a modified bill was beaten in

the Senate. The administration gave corporations and wealthy taxpayers a $7 billion tax cut in the Republican 83d Congress when the Government had a deficit. It opposed tax relief for low-income and middle-income families in the 84th Congress even though our budget surplus was nearly $2 billion in the last fiscal year.

Democratic pressure in the 84th Congress sometimes produced impressive results, even though the administration did not truly feel liberal toward people.

The President vetoed our first bill to restore the income of farmers. But his Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, was compelled to raise support prices for this year far above what he desired. He was compelled to adopt the soil-bank plan that we Democrats pushed through even though as late as September of last year the Agriculture Department attacked it as worthless. The second farm bill, though it falls short, is vastly superior to the Benson plan to drive marginal farm families off their land.

The story of pay raises for Federal employees is instructive. Federal Government salaries had slipped badly in relation to those of other workers and because of inflation. The President vetoed a bill to raise salaries by an average of 3.5 percent. Yet the 84th Congress, under Democrats, was able to apply enough pressure to force him progressively to announce willingness to accept ever larger percentages—and finally to sign a bill for 7.1 percent.

The exceedingly narrow majorities by which Democrats controlled Congress sometimes made it impossible for us to achieve desirable things.

The Hells Canyon bill fell through, and because of this failure other great and important Federal projects to make full use of our water resources and develop river valleys were beaten.

On the other hand, we were able to check the intense efforts of the administration to destroy our 50-year-old Federal power policies which aid reclamation and give preference in Federal power to rural co-ops and publicly owned electric-distributing systems. A large group of Georgia co-ops, for example, finally got their rights to power from the Clark Hill Dam after resisting for 3 years Interior Department attempts to compel them to surrender their rights.

On the Dixon-Yates issue, I am especially pleased at the later trend of events. Representative CHET HOLIFIELD, of California, and I raised the first warning flags, in 1954, that the administration was attempting to cripple the TVA by having the Atomic Energy Commission sign a contract with the Dixon-Yates combine to furnish power to the city of Memphis, a TVA community.

President Eisenhower finally canceled the contract, after investigations showed that his subordinates had falsified records and otherwise been guilty of inconsistencies, improprieties, and lack of candor. But it took him nearly a year to cancel, and the record shows that if the President had listened to Democrats he would have got out of the "mess" more quickly.

Now the Dixon-Yates combine is suing the Government for damages of $3.5 million, and Mr. Eisenhower's own Justice Department in fighting the claim has made damaging admissions. The Department has told a Federal court that the whole contract was illegal to begin with—and this contradicts an official opinion by Attorney General Brownell in 1954.

The Department has told the court that in 1954, when the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy approved a waiver of the right of Congress to study the contract, the Republican majority of that year had acted illegally. It has admitted, in effect, that when we Democrats regained control of the committee in 1955 and repudiated the waiver we acted correctly and legally.

The Justice Department has adopted all our arguments about the conflict-of-interest activities of the investment banker brought into the Government as an adviser to cook up the scheme to destroy the TVA. The activities of this banker alone, now says the Department, were enough to void the purported contract.

It is a sad episode. I am, however, a member of the joint congressional committee, and the episode at least gave me a clear firsthand look at the domination of the Eisenhower administration by a single economic group—the big-business men and big-business bankers and lawyers—who try to work their desires behind the protective shield offered them by the President's reputation.

Where we failed in this Congress, it was because Democratic majorities were not big enough and because the Republicans, while paying lip service to their President, support him really only when he does what they please.

The collapse of the school-aid bill is a key example. Mr. Eisenhower, after 3 bewildering years of delay, finally recommended an almost adequate program. Our own program was better—the bill sponsored by Representative KELLEY of Pennsylvania proposed more money more quickly.

Almost any bill would have been better than none. But Republican Members of the House ignored the President's request for action. They voted against the bill on final passage.

The great majority of Democrats voted for passage of the bill. But the President had no observable influence on members of his own party.

In housing, the usual pattern was observable. The President asked an inadequate program; the Senate voted a much bigger program—and then Republicans on the House Rules Committee bottled up the bill until the closing days of the session. Democrats voted 4 to 2 to report out a better bill than the President's, although one less liberal than the Senate's. All four Republicans voted against reporting it, and the logjam could not be broken until Democrats agreed to compromise for the sake of getting something.

On the highway bill, however, we were able to salvage a great deal. The Democratic majority flatly turned down the President's proposal to finance new roads by long-term bonds offering $11.5 billion in interest charges to bankers. We insisted on financing roads on a pay-as-we-go system, and we will get the roads without unnecessary payments in interest from the people's taxes.

It has been instructive to us to see where the administration stands and fights and where it merely pays lip service to programs.

It did not stand and fight on the school-aid bill. GOP Floor Leader MARTIN of Massachusetts could not possibly have led his drive to defeat it, had the full power of the White House been used with him.

But the Republican White House used all its power to kill tax relief, to kill the big Federal Hells Canyon Dam and to try to kill the social-security bill. Telephone calls went from the White House to important Members, the President's emissaries were on Capitol Hill working hard against the bills. Within an hour or two of the key Senate vote on disability insurance, four Republican Senators who had previously promised to vote for the measure felt compelled to change their minds, and the proposal barely passed. A comparable amount of pressure was applied to beating 90 percent farm-price supports.

Mr. Eisenhower was a part-time President long before his two illnesses. But the White House staff is always present—and the things the staff demands and opposes, and how it makes its desires known, how hard it fights, are the key to this administration.

Under the excellent Democratic leadership of House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, with Senator LYNDON JOHNSON in the Senate, the ordinary business of Government has been handled skillfully and speedily. The necessary appropriations bills went through this year earlier than in any year in recent history. The congressional machinery was kept in excellent condition.

My own special legislative interests have been in relation to my work as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, I arranged for an authoritative House document warning that the Soviet Union is gaining a tremendous jump in the training of engineers, scientists, and technicians.

The United States cannot afford to let the Soviets train twice as many engineers and scientists as we do—but that is what we are seeing happen.

We must have a great breakthrough in our concepts: we must spend Government money, if necessary, to encourage bright young students and to expand the scientific and engineering schools of our universities. This is a field in which budget-balancing concepts cannot be allowed to dominate.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee, I traveled to Okinawa to study the problems involved in the desire of our military forces there for more land and the need of the Okinawan people to grow crops for food. It is my hope that our report laid the basis for compromises that will let the people of the trusted island use their arable land

for food without limiting our forces to the point of weakness.

I traveled to Geneva, also, for the first United Nations conference on the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We learned there much to disturb us about Russian success in developing nuclear power reactors larger than any we yet have in this country.

I was deeply disappointed, therefore, that the Gore-Holifield bill to direct our AEC to build nuclear power reactors was beaten by the combined opposition of President Eisenhower, his Republicans in Congress, and his AEC Chairman, Admiral Lewis Strauss.

Our private utilities are not yet ready to underwrite the expense and risks involved in experimental power reactors, and the Government therefore should do the job. Eisenhower-Strauss opposition to AEC-built reactors seems grossly shortsighted in relation to Soviet advances in the nuclear power field.

Also, from the Armed Services Committee, I played some part in persuading the administration—once again—to stop cutting airpower dangerously in order to balance the budget. The administration itself asked for $1 billion more than it originally proposed this year for the services, and in Congress we added $900 million more.

The country is rich and we can afford what we must spend for defense. President Eisenhower is a military man, but when he lets budget-minded businessmen control his decisions on defense he is not acting properly in exercising the functions in the civilian high command.

We in the Congress, in any case, have our own responsibility to provide for the common defense. We cannot abdicate this responsibility—and we have not done so—to anyone else.

Hon. Clifford R. Hope

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored indeed to have the opportunity to express my feelings and to associate myself with my colleagues who have so sincerely expressed their high regard for Congressman CLIFFORD R. HOPE, who is leaving the Congress after 30 years of service.

It is with sadness and regret that we say goodbye to this great man who has so influenced agricultural legislation in the United States for more than a quarter of a century.

Congressman HOPE came into the House when we were first discussing a phase of agricultural legislation concerning price supports. This was during the days of the McNary-Haugen bill.

During my service in the House and for the past 14 years, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture, of which Mr. HOPE has either been chairman or ranking member. In this position he has had an opportunity to direct and carefully guide agricultural legislation through the committee, hearings, reports, and on the floor of the House. In every one of these positions he has discharged his obligations to his district, the State, and the country in a way that has endeared him to the hearts of all farm organizations, as well as a multitude of farm families and city consumers. Words are poor vehicles to express what this Nation, his neighbors, and his district, as well as the Members of this Congress, think of this great agricultural leader.

In the parlance of the day, he is "tops" and we shall sorely miss his counsel, his advice, and his application of his every energy to the work of agriculture to which he has directed a lifetime.

May the blessings of a kind providence guide and protect not only Congressman HOPE, but his wife and family in the days to come.

Will Strict Laws Solve the Narcotic Problem?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert herewith a letter I sent to Mr. Jess Stearn of the New York Daily News, and the text of an article he wrote called "Addict's Story: You Can Always Find a Pusher." This subject is of particular interest in view of the recent passage of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956.

The letter and article follow:

Mr. JESS STEARN,
New York Daily News, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. STEARN: I read your article in today's issue of the Daily News, Addict's Story: You Can Always Find a Pusher, and am much impressed with your series on the general subject, Will Tough Laws Curb Dope?

In view of your concern for this distressing problem I thought you might be interested in my views on one facet of the problem.

The Narcotics Control Act of 1956 has just become law. It makes the death penalty applicable to persons convicted of selling heroin to minors and increases jail sentences to a maximum of 40 years in other cases.

Admittedly, the sale and use of narcotics leading to addiction is a tragedy of horrible proportion, resulting in irreparable damage to the individual and to society. We cannot look upon the corruption of minors to drug addiction without horror. I maintain that it is our responsibility to summon all our forces to understand the cause and to effect the cure of the narcotic habit. It is a problem that, to date, has baffled us, and we are frightened. In the panic we have seized upon the death penalty as an answer to this problem.

The imposition of a death penalty brings us no closer to a solution. This is not a problem for the penologists; it is a problem for the medical men, for the psychiatrists, and for the social workers.

Advocates of the extreme penalty seem to believe that the cure of the narcotics scourge rose in proportion to the severity of punishment. This is nonsense. Incarceration is no cure, much less life imprisonment and the death penalty.

Dr. Herbert Berger, chairman of the committee on alcoholism and narcotics of the New York State Medical Society and president of the New York City Medical Society, has this to say on drug addiction:

"For more than 40 years our lawmakers and administrators have been trying to cure an illness by treating it as a crime. That illness—steadily on the increase in this country—is addiction to narcotic drugs.

"Our legalistic approach * * * has wrought its own reward. We have created a new criminal class. We have a flourishing narcotics racket. We have ever more drug addicts. Yet, in spite of the peculiar lack of success that the punitive principle has had in the narcotics field during four decades, Congress is now seeking to extend this principle. * * *"

The drug addict is mentally and emotionally ill. He requires medical attention and rehabilitation more than penal punishment. What we need desperately is to find a way to remove profit from the drug traffic. This is the heart of the matter.

I turn again to a statement by Dr. Berger:

"Since society shuns and abhors him (the drug addict), he must turn to the underworld to satisfy his demands. Its members are more than happy to comply. The profits are fabulous. Five dollars in Red China purchases an ounce of heroin. It has been sold for as much as $8,000 in New York City. Small wonder that punitive legislation has failed to remove the importer. We have created a criminal market that is both lucrative and safe. When, occasionally, one of these purveyors is caught there are always others willing to step into his place."

The seller or pusher is generally an addict himself. He sells to get money for the drug he must have. He sells to anyone, including the minor, so that he can insure himself a steady flow of customers. The death penalty will not deter him. Medical men will tell you that the compulsion of the addict is so strong that nothing deters, since the misery of doing without the drug is so intense that any risk, even death, is preferable.

It is prevention that we want, not vengeance. It is reduction of crime we seek, not retribution.

Moreover, criminologists admit that the death penalty does not reduce crime. Juries are less willing to convict and judges loathe to sentence when the possible penalty is death. The commission of first-degree murders in States barring capital punishment is no greater than in States imposing the death penalty.

Gov. Walter J. Kohler, of Wisconsin, has written:

"I have never favored capital punishment and 6 years as Governor of a State which does not impose the death penalty has merely served to reinforce that conviction. I have yet to see any evidence which indicates that the death penalty is effective as a deterrent to major crimes. * * * Here in Wisconsin all murderers who are sentenced to life terms are eventually paroled, and experience has shown that they generally establish outstanding records while on parole, ultimately are pardoned and continue to live as useful and productive citizens."

Attorney General Edmund G. Brown, of California, has stated:

"I have now been in law enforcement for some 12 years. I have grave doubts as to the efficacy of capital punishment. As a matter of fact, I think that it could well promote violence rather than deter it."

Attorney General Don Eastvold, of Washington, says:

"Those who advocate the imposition of the supreme penalty insist that it is justified as a deterrent to similar crimes. The evidence

available to support this view is not convincing."

The attorney general of Utah, E. R. Callister, states:

"My opposition to capital punishment is based on the fact that this type of punishment is not fulfilling its purpose. In other words, it does not seem to be a deterrent to crimes of violence, and in many instances relegates the convicted murderer to the position of a martyr."

The evidence mounts. The death penalty solves nothing.

In the United Kingdom the criminal addict is not recognized. Addicts are treated by physicians and given prescriptions by reputable pharmacists. As a result there are only 279 known addicts and probably very few unknown. The problem has thus been effectively removed from the realm of the underworld.

I repeat, prevention and rehabilitation are the only practical approaches. Rehabilitate the addict without drugs if you can, or with them if you must. Kill one and a dozen others spring up to take his place.

We may be gripped by the horror of the whole subject, but we must not lose sight in our outrage of what procedures would be most effective and realistic. It is too easy to sink into the clouds of emotion.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

[From the New York Daily News]

ADDICT'S STORY: YOU CAN ALWAYS FIND A PUSHER

(By Jess Stearn)

Living in the suburbs was a great inconvenience for Frankie, since he had to journey into New York every day for his shot of heroin.

"It got so that I finally had to get myself a commutation ticket," said the 23-year-old addict. "I needed every dollar I could for the drugs."

Frankie, who comes of good old-line stock, frequently varied his itinerary. Sometimes he stalked Eighth Avenue, from 14th to 59th, sometimes Broadway, and sometimes Harlem, Spanish Harlem and the old Harlem.

"It was expensive traveling," said Frankie, "but I had no choice—the stuff you got in my town was cut so much that it didn't give me a boost anymore."

Frankie never returned home without his fix. "If you look hard enough you can always find a pusher," he said. "I don't know how they do it, but they always seem able to spot me.

"The other night I thought I'd try Broadway. I was standing outside this place, minding my business, when a guy walks up to me and says:

" 'What's happening?' "

Frankie gave him a searching look.

"Nothing's shaking," he replied.

The guy was satisfied.

COMPLETES SALE IN OLD ASHCAN

"He told me to meet him in a hall around the corner, asked me for $15, and then told me I'd find what I was looking for up forward in an old ashcan."

The word dope, or heroin, was not once mentioned.

Frankie has already been in jail twice for addiction, and is not keen on taking risks, particularly since the recent congressional and State stiffening of penalties for pushers and addicts alike.

"I'd rather get all I needed every week," he said, "but I have no place to bring it but home, and my mother is always turning the house upside down looking for needles, syringes, and the stuff itself—she doesn't trust me when I say I'm off.

"I'd rather live in New York, so I wouldn't have to make that trip every day, but living home I don't pay room and board and that money goes for the stuff. As it is, my job doesn't carry it all. I make $90 a week as an electrician's helper and I need another $25 or so to buy what I need."

DAD'S ALWAYS GOOD FOR EXTRA DOUGH

"My father," he said, "is the only one in the family who has not given up on me. I can nearly always go to him and get an extra $10 or $20, saying I need it for a date.

"I don't think he believes me, but he's afraid that if he doesn't give it to me, I'll go out and get it some other way. He just says to me, 'Frankie, I hope you're telling me the truth.'

"Sometimes I feel ashamed to think I'm deceiving the only person who has any faith in me, but I've never felt so much shame that I haven't felt the need for the stuff more.

"The rest of my family are fed up with me and I don't blame them. I'm the only one that ever got into trouble or went to jail, and sometimes I wonder if I really belong in the family, since my brothers and sisters are all respectable and doing well.

"Nobody could be more patient with me than my father. If he ever gives up on me, I don't know what I'll do. Maybe it's because he was an alcoholic once, and knows what I'm going through. My mother is pleasant, but she doesn't seem much interested. I guess having a husband an alcoholic for years, and then a son an addict, sort of tires a person out after a while.

"Once I thought about trying to get into that New York hospital (Riverside) for teen-age addicts, but it didn't seem to help any of my buddies in New York. They were always swimming the river to get away from there or else shooting themselves up again. It was all right for rest, good food, and girls, I heard, but, hell, I could get all that at home."

SOMETIMES SORRY, TRIES TO QUIT IT

At regular intervals, since becoming an addict 8 years ago, Frankie is overcome by remorse and tries to quit.

"I had gone to this place because they cut the stuff right in front of you and you know you're not getting cheated. And that night I felt the need of a real stiff shot."

He grimaced as his mind went back to that night. "You never saw anything like that room before. The pusher who was an addict, had passed out and was lying on the bed. He had thrown up and he was lying in his own vomit. The stench was terrible.

"There were 3 or 4 little kids, crawling and toddling around the room, dirty and without any clothes on. You could have scraped the filth off them with a knife, and they obviously weren't housebroken.

"The mother—I guess she was the mother—was busy mixing the stuff. She had a mask over her face, so none of it would get in her nose and throat. That struck me kind of funny, a surgical mask with all that filth.

AFTER YOU GET FIX YOU JUST DON'T CARE

"I kept asking myself, as I sat there, what had ever happened to me. I came from a clean home, with clean parents, and here I was sitting in a place where things were crawling out of the walls, waiting for a fix.

"I almost got up and ran out, but all the time I was thinking of it I knew I wouldn't. As the woman was diluting the stuff, I could almost taste it. And once I got the fix, I knew I wouldn't care where I was."

Frankie shows few outward signs of addiction as yet. Except for the needle marks on his arms and his shifty eyes, I saw nothing unusual. He found it impossible to look me in the eye as he talked and he prefaced each remark with an apologetic, "I suppose you'll think I'm feeling sorry for myself, but——."

Although tall and muscular, in striking contrast to the usual frail type, he was beginning to find it increasingly difficult to handle his job.

"If I lose the job," he said, "I'm sunk, because I just have to have that money every week."

He dates occasionally, but isn't interested in women. Blushing, he acknowledged that he had never done more than casually neck with a girl, but hastened to add:

"Not that I'm funny or anything like that. But whenever I'm with girls I'm thinking of my next fix."

He has no marriage plans.

"No," he said, "I haven't thought about it in terms of making some woman unhappy. It would make me unhappy, though. I just don't see how I can support a wife—and the habit—at the same time."

And like so many of the new and growing crop of addicts he was barely in his teens when he started—just past 14.

HE'S HOOKED AND BECOMES A CROOK

He has searched for an answer himself, but hasn't found it. "It wasn't anything in my home, or like that," he said. "My mother and dad were both good to me and I had nearly anything I wanted.

"Maybe it was bad company, but they were just kids like myself. There were about a dozen guys in our crowd and we used to see each other around every night.

"When I took my first shot I didn't think I'd get hooked. Hell, I didn't see how anything like that could hook me. I got it from one of the kids in the crowd. He asked me if I wanted a thrill and I said yes. It cost me $3 for that first shot.

"I've heard a lot of stuff about pushers giving the kids the dope at first to get them hooked and then making them pay for it through the nose. But I haven't seen it work that way myself.

"I think the smart pushers don't try giving it to the kids now; most kids today would get suspicious of something they got for nothing, and pushers know that kids that get hooked will hook other kids. It makes their work easy for them."

Three months after that introductory offering, Frankie was thoroughly hooked. He had dropped out of school unknown to his parents and was engaged in a 2-man crime wave with another teen-age addict.

IN SEPARATE CELLS AND NO EXERCISE

"We did pretty good for a while," he said, "but one day without realizing it we took some stuff out of the police chief's house and there was hell to pay. They really went after us. You would have thought it was the biggest crime that ever happened. About every cop in town was on the case.

"They finally caught up to us through the pawnbroker we had peddled the stuff off to. And then they gave us a going-over until we admitted taking the stuff. By that time I would have admitted anything."

Frankie was 16 when he went to jail for the first time, charged, among other things, with addiction.

"Hell," he said, "you would have thought we were the most dangerous criminals in captivity. There were 2 or 3 of us and they put us in separate cells by ourselves and wouldn't let us out. The other prisoners exercised every day, but not us."

DO ANYTHING TO GET OFF, HE SAYS

"About every 2 or 3 weeks, they'd break down and take us out for air, and you should have seen how they guarded us. Guards stood by with sawed-off shotguns, and they had machineguns up on the walls in case we got violent.

"If it hadn't been so ridiculous it would have been comical. It shows how much they know about addicts. I've known lots of addicts and I've never known one that did anything violent—unless, of course, he was interrupted while he was stealing, or something like that.

"It's funny how they can deal with addicts all the time and know so little about them. Maybe they don't want to know. The last

time I was arrested, I'd just been picked up on suspicion. I told the judge I had been off drugs for a while, but he said he'd take the narcotics agents' word for it.

"'They're the best judge,' he said, 'of whether an addict's on drugs or not.'

"What a joke that was. They don't know any more about it than you or I do. Nobody knows anything about it. But I got sent away again, anyway. I suppose that made up for the times that nobody caught me. You get to be philosophical after a while."

Frankie suddenly paused and looked up, directing his gaze to the level of my shoulder. "Do you think," he asked, "a psychiatrist could help me?" He grimaced, "But I don't have the money."

"I don't know," I told him, "but I know a few who work with addicts and I could ask them."

I suggested he call the following afternoon.

That was 2 weeks ago and I haven't heard from Frankie. "It's lots easier," the psychiatrist said, "to talk about kicking drugs than do anything about it."

Britain, Turkey, and Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article written by Mr. Gene Rossides on the Britain, Turkey, and Cyprus question:

BRITAIN, TURKEY, AND CYPRUS

(By Gene Rossides)

Recent press dispatches have stated that the British Tory Government's efforts to get a direct international settlement for Cyprus have been thwarted by Turkey's opposition to eventual self-determination for the Cypriots. An analysis of the Turkish position and actions, and the British part therein, is important to the United States in evaluating our role in effectuating a settlement to this problem and in determining the position we should take at the next U. N. General Assembly.

The Turkish position is threefold: She wants no change in the status quo; i. e., she wants British colonial rule to continue; if there is to be a legislative assembly (she is opposed to having one), she wants the 17.5 percent Moslem minority to have 50 percent representation and if there is any change in sovereignty, it should revert to Turkey. She predicates this position on the proposition that freedom for the Cypriots resulting in union with Greece poses a security threat to Turkey. She argues additionally that Greece may be taken over by the Communists and also that if Cyprus is given its freedom the local Communists may take control.

It is important to note, at the outset, that the recent statement of the Turkish position is merely a reiteration of the stand Turkey took nearly a year ago at the London conference. On its face this position is wholly contrary to democratic government as understood by the Western democracies and in direct contradiction to the principles of the U. N. Charter to which Turkey is a signatory.

Turkey's sole security concern stems from the imperialism of the Soviet Union to the north. For Turkey to suggest that Greece, with whom she is allied in the NATO and Balkan alliances, would constitute a threat to Turkey's security of united with Cyprus, would appear to be highly unrealistic. As stated by Mr. Homer Bigart, writing from Nicosia (the New York Times, July 8, 1956, sec. E, p. 4): "for Turkey to invoke security against Greece, a country to which she is allied by two defense pacts, seems to observers here farfetched."

The compromise solution, opposed by Turkey, of military bases for Britain and freedom for the people of Cyprus, is predicated on the assumption British troops will remain. Further, whatever Greece could do from Cyprus, could be done far more effectively from the Greek mainland and the other Greek islands. As far Greece being taken over by the Communists, Turkey should not forget that Greece is the only nation in the world to have completely defeated the Communists by force of arms and that that defeat prevented the outflanking of Turkey by the Soviet Union. For the sake of argument, though, assume the Communists occupied the Greek mainland, they would still have to occupy separately the island of Cyprus, which the American and British Navies (as in the case of Formosa) and British troops on the island could prevent.

In reality, Turkey does not have any right to determine the application or nonapplication to Cyprus of the principle of self-determination as enunciated in the Atlantic and U. N. Charters.. Britain is a signatory to both charters and Turkey to the U. N. Charter. Further, in the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey—and only Turkey—specifically renounced all rights to Cyprus along with other islands and territories. Article 16 of this treaty also contains language which indicates that the future of Cyprus was "to be settled by the parties concerned." Article 16 reads as follows:

"Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present treaty and the islands, including Cyprus, other than those over which her sovereignty is recognized by the said treaty, the future of these territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned."

In addition, the Turkish element in Cyprus is in a distinct minority position, representing less than 18 percent of the population as compared to the over 80 percent Greek population. Turkey should not forget, as was pointed out by the Labor Party in the House of Commons, that the Sanjak of Alexandretta was ceded to her in 1938 simply because the Turkish population formed 60 percent of the whole and that the 40 percent minority of Arabs, Greeks, and Armenians objected unsuccessfully to the transfer. (Hansard, official report, May 5, 1955; vol. 540, ch. 1976.)

The public position of the Menderes government merely serves as a screen for the real reasons why the Turks responded with such fanaticism to Tory urging. Primarily it gave Premier Menderes an opportunity to divert attention from serious political and economic troubles at home to a foreign issue. The Atlantic Monthly issue of February 1956, in a report on Turkey states (p. 12) that Turkey's interest in Cyprus "is thought by many experienced observers to be due to the Menderes government's deliberate desire to divert public attention from a growingly serious economic situation at home."

Mr. Ray Alan in commenting on Eden's bringing Turkey "into what was strictly an Anglo-Greek question" at the London conference last year, writes the following in the Reporter magazine (June 28, 1956, p. 21):

"Unfortunately, Sir Anthony's maneuver came at a time when Turkish Premier Adnan Menderes was facing a revolt within his Democratic Party aimed against both his personal authoritarianism and his literally bankrupt economic policy. Turkey's foreign-exchange reserves were exhausted; the Turkish lira had dropped to 10 to the dollar (nominal rate 2.8); urban unemployment figures were soaring; and factories were having to restrict their output for lack of raw materials. So the Cyprus diversion was more than welcome to the Turkish regime."

And as the repected Manchester Guardian Weekly stated in its editorial of July 5, 1956:

"The Turkish Government, having muzzled its press, stifled its opposition, and, being in desperate economic straits, welcomed the opportunity of a foreign diversion. So it has been breathing fire and slaughter and asserting majority rights for its small minority in Cyprus."

In addition, Turkey may be hoping to use Cyprus as a bargaining point in her efforts to seek the large loan of $300 million from the United States. This is suggested inferentially by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger who wrote (the New York Times, May 12, 1956): "the Turkish treasury is bare. Ankara hopes for a $300 million loan from the United States—which we are reluctant to provide. Surely we might view the Turks' request more sympathetically if they realized a Cyprus settlement was logically in allied interest."

The seriousness of Turkey's economic situation was stressed in a dispatch from Ankara, dated July 13, 1956, which deals with Turkey's need for "a huge loan * * * to straighten out her finances." (The New York Times, July 24, 1956, p. 4.)

If Turkey had continued to speak about the issues involved there could have been little complaint, for truth, though momentarily blocked, will emerge from free debate. But the Turkish Government was not content with mere words and on September 6, 1955, a few days after the breakdown of the London Conference, resorted to planned atrocities against the unprotected Greek minority in Turkey which devastated the Christian and Jewish communities in Constantinople and Symrna. The Atlantic Monthly issue of February 1956 gives some details of the barbarism describing the riots as an "orgy of planned destruction" (p. 14) and directly implicating President Bayar and Prime Minister Menderes. The report states (p. 14):

"The President of the Turkish Republic, Slal Bayar, the Prime Minister, Adnan Menderes, as well as the Minister of the Interior, were in Istanbul on September 6. It was reported immediately after the riots that they had personally discussed the feasibility of an anti-Greek 'demonstration' at this time with the local governor, and that despite the latter's opposition to the idea, it was decided to stage the demonstration that night. The President and the Prime Minister boarded the train for Ankara that evening, just as the rioters were getting down to work. They were reported to have left instructions that they be kept informed of the progress of the demolition operations. On reaching Izmit, a town on the Sea of Marmara 2 hours away from Istanbul, they got off the train and rushed back to Istanbul by car to 'restore order.'

"The following morning the Prime Minister issued a communique stating that the whole thing had been a Communist plot, that a national emergency existed, and that martial law was needed to restore order. Some Communists were arrested along with a number of Turks who protested in vain that they had only been carrying out orders the night before."

The full extent of those riots, so reminiscent of other massacres by Turkey, is slowly coming to light. In an excellent article on the overall problem of Cyprus in the June 1956 issue of Harper's magazine, Mr. John Phillips, an American novelist, wrote the following description of the riots (p. 48):

"On the 5th of September 1955, a bomb exploded under singular circumstances inside the Turkish consulate at Salonika in

northern Greece. The Turkish press and radio, over which the government is influential, blared out the incendiary and false report that the nearby birthplace of Kemal Ataturk, a sort of Turkish Mount Vernon on foreign soil, had also been destroyed. The events of the following day in Turkey were planned and executed with the same discipline the Nazis used in their onslaughts on the Jews. Squads of marauders were driven to the shopping area in trucks and taxis, waving picks and crowbars, consulting lists of addresses, and the police stood smiling by. Greek priests were reported circumcised, scalped, burned in bed; Greek women raped. The Greek consulate was destroyed in Izmir. Just 9 out of 80 Greek Orthodox churches in Istanbul were left undesecrated; 29 were demolished. Ghouls invaded the hugh Greek cemetery where the patriarchs of Constantinople are buried, opened mausoleums, dug up graves, and flung bones in the streets; corpses awaiting burial were lanced with knives. There had been no comparable destruction of Greek sanctuaries since the fall of Constantinople.

"The Turkish Government did its best to keep the world from knowing. A familiar heavy hand fell upon the press, and editors who criticized President Menderes were jailed again. Despite advance knowledge that there would be demonstrations, Turkish authorities had not dreamed they would come to this. Hikmet Bil and his party were made the scapegoats, along with the Communists, although the government had boasted for 14 years that there were no Communists in Turkey."

Those riots, for which Britain must bear part of the responsibility, brought the Balkan alliance to a standstill. In 1 night the Turks ruined the work of their great leader, Kemal Ataturk, who, over 25 years ago with Eleftherios Venizelos, initiated Greek-Turkish friendship. The restoration of that friendship will take many years.

Turkey's irresponsible behavior in the Cyprus matter calls for a basic reexamination by the United States of Turkey's role in the defense of the free world. In addition we have the even more serious problem of Turkish retrogression in regard to democratic development. The New York Times in an editorial entitled "What's Wrong With Turkey?" wrote (June 29, 1956):

"The government of Premier Adnan Menderes is not making friends or inspiring admiration here by its recent drift toward dictatorial methods. There have been several symptoms of this drift, including a 50 percent increase in the cost of newsprint imposed last February in an obvious attempt to shackle the press. In Cyprus the Ankara government has interfered with the efforts of the British to make peace with the overwhelming Greek majority. Three weeks ago Premier Menderes rushed through the national assembly a law against 'false news' that might damage public confidence in the government. Under this law newspapers can be suppressed and reporters, including foreign correspondents, can be imprisoned. This week Premier Menderes has procured a law that would effectively prevent anti-Menderes political meetings.

"Such tactics as these have become tolerably familiar during the generation since Mussolini marched into Rome, setting a pattern imitated by a flock of big and little dictators. We have had, and still have, some of these in our own hemisphere. We cooperate under necessity, with some of them, as in Spain. But we don't admire them anywhere. It is to be hoped that Premier Menderes isn't setting off on this tragic road, whose only end can be frustration and defeat."

In connection with the large loan sought by Turkey it should be a condition in addition to the regular safeguards which Turkey has to date refused to comply with, that she withdraw her spurious objections in the Cyprus dispute and recognize the right of the people of Cyprus to self-determination. Indeed, it would appear to have been wise on our part if, in arranging several months ago for the World Bank loan of $35 million to Turkey, we insisted that she pay full attention to the real danger from the north, instead of setting up straws in the wind.

It is well for us to understand that Russia is Turkey's traditional foe and is today Turkey's sole security threat. For self-preservation Turkey is bound to oppose that threat. There is no sound reason for us to sacrifice American principles and prestige to Turkey's authoritarian methods. We should not let the combat record of a few thousand Turkish troops in Korea blind us to Turkey's economic weakness, and her moral and political deficiencies.

The major responsibility, though, for the weakening of NATO, the disruption of the Balkan alliance and the unleashing of hatreds lies with the British Tory Government. For over 2½ years they have refused to accept the relatively simple compromise offer entailing military bases for Britain and self-determination for the people of Cyprus. Realizing their position was extremely weak, particularly as Greece was a NATO ally, the Tories deliberately fostered and promoted Turkish opposition. Although for years Britain flatly refused to discuss the situation with Greece, 6 days after Greece initially requested that the U. N. consider the colonial issue of Cyprus, a dispatch from Istanbul reported that "Britain and Turkey have agreed to follow the same line in the Cyprus question." (The New York Times, August 28, 1954.)

Mr. Ray Alan writes the following in the Reporter magazine (June 28, 1956, p. 21) concerning the London Conference held August 30, 1955:

"Sir Anthony Eden deliberately brought Turkey into what was strictly an Anglo-Greek question at his ill-fated London conference last year. As the conservative Spectator commented, it was like trying to patch up a broken marriage in the presence of the corespondent. Turkey renounced all interest in Cyprus after the First World War. Neither Turks nor anyone else had ever suggested that the Turkish minority in a Greek-governed Cyprus might be ill treated."

In this regard it is important to recall Mr. C. L. Sulzberger's comments concerning Britain's negotiations with Turkey designed to obtain the open opposition of Turkey to self-determination for Cyprus. He wrote (the New York Times, August 24, 1955):

"The British privately encouraged the Turks to express their interests. That was all Ankara needed. Ever since Turkey has been whipping itself into a frenzy over Cyprus. Instead of being dismayed, the British Foreign Office—which had taken over the hot potato from the Colonial Office—was pleased to cite Turkey's arguments as further excuse for doing nothing about changing the island's status."

Is it any wonder that the Greek Cypriots, experiencing Tory duplicity, have no faith in British generalities and, during the negotiations between Archbishop Makarios and Field Marshal Harding, asked for specific details of the offer of self-government and for assurances that would guarantee democratic government?

The same Tory leaders have indicated no willingness to repudiate the Turkish position, a position which is in direct conflict with democratic principles and which contradicts the principles of the Atlantic and U. N. Charters, to which Britain is a signatory. In addition the Tories have studiously avoided mentioning the fact that in article 16 of the Lausanne Treaty of 1923, Turkey specifically renounced all rights to Cyprus. The present withdrawal of the offer of self-determination is in line with the Tory government's previous action and further justifies the Greek Cypriots' lack of trust in Tory good faith.

America's greatest weapon in the struggle against communism is the concept of freedom. The rule by force of a mature people who can govern themselves is the worst form of colonialism. Continued British sovereignty makes a mockery of the moral position of the West, particularly as regards the satellite nations. We must correlate our Cyprus policy with our overall policy of promoting freedom while combating tyranny and imperialism whether of the Soviet or Western variety. The Soviet Union may be the worst and most dangerous embodiment of these evils but that does not lessen the loss of prestige for the United States, as the leader of the free world, resulting from the colonial actions of the British Tory Government.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1956.*

Hon. Clifford R. Hope

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of CLIFF HOPE, of Kansas, from Congress brings to a close a tenure of congressional service to the Nation which I believe can best be described as one devoted to the preservation of the American system. He has performed his duties as Congressman with great integrity and energy. Without fear of contradiction it can be stated that all Kansas is proud of CLIFF, they regret his leaving the Halls of Congress, but they are glad he is coming back to Kansas to stay for a while.

One could discuss at great length the outstanding accomplishments of CLIFF HOPE. For nearly 30 years he has played a major role in the formulation of all agricultural legislation. He introduced the original domestic allotment bill, most of which is now embodied in the present farm program. He sponsored the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. This legislation is recognized as one of the greatest advancements in agricultural research since the establishment of the Department of Agriculture. He was the author of the Extension Service consolidation bill, which is an outstanding contribution to Extension Service legislation. He is an authority in the field of conservation. Another milestone in his career on the Agriculture Committee came with the passage of the act establishing the upstream watershed program. He again exhibited his outstanding ability with the passage of the Farm Credit Act of 1953, which increased the farmer ownership and control of the Federal farm credit system.

These are only a few of his many accomplishments in the field of agricultural legislation. Senator FRANK CARLSON has made an excellent presentation of CLIFF HOPE'S devotion to duty and his outstanding accomplishments. This was done in a speech given on May 3, 1956, at the testimonial dinner in honor of CLIFF

HOPE given by officials and employees of the Department of Agriculture. Senator CARLSON'S speech follows:

When my close and trustworthy friend, CLIFF HOPE, told me several months ago he was retiring from public service, my reaction was one later shared by the people of his home district and farm families everywhere, one of dismay and deep regret. I still feel the hard-pressed farmers of the Nation are losing a great champion, but in all fairness I must say retirement was never more richly deserved.

Congressman HOPE has served the Fifth Congressional District of our home State through 30 of this country's most turbulent, trying and revolutionary years. He has served it in a way to win the respect and affection of his constituents and colleagues alike. He has won his place and held it because he has kept mental pace with the fast-changing times. We all recognize that many of his sound views on agriculture are of such far-sighted nature they will not be officially accepted until some future date, after his retirement. It is a sad fact that true progress is slow to evolve and that many times deserved credit is not given to men like CLIFF HOPE who tediously pioneer the way to better living.

There are many high points in his enviable 30-year career, but the ones to which CLIFF HOPE himself points with quiet pride are those concerning soil and water conservation legislation, and laws to promote agricultural research—particularly in the area of marketing research. His first major effort in this field came in 1935, when he was responsible in large measure for the original Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, the forerunner of much of the Nation's farm program today.

Another milestone came just a little more than 2 years ago with the passage of the Hope-Aiken Act to establish the small watershed program.

As chairman of the House Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress, he also established the insured-loan program for soil and water conservation, a program which is developing slowly but which has great long-range possibilities. He is still working on better means for marketing farm products, a job which had its first major impetus with passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, which he coauthored.

A newspaper in Congressman HOPE'S home district summed up his career in these words: "The most amazing facet to his career is that not since his first election has his vote-getting power been seriously challenged, nor his reputation as the friend of the farmer been seriously questioned." Truer words were never written, and I think they are a fitting testimonial to Mr. HOPE'S abilities.

Congressman HOPE entered the political arena as a representative in the Kansas Legislature in 1920. He was reelected to that post in 1922 and 1924, serving as speaker pro tempore in the 1923 session and speaker of the house in 1925–26. He has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture continuously since entering Congress in 1927, and was chairman of this committee during the 80th and 83d Congresses. He has been the ranking Republican Member since 1932. It is truly a distinguished record of service.

Although agriculture has been his principal field, Congressman HOPE has had numerous other chores in Washington. He has served as a member of the Labor Committee and was appointed to several special committees, including the vital Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the 78th Congress. He visited and made economic surveys of Russia, Iran, Egypt, Greece, Italy, and most of Western Europe in 1945 in connection with this latter work.

And now the CLIFF HOPE public-service story, which had its start with a small-town plains lawyer battling his way through a tough Republican primary to become the Representative of his neighbors, is drawing to a close. The last political chapter reveals CLIFF at the height of his popularity and respect, with a reputation for legislative action—particularly farm legislation—that has been consistently astute, farsighted, and fair. Even now, when he could easily taper off his heavy schedule of congressional activities in view of his announced retirement, CLIFF HOPE remains one of the most conscientious, responsible, and hard-working men on Capitol Hill. He is still keeping trust with the remarkable faith his constituents and the American farmer have shown him.

I, for one, will sorely miss his wise counsel and personal friendship here on Capitol Hill. And I am convinced that in the years ahead we all will realize more fully what major contributions he has made to the economic welfare of the Nation.

Ohio Roads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President the recent action of the Congress in enacting a major road building plan has focussed public attention upon the highway program of each State. In the last analysis, the success or failure of the entire national project must depend upon the effectiveness of the work done by State highway departments. Intelligent planning and execution are essential.

One of the most illuminating examples of deficiencies in planning, foresight, and performance in the entire Nation comes from the State of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to insert a discussion of Ohio's roads into the Appendix of the RECORD as an object lesson to the other States. The writer of the article, Mr. Phil W. Porter is one of the most penetrating and reliable students of government in the State of Ohio.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTER ON OHIO ROADS—STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS FINALLY STIR THEIR STUMPS AFTER UNITED STATES WAVES BANK ROLL

(By Philip W. Porter)

It's comforting that roadbuilding public officials, now that Congress has voted umpteen billions for intercity highways adequate for our population and traffic density, are talking about putting the show on the road quickly. For during the last 10 years or so, the Ohio Highway Department has been a marvel of ineptitude.

Any careful, impartial examination reveals that the State highway department has consistently been too penurious, too hesitant, too late, too shortsighted. It hasn't even begun to cope with the urgent necessity of providing roads for this heavily populated industrial area, where adequate highways are the breath of commercial life.

People who must drive a lot in business, travelers who have had a lot of experience in other populous States, long-distance truck drivers, all will tell you—in fact, have been cursing about it for years—what a lousy set of main roads Ohio has in comparison to other big States. Good secondary roads are plentiful, but main roads, oh brother. They are 2 lane and 3 lane where they should have been 4 lane at least 5 years ago. They are accident traps. They're 20 years out of date.

THEY WERE GOOD ONCE

Back in the thirties, we used to believe Ohio had a fine road system. The main highways had been fairly recently built; the secondary roads were all new, because a disproportionate amount of dough had been made available for them by rurally dominated legislatures. But today it's the midfifties; the population has increased tremendously, the auto and truck registrations have just about doubled, the accidents have zoomed alarmingly. Isn't it time the State government got off its bucket and started doing the job it's charged with doing, paid to do, and took an oath to do?

Right after the war, when new road costs began to rise alarmingly, adequate funds to do a big job apparently were not available. A sort of shellshock seemed to spread over the State offices, from Governor Lausche on down to the men on the drafting boards. If there wasn't enough "dough" to do the job, why do anything much? That seemed to be the attitude. Aside from patching up and doing a little spot widening here and there, nothing of importance, to accommodate the big trucks, to make roads wide enough for motorists to pass them, to handle the swarm of new cars, was done.

NO GOOD EXCUSE

But lack of money cannot be the excuse for the dismal flop of the last 3 years. A bond issue of 500 million "bucks" for roads was voted up in 1952. You might have thought Governor Lausche and the Highway Director Linzell, under this mandate, would have knocked themselves out to provide plans, buy right-of-way, expedite allocations from the Federal Government—in short, have the whole bundle on high priority ready to move in on and let contracts. Actually, they seemed afraid to spend the money—or didn't know how. For the first couple of years, the department was a study in slow motion. They didn't think big at all, or plan in advance. They didn't have enough right-of-way purchasers, they couldn't hire 'em. They couldn't hire enough engineers or draftsmen. They didn't get the contracts out for bidding in time. At the end of the first couple of years they didn't even have plans made to spend half the $500 million. Even today they haven't even programed $168 million. How come?

TURN HEAT ON

It's perfectly true that building State roads, even spending State highway funds, is a much more complicated business than spending private funds. Letting of contracts legally after advertising for bids is a tiresome job. But there's nothing in the law that requires a highway director to proceed at a snail's pace, or to prevent a governor from injecting some turpentine in the proper places by sacking the laggards. Yet somehow or other, till comparatively recently, public opinion has not given either the governor or the highway director the "hotfoot" for this failure. The motorists have not organized themselves; were this the twenties the auto clubs of the State would be hollering bloody murder about the poor job done in Columbus.

The building of the Ohio Turnpike temporarily took the heat off the sad condition of the rest of the State highway system, such heavily-traveled main roads as No. 42, No. 14, No. 20, No. 2, with which all of us around here are painfully familiar. But it won't stay off forever.

The principal functions of the State government lie in the fields of education, welfare, and roads. Education in State-supported colleges is usually well provided for, because the college presidents have an excellent lobby. Until just the last couple of years, Ohio's care of mental patients has been a shameful flop. Its production of roads still is.

Some Atomic Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. BEAMER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial from the Indianapolis Star dated July 26, 1956.

It is hoped that the good sound constitutional government that has made this country great can be maintained instead of a nationalization and socialization of industry as was proposed in the instances that prompted this excellent expression.

SOME ATOMIC SANITY

Back-door socialism had the shutters slammed in its face Wednesday. The House of Representatives voted 203 to 191 against a bill that would have put the Federal Government on the road to a monopoly in the electric power business. It was the proposal to spend $400 million of the people's money to build a network of atomic-powered electric generating plants across the country.

Today's Socialists are careful never to label their schemes too plainly. They know that socialism as such is unpopular. The atomic powerplant idea, therefore, was paraded before the public gaze as a plan to keep this country abreast of others in atomic research. The familiar, phony cry was raised that it was necessary to keep Russia from giving us a drubbing in atomic discoveries.

Even the Atomic Energy Commission had frowned on that argument. The fact is that when blueprints are drawn and construction started on half a dozen atomic energy plants, research is frozen right there. Permanent reactors are built on the basis of knowledge already available at the time construction starts.

The only possible logical reason for building a chain of atomic powerplants across the Nation on the scale proposed in the House bill would be to develop electrical power. Since power from atomic sources is three times more costly than steam-generated power, it appears that the bill had no other purpose than to put the Federal Government in a monopoly position against the day when atomic power does become economically feasible.

Ever since electricity became a dominant necessity in industrial life, Socialists have viewed its control by Government as their top objective. Through its distribution, they could control also the placement, size, and type of industry in any region. At bottom, this provides the reason for the bitter, continuing struggle by Socialists and their dupes in behalf of public power. It is a primary reason as well for their vehemence in favor of federalizing such projects as the Hells Canyon and Snake River Dams. At one time during the New Deal days there existed in the Interior Department a complete schedule for interlocking Federal power authorities across the whole of the United States.

The Indiana delegation in the House of Representatives deserves praise for its decisive vote in defeating the fraudulent atomic generating scheme. Hoosiers in the House voted 10 to 1 against the bill. Its only supporter from this State was Democratic Congressman RAY J. MADDEN, of Gary.

Atomic research is a legitimate Federal operation, although even there private industry might go further, faster, if security needs allowed it full access to all atomic data. But atomic development for industrial use is another matter. Atomic processes which are so well know that they can be put to industrial use will be better handled, and will do the public far more good, if left to the kind of private initiative which reacts to public demand.

The House was on the right track in killing the federalized atomic power scheme.

Benefits for Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, much constructive action was taken by the 84th Congress in behalf of Alaska. Some of the legislation passed and signed into law certainly ranks as equal in importance to any adopted since the Organic Act of 1912.

Of course, the order of importance is a matter of subjective judgment. To the man seeking a homestead title which he could obtain only by action of Congress, certainly the legislation of most particular consequence would be the bill concerning him personally. However, in the broader field affecting the general public interest, there were four legislative gains long-needed by the Territory, the effects of which will be beneficial and lasting.

Without attempting to assign any order of priority in respect to these four, I immediately think of the Alaska Mental Health Act. That law, long sought and achieved after almost incredible difficulty, places legislative responsibility for the care of Alaska's mentally ill where it properly should be—with the Territorial government. It provides that the ultimate taking over by the Territory of the financial costs with temporary grants-in-aid and help in building institutions coming from the Federal Government. It also permits commitment procedures to be established by the Territory.

Then, of course, Alaska's inclusion in the Federal-Aid Highway System through adoption of an amendment to the National Highway Act of 1956 is really monumental. Before this time Alaska only among the States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico was denied the benefits of the national law. Now we can go forward and build the roads which are so necessary to the opening up for settlement of the vast country.

Next, the 84th Congress gave the Territorial government authority for the first time to issue bonds for needed public improvements. The people of Alaska in a referendum vote previously taken had sought the right to issue bonds for school buildings. The law was enlarged in scope to include other public improvements and will, I am confident, serve a most useful purpose.

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress a bill was enacted into law abolishing the 80-rod shore-space reservation. This had been a barrier to settlement and its repeal had long been sought. The old law provided that homesteads, for example, on shore space of whatever kind it might have been, must be separated by at least a quarter of a mile. It is not necessary to point out how crippling this was in a country with such vast expanses of shorelands. True enough, the old law provided that the Secretary of the Interior had the right to waive the requirement, but Alaskans are mindful that for a long period no such waiver was granted and that circumstance might rise again, so the law repealing the 80-rod provision was a desired and a welcome one.

In the 2 sessions of the last Congress appropriations amounting to $304,025,774 were made for operations of the Federal Government in Alaska.

Of especial significance was the fact that a breakthrough came in respect to appropriations for desperately needed river and harbor projects in Alaska. In the first session, the President's budget message had asked for funds for the Seward Harbor of Refuge and for planning flood-control work on Gold Creek, in Juneau. But the Congress made additional appropriations and as a consequence small boat harbors are being built in Petersburg, Metlakatla, and Wrangell. This year the President's budget message asked for money for the Bar Point river and harbor project at Ketchikan, for the Gold Creek flood-control work and the Valdez breakwaters. Again Congress, on its own motion, made additional projects possible. This means that the small boat basin and breakwater at Pelican will be constructed soon; that Craig will have a mooring basin; that the Elfin Cove channel will be deepened; that the Kodiak small boat basin will be started with an initial appropriation of $500,000; and that further planning will be done with respect to the needed small boat basin at Sitka. I am also delighted to report that the House Public Works Committee approved my resolution to make possible a flood survey of the Matanuska River. Also, and in this same field, the omnibus navigation and flood-control legislation of the 84th Congress authorized navigation and flood-control projects for Juneau, Douglas, Naknek River, Dillingham, and the Chena River.

A new Alaska native health service 50-bed hospital at Kotzebue will be constructed, thanks to appropriations made by the 84th Congress.

The Housing Act of 1956 will be of real benefit to Alaska because it lifts the ceiling of $15,000 on Federal National Mortgage Association mortgages for Alaska and extends to the Territory loans under the public facilities program.

These are only a few of the legislative aids given to Alaska by this Congress so recently adjourned.

I am proud to say that there were enacted in the 84th Congress 26 public laws which either bore my name or were introduced in the Senate at my request.

The same two sessions witnessed the enactment of 19 private bills introduced by me. Especially heart-warming so far as I was personally concerned was the legislation which permitted a young Filipino resident of Ketchikan to become a citizen of the United States and another private bill which will make it possible for Miss Sue Kennedy, of Juneau to bring two Greek children she has adopted to Alaska. These do not fall, naturally enough, in the list of accomplishment affecting broad groups of people, but I assure you that they bring a glow to one such as myself who is able to make a contribution in bringing happiness to individual human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken about how many bills I sponsored in the 84th Congress which have become law. It might be of interest to record that since I came here in the 79th Congress and including the 84th, 109 bills of mine or their companions in the Senate have become public laws and 55 private bills introduced by me were enacted, making a grand total of 164.

Mr. Speaker, I am sensible of the fact that all these bills for Alaska were translated from mere words into the law books of the United States through splendid cooperation which has been given me. I appreciate it very deeply. This cooperation has come from both sides of the political aisle. For my own personal part during the almost 12 years I have been in Washington seeking to serve the people of Alaska I have come to hold in ever-increasing respect and affection those Members, both Democratic and Republican, who have given so freely of their time and assistance in bringing about legislative gains for a Territory and people so distant from so many of them. Their friendship has been not only a continuous pleasure to me but has been vitally important to the welfare of the Territory of Alaska.

The Republican Party on Its Record Is the Economy Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I take this time to point out that Government reports covering appropriations for the past 12 fiscal years establish beyond question that the Republican Party by its record is entitled to be known as the economy party. I make this statement because of the records established by the Republican-controlled 80th and 83d Congresses.

According to Senate Document No. 158 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, the 80th Congress reduced the appropriations for fiscal 1948 and 1949 approximately $28 billion below the appropriations by the 79th Congress.

The 83d Congress reduced the appropriations more than $63 billion below the totals appropriated by the 82d Congress.

In the past 25 fiscal years our Federal budget has been balanced but three times, twice during the 80th Congress and again this year under the administration of President Eisenhower.

The table which follows show the amounts appropriated in each of the past 12 fiscal years, and was compiled by Mr. Paul O. Peters, of my office staff:

Appropriations, excluding payments from trust funds

DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
79th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1946	$69,780,137,109
2d sess., fiscal 1947	35,734,209,165
Total	105,514,346,275
REPUBLICAN CONGRESS	
80th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1948	35,982,887,708
2d sess., fiscal 1949	41,675,480,957
Total	77,658,368,665
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
81st Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1950	46,497,456,897
2d sess., fiscal 1951	81,045,040,411
Total	127,542,497,308
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
82d Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1952	101,117,768,897
2d sess., fiscal 1953	85,999,646,411
Total	187,117,415,308
REPUBLICAN CONGRESS	
83d Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1954	65,156,254,797
2d sess., fiscal 1955	58,160,445,563
Total	123,316,700,360
DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS	
84th Cong.:	
1st sess., fiscal 1956	60,428,197,491
2d sess., fiscal 1957	68,138,077,423
Total	128,566,274,914
Grand total of appropriations	749,715,602,829

The appropriations during the 12 years exclude approximately $83,325,000,000 payable from trust fund receipts.

Appropriations by the 82d Congress were the greatest in history except for the $204,863,924,329 appropriated by the wartime 77th Congress.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Montana-Canadian Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on Montana-Canadian relations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA-CANADIAN RELATIONS

Mr. President, in this world of cold wars, border patrols, uprisings, and international tensions, there is one place where peace is real and lasting. That is the border between the United States and Canada.

The frontier stretches from Puget Sound along the 49th parallel, the Great Lakes, and Maine—without a soldier, warship, or fence to be found. People visit back and forth like neighbors. In brief, it is one of the few places in the world where disarmament between two countries has actually worked.

The State of Montana is an important part of this 4,000-mile frontier; and, following true to form, people and goods from Montana and the neighboring Provinces of British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan are flowing back and forth across the boundary in ever-increasing numbers. In fact, Canada is proving to be one of Montana's best customers.

Canadians spent an estimated $16 million in Montana during 1955. They are expected to spend even more this year, according to Department of Commerce figures. The Departmental studies show that more than 23 million Canadians visited the United States in 1954.

About 14 million came by automobile alone. While the stay was short for many, 3 million Canadians stayed for 3 days or longer. The traffic to and from Canada is beginning to have more and more significance.

Vast distances, poor roads, forests and mountain ranges, all tend to isolate Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta from the more populated and industrilalized areas on the eastern and western coasts of Canada.

People in the Prairie Provinces, as a result, find themselves drawn more and more toward north central United States. This friendly relationship is a two-way street and Montanans are becoming concerned that they are not living up to their part.

With this view in mind the Montana Chamber of Commerce has planned an all-Montana-Canadian relations tour for a week during August. All major communities in Montana are participating in the large caravan of Montana cars which will tour Alberta and Saskatchewan.

A. W. Johnson, president of the Montana Chamber of Commerce, estimates that the tour will be the biggest mass good will Canadian visit any State has attempted.

Montana Day events are being planned in every city along the tour route. The meeting of Montanans and Canadians will be strictly informal. The purpose of the tour is multipurpose, but generally designed to show our Canadian neighbors an expression of our good will and desire to further cement the growing Montana-Canadian relations.

The need for greater Montana-Canadian relations has expanded in recent years. And it is the feeling of Montanans that they should be organized in an all-out effort to thank our Canadian neighbors for the trade they have given in the past and to open the door even further for the future.

The small Montana towns along the boundary are fine examples of how two nations and two peoples have learned to live together in peace. There is completely free interchange and cooperation in civic matters extending from emergencies to civic entertainment. In some instances farmers till land on both sides of the border.

Though the 4,000-mile frontier stands as a monument to peace, there are still occasional differences of opinion and even sharp disputes, over investment, tariffs, international water rights, and the fact that the Canadians at times feel they are being taken too much for granted.

However, whatever the dispute, people on both sides of the border are assured that it will be settled at the conference table and not on the battlefield.

Montana has a great deal at stake in its relations with its neighboring Canadian Provinces—as much, if not more than any State along the frontier. It is quite important that the current relationship be preserved and improved upon in the future.

The strengthening of this two-way street between Canada and Montana can be exemplified by increased trade, expanded north-south transportation with new highways and airlines, agricultural and livestock cooperation, and expanded tourist travel.

Conditions in Some Soviet Slave Labor Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, through my friend, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, and also chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, I have received some interesting information with regard to conditions in some slave labor camps in Russia. For some time I have been aware of the struggle of the Ukrainian nation for its independence and sovereignty. This struggle appears to be continuing in all its vigor even though the Ukraine itself is incorporated as a part of the U. S. S. R. The history of the past 36 years is replete with Ukrainian rebellions and unrest in the Soviet Union.

Through the efforts of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, of which Dr. Dobriansky is chairman, I have received copies of certain important documents written by Ukrainian political prisoners in the special Soviet concentration camp in Mordavia, located about 400 miles southeast of Moscow. The originals, written in September and October, 1955, are pieces of linen cloth which were funneled through the Ukrainian underground to the the Foreign Representation of the Supreme Ukrainian Council in Western Europe. This council, I am advised, was founded in 1944 as the governing body of the Ukrainian people's liberation movement against the Nazis and Bolsheviks, and is still very active in the Ukraine.

One of the documents which was brought to my attention, is addressed to the Committee on Human Rights in the U. N., and requests an investigation of the Soviet cruelties in the forced labor camps. The other document is an appeal to the Ukrainian emigres by some prisoners in these camps to inform the free world of their plight.

As this information is of interest to all of us illustrating the cruelties of the Soviet Union to those who attempt to revolt against its domination, I ask unanimous consent that the translations be incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE UNITED NATIONS, DIVISION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, AND TO THE ENTIRE CIVILIZED WORLD FROM THE PRISONERS IN CAMPS IN THE U. S. S. R.

We, the prisoners in Mordovian special camps, wish to bring the following statement to the attention of the entire civilized world. We Ukrainians are in favor of any movement whose aims are freedom and truth; we advocate cultural progress in all walks of life; and we stand behind self-determination for all nations, including the United Ukrainian State.

We have no desire to exaggerate the facts of the situation that has existed in Ukraine for a long time. We do not ask for mercy or for pardon. We demand our right to live under laws that should be recognized by the entire civilized world—the world of 20th century civilization. This century has been spearheaded by a number of humanitarian organizations, from small groups on up through national leaders. They include the great worldwide organization, the United Nations. Our Ukrainian nation, like a number of other nations, has come under the conquering heel of Red Russia. We have been deprived of the basic rights of existence. We have been driven into camps, with severe sentences from 10 to 25 years—not for criminal acts, as the Bolsheviks maintain before the rest of the world; not for arson, treason, or murder; but because we, like every freedom-loving people, demand our lawful rights in our own land.

The question therefore arises: Does the civilized world know about the conditions prevailing not only among us prisoners, but throughout our country? Does the civilized world know that, when we have served our sentences, we are exiled to the so-called virgin lands of Kazakhstan, Krasnoyarsk, and the far north—while they proclaim that it is volunteers and members of the Komsomol who go out to those areas.

Can the civilized world conceive of Ukrainian sovereignty without a Ukrainian government, without a Ukrainian army, and without the Ukrainian people? If Ukraine is sovereign—and she should be—why is there no army composed exclusively of Ukrainians? Why do Ukrainians serve their terms in the army beyond the borders of their country? Why are military units, composed of Russians and other nationalities to whom the interests of the Ukrainian people are alien, if not directly hostile, stationed in our country? If we are traitors and if our punishment is just, why were we tried by peoples' or military courts, whose composition is certainly not Ukrainian? Why do we not serve our terms on Ukrainian territory, which was ravaged by the last war and is in need of reconstruction? Why do we have to work at the cultivation of wild, remote lands and forests, when there is such a need for our forces at home?

Does the civilized world know that, over the mass burial sites of the prison camps, new camps and cities are built, canals are dug, and stadiums are erected, in order to obliterate the traces of these crimes? In Abez' (Komi ASSR) Camps 1, 4, and 5 stand on former cemeteries. At Zavod 5 in Leplya (Mordovskaya ASSR), the first and second polishing shops, the technical laboratory, and the forge were erected on human bones. Does the world know about the mass executions of prisoners who only demanded their rights as political internees (at Mine 29 in Vorkuta, Attorney-General Rudenko was in charge of the firing squads). Is it known that, in Kingir (Post Office Box 392, Colonies 1 and 3, Kazakhstan), men and women demanding their lawful rights were charged by four tanks and crushed by them?

Does the civilized world know that Ukraine has suffered starvation for 38 years, in addition to the artificial famine of 1933; that western Ukraine has been inundated by floods, and that the people have been condemned to death by starvation, with no hope of aid from "humanitarian, peace-loving" Communist Russia? This, at a time when millions of tons of grain are exported abroad for propaganda purposes, when all sorts of foreign delegations visit model collective farms (special display models) and factories in the U. S. S. R.

In the postwar period, 1945–55, Russia has raised the level of light and heavy industry beyond the prewar level. This was accomplished by the toll of millions of prisoners. Those prisoners raised the issue of improved living conditions, an improvement essential for any creature that breathes air (after between 9 and 11 hours of work in the mines, the prisoners were shut up like cattle in close, smelly barracks furnished with the well-known slop buckets). Some of these prisoners were shot, others were crushed by tanks. Many of them received additional sentences of from 10 to 25 years and were put in jail, where they are to this day.

This is addressed to the civilized world of the 20th century, a century of education and progress. We feel certain that anyone who reads these lines will experience revolt and contempt for the "just and humanitarian" Communist Party of Russia and crimes committed against the nations she has enslaved.

We are not discouraged, because we know that our will for freedom is founded on natural law, and we believe that the entire civilized world will uphold us in our course.

Bearing in mind the foregoing points, we—the prisoners in Mordovian special camps—have adopted the following resolution:

I

1. A commission is to be appointed for precise verification of the facts as we have stated them: That Attorney General Rudenko and Deputy Minister of the MVD, Maslennikov, were distinguished by the cruelty of their conduct in Vorkuta and Noril'sk in 1953, and in Karaganda in 1954.

2. The fact that camps 1, 4, and 5 in Abez' (Komi ASSR) and Zavod 5 (Mordovskaya ASSR) were built on cemetery grounds is to be verified. Similar cases are not hard to find; there are 44 such camps in this area.

3. We demand that the cemeteries be put in order, that the buildings and plants on them be razed, and that memorials be erected to the dead, as a symbol of perpetual shame to Red slaveholders. Since members of all nationalities of the world are numbered among the dead, a special international organization is to be established for the purpose of erecting these memorials.

4. We demand comprehensive social security for the orphans, widows, and parents (if they are not fit for work) of these victims of cruel injustice; also for those persons and their families who incurred complete physical disability in camps and are unable to provide for themselves and their families.

5. Since an entire family is held responsible for an offense committed by one member (they are all subject to exile, deportation, confiscation of property) and a man's grandson as well as his son may suffer because of an act he himself has committed, there have appeared castes of reliables and unreliables. The unreliables live under constant oppression, persecution, and misery. We therefore demand that these people be given back their rights as human beings, that they receive social security, and that they be permitted to return to their countries.

6. We demand that all persons who have served out their sentences be permitted to return to their native lands. We protest the passing of sentences to 25 years on a mass basis, because such a sentence is a sentence for life.

7. All persons who underwent a second trial and were then transferred from camp to jail because of their participation in camp strikes or in any other form of mass or individual protest against the violation of

their rights as political prisoners are to be released from jail and to have their sentences annulled.

8. All desert lands, pits, mines, and forests that became part of the U. S. S. R. after their discovery or cultivation are to belong to the nations whose sons and daughters worked on them and strewed them with their bones.

II

1. We demand the establishment of an international control commission charged with the fair distribution of aid earmarked for underdeveloped countries and for disaster areas including the U. S. S. R.

2. We are wholeheartedly in favor of extending aid to all those who need it—regardless of their nationality, religion, race, or political convictions. But we cannot agree that bread should be torn from the mouths of the starving and sent abroad as aid, when it is really for purposes of propaganda. This is done in the Soviet Union, at a time when millions of people are starving.

III

1. Whereas every criminal act against the enslaved nations is perpetrated with the knowledge of the Politburo and of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we demand that the entire ruling class of the Soviet Union be brought before international justice.

2. Yezhov, Beria, Abakumov, and others, whose execution was ordered by the security organs in order to deceive people at home and abroad, cannot be made to hold full responsibility for everything, because crimes against the enslaved nations continue to be perpetrated.

IV

We, Ukrainians, make the following demands on purely nationalist grounds:

1. All Russian nationals shall be required to leave Ukrainian territory. They will not be permitted to return until such time as Russia abandons her dream of denationalization, assimilation, and of eventually devouring Ukraine—until she ceases to regard herself as big brother. It is a distortion of reality and of historical fact to speak of "the union of Ukraine with Russia." Ukraine has always been cruelly enslaved by Russia.

2. We concede the right of other nationals—unless they have been sent by the Russian Government for aggressive purposes—to live on Ukrainian territory, enjoying equal rights with the Ukrainian people. Russians may live there only when they begin to be governed by general standards of morality.

3. As long as there are armed forces in the world, the only units stationed in Ukraine are to be composed exclusively of Ukrainians and under the command of Ukrainians; all soldiers and commanders not of Ukrainian extraction are to be withdrawn beyond the borders of our country. This also applies to the administrative and security organs of the MVD.

4. Anyone who violates the laws of Ukraine is to be tried before a Ukrainian people's or military court; if convicted, his sentence will be served within the national borders.

NOTE.—We request that the citizens of the world be informed of this letter by the United Nations, Division on Human Rights.

We have signed with initials and pseudonyms, so as to forestall any possible consequences.

(NOTE.—On the original, here follow signatures, by initials and pseudonyms, of 5 deputies from the women's column and 8 deputies from the men's column of prisoners.)

Entire chapters in these libelous sheets are devoted to you, our political emigres of today. Emphasis is placed on internal disorder, dissensions, the struggle for power, the lust for gain, and politiacl immaturity. Our attitude toward all forms of Bolshevik propaganda is the same. We are convinced that the written and the spoken word in the Soviet "prison of nations" is hopelessly slanted. We firmly believe that, with the benefit of past experience, you will do your duty with honor—a moral duty imposed by the nation upon its political emigres; that your years in the emigration will not prove to be time lost; that you are using this time to good advantage; and that you will return to Ukraine with your forces undiminished and with an awareness of all important theories successfully practiced in Europe and the rest of the world, so that our nation may benefit from them. We believe that your long sojourn abroad will not diminish your longing for your country and that it will not make you want to live abroad for the rest of your lives.

And now a few words about living conditions among political prisoners in Soviet special camps during the postwar years. The basic features of the Bolshevik prison-camp system have not changed. Almost all of the special camps are located in areas where the climate is severe (Kolyma, Taymyr, Siberia, Komi, Kazakhstan). Sentences for political crimes vary in length from 5 years (for a single attempt, as they say in jest, at "suspect" thought) to 25 years in so-called corrective labor camps, and from 15 to 20 years of penal servitude. In the immediate postwar period, famine, unendurably hard labor, and appalling sanitary conditions took a toll of thousands of political prisoners. Again in 1948 a so-called strict regime was introduced in the special camps; the iron-barred barracks were locked at night, correspondence was restricted to two letters per year, one was not permitted to keep cash, there were penal barracks, prisoners were not allowed to wear their own clothes and had to wear prison uniforms with numbers on the back, they were not allowed to take notes from books, to engage in handicraft, to assemble in large groups, and so forth. This was coupled with 12 hours at hard labor and a deliberate increase in the work norms. The unbearable living conditions brought about uprisings in certain camps centers—Vorkuta in 1953, Noril'sk in the spring and summer of 1953, and Kengir (Kazakhstan) in 1954. Over 40,000 prisoners of different nationalities took part in the uprisings. The enemy used all kinds of weapons, including tanks, in suppressing the uprisings. At the cost of several thousand comrades killed or wounded, we brought about the abolition of the stricter regime and the introduction of an 8-hour day.

DEAR FRIENDS: We want to take advantage of this opportunity to tell you in brief what the Bolsheviks say about you—our political emigrees of the last decade—in their so-called lectures and in recent articles in the press. We would also like to give the Ukrainians abroad who are not indifferent to our fate some idea of the conditions prevailing among political prisoners in special Soviet camps since the war.

Lectures on Ukrainian affairs are delivered by important officials in the Mordovian Party, and not by members of the administration of local special camps. The main point in what they have been saying about you is roughly as follows: Although the number of Ukrainian political emigrees in the last decade has been small, the group is torn by dissension and split into many parties. They are politically short-sighted, and they no longer enjoy popularity among their people, whose support they have lost. They are not fighting for anything real—just for the capital letter "U." The Bolsheviks cite the names of our most prominent political leaders abroad, calling them "the most despicable betrayers of the Ukrainian people."

Lectures on Ukrainian affairs were discontinued recently. The reason may lie in the prisoners' dignified reaction to the Bolsheviks' tendentious distortion of historical fact. These lectures, held at unexpected times, caused us spiritual anguish. But, at the same time, they were a welcome event, because they allowed us to think (correctly, we hope) that our position in international politics had improved and that the Bolsheviks were therefore intensifying their propaganda efforts in the pertinent direction. Political prisoners of other nationalities in the Soviet Union envy us without rancor, and they hope that we did not rejoice in vain.

Among recent printed works attacking us, first place is occupied in the libraries of Mordovian special camps by the brochures of Halan (Selected Works, 1954), of Belyayev, and of M. Rudnitskiy (Under Alien Banners). They are permeated with monsters, unparalleled venom, bigotry, and hatred for everything Ukrainian and non-Communist.

In the last few years the Bolsheviks have paraded their humanitarianism before the world. They issued decrees that also pertained to political prisoners, but most of them were not put into effect on a comprehensive scale (the decree releasing invalids from special camps, the probationary release of political prisoners who had served two-thirds of their terms). Following their release from special camps, prisoners can usually expect to be exiled to Siberia for an indefinite period. In September of this year, an amnesty was declared for political prisoners who had collaborated with the Germans during the war. The official Bolshevik term for our nationalist prisoners is "Banderivtsi" or "Ukraino-German Nationalists," and the amnesty does not apply to us. Another proof of the perfidy of the Bolshevik system.

For the sake of the truth, we want to say in conclusion that we hold the name of Ukrainian political prisoners in deep respect and that we have, generally speaking, gained favor and recognition from political prisoners of other nationalities.

God bless you, dear friends. Do not forget us, and keep in mind your return to Ukraine.

UKRAINIAN WOMEN POLITICAL PRISONERS IN MORDOVIAN SPECIAL CAMPS.
MORDOVIA, *October 5, 1955.*

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, OLIVER P. BOLTON, is retiring from Congress, but he will never lose the warm friendships which he has made during the two terms he has served the people of the 11th District of Ohio. OLLIE is my personal friend, and it has been a pleasure to serve with him.

Mr. BOLTON comes from a distinguished family of public-spirited citizens. His father served in the House before him. His mother has ably represented the people of the 22d District of Ohio for the past 16 years. OLIVER P. BOLTON has made his mark in the Halls of Congress, and in every sense he measures up to the standards of performance set for him by a famous mother and father.

Few men who have served in the House of Representatives the brief period of 4 years have enjoyed the great popularity, and have won in such a short period of time the profound respect of their colleagues. Mr. BOLTON is a man of irreproachable integrity. By his keen and sympathetic understanding of the many problems which come to a Representative he has diligently and zealously served his constituency.

Nature endowed OLLIE BOLTON with a warm personality which has won him countless friends, and he has kept those friends by being steadfast. I wish him good health and good fortune in the future.

Address of Hon. Thomas H. Werdel at for America Patriotic Rally, Los Angeles Shrine Civic Auditorium, June 7, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is generally accepted that the "gimme-gimme" philosophy of American politics for the past 25 years has placed men of varying abilities in public office. To be sure, all Americans respect the patriotism of the men and women of the United States Congress. No man thinks more highly than I do of a free press or would more willingly defend it to preserve freedom. When I refer to the press, I include radio and television commentators. However, some of us see a subject in different light than do others. I, therefore, hope that I will not be thought disrespectful to the gentlemen of Congress, or to editors and to publishers in general, if I express my sentiments freely. There is scarcely time left in America for further pleasantries and platitudes if we continue to travel down the middle of the same freeway.

The "gimme-gimme" philosophy quickly took over the Democratic Party. It then infiltrated the Republican Party. The middle-of-the-freeway slogan was used without regard to where the road led. Synthetic personalities chanted the slogan; bypassed the grassroots and local county central committees by constructing satellite political machines. Many of these flashy personalities were not able to earn a living outside the public trough. Too few are in public office today who by experience know business or ever paid a payroll. Yet, they are supported by many of the leading publishers of the Nation on the road away from government by law and toward government ownership and control through Executive decrees. Many of these publishers, editors, and commentators receive flattering political appointments. For 20 years many have promoted Government support of an artificial economy in their metropolitan areas without regard to the consequences; they increased their advertising revenue by increasing circulation as a result of their middle-of-the-freeway policy; they create their own polls to prove the phantom popularity of their own candidates; real Americans may well doubt whether their segment of the free press is even attempting to carry the true facts to the American people, or whether they are deliberately perverting the American form of government that liberated the press for their own individual temporary power or pecuniary gain as prophesied by Lord Macaulay.

The recent result has been:

1. The delegations of 10 large industrial States to the Republican Convention control that convention.

2. The metropolitan press of those 10 States support synthetic personalities in each State, and by smoke and smother tactics evade the issues, and deprive the Republicans of that State of their constitutionally-guaranteed right to an independent delegation of their party on the ballot in presidential primaries.

3. They, thus, deny all Republicans of that State their right to ask the question: "Where does the freeway go?"

4. At the convention, 10 such personalities write the platform without issues. That action disfranchises the Republicans of all the other 40 States.

5. When the presidential November arrives, they have successfully disfranchised all the people of America of both political parties who want to vote against the policies of the party in power.

6. Having gained power as the lesser of 2 evils, the Republican Party thus destroyed all existing political vehicles at the national level that could reinstate a trend toward government by law enforceable in local courts by poor men.

There is little doubt that a few such personalities, by playing ball with the interests that had dictated the policies of haphazard Harry, disfranchised the American people at the last Republican Convention. They boldly cried, "fraud" and "Thou shalt not steal" at Bob Taft and unseated delegations elected under rules adopted by themselves 4 years previous. They then campaigned "down the middle of the freeway" on generalities and ambiguities with the result that Congressmen could not know how the people they represented believe important issues of foreign affairs, agriculture, and other domestic policies should be handled.

Dean Manion has already discussed some phases of this subject with you. I want to discuss with you the proper function of the Congress in such circumstances.

Tonight we have supplied you with an index of party cohesiveness. On all issues set forth, except the 24th issue presented in the House of Representatives, the Republican leadership of the House or Senate recommended one vote and the Democrat leadership recommended the opposite vote. The index is not intended to express the policy of the executive department. It is intended to indicate the willingness of the respective members of each political party to follow their party leadership of the Congress. It, thus, is intended to indicate the willingness of Republicans to follow a planned leadership in the House and the Senate to turn the tide of creeping socialism.

I particularly want to discuss the so-called bipartisan foreign-aid program which to date has not been opposed by the leadership of either political party in the House or Senate. Because of a failure to draw the issues in the last presidential election, both political parties favor such giveaway of American tax dollars even though there is no constitutional power in any agency of Government to do so. The Congress at the present time is considering that program for this 2d session of the 84th Congress. Let us take a quick look at the way it was handled in the 1st session of the 84th Congress. The 24th house of our index.

There is an old adage that politicians should vote for all appropriation bills and against all tax bills, if they want to remain in office. Members of Congress have profited from such instruction and by the rules of their respective Houses, have provided that policy bills be referred to one committee, appropriation bills to a different committee, and tax-raising bills to a third committee.

By way of example, let us consider how S. 2090, the foreign-aid program was handled under H. R. 288 in the 84th Congress, 1st session. It was the responsibility of the Foreign Affairs Committee to look into the contracts under which funds had been spent in the past under similar authorizations and what funds were available that were not obligated. In this way, and in this way alone, could the committee get a true picture of what the real accomplishments of the program were in relation to what Congress had theretofore planned and intended them to be.

The recorded hearings demonstrate that the executive department officials in their testimony before the committee frankly admitted that they did not themselves know what all the obligation of funds was about. They did tell the committee that they hoped to understand the subject at an early date. Such testimony either indicated that those in charge of the program did not know about the details of their fiscal affairs, or somebody in the executive department had been guilty of concealing the exact fiscal picture. The committee, in such circumstances, should have turned the request down as being unneeded powers or money, or they should have sent the executive officials back to their offices downtown to get their shop in order.

Instead of taking such action, however, the Foreign Affairs Committee cut the President's request a little and then recommended favorable passage of a bill authorizing an additional $3¼ billion as a new blank check to the executive department.

When the bill was debated on the floor on June 30, some courageous Congressmen pointed out to the House:

1. That the committee and the House had no real knowledge as to how much money was in the bill; or

2. How much money was in the pipeline from previous authorizations and appropriations on the same subject;

3. That figures from the executive department showed there was $8,717 million as a carryover;

4. That the carryover plus counterpart funds abroad, together with the new authorization, would make a total of $12,975,900,000, which the executive could obligate, deobligate, and reobligate in blank-check fashion as it saw fit.

5. That the executive department refused to indicate how much funds on hand were needed and why new funds were needed; that the money could not be spent, and therefore, should not be authorized.

No one could tell beyond a series of generalities what the program had been, was, or what it was proposed to be. There were fancy speeches made in generalities. There were editorials in generalities from so-called free press in the industrial areas that might benefit from such discretionary power in a President. The editorial heat was turned on Congressmen to vote for these high-sounding policies under which our 160 million people were to take care of the world. With hidden taxes already totaling 8 cents on a quart of milk, the Foreign Affairs Committee collapsed and did not do its duty. The executive department presented no adequate justification for the additional powers requested to continue a program originally intended to prime Europe's pump for 1 year in 1948. There were absolutely no connecting links between the oratory and international editorials and the specific authority or money requested. A free people cannot regard a blank check and a blind trust in the executive department as a connecting link.

If the executive department fails to supply the details to the congressional committee, or, indeed, misinforms the Congress, or if the Congress fails to demand and require the details—which alone can make meaning of the

stated noble intentions—there has been a collapse of responsibility.

The real issue in America today is whether we are going to continue to set up detailed programs to attain certain results through action of Congress or other legislatures.

Certainly the Congress can vote blank checks and blank authorities to the executive department. However, if this is done because complete confidence is placed in a President and his appointees to know the needs of European people, who can argue that that President and his appointees do not have similar complete knowledge and beneficence for governing the American citizen. In such circumstances, Members of Congress cannot justify salaries, because no Congress is needed. We need only give the President a blank check and let him obligate, deobligate, and reobligate, as he travels down the freeway. The Founding Fathers expressly provided against this—it was too much power for a good man to need or want because it was too much power for a bad man to ever acquire. Is there any wonder that many of us today believe we are living in a fool's paradise. Oratory and dollar bills are meaningless by themselves, even though they are supported by editorials. They cannot defeat an enemy from without and they can only aid the enemy from within. We need no foreign armies to defeat us—the ticking of our clocks will do the job.

At the same time the Congress was being abused for not turning over blank checks to the Executive in connection with foreign aid, it was being abused for not giving blanket authority to the executive department and the Pentagon over the youth of America. Here, too, it surrendered.

Now we have all heard many learned people discuss the United States budget. It is seldom done so as to demonstrate the problems of the Congress and a free press which might undertake to carry the facts to the American people. Let us consider some examples:

1. A conscientious Congressman might desire to get rid of some unnecessary national bureaucrats. To do so, he would necessarily be required to list them with their respective salaries. Such list, single-spaced typewritten, would reach about 7 miles. If he decided to inquire into the Military Establishment in peacetime, the list would reach about 15 miles.

2. If we assume that the average Government expenditure is $10 and he desired to acquaint himself with the budget of $50 billion in addition to salaries, the typewritten list would reach about 13,500 miles.

3. If you undertook to read such listings, your line of vision would be about 225,000 miles.

With these figures in mind, we can understand why it takes from August of one year to January of the next for the executive departments to prepare their budgets and why it costs about $12 to process a 50-cent purchase. We can also understand why it is physically impossible for the Congress to understand the budget.

Today, it is self-evident to any knowledgeable person:

1. That we have blank-check government by Executive decree as distinguished from the Government planned by our forefathers.

2. That we cannot recover constitutional government so long as the independent legislative branch cannot comprehend its work.

3. That we cannot again enjoy government by law until the Congress returns to the local governments these functions heretofore usurped at the national level, so that the Congress, the people, and the local press can comprehend their work.

4. The minimum required of any Congressman should be party cohesiveness in following party leadership of the House in an attempt to accomplish these purposes at an early date. That leadership should be criticized and changed by the Members of Congress, whenever it refused to boldly take a position in discharging its responsibilities, no matter whether a good man or a bad man is President.

5. Can this be reaction? Is it reaction to demand that all Congressmen preserve the political progress achieved 160 years ago? City councils, boards of supervisors, State legislatures, and the Congress must be able to understand the requests for power and the need for governmental appropriations if we are to avoid totalitarian government. Those legislative bodies must exercise that power under their oaths of office if we are to avoid totalitarian government. Any Congressman, who realizes that so much power has been moved to Washington through the "gimme gimme" program that the local legislative bodies have no authority to act and the Congress cannot possibly understand and comprehend the past actions of the executive branch, or the requests for additional power and money, should recognize his duty to immediately return State functions to the States including all functions that can be handled at the State level and which Congress can only handle in blank-check fashion. The time is late; Congressmen who support party leadership which opposes such program should be turned out of office; Congressmen who find that they cannot support their party leadership which favors such program should voluntarily leave office or should be returned to private life by the taxpayers.

To the left of the digest of votes in the index of party cohesiveness which we have supplied you tonight, we have listed the Congressmen of California of both political parties on issues designed to contract the powers and expenditures of the Washington bureaucrats. The Democratic leadership of the House was against such contraction. You will notice that with few exceptions, all Democratic Congressmen from California followed that leadership, whether they were able to understand what they were doing or not. The Republican leadership of the House favored such contraction, and we have indicated for you the number of times each Congressman followed his House leadership and the number of times he did not. As Republicans, there were some who refused to follow their leadership, 11 times out of 23. This, of course, demonstrates that since the artificial economy wizards from our industrial areas snitched and then pilfered the last Republican convention, those who want to save liberty must look through both party labels to the record. A good look will demonstrate that we again have "taxation without representation," if "representation" still means investigation and understanding by the peoples duly elected representatives of all requests for executive power and money.

It, of course, is very difficult to understand why such an important and large segment of the American press is supporting this trend of both political parties which can only lead, in 1 year or 20, to complete blank-check executive government through a bureaucracy. Surely, they must know that there will be no need for a free press when there are no longer two sides to any political or economic question, and in support of the general welfare, Federal guns will enforce law and ordef through Executive decrees.

In closing, I repeat: No man values a free press more highly than I do, or is more willing to defend it. I hope that my remarks tonight will not be considered otherwise than an appeal to the multitude of men of the press, radio and television, to immediately come to the defense of the functioning principles of that great document to which we owe allegiance. The American people must be informed, and it must always be recognized that they are fit to be free and that they can understand. They must have information to be instructed. With such information and instruction, they will demonstrate the political virtues of our forefathers. Without instruction and virtue, liberty will be the greatest of all possible evils because it will be covetousness, folly, vice, and iradness in a temporary storehouse of wealth, without instruction or restraint.

Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Swiss Independence Day will be celebrated on August 1, and I would like to take this opportunity to extend my greetings to the Swiss Republic. This anniversary will represent the 665th of the founding of the modern Swiss Republic. More than 6½ centuries ago, the Swiss people struck off the shackles of despotism and tyranny and began the long ascent toward governments in which the rule of people is supreme. The Swiss philosophy of democracy fired the revolutions against despotism in France, Italy, and elsewhere. It set the framework for constitutional democracy in the United States.

Today, Switzerland's people, of German, French, and Italian ancestry, live, work, and prosper together, solving their problems in the open, democratic tradition.

Many of the world's modern humanitarian projects—such as the Red Cross and the World Health Organization—have originated and make their home in that country. Similarly, other agencies in the service of mankind have located there. For example, the League of Nations, the first world peace organization founded on the plans and ideals of Woodrow Wilson, made its headquarters in Switzerland.

Throughout America today we find the descendants of the hardy Swiss immigrants. One of their sons was Albert Gallatin, who served as Secretary of the Treasury and represented the United States abroad on many diplomatic missions. He was an early and vigorous proponent of increased foreign trade for the United States.

Modern-day Switzerland is one of the most constructive forces in the promotion of world trade. Because she is poor in land resources, ores, metals, and other raw materials, Switzerland has concentrated on science, skill, and industry upon which to found one of the most vigorous trade economies in the world today. In this manner, Switzerland has become the world-acclaimed source for the highest quality watches, textiles, precision instruments, and other commodities. Relying totally on free competition in a free market, they have won an excellent market in the United States for their products. By so doing they have also enriched American export economy because the Swiss have invariably permitted the United States to acquire a

surplus in our trade with that country. Today, after 20 years of Swiss-American reciprocal trade, a concept fathered by Cordell Hull, the United States has accumulated a trade profit in the form of a surplus of more than one-half billion dollars.

Americans of Swiss descent greatly resent the Republican administration's series of decisions which harass Swiss-American trade by increasing tariff on Swiss products, including their watches, which constitute the lifeblood of Switzerland. And they are happy that the recent report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Democratic Congress stated that these Republican trade restrictions represent an undue burden on consumers, on other industries, and on the trade of the free world.

The Current Plight of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, of the estimated 4,225,000 businesses in the United States on June 30, 1955, 4 million, or 95 percent, were classified as small business by the Small Business Administration. These small businesses account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of the total nonagricultural business done in the United States.

Thus we see that small business contributes a significant share of our national product in addition to providing the broad competitive base which we look to as the economic bulwark of our American system of free enterprise. Such an important segment of our economy should quite naturally warrant the continued concern of both the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

THE PRESENT STATE OF SMALL BUSINESS

One cannot avoid considerable alarm, therefore, upon learning that the net profits after taxes of manufacturing firms with assets under $250,000 have fallen more than 50 percent since the present administration took office, from $308 million in 1952 to $149 million in 1955. Such a significant decline in the fortunes of small business becomes even more noteworthy when contrasted with the earnings of manufacturing corporations having assets in excess of $100 million. Net profits after taxes of these corporations rose from just over $6 billion in 1952 to nearly $10 billion in 1955, an increase of 61 percent.

Business failures are especially indicative of the welfare of small business since over 90 percent of all business failures occur in firms having total liabilities of less than $100,000. The average number of business failures under the present administration from 1953 through 1955 was up 25 percent over the average number under the previous administration from 1949 through 1952. Business failures during 1956, which totaled 7,879 on August 2, are continuing at an even faster pace. If they proceed at their present rate, business failures in 1956 will be 55 percent more than the average number of failures for the years 1949 through 1952.

The failure of small business starting in 1953, to share in the general prosperity of our economy behooves a careful examination of governmental policies which affect small business. Consequently, I would like to review the activities of this administration and of the 83d and 84th Congresses in the fields of antitrust policy, taxation, monetary policy, and small-business assistance.

THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND MERGERS

Primary responsibility for the administration of our antitrust laws rests with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Federal Trade Commission. The basic intent of the antitrust laws is to prevent the growth of monopolies and economic concentration which substantially lessen competition.

While not all mergers lessen competition, that is frequently the intent or result of a merger. A loophole in the antimerger section of the Clayton Act prevented the Government from taking any action against mergers consummated through the acquisition of assets, in contrast to mergers effected through stock acquisition, until the Celler-Kefauver amendment was passed in 1950. The hope that this amendment would provide a future safeguard against large-scale merger movements such as the one which occurred in the late 1920's appears thus far to have been a false hope. The year 1955, in which the Federal Trade Commission reported 846 corporate mergers, was estimated by Commission economists to have been the greatest year for corporate mergers since 1930. Moreover, the Trade Commission reports that mergers are taking place at an even faster rate this year. The total number for 1956 is likely to exceed 1,000.

Not only are mergers now taking place at a rate equaled only during the boom-and-bust years of 1928–32, but, as the following table indicates, the incidence of these mergers among the larger firms is becoming greater and greater:

Relative distribution of manufacturing and mining concerns acquired by size of acquiring concern, 1940–47, 1948–54, 1955

[Percent]

	1940–47	1948–54	1955
$50,000,000 and over	29.3	29.4	33.2
$10,000,000 to $49,999,000	28.6	36.1	36.8
$5,000,000 to $9,999,000	12.8	13.9	9.8
$1,000,000 to $4,999,000	17.7	13.3	12.9
Under $1,000,000	11.6	3.2	1.5
Assets unknown	--------	4.1	5.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission, Economics Division.

Paralleling the continued increase in mergers has been the growing number of complaints received by the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department. The great majority of these complaints are from small-business men protesting against the allegedly unfair-trade practices of their larger competitors. In 1952 the Antitrust Division received 692 complaints; in 1955, 1,261.

Is is merely a coincidence that in the first 3 years of this administration small-business profits have been cut in half, small-business failures have gone up 25 percent, mergers have reached their highest peak since 1930, and complaints of antitrust law violations have nearly doubled? A clue to the answer lies in a review of administrative efforts prior to, and in view of, these developments.

FTC AND ANTITRUST DIVISION APPROPRIATIONS

In its drive to economize, the administration trimmed the already meager budget of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division by $400,000, or more than 11 percent, in fiscal 1955 and left the appropriation at the same level for fiscal 1956. Meanwhile, the budget appropriations for the antimonopoly work of the Federal Trade Commission were nearly 10 percent lower in fiscal 1954 and 1955 than they had been during the last fiscal year of the previous administration, 1953.

The alarming increase in the number of mergers which followed these budgetary cuts was brought to light by the House Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary in its interim report on corporate and bank mergers published in late 1955. The studies and investigations conducted by the subcommittee were undoubtedly influential in restoring the 1957 fiscal budget of the Antitrust Division to its 1953–54 level, and in obtaining an increase over the previous year of $1,001,500 in the appropriations of the Federal Trade Commission. Furthermore, the increased funds of the Commission were specifically "requested for an expanded enforcement program of the Antimerger Act"—the Budget for fiscal year 1957, page 139.

ANTIMERGER ACT

The administration is just beginning to exhibit concern over the merger problem in this election year. During its first 2 years in office, on the other hand, the administration showed no apparent concern over the fact that the Justice Department had not issued a single complaint under the new Antimerger Act.

As of July 1956, the Federal Trade Commission had issued 10 complaints under the Antimerger Act, one of which had been settled by a consent decree, and one of which was pending before the Commission. The other eight cases had not yet reached an initial decision. Also, as of July 1956 the Department of Justice had issued 6 complaints under the Antimerger Act, 3 of which had been settled by consent decree and 3 of which were still pending.

Since the adoption of the antimerger amendment, not a single cease and desist order has been issued in a contested case by either the Commission or the Justice Department. The combined total of 4 consent decrees thus far entered by both agencies under the Antimerger Act cover less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the more than 4,000 mergers which have taken place since the beginning of 1951 in the mining, manufacturing, and trade industries.

THE CONSENT DECREE

As it has done in so many other areas, and particularly in the field of defense, the administration has sought to convey the impression that it is producing more results for less money in the conduct of its antitrust program. One aspect of this policy has been an increasing reliance upon consent decrees and other voluntary agreements with businesses accused of violating the antitrust laws. The contention has been that such agreements accomplish the intended purposes of our antitrust laws while avoiding the expense and delay of formal proceedings.

The consent decree has for many years been a necessary and important instrument of antitrust law enforcement. Its expanded use should not lessen the Government's responsibility, however, in prosecuting violations of antitrust laws where no satisfactory agreement can be reached voluntarily.

The effectiveness of a consent decree in discouraging future violations of the antitrust laws is limited. The corporation against whom proceedings are brought is not even referred to as a defendant but is merely a respondent. In agreeing to a consent decree the respondent neither admits nor denies the allegations made. Subsequent violation of a consent decree by the respondent cannot successfully be prosecuted unless the courts rule that the alleged violations spelled out in the consent decree were in violation of the antitrust laws. In such a case it can well be argued that more positive action should have been taken against the respondent at the time the consent decree was issued.

The proceedings leading up to a consent decree are at present completely unpublicized. This makes it difficult for people outside the administration to know how effectively the antitrust laws are being administered.

In view of the present emphasis on the consent decree and the corresponding rise in mergers and antitrust law complaints, I feel that the Congress should give careful consideration to proposals for greater safeguards on the present consent decree procedure. One proposal which merits particular attention would require the Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission to publish an opinion accompanying each consent decree stating the Government's case, the respondent's proposition, and the reason for the Government's acceptance of the particular compromise.

BANK MERGERS

When the Antimerger Act was passed, it provided a special exemption for bank mergers. Yet the problem of mergers in the banking industry is at least as serious as it is in other fields. During the 4 years of the previous administration the average yearly number of bank mergers and acquisitions was 88. In 1953 this figure rose to 116; in 1954 it soared to 207; and in 1955 it reached an estimated 250. During the first 6 months of 1956 bank mergers continued at an estimated yearly rate of over 200.

The rate of bank mergers from 1954 to the present has been far greater than at any time since 1934 when the effects of the depression were still forcing banks to merge as a matter of survival. The present trend of bank mergers is all too reminiscent of the earlier period when bank mergers rose steadily, from 363 in 1925 to 798 in 1931.

As they eliminate more and more small businesses from the banking field, these bank mergers dry up a primary source of capital for small business in all other fields. The small banker has most often been willing to grant financial assistance to the small-business man, but the larger banks seldom find that such small loans are worth their while.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO MERGERS

Growing protests over the increasing number of mergers in the fields of banking, mining, manufacturing, and trade led the President this year to recommend four revisions in antitrust legislation relating to mergers. None of his recommendations had strong party support, however, and none managed to pass both Houses of Congress.

Probably the most important bill relating to mergers, H. R. 9424, was introduced by Mr. CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of this year. Among other things, it would have required companies planning to merge to notify the Attorney General 90 days prior to any merger in which the combined capital, surplus, and undivided profits of the merged companies would be in excess of $10 million. The bill passed the House in April, but was not considered by the Senate. H. R. 9424 was effectively killed when Senator DIRKSEN, *Republican*, of Illinois, of the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee insisted upon an amendment giving companies which might be subject to antitrust suits the right to go to court as plaintiffs and seek a declaratory judgment against Government action.

A bill to bring bank mergers under the provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Act, H. R. 5948, was introduced by Mr. CELLER and passed the House in February 1956. No action was taken on this bill by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Another bill relating to bank mergers was introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, and Senator CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, on May 23, 1956. It passed the Senate on July 25, 1956, but has not yet been considered by the House.

Legislative action to stem the growing wave of mergers should certainly be given careful consideration during the next session of Congress. Some measure to provide for Federal control of bank mergers should merit particular attention.

But we cannot attain an effective antitrust program merely by passing further laws. A 1956 House of Representatives document entitled "Antitrust Laws With Amendments" contains 107 pages of antitrust laws. The Sherman Act of 1890 covers the first 1½ pages of this document. A strong argument can be made that our antitrust policy would be more successful if we devoted all our antitrust efforts toward a rigorous enforcement of this basic law. The important point is that effective antitrust policy depends primarily upon its administration.

FTC AS AN INDEPENDENT AGENCY

Realizing the need for a consistent policy and impartial attitude in the enforcement of the antitrust laws, Congress established the Federal Trade Commission as an independent agency in 1914. The reorganization plan of the Hoover Commission adopted in 1950 has tended to place the Commission more and more under administrative control. Since 1950 the Chairman of the Commission has been a political appointee of the President, responsible to him and serving at his pleasure. The Chairman had previously been elected once each year by a vote of the 5 Commissioners. The reorganization plan has also given the Chairman considerably more control over personnel administration.

Since 1952 the policies of the Federal Trade Commission have changed considerably, apparently to coincide to a high degree with the "philosophy" of the administration. Moreover, Commission reports have recently tended to build up the accomplishments of our present antitrust program in a manner which indicates a certain lack of impartiality and objectivity.

As Mr. PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, pointed out in January, recent Commission reports have placed a good deal of emphasis upon the number of complaints which were issued under the chairmanship of Mr. Howrey. The reports failed to mention, though, that these complaints were being directed more and more toward the small rather than the large business enterprise. Under the chairmanship of President Eisenhower's appointee, Mr. Howrey, from April 1, 1953, through December 31, 1955, average assets of the 60 companies charged with antitrust law violations were $32,500,000. Under the chairmanship of James Mead, formerly Democratic Senator from New York, during the 33-month period immediately preceding April 1, 1953, the average assets of the 66 companies charged with antitrust-law violations were $256,200,000, or nearly eight times as great.

Last year the House Small Business Committee announced its intention to look into the frequently made allegation that the Federal Trade Commission and other independent regulatory agencies have lost their independence through reorganization and have in practical effect become a part of the executive branch of the Government. Hearings on this subject were held in July 1955 and are to be published in the near future. They should shed considerable light upon the extent to which the Commission has come under the domination of the present administration.

FINES UNDER THE SHERMAN ACT

One antitrust law of interest to small business was the result of a bill introduced by Mr. CELLER, of the House Judiciary Committee, on February 7, 1955, and signed by the President on July 7, 1955. The law increased from $5,000 to $50,000 the maximum penalty which could be imposed by the courts in cases of violation of the Sherman Act. It remains to be seen to what extent the courts will take advantage of this law to

impose stiffer penalties upon antitrust law violators. During fiscal 1956 the total amount of fines imposed in antitrust cases was $460,800 as compared with $260,580 in 1955. Although the amount of fines imposed in 1956 was the highest total since 1951, it was still less than half the total amount of fines imposed in 1948.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Price discrimination is another aspect of antitrust law which is of particular interest to small business. The original law banning discriminatory pricing was contained in section 2 of the Clayton Act enacted in 1914. Certain weaknesses in this section prevented it from stemming a widespread growth of harmful discriminatory practices by large distributors, notably chainstores. These practices were often intended to and frequently did result in the elimination of small businesses which could not command price discounts similar to those of their larger competitors.

Congressional investigations of discriminatory pricing practices in the early thirties led to the Robinson-Patman amendment to section 2 of the Clayton Act in 1936. According to the Senate Judiciary Committee report on the amendment, a principal weakness of the original section 2 lay in the fact that "it permits discriminations to meet competition, and thus tends to substitute the remedies of retaliation for those of law, with destructive consequences to the central object of the bill"—Senate Report No. 1502, 74th Congress, 2d session, 1936, page 4.

Until 1951 it was generally thought that the Robinson-Patman Act had remedied the weakness cited in the Senate report. In that year, however, the 5 to 3 Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil of Indiana case interpreted the "good faith" provision of the act in a manner which indicated that the old weakness in the price-discrimination law was still present. The "good faith" defense of a price cutter was a complete defense according to the Court even though the price cuts were not cost-justified and regardless of their competitive effect.

Legislative proposals to clarify the "good faith" clause of the Robinson-Patman Act have been forthcoming ever since 1951, but none has yet passed both Houses of Congress. Certain of these proposals have sought to write the Supreme Court decision into law. Others, such as H. R. 1840 directly paralleled by my bill, H. R. 2690, which passed the House during this session of Congress, have sought to clarify the original intent of the act by making it plain that section 2 (b) should not be a defense where the effect of the discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

Unfortunately, administration policy as expressed by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission was for some time opposed to H. R. 1840 and other similar bills introduced in this Congress. The majority of the Commission reversed itself to favor passage of H. R. 1840 after a decision handed down by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals in May of this year. This was in the same Standard Oil case which the Supreme Court had remanded to the Commission in 1951 for reconsideration of the "good faith" clause. The Commission found that Standard Oil had not shown good faith and in its brief before the circuit court stated that any other finding would make the Robinson-Patman Act meaningless. Nevertheless, the court overruled the Commission by finding good faith on the part of Standard Oil.

If, as the Commission has said, the Robinson-Patman Act has now been made meaningless as a result of judicial interpretation, the next Congress should give early consideration to further legislation to protect small business from unfair price discriminations.

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S COMMITTEE

The most significant step taken in the antitrust field by the present administration was probably the Attorney General's creation of a National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws. On March 31, 1955, the Committee issued a lengthy report which included 85 recommendations.

The need for such a comprehensive study of our complex antitrust system has seldom if ever been questioned. The membership of the Committee and the tenor of its recommendations have, nevertheless, come in for sharp criticism. The Committee was made up almost exclusively of lawyers specializing in defending business clients in antitrust suits. Approximately half the lawyers on the Committee were representing defendants in antitrust suits while at the same time serving on the Committee. Without questioning the motives or qualifications of any of these practicing antitrust lawyers, it might have been expected that the Committee's report would reflect their interests in simplifying the antitrust laws so as to benefit their clients.

The sixth annual report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business contained the following comments on the National Committee's report on the antitrust laws—pages 78, 79:

> The scant attention which was paid to legislative history by the National Committee becomes the more disturbing when it is noted that the group made a total of 85 recommendations respecting the antitrust laws. Instead of concentrating upon discovery of what was the intent and purpose of Congress in enacting the antitrust statutes, the National Committee's majority appears to have been more concerned with how the laws could be modified to conform to their personal preferences. * * *
>
> In the National Committee's report, not a single formal recommendation is to be found which can be construed as being favorable or even sympathetic to the victims of antitrust law violations. Your committee's interest in this point was prompted by the personal knowledge that antitrust victims are generally the small-business men of our Nation. On the other hand, the report is replete with recommendations reflecting concern for violators. * * *
>
> Here it seems that the national committee digressed from the issue of soft versus hard competition to tackle the question of soft versus hard antitrust enforcement, and the national committee resolved the issue squarely in favor of the soft or lenient variety.

CORPORATE INCOME TAX

Another area of major concern to the small-business man is our Federal revenue structure. In answer to a questionnaire circulated last year by the National Association of Manufacturers, a revision of the tax laws was considered the most important step which the Government could take to help small business.

The present corporate-tax structure fails to give proper consideration to the relatively greater need of small business to finance its corporate growth through retained earnings. Financing through the issuance of stocks and bonds is often impractical for the small firm and is in any case considerably more expensive than it would be for the larger firm. Bank loans also tend to be much more expensive when made to the small firm. At the same time the small business is much more likely than the large firm to find it economically desirable to undertake a rapid expansion of its existing facilities.

The need for a more moderate corporate tax on small business was recognized to some degree in the Internal Revenue Act of 1938 when the $25,000 exemption from the surtax was enacted. The rapid devaluation of the dollar since 1938 has, however, made this exemption wholly inadequate today. If the exemption were raised to $50,000, as some have proposed, we would be doing no more than adjusting the 1938 law in accordance with the changing value of the dollar.

In addition to proposals to increase the present surtax exemption to somewhere between $50,000 and $100,000, there have been suggestions for replacing the present corporate income tax with a graduated corporate tax. Companion bills were introduced in the House and Senate during this session of Congress which would have adopted a new corporation tax graduated from 5 percent on the first $5,000 of taxable income to 55 percent on all taxable income over $100,000. No action was taken on either of these bills.

In view of the difficulties which small business is now encountering in its search for necessary capital, some revision in the present corporate income tax law would be a vital step in reversing the downward trend of small business during the last 3½ years.

TAXES AS AN INFLUENCE ON MERGERS

The next Congress should also consider the extent to which our tax laws have stimulated the current merger movement. The ability of large firms to carry forward past losses against current and future profits so as to reduce their corporate tax liability has encouraged them to seek firms with a history of losses. Under present conditions, firms with losses are generally the small firms and it is exceedingly difficult for a firm in such condition to resist the temptation to merge.

Other tax incentives which have encouraged small firms to merge have been, first, lessening the impact of the estate tax; and, second, in the case of a successful closely held business, the ability to take profits out of the firm by the capital-gains route as an alternative to having the profits distributed as divi-

dends subject to high individual income-tax rates or left in the company to have the retained earnings taxed under section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

On July 30, 1953, the Small Business Administration—SBA—was established as the first peacetime agency charged solely with the responsibility for fostering the welfare of small business. The SBA took over many of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Small Defense Plants Administration which had provided valuable assistance to small business in preceding years.

The Small Business Act of 1955 extended the life of the SBA for another 2 years, raised the maximum amount permitted on any individual loan from $150,000 to $250,000, and required the Secretary of Defense to submit monthly reports to the President and the Congress on the amount of military expenditures going to small business.

Early this year Congress increased the disaster loan fund of the SBA from $25 million to $125 million. This action resulted largely from the floods which swept the New England States in the fall of 1955.

The programs of the SBA—to provide sound loans to small business where other sources of credit are not available, to assist small business in obtaining Government contracts, and to provide production and management assistance to small-business men—are all highly commendable. They should continue to receive the full support of Congress and the administration.

INCREASED LOANS OF THE SBA AND THE TIGHTENING OF CREDIT

The $126 million in loans approved by the SBA in fiscal 1956 was double the amount approved in fiscal 1955 and was considerably more than the total amount of loans approved in the 22 months from September 1953, to July 1955. It is encouraging to note that substantial funds from this much needed source of credit are finally being made available to small business.

The principal reason for this sudden increase in loan approvals, nevertheless, appeared to be a severe tightening of the availability of private credit to small concerns over the past several months. A survey by Standard Factors Corp. showed that between March 1955 and March 1956 firms enjoying lines of bank credit declined from 53 to 18 percent among companies having a net worth of $5,000 to $25,000, and from 82 to 44 percent among companies having a net worth of $25,000 to $100,000. There was almost no change in the percent of large firms maintaining credit lines.

As credit has become more difficult to obtain it has also become more expensive, particularly for small businesses. Interest rates on short-term loans are now 4 percent, the highest they have been since 1929. In the past 18 months interest rates have risen from 3.3 to more than 4 percent on new issues of medium-grade corporate bonds; from 1.3 to 3.38 percent on prime commercial paper, 4 to 6 months; from 1.1 to 2.55 percent on 91-day Treasury bills; and from 2 to 2.91 percent on 3- to 5-year Government securities.

Although commendable as far as it went, the increased amount of loans approved by the SBA in fiscal 1956 met only a small fraction of the credit needs of small business. Of much greater benefit to small business would be some relaxation in the tight money policy being followed by this administration.

CABINET-LEVEL COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

On June 1, 1956, President Eisenhower established a 7-man committee including 3 Cabinet Secretaries to deal with the problems of small business. The President called for a review of existing programs to aid small business and assigned the committee the continuing task of "making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and when necessary for additional legislation to strengthen the economic position of small businesses."

For 3½ years the present administration has followed policies which have brought about a swift and steady deterioration in the welfare of small business and in its future prospects. Now the President establishes a committee to look into the problem and make recommendations. Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat of Wyoming, issued a significant warning when he said that this Cabinet-level committee "may be taking the approach of giving Government aid to small business" through loans and contract awards "instead of helping to make it free to stand on its own feet."

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

No matter how benevolent the Government may wish to be, it cannot personally assist every 1 of the 4 million small businesses in the country. What the Government can and should do, however, is to seek to preserve equality of opportunity for all business enterprises, whether large or small.

If small business is to remain a significant and dynamic force in our economy, it must be given greater opportunity to come into existence, to grow, to survive, and to compete on an equal basis with larger and better established firms in its field. These goals can best be achieved by a more vigorous enforcement of our antitrust laws which will reverse the rising trend of corporate mergers and which will prevent large buyers from obtaining unfair price discriminations. There is also a great need to adjust our tax laws and particularly the corporate income tax so that small business will be able to grow and will not be tempted to sell out in order to realize tax savings. Finally, there should be some relaxation of our present tight money policy so that small business will again be able to find credit sources which will enable it to finance future growth.

Although there are a great many other areas in which the Government could take more positive action to assist small business, it is particularly in these areas of antitrust enforcement, taxation, and monetary policy that the current administration has been neglectful of the needs of small business over the past 3½ years.

The Easy Chair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, from some of the things that have been inserted in the RECORD previously, it seems as though some people are again trying to distort my role in the now-defunct Reece committee, which died 2 years ago with the end of the 83d Congress. For this reason I am inserting an article by the late Bernard DeVoto, which appeared in the April 1955 issue of Harper's Magazine, which sets the record straight:

THE EASY CHAIR

(By Bernard DeVoto)

GUILT BY DISTINCTION

Paranoia, the textbook says, is "a chronic mental disorder of insidious development." It is characterized by "persistent, unalterable, systematized, logically reasoned delusions." The text goes on to speak of "delusional beliefs which become the uppermost and guiding theme of the patient's life." No scientist, I believe, has tried to produce it experimentally. But we have seen it can be grown from seed.

In order to follow the Reece committee, which was appointed to investigate tax-exempt foundations (all over again), one must do a lot of reading. Its report runs 432 pages. Add the 943 pages of the first volume of the hearings which are mainly devoted to an attack on various scholarly foundations and societies. Some additional material of this kind appears in the second volume, 298 pages long, but most of the volume consists of the statements which a number of foundations filed in rebuttal to the accusations by the committee's staff and its hand-picked witnesses.

There are some interesting accessory facts about the report. The minority members of the committee, Mr. WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, and Mrs. GRACIE PFOST, of Idaho, announce that they were not consulted during its preparation and say that, so far as they can tell, the majority members were not consulted, either. They add that the staff, which prepared it, altered some portion of the text of the hearings, "changing the context and meaning of questions by minority members." Also, the report contains a supplementary statement by Mr. REECE vilifying Mr. HAYS, which was added to it without Mr. HAYS' knowledge.

Finally, there is a remarkable omission, which is connected with some odd behavior by a member of the committee, Mr. Angier L. Goodwin, of Massachusetts. Mr. Goodwin signed the report, thereby making it a majority report, on December 20, 1954. That is, the report as printed carries that date. But on December 18 Mr. Goodwin gave Mr. REECE a statement of additional views, which has been mimeographed. A note prefixed to it says that the report had been filed for printing 2 days earlier, on December 16. In his statement Mr. Goodwin says that he dissents from the principal findings of the report that carries his signature. He says that the Cox committee, of which he had been a member, investigated the same charges against the foundations and explicitly and specifically denied what the Reece report affirms. He ends the statement, "Nothing has transpired in the proceedings of the present committee to cause me to alter or modify the views

expressed in" the Cox report. Why he signed a verdict which he considered unjustified and untrue is not explained.

Most of the press has shrugged off the Reece investigation as too idiotic to be taken seriously. I am afraid that this attitude was a mistake. The investigation was a brilliantly planned and executed attack not only on scholarly foundations but on much else besides. The report is preposterous but it is permanently on record as the findings of a House committee. From now on it will be useful to anyone who may be interested in growing paranoia from seed.

The Cox committee ended by reporting that the mishmash of accusations about the foundations with which it had dealt were unjustified by the facts. Mr. REECE's motives in procuring another inquiry into the same mishmash may or may not be obscure, but his purpose was clear. In July 1953 he made a speech in the House; rather, he made part of a speech and entered the rest of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was a bill of particulars which set forth the conclusions he was directing the new committee to reach. The dreamlike or phantasmagorical state in which the committee was to operate begins with this speech. It is composed of fantastic allegations presented as facts. Of the ultimate report the minority says, "Some of the statements of fact and opinion contained in [it] are untrue on their face, others are at best half truths, and the vast majority are misleading." That goes for Mr. REECE's speech.

Here is a specimen. Mr. REECE alludes to "a grant of $15 million to protect the civil liberties of Communists and to investigate the Congress of the United States," which he says has been made by the Fund for the Republic, an offshoot of the Ford Foundation. A couple of sentences farther on this becomes "$15 million being set aside to investigate the Congress of the United States." To Mr. REECE the grant seems not only subversive but blasphemous, and his outrage was to be faithfully echoed by the staff in the hearings, but what is he talking about? About this: a grant of $50,000 to the highly respectable American Bar Association. One of its committees was to make seven studies of the state of individual rights, under our security system, among them one dealing with "the extent to which Congress should limit the scope and regulate procedures of its investigations." Observe: not investigate but study; not $15 million but one-seventh of $50 thousand; and not Congress but some of its committee procedures which many other organizations are studying.

The committee was named and in September 1953 a staff of 15 was appointed, of whom 1, apparently clerical, was assigned to Mr. HAYS and Mrs. PFOST. The preparation of an ex parte case occupied the staff 8 months, till May 1954. In May and June 12 public hearing were held. Mr. REECE, Mr. HAYS, and Mrs. PFOST attended them faithfully. Mr. GOODWIN was present occasionally, the third majority member hardly at all. He was Mr. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, of Michigan, a trance-bound figure whose only contribution to the proceedings was a melancholy assent to the thesis of a witness that Fabian Socialism had destroyed Great Britain and was rapidly destroying the United States.

"I do not like what I see on the horizon," Mr. WOLCOTT said. "The sun is not coming up. It is a very cloudy day in America because of Fabian Socialism."

His and Mr. GOODWIN's proxies were in Mr. REECE's pocket, so that the minority could be voted down whenever they tried to bring realism or fairness into the hearings.

There were only 12 witnesses. Three of them were members of the staff and 2 were officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The latter 2 had been brought in to represent that the foundation should be denied tax-exemption because they were engaging in propaganda and financing subversive activity, but they were much too honest to do so. Six of the remaining 7 had been sedulously hunted out, apparently by means of the Cox committee files, to support the case which the staff had put together—the most bemused of them was the one who saddened Mr. WOLCOTT by establishing that the downfall of the United States was the work of Fabians. (The Fabians made a beachhead here in the early 1890's. The destruction they have wreaked on us goes back to their first great triumph of subversion, the income-tax amendment.)

The other witness was Dr. Pendleton Herring, of the Social Science Research Council. His calm and lucid statement instantly reduced the staff's hurrah's nest to its constituent lies, slander, irrelevance, and nonsense. He was not permitted to complete his appearance and no one else was permitted to testify for the foundations: Mr. REECE called off the hearings. The report says that the conduct of Mr. HAYS had made further ones impossible. It also says that the foundations will be permitted to file statements and that they will thus escape "the embarrassment of cross-examination." (Yes, that is exactly how it reads.) All along this had been the staff's idea of how to conduct the investigation. There should be no witnesses, they thought, only research; best simply to enter their own paste-up of selected excerpts, assertions, and allegations protected from the embarrassment of cross-examination by Mr. HAYS and from any requirement that supporting evidence be offered.

The opprobious conduct of Mr. HAYS consisted of his daily effort to bring out the facts which the staff refused to submit. A witness would make an extreme ominous, and usually irrelevant assertion of something that was supposed to be fact. Mr. HAYS would force him to reduce it to a private opinion, then to a vague suspicion, and finally to mere gas. (Thereupon the chairman would let the witness proceed on the assumption that his original wild statement had been established incontrovertibly.) Mr. HAYS would demand that one or another of the scholars casually maligned by suspicion or slander be brought in and allowed to speak for himself. Mr. REECE or the staff would reply that he certainly would be as soon as the staff's case was completed, but none ever was. Mr. HAYS would ask that an issue raised by a witness be explored in the interest of decency; he would be told, "Everything at the proper time," and that was the end of that. The wire services featured his success in getting a member of the staff to identify excerpts from two Papal encyclicals as typical of the "Communist thinking" that the foundations are supposed to have succeeded in imposing on our betrayed society. It was a valuable demonstration but it was less important than his obstinate struggle to expose the dishonesty, distortion, misrepresentation, and malice in the testimony that has been printed in the hearings.

I cannot summarize here 900 pages of allegations that are usually crackbrained when they are not dishonest. The staff claimed to have studied only about 10 foundations but succeeded in traducing several dozen. Its prime targets were those established by Carnegie, Rockefeller, and Ford money, and great professional and educational organizations to which they have granted funds. These, the case is supposed to establish, have been captured by an interlock, a managerial caste, which uses them to subvert American scholarship, education, government, foreign policy, religion, morals, family life, and what have you. They are anti-American, international minded, globalist, pro-Russian; also collectivist, socialistic, and headed toward communism when not already Communist-controlled. Their principal instrument of subversion is the social sciences, most of all sociology. In fact it is the social sciences that have poisoned us. They stand for moral relativism and empiricism. They are subversive and the foundations finance their subversion.

The scarlet thread that unifies this hodgepodge is the theme of conspiracy. Whenever Mr. HAYS was able to nail a witness down, he backed away from the word and spoke instead of a tendency; but the existence of an active conspiracy is frequently asserted and endlessly implied. We are to believe that a large and growing group of scholars and foundation officials are working to convert the United States into a socialistic if not communistic society, to destroy our political sovereignty and to force world government on us. (And that many more who do not know what they are doing serve the same ends.)

The conspirators have made use of scientism, the philosophy of John Dewey, the Kinsey report, progressive education, the New Deal, and every other principle of education or historical event that the staff could lug in. (There was an amusing moment when Mr. REECE, who represents a Tennessee district after all, had to turn a somersault in midair and come up defending TVA, which someone had said was communistic and conspiratorial.) Almost everything that has happened in or to the United State in three-quarters of a century was wholly or in part the work of this conspiracy. Its activities multiply all the time.

This mass of innuendo, insinuation, allegation, and misstatement is too insubstantial to be dealt with critically. But the past few years have made us all too familiar with the methods used to spread it on the record. It is a montage. The staff presents innumerable extracts from books, reports, and other documents wrenched out of context (frequently by elision) and made to say, or to imply or suggest, what they obviously do not mean, often the exact opposite of what they obviously do mean.

Many of the assertions and innuendoes that the record contains are of such a kind that they cannot be checked or even analyzed. Many others are absurd and still others are, as the minority says, untrue on their face. The trumped-up case makes use of any material whatsoever that can be made to bring the persons and foundations involved under suspicion, no matter that one allegation often contradicts another one. It contrives to mention accusingly or suspiciously a far larger number of scholars and public figures than any earlier exercise in defamation. Other ventures have tried to defame respectable people by use of the by now wearily familiar principle of guilt by association. But the Reece committee has created two new categories, guilt by distinction and guilt by advanced education.

And at the end of its report the committee draws up a new list of subversives, or at least of people who are suspect. It runs 190 pages, it includes many brilliant and irreproachably patriotic people, and some of its tests for guilt are the most frivolous so far. Take the three counts against Henry Commager. He wrote Who Is Loyal To America? in Harper's and the Daily Worker praised it. He wrote for the Times magazine another piece which the Daily Worker commended. And he was, or so the list says, on a committee of welcome for the Dean of Canterbury. Of the three equally horrifying revelations about George F. Kennan, one is "Spoke on Communist China"—end of quotation.

This systematic attack on learning could not have been made honestly by sane minds, and we must not libel the staff by supposing that there was anything wrong with their intelligence—I would like, however, to see a psychiatrist's report on three of the imported witnesses—quite the contrary. The attack was designed to bring into suspicion the learned foundations, the scholars whom they assist and who serve them, and the very spirit of free inquiry itself. It was designed to intimidate scholars and to undermine public confidence in them and their work.

Whether by design or inadvertently, it serves to inflame the anger of all who fear or resent the 20th century. It is a denunciation of everything that has transformed the United States from a simple society, isolated from the other continents, into a complex industrial society with a necessarily powerful government and inextricably involved with world events. But its target is neither industrialization nor the process of history; it is those who try to bring intelligence to bear on them. It is an attack on inquiry, on the progress of knowledge, on education itself.

So it will serve even more vicious ends. It implements with free-floating suspicion the molelike fears and hatreds of Caliban. It appeals to the sickness of our time, the craziness of our time, the craziness in everyone. It will be used to strengthen the neuroses of those who fear reality, fear learning, fear the uses and usages of reason. In this tragic time it is hard enough, God knows, for a stable mind to keep a firm hold on reality, to control the impulses to flee from it that we are all subject to. What about unstable minds? There are those who fear they may be inferior and therefore fear people who they think may be superior to them. There are those who are under almost intolerable pressure to flee from terrifying realities into a fantasy of past time supposed to be safe—to achieve safety by withdrawing from the present and repudiating the necessities of our age. There are those whose judgment has already been impaired by something very much like delusional beliefs—and whose fears can be converted into a conviction that there is directed at them a wholly imaginary hostility of other people, of anyone at all. But especially of a conspiracy.

To create suspicion that a conspiracy is at work is the most effective way to make such fears into persistent, unalterable, systematized, logically reasoned delusions. We have seen the carefully propagated delusion of conspiracy dissolve away the cements that held other societies together. Here in the United States we have seen many people labor to create in troubled minds a conviction that countless men, institutions, ideas, and events constitute a conspiracy whose aim is to destroy the United States from within. Many of the best and truest among us have been defamed with suspicion for which there was no reason at all. Now the Reece report has done what it could to taint with the suspicion of conspiracy the institutions of scholarship and learning, and to suggest that colleges and universities are agents of the conspiracy, or when not its agents, then its captives. To suggest that our high schools and primary schools and kindergartens are its victims. That the poisons it spreads are constantly at work among us, our children, our Government, our press, and all the other institutions of our society.

The press was right in calling this preposterous but not in dismissing it as only that. It is the kind of nonsense that can be used to make the seeds of paranoia germinate. Is it not, in the most exact sense, subversive?

Increase of Price Supports on Farm Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a table on the increase of price supports on farm products as a result of the President's determination to give the farmer a break. Farm prices have reacted to this program and are increasing steadily, which will result in a much larger income for the farmer for 1956 over 1955.

The table follows:

Increase in price-support rate

Commodity	Previous announced program		Present program		Increase	
	Support rate	Percent parity	Support rate	Percent parity	Support rate	Percent parity
Corn.....bushel	$1.40	81	$1.50	86.2	$0.10	5.2
Wheat.....do	1.81	76	2.00	83.7	.19	7.7
Grain sorghum.....hundredweight	1.80	70	1.97	76.0	.17	6.0
Oats.....bushel	.59	70	.65	76.0	.06	6.0
Barley.....do	.93	70	1.02	76.0	.09	6.0
Rye.....do	1.16	70	1.27	76.0	.11	6.0
Flax.....do	3.09	70	3.09	70.0	0	0
Rice.....hundredweight	4.04	75	4.50	82.7	.46	7.7
Milk.....pound	3.15	82	3.25	84.4	.10	2.4
Butterfat.....do	.562	78	.586	81.2	.024	3.2

Tolerance in Public Life Exemplified in Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a recent event in one of our sister democracies, a land with which I claim some ties of descent, is, I believe, worthy of note here in the Congress of the United States. I refer to the election of the Honorable Robert Briscoe as lord mayor of Dublin.

Mr. Briscoe is one of the outstanding Irish patriots of today; he is also an orthodox Jew. At a time when countless persons throughout the world are being persecuted for their beliefs—religious, racial, and political—the election of Mr. Briscoe as lord mayor of the Irish capital is a refreshing and encouraging example of true democracy. If one were to label the Irish according to their religious faiths—which is not the Irish way, nor the American way—the Jewish group would surely be designated a "minority," since it is unofficially reported that only one-half of 1 percent of the population of Ireland is of the Jewish faith.

HIS ELECTION "MAGNIFICENT GESTURE" OF TOLERANCE, SAYS NEW LORD MAYOR

When he was invested with the great chain of office in the city hall the new lord mayor said:

It is a magnificent gesture that in Catholic Ireland it is possible to elect to this important office a man of a different faith, particularly my own, which proves that in this Catholic Ireland tolerance exists. I hope it will go forth from this chamber to the world that in a free Catholic Ireland there would be no intolerance. * * *

My participation as a soldier in the Republican army during the fight for freedom of Ireland from British control has justified the views I always held that the Irish people could be an example to the world in the spiritual sphere of life.

HE HAS LONG RECORD OF PATRIOTIC SERVICE

Mr. Briscoe, who is said to speak fluently and often on the subject of bringing about the union of the six northern counties of Ireland, has served with distinction in the Irish Parliament, the Dial Eireann, for 31 years, and as a member of the Dublin City Council during the same period. A long-time friend of that great Irish patriot, Eamon de Valera, Robert Briscoe, after the split in 1921, alined himself with that section of the Irish Republican Army which refused to accept the treaty. He later became a member of the Fianna Fail Party of which Mr. de Valera is the leader, and is now a member of the opposition headed by the former Prime Minister.

Active politically in Irish Government affairs, Mr. Briscoe is also active as an exponent of the Zionist movement. He is a friend of Chief Rabbi Herzog, of Jerusalem, who was formerly chief rabbi in Dublin, and has raised funds not only in Ireland but in other countries to further the cause of Zionism.

I am interested in Israel and pleased it is there—

He said recently:

I hope that in a time not too far distant, amicable relations will be resumed between old friends, the Jews and the Arabs.

The new lord mayor was born in Dublin 61 years ago. He started work as an electrical engineer and in later years has been instrumental in bringing capital into Ireland and in helping establish industry in the country. He has been associated, as director, with a number of the younger Irish industries, including the pharmaceutical industry. For many years chairman of the city corporation finance committee, in this capacity he worked hard to rid Dublin of its worst slums and to provide homes for the laboring people.

Mr. Briscoe married early in life Lillian Isaacs, also of a Dublin Jewish family, whom he had known from childhood. They have 7 children, 4 boys and 3 girls. The lord mayor is known as a family man. He loves reading and good music and is a collector of pictures, particularly of still life and early Italians. For recreation he likes to go to Graystones on the east coast and go out in a boat sea fishing.

INVITATIONS TO VISIT UNITED STATES POUR IN TO LORD MAYOR

As soon as Mr. Briscoe's election as lord mayor of Dublin was announced,

various groups of Irish-Americans in the United States began urging him to visit this country. John J. Sheehan, chairman of the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York, cabled him an invitation to review the 1957 parade, and many other invitations have poured from this country across the sea to the popular Irishman, who has many friends on this side of the Atlantic. One New Yorker is reported to have remarked that if Mr. Briscoe accepted all the invitations to speak here, he could embark on a lecture tour that would keep him out of Dublin for the rest of his term.

His Honor lived in the United States for a time when he was a young man and has been a visitor to the United States on various occasions, beginning in the early days of his country's struggle for independence, when he made several secret missions to this country to raise funds and arms for the rebels. He has also visited here in the interests of the Zionist cause.

I add my voice to the many that are extending invitations to Mayor Briscoe to come to these shores. I hope that the Capital City of the United States may soon welcome for a visit the lord mayor of the capital of Ireland.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Leader, of Dublin, Ireland, dated July 7, 1956, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLERANCE IN PUBLIC LIFE

The election of Alderman Robert Briscoe, T. D., to the lord mayoralty of Dublin, has evoked far more interest overseas than it has in the new chief citizen's own native city and country. This is a healthy symptom.

We take it for granted that the Fianna Fail nominee should have as good a chance as the votes give him to be elected to his present high office. Outside the country the whole interest is in the fact of Catholic Dublin having a Jewish lord mayor. It can fairly be said that Alderman Briscoe's religion was at no stage a factor in the contest. He was opposed and supported by men of varying faiths. The very fact the election was so conducted is proof that our Constitution is not a bouquet of pious hopes but a series of practical directives for the rational conduct of the Nation's affairs. Robert Briscoe's tenure of office in the Mansion House is and will be a standing challenge to those who, in their ignorance and prejudice, accuse us here in free Ireland of running a clerical-fascist state. It will be more. It will be a standing reproach to those in the north-east corner of Ireland who have so rigged the machinery of government that it is not alone impossible for a member of the large Catholic majority of the city of Belfast to attain to the mayoralty but even for representatives of the overwhelming Catholic majority of the city of Derry or of the substantial Catholic majorities of Armagh and other centers in the six counties to attain to the highest civic office. This point was well and forcefully brought out by Mr. Hugh McAteer, Member of Parliament for Derry City, in a telegram of congratulation to Alderman Briscoe—and one quoted by the lord mayor in an interview with a representative of a great American newspaper.

Alderman Briscoe took the same opportunity of reminding people at home and abroad that Irish Catholics have had an unblemished record for their treatment of religious minorities. Incidents such as that recently quoted where agents of the sect known as Jehovah's Witnesses were forcibly expelled from the village of Clonlara near Killaloe do not materially affect his thesis. Such people are not content to make their doctrines known in a normal way. They have been in trouble in their country of origin, the United States, for their grossly insulting criticisms not alone of the Catholic religion but of the faith and practice of Protestants of many different shades of belief and for the methods—amounting to invasion of the fortress of the home—which they employ to put their "message" over. If their organization has at the same time been declared illegal in Canada and in countries beyond the Iron Curtain that is no proof that Canada is Communist or intolerant.

It is important for us in Ireland to guard against any and every tendency—even when the situation calls as it were for measures of self-defense—to use our numerical power as Catholics or Protestants to the detriment of minority groups. It is apparent, for instance, that inside the Protestant body generally in the six counties a split is developing mainly on the schools question and the appointment of teachers to the so-called transferred schools. Church of Ireland spokesmen are citing cases where the Presbyterians are squeezing out church members from posts even where parents and children in the area are in the large part of non-Presbyterian affiliation. That sort of thing is destructive of that internal peace in the community which should be a prime mark of Christian life. It can give no pleasure to the Catholics of the north, already suffering under other forms of discrimination or to those in the south whose memories of near-persecution, economic and political, are all too fresh.

Ireland, north and south, is in a position to be an example to the world. With a population overwhelmingly composed of practicing Christians, with constitutional guaranties, even in the north, of fair play for all men of whatever creed, our people should consciously set out to create a tenor of life in which religious discrimination would be so little known as to be hardly worth mentioning in any discussion of our affairs, when the election of a Catholic lord mayor of Belfast would be of as little internal interest as the election of a Jewish or Protestant lord mayor of Dublin.

Hon. Oliver Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in paying tribute to my good friend and colleague, Hon. OLIVER BOLTON. OLLIE and I came to Congress at the same time and during the past 4 years, I have enjoyed his friendship and association. He has won for himself not only the respect of his colleagues, but a splendid reputation for intellectual capacity and courage. He will always be an inspiration and challenge to those of us who have known him and worked with him and we will remember him for the example of devotion to his constituency and his country which he has set.

I concur in the opinions expressed here tonight, that although OLLIE BOLTON is leaving the Halls of Congress, we will be hearing from him in the future. He has my sincere good wishes for future happiness and all of life's blessings.

Alleged Discrimination in Transportation Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from Mr. Karl J. Grimm, traffic manager of the Houston, Tex., Port Bureau, with respect to Senate Concurrent Resolution 87.

Mr. Grimm, through his previous assignment with the Baltimore Association of Commerce, is well conversant with this subject, and I hope that my colleagues will give his observations their thoughtful consideration.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSTON PORT BUREAU, INC.,
Houston, Tex., July 27, 1956.

Hon. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Ed Hood has been kind enough to send me a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 87 recently introduced by Mr. KENNEDY for himself and the other New England Senators and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

You will recall that in the closing days of the 2d session of the 83d Congress the same Senators introduced Senate Joint Resolution 284 requesting a congressional inquiry into alleged discrimination against New England in transportation matters and that you and I vigorously opposed it as an attempt to inject politics and sectional considerations into rate proceedings then pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I have too much respect for the ability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to fairly decide such matters solely on the public record which the parties to any controversy make before it as to wish to enter into any quarrel with Senator KENNEDY and his colleagues concerning the merits of the controversy new pending before the Commission involving rates to and from North Atlantic ports. However, because the resolution in its fifth paragraph involves the southern ports, including Houston, I cannot refrain from some comment.

You will recognize, of course, that the resolution goes beyond Senate Joint Resolution 284 in that it not only bluntly asks the Congress to direct the Commission to decide the pending North Atlantic case (I. and S. Docket 6615, Equalization of Rates at North Atlantic Ports) in favor of New York and Boston, but also by direct implication prejudices any rate controversy which might arise between the North Atlantic ports collectively on the one hand and the South Atlantic and gulf ports on the other hand. I am confident that the Congress will not take favorable action in this direction because it should be clear that passage of the resolution would by implication repeal the basic foundations of the Interstate Commerce Act and completely destroy the quasi-judicial functions and the in-

dependence of the Commission. I know of no other instance in which a legislator or group of legislators has gone so far as this.

I cannot refrain from commenting also that I am amazed that the Senators would cite *I. C. C. v. New York Central Railroad Co.* (342 U. S. 890) as authority for recognition and affirmance by the Supreme Court of the United States of the principle that railroads serving the northeastern ports should be permitted to establish rail rates which are competitive with rates to ports in the Southern United States. You will recall that in the case cited the Supreme Court without opinion affirmed per curiam a decision of the Massachusetts district court setting aside an order of the Commission refusing to permit an equalizaiton of the North Atlantic ports on ex-lake grain from Buffalo. All that was involved was the lawfulness of proposed reductions in the rates to New York and Boston without consideraiton of rates to other ports. Apparently the author of the resolution assumes that a per curiam affirmance by the Supreme Court of a district court decision is a blanket approval of all that is said in the district courts' opinion even by way of dictum, whereas any competent lawyer knows that all that such an affirmance means, like denial of certiorari, is that a sufficient number of Justices did not believe that the case was of sufficient importance at that time to justify review by the Supreme Court. It is by no means to be interpreted as an expression by the Court on the merits. When it is considered that the Massachusetts district court reversed the Commission only because of technical defects in the Commission's report, the lack of value of the Supreme Court's affirmance as a precedent for such a broad proposition as espoused in the resolution becomes obvious.

I realize, of course, that the resolution was introduced too late in the session for action to be taken upon it at this time. However, in his remarks to the Senate when introducing it, Senator KENNEDY has made the suggestion that the staff of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee inquire into the matter during the recess in order that action can be taken promptly at the beginning of the next session. As you know, the Commission has already assumed jurisdiction over this controversy and I should like to suggest that because it is completely capable of dealing with it fairly to all parties, the inquiry suggested would be a complete waste of the time and energy of the committee and its staff.

I have taken the liberty of encroaching on your time in this matter because I know of your keen interest in it through our close cooperation in the past, and because I have not had the pleasure of making the acquaintance of Senators JOHNSON and DANIEL as yet. Copies of this letter are being mailed to both of them, however, so that they can make their views known if they see fit to do so.

Sincerely yours,

KARL J. GRIMM,
Traffic Manager.

Beef Broth on the Rocks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, beef broth on the rocks seemed to be a popular drink around the Capitol during the adjournment days of this 84th Congress.

The House of Representatives restaurant served the drink, courtesy of Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas; and Representative JAMES M. QUIGLEY had a beef-broth fountain in his office, which was enjoyed by many of my thirsty colleagues, including myself and Mrs. Hagen.

This is illustrative of still another way the great American cattle industry can serve the Nation.

I can truthfully say that both my wife and I attest to the fact that iced beef broth is a gourmet's delight and should receive wide public acceptance.

S. 4046, Amending Certain Provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief statement concerning S. 4046.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HENNINGS

On June 13 the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] introduced S. 4046. That bill proposes an amendment to the provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act and is designed to eliminate certain difficulties which have arisen in the administration of Public Law 626, 83d Congress, 2d session. Public Law 626 arose out of a bill which I introduced in the Senate on my own behalf, and on behalf of Senators DIRKSEN and LANGER. I am therefore greatly interested in S. 4046, which would assist materially in carrying out the purposes of existing legislation. Senator LANGER has authorized me to state that he joins in these remarks.

Public Law 626 was addressed to the problem of so-called heirless property in the United States. It established a procedure under which the President of the United States could designate a successor organization which could lay claim to this property. The property in question was that which had been vested by the custodial authorities of the United States, but which, in fact, belonged not to enemies of the United States but to persons who had been persecuted by the Nazis for political, racial, or religious reasons. Such persons, if alive, would have been eligible, under long-standing provisions of the Trading With the Enemy Act, to claim and obtain the return of their property; and this right was transferable to legal successors in interest. In many situations, however, the extermination policies of the Nazis were such that there were no survivors, and a substantial amount of unclaimed or heirless property remained.

Public Law 626 thus permitted the return of such property to a successor organization which could obtain return only upon certifying to the proper authorities that the property would be used for the relief of needy surviving persecutees. In addition, the successor organization was required to certify other conditions prohibiting the payment of any part of these funds for legal fees, requiring regular accounting, and so forth. The Jewish Restitution Successor Organization was duly authorized and designated by President Eisenhower as the successor organization under this legislation in January of 1955.

The administrative task involved in the filing of claims by the successor organization was an enormous one, particularly in view of the wholesale destruction of records and of the complexity inherent in the heirless property situation. Nevertheless, the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization did file numerous claims. These have been examined and discussed with the Office of Alien Property, and have now been boiled down to a relatively small number of claims. With respect to these claims which remain, however, the problems of proof—of finding documents which have been destroyed or which are located beyond the reach of the United States authorities, etc.—are almost insuperable.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is, therefore, to provide a method of expediting consideration and disposition of these meritorious claims. I am informed that, although Public Law 626 provided a ceiling amount of $3 million, the amount which would be involved under the proposed legislation would not be in excess of $865,000. The proposed bill would authorize and direct the proper executive agencies to settle by payment to the Jewish Restitution Successor Organization claims in cases in which the claim had been properly and timely filed, had been examined by the custodian, and information adverse to the claim had not been produced. Proper custodial charges would, of course, be levied against this property, as against other property which is returned by the custodian.

The proposed legislation will eliminate an administrative burden which will be costly both to the private charitable organizations concerned and to the Government of the United States. It is, I believe, essential if the intent of the Congress as already expressed in law is to be carried out. The legislation in question is necessary if the humanitarian purposes of Public Law 626 are to be accomplished; and it is hoped that this meritorious legislation can receive prompt and favorable consideration.

Hon. Thomas J. Dodd

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will lose one of its most able Members in the next session because THOMAS J. DODD has decided to seek election to the Senate of the United States.

Mr. DODD is respected by every Member of this House and everyone who came to know him intimately as I did. He is held in highest esteem because of his unusual qualities of leadership, together with his sense of fairness and justice. During the 83d Congress it was my pleasure to serve on the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression. Mr. DODD was also a member of that well known select committee. This gave me an opportunity to work very closely with Mr. DODD and to observe firsthand his keen grasp and understanding of the worldwide struggle between the forces of human freedom and those totalitarian

forces which seek to enslave all mankind. His experience as chief trial lawyer during the trial of the Nazi leaders gave him an unusual comprehension of the terrible crimes against humanity committed by the Russian Communists. He has long advocated the establishment of an International Juridical Commission so that the crimes against humanity committed by the real tyrants of Moscow may be recorded, and so that all free men may accordingly be warned that so long as any segment of humanity is exploited and enslaved, the liberty and dignity of all mankind stands in mortal danger.

We will all miss our colleague, THOMAS J. DODD, and we wish him continued success in the great work he has been doing as I am certain he will take it up with equal vigor and determination when he begins to serve his term in the Senate.

Accomplishments of the 2d Session, 84th Congress, Directly Concerning Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of the accomplishments of the 2d session, 84th Congress, which directly concern the State of Montana as prepared by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Representative LEE METCALF, and myself, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE 2D SESSION, 84TH CONGRESS, DIRECTLY CONCERNING MONTANA

(By Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and Representative LEE METCALF)

The 2d session of the 84th Congress approved a number of laws and appropriations beneficial to Montana. They include the following:

1. A $500,000 appropriation provides for construction, by the Army engineers, of the badly needed second powerplant at Fort Peck Dam. This plant, when completed, will add 80,000 kilowatts to the existing 85,000-kilowatt plant now in operation.

2. Construction of a new fish hatchery at Miles City was authorized and $359,000 appropriated for construction. This hatchery will produce approximately 10 million bass, blue gill, pike, and catfish annually.

3. The Helena Valley unit received an additional $1,750,000 appropriation for a total of $4 million. Construction of the dam and reservoir should begin shortly after an additional contract is signed with supplemental water users of the city of Helena.

4. An appropriation of $225,000 for the Bitterroot Irrigation District in western Montana will permit rehabilitation and repair work and thus reduce farmers' maintenance costs and assure them a reasonable uninterrupted delivery of irrigation water.

5. The Corps of Army Engineers received $200,000 with which to begin construction of the flood-control project at Billings.

6. An appropriation of $115,000 for the lower Marias unit will permit cleanup work on Tiber Dam and Reservoir, a Bureau of Reclamation project; Tiber Dam will be operated for the first full year in fiscal 1957.

7. Congress authorized $1,236,000 in additional funds for construction and operation of training facilities, maintenance, housing, and community facilities at Malmstrom Air Base, Great Falls. A total of $706,000 was appropriated for this installation.

8. The Glasgow Air Base, now under construction, received an additional authorization of $2,470,000 for operational training, maintenance, utility, and family-housing facilities and for ground improvements and land acquisition. A total of $3,677,000 was appropriated for this project, a portion of this amount having been authorized previously.

9. Congress authorized and appropriated $21 million to implement a strategic minerals-purchase program which will permit some 250 persons to stay on the payroll of fluorspar companies at Hamilton and Darby and the tungsten operation at Dillon.

10. Congress authorized the letting of contracts with water users organizations for drainage works and other completion items on small irrigation projects. This new law is particularly helpful to the Buffalo Rapids irrigation project near Terry and the Greenfields Irrigation District near Fairfield.

11. The Milk River mosquito-control program was bolstered by increased allocations by the Department of Agriculture and the Public Health Service.

12. Congress approved appropriations to initiate a long-range program for the improvement of Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks. Funds were increased for the all-important State and private forestry-cooperative programs of the National Forest Service.

13. Montana libraries in communities with less than 10,000 population will share a grant of $40,000 to Montana for improvement of rural-library service. This appropriation followed passage of the Library Services Act this session.

14. Congress appropriated $50,000 for barley research this year and of that amount $11,600 will go to Montana, for research on two-row barley at Montana State College.

15. Montana was allocated $138,671 in Federal funds for airport development during fiscal 1957. These funds were divided as follows: Billings, $17,167; Great Falls, $29,854; Missoula, $25,000; Plentywood, $66,650.

Public Law 685 of the 84th Congress has amended the small projects authority of the 1950 Flood Control Act, by raising the limitation on Federal expenditure for small flood-control projects from $150,000 to $400,000. This new law will allow the Army engineers to proceed with the construction of the West Glendive flood-control project, waiving the requirement for local contribution of all construction costs over and above the former Federal cost limitation of $150,000. This will save local interests approximately $15,000 to $20,000.

This summary does not include passage of general legislation like the highway bill, which will mean hundreds of millions of dollars to Montana during the next 13 years. But one such major bill deserves mention here because of the part ordinary Montana citizens had in it.

A provision written into the military construction authorization assures telephone and electric cooperatives the right to serve SAGE air defense installations in their area. Previously some cooperatives were being bypassed even though they could do the job more cheaply than private utilities could. The construction of duplicating lines will be forbidden by this amendment. It has been estimated that this and other provisions of the new military construction law will result in savings to the taxpayers of $830 million. We are pleased to add that this economizing legislation was initiated by representatives of two Montana cooperatives, the Mid-Rivers Telephone Cooperative with headquarters at Circle, and the Sheridan County Electric Cooperative with headquarters at Medicine Lake.

One executive decision strongly urged by ourselves and some other Members of Congress from Western States is particularly helpful to Montana. We refer to the Secretary of the Army's decision to maintain the 96th Infantry Reserve Division in its present operating status instead of reducing it to a maneuver area command as once programed. An unfavorable decision would have doomed the reserve armory construction and entire Army Reserve setup in Montana. Army has approved Army Reserve training center sites at Billings, Bozeman, Butte, Glasgow, Great Falls, Havre, Livingston, and Polson. We would emphasize that these designations are for planning purposes only and that final departmental approval of the projects and requests for construction funds for the necessary 100-man and 200-man armories cannot be initiated until the minimum strength of troop program units meets the departmental requirements.

Eastern Montana has been plagued by serious drought conditions this year and we have repeatedly appealed to the Secretary of Agriculture for assistance for these counties. We were disappointed and disturbed when the Secretary did not declare all 17 counties in eastern Montana as disaster areas as requested by the Governor of Montana. However, we were able to obtain an allowance for some of these counties to continue grazing on soil-bank acreage during the summer months.

During the past year considerable progress was made locally and nationally in bringing attention to the deplorable conditions which exist among some of the Indian reservations and settlements in the State such as Hill 57 in Great Falls. It was unfortunate that legislation providing for relief of depressed areas, including Indian tribes, did not pass before adjournment of Congress. However, Congress did enact legislation, Public Law 959, providing for a vocational training program for Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 to help them obtain employment. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been persistent in its denial of additional aid to the destitute Indians in Montana, but we shall continue our efforts in behalf of "America's first citizens," the Indians.

The most grievous defeat for the people of Montana during this session was the Presidential veto of the resolution which would have authorized payment of $5 million to the Crow Indians for Yellowtail Dam land and right-of-way, and thus cleared away the last obstacle to construction of this multipurpose project which will mean so much to the industry and growth of our State. We believe the record of the 84th Congress, as it affects Montana, is good. We plan to make the record of the 85th Congress even better by providing, at the earliest opportunity, for a $5 million settlement for the Crow Indians. We are hopeful that the President, whomever he may be, and his advisers will agree that this figure is just and reasonable, and approve the proposal so we can get on with the job of building Yellowtail Dam and thus a better life for Montanans.

Work of the Agriculture Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, finally I make brief comment on the work of the

Agriculture Committee of which I am the only California member. We enacted these laws of particular interest to California: Put a floor under 1957 and 1958 national cotton acreages with the result of about 33,000 additional cotton acres in California in 1957 alone; extended the Sugar Act with a formula expanding domestic quotas including an estimated added 25,000 of beet acres in 1957; streamlined the PCA lending program; liberalized Farmers' Home Administration lending programs for the benefit of small farms; and expanded the school milk program.

Reorganization of the Passport Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the reorganization of the Passport Office.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

During the recess following the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the staff of the Committee on Government Operations was directed, at my suggestion, to initiate a survey of the operations of the Passport Office of the Department of State with a view toward reorganizing and modernizing the Office to meet the increasing demands for passport service.

As a result of this directive, and at the request of the committee, a survey team, composed of representatives of the General Services Administration, the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission, was assigned to assist Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, to determine what action was necessary to increase the efficiency of the Office, to prevent the recurrence of backlogs and delays, and to meet current demands for passport services.

A detailed report was submitted to the Senate following this reorganization survey. The committee approved the staff report (S. Rept. No. 1604, 84th Cong.) and initiated legislative action designed to correct reported deficiencies and to modernize the operations of the Passport Office (S. 3340). Officials of the Department of State requested an opportunity to appear before the committee in order to present their views relative to certain provisions of the proposed legislation to which they were opposed, and the bill was thereupon recommitted to the Committee on Government Operations. I have since been informed by the staff of the committee that, although there have been marked improvements in the operations of the Office following the reorganization, there are a number of tasks which still remain to be undertaken before the Office will be prepared to serve the public in its fullest potential, such as the providing of adequate telephone facilities and increased personnel during peak periods, the training of personnel to conform to the new mechanization program installed at the direction of the reorganization survey team, the initiation of a program for advance planning to handle the continuing increase in the workload of the Office and the determination of the need for decentralization.

Accordingly, with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I have requested the staff of the committee to continue these studies and to prepare a further report for committee consideration before the convening of the 85th Congress.

I include at this point in my remarks copies of correspondence directed by me to the chief clerk of the Committee on Government Operations and to the Director of the Passport Office, in which I have set forth suggestions relative to the specific data which should be compiled by the staff of the committee in cooperation with the Passport Office and the reorganization survey team, to insure that all aspects of the operation may be given further study and appropriate action initiated to correct any continuing deficiencies, as well as replies from the chief clerk of the committee and the Director of the Passport Office setting forth the present status and the projected study program.

JULY 18, 1956.

Mr. WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR WALTER: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have just written to Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, in which I have requested certain information relative to the operations of the Passport Office.

My thinking is that our committee ought to keep abreast of developments in light of the hearings that were held on the proposed legislation earlier in the year. I would appreciate you and the staff following up with the State Department in line with these suggestions:

That the Passport Office be assigned a liaison office on Capitol Hill;

That the Passport Office provide the requisite agents and clerks;

That the Passport Office keep alert to the needs of the traveling public and be encouraged to render whatever services are necessary in this respect; and

That the Passport Office continue to supply Members of Congress with passport statistics on a quarterly basis.

Perhaps, upon receipt of replies from the State Department and from Miss Knight a staff report could be issued.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
July 20, 1956.

Hon. HUBERT M. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 18, 1956, with reference to certain additional information you desire in connection with the operation of the Passport Office.

As I informed you personally, I have already been in contact with Miss Frances Knight and have further conferences tentatively scheduled for a full discussion of the various problems encountered by the Passport Office, including the points you raise in your communication to Miss Knight.

Following the development of the essential facts through consultation with officials of the Passport Office, the GSA, and the GAO, I shall have a further conference with officials of the Department of State with a view to initiating appropriate action necessary to correct any deficiencies in the organization of the office that still may exist and will, as you suggest, prepare an additional progress report as soon as all of the facts are available.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Chief Clerk.

JULY 18, 1956.

Miss FRANCES G. KNIGHT,
Director, Passport Office, Department of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS KNIGHT: I have seen your report of July 13 giving a breakdown on the number of applications for the issuance or renewal of passports during the first 6 months of 1956. As you know, I am extremely interested in the operations of the passport office. In light of the hearings earlier this year before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I feel our committee members would desire additional and more specific data on the operations and plans of the Passport Office along the following lines:

1. We have been informed that a passport agency has been proposed for location in Los Angeles. What progress is being made toward the opening of this office? What will this provide in terms of lightening the workload of the Washington office and furnishing speedier service for west coast travelers?

2. What are the plans for providing more adequate telephone service to the public and to Members of Congress? You will recall my recent letter to you on this aspect of the passport office functions.

3. What is the present status of the mechanization program, and what consideration is being given to additional machinery and automation?

4. During the hearings it was recommended that the passport office be provided with more flexibile budgetary authority to meet changing personnel and supply requirements. Has such budgetary flexibility been provided, and what changes in budget handling have been effected in this regard?

5. Are plans for more adequate staff and facilities being activated now in preparation for the 1957 travel season?

6. In addition to the information contained in the July 13 report of statistics on issuance of passports, I feel our committee would be greatly interested in statistics showing the number of telephone calls, incoming and outgoing, including congressional inquiries, relating to the status of passport applications and their issuance. Other data representing the workload, such as employee overtime, for the past 6 months will be also of interest.

I know that during the peak travel period Members of Congress are called upon by their constituents for assistance in expediting action on their passport applications and that a goodsized portion of the workload is concerned with providing this service. It has occurred to me that there may be a way to facilitate this service through the establishment of a passport liaison office on Capitol Hill, in the Capitol itself or in the Senate or House Office Buildings, from January to, perhaps, September 1. This would be for the purpose of servicing emergency calls and requirements concerning passports which arise in congressional offices. One or more agents and clerks could be provided by the passport office for this liaison office during these peak months.

Your comments and reaction to the above suggestion, and your furnishing me with the information requested in the foregoing at your earliest convenience will indeed be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Thank you for your letter of July 18, 1956, inquiring into the operations of the Passport Office. I want you to know that we greatly appreciate your personal interest in our welfare and your help and suggestions in solving some of our problems.

I will answer your specific questions in the order you asked them:

1. Question: "We have been informed that a Passport Agency has been proposed for location in Los Angeles. What progress is being made toward the opening of this office? What will this provide in terms of lightening the workload of the Washington office and furnishing speedier service for west coast travelers?"

Answer: We are planning to establish a Passport Agency in Los Angeles to be open for business October 1, 1956. The Department was advised this week that the General Services Administration received three bids which could be considered as meeting our requirements for office space. A decision was made this week to locate the Passport Agency in the Architect's Building at Fifth and Figueroa Streets. This is the downtown area, located near transportation companies and travel agents.

The space measures approximately 4,500 square feet and is located on street level. I am planning to fly out to Los Angeles on Sunday to see it and arrange with GSA for renovations, modernization, and to select and purchase the necessary furnishings and equipment. In accordance with my request, the Department's representative on office space will be with me.

Our recent statistics indicate that in the first 6 months of 1956, we received 44,575 applications for passports from California. A substantial proportion of this number originated in the Los Angeles area. I believe 20,000 is a conservative estimate of the number of passports which may be issued annually by the Los Angeles agency. This, of course, would relieve the Washington office of that many issuances and, at the same time, would provide faster service to citizens on the west coast.

I am presently working out the staffing pattern of the Los Angeles agency and hope to have it at least 75 percent staffed by the proposed opening date of October 1, 1956.

2. Question: "What are your plans for providing more adequate telephone service to the public and Members of Congress? You will recall my recent letter to you on this aspect of the Passport Office functions."

Answer: The telephone service which we should but have not been able to provide, remains one of our major problems. We have had experts from GSA, the telephone company, as well as the Department study our system, and presently the only answer appears to be additional equipment and more operators.

It is generally agreed that the additional lines assigned to the Passport Office last April, while helpful, did not meet the need. Lines were added, but we still had insufficient instruments with which to answer incoming calls, or to make outgoing calls. We should have at least four lines and phones, as well as four additional operators. This additional equipment and staff has been recommended and is under consideration by the Department. As soon as the pressure lessens to the point where we can devote adequate time to a training program for new operators, we will do so.

The idea of a switchboard has been discouraged because of the expense of initial installation, which would hardly be justified if the Passport Office is to move into the proposed new building for the Department of State within the next 2 years.

The Department has looked into the possibility of securing two off-premise lines from the Capitol direct to the Passport Office. I have been informed that contact was made with Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, the Clerk of the House, and that he reported the present inadequacy of the Capitol switchboard. He also reported that due to this congestion Members of Congress have been requested, whenever possible, to place their long-distance calls through commercial facilities.

I know for a fact that my staff and I personally have had long waits to reach the Capitol switchboard through the code number of 190 and through outside lines. As of the present time, the request for two direct lines from the Capitol board to the Passport Office has been denied. If this arrangement could be reconsidered, I believe it would do much to relieve congressional offices of their problems in reaching the Passport Office. With such a system, the Capitol operator could connect a congressional call directly to the Passport Office, and, if the lines are busy, she could watch them and plug in the call as soon as they are free.

3. Question: "What is the present status of the mechanization program, and what consideration is being given to additional machinery and automation?"

Answer: We have fulfilled our requirements insofar as electric typewriters are concerned. The specially built pin-feed machines on which we type the control card, the file record, and the address insert are installed and operating satisfactorily.

We have just ordered a new combination seal-and-legend machine which will emboss the seal of the Department of State on the passport picture and the red wafer, and at the same time punch in the legend reading "photograph attached Department of State Washington."

Delivery on this combination machine will be made on or about December 1, 1956.

We are presently looking into a new process for applying the photograph onto the passport. This is going to take some time to develop, but we are making some progress.

4. Question: "During the hearings it was recommended that the Passport Office be provided with more flexible budgetary authority to meet changing personnel and supply requirements. Has such budgetary flexibility been provided, and what changes in budget handling have been effected in this regard?"

Answer: There has been no change in budgetary control which would give the Passport Office flexibility in the sense the committee had in mind. However, Mr. I. W. Carpenter, Jr., Assistant Secretary-Controller, has held two meetings since your hearings, at which the affairs of the Passport Office were discussed. At these meetings I was permitted to present my requirements, and I pointed out that reappraisals and adjustments of the Passport Office budget were in order, due to the increased workload from applications received as well as unforeseen additional services required of the Passport Office. Mr. Carpenter's deputies in charge of budget, personnel, and operations, who also attend these meetings, are making sincere efforts to be of assistance to the Passport Office. They have been briefed on our workload and requirements. A revised Passport Office financial plan for 1957 which would permit us to staff adequately for the next travel season, has been submitted, and I hope to receive favorable and expeditious action.

5. Question: "Are plans for more adequate staff and facilities being activated now in preparation for the 1957 travel season?"

Answer: In connection with the revised financial plan for 1957 mentioned in the preceding paragraph, I have requested additional staff and funds for the immediate future in order to permit the training and staffing of the Washington headquarters as well as the field agencies. I stress the need for prompt action, because what is not completed in the way of organization and planning during the months of September, October, and November becomes delayed or sidetracked when our travel season begins.

6. Question: "In addition to the information contained in the July 13 report of statistics on issuance of passports, I feel our committee would be greatly interested in statistics showing the number of telephone calls, incoming and outgoing, including congressional inquiries, relating to the status of passport applications and their issuance. Other data representing the workload, such as employee overtime, for the past 6 months will also be of interest."

Answer: The following statistics give a partial picture of workload we have carried in the past 6 months:

Applications for passports received by the Passport Office indicate the following increases in 1956 over 1955:

	Percent Increase
January 1956 over January 1955	19.5
February 1956 over February 1955	22.9
March 1956 over March 1955	3.5
April 1956 over April 1955	9.5
May 1956 over May 1955	8.0

Applications for passports received by the Passport Office field agencies indicate the following increases over a 10-month period:

	Percent Increase
New York	9.7
San Francisco	10.5
Chicago	15.0
Boston	11.2
New Orleans	10.0
Washington, D. C	15.8

Analysis of incoming telephone calls to Passport Office inquiry section, January 2 through January 6, 1956, 1,022 calls.

Analysis of incoming telephone calls to Passport Office inquiry section, June 1 through June 7, 1956, 4,592 calls.

Increase of 400 percent.

Analysis of incoming congressional telephone calls to the Passport Office inquiry section February 3 through February 9, 1956, 394 calls.

Analysis of incoming congressional telephone calls to the Passport Office inquiry section June 1 through June 7, 1956, 1,266 calls.

Increase of 237 percent.

Between January 1 and June 30, 1956, the Passport Office was called upon to render "special service" on 31 percent of the applications received. This special handling involving 115,000 applications includes expediting individual cases involving matters of life and death, sickness and other emergencies. Included also are special searches and stop orders due to last-minute changes in departure dates, changes in mailing address, and amendments to passports due to changed travel plans. The Passport Office has absorbed this additional and greatly increased workload through considerable overtime on the part of its employees.

In the first 6 months of calendar year 1956, the Passport Office worked a total of 16,235 hours of recorded overtime. Supervisory personnel do not record their overtime since it is voluntary. However, it is conservative to state that there are at least several thousand hours of voluntary overtime unrecorded. I, personally, put in 620 hours overtime from January 1 through June 30, when I gave up keeping even a fragmentary record of the nights, weekends, and holidays spent at the office.

With reference to your suggestion that a Passport Liaison Office be established on Capitol Hill during the peak travel season, for the purpose of serving the Members of Congress—I think it is an excellent idea. I know that space is very tight in both the Senate and House Office Buildings, and as far as I can determine, it is equally tight in the Capitol. I have been informed that various departments have been asked to remove their liaison officers from the Capitol because of the size of their contingents and large amount of space and facilities they absorbed. The Passport Office service would not present this problem since one of our agents could operate from any corner that would be made available to us. Furthermore, we would not have to tax the Capitol's switchboard facilities because I find we could install a tele-

type between the Hill and the Passport Office which would provide us with a two-way recorded communication system. In any event, if the space could be provided, we would be very glad to cooperate and provide such a service.

In the final analysis, the answer to our major problems of delays and overwork, is a realistic view of our personnel requirements, both in Washington and in the field agencies. I believe we are making progress in that respect, and I do hope we will have a much more effective office in operation by the time Congress convenes in January 1957.

Thank you again for your continuing interest in our welfare. With best wishes,

Sincerely,

FRANCES G. KNIGHT,
Director, Passport Office.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS.
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Pursuant to your letter of July 18, 1956, I have consulted briefly with Miss Frances Knight, Director of the Passport Office, and with representatives of the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office who originally served as members of the survey team appointed at the request of the committee in 1955 to effect necessary reorganization in that Office, with the objective of carrying out your suggestions for further improvements in its operations.

In a preliminary review of the present operations of the Office, it has been developed that there are several areas which will require further studies and administrative action in order to permit the Passport Office to render adequate service to passport applicants in accordance with the reorganization program. These surveys and studies are presently under way.

It develops that, although the new mechanized program initiated early this year has been effective in many respects, there are still certain problems that have to be resolved before the Office will be able to keep abreast of the increased demands for passport services. As you have indicated, there appears to be a need for closer liaison with the Congress, improved telephone facilities, increased seasonal personnel to meet the demands for passports during peak travel periods or to handle emergencies, and more flexibility in budgetary authority in order that changing personnel and supply requirements may be met promptly. The staff will direct its efforts, through the cooperation of the Director, the members of the original survey team, and officials of the Department of State, to effect appropriate administrative action to accomplish these objectives.

I have been in contact with officials of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, who have indicated a desire to cooperate with the staff in working out solutions to these problems, after full information has been developed through conferences with the Director of the Passport Office and the other Government officials.

Contact has also been made with officials of the International Travel Division, Department of Commerce, and the staff will give consideration to information and recommendations submitted to that Agency by the Travel Advisory Committee relative to further reorganizations of the Passport Office, the developments of the statistical information service by the Office and effecting appropriate adjustments in passport fees.

As previously indicated, a report will be prepared for submission to you and other members of the committee as soon as all the facts have been developed, with recommendations for further committee action.

With kinds regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

James L. E. Jappe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on July 8, the Cleveland Plain Dealer carried an article written by their city editor and ace political analyst, Alvin Silverman, in tribute to James L. E. Jappe who this year celebrates his 65th birthday.

At a time when most men begin a leisurely retirement, Jim Jappe is embarking upon the second half of an energetic career already unparalleled in success. As he approaches and solves new problems, my best wishes are with him for continued happiness and prosperity in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point the article referred to above.

The article follows:

FRIENDS SAY BEST LUCK, JIM JAPPE
(By Alvin Silverman)

One of the most influential political figures Ohio has produced in the last half century is to be honored at a "belated 65th stag birthday party" next Sunday evening.

His name is James L. E. Jappe.

Chances are that you never have heard of Jimmy Jappe. That is, unless you have held public office or have attended a Republican National Convention, or on some occasion wanted to get a bill through the Ohio General Assembly or work for a newspaper or practice medicine or found yourself up against it with no one to whom to turn.

Jappe never cared too much about having his name publicized. He always has been a behind-the-scenes man, with a strong desire for anonymity, operating on the rather sound principle that a big writeup, plus one dime, will buy a cup of coffee at some restaurants.

Yet it is not too great an exaggeration to say that no Ohio law of any consequence has been enacted since the 1920's without his participation in the drafting, somewhere along the line. Indeed, he served as a member of the commission which recodified our whole book of State laws several years ago.

FARMER'S FRIEND

Nor is it stretching the truth to note that no Republican National Convention in recent times could have proceeded smoothly and efficiently, especially insofar as press and radio accommodations were concerned, without his direction of arrangements.

Certainly there is not the slightest doubt that Jappe's personal influence with Ohio Representatives and Senators—particularly among the so-called cornstalk brigade, the rural bloc that runs the show—is without precedent.

Doctors and persons who have hit a streak of bad luck are his hobbies, as are fishing, gin rummy, and talking. He loves just being with medical men and numbers among his most intimate friends some of the most distinguished doctors in the Nation.

If all the help he has extended to people who needed a few bucks to tide them over was deposited in one account, James L. E. Jappe now would be well started on his second million.

TOUGH SUBJECT

This is a fellow about whom it is difficult to write without getting sentimental because a more considerate, helpful, thoroughly kind little fellow never lived.

Objectively, however, it must be remembered that Jappe is a lobbyist, a lawyer who receives high fees for seeing that certain pieces of legislation are enacted and others never get out of a committee box.

In his heart, Jimmy feels that he never has worked for a measure that was against the public interest. Nevertheless, he was the judge of what was good or bad and, undoubtedly, some legislation he believed equitable may not have so appeared to those affected by it.

Many times Jimmy has persuaded his clients, principally the utility interests, to pull out of legislation that would have aided only a small section of the citizenry. Many times he has advised legislators to vote against a bill that personally would have helped him. But on occasion, he has bucked for the special interests.

SECRET OF SUCCESS

The secret of Jappe's lobbying success is no mystery to anyone who knows his way around Columbus or Washington.

He counseled and backed bright young men when they were starting out on their political careers and hardly knew a ballot from a precinct. He groomed them as a trainer schools a racehorse. And, in time, these bright young people become the chairmen of legislative committees, the leaders of the Ohio General Assembly, Congressmen, judges and prosecutors, mayors and governors, Cabinet members and, on two occasions, Presidents of the United States.

Jimmy still was their adviser. He still was their close friend. He was in. Yet, it would not be fair to say he was entirely motivated by a desire for power. He is a great believer in putting smart people in government and he would rather sell a program to an able administrator than a political hack, the whole tribe of which he detests.

A bachelor, garrulous and animated, self-confident but modest, street wise but soft-hearted, James L. E. Jappe is about 5-foot-2.

But he'll be the biggest man at his birthday party next Sunday at Brother Al's, just as he has been one of the biggest men of his Ohio Republican Party for many of his 65 years.

Senate Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the Senate leadership.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

During the last hours of the 2d session of the 84th Congress I had hoped to be able to take the floor for a few minutes to express my high regard and great respect for the legislative leaders of our two great political parties. The press of adjournment, however, made this impossible.

The majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, has once again demonstrated his great and all-embracing grasp in matters affecting legislative procedure. He has been uniformly considerate and courteous to all members in his own party and I am certain to the membership of the Republican Party as well. His magnetism, his skill, his understanding have been in large part responsible for the responsible attitude that the Democratic Party has taken during the 83d and the 84th Congresses. He has tried to understand our individual problems and

he has cooperated to the fullest extent possible in seeing to it that every Member was given every possible consideration. He has proved to the country that, despite his severe heart attack of over a year ago, he is once again his old self and that he is able to carry on his duties as effectively and expeditiously as before. We are thankful for his complete recovery and we look forward to serving with him and under him when the 85th Congress convenes.

The minority leader, Senator WILLIAM KNOWLAND, has, as always, displayed his outstanding integrity, honesty, and consideration of his fellow Members. He, too, has been uniformly courteous and has worked hand in hand with Senator JOHNSON in carrying through the legislation which has been before the Senate and he, along with the majority leader, has kept alive the traditions of decency, fair play, and honest debate throughout the two Congresses. The patience of the majority and minority leaders has been tried at times, I know, but they have always been able to overcome difficulties, to explain to the membership what the situation was, and to emerge with greater stature than before.

As we look back on the 84th Congress, we realize more than ever the greatness of the leadership of these two men and we are thankful to them that in time of crisis the Nation is blessed with a partnership of this kind which has maintained congressional integrity and kept the standards of the Senate at a high level.

To LYNDON JOHNSON and BILL KNOWLAND I want to express my thanks for their fine leadership and friendship, their courtesy and consideration. They are real assets and a great credit to our country, their respective parties, and to the Senate of the United States.

Hon. Brady Gentry

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to one of the members of our own Texas delegation who is retiring from the Congress this year, the Honorable BRADY GENTRY. Mr. GENTRY has had a lifetime of public service, holding various offices within the State of Texas prior to his being elected to the House of Representatives.

It was my pleasure to have served with him during his first term of office on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. His sincerity of purpose, his honesty, and integrity made him a most valued member of that committee, and I regretted very much that he resigned from the committee at the outset of the 84th Congress at which time I was elevated to the post of chairman. It would have been a pleasure to have had him serve with me.

His work with the Public Works Committee on the recently enacted Federal Aid Highway Act was most valuable as his prior public service covered a number of years on the Texas Highway Commission which gave him a keen insight to the problems of the State in highway construction and maintenance.

I wish for him the best of everything in his future life and I for one am sorry to see him leave this legislative body.

Dangerous Pitfalls in Price Support Limitation Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, during this session of the Congress considerable publicity was given to various proposals which would provide some type of limitation, usually in terms of dollars, on the participation of individual farm operators in the farm price support program.

Limitations were first suggested in the so-called Brannon plan, but they were later withdrawn from that proposal when the inequity and unworkability of the idea became clear. The idea was reviewed again in President Eisenhower's message to the Congress on the farm problem, which was submitted earlier this year.

With this impetus, a price support limitation was adopted in the form of an amendment to H. R. 12 when that bill was being considered on the Senate floor. The confereees on the bill, the most experienced and knowledgeable men in the Congress on agricultural problems, deleted the provision by unanimous vote. Senator ELLENDER, in reporting on the conference, said:

> These provisions did not seem to be effective * * * or to the extent effective (would be) destructive of the purpose.

The idea of limiting price supports has its greatest appeal to those who think of our entire price support program as nothing more than a dole or handout. Naturally, if the farm program is to be nothing more than that, we should limit individual participation as much as possible.

The purpose of the price support program, whether it be flexible, rigid, or otherwise, is not to provide a dole or handout. It is designed first of all to provide, a system of orderly marketing of farm commodities. Before price supports were offered, the average farmer had to market his crop as soon as it was harvested, thereby leaving himself at the mercy of the buyer in a buyer's market. The price support system makes it possible for the farmer to place all, or a portion, of his crop in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan if the price offered at harvesttime is not acceptable. The placing of portions of the crop in the loan prevents the flooding of the market and preserves a stabilized price in a free market. If and when the market rises, the farmer can pay back his loan plus interest and carrying charges, redeem his crop and sell it on the higher market.

The use of the loan is a tool in the hands of every farmer, large or small, that brings benefits to all agriculture. Naturally, the greatest benefits come to the small farmer, for he has no other means of waiting out the market or withholding his crop for more favorable prices.

The operation of the loan program usually means that commodity markets are influenced primarily by the loan level. There is almost always a free market price approximating that of the loan because no commodities on the market are barred from participation. Small farmers desiring immediate cash returns, with a minimum of redtape involved in loan operations, quite often sell their crops as soon as harvested. They do not actually participate in the loan program, but they secure all the benefits of the free market price sustained by the loan level.

Suppose, through a limitation on participation in the price supports, the large producers were denied the use of the loan for their commodities. The loss to the big farmer would be nothing by comparison with the hardship brought upon the small or family-size farmer. He would be faced with the choice of placing his crop in the loan or selling immediately in competition with the unsupported crops of the big producers in the open market. Naturally the large quantities of unsupported crops from big producers would keep the free market well below the loan level.

It is obvious that a limitation on support would tend to draw the entire crops of small producers into Government stocks, leaving the market to the large producers that would be barred from participation in the program. This would result in the free market never rising above the price-support level. The end result would be the destruction of every type of price-support program. Large operators would, of course, suffer hardships as a result of this, but by far the greatest losers would be the small farmers.

The contribution of the family-size farm to our great American economy and culture has always been recognized, and no one belittles it today. Those who propose price-support limitations like to call themselves defenders of the family farm. I hope that the true friends of family-farm operators will see the danger to the entire commodity-loan program which would develop from these limitation proposals.

The limitation plan would also deny the benefits of the loan program to a large group of farmers who are entitled to just as much consideration as any others—the tenants and day laborers who secure their income as a part of the operation of these large producers who would be barred from participation in the loan. Tenants on cotton farms, for instance, work under a contract which provides that they shall have a certain share of the proceeds from each bale of cotton which they produce. There is no way in which that bale can be divided to be placed in the loan. Price-support limitations would effectively bar tenants from obtaining any benefits from the basic Government farm program.

The same result would apply to farm laborers who work for wages. As is true with any business enterprise, the wage scale is to an important degree related to the income of the operation. Denial of the loan program to the employers of these laborers would be denying them an opportunity to earn the highest possible wages. Rank discrimination would be involved, of which we can find no parallel in industry.

One of the prize exhibits which supporters of loan limitations have presented is a list of large farming operations over the country with a tabulation of the commodities which these farmers placed in the Commodity Credit Corporation loan during a certain period. The inference has been made that these farmers received a handout amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars in individual cases. Actually there were no handouts in any case, and the figures shown merely represented the value of crops placed in the loan.

Two of the farms listed were in my own district, and I have taken the trouble to secure a detailed report of the loan operation involved. In one case the interest amounted to a profit of $4,828.67 for the Government. In another case the vast majority of the cotton placed in the loan was withdrawn and sold. The interest paid the Government exceeded the value of the cotton left in the loan, and, in addition, the Government now has full title to this cotton. In both cases the Government actually made a profit on the operation.

I hope that the entire country, and the Congress and our agricultural leadership in particular, will study this issue carefully in the coming months. I am confident that any impartial analysis will result in the entire idea of limitation being rejected by those who want to see a sound price-support program retained to benefit not only our farmers but our entire economy.

Report to First Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as I again make my report to the First Congressional District, it is with a feeling of utmost appreciation for the opportunity that has been given to me to serve this fine congressional district in the House of Representatives. I trust that my service has been satisfactory. I have tried to the best of my ability to be zealous in doing what I have considered best, not only for the people I have the honor to represent, but, also to promote the welfare of all our people and make America strong and secure.

PEACE

It is particularly pleasing to realize that our Nation is at peace. Four years ago, when General Eisenhower was a candidate for President, he pledged, if elected, he would make a personal visit to the battlefields of Korea, and would endeavor, to the best of his ability, to bring the war to an end. We are all grateful that this has been accomplished and as a consequence our boys are no longer being killed or maimed on Korean battlefields.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Everyone is conscious of the fact that since World War II we have been living in a world of uncertainty. It has seemed that each day presented some new problem that required solution. It is also generally recognized that Russia in most instances, either working alone or through its satellite nations, has been the cause of this uncertainty. This at times has created situations of a most critical character. A single unwise act or word upon our part might, or, could have precipitated war. We should be thankful to Almighty God for guiding our course as a nation in such a manner that peace prevails among the nations of the world. There can be no doubt that this Nation, as it has assumed the moral leadership of the world, has been an instrument in God's hands in promoting a greater sense of understanding and good will among the nations of the world. Although at times it may have been but a flickering light, yet it has been sufficient at all times to light the way to a better and more peaceful world. It should be our fervent prayer that the light of morality among nations will continue to grow stronger that peace and good will may be established and made enduring.

GENEVA CONFERENCE

In considering what seems to be a new force working for a more peaceful existence in the world, we should not overlook the tremendous good that was created by the Conference at Geneva, nor the great influence of President Eisenhower in directing the course of the Conference and thereby creating a more friendly attitude among the great nations of the world and thus promoting the cause of peace and good will.

It has been acknowledged throughout the world, if we can judge by the favorable comments of the foreign press, as well as our own columnists and editors, that President Eisenhower by his magnetic personality, his words of wisdom, his evident sincerity, and his high and unselfish ideals, raised the Conference to the highest level of any meeting of world diplomats that has ever been held. Even Russia since the Conference has announced new policies that have astonished the world as a new approach to a more peaceful existence. It will be our hope that fulfillment of these policies by Russia will be as genuine as the words that were used in expressing them.

FOREIGN AID

Since World War II we have given many billions of dollars for foreign aid. This was necessary because of the impoverished condition of our allies. Their need was so great that if we had refused the aid so sorely needed they could have been taken over by communism very easily. However, the economic and military financial aid we extended have enabled them to retain their independence from Russian domination, and, in addition, we have built up an organization of military strength in each of these nations, the existence of which can be of real assistance to us in time of any emergency and a strong deterrent against war at this or any other time. Thus, while our expenditures for foreign aid have been great, yet, equally great have been the beneficial results attained by us. And, with lessening of world tensions we can look forward to a substantial curtailment in such expenditures in the near future.

FISCAL POLICIES

At the present time the high degree of prosperity that exists throughout the Naiton is exceedingly gratifying. With 66½ million of our people gainfully employed, at the highest average rate of wages ever paid in the entire history of our Nation, and, with production at the highest peak of all time, we have reason to be truly thankful. In addition to all of this, we have a fiscal policy that has not only balanced out budget, as promised by President Eisenhower during his campaign for the Presidency, but, has provided a surplus of receipts over expenditures that has enabled us to utilize such surplus in reduction of the national debt and thereby cut down the tremendous interest charges incurred by previous administrations because of their failure to live within our means. These satisfactory results arising from a sound fiscal policy make for a strong Nation. Financial stability is of prime importance in maintaining our security in the present and in the future. A continuance of such is most necessary.

TAX REDUCTION

The tax reductions effected by the Republican Congress in the 83d Congress under the Eisenhower administraiton totaled $7,400,000,000. This reduction was made possible by the greatest economy drive in the history of our country. Through the elimination of wasteful, duplication, and often ridiculous spending policies set up and carried on by the previous administrations, it has been possible for the present Eisenhower administration to cut the expenditures of Government and, in consequence thereof, cut taxes by $7,400,000. This spectacular Republican effort produced the largest tax reduction in the history of the world and ended the "tax and spend" policy of the previous administrations to the great relief of financially burdened taxpayers in every walk of life. And these reductions represented the first big step in a long-range program to rewrite our tax laws in the interest of fairness to all the taxpayers, and thereby permit them to retain as much of their hard-earned money as possible. President Eisenhower with a Republican Congress can continue to give this kind of tax relief if elected.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Notwithstanding the strong desire for peace in our Nation, yet, as long as the world continues in an uncertain state with some nations less peaceably inclined than our own, it is necessary for our own security to maintain a strong national defense. The amount to be spent is necessarily large. However, under the wise and informed leadership of President Eisenhower, the greatest military man of our time, and Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson, who is undoubtedly the greatest production engineer of our time, we can rest assured that whatever may be the program de-

cided upon by these two men, it will be the best that wisdom and experience can devise. There will be neither waste nor anything beyond what necessity would demand.

Already under this administration there has been a considerable reduction in the cost of our national defense. The two outstanding men at the head of our defense, President Eisenhower and Secretary Wilson, know better than anyone else what we need and how to get an adequate defense at the least possible cost. Their performance in the past is a guaranty of what we can expect from their continuance in office. A Congress that is in accord with them, and, willing to make effective the program they decide upon, can be most helpful in providing a strong and adequate defense at reasonable cost.

LABOR

There are more of our people at work, earning more, building more, saving more, and buying more than at any other time in our history as a nation. We are enjoying the highest standard of living ever enjoyed by any nation in history. An increasing population, businessmen actively engaged in starting new enterprises and expanding old ones, and the discoveries of science and technology opening up new opportunities, give promise of providing even greater employment and an even higher standard of living.

President Eisenhower's administration, with the Honorable James P. Mitchell, as Secretary of Labor, presented to Congress a slate of labor legislative proposals which included more major items, benefiting more wage earners, than has been included in any labor legislative program in many years. Some of its more important recommendations were: First, amendment of the Taft-Hartley law; second, amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act to increase the minimum wage and to bring additional workers within its coverage; third, to revise and improve the 8-hour laws relating to work on Federal contracts; fourth, to provide financial aid to the States for improving industrial safety; fifth, to increase benefits payable under workmen's compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act; sixth, to further improve the District of Columbia Unemployment Insurance Act in line with other recommendations by President Eisenhower for improvement of the Federal-State unemployment compensation system; and seventh, a bill to require equal pay for women to eliminate discriminatory wage practices based on sex.

Some of the above, in part or in whole, have been adopted. Others, and in addition to the above, await action by Congress. Among the many things that were done to promote the welfare of the workers was the adoption of a $1 per hour minimum wage law, with an expanded coverage thereunder; increased pay for postal workers and other Federal employees, together with improved retirement benefits and civil-service provisions; retention of Walsh-Bacon Act for the benefit of workers on Government projects. There was other legislation that will be helpful to workers. This includes legislation increasing benefits for rail workers, their widows, and dependents. In this connection, I am pleased to include in my remarks a letter received by me from G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association. He wrote:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of all organized railroad employees both retired and active, I want to thank you for your help in obtaining relief for our retired people.

Your career has been marked with many manifestations of your concern for the welfare of our people. For this we are, as ever, grateful.

Sincerely,

G. E. LEIGHTY,
Chairman.

AGRICULTURE

Real prosperity in our Nation demands prosperity in each segment of our economy. There can be no real prosperity if it pertains only to labor, nor, equally true, if there is only agricultural prosperity but none for labor. There must be prosperity for both and every other activity within the Nation if there is to be full national prosperity. We all go up together, or, we all go down together. This describes the situation both fully and accurately.

In speaking of prosperity in agriculture, I am well aware that recently in some sections of the country it has not been as great as some might desire. But, when there is a tendency to criticize, it might be well to remember that when the Republicans took office in January 1953, farm prices had been declining for 2 years. Prices received by farmers had dropped 15 percent between February 1951 and January 1953. This sharp rate of decline has been in great measure stopped and prices have leveled off and show more stability.

The President, since assuming office, has endeavored to have policies adopted that would be helpful in halting any further dropping of prices, and, that would give real price protection to farmers. To accomplish this, he has sought to rebuild export markets, sale of agricultural surpluses, authorization to set aside surplus commodities to be used in constructive ways, such as in school-lunch programs, disaster relief, aid to stricken people in other countries, and stockpiled for use in a national emergency, drought programs, water conservation, tax credits for conservation, new laws improving and expanding farm credit, farm-housing program, expanded Federal crop insurance, more effective agricultural extension service, increased appropriations for Department of Agriculture, agricultural research programs and State experiment stations, agriculture extension service and agricultural conservation programs.

In addition and in order to keep politics from interfering with the administration of farm programs, as has occurred heretofore, he created by Executive order a bipartisan Agricultural Commission to review the policies and administration of farm programs. This new 18-member Commission is made up of 9 Republicans and 9 Democrats. A minimum of 12 members must be farmers.

All of this indicates that President Eisenhower is aware of the needs of the farmer. As time progresses it is becoming more and more evident that the policies inaugurated by the administration, together with the improved general economic condition of the country at large, is working toward a better economic condition for the farmer.

The Department of Agriculture has reported farm prices are on the upturn. While the increase is not yet as high as we want, nor expect it to be, yet, it is most gratifying to realize that the 5-year downturn that commenced under the previous administration has been arrested and farm income is now headed upward. It is clear we have passed the bottom and are definitely on the road to recovery with better prices.

VETERANS

The Republican attitude toward veterans was expressed by President Eisenhower in his first state of the Union message, immediately after he assumed the office of President. He said:

Proper care of our uniformed citizens, and appreciation of the past service of our veterans, are part of our accepted governmental responsibility.

Following this declaration of responsibility toward our ex-servicemen, the Republican Party has shown a desire and intention of fulfilling such obligation. And, such has always been the policy of the Republican Party from the time of the Civil War until the present.

Since the advent of the Eisenhower administration there have been many and varied improvements made in laws beneficial to veterans, their widows, survivors, and dependents. All of these have received increased benefits to which they are justly entitled, in addition to which provision has been made for greatly increased hospital facilities. In the 83d Congress, the first under President Eisenhower, the Republican veterans' program provided more hospital beds and medical care for a greater number of veterans than in any other year. This Republican Congress appropriated $33,032,875 more than the preceding administration and $55 million more than the year preceding that.

In addition to providing increased benefits and increased hospital beds and medical care, under the Eisenhower administration there have been laws to improve the status of veterans in many other ways. For instance, there has been a decided improvement in the law regulating housing loans, improved procedures relating to veterans' life-insurance policies that will give veterans better service, continuance of pay checks and family allotments for Korean war prisoners or soldiers missing in action, extending to Korean veterans public-housing provisions enjoyed by other veterans, facilitating appointment of veterans who had lost civil-service opportunities due to service in the armed services, legislation providing an additional $75 million to pay World War II veterans for compulsory labor or inhuman treatment suffered as prisoners of war, granting preferential status of veterans in Federal employment, and, in addition to the above, many more designed to be beneficial to our veterans.

It has been a personal pleasure and privilege to have had a part in the enact-

ment of these laws, and, assurance is given that the same considerate action may be expected in the future with the privilege of continued service in Congress being granted.

HEALTH AND HOSPITALS

There has been no activity of Government that has been of more interest to the Eisenhower administration and its supporters in Congress than that pertaining to the health and welfare of our people. This interest has been translated into action surpassing all that has been done in the past 20 years.

The intense interest displayed by Republicans in this important activity of Government was shown by the creation of a Cabinet post, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It was created for the purpose of expanding the Federal Government's interest and participation in promoting the health of our people. Under its jurisdiction has been created facilities to better care for the sick, the disabled, the handicapped in all categories, temporary and chronic. To accomplish this, provision has been made for greater Federal assistance in hospital construction, including nursing homes, rehabilitation centers, clinical and diagnostic centers. All of this has been done through a Federal-State building and maintenance program in which each participates in sharing the cost.

In addition to the hospital construction program, there has been a tremendous interest taken in providing the National Health Service with facilities to carry on the most extensive research as to the cause, prevention, and cure of our most outstanding, crippling, and killing diseases. This includes heart, cancer, all mental, nervous, and muscular diseases. The accomplishments of this increased and ever-expanding research program is producing results that have meant much to the individuals affected by such, as well as providing methods of care and cure that have greatly reduced the cost of maintaining public institutions devoted to their welfare, and also the cost of home and private treatment and care.

There is no Government activity in which the Eisenhower administration is more interested or more definitely committed to extending. Already appropriations for the accomplishment of these activities are being greatly increased each year. I confess it has given me a pleasure and privilege to have been a participant in this great undertaking as a member of the committee having jurisdiction and on two occasions its chairman. It was indeed gratifying to receive the following letter from Dr. Leonard Scheele, the retiring Surgeon General of the United States:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., July 27, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLVERTON: In departing from Washington and my Government career, I want you to know how much I have enjoyed, and have appreciated, my association with you. I shall always cherish the experiences during my years in Government service, and I want you to know that among the most pleasant has been my relationship with you. Your understanding and your sympathy with the aims of the Public Health Service have been an inspiration to all of us. Much of our accomplishment—and I like to think of it as substantial—would not have been possible without your counsel, your friendly and constructive criticism, and your support.

I will be located in New Jersey, as you know, but I hope to come back to Washington from time to time, and, hope that I may be privileged to appear before the Congress in the future in behalf of health legislation. I am sure that our paths will continue to cross.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely yours,

LEONARD A. SCHEELE,
Surgeon General.

HIGHWAYS

President Eisenhower proposed and the Congress enacted a law that will provide the greatest road system in the world. It will cross the Nation from north to south and from east to west. Every one of the 48 States will benefit. It will be financed by Federal-State participation. It will be one of the greatest achievements that has ever been carried out in the entire history of the Nation. It will prove beneficial to all our people and carry the Nation on to greater heights of progress.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Much to the dismay of President Eisenhower the Congress failed to enact a program for school construction. The question of segregation played a big part in the failure to pass appropriate legislation. The Republicans in Congress proposed a measure that would have greatly relieved the present stringent need for additional schoolrooms. The South is adamant in its refusal to accept any legislation that will curtail or eliminate the right of the individual States to adopt a policy of segregation if they so desire. Of course, such a policy runs counter to the Supreme Court, which has declared that segregation, as applied to the public-school system,. is unconstitutional. It is hoped that legislation can be enacted in the next Congress that will supply the need that exists for additional schools.

HOUSING

Another agency of Government that reflects the interest that Government should take in promoting the welfare of our people is that of providing proper housing and means for individuals to own their own homes. This, taken together with the legislation that has made possible slum clearance and the substitution of up-to-date and sanitary living quarters for the low-income groups, has improved the morale of our people to a point that cannot be fully estimated. In accomplishing these most desirable results the home builders as well as homeowners have been greatly assisted in providing these better living conditions. Homeownership makes for a stronger nation and a more satisfied people.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As an agency of Government social security has proved that it is worthwhile. Every day there comes to my attention the advantages that arise as a result of its far-reaching provisions. Of course, we are all aware that payments under social security and old-age assistance do not produce a state of affluence by any means, but it does constitute some help to those who come within its provisions. As our experience in its operation increases we learn of deficiencies and the need for improvement.

Since the Eisenhower administration came into office, and under a Republican Congress that was in the majority for only the first 2 years of that administration, great and important changes took place; namely, there was added 10 million citizens to the eligibility rolls, and benefits were increased for more than 6 million of our citizens now entitled to and drawing benefits. The changes approved in social-security legislation were designed to provide coverage for an increased number of our older citizens as rapidly as possible. The changes provide that, by 1960, 75 percent of our citizens reaching 65 years of age will be eligible for benefits. When the Republican administration replaced the previous administration in Washington only 47 percent of our aged were eligible for social-security benefits. It is the basic thought of the Republican administration that the program should be designed for the full benefit of all who now, or in the future, will need to rely upon it. The most recent changes that will prove highly beneficial provide that women shall be entitled to benefits upon reaching the age of 62 years instead of 65, and all totally disabled persons shall be entitled to draw benefits at 50 years of age instead of 65. Thus, we are moving on and the future will see further necessary improvements in the Social Security Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The question of civil rights is not new. The same old contentions arise in each session of Congress. The result is that legislation to improve and firmly establish the civil rights guaranteed to all our citizens by the Constitution passes the House and dies in the Senate. Its death in the Senate is not the result of a vote that defeats it but by reason of the fact that under the rules of the Senate it can be talked to death. This is accomplished by a filibuster carried on by Senators from the Southern States who talk and talk. The effect of this waste of time without action is to lay the legislation aside so that other business can be conducted, or, in many instances, the bill is held in committee and not permitted to be reported to the Senate floor for consideration.

This latter condition prevailed in the session just closed. A bill drawn by the Republican administration's Attorney General, Mr. Brownell, provided for the establishment of a bureau within the Justice Department, under an Assistant Attorney General, to investigate any denial of civil rights to any citizen on account of race, color, creed, or national origin, and giving authority to the Justice Department to go into court and protect the rights of any and all citizens. It can be readily seen that such a proposal was reasonable and entitled to favorable consideration by the Con-

gress. And, of course, it would have had the signature of the President if the Congress had passed it.

But notwithstanding the fact the House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority, it was sent to a committee in the Senate on which Democrat Senators from the South prevailed, and the bill was not even permitted to go to the floor of the Senate for discussion or vote.

Such a disposition is wrong. It is hoped that the coming elections in November will correct the wrong by the election of a House and Senate that will see the justice of the legislation and enact it into law.

WOMEN IN GOVERNMENT

Many have said that the women elected President Eisenhower and the Republican Congress in 1952. There can be no higher tribute to our party than to know we have the support of the women of America. Our party will remain strong and effective in providing good government as long as we can claim the support of our women.

As might be expected, the present administration has recognized the ability and utilized the services of women in the Government service to a greater extent than has ever existed heretofore under any other administration. More than 40 top-level posts in the Eisenhower administration are occupied by Republican women, and an estimated 1,200 are holding positions classified by the administration as policymaking or of high administrative authority. They are in diplomatic positions, the United Nations, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, civil defense, social welfare, postal operations, fiscal positions, customs, legal jobs, and in employment and Federal parole offices. And this is only a brief summary of the positions held by women in important agencies of Government. Altogether there are upward of nearly a half-million women engaged in the Federal Government service.

In the Federal diplomatic service, the Republican administration has called on the aid of women in 67 embassies and 9 legations abroad. Two ambassadorial posts are held by women, in Italy and Switzerland. More than 350 women hold important posts in the Foreign Service.

It is also interesting to note that at the State, county, and local municipal levels, innumerable women have been encouraged by the Republican Party to assume governmental duties. It is unnecessary to say, but pleasing to acknowledge, that in each instance these Republican women are doing an excellent and praiseworthy job. They are bringing credit to the women of America and the Republican Party of which they are a part.

COMMUNISM

The forces of communism are no longer in policymaking positions of our Government. They have been cleared out as soon as their subversive affiliations have become known, and none have been appointed to office by the Eisenhower administration, nor will they be. They are out and will stay out.

CONCLUSION

There is much more that could be said of which the present administration can feel proud and which the people of the Nation approve. In this connection it would seem that there has been nothing that has been more generally approved than the sincerity and dignity that has been displayed by President Eisenhower in his conduct of the affairs of our Nation. From the moment when at his inauguration he asked if he might offer a personal prayer, and in which he displayed a firm faith in the overruling providence of Almighty God and his personal dependence upon that divine source for guidance and help, there has been a feeling among our people that the Nation has as its head not only a just man but a religious man in whom they can trust and in whom they can have confidence. It is good for our Nation that this feeling exists throughout the United States regardless of political affiliation.

May I close by acknowledging the great honor and privilege it has been to represent the First Congressional District in the Congress of the United States. I hope that my service has been satisfactory and that if there have been differences of opinion at any time that at least I may be considered as having been sincere in my convictions and with no desire other than to serve our people well and thereby promote their welfare. The confidence that has been displayed in the past and which I sincerely appreciate I trust may also be justified as to the future.

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to say a few words about my very good friend, the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM. While we in Texas are always accused of not being able to speak of anything but Texas, it is not unlike speaking of Texans when you speak of THURMOND CHATHAM. His characteristics of warmheartedness and congeniality made him one of the most popular Members of this body.

It was my good fortune to have been closely associated with him during my tenure of office in this legislative body and I know of the great service he rendered as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee which legislated not only for the people of North Carolina, but our whole Nation.

I am sure that he will be sadly missed in the forthcoming Congress by all that knew him and I hope that the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina see fit to return him to us sometime in the future.

Surplus Property for Education and Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of the Members of this body and to the public a report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which shows that educational and health institutions were allocated personal property at cost value of $49,990,174 during the months of April, May, and June 1956. Real property in value of $5,314,668 was also allocated for these meritorious purposes, making a total of $55,304,842 in allocations for both personal and real property.

A summary for the entire fiscal year 1956 shows total allocations of $218,872,568 with personal property accounting for $204,497,417 and real property $14,375,151.

The summary follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
July 27, 1956.

Mr. RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. ROBERTS: In accordance with section 5, Public Law 61, 84th Congress, enclosed is a report covering personal property made available for distribution to educational and public health institutions under section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; and all real property disposed of to such institutions under section 203 (k) of that act.

This report covers the calendar quarter, April 1 through June 30, 1956.

Sincerely yours,

M. B. FOLSOM,
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Surplus property for which the Federal Government has paid $55,304,842 was made available to the States for educational and public health purposes during April, May, and June by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Real property accounted for $5,314,668 and personal property $49,990,174.

Secretary Marion B. Folsom announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion-picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

Personal property made available for distribution to and real property disposed of to educational and public health institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1956 (acquisition cost) (In accordance with sec. 5, Public Law 61, 84th Cong.)

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$49,990,174	$5,314,668	$55,304,842
Alabama	1,279,295		1,279,295
Arizona	427,604	9,277	436,881
Arkansas	545,751	25,000	570,751
California	4,545,091	290,517	4,835,608
Colorado	697,236	1,450	698,686
Connecticut	560,296		560,296
Delaware	217,901		217,901
District of Columbia	310,664		310,664
Florida	1,656,300		1,656,300
Georgia	981,360	7,275	988,635
Idaho			
Illinois	2,444,258		2,444,258
Indiana	831,384	5,000	836,384
Iowa	802,994		802,994
Kansas	563,685	253,607	817,292
Kentucky	1,150,987	70,075	1,221,072
Louisiana	828,647		828,647
Maine	300,956		300,956
Maryland	1,325,109	107,510	1,432,618
Massachusetts	1,311,469		1,311,469
Michigan	949,932		949,932
Minnesota	935,674		935,674
Mississippi	815,138		815,138
Missouri	1,497,906	14,838	1,512,744
Montana	157,647		157,647
Nebraska	701,046	54,628	755,674
Nevada	107,600		107,600
New Hampshire	291,345		291,345
New Jersey	543,395	4,399	547,794
New Mexico	462,552	979,999	1,442,551
New York	2,280,623	441,270	2,721,893
North Carolina	1,337,190		1,337,190
North Dakota	48,069	43,100	91,169
Ohio	1,778,459	93,900	1,872,359
Oklahoma	1,237,514		1,237,514
Oregon	519,940		519,940
Pennsylvania	2,646,799	420,062	3,066,861
Rhode Island	664,329		664,329
South Carolina	741,191		741,191
South Dakota	392,596	4,500	397,096
Tennessee	1,388,435	19,710	1,408,145
Texas	3,454,255	1,020,478	4,474,733
Utah	354,238	3,200	357,438
Vermont	162,187		162,187
Virginia	1,654,810	14,690	1,669,500
Washington	1,081,509	329,795	1,411,304
West Virginia	909,079		909,079
Wisconsin	1,116,131		1,116,131
Wyoming	202,155		202,155
Alaska	44,719	18,000	62,719
Hawaii	348,645	1,072,378	1,421,023
Puerto Rico	377,178	10,000	387,178
Virgin Islands	6,901		6,901

Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that when the people of the eighth district of North Carolina take time to review the record of the Honorable CHARLES DEANE who has so ably represented them here in the Congress for some 10 years, that they will reconsider their actions.

I have always considered Mr. DEANE to be one of the ablest legislators and a gentleman of the highest character. He compiled a most enviable record in this body and it is my wish that both he and his family will enjoy good health when they return to their home in North Carolina.

In closing, it is my sincere hope that at some future time it will be my pleasure to again serve with him in this legislative body.

Congressman Wolverton's Policy in Representing Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, as we come to the close of this session of Congress it seems to me appropriate that I express to my constituents in the First Congressional District the privilege, as well as the pleasure, it has been to have had the opportunity of serving them in the Congress of the United States.

There has been no period in the history of the United States that has presented more difficult and fundamental questions to solve, other than at the foundation of our Government and later in its maintenance. Commenting with the depression with its numerous and varied problems, the recovery period, World War II, and the Korean conflict, it seems that the questions have not only been unique but extremely vital to the welfare of our Nation and its people.

The solution of these problems at times has required the adoption of new and untried policies. Because of this fact, serious divisions between political parties and within each of the political parties have been created. In all such instances it has been my policy to make my decisions and give support to proposed legislation on the basis of what seemed best for our people. Thus, I have never permitted mere partisan reasons to control my thought and action. The fundamental factor has been, as it should be, what is best for the people.

In the fulfillment of the same policy, I have always assumed and maintained, after the election was over and I had been elected, that thereby I was the representative of all the people in the First Congressional District, regardless of political affiliation, Democrat or Republican. By reason of the fact that there could be only one Representative for the district, I felt that it was incumbent upon me to represent all within the district to the best of my ability. This has been, and will continue to be my policy as long as I have the privilege and honor to represent the First Congressional District.

I have been encouraged in the fulfillment of this policy, during my entire service in Congress, by having been elected each time I have been a candidate by majorities that left no doubt that my attitude in this respect had the approval of the voters, regardless of party. I have been deeply appreciative of this manifest approval, and I have continually endeavored to merit the confidence that has been shown, and give assurance that it will be my constant endeavor to merit such confidence in the future as in the past.

It has been highly gratifying to me to realize that in so many instances it has been my privilege to advocate and support legislation, the subject of which has proved so helpful in promoting the welfare of our people.

As a people, we have much to be thankful for. Peace. Our boys are no longer dying on Korean battlefields, nor anywhere else in the world. We are enjoying the highest peak of employment with the highest average rate of wages at any time in the history of our country, and surpassing in production of goods for our people that of any other nation in the world. Less days of cessation of work than ever before in our history. There have been tax reductions, and more are planned as a result of a balanced budget that has been brought about by reducing expenditures of Government and the high degree of employment that exists. Additional health facilities have been provided, including construction of hospitals, nursing homes, and rehabilitation centers, and numerous and varied research programs, all of which have proved highly beneficial to our people. Increased benefits and extended coverage under social security with reduction of the eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years of age, and reduction of eligibility age for all who are totally disabled from 65 to 50 years of age. Increased benefits under Railroad Retirement Act, including widows and survivors of railroad workers. Increased benefits for veterans, their widows, survivors, and dependents. Improved facilities for medical care for veterans. Improved housing for low-income groups, easier financing for all, and slum clearance. Legislation helpful to farmers and small-business men.

It has been particularly pleasing to have had a part in bringing a substantial program of work to the New York Shipbuilding Co., Camden, N. J. I know what it means to the families of the workers. I confess that there is nothing more pleasing to me than when I can be helpful to the people I represent.

What I have already mentioned does not begin to cover all the numerous and varied ways in which the welfare of our people have been promoted. It would be impossible to enumerate them all without extending these remarks unduly. Suffice it to say that in all the matters I have enumerated, and many more, including the help I have had the privilege to give to thousands of individuals in solving their problems and answering their inquiries, has given me a pleasure beyond words to express, and I assure my constituency of a continuing desire to be helpful at all times to the fullest extent of my opportunity and ability.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of my good friends and colleagues has voluntarily decided to withdraw from public life. This would be tragic if I did not believe that the withdrawal is temporary. OLLIE BOLTON has too much dynamic energy, too much to offer, to place

himself out of political circulation. It is all too rare on the American scene that someone like OLLIE devotes this energy to service in behalf of the people.

His work in Washington will long be remembered. He has followed in the footsteps of already illustrious predecessors bearing the Bolton name. What more can be said than "Godspeed and hurry back."

Nasser and the "Muddle East"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, occasionally we in Congress receive the kind of letter which indicates that our efforts are understood and that the writer, too, has a valuable contribution to make.

Recently I received a note from my good friend Anthony Akers who happens to be a candidate for Congress on the Democratic and Liberal Party tickets in the 17th Congressional District of New York. His lucid analysis of the crisis in the Middle East is so well drawn that I feel Mr. Akers' letter deserves publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I submit it herewith:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *July 27, 1956.*
Hon. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIDSON: Your alert and enlightened interest in our foreign policy has given many Americans perspective on the developing crisis in the Middle East. Through your understanding of events in that troubled area you have been able to present timely and forceful views to the Secretary of State. You have accurately mirrored the thinking of the great majority of our people in the expression of those views.

The inauguration of the Dulles era as Secretary of State was begun by the promise of a new United States policy in the Mideast. It was rumored that we would upgrade our relations with the Arabs and downgrade our then close relationship with Israel regardless of the merits of that conflict. This rumor has been amply substantiated by our indifferent attitude toward Israel, the only real democracy in the Middle East. By refusing to ship arms to Israel we have allowed a military imbalance to develop which is an open invitation to aggression and continued border warfare.

One of the basic tenets of our foreign policy has been the deterrence of aggression through the presence of adequate defensive strength; with reference to Israel we have disregarded this fundamental. We have even allowed the status of our American citizens, particularly servicemen and businessmen, to be successfully challenged by the discriminatory practices of the Arab governments. For the United States Government to continue acquiescence in support of such practices is a regrettable blemish on the shield of American citizenship.

We are engaged in a worldwide struggle for the minds of men. Mr. Dulles readily and often buttresses his policies with "morality." The surrender of principle to expediency in the Mideast has done much to undermine moral leadership. This is not to deny in any measure the strategic importance of the Middle East, but I do not believe that the strength of the free world can be built upon the quicksands of expediency.

By allowing ourselves to be played off against the imaginary Soviet offers, we have permitted a dictator to build his position at the expense of our Nation's prestige. We provided Arab leaders with an invitation to blackmail. The invitation was accepted with delight and cunning. It is a source of humiliation to us as a nation that we ever allowed a game of deceit to be played with the humanitarian principles which we espouse. Our real failure came about because we had neglected to premise our offer of economic assistance on the only tenable ground available to a democracy—a program of economic and social reform for the Middle East which would have helped create a stable framework for Arab-Israel relations.

One result of the Dulles foreign policy in the Middle East is the development of a fanatic dictator in the person of Nasser of Egypt. In a book which he authored, The Philosophy of the Egyptian Revolution, Nasser outlines his intention to unite all Africa with Egypt's power. To accomplish this, he has allowed himself to become the tool of Communist power politics. He has moved even closer within the Soviet orbit and has become the arms broker for the Communists in the Arab world.

Since ancient times, the people of Egypt have been undernourished, overworked, poorly housed and the victims of ravaging disease. These conditions were proper subjects of our interest and economic assistance. Nasser came to power because a corrupt regime failed to heed the cry for economic and social reforms. In part, to cover up his failure to alleviate conditions for his people, Nasser has turned to deceit and chauvinism.

I know that you and others have already petitioned the Secretary of State on many of these matters regularly. With Congress adjourning, I know that you will continue to stress the urgency of the situation in the Middle East to the State Department. I would like to give emphasis to the following objectives:

1. Reaffirmation of the provisions of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 which guaranteed freedom of international navigation through the Suez Canal for all nations in times of peace or war; or the establishment of a new and effective means of international control.

2. Support for Israel, including the shipment of military supplies for the maintenance of an adequate defense.

3. Cessation of discriminatory practices against our citizens in the military services and in the business world.

4. Assumption of leadership in the establishment of an equitable and permanent peace settlement in the Middle East.

5. Reassessment of our policies of economic assistance, casting these within an affirmative framework rather than in forms that can become avenues for blackmail.

I believe that the above reflects the thinking and desires of literally millions of people in New York and across America.

With sincere best wishes to you and for your success, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY B. AKERS.

Hon. Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of deep regret that I realize our good friend CHARLES B. DEANE will leave the House of Representatives at the close of this session.

During the time that he has been a Member of the House he has demonstrated at all times an outstanding sincerity in the fulfillment of his duties. He has been extremely conscientious, with no thought other than a desire to do what is right. He has shown ability and a quality of character that is highly desirable in the membership of the House. He has had at all times the friendship of all the Members, regardless of political affiliation, because of his fine Christian character and his friendly attitude to everyone.

He goes from this House possessing the kind thoughts and the sincere wish of each of us that his future will be bright, that good health and happiness will be his in large measure, and that success may attend his efforts in all his activities.

The Waters of Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following item which was published by the American Christian Palestine Commission:

THE WATERS OF THE JORDAN

One of the major points of friction between Israel and the Arab States—particularly Syria and Jordan—centers about the use of the water of the Jordan River.

Historically, the Jordan Valley was a rich grain-producing area, with an intricate system of dams, canals, and reservoirs which sustained a population of over 1,500,000. It was the granary of the Holy Land; here, too, particularly along the eastern bank, the Greeks founded the flourishing League of Ten Cities, and later Rome received a considerable portion of her wheat supply from the area.

WATER IS LIFE

The Mongol invasion of the 13th century put an end to this prosperity; the canals were allowed to become choked with silt; the dams were broken; and the reservoirs dried up. Bedouin moved into the area, cutting down the forests for fuel and allowing their herds of goats to eat away the vegetation which preserved the soil. Today the region, according to a U. N. report,[1] is a sparsely settled land of poverty and hunger with barely enough food to keep life in the people, a lang where vast areas are desert.

In such a wilderness, it is important that all water resources be utilized to the maximum. Mr. Gordon Clapp, former Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, stated the situation succinctly in his introduction to a TVA-sponsored water-development plan for the Jordan published on October 19, 1953[2]: "In a region where water is life and where more and more people are crowding a scant water supply, there is a tragic need to develop, conserve, and dispense the

[1] Report of the United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine, Dec. 28, 1949.

[2] The Unified Development of the Water Resources of the Jordan Valley Region, prepared by Charles T. Main, Inc., under the direction of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

waters of the Jordan Valley on unified and impartial basis."

THE JORDAN RIVER UNDER THE MANDATE

The absolute dependence of the Holy Land upon the waters of the Jordan was recognized by the Allied Powers when allocating the mandates over the non-Turkish territories of the Ottoman Empire after World War I. Prime Minister David Lloyd George, impressed by this dependence on water, insisted that the entire Jordan River and the Sea of Galilee be included within the boundaries of Palestine: "The waters of Palestine are essential to its existence," he emphasized; "without these waters, Palestine would be a wilderness. * * * On the other hand, those same waters are of no use to anyone holding Syria." The inclusion of these lifegiving waters within the boundaries of the Holy Land became formalized in the Franco-British agreement of 1923 when the Syrian border was set back a short distance from the east bank of the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee.

In 1926 the British mandatory government granted a concession to the Palestine Electric Corp. to utilize the upper stretches of the Jordan for hydroelectric purposes. The company established a hydroelectric plant at the juncture of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers and was about to proceed with other development plans prior to the invasion of Israel by the Arab States in 1948. This plant was subsequently seized and dismantled by Jordan.

NOT A WASTELAND

The cease-fire in the spring of 1949 found the Syrian Army, which had crossed Israel's frontiers, in occupation of a small segment of territory along the eastern bank of the Jordan and at one point along the western bank. The U. N. mediator, Dr. Ralph Bunche, suggested a return to the former international boundaries. Under this agreement Israel gave up 80 square miles of Lebanese territory which she had occupied and Syria turned back 2 square miles of Israel territory she had occupied. In compliance with the terms of the armistice agreement, Syria retired to her former frontier and Israel agreed to the establishment of a demilitarized zone on her territory from which all armed forces were to be excluded. On June 26, 1949, announcing the successful conclusion of the armistice, Dr. Bunche stated in a report sent to the U. N., copies of which were forwarded to the Israel and Syrian Governments: "From the beginning of these negotiations, our greatest difficulty has been to meet Israel's unqualified demand that Syrian forces be withdrawn from Palestine. We have now, with great effort, persuaded the Syrians to agree to this. I trust that this will not be undone by legalistic demands." Then, to allay Israel's fears that the demilitarized zone might revert to wilderness, he added: "In respect to the question of economic development, I may also assure both parties that the United Nations, through the Chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, will also insure that the demilitarized zone will not be a vacuum or a wasteland."

Israel thereupon drew up a threefold plan to utilize the Jordan waters: (1) Drainage of the Huleh Swamp; (2) erection of a dam for the generation of hydroelectric power, and (3) commencement of a vast irrigation system.

THE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

In the spring of 1951 Israel launched a 3-year plan to drain the Huleh area by broadening and deepening the Jordan bed to hold the floods racing down from the Lebanese and Syrian hills. This drainage not only salvaged 20,000 acres of badly needed farmland, but considerably increased the flow of water down the river, which falls from a height of 220 feet above sea level to 1,300 feet below sea level over a distance of less than 100 miles.

With the beginning of the drainage plan, Syria objected that the clearing of the Huleh would remove this natural obstacle to military movement, and that furthermore, the plan would endanger property rights of Arabs living in the area. Appearing on May 2, 1951, before the U. N. Security Council, Gen. William Riley, the U. N. Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervisory Organization, rejected the suggestion that military security might be impaired by the drainage plan. Concerning the development of the area and the rights of the Arab landowners, he stated: "I feel that the United Nations should never impede progressive work. However, I am involved here with the armistice agreements in which the United Nations is charged with the normal restoration of civilian life. I have never found fault with the concession [granted the Palestine Land Development Corp.] and never will * * * I feel that it is not a matter which affects either Syria or the United Nations. I am merely involved in the normal restoration of life within the demilitarized zone which affects the 30, 40, or 50 Arabs that own approximately 7 or 8 acres of land within the demilitarized zone."

Acting on General Riley's advice, the United Nations in May 1951, declared that if Israel would safeguard the interests of existing landholders, she could, with the permission of the Chief of Staff, continue drainage. The arrangements were worked out and the drainage continued. Today it nears completion.

In the spring of 1953, Israel was ready to commence the second phase of the program, the erection of a dam and powerplant to provide 170 million kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power annually. (Israel has to import most of her fuel, much of it from so distant a country as Venezuela. The neighboring oil-rich Arab States imposed a boycott on Israel in 1948 which is still continuing.)

Through Secretary of State Dulles, Israel on July 9, 1953, extended an invitation to Syria to participate in the erection of such a dam; the offer was ignored.

REGION COULD BENEFIT

Earlier, in December 1952, Ambassador Abba Eban of Israel had declared at the seventh session of the United Nations General Assembly that "Israel, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon could all derive great benefits from such cooperation." Accordingly, on July 31, 1953, Israel informed the chairman of the U. N. Truce Supervisory Organization, Gen. Vagn Bennike, that she intended to commence work on an 8-mile diversionary canal to lead part of the Jordan flow from a point 40 feet above sea level to a power-generating plant 600 feet below sea level and then channel it back to the Sea of Galilee. Because of the topography, 1½ miles of the 8-mile canal would run through the demilitarized zone. To insure that the 7 or 8 acres of Arab-owned land would not be adversely affected, water was to be diverted south of these holdings, even though it involved the loss of an 11-foot drop in height. These plans were later transmitted in writing to Col. Ray Tillotson, the acting chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission. Three weeks later Syria again raised objections, whereupon General Bennike, after ordering a temporary halt to the work pending agreement by both sides, brought the matter before the U. N. Security Council.

SYRIA'S COMPLAINTS

Syria's first complaint was that Israel had to secure her permission before any work could be commenced in the demilitarized zone. Though the U. N. had rejected that point once before in 1951, Syria raised it again. Her representative, Farid Zeinnedine, on September 29 and October 16, 1953, declared: "The Jordan separates Syria from Palestine. * * * The Israelis are acting as if the demilitarized zone was disposed of in their favor and as if Israel were sovereign in the area * * * after all, the Jordan between the lakes of Huleh and Tiberias is an international river by any definition we like."

A glance at the map reveals the falsity of this claim.

A second Syrian objection was that Arab land rights in the zone would be endangered. This, too, was met when Israel agreed to fence off Arab lands and protect them against trespassing and molestation.

A third objection was that the operation of the diversionary canal would deprive 1 or 2 Syrian farms of existing rights in the river. Israel cited the report of Col. Samuel Taxis, former chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, that the farms could absorb no more than 1½ percent of the water; moreover, Israel offered to provide guaranties, backed by internationally underwritten safeguards, that this flow would be continued.

A final objection was raised that the creation of a diversionary canal would change the existing military situation. This item had been dealt with by the U. N. in the matter of the Huleh drainage in 1951.

URGENT EXAMINATION OF QUESTION

Though the U. N. Security Council addressed itself to the urgent examination of the question, discussions dragged on for almost 13 weeks. Siding with Syria in the debate was the Soviet Union which insisted that the consent of both sides was necessary before work could be started in the demilitarized zone.

On December 16, 1953, after 2 months of debate, American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, speaking on behalf of the United States, Britain, and France, made the following proposal before the Security Council: "The issues raised by the Jordan River diversion should be decided by the chief of staff in accordance with his authority under the armistice agreement, and in these and other matters concerning the status of the demilitarized zone, an important consideration should be the just and orderly development of the natural resources affected, with due regard for the general welfare and the interests of the parties and individuals concerned."

RUSSIA VETOES ALLIED PROPOSAL

In an effort to head off the inevitable Russian veto, Mr. Lodge, on January 22, 1954, proposed a compromise resolution calling upon the chairman of the Israel-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission to try to bring the two sides together and report back to the Security Council. When the Syrians objected to this too, the Russians (casting their 57th veto) killed the proposal.

Immediately after Mr. Vishinsky's negative vote, Sir Gladwyn Jebb, the British representative prophetically stated: "Yet once more have we witnessed the application by the Soviet Union of a veto in the Security Council—and what is more, this veto has been applied for the first time in connection with the affairs of the Middle East. This, therefore, is both a melancholy and a sinister occasion—melancholy because it can hardly be a good augury for the future of international cooperation; sinister perhaps because of its implication with the cause of peace in the Arab world."

THE JOHNSTON PLAN

In a parallel effort to bring about agreement, President Eisenhower, in October 1953, designated Mr. Eric Johnston as Ambassador at Large to attempt to get both sides to accept a common irrigation and hydroelectric plan. In the fall of 1953, armed with a plan drawn up by the Charles T. Main Co., of Boston, at the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Mr. Johnston set out for the Middle East. The so-called Main plan,

which cut across frontiers, called for the erection of a dam on the Hasbani River in Lebanon; the construction of a canal from the river to the settlement of Tel Hai in Israel; the building of a dam and hydroelectric plant on the Yarmuk River in Jordan; the diversion of the Yarmuk flow to the Sea of Galilee; and the piping of Jordan water to Jericho and the Dead Sea area.

Under this plan 394 million cubic meters of water would have been provided to irrigate 416,000 dunams[3] of land in Israel; 774 million cubic meters to irrigate 490,000 dunams in Jordan; and 45 million cubic meters for irrigation of 30,000 dunams in Syria.

The Main plan, estimated to cost $121 million—subsequently raised to $200 million—would have provided a sevenfold to ninefold increase in the potential agricultural productivity of the Jordan Valley, and would have provided for the settlement of 150,000 Arab refugees, most of whom are being supported by United States contributions to the United Nations Relief and Welfare Administration.

To Israel the Main plan was a pronounced disappointment. It represented a radical modification of the famous Hayes-Lowdermilk "TVA-on-the-Jordan" plan, published in June 1948, which involved the diversion of the sweet water of the Jordan River to the arid Negev and its replacement by salt water piped from the Mediterranean across Israel to the Jordan bed where the swift drop to the Dead Sea would have provided abundant waterpower.

ARABS REJECT JOHNSTON PLAN

The Arabs at first rejected the whole Johnston scheme out of hand. Jordan's Prime Minister Fawzi el Mulki, as reported in the New York Times on November 15, 1953, declared: "Jordan would consider no scheme involving departure from its policy of no peace with Israel. Jordan is fully prepared to continue bearing economic hardships rather than participate in any project with Israel, either directly or indirectly."

[3] A dunam is about one-fourth of an acre.

The Johnston and cotton plans

	Jordan		Syria		Israel		Total kilowatt-hours power per year	Total cost
	Million cubic meters	Irrigated dunams of land	Million cubic meters	Irrigated dunams of land	Million cubic meters	Irrigated dunams of land		
Johnston ("Main") plan	774	490,000	45	30,000	394	416,000	210,000,000	$200,000,000
Israel ("cotton") plan [1]	575	430,000	30	30,000	1,220	[2] 1,709,000	1,412,400,000	470,000,000

[1] The "cotton" plan also called for Lebanon to receive 450 million cubic meters of water to irrigate 350,000 dunams.
[2] Including water from Litani River.

Similarly the Arab Palestine Office in Beirut commented in June 1954: "It (the Johnston plan) is political through and through. Its framework is political, its implications are political and its consequences are political."[4]

Israel, agreeing in principle to the sharing of the Jordan waters, came up with a plan of her own (the Cotton plan) involving the use of the nearby Litani River which flows unharnessed through Lebanon to the sea. Under the plan Israel would have augmented the water she would receive from the Jordan (from 40–50 percent) with water from the Litani and in return would provide Lebanon with electricity.

Countering the Israel proposal, the Arab League suggested that Israel's share of Jordan water be reduced from 40–50 percent to 20 percent and that no Litani water be piped into Israel.

After three subsequent trips to the Middle East, Johnston succeeded in brinking the two sides fairly close together with only a difference of 10 percent in the water allocation separating them. Though the acceptance of the Johnston plan meant that Israel would experience great difficulties in meeting her minimum water requirements by 1960 when her population would have grown to 2 million, she was prepared to go along with it. However, the Arab Governments, realizing that Israel was prepared to come to an agreement, refused to continue negotiations, fearing that any arrangements with Israel would imply recognition of the Jewish State.

Typical of Arab reaction was the statement of the Lebanese Premier, Dr. Abdullah el Yafi who declared in March 1956: "The Johnston plan is intended to force peace with Israel upon the Arabs for the benefit of Israel alone. If the United States wants to help the Arabs, she should develop an Arab water project without Israel."

Though she has persistently refused to allow Israel unhampered use of the waters of the Jordan, Syria has unilaterally deflected the water in her own Wadi Duffila from flowing into Israel territory, thereby depriving Israel villages of water they have enjoyed during the past 25 years. In addition, Syria has announced that she intends to cooperate with Jordan to erect a dam and power plant on the Yarmuk River, despite the fact that the Yarmuk for a number of miles forms a contiguous border connecting Jordan and Israel. Syria has no lack of water; she possesses five large rivers—Euphrates, Orontes, Balikh, Khabour, and Tigris, all of which provide her with billions of cubic feet of water annually and which could, in addition, provide electric power if dammed and exploited.

To Israel's protest that her economic progress and rights were being obstructed, the Syrian Premier, Said el Ghazzi, stated on January 29, 1956, that Israel's renewal of the work "would be regarded as a serious threat to peace in the Middle East and that Syria would use every necessary measure and all means at her disposal to safeguard her essential interests against the Israeli threat."

The situation was further exacerbated when the heads of the Governments of Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt met in Cairo in February 1956 and served a joint warning on Israel that any attempt by her to go ahead with her irrigation and hydroelectric plans would be forcibly opposed by the three Arab States.

The Syrian Government on April 26 reiterated this stand to U. N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold when he visited the Middle East on a mission to bring about closer adherence to the armistice agreements.

ISRAEL'S POSITION

Israel's position was made clear by her representative to the U. N. Ambassador Abba Eban in an appeal to the United Nations in October 1953:

"I do not even now fully understand why Israel is called upon so frequently to justify the most modest exercise of rights and facilities which nearly all other countries possess in more abundant measure. We have only 8,000 square miles of soil, the greater part of it arid and desert, requiring the utmost sacrifice, ingenuity, and devotion to enable its restoration to fertility. Yet the neighboring countries which have millions of square miles of rich, fertile territory at their disposal continue to begrudge us this small stretch of land. The same is true of water. Through the rich domains of the free Arab world flow the great historic rivers of the Tigris, Euphrates, Nile, Orontes, and Litani, and a host of other streams. On the other hand, all of Israel's hopes of enlarged food production, of power development, and irrigation hang upon the Jordan, flowing for a few miles from northern Galilee to south of Lake Tiberias. On this meager resource, which small as it is, is the blood stream and the life artery of our country, covetous eyes are cast by governments to whose projects of development and growth our river has no real relevance at all.

"In this struggle between the Syrian attempt to insure Israel's economic strangulation and Israel's vital ambition to preserve and utilize its own source of natural power and irrigation, is there any doubt where the duty of the United Nations lies—the United Nations whose charter bids us all to promote not only international peace, but also higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development."

A NEW DAWN

Echoing this plea, Eric Johnston, now preparing for what may prove to be his last try in the Middle East, told a Herald Tribune Forum October 18, 1955, in New York City: "The Jordan plan is a promise of a better life for hundreds of thousands of people in the area. The plan is an idea to enable these leaders to take their people into the 20th century from antique civilizations. It is an offer to build new industries, to irrigate tens of thousands of acres of land, to let people get out of the beaten paths that are for beaten men and see the rise of a new dawn."

As men of good will plead for international cooperation, the unharnessed river Jordan still flows wastefully down to the Dead Sea, its promise of life unfulfilled.

[4] Commentary of water development in the Jordan Valley region.

Company H, Fifth California Infantry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, back in 1909 some 62 young men of the town of Hayward, who had patriotic ideas, enlisted in Company H, Fifth California Infantry, a National Guard outfit. The leader of the unit was James J. Borree who served as an enlisted man in the First California Infantry in the Philippines in 1898.

The volunteers, most of whom were born and raised in the Hayward area, were natural shots and within 3 years captured both the regimental and the State championships for rifle firing.

No social event was complete in Hayward unless Company H was involved. The annual military ball would attract a crowd of at least 500 guests. The annual inspection of the unit by the War Department was an important event and hundreds of citizens packed the armory to wintess the close-order drill, inspection of arms and selection of the best-drilled member of Company H.

This unit furnished many men for World War I and one of the charter

members, the late Joseph Tupper, remained in the Regular Army, becoming the principal instructor for rifle marksmanship. Tupper attained the rank of colonel during World War II and died in 1948.

Today the trophies won by the members of Company H are in custody of a committee who will place them in the proposed Hayward Museum when completed.

California never had a more enthusiastic and outstanding military unit than Company H, 5th Infantry.

The Hayward Daily Review designated one of its feature writers, Frank Monto, to do a story on Company H. It follows:

[From the Hayward (Calif.) Daily Review of July 26, 1956]

HAYWARD'S OLD GUARD—UNIT SERVED IN MEXICO, FRANCE

(By Frank Monto)

A short life but a colorful one.

Back in the days when National Guard companies elected their own officers, 62 Hayward men formed a unit which lasted 11 years but—to mention only the highlights—distinguished itself in its short span as a crack outfit of marksmen, served on the Mexican border and sent its members to France.

This was company H of the 5th California Infantry, organized by the late James Johnson Borree, mustered into service on April 29, 1909, mustered out in 1920.

CHARTER MEMBERS

The roster of its charter members reads like a deliberately compiled cross-section of the community. Howard Marion McGrew, of Boise, Iowa, 29 years old, telegrapher; Malcolm Farley Calkins, California, 23, journalist; Frederick Jensen, California, 18, student; Benjamin Harrison Gordon, Nevada, 21, horseshoer; George Coffee Van Dyke, California, 35, painter; George Samuel Meininger, California, 30, merchant; Herman Arthur Eggert, Hayward, 23, dentist; Stanley Clifford Marlin, California, 19, farmer.

Borree, 34, a veteran of the Spanish-American War, was elected the first company commander.

John Holcomb, 30, a Nebraska native and a merchant, was elected first lieutenant, and David Dunlap Smalley, 21, a native son and a student, was elected second lieutenant.

Harry A. Bradford, recently retired Hayward librarian, was named first sergeant, (later to become company commander) and Leonard R. Rosenberg, 29, a merchant, was named quartermaster sergeant.

The mustering in ceremony was held in the old Native Sons hall at Main and C Streets, which became the guard's armory.

MUSTERING OFFICER

Col. Thomas Wilhelm, retired cavalryman, was the mustering officer.

Top brass attended the affair, including Brig. Gen. John B. Lauck, adjutant general of California; Brig. Gen. Robert Wankowski, commander of the 1st Brigade; and Col. David A. Smith, regimental commander.

Company H staged its first full-dress parade at the San Leandro cherry carnival of 1909.

Then in July of that year the company went on its first summer maneuvers—at Seabright in Santa Cruz County.

It wasn't long before a rifle range was acquired, in the area now known as Hayward Highlands, and the men wasted no time in becoming experts.

Within 3 years they had won the regimental and State rifle championships.

During that period Company H sent two men to the national rifle matches at Camp Perry, Ohio, Sgts. Earl Frederick Brunner and Charles Albert Pimentel.

Brunner, a plumber who joined the company at the age of 21, is still living in Hayward.

OLDEST GUARDSMAN

Pimentel, oldest of the charter members in point of age, is living in Orinda. Now 83, he was a brother of Alfred O. Pimentel, 86, who died March 23, 1956, shortly after officials of Hayward's 80th anniversary celebration named him the oldest male native still living in the city.

In 1910 Company H led a parade during a countywide Fourth of July celebration in Centerville. That year the company went to Atascadero for maneuvers. Why famous?

Well, the National Guard was fighting a sham battle against Regular Infantry units from the Presidio of San Francisco, and the Fifth Infantry was knocked out of the battle when the Regulars captured Colonel Smith, the regimental commander.

Riding with him at the time was Harry Bradford.

Lieutenants Holcomb and Smalley resigned around that time. Bradford was elected first lieutenant and Harrison Holmes, a grocer, was named second lieutenant. Holmes is still living in Hayward.

FOUGHT FIRES

In 1913 Gov. Hiram Johnson called Company H out to fight forest fires at Muir Woods and on Mount Tamalpais, under the command of Lieutenant Holmes.

The company did duty at Panama-Pacific International Exposition in San Francisco in 1915. Captain Borree served as personal aide to Governor Johnson.

The next year Borree was promoted to lieutenant colonel and appointed assistant adjutant general for the State. Bradford was made captain and company commander.

Holmes resigned. Arnold H. Morris, a brother of A. B. Morris, recently retired superintendent of the Castro Valley Elementary School District, became first lieutenant, and Chester Phillips became second lieutenant.

Borree in less than a year advanced to adjutant general of California with the rank of brigadier general. He also served as California's director of selective service during World War I.

In 1923 he qualified as a line officer and was given command of the 76th Infantry Brigade. He retired in 1925 and died 2 years ago in Sacramento.

SENT TO MEXICO

President Woodrow Wilson called many National Guard units into Federal service in June 1916, and Company H was sent to the Mexican border, stationed at Nogales, Ariz.

While the company was doing border duty, Lieutenant Phillips disappeared and was never heard from again.

After the company returned to Hayward in October 1916, Bradford resigned and Morris was promoted to captain.

The country entered World War I in April 1917, and Company H was called back to active duty. The men served at Fort Mason, the Feather River Canyon, Elko, Nev., and Camp Kearney in San Diego County before they were sent to France early in 1918 as part of the newly organized 40th Division.

The company did not fight as a unit in France. The men were transferred to other units.

The first casualty from Company H was Alexander John Bowman, a teamster who joined the outfit as a charter member at the age of 21. He was killed in action.

IN WATER TWO DAYS

Another charter member George Michael Smith, 16-year-old farmer at the time of his enlistment was in the Navy during World War I. En route to France in 1917, he was shipwrecked and drifted for 2 days before he was rescued.

Company H returned to California in the spring of 1919 and was mustered out of the Federal service. Captain Morris was in command at the time.

(Bradford reentered the military, joining the Air Corps and serving as a ground officer and instructor in military tactics.)

The company was mustered out of State service in 1920. A new unit, Company F of the 159th Infantry was formed in 1925. It remained in existence a few years but was then transferred to Oakland due to lack of enlistments.

The oath of allegiance given the charter members of Company H, 5th California Infantry, National Guard, discloses not only their names but the ages, and so forth, of the men who founded this fine organization. I ask that it be reproduced so that it may be preserved.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Alameda:

We do solemnly swear that we will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of the State of California; and will maintain and defend the laws, and all officers employed in administering the same.

No.	Name	Born in	Age	Occupation	Former military service
1	James Johnson Borree	Illinois	34	Contractor	Spanish-American War.
2	Walt Christian Petersen, Jr	California	28	Merchant	None.
3	Newton Wesley Armstrong	do	16	Student	Do.
4	Henry Alonzo Bradford	do	22	Assistant paymaster.	Do.
5	Leonard Roscoe Rosenburg	do	29	Merchant	Do.
6	Earl Frederick Brunner	do	21	Plumber	G. 5th Inf. N. G. C.
7	Howard Marion McGrew	Iowa	29	Telegrapher	6 years U. S. A. 180 N. G.
8	James Peter Cox	California	32	Clerk	None.
9	Malcolm Farley Calkins	do	23	Journalist	Do.
10	Jep. Eschelsen	Germany	28	Clerk	Do.
11	Harrison White Holmes	California	26	Grocer	C. B. 5th Inf. N. G. C.
12	Frederick Jensen	do	18	Student	None.
13	Chester Andrew Madsen	do	18	Clerk	Do.
14	Harry Andrew Nissen	do	19	Farmer	Do.
15	Peter Archibald Quist	do	19	Clerk	Do.
16	Alfred Nelson	South Dakota	21	Milliman	Do.
17	George Walter Kavanaugh	California	36	Merchant	Do.
18	George Michael Smith	Massachusetts	16	Farmer	Do.
19	Herbert Nicholas Wahl	New York	28	Merchant	Do.
20	Andrew Edward Sorensen	California	22	Carpenter	Do.
21	Stuart Ogden Holmes	do	21	Laborer	Do.
22	Frederick Werner Cooper	do	22	Bookkeeper	Do.
23	George Coffee Van Dyke	do	35	Painter	Do.
24	George Samuel Meininger	do	30	Merchant	Do.
25	Peter Borree	do	21	do	Do.
26	Thomas Ional Gibson	Arkansas	37	Painter	Do.
27	Robert Harris Cooper	California	19	Clerk	Do.
28	Walter Dittmer	do	24	Farming	Do.
29	Charles August Ubhoff	do	25	Carpenter	Do.
30	Cyrus McKenna	do	22	Teamster	Do.
31	Otto Jensen	do	24	Electrician	Do.

No.	Name	Born in	Age	Occupation	Former military service
32	George W. Luce	California	24	Plumber	None.
33	John Edward Jensen	do	22	do	Do.
34	Benjamin Harrison Manter	do	18	Farmer	Do.
35	Edward Nelson	do	18	Plumber	Do.
36	Lawrence Thorwald Sorenson	do	25	Embalmer	Do.
37	Magnus Mathisen Borree	do	24	Teamster	Do.
38	Edward Payson Manter, Jr	do	20	Bookkeeper	Do.
39	David Dunlap Smalley	do	21	Student	Do.
40	Alexander John Bowman	do	21	Teamster	Do.
41	Charles Albert Pimental	do	36	Barber	Do.
42	Benjamin Harrison Gordon	Nevada	21	Horseshoer	Do.
43	William Hesse Garner	Georgia	27	Printer	2 years 19th Inf, U. S. A.
44	Henry Peer Angus	California	18	Student	None.
45	Charles Glen Wilson	do	29	Blacksmith	Do.
46	Joseph Leonard Tupper	Texas	18	Shingler	Do.
47	Harold Robert Mansfield	Canada	24	Salesman	Do.
48	Henry Meryes Sorensen	California	34	Teamster	Do.
49	Richard Benjamin Gansberger	do	19	Farmer	Do.
50	Carl Moritz Sorensen	do	27	Blacksmith	Do.
51	Jacob Harder, Jr	do	30	Electrician	Do.
52	James Percy Robinson	Montreal	25	Drayman	Do.
53	Charles Hamilton Farrell	California	22	Clerk	Do.
54	Frank Lee Kelley	Nebraska	23	do	Do.
55	Stanly Clifford Marlin	California	19	Farmer	Do.
56	Frederick Henry Parker	do	32	Painter	Do.
57	Edward William Jones	do	35	Carpenter	Do.
58	Carl Knudsen	do	18	Plumber	Do.
59	Walter Frank Smiley	Washington	20	Student	Do.
60	Herman Arthur Eggert	Hayward	23	Dentist	Do.
61	Clarence Johnson	California	1	Student	Do.
62	John Holcomb	Nebraska	30	Merchant	Do.

All being members of Company H, 5th Regiment, Infantry.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 29th day of April 1909.

THOS. WILHELM,
Colonel, United States Army, Retired.

One of the youngest men on the roster was Newton Wesley Armstrong who enrolled at the age of 16. He became devoted to the National Guard and served it faithfully and long. He served in World War I and World War II and retired recently as a colonel. It was men like him who gave the National Guard its great tradition.

Hon. Frank Ertel Carlyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been a real pleasure and privilege to have had the opportunity to serve on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with ERTEL CARLYLE, and it is with a sincere feeling of regret that I realize he will leave the House of Representatives at the close of this session of Congress.

ERTEL CARLYLE has been an able and faithful member of the committee. His ability, experience, and sound advice has been unusually helpful in the work of the committee. He will be greatly missed as his assistance has always been most worth while.

At all times, during his membership in the House, he has been most anxious to represent the constituency of his congressional district in a manner that would bring to each of them the greatest possible good. He has always been zealous in promoting their welfare and all that pertained to their well-being.

Not only has the service of ERTEL CARLYLE been of an outstanding and challenging character, but he has shown at all times a spirit of friendliness to his fellow Members that has endeared him to all, both Democrats and Republicans. It is our hope that the days and years ahead will be filled with health, happiness, and success for him.

A New Horizon for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, many of us concerned with the future of American agriculture are giving increasing attention to a proposal that a part of the press has dubbed the Indiana plan. This is the proposal that would seek to open up a new horizon for our farmers by marshaling the scientific resources of the country to concentrate on the development of new industrial uses for farm products through research.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, the House Subcommittee on Research and Extension, with Chairman THOMAS G. ABERNATHY presiding, took testimony on H. R. 10125. This is my bill, serving as the House counterpart to an identical measure introduced on the other side of the Hill by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART and 33 cosponsors. While action on the measure is hardly expected so late in the waning hours of the 84th Congress, I wish to assure all those interested, in and out of Washington, that the legislation will be reintroduced in the next Congress. It is my confident hope that in the foreseeable future the essence of this proposal will become basic law in the long-range program for a sound and expanding national farm economy.

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I should like to reproduce here the statement I was privileged to place before members of the subcommittee:

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of myself and many others, I wish to thank you for your courtesy and thoughtfulness in scheduling this hearing.

While it appears certain this session of Congress is about to conclude, surely the subject matter of the proposal before us deserves attention and consideration.

Although H. R. 10125 bears my name as author, its sponsorship can be widely credited. In its present form, it was first introduced as S. 3503, with 33 Senators joining the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART in its sponsorship. On this side of Capitol Hill, numerous House colleagues have advised me of their approval of the bill's aim, and four of them—Representatives ADAIR, BEAMER, BRAY, and HARDEN—have offered duplicate proposals.

The subject of H. R. 10125 is that of research, research of a type that will broaden the industrial and commercial uses of farm production, particularly farm commodities in surplus.

On this occasion, Mr. Chairman, I believe we sense the irony of the American farm problem. Mankind, since the dawn of recorded history, has known no greater problem than that of sustaining life by protecting food from the ravages of flood and famine. But today our farms and farmers are most seriously challenged by the constant production of more food and fiber than can be consumed. The problem is more incredible with the realization that millions throughout the world are in dire want of food and clothing.

It should be noted, I think, that the Congress has acted to ease the situation. Public Law 480, for example, is operating with more and more success to help distribute our agricultural largess among needy and friendly people of the world. Only last week the President reported that United States commodities valued at more than $1 billion had been disposed of by means of this legislative act.

But the surplus-disposal law, like earlier enactments limiting crop production and the more recent one creating a soil bank, must be recognized for what they are—temporary devices that promise no permanent solution of the basic problem. I am one of those, Mr. Chairman, who feels sure our farmers are no different than other productive Americans—deservedly most happy and prosperous when they are producing to the maximum of their ability, with due regard for enlightened practices of conservation in order to preserve the fertility of the soil for future generations.

The employment of scientific research as an aid to agriculture is not new in our history. Legislation creating our land-grant agricultural colleges was enacted 94 years ago. And through nearly a century of research activities under Government direction, we have witnessed amazing advancement in the productivity of our farms. This progress has released millions of people from the cultivating of food and fiber to work in the factories and mills of industry, and thus accounts for today's high standard of living.

But is it not apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come to shift the emphasis of agricultural research? In the face of mountainous surpluses, we are spending this year about eight times as much money for still greater production than we are to find new and extended uses for the crops we have. H. R. 10125 is urged as a practical and realistic expression of faith in our ability to find new and enriching industrial uses for the output of modern-day farming. Surely in terms of our national well-being, we need not to produce more, but to realize more from all we produce.

At present we have four regional laboratories, each devoting limited funds and modest manpower to scientific research. Their work, much of it impressive, is di-

vided between the search for better production and new utilization of existing production. I certainly am not complaining about the work that has been done. It is conceded that a great deal of good has accrued from both types of research, nor would I wish us to abandon research in methods to increase the productivity of our farms. What I am saying is that we need now to concentrate more of our resources upon research for new and broader utilization of farm production.

Research for use, some will say, is going on daily, thanks to the laboratories of private industry. But is this enough? I would not want to be in the position of saying that such research is not good, because I think it is. What I am saying is that this type of research is not dedicated to a solution of the overall problem, which is the lack of industrial use of the surplus products we have.

Perhaps I can illustrate my point by citing the several great industrial concerns who are currently seeking to devise substitutes for cotton. Now cotton is one of our surplus problems, and the economic welfare of millions of people is dependent on cotton. Surely research is a matter of future concern to them, because cottongrowers themselves cannot conduct a research program. We should at least try to help them hold their own in a fiercely competitive race by seeking new and better uses for cotton.

We have seen tremendous progress come about in the utilization of soybeans which is a newcomer in terms of the long-range agriculture picture. Our Midwest regional laboratory, located in Illinois, has made some very worthwhile contributions with regard to better uses for soybeans byproducts, and this has meant millions of dollars to the agriculture of the Nation. I cite this as a good example of the potential of utilization research, but the program of research in my opinion has to have much more emphasis and much more money for its use.

I know that the Department of Agriculture has historically supervised all agricultural research even into commercial utilization and I believe they have given to this activity the very best support. My bill, however, provides that there shall be set up a separate administration for industrial-agricultural research and it is given certain powers, duties, and responsibilities. The members of this agency shall be subject to appointment by the President and the members shall serve at his pleasure. The administration which my bill would create is to conduct scientific research, maintain and expand pilot plants wherever necessary, operate manufacturing facilities to prove the commercial feasibility of volume production, and in every way promote the finding and development of commercial uses of agricultural products.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that such an agency for budgetary reasons alone can proceed more expeditiously if operated independently of the Department of Agriculture. But whether the Congress in its wisdom finally concludes to approve the provisions of my bill or amend it to make it a continuing but considerably expanded segment of the Department, the main thing I want to stress here today is the urgency for action.

Hon. James Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to pay tribute to DICK RICHARDS who has announced his retirement from the Congress; although I do it with much sadness.

The Fifth District of South Carolina is losing a most able legislator, not only for themselves, but for our country as a whole. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, his ability, integrity, and leadership of this great committee placed him in a position of the highest esteem not only here in the House of Representatives, but throughout the world.

I deem it one of my personal fortunes to have been associated with DICK RICHARDS and it is imposible to express in words my admiration of and for him. I wish for him the best of luck and health in the coming years.

Hon. Thomas J. Dodd

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, a close friend and colleague of mine during my two terms in the House is leaving this body. I refer to the distinguished Representative from the First District of Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

Representing, as I do, the neighboring Second District of Massachusetts, I am particularly aware of the service that TOM DODD has rendered to the people of the great State of Connecticut and to the Nation as a whole.

I have known him to be a man who thinks out problems long and well and then forms determined convictions. I have known him as a man who has shown a rare courage and a rare talent in fighting for his convictions. I have known him as a man whose sincerity and eloquence on the floor of the House has caused many of us to readily follow his leadership on many of the vital issues of our day.

On July 7 in Hartford, Conn., at the Democratic State convention, TOM DODD was nominated to the office of United States Senator from Connecticut. His name was placed in nomination by a distinguished former Member of the House, and now Governor of Connecticut, Abraham A. Ribicoff.

The political philosophy of these two men, who have been so singularly honored by the people of Connecticut, is reflected in their remarks to the convention delegates. The principles for which they stand and the creed in which they believe are part and parcel of the great political party that numbers both Governor Ribicoff and Congressman DODD among its most outstanding leaders.

Mr. Speaker, it is upon this philosophy, this creed, and these principles that our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], has offered himself as a candidate for United States Senator from Connecticut.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD Governor Ribicoff's nominating address and Congressman DODD's acceptance speech:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF, GOVERNOR OF CONNECTICUT, AT THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION PLACING THE NAME OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. DODD IN NOMINATION FOR THE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES SENATOR

Politicians are a superstitious lot. I remember during the last campaign for the governorship, many of you gave me good-luck charms.

Before the campaign was over, my pockets were weighted down with four-leaf clovers and good-luck medals and a rabbit foot or two. And frankly, I carried them with me through the entire campaign. Two years ago on this platform, when I was nominated for the office of governor by this convention, I wore a gray suit and a gray and black tie, and I felt that that was sort of a lucky suit for the Democratic Party 2 years ago. I went up to the attic and got that same gray suit and that same gray and black tie and I am wearing it on the platform today. I hope it brings the same luck to our nominee.

We are assembled here today to nominate the next United States Senator from the State of Connecticut.

There are few offices in this land, or as a matter of fact, there are few offices anywhere in the world that can compare with the importance of the office of the United States Senate.

When our Constitution was first adopted and when our Republic was in its infancy, the United States Senate had a different meaning than it has today.

The House of Representatives was of the people. The House of Representatives was an elective office.

The concept of the United States Senate was a group of dignified men of great honor, who were chosen by legislatures. It was many years, many, many years, before you had direct elections by the people to the United States Senate. And for some 30 years, in the infancy of our Nation, the United States Senate was a more or less honorary, but meaningless body.

Then the United States Senate, due to the impact and the growth of America, because of the type of men that it was attracting, became a very important body.

And I dare say, if you recall the history of the United States, there are many United States Senators whose names and deeds are in your minds when you find it difficult to name and think of many men who served in the Presidency of the United States.

The United States Senate has become and is a powerful position. The United States Senate now not only has significance to the people of this State and the people of the Nation, but the United States Senate has significance today for the entire free world.

We in Connecticut have sent great Democratic Senators to the United States Senate. In recent years we have had distinguished men like Gus Lonergan, Francis Maloney, Bill Benton, and that great man, Brian McMahon.

As a matter of fact, this would have been the time for that nomination to have come back. I recall, when I was in Washington, the great influence that Senator McMahon wielded in the affairs of our Nation and the affair of the entire world, because in the matter of international relations, in the matter of appropriations, the United States Senate is a very, very important body. And, therefore, it behooves us today to send a man to the United States Senate that can carry on in those great traditions and play his role, not only on the floor of the United States Senate, but, indeed, to be spokesman for the free world in the United States Senate to the entire world.

The United States Senate is a peculiar position, too. My concept of a man to go to the United States Senate is this: Technically, a Senator, while he represents the State of

Connecticut in Washington, is also a Senator for the entire United States. And I would be very disappointed if this convention nominated a man who is narrow in outlook, whose concepts are restricted and confined, and who failed to exercise leadership that went beyond the borders of his own State and only the interests of the State and failed to encompass the interests of our entire Nation.

A United States Senator must be a man of courage, and this may be a strange thing to say, but a United States Senator must be a man who can be lonely, a man who can withstand pressures, a man who may often have to say no to the leadership of his own party, and a man who on occasion may have to go into the face of temporary or public opinion as it may be mobilized on an emotional basis.

A United States Senator must have a historical perspective. A United States Senator must have breadth. A United States Senator must have a philosophy. And a United States Senator must have the courage to face an issue and a great deal of loneliness, and often as I say, against fleeting public opinion as he may find it on any special occasion.

A United States Senator not only must represent the State of Connecticut, in the Halls of the United States Senate, but a United States Senator must from time to time come back to the State of Connecticut and explain to the people of this State what the basic problems are that face the Nation and face the world.

He must be in a position to mold public opinion. He must be in a position to mobilize public opinion. And he must interpret the world and the United States to his own people.

Now I am satisfied that the man that I am going to nominate today fulfills those qualifications.

All of us realize that today one of the great struggles in this world is that between freedom and slavery, between democracy and tyranny. This great struggle is not one of short duration. This struggle now has been going on since 1917 and this struggle will continue on for many, many more years. It is long; it is difficult; and it is arduous.

It is important that the man that we nominate understands the perspective of freedom and a perspective of tyranny.

The man we are to nominate knows tyranny; he knows dictatorship. He has played the prime role in the Nazi tyranny that preceded in power on a worldwide basis the one we are struggling with today. He faced this situation face to face in the Nuremburg trials. This man understands the present tyranny of worldwide godless communism.

As an FBI aganet, as a special assistant United States attorney, as Assistant Attorney General, and in Congress and out of Congress he has been the leader in the understanding of the position of the free world and what must be done and what has to be done if democracy and freedom should be preserved, not only for the United States of America, but for the entire world. I am satisfied that the man we are going to nominate today fulfills that qualification to the utmost limits.

But not all the problems that a United States Senator deals with are in the international field.

You heard an outstanding speech last night, and you heard an outstanding Senator mention the programs and great policies of Woodrow Wilson, of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Harry S. Truman.

You understood that here was founded a party with principles that had brought to fruition and success great economic and social reforms for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

So solid and so accepted have these social and economic reforms become that when the Republicans came to power in 1952 they dared not, nor did they advocate, nor did they try to eliminate any of them, because the American people know, respect, and live by these great economic and social reforms that have done so much for the benefit of our entire Nation.

TOM DODD understands these things. TOM DODD is a liberal and progressive in the true sense of the word. He understands the position of America on the domestic scene. His voice was raised against the tideland oil grab. He understands the State's problem on flood insurance and flood control where he has been a strong and ardent advocate in the Halls of the House.

He understands the problems of the aged. He understands the problems of housing. He understands the problems of labor. And he understands the problems of old age and social security.

We have here a man whose domestic record has been one of success. We have here a man who has been successful in understanding the great international problems.

What else do we have? We have a man who all of us know, born and bred in the State of Connecticut, his years, both formative and mature have been spent in this State.

He was born in Norwich, educated in their local schools, a graduate of Yale University, a practicing member of the bar, and twice United States Representative from the First Congressional District; a lovely wife, understanding, intelligent, charming, a true mother, and a great helpmate; six bright children with shining Connecticut faces, who are indeed a credit to our candidate and a great asset. And, indeed, I think that I would underestimate his political astuteness were he not to show this wonderful wife and family of his to the electorate during the next couple of months.

The Democratic Party is going to win in November.

The Democratic Party is going to elect a United States Senator.

The candidate we are going to nominate has a lot of work to do. Believe me, no one is going to win an election in the State of Connecticut just by using the mechanical means. The candidate who the Democratic Party nominates has the obligation to go up and down the highways and byways of this State to make his views known and the views of the Democratic Party, and I am confident that our candidate is that type of campaigner. And I am confident that each and every one of us will be in there fighting for him, working for him, and helping him to victory.

Ladies and gentlemen and fellow delegates, I give you the Democratic nominee and the next Senator to the United States Senate from the State of Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of West Hartford.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN THOMAS J. DODD OF THE DEMOCRATIC NOMINATION FOR UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT, JULY 7, 1956

Fellow Democrats and friends, I accept humbly and gratefully the honor you have given to me.

I am well aware of the challenge that we face. I am a Democrat who was born and raised in Connecticut. My father and my grandfather were Democrats in Connecticut so I know something about the task which confronts our party in every election year. There was a time when the odds were almost always overwhelmingly against us. But in recent years our State has shown a disposition to select Democrats with considerable frequency. As I stand on this platform today I think of some of the great Democrats from Connecticut who have served in the United States Senate during my lifetime.

I can see the honest and generous face of Augustine Lonergan.

I can hear the wise and eloquent words of Francis T. Maloney.

I can feel the strong personality and brilliant intellect of Brien McMahon and happily, in our midst I see the friendly and courageous Senator Bill Benton.

These are great Democrats who in recent years have represented Connecticut in the United States Senate.

The opportunity to follow and carry on in the tradition which they have established fills me with a sense of grave responsibility.

The campaign which we start today will result in a victory for us in November. The signs of this victory are all around us, although obscured somewhat by political propaganda.

During the last 2 years the voters of Connecticut have given ample evidence of their interest in the Democratic Party. Our great Governor, a Democrat, directs the policy of this State. Every major city is headed by a Democratic mayor. Town after town, some of which had never been Democratic before, have joined the growing list of Democratic strongholds.

These are reasons for encouragement. But to insure victory we will work together until every vote has been counted. Today our party is united and strong. The first and greatest credit for this unity and strength is due to the great leadership of our State chairman, John M. Bailey, and to his associates on the State Central Committee.

All that remains to be done is for us to talk facts in this campaign and to tell the people the truth about the issues which confront us.

For it is my deep conviction that a Democratic victory this fall is essential to the welfare of our Nation and to the security of the world at large.

For nearly 4 years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress and I have watched with growing apprehension as our national administration falls more and more under the control of big money and big business.

Big oil has won its tidelands fight.

Big gas has only temporarily been delayed in fulfilling its avaricious ambition to reap high profits from the gas-consuming public. I say only temporarily delayed for the President vetoed the gas bill because of shameful lobbying tactics, but significantly, in his veto he said nothing about the evil of the legislation itself.

The corporate profits of big business go and and up every day. Special privileges are given away every day. Many of our natural resources are just handed over to private profit seekers. The hard-money boys still have the controlling voice in Washington and through all of this the small-business man, the salaried individual, the wage earner and the professional people have been completely forgotten.

The only tax relief has been given to a special and privileged group in our society while the rest of us carry a tax burden that is heavier than it has ever been in the history of our country during peacetime and there is no interest in the administration to reduce it.

Here close at hand in New England we see our textile industries languishing in the face of Government indifference. We see enticements in the form of tax exemptions being used to lure industries from our State and region and the tragedy is that nothing is being done by the Federal Government to help us keep them here. Very recently an administration sponsored proposal to geographically disburse industries was pushed through Congress. There are strange and sinister shadows on this measure which may take on harmful form and substance for us in Connecticut.

The voice of labor has been without influence in the halls of the Federal Government, for the hopes and aspirations of work-

ing men and women have been drowned out by the more powerful and politically persuasive voice of big business.

We live in an uneasy prosperity. Our people sense that all is not as well as it appears to be on the surface. For most of the blessing of this prosperity have been reserved for a favored few. Our economic structure is top heavy.

We have a barrage of words on the ever acute problem of civil rights—but no action. The Department of Justice has the means and the power to move right now on civil rights. I know whereof I speak because I was privileged to serve as assistant chief of the first civil rights section established by the then Attorney General during a Democratic administration almost 20 years ago. We pioneered in this field in fighting intolerance and bigotry in the Deep South and in the Far West. It is a fact of history that under a Democratic administration, we tried more civil rights cases in the United States than at any other comparable time in the history of the United States.

That fight which we undertook has for all practical purposes been abondoned. No longer do we hear of civil rights prosecutions against those who violate the constitutional privileges of Negroes. No more do we hear of litigation to protect the rights of organized labor. It is a long time since we have heard of Government activities to protect minority groups. But the great and good work which we started must be carried on and expanded if we are to fulfill the promises of our own Democracy and set an example of freedom, of liberty and of justice for the people of the world. For we cannot sell Democracy abroad, we cannot preach fairness or equality of opportunity in distant places if we do not enforce justice at home.

While talking big about civil rights this same administration tried to force legislation through Congress which would allow the Federal police to tap your telephone wires and listen to your private conversations. I am proud of the fact that I fought that vicious grasp for power and helped to defeat that proposal in Congress.

Two days ago in Congress, legislation which would have provided necessary Federal assistance in the field of public education was defeated. The significance of the vote by which that necessary legislation was lost lies in the fact that 119 Democrats voted for the bill while only 75 Republicans supported it and 119 Republicans, almost exclusively from Northern States, joined 105 southern Democrats in voting against the bill. This cynical performance on a matter as essential to our national welfare in and of itself is enough to indicate the necessity of a Democratic victory in November. The truth of the matter is that the national administration has given only lip service to assistance for public education. So, as well in the field of public housing, in social security, in public health, this administration has not advanced an original idea but rather has dragged its feet and grudgingly continued, because it feared to do otherwise, the great social and economic programs given to this Nation by the Democratic Party.

Thus in domestic affairs after nearly 4 years the pattern is clear. That pattern is one of extraordinary and inordinate concern about big money and big business and a poor cousing approach to the problems of the average American citizen.

The opportunity to reverse this trend and to put this Nation back on the high road of social conscience moving toward the improved welfare of people awaits us.

This is an historic opportunity which we Democrats have in this decisive election year.

This is the opportunity to elect candidates who believe that people are entitled to decent homes in which to live, to a fair chance to earn a living with reasonable security against the disasters of illness, injury, and the infirmities and insecurities of old age.

These are the first interests of the Democratic Party because we believe that human beings are more important than anything else.

These social programs are the handwork of those who have a passion for social justice and they must not be entrusted to those who do not really believe them to be of first importance.

What of our foreign policy? What has happened to our former position of the leadership and influence throughout the world?

The great battle of our age is that of freedom against tyranny.

The great evil of our times is that of communism.

The frightening facts are that communism has continued to spread across the world and it has more influence now than it had 4 years ago. As we look out on the world we see a divided and restless Korea. In the northern half the Communists continue to build up power and strength for aggressive purposes.

We see Asia whose people are slowly but certainly deserting us for the soft blandishments of the Communists.

We see a divided Indochina where in the north again the Communists build up mightily for purposes of attack and conquest.

We see Germany still divided.

We see a major crisis developing in the Middle East.

Soviet and Iron Curtain arms are pouring into Egypt. Egypt has recognized Red China. Nasser flouts the United States while he embraces the Bulganin-Khrushchev-Chou En-lai axis. Nasser has announced that he will soon visit Communist China, accompanied by a military mission to Peiping.

Syria is flirting with the Communist world and has recognized Red China. Moreover, she is negotiating an agreement for the purchase of arms from the Communist bloc.

And in the face of this growing danger in the Middle East we have no policy but one of wait and see.

The enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe have been told to hope, to trust in the free world, and in the leadership of the United States. These nations in bondage, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, have been told to keep faith in us and our democratic creed. But they are beginning to despair of our sincerity and steadfastness. They find that the benefits they have received from the wily, ingratiating policies of the Kremlin have been more valuable than our words. The Kremlin knows how to move for purely propaganda reasons to confuse and divide, and—unless we stop it—ultimately to conquer.

Within a matter of the last few days the Polish people of Poznan gave a lesson in freedom for all the world. That lesson is that there is no price too great to pay for liberty.

Many of the people of Connecticut have living ties with the captive peoples of Europe. They know full well the price that has been paid, and is being paid, because of our State Department and its lack of policies. Time has not been on our side, as some administration leaders try to tell us. Time has robbed us of prestige and power. Time has weakened our friendships abroad. It has spread suspicion and dissatisfaction.

Only a change of administration can correct this faltering, inept policy. Only a return to a strong bipartisan foreign policy can restore us to our former position in the eyes of the world.

I propose to discuss these issues in every part of the State of Connecticut during this campaign. I promise you that I will work tirelessly from now until election day and that I will tell the truth to the people of our State.

I expect to run on my record, on my record as a Member of Congress, and on my lifetime record in resisting tyranny, in fighting for civil rights, the battle for social justice and for peace.

I invite my opponent to discuss my record as I expect to discuss his.

The people of Connecticut are entitled to a discussion of our respective records and to know where we stand on every issue which confronts this Nation.

I now suggest to my Republican opponent that he and I publicly debate these issues before the people of Connecticut. I am sure that we can mutually arrange for radio and television coverage and that we can work out a schedule which will bring these debates to every section of this State. If my opponent is willing to do this the campaign will be more clear, more effective, and less expensive.

In former years it was an accepted practice for competing candidates to appear in public on the same plafrom and to discuss the same issues. There is no reason why this good practice should not be revived and I hope and expect that my opponent will accept this invitation.

Finally, I thank all of you for the work that you have done throughout the years in the interest of the Democratic Party and in the United States of America. As your candidate for the United States Senate this year I can look you in the eye and say that as a United States Senator I will wear no man's collar.

I am beholden to no special interests or to any pressure group.

I have made no promises, no commitments of any kind.

However, I made one promise to you and to the voters of Connecticut and that is that as a Member of the United States Senate I shall at all times honestly and energetically do my best to improve the lot of people and to raise the standard of living at home and to work for peace in the world. God willing, the opportunity to fulfill this promise will be given on election day.

The River Jordan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 3, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following excerpts throw considerable light upon the discussions that surround the use of the waters from the river Jordan:

[From the New York Times of May 3, 1956]

THE RIVER JORDAN

Dag Hammarskjold, the United Nations Secretary General, would be forgiven if he felt like Sisyphus these days. No sooner does he get to the verge of his cease-fire agreement in the Middle East than he is tripped up by another incident or another problem dragged in by one side or the other. Now it is the Syrian demand, backed by Lebanon and Jordan, that Israel give a promise not to divert the waters of the river Jordan.

An issue of this sort must not be allowed to wreck so important an accomplishment as the unconditional cease-fire that Mr. Hammarskjold has been negotiating. We trust that some formula will be worked out, but this incident does call attention to one of the major problems of the area. It is typical of the processes whereby the Arabs are biting off their own noses to spite the faces of the Israelis.

A plan to develop the Jordan River Valley for waterpower and irrigation to benefit the

Arab States as well as Israel has been drawn up. Eric Johnston, representing President Eisenhower, has been trying for 3 years to get the Arabs to accept the plan, which the United States will do much to finance. Israel quickly agreed to it. Since the Arabs rejected it, Israel prepared a plan to divert Jordan River waters within Israeli territory and started work on the project. Syria protested to the United Nations Security Council late in 1953 and Israel was requested to suspend operations pending urgent examination of the question.

Since then 2½ years have passed with the Arabs blocking any solution and the Russians abetting them in the Security Council with their veto. The Israelis understandably feel that there is no hope for the Johnston plan. This is a clear case, so far as placing the blame is concerned. The Arab attitude is especially reprehensible since they are preventing their own countries and their own peoples from getting the benefits of a fine development.

WHAT RUSSIA WANTS

"By his action, Mr. Vishinsky will render the chances of our achieving any constructive solution of the problem before us, such chances as there are, completely nugatory. I should hesitate to say that this is what Mr. Vishinsky wants, but I can certainly say here and now that this is what he seems to want." (Sir Gladwyn Jebb, British representative to the Security Council, commenting on Russian veto of United States-United Kingdom-France resolution empowering General Bennike to decide on validity of Syrian protest, January 22, 1954.)

RIVERS SHOULD UNITE NATIONS

"We are convinced that this business of sharing the waters can be settled without prejudice to the interest of anyone. World opinion will not understand why the question should continue to strain relations between the two States on the banks of the Jordan, nor why the river should continue to flow betweeen two almost desert banks, as it has done for centuries, simply because there has been no agreement concerning its utilization. Rivers should bring nations closer together, not separate them." (Mr. Henri Hoppenot, French representative to the Security Council, in supporting American position, December 16, 1954.)

ISRAEL AND ARAB WATER ENDANGERED

Israel's inability to use Jordan water is forcing her to resort to a too extensive exploitation of her fresh-water springs and wells. Prolonged intensive "mining" of these water resources, according to experts, will lower the fresh-water level to the point where seawater from the Mediterranean will seep in. This would not only harm Israel, but would adversely affect the water table of the entire region, including wide areas of the surrounding Arab States.

CHRONOLOGY

1923: Establishment of Syrian-Palestine frontiers by Franco-British agreement.

1926: British Mandatory Government grants Jordan River hydroelectric concession to Palestine Electric Corp.

May 1948: Arab invasion of Palestine.

June 1949: Conclusion of Israel-Syrian armistice.

March 1951: Israel commences drainage of Huleh swamps.

May 1951: Syrian protest on Huleh drainage overridden by U. N. Security Council.

July 1953: Israel extends invitation to Syria to participate in Jordan hydroelectric project; Syria refuses.

October 1953: Israel asked by General Bennike to temporarily suspend Jordan River development pending examination of question by U. N. Security Council.

October 1953: U. N. Security Council undertakes "urgent examination of question."

October 1953: Johnston makes first trip to Middle East.

January 1954: Russia vetoes United States-United Kingdom-French resolution to empower Bennike to approve Jordan project.

May 1954: Johnston makes second Middle East attempt.

January 1955: Johnston makes third Middle East attempt.

August 1955: Johnston makes fourth Middle East attempt.

February 1956: Syria, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt threaten war if Israel recommences hydroelectric project.

April 1956: Syria tells Hammarskjold that resumption of Jordan work would mean war.

Saudi Arabia Celebrates King Saud's Anniversary of Accession to the Throne, November 12, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, when I came back from the Bandung Conference I announced that I would address the United States Congress each time there was an anniversary of 1 of the 29 participating nations in the Asian-African Conference on friendly relations with the United States.

Inasmuch as the Congress will not be in session at the time of the event, I wish to take this opportunity to extend felicitations to the people of Saudi Arabia, His Majesty Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud and His Excellency Sheikh Abdullah Al-Khayyal, Ambassador of Saudi Arabia, upon the occasion of the celebration of the third anniversary of His Majesty King Saud's accession to the throne of Saudi Arabia, November 12, 1956.

The herculean efforts of the late King Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman al Faisal al Saud to weld his country into an independent entity and break the bonds of the post-World War I mandate system are too well known to warrant detailed recounting here. Perhaps nowhere else in the annals of modern history could be found a state which owed more of its existence to the efforts of a single man. It suffices to say that King Saud's valiant struggles to regain for his family its lost authority and past glory began many years before he acceded to the throne of his country. Despite numerous obstacles created by man and Nature which confronted him, nullifying his initial successes, King Saud forged ahead, achieving remarkable victories over the enemies of his people. Personal courage, faith, and determination undergirded him for his tasks.

With the advent of the First World War, King Saud's plans for independence of his country suffered a setback. Upon the termination of the war, the Arab countries which revolted against colonialism, and which were promised their independence by the Allies, were placed instead under the mandate system of the League of Nations.

In 1924 the forces of King Ibn Saud captured Taif and Mecca followed the next year by similar victories over Medina and Jedda. In January 1926, King Saud was proclaimed King of the Hejaz. When Nejd was proclaimed a kingdom in 1927, His Majesty's title became king of the Hejaz and of Nejd and its Dependencies. In September 1932, King Ibn Saud proclaimed the union of the Hejaz and Nejd into the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia with himself as monarch.

During the early years of World War II Saudi Arabia remained neutral. Its contribution to the war effort is described in the citation of the Legion of Merit, Degree of Chief Commander, presented in 1947 to the late King Ibn Saud by President Truman. The citation reads in part:

His Majesty Abdul Aziz Ibn Abdur Rahman Al Faisal Al Saud, King of Saudi Arabia, rendered exceptionally meritorious service to the war effort of the United Nations. He led his country in an unwavering course of support and encouragement to the cause of the Allies. * * * As commander in chief of Saudi Arabia he kept the land, sea, and air routes under his control open for use, and by his attitude of wholehearted cooperation, he enabled American forces to accomplish a program of construction and resource development in the country that derived benefits of major proportions for the prosecution of the war. Through his unswerving loyalty, and his dynamic leadership, at the head of his nation in the support of the cause, King Abdul Aziz Ibn Saud made a notable contribution to the successful war effort of the United Nations.

The success which the late King Ibn Saud achieved through his efforts and with the minimum of external support gained for him universal esteem and affection. No more outstanding figure has appeared in the Arab world for many years.

Upon the demise of his illustrious father, His Majesty Saud Ibn Abdul Aziz al Saud ascended the throne of Saudi Arabia on November 12, 1953. King Saud had had years of training in practical administration of his country as prince, under the guidance of his father. During his brief years as chief of state King Saud has vigorously interested himself in maintaining the unity of his country and in the continued progress and development of Saudi Arabia.

We trust that his bigness in his country will be expanded; that his conscience and regard for the prestige of Saudi Arabia in the free world will lead to an expression of that same greatness in all relations with all people; that nothing will be permitted to cast a shadow over an otherwise shiny career.

Hon. Clifford Hope

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, agriculture and farmers throughout our great country lost a trusted and true

friend when the Honorable CLIFFORD HOPE announced his retirement from the Congress.

While I am on the opposite side of the political fence I have always found Mr. HOPE to be most sympathetic to the problems of agriculture irrespective of any political implications. He was always kind, courteous, and patient and on a number of occasions I have counseled with him when he was chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. I found his advice most constructive and his friendship I have valued.

Mr. HOPE has compiled an enviable record in the Congress, and he more than any living American has been a true champion of the farmer.

The Farm Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the general prosperity is dependent on the prosperity of each major segment of our population. This fact makes the drop in farm income of 28 percent in the last 3 years most disturbing. During this period profits of business and income of others were increasing to an alltime high. Since each depression has been led off by a break in farm income, it is time the causes of the present farm situation be searched out and corrected. The present administration now seems to see the problem, but would do little to correct the causes. From my experience it is my opinion that the President's farm plan, when considered in connection with what we are doing to destroy our farmers by foreign aid and other governmental policies, could well do more harm than good. It is a case of giving the average farmer aspirin while he has his production dried up to producing for domestic consumption only. Of course, the big landowner would get several aspirin.

If implemented by cash it will provide a few dollars to each farmer. However, unless great care is taken to see that it is not all distributed to big landowners, it is to be doubted that such payments to the average small farmer will equal what he has lost this year on one hog. After all, what the President asks for is for his Secretary of Agriculture to take action under the law enacted years ago by the Democrats. Having brought about reduced farm income by lowering prices, increasing costs, and cutting acreage, truly, this administration—to cure the problem—has labored and brought forth a mouse.

The point I wish to make, however, is not along the line of how little it amounts to, but actually in view of present policies of our Government I believe for the farmers to rely on such program is dangerous in that it will lull the American farmer into going along with present policies which are destroying American agriculture and the farmer.

Secretary Benson has had and now has unlimited authority to sell our commodities in world trade through normal channels. Until recent months he would not use it. While he has held United States commodities off world markets, our Government is furnishing 738 agricultural experts, at United States expense, to help promote increased foreign agricultural production.

Through various foreign-aid programs the United States is supplying fine seed, tractors and combines, and other farm machinery to nearly every country outside the Soviet bloc. The United States is helping provide irrigation, flood control, highways, and cotton gins to increase foreign production to the point of meeting all world needs in the years ahead.

Our Government was and is granting tax concessions to American financial interests to advance increases in foreign production. United States promoted foreign production has increased as fast as Secretary Benson cut acreage in the United States. All this is shown in the report of the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Pending the day when the United States Government has increased foreign production to the point of there being no need for United States agricultural production, except for our domestic consumption, the Government—through Public Law 480—has been virtually giving away United States commodities to take up slack in world needs, though our Government refused to sell such commodities in world markets.

Many people have supported Public Law 480 and foreign aid without realizing that, through the faulty policy of using Public Law 480 in substitution for sales through normal channels, such programs were being used to put American farmers out of business.

THE REAL CAUSES OF PRICE-COST SQUEEZE

Mr. Speaker, there have been 13 freight-rate increases in the United States since World War II. Prices charged by manufacturers and wholesalers have given them the highest profits ever received. Whatever the merits of such increases and the benefits to these groups, the result has been to increase the costs of what the farmer must buy.

At the same time, the farmer's parity formula has been changed on the recommendation of the Eisenhower administration so that these increased costs are no longer fully reflected in the price supports. The supports are now largely based on the average price the farmer has received for the preceding 10 years.

Since farm income is the sum of volume times price less cost, is it any wonder, in view of reduced acreage and volume, lower prices, and increasing costs, that farm income is dropping rapidly to depression-day levels?

The United States Department of Agriculture has held United States commodities off world markets so as to give markets to foreign countries far beyond their prewar share.

UNITED STATES AID TO INCREASE FOREIGN PRODUCTION

Largely financed by the United States, 1 million new acres of fine farmland have been added in Mexico through irrigation. The same situation exists with regard to many other countries in South and Central America. And in recent weeks, through the Aswan Dam proposal, the United States has taken the first step to help finance the development of 2 million new acres in Egypt.

India, where the United States financed 2,600 deep irrigation wells, has increased cotton production 50 percent since 1950–51 and will have a 4-million-bale crop in 1955–56.

Foreign dairy production has been increased by 740 million pounds of cheese and 66 million pounds of dried milk in the years 1950–54. During that period, while the United States would not sell competitively, exports of cheese from the United States dropped from 47.5 million pounds in 1950 to 5.4 million pounds in 1954.

During the period July 1, 1947, to August 1, 1955, the United States Export-Import Bank of Washington made loans of $250 million to foreign countries for farm machinery and equipment. The International Bank of Reconstruction extended $500 million in loans for the same general purposes.

From April 3, 1948, to March 31, 1955, the United States foreign aid program provided $984,159,436 in United States dollars to promote agriculture in foreign countries and created $710 million of counterpart funds for furtherance of agriculture in those countries. During this period the International Cooperation Administration granted a total of $476,819,000 for agricultural machinery, tractors, and equipment for foreign countries.

On June 1 of last year, there were 738 United States agricultural technicians—paid by our Government—on duty in foreign countries, helping to increase agricultural production. Two hundred and forty of such agricultural technicians are located in Latin America.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Secretary Benson and President Eisenhower tried for the first 2 years of this administration to virtually eliminate the present soil-conservation program—in which the Federal Government pays for only about one-third of the soil-conservation work on land.

Making payments for the soil-bank acreage reserve, as recommended by the President, will put a little money into the hands of the farmer, but will cure none of the basic ills. How can these people who now espouse this solution believe in a soil-bank idea, where the Government pays substantially all costs and the farmer would take little affirmative action other than not to farm? May I say it is my belief that the suggested payment for conservation reserve could be much better used if added to funds available for present soil-conservation programs. However, even to receive the recommendation of his soil-bank program, is a belated recognition of the soundness of the action of the Congress

in retaining the soil-conservation program in spite of administration attacks against the program back through the years.

Secretary Benson and the President led the fight for modern parity, which reduced parity itself. They led the fight for flexible supports which reduced the percentage of parity, all because they said high-level supports led to farmers producing for sale to the Government.

Now, this election year, after they reduced acreage by holding United have reduced price, increased costs, and States commodities off world markets through refusing to sell for dollars at competitive prices, they claimed to be surprised to learn that farm income is down. The United States Government goes merrily on, supplying dollars to foreign countries for building dams, furnishing seeds, providing tractors and combines and other equipment and machinery, and—to cap it all—at United States taxpayers' expense it furnishes 738 American agricultural specialists to teach people in foreign lands how to increase their production of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, dairy products, and all the rest—much of it for export—all to add to world supplies in competition with American farmers.

With this state of affairs the situation of American farmers is bound to get worse before it gets better. Such a course leads to reducing the American farmer to producing for the domestic market only; and to remain solvent he must look to the Government for an annual dole, or Government handout, dependent on the whims of succeeding Congresses, and knowing full well only every fourth year is election year.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES OFFER AT COMPETITIVE PRICES

All foreign countries take what action they deem necessary to help move their agricultural commodities. I cite the following examples of subsidies provided by other countries. France pays $1.40 subsidy per bushel to export wheat: Uruguay pays a subsidy of 47 percent on beef exports; Australia pays an export subsidy on butter and cheese of 11 cents and 7 cents, respectively; and Colombia pays a 40-percent subsidy on tobacco exports. Brazil has met the export problem by juggling its rates of exchange. All these foreign countries move their commodities by one means or another. The United States seems to be one of the few countries which fails to take whatever steps may be necessary to keep its agricultural commodities moving into world markets.

If our Governments wants its farmers to have any foreign market, it is basic and fundamental that it must offer what the farmers produce for sale through normal channels in world trade at competitive prices. Such action is not only authorized by law but is contemplated by the law and is essential to protect the American taxpayer as well as the farmer.

UNITED STATES POLICY ADDS TO WORLD SUPPLY

By refusing to sell, the United States has, and is cutting, its own farmers' production down and is putting many of them out of production entirely. Such United States Government policies constantly add to total world supplies and United States surpluses. Even more dangerous, perhaps, is the fact that the United States is deliberately promoting increased world production in foreign countries for export. In addition to creating competition for United States farm products, such a policy will eventually enable Russia to meet her agricultural needs from these other countries, despite anything the United States may do to prevent it.

ORIGINAL FARM PROGRAM

The farm program was originally written in the midst of the last depression, at a time when the farmers' purchasing power had fallen to an all-time low, leading to the break in prices which resulted in the depression. It was realized that if we were to restore a fair share of the purchasing power to farmers, in relation to other segments of our economy which are protected by various laws, agriculture would have to have protections written into the law.

It was then provided and has since remained, until changed on the recommendation of the Eisenhower administration through Benson, the present Secretary of Agriculture, that price supports should be a percentage of the comparative purchasing power which the farmer had in 1909–14, which was determined by the Congress to be a fair base. Under that formula, the price the farmer was guaranteed, which was less than 100 percent of parity, was based on a parity formula which rose with increasing costs the farmer paid and fell with decreasing costs.

The whole approach was to assure the farmer a fair share of the Nation's purchasing power.

SECRETARY BENSON'S FARM PROGRAM

Secretary Benson apparently has differed with that concept. It seems to be his view, and concurred in by President Eisenhower, that price supports should be limited, as he would describe it, to preventing the bottom from falling out of prices; and he considers price-support levels as a means of regulating production.

First he recommended, and has gotten through the Congress, a change in parity. The old formula was repealed, leaving a so-called modern parity wherein price supports are based, not on maintaining the average purchasing power of the farmer, but largely on the average price the farmer has received for the past 10 years. The so-called flexible price-support program.

Thus, increasing costs because of such factors as wage increases, and the 13 freight rate increases mentioned are not fully reflected under the new formula in the price the farmer receives from price supports. Actually, should the farmer have to continue to sell at the price-support level under modern parity, the price he receives will gradually go down, though his cost of production will probably continue to rise.

Further evidence that the Secretary has a different concept of price supports is that he would assure the farmer a larger percentage of parity under his flexible support formula—the average price the farmer has been receiving for the past 10 years—if supplies are short. Of course, if supplies are short enough, there will be a demand and a market and less farmer need for supports. On the other hand, if supplies are large so that there is virtually no market, which means that the farmer is in more serious straits, Secretary Benson would give a smaller percentage of his modern parity. Thus the Secretary's law helps the farmer more when he needs less help and provides less help when he needs more. That is the principle of the law which the Eisenhower administration requested and got through the Congress.

Experience has shown that a lower price does not necessarily reduce production; for the farmer, in the absence of other controls, will increase production in an effort to retain his income, declining in the fact of reduced prices.

NONBASIC COMMODITIES

With regard to the nonbasic commodities, Secretary Benson has given clear evidence that he either does not understand the approach contemplated under the law or is opposed to it. To support prices for nonbasics, section 32 funds are made available to him automatically each year. A courageous Secretary of Agriculture should move in promptly, having the money at his disposal, and announce a purchase program before a break in the price of nonbasic commodities occurs.

When we review the actual operations of the various farm programs each year, there have been umerous instances where a prompt announcement that the Government would purchase a commodity in distress has resulted in sustaining the market. Usually it has had to buy very little of the commodity.

PORK PURCHASE

The prime example of the Secretary's lack of understanding is the break in hog prices last fall. This break could easily be foreseen. However, instead of moving in promptly, the Department of Agriculture waited until prices broke, as I recall, from some 20 cents a pound to around 15 cents a pound. Even at that time, instead of moving it to support prices, Secretary Benson announced in the press that the prices had not yet broken sufficiently for the Department to justify moving in. He stated that if prices broke still further apparently meaning to around 13 cents the Department would buy millions of dollars worth of pork.

While I grant that it was probably not so intended, if you analyze this announcement, it was obviously an open invitation to the meat packers to further reduce prices to the farmers, in which event they would have a ready sale to Mr. Benson's Department of Agriculture for $85 million worth of pork. Quite naturally, within a short time the meat packers met his requirement, reduced the price as he indicated, and are now selling pork to Mr. Benson. The Secretary forgot to require that any benefits be passed on to the farmer, and the packers are declaring the largest dividends in years.

UNITED STATES COMMODITIES MUST CONTINUE FOR SALE IN WORLD MARKETS

Whether you believe in the approach of Secretary Benson, which is that price supports should be a means of regulating production, or whether you agree with

me and others that price support should be used to maintain the purchasing power of the farmer, one thing is essential to either approach: That is, the production of American farmers, which is surplus to American need, must be kept on world markets for sale for dollars.

To finance these support programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation was created.

The Congress, in order to protect the domestic price, provided that the CCC could sell on the domestic market at its investment price, plus reasonable carrying charges, normally set at 105 percent of parity. However, when the Congress limited the price at which the commodities could be sold domestically, it also realized that in order to retain any of our share of world markets we must make our offering prices competitive with those of the same commodities produced in other parts of the world. Thus the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation also provided for sales in world markets on a truly competitive basis, or at any price necessary to move them.

Most of our present difficulties have resulted from the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has been buying commodities as provided by the law, but has refused to sell them in world markets as contemplated by that same law.

SALES POLICY, OR RATHER, LACK OF

For the past several years and until recent months, our Government has made the support price its offering price in world trade. In the words of Secretary Benson, this country became the residual supplier. By sticking to a position of offering our production in world trade either at the domestic sale price or at a fixed price close to that level, we have held an umbrella over expansion in world production. Foreign buyers have bought elsewhere until the world supply was exhausted, and then the United States has taken up the slack. These are the words of the Department of Agriculture, and yet that Department has at all times had authority to sell in world trade at truly competitive prices. Until recent months it has not exercised that authority, and is now doing so only on a very limited basis.

The course followed is an open invitation for foreign expansion in the very commodities in trouble in the United States. The records show such invitation has been accepted. As we have reduced acreage in the United States, under Mr. Benson's convenient umbrella over world prices, foreign production has increased at approximately the same rate that our farmers were reduced. This was not because of the high level of supports in the United States, but because of faulty governmental policy. I would point out again that whatever the level of supports, Mr. Benson and the Department of Agriculture have had, and now have, authority to sell in world trade at whatever price it takes to move the commodities.

WHAT WE MUST DO

It is my opinion that there are several things which must be done.

First. We must stop all foreign aid which increases production of agricultural commodities for export.

The present program whereby the United States is furnishing capital, machinery, improved seed, and technical assistance is doing United States agriculture great harm. And when this is coupled with tax concessions for United States investors abroad and a Government policy of holding United States commodities off world markets at competitive prices, despite authority to sell—thereby holding an umbrella over world prices—it can only have the effect of wrecking the present farm program or any which might be adopted.

Second. Whatever the percentage of purchasing power the farmer should have in the opinion of the Congress; and I personally believe 90 percent is low enough, we should immediately restore the original parity formula so that parity will be tied tightly to the cost of what the farmer has to buy and provide that whichever formula—modern or old—provides the highest support level should apply.

Third. Since reduction in acreage will not necessarily reduce production of the basic commodities, price supports should be placed on a given number of pounds, bushels, or bales with some attention to farmers instead of being tied to land entirely. It is bad enough for small farmers to be squeezed because of economics; certainly we must see they are not squeezed out of business by Federal law.

I know many farmers differ with this approach. They believe that under acreage controls, by the use of fertilizer and other chemicals, they can produce just as much on reduced acreage. In fact, they usually have; but what most farmers overlook is that each time they do this, under present law they get further reductions in acreage the next year—with more fertilizer and other overhead costs. Thus each year the situation becomes worse.

Fourth. In order that curtailment in United States production will have the effect of reducing world production, which is essential to any effective farm program in the United States, I believe the Congress should require the Secretary of Agriculture to use his authority under the CCC charter to offer our commodities in the markets of the world for sale for dollars through normal channels on a competitive basis. This should be done at least to the extent of recapturing our normal share of world markets.

Fifth. Since most of the CCC losses come from inferior quality commodities, we should greatly increase the spread of support levels for good and poor qualities. This should be done by increasing supports on the good grades to the extent supports are lowered on inferior qualities.

Sixth. We should see that United States farm production is allowed to move into every section of the United States free of local boycotts or other restrictions.

Seventh. We must insist that the Secretary of Agriculture move promptly in the purchase of perishables, diverting purchases to the school lunch or similar good uses; and we must require that the benefits be passed on to the producer.

The suggestions I make are "musts." If we act on them, doubtless experience will show other changes which may be needed later.

ACTION BY CONGRESS

In the last appropriation bill before the Congress we made separate provision for a sales organization, for which there was already authority and funds but no organized sales force. Over the opposition of Secretary Benson we earmarked money in the bill for that purpose only. This organization has now been set up.

The committee also provided separate funds to find out what foreign countries are doing to export their commodities, though here, too, authority and funds were already available.

We provided for a study by the Department as to the price spread between the farmer and consumer, because the Department was urging reduced farm price supports. This information is now being assimilated.

We demanded that United States commodities be sold in world trade on a competitive basis; and in recent months limited amounts of several commodities have been offered on a competitive-bid basis. But even here the announcement of the Department of Agriculture gives no assurance that our Government will issue an export permit to whomever buys commodities on a competitive-bid basis from the CCC for export.

CONCLUSION

We may argue as to the proper parity percentage; we may argue as to the mechanics of the program; but in order to be of lasting value to the farmer, the support price must be tied to the cost of what the farmer has to buy. That we did have. That has been taken away from the farmer by the Eisenhower administration.

Any farm program, to be workable, must provide for the sale of what we produce over and above our needs in world trade for what it will bring; that is authorized by existing law, but has not been done.

Any farm program, if it is to work, requires an absolute cessation of the use of United States taxpayers' money for foreign aid to put the farmer out of business by providing everything for foreign expansion, including an umbrella over the sale of their increased production. If this foreign aid, which increases foreign production for export, is not stopped soon there will be no foreign markets to reach and the United States farmer will be cut back to producing for the domestic market only. Under existing administration policies such a situation is drawing near.

Beware of Republican Promises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, we all remember how during the 1952 campaign, Republicans told us about how

inflation was destroying the country and that their election would stop the runaway inflation and bring things back to normal. One of the things they prated most about was their ability to increase the value of the dollar.

The statistics made available to us during this last week of this session of Congress establish the emptiness of their promises and their inability to cope with the situation. Our Republican friends can hardly pretend that the figures were colored, certainly not colored against them, because the statistics have been made available to us by departments controlled by Republican-appointed Republican appointees.

There has been a softening of the talk about controlling credit as the inflationary influences continue at work. While the profits of the big corporations have continued to climb, the profits of the small-business man have continued to decline. While the earnings of the wage earner have declined, disappeared, or remained static, the cost of living has increased and the value of the dollar has again slipped.

Thus far in 1956, the rate of failures, according to Dun & Bradstreet, is higher than in any of the previous years in this administration. Obviously the failures are not in big business, but in small business.

The national public debt at the end of the year 1952 was just over $259 billion. At the end of 1953 it was $7 billion higher. It climbed another $5 billion in 1954, and more than $3 billion more in 1955. The 1956 estimate indicates that there will be no decrease.

Mulford Gardens, Calif., Fire Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mulford Gardens in Alameda County, Calif., is justly proud of its fine fire department.

Volunteer fire departments are an exception to the rule in the metropolitan area around San Francisco Bay but the Mulford Gardens' department is just that.

Under the efficient leadership of Chief Robin Wilson the Mulford Gardens Fire Department has won first honors in competition with neighboring professional departments.

The residents of the Gardens brag about their friends and members of their families who compose the firefighters. They have a right to do so.

With the rapid growth of this area, sometime in the not too distant future, the Mulford Gardens Fire Department will lose its voluntary status. It will most likely be absorbed in one of the major departments that bound it. I am sure that the residents who joined in forming it and who have so constantly supported it will hate to see it go.

It was a wholesome, necessary, and efficient community project that has become part of them.

Here Virginia Ringwood, of the staff of the Daily Review of Hayward, Calif., which serves this area, writes well and knowingly about the Mulford Gardens Fire Department and the happy community it protects:

IT'S YOUNG, BUT GROWING FAST—MULFORD FIRE PROTECTION IS SOURCE OF PRIDE—THREE REGULARS, 38 VOLUNTEERS ANSWER CALLS

(By Virginia Ringwood)

MULFORD GARDENS.—This community looks with pride to its fire department, youngest in southern Alameda County but one of the best.

Organized only since June 1947, the department has grown rapidly until now it boasts four pieces of equipment and a modern, attractive station on Avenue West 132.

While still largely a volunteer department, MGFD has three regular firemen staffing its station, including Chief Robin Wilson.

Manpower to fight fires in this community of 1,900 persons is drawn from some 38 volunteers who answer the alarm siren atop the station.

Mulford residents had long been discontented with fire protection which they claimed often took 30 minutes to arrive for fires. So in January 1947, a committee appointed by the Mulford Gardens Improvement Association started to work to building a community fire department.

Soon the committee, headed by Russell Yates and containing George Mitchell, Joseph Chanley, Edward Futrell, and Paul Minor, had organized the Volunteer Firemen's Association.

First fire commissioners elected by the group were James C. Fortney, Lionel Carden, Ray Dolan, Kenneth Denning, and Yates.

Yates was named first fire chief, badges were purchased for 31 vols, and a siren put up on the chief's house.

In June 3 pack pumps and 5 lengths of garden hose were added and Mulford Gardens Fire Department was in business.

FIRST TRUCK

One month later the department acquired its first truck, a 1933 Seagrave 500-gallon pumper bought from Gilroy for $1,500.

Money to buy the truck came from $12 per house donations and several social events, used to pay off a loan cosigned by store owner Clyde Denning and pioneer resident George Mendonca.

With the truck came a new problem—a fire station. For 2 months the rig stood in the chief's driveway, covered with canvas. Then it was moved to a shed provided by the improvement association.

The next few months were busy as volunteers organized and drilled crews, captains were named, and an auxiliary set up.

A fire district was formed and early in January 1948 Fortney, Mendonca, and Yates were elected commissioners.

PLANS DRAWN

The following year the site of the present station was purchased and plans drawn for a $22,000 building. Late in 1949 the department bought its second truck, a new Maxim 1,000-gallon pumper, and a second shed was built for it.

In 1950 ground was broken for the new station, which was completed 2 years later, much of the work done by department members. Included are a recreation-drill room, dormitory, chief's office, and apparatus room.

In 1953 the first full-time man was hired, with regulars increased to three since then.

In addition to the two fire trucks, the department has a civil-defense pumper and a station wagon used for resuscitator and other emergency calls.

WINS PLAQUE

High point in the department's work came in 1952–54 when for 3 years straight the department won the Robert E. DeCelle plaque for promoting fire prevention in Alameda County.

Mulford Garden's fire record is short, topped by a $5,800 house fire which occurred just before the new Maxim arrived. Most department activity is confined to grass and garage fires.

Indicative of the fire department's financial value to Mulford taxpayers is the fact fire-insurance rates have dropped from $1.20 per $100 (1947) to 42 cents now.

The district owns all equipment and station outright and has a 44-cent tax rate, a creditable record achieved in 9 years.

Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the principle of geographical dispersal is to protect our industries against the hazards of a nuclear attack, but I question the ability of such a plan in this atomic age. Where are the industries going to be located in the future so that they will have such safeguards? Testimony given before our committees proves that there is no safe place that we can pinpoint in this country as having a perfect defense against such a devastating weapon.

The experts in the Defense Department and the Civil Defense Administration are deeply concerned over this very problem, the inability to give adequate protection to human beings and property in the dreaded event of a nuclear war.

The geographical dispersal provision of this bill will prohibit Government loans or aid for the construction, expansion, or improvement of "any" industry with a Government contract in any part of the country if the area in which the industry is located is deemed to be a so-called "target" area. New England areas, and particularly the Greater Springfield area of my district, have been so classified by the Civil Defense Administration. This geographical-dispersal provision could very well mean that no Government contracts would be let to industries in New England in the future.

It would seem to me that if we are going to have geographical dispersal of industry, then the next logical step would be a geographical dispersal of populations to protect them from the atomic bomb. But where would the industries and populations be relocated? There is no such safe place in the entire country. Mr. Speaker, I hope that this provision of the bill is defeated.

Swiss Watch Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Congress to the authoritative and well-reasoned report recently published by the Joint Economic Committee following the hearings of its subcommittee on defense essentiality and foreign economic policy which used the watch industry and precision skills as its case in point. I should like to commend the chairman of this subcommittee, Representative RICHARD BOLLING, for the excellence and thoroughness of this examination into a most controversial subject. I have been impressed with the conclusions and recommendations set forth in the report and I am pleased to note that they are in consonance with recommendations which I have made to the Congress and to the President on this subject.

As is often the case in such hearings, those before the Joint Economic Committee brought forth a number of charges and countercharges. Some of these were highly antagonistic to the Swiss watch industry, though many supported the operations of the Swiss and cited the fact that the Swiss has not dumped their watches into the American market but have been a force for good in their production and sales programs. A letter which sets the facts straight and places them in their proper perspective has been received by Mr. BOLLING from Mr. P. Renggli, chairman of the coordination committee of the Swiss watch industry. Because I believe this letter, which is being printed along with the transcript of the subcommittee hearings, is a most informative document and one which lays at rest many of the untruths and innuendos that have been leveled against the Swiss watch industry, I include a copy of it in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COORDINATION COMMITTEE OF THE
SWISS WATCH INDUSTRY,
Bienne, Switzerland, July 13, 1956.

The Honorable RICHARD BOLLING,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BOLLING: I am availing myself of the privilege of writing to you as president of the coordination committee which has been entrusted with the interests of the watch industry of Switzerland in the United States. We have been following with careful attention the proceedings during the open hearings of your committee from June 4 to June 7. During the interval we have had the opportunity of studying the minutes of the hearings and to find out that some witnesses made statements which we consider erroneous and misleading with regard to the Swiss watch industry, its organization, its practices, and its marketing methods. The purpose of our letter to you is to comment on some of these statements which have a direct bearing on the Swiss watch industry and which are of great importance.

As a general preface to my remarks I would like to stress the critical position of the Swiss watch industry to the economy of Switzerland. Our country is not in as fortunate a position as the United States, and we have very few leading industries upon which to rely. On these few industries falls the burden of earning the exchange with which to purchase the raw materials, food, and agricultural products which we cannot produce on our own limited soil. It is recognized that chief among these key industries is the watch industry, which gives employment and a livelihood to more than 10 percent of Swiss labor; and whose products earn nearly half of the exchange income which Switzerland obtains by sales of commodities in foreign trade. The relation of the Swiss watch industry to the national economy, and the effect of national law upon the industry, have been a matter of general knowledge to all, and especially to those supervising the trade program between our two countries.

From the tenor of much of the testimony given by witnesses appearing for the American companies, one would gather that the entire trade associations' system of the Swiss watch industry was inspired solely by a desire on our part to defy antitrust laws of the United States. Or that there was a concerted program launched by the Swiss watch industry for the purpose of systematically destroying the position in the United States market of the American watchmakers.

With respect to that contention, I wish to point out that the conventions (bylaws) of our industry, unlike trade association bylaws in the United States, are a joint product of our national law and the measures taken by the industry itself on a democratic basis to promote and defend its trade position; these measures are primarily intended to be effective within the Swiss territory. The Swiss watch industry does business with all of the countries of the world, and our laws inevitably differ on some points with the laws of other countries. But it has never been the intention of our Government and the associations concerned to violate any laws of any countries, particularly relating to business practices. The Swiss watch industry is composed of more than 2,000 member firms who democratically govern the associations; this requires a common policy to assure a sound evolution to the benefit of all. The said conventions are a product of much deliberation, of slow growth, of trial and error on the part of an industry seeking to protect itself against economic fluctuations. After the disastrous world crisis and its aftermath, our industry made a great effort to preserve a vital source of national wealth from the destructive influences of cycles in world economy. We recognize that our approach to the problem may be construed by those not familiar with the history of our industry, to be at variance with certain practices in your country. However, we feel that under closer scrutiny there may have been many results of the trade practices followed by us which would win the approval of most American economists. One clear proof of the value of our system is the fact that overconcentration could be avoided and that it has encouraged the growth and expansion of an industry now numbering more than 2,000 individual enterprises.

This economic policy has not prevented the Swiss watch industry as a whole to take into account the interests of the American watch industry. It is well known that the Bulova Watch Co. began business as an importer in the United States. That without the unique assistance of the Swiss industry it is evident that Bulova Watch Co. would not today be one of the major watch companies not only in the United States but in the world. It is, of course, due to the extensive use of Swiss machinery, Swiss techniques, Swiss patents, and Swiss watch parts that Bulova Watch Co.'s watchmaking facilities have now been put at the disposal of the consumer economy of the United States.

Similarly we mention the assistance, in terms of machinery and techniques, tendered to the Waltham Watch Co. in its effort to rehabilitate its business.

Factually, we can cite also additional offers of assistance which were made within the past year to both Elgin National Watch Co. and Hamilton Watch Co. by representatives of the Swiss watch industry. Our people, cognizant of the fact that these entities of the United States watch industry were, in some respects, in need of modernization of machinery and production practices, offered to supply needed devices and developments from Switzerland. The offers were rejected.

The charge of systematic dumping has been leveled for many years at the Swiss industry by its American critics. Protectionists have attempted to prove that a strategy based upon sales below cost of Swiss movements was aimed at forcing the United States industry out of the market.

It was a source of interest, therefore, for us to note that Mr. Arde Bulova, one of the witnesses, admitted during the course of cross-examination that it would be impossible for Swiss manufacturers to practice dumping operations under the conventions; and that, in fact, the conventions and trade practices operated, on the contrary, to hold the prices of Swiss exports at a fair and profitable level. This should serve to discourage any further promotion of the dumping story.

Considerable issue also was made of the fact that our industry has for years sponsored an advertising program to advance and protect our trade interests, and unfavorable inference were drawn. And your committee was told that over $3 million a year is spent in this fashion. In fact, of the funds subscribed by the industry for trade promotion and advertising purpose only a proportion equivalent to the sales in the United States is expended in the United States campaign, or about one-third of the amount stated.

This worldwide program of advertising began and continues in response to the demands of United States retail jewelers and other distributors who have sought this type of assistance from the Swiss industry in helping them to market our product in the United States and other countries. It is similar to advertising programs undertaken by trade associations in the United States—the steel, automobile, electric power, railroad, and other industries—to name a few. It does not represent a radical departure from custom for foreign industries, either, since the foreign producers of coffee, tea, and other commodities are accustomed to subsidize such advertising programs, as are industries of Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, and other nations in friendly trade with the United States.

Furthermore we wish to state that at its onset, the advertising campaign of the watchmakers of Switzerland stressed the watch as such regardless of its origin. This shows that we had no hostile intention toward the American watch manufacturers since we considered the United States market big enough for everyone. Even if later the attitude of the American watch manufacturers led us to mention the Swiss watch, the aim of our advertising campaign was never to hamper the American manufacturers. We trust that your committee will take cognizance of the facts adduced here to help offset the implication that our advertising represents a sinister plot against the American companies.

Dating from 1936 forward we note that there has been a progressive trend in watch production output and sales by the Ameri-

can companies, and discounting year-to-year variations, that they have consistently improved the volume of production and sales. Similarly, with the exception of the Waltham Co. whose difficulties can properly be blamed on internal management problems, the American watch companies have been able to increase their assets and plant and net value in a steady, continuous process of growth.

From the broader view of total American national interest, we believe that the watch exports of our industry have been very influential in building an unprecedently high volume of United States-Swiss trade. It must be recalled that in 1936 the total of American exports to Switzerland were less than $10 million; and that in recent years this volume has grown to the point to which exports of United States products to Switzerland have varied between $150 million and $190 million annually. Nor should it be overlooked that the trade between Switzerland and the United States has resulted almost invariably in a surplus in favor of the United States, now totaling well over one-half billion dollars. Although we would not pretend that improved watch sales have been the only factor in producing such excellent trade results, it is apparent that this watch trade has been one of the most important elements in improving trade between our countries.

We are also particularly interested in certain evidence and testimony offered by the spokesmen for the United States clock and pin-lever manufacturers.

It was apparent from this information that one of the unexpected effects of the 1954 tariff decision has been to increase measurably the pressure of competition of manufacturers in the pin-lever segment of the American watch market. We have been aware of the fact that there has been considerable diversion away from the better grade, more reliable jewel-lever watch exports and to the less expensive pin-lever, or clock-type watches.

That this result was unexpected by American officials might be attributed to an unawareness of the nature of United States markets for watches. We say markets advisedly because we believe that there exists a number of levels at which good jewel-lever movements may be sold in the United States. In only one of these levels can our jewel-lever product be considered truly competitive with that of the three American jewel-lever companies.

It is apparent, also, that in lower-priced levels, where the three American companies have never sought to compete, there was a consistent and firm consumer demand for reliable jewel-lever timepieces, which was filled mainly by Swiss exports to the United States. With the increase of tariff there was a diversion of this demand to lower-priced and less reliable products, since a market cannot be ruled out of existence by the simple act of raising tariffs.

In closing, I would like to take the liberty of summarizing certain aspects of the watch controversy, as it is seen from Switzerland.

First, we lay claims to being as thoroughly conversant with the techniques of modern watch manufacturing, as our rivals in the United States, and for this reason we find it difficult to accept their contention that a watch industry can be said to occupy a completely special position in the production scheme of any country, totally apart and separate from all the other precision machining and assembly industries in the country. By experience, we have found that there is a certain gradation in the level of skills and special techniques employed throughout the entire group of precision industries in Switzerland. And that, in many cases, the skills of the watch industry will overlap with the special skills of other precision manufactures. Experience has taught us, therefore, to be skeptical of the idea that we are unique, or that we produce anything which cannot be duplicated by others of our machine industries. Our people are therefore strongly inclined to believe that the same is true of the relation between the American watch industries, and all the other elements of the precision machining and assembly industries of the United States.

Second, it has not been thought desirable or necessary to use our watch industry in the production or assembly of war materials. Even in the case in which industries here are cooperating with the United States Government in production of components for the guided-missile program, their production problem has been kept totally separate from the watch industry. This factor, of course, has raised considerable speculation here as to the actual reasons why the watch industry of the United States seems to have become so deeply involved in the production of defense materials.

Third, we are constrained to wonder whether the intensive programs of diversification, in which each of the three American watch companies are now engaged, will ultimately help or hinder them in their main task, which is the efficient production of watches at competitive prices. Programs for the production of electronic and electrical products; for transistors, radio frequency crystals, clock radios, and shavers are now in operation at one or another of the American watch companies. All of these are specific production tasks, requiring the diversion of skilled personnel, management, and capital away from the job of manufacturing watches, and can fairly be presumed to be placing considerable strain on the limited resources of the companies in the American jewel-lever watch industry.

I mention this because the procedure evidently being followed by the American watch companies is not current in our industry, where we have concentrated on the production of watches, and where we have obtained our reductions in costs and overhead by decentralizing the production of the industry, and by investing money and effort in the modernization of production techniques.

I trust that you will accept the information offered in the letter in the helpful spirit in which it is intended. I close with the fullest assurance of our continued regard for yourself and for the esteemed members of your committee.

Respectfully yours,

P. RENGGLI,
Chairman, the Coordination Committee of the Swiss Watch Industry.

Amending Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that this House today acts favorably on this bill, S. 3616, which will amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by providing for a necessary 10-percent increase in railroad-retirement benefits. I wholeheartedly support this measure, because it will give some measure of relief to thousands of elderly annuitants whose income in retirement has not kept abreast of the cost of living. These persons are entitled to more generous benefits, and this modest increase in retirement annuities, without requiring an increase in payroll taxes to cover its cost, will at least be of some help in reducing the economic strain that this group in our society has been under for some time.

Incredible Political Pressure—Kohler Strike: A Dispassionate Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I am including an article that appeared recently in the Milwaukee Sentinel. It was written by an outstanding Wisconsin journalist, Mr. William A. Norris, feature writer for that newspaper.

Mr. Norris raises the important question if the situation he describes is not the beginning of an era in which powerful special-interest groups can buy unjust economic advantages for themselves with a promise of support at the polls.

The article follows:

KOHLER STRIKE: A DISPASSIONATE APPRAISAL

(By William A. Norris)

If you could divorce yourself from all political convictions and prejudices; if you could forget that you ever felt strongly in favor of a Democratic or Republican candidate; if you could wipe your mind clean of any sympathy you ever felt for workmen unjustly treated by employers or employers unjustly treated by organized workmen; if you could clear your memory of Samuel Gompers, yellow-dog contracts, Franklin Roosevelt, John L. Lewis, the Wagner Act, the Taft-Hartley Act, the NLRB, Walter Reuther, and George Meany; if you could feel in your heart that there is no essential reason why men and women, whatever their occupations, cannot live together in peace and understanding, then you might achieve what we newspaper writers like to call a dispassionate approach to this long, bitter, and confusing business called the Kohler strike.

What would you see if you achieved such an approach? Here's my guess, for what it's worth.

You would see a powerful and confident union suddenly stopped cold in its battle with a small but strong, resourceful, and stubborn company.

As the going got tough for the union, you would see some of its officials and members resorting to tactics of violence that are generally frowned upon by the public and the courts.

You would see other unions in many parts of the State and Nation rushing to the assistance of the Kohler union and its parent body, the UAW–CIO.

You would see national labor leaders selecting this local strike in the little village of Kohler as a sort of proving ground for union strength everywhere.

You would see employers in many States applauding and encouraging the tough management of the Kohler Co.

You would see the company continuing to operate with new employees—strikebreakers in the eyes of union leaders—and you would see more and more strikers drifting away to get jobs in other cities in order to keep their families fed, clothed, and moderately happy.

In other words, you would see the union losing the strike.

But then you would see something else, something that may make the Kohler strike unique in labor history.

You would see the unions, as stubborn as the company and more powerful, attempting to do on an extraordinary political level what they could not do on the ordinary economic level of the strike itself.

You would see the strange incident of the Kohler clay ships, with union leaders using their political influence on Milwaukee's city government to close the public port of Milwaukee to cargoes destined to the Kohler plant.

And now, a full year after the clay ships incident, you see the union leaders, as a last resort, attempting to force the Milwaukee County Board, and other local legislative bodies in Wisconsin, to stop buying Kohler products.

If you are sufficiently dispassionate you will see that these union leaders are offering labor support at the polls to supervisors if they will vote to put Milwaukee County on the side of the union in a labor dispute in another county, a dispute in which Milwaukeeans are not directly concerned, except as their sympathies may lie with one side or the other.

You will see that the union leaders are in effect asking the county board to take action that will bolster union prestige and strengthen the union position in future labor disputes.

You will see that the demands of the union leaders are no more justified than would be a demand by the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association that the county board help the Kohler Co. by buying only Kohler products.

And perhaps you will wonder whether this can be the beginning of a deterioration in local government, the beginning of an era in which powerful special-interest groups can buy unjust economic advantages for themselves with a promise of support at the polls.

Mr. Humphrey in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1956, entitled "Mr. Humphrey's Bite," and an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 27, 1956, entitled "Mr. Humphrey in Politics."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 26, 1956]

MR. HUMPHREY'S BITE

The interest of Treasury Secretary Humphrey in helping elect a Republican Congress in November is altogether understandable. Not so much can be said for Mr. Humphrey's judgment in agreeing to serve as chairman of the Bender-for-Senator Campaign Committee in Ohio. The committee reportedly has undertaken to raise a $400,000 campaign fund for Senator BENDER.

The Secretary of the Treasury has the ultimate responsibility for ruling on Federal tax cases from all over the country, including Ohio. Although Secretary Humphrey's personal integrity and honorable intentions are not in the slightest question, his position at the head of a campaign raising political funds might lend itself to misunderstanding on the part of persons solicited. The solicitations might be construed as alternatively a command or a come-in for favorable treatment. The chief fiscal officer of the Government, a senior member of the Cabinet, ought to be especially at pains to set an example in his conduct and to refrain from any political activity of the sort that might involve his office even remotely. Surely Mr. Humphrey, when he thinks about it, will see the impropriety of the extracurricular job he has undertaken.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 27, 1956]

MR. HUMPHREY IN POLITICS

Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey has denied emphatically that his chairmanship of the Bender-for-Senator Campaign Committee in Ohio has anything to do with finances. This newspaper made careful efforts to check the facts on which yesterday's editorial was based, and the Monday Associated Press story which attributed a fund-raising role to the committee was not contradicted by Secretary Humphrey's office until after our editorial was published.

We are nevertheless happy to print Mr. Humphrey's assertion that his sole interest as chairman of the Bender-for-Senator Campaign Committee is to let the people of Ohio know that he is supporting Mr. BENDER against the Democratic contender, Governor Lausche. Mr. Humphrey, who reiterates that he is proud to be taking part in this drive to give President Eisenhower a Republican Congress, asserts that the money-raising activities on behalf of Senator BENDER are in the hands of the chairman of the Ohio Republican Senate Finance Committee, J. C. Shouvlin, of Springfield.

This disclaimer of any part in actual fund solicitation for Senator BENDER casts the political role of the Secretary of the Treasury in a somewhat different light. We wonder, nevertheless, whether the country will consider his activity a wise or proper one. There is a difference between the endorsement and private support of individual candidates, which is a common practice among officeholders of both parties, and the lending of a Cabinet officer's name as the head of a campaign committee.

Even if the purpose is primarily symbolic, the name of the Secretary of the Treasury on a letterhead conveys a certain authority—and implies a responsibility for what may be done by others in the campaign. Can a Cabinet officer really divorce such activity from his official job? We think not. To command full confidence in his dealings with both parties, the Secretary of the Treasury must be above partisanship. Political interest is in itself commendable, but an active partisan role tends to demean Mr. Humphrey's great office.

It has not been so many years since the Republicans raised a hullabaloo about the Democratic practice of having the Postmaster General serve as chairman of the national committee—a practice now happily in abeyance, with consequent benefit to Cabinet prestige. Is the crusade which the Eisenhower administration trumpeted with such fervor now becoming a little shopworn? Mr. Humphrey's role at least suggests that a double standard is in fashion. The public has a right to expect more sensitivity than this from a man of Mr. Humphrey's high reputation. Can you imagine the self-righteous bluster of indignation that would have emanated from the Republicans if Secretary Morgenthau or Secretary Snyder had assumed a similar campaign chairmanship?

Proclamation of SS. Cyril and Methodius Pilgrimage, Scranton, Pa., July 8, 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following proclamation, issued on July 8 by the fifth annual SS. Cyril and Methodius Pilgrimage of Scranton, Pa.:

PROCLAMATION OF FIFTH ANNUAL SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS PILGRIMAGE, SCRANTON, PA., JULY 8, 1956

We Americans, members of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America (eastern district), of Slovak origin, assembled here, recall with gratefulness that in this land of freedom we can perform our religious and civic duties without restriction. This SS. Cyril and Methodius pilgrimage is proof of that.

We are descended from a nation of profound faith. Already at the end of the 8th century Christianity penetrated into the territory of Slovakia, and in 833 Prince Pribina of Nitra already had built a Christian church. Thirty years later our forefathers joyfully welcomed the advent of the saintly brothers of Salonika, Cyril and Methodius, who spread the Gospel of Christ and translated the sacred books into the language of our ancestors. The Slovak nation is a nation blessed by its patrons SS. Cyril and Methodius.

A profound faith it was that enabled the Slovaks to overcome even political thraldom, and it is the living faith of our people which maintains them even today when Slovakia is suffering under the terrible ordeal of Communist dictatorship already in its 12th year.

Deeply moved, we recall that already in 1945 2 Slovak bishops, John Vojtassak and Michael Buzalka, and some 200 priests were imprisoned, and that thousands of our people were deported to Siberia by the Communists who never returned to Slovakia.

At the present time, the status of the Catholic Church in Slovakia is very sad, indeed. After a theatrical trial in 1951, the Communists imprisoned Bishops Michael Buzalka and Paul Gojdic for life, and Bishop John Vojtassak was sentenced to 24 years. Later, Bishops Stephen Barnas and Basil Hopko received 15 years, and Bishop Robert Pobozny was taken to an unknown place. Bishops Edward Necsey, Joseph Garsky, and Ambrose Lazik are under constant police surveillance; their offices and residences are surrounded by Communist police and they can leave their homes only with a police escort. Practically, therefore, the entire bishops council in Slovakia is imprisoned or under house arrest.

Furthermore, some 700 priests are in prisons or concentration camps. The Communists dissolved all monasteries and convents, incarcerating or sending into forced labor camps all monks and nuns. There is no Catholic press in Slovakia; prayer books, rosaries, and other religious articles are not available; and Slovak Catholics are denied the right of assembly. The entire church is under the strict control of the state.

The sorrowful condition fills us with fear for the future of our brethren in Slovakia, because we do not know when liberation shall come.

We therefore respectfully remind the American Catholic hierarchy, all Catholic

institutions, the Catholic press, Catholic educational institutions, and the entire Catholic population of America, about the extremely unfavorable, practically hopeless situation of the Slovak Catholics. We also respectfully remind responsible political factors that every movement tending toward so-called coexistence only prolongs the calvary of Slovak Catholics, as well as the suffering of all nations behind the Iron Curtain.

We appeal to our American legislators and to our Government to demand that the United Nations issue a resolution to the effect that Slovakia be given the opportunity as soon as possible to hold free elections under the control of U. N. representatives. We are certain that the Slovak nation can best secure its national existence and welfare of Slovak Catholics, who constitute 82 percent of the total population of Slovakia, with its own freely elected government.

We respectfully request for the Slovaks the kind of freedom we ourselves enjoy here in our free and blessed America.

Given this 8th day of July 1956, in Scranton, Pa., at the fifth SS. Cyril and Methodius pilgrimage of the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

Rev. JOHN E. SENGLAR,
National Spiritual Director, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rev. MICHAEL DITSKY,
Eastern District Spiritual Director, Egypt, Pa.
Rev. PAUL PEKARIK,
Executive Board Member, Emmaus, Pa.
Rev. JOSEPH OLSOVSKY,
Executive Board Member, Raritan, N. J.
Rev. JOSEPH BARAN,
Executive Board Member, Lansford, Pa.
Mr. MARTIN KOPUNEK,
Chairman, Executive Board, Lansford, Pa.

Statement in Support of Amendments to the Social Security Act Contained in H. R. 7225

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to present my views on the 1956 amendments to the Social Security Act embodied in H. R. 7225, and to voice my support for the humanitarian measures contained in this vital legislation.

When this legislation was before the House just a little over a year ago, I was glad to join my colleagues from Connecticut on the other side of the aisle in supporting these measures to improve our social-security laws. The other body passed a bill with certain modifications, and still further changes were made by the conference committee of the House and Senate. The final result, in my opinion, is not a perfect bill, but certainly one that will add many vitally needed changes to the Nation's social-security program.

I am particularly pleased that the essential characteristics of a provision for the payment of disability benefits has been retained in this bill. The Senate bill as it went to conference provided that this program for protection to those permanently and totally disabled be set up with a separate system of financing.

No doubt a great many, and probably even a majority, would agree with me in the belief that this was not necessary in order to preserve the integrity of the old-age and survivors insurance fund or to prevent excessive drains upon that fund. However, no one can quarrel with the desire of those who designed this particular provision to set up special safeguards to make doubly sure that the equity of the 70 million wage earners and self-employed who have contributed to the present reserve fund is thoroughly protected.

Even those of us who felt that it was probably not necessary can likewise agree that no harm is done by this arrangement and that the interest of those who look to the fund for the basis of their security in retirement as well as those who look to the newly created fund for protection against the contingency of physical disability are both adequately provided for.

I was pleased that the House and the other body promptly approved this bill as it came from conference. Passage of this bill in my opinion marked a significant advance in protection afforded the working people of this country. It will go down in the history of the social program of this country along with the first passage of the Social Security Act 21 years ago, the addition of survivors' insurance in 1939, the notable advancement in benefits marked by the amendments of 1950, and the significant extension of coverage contained in the amendments of 1954.

The extension of our system of social insurance for the first time into the field of disability insurance well deserves a place among those historic landmarks.

This venture, while of deep and lasting significance, should not be thought by any to be hasty or without the most careful study and analysis. In fact, a great part of the significance of this venture arises from the fact that it culminates efforts reaching back for some 18 years. I am informed that in 1938 studies made by the then Social Security Board outlined the feasibility of providing protection against the contingency of permanent and total disability. The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Finance Committee studied this proposal in 1948 and 1949. They included the following statement in their report to the Senate:

> Income loss from permanent and total disability is a major economic hazard to which, like old age and death, all gainful workers are exposed. The advisory council believes that the time has come to extend the Nation's social-insurance system to afford protection against this loss.
>
> There can be no question concerning the need for such protection. On an average day the number of persons kept from gainful work by disabilities which have continued for more than 6 months is about 2 million. The economic hardship resulting from permanent and total disability is frequently even greater than that created by old age or death. The family must not only face the loss of the breadwinner's earnings but must meet the costs of medical care. As a rule, savings and other personal resources are soon exhausted.

This was the finding of a distinguished group of 17 people drawn from the fields of industry, organized labor, and representatives of the general public, many of whom held posts of honor and distinction in our great universities.

Members of longer service in this House will recall that the House bill of 1950 incorporated the recommendations of this advisory council but it failed of passage in the other body. We are most happy now to observe that the Senate bill carried this provision for payment of benefits to the permanently and totally disabled after age 50.

In 1954 a start was made toward the problem of disability by including the provision to freeze the benefits of those covered by social security who suffered disablement. This was a worthwhile step and it laid the foundations by proving that the determinations of a disability can be made soundly and objectively by a Government agency. The provisions similar to the waiver of premium provisions of private life insurance companies preserve the retirement benefits of a worker whose earnings were cut off because of his disability.

However, as Mr. George Meany, now president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, said in his statement to the Senate Finance Committee in support of this measure on April 9, 1954:

> It is not enough to say to the permanently and totally disabled worker, "If you contrive to hold body and soul together during your years of incapacity until you reach age 65, we assure you payment of full retirement benefits."

This measure will give much more assurance to the unfortunate disabled workers. We are giving them the assurance that their primary retirement benefit will be paid to them if they should be forced to retire as early as age 50 because of a physical disability.

Through this legislation we are recognizing that men and women, while still young in years, are inflicted with the impairments associated with old age that result from illness, disease, and accident.

Many of us were distressed in the course of the hearings to observe the effort that was made to place the provision for benefit payments in opposition to rehabilitation efforts. No greater disservice could be done the very worthwhile and highly successful rehabilitation programs carried on by our State vocational rehabilitation agencies with the assistance that has been made available to them through Federal grants.

We need, however, to recognize that there are some cases that are beyond rehabilitation either because the physical impairment is too severe or because it occurs too late in life. But for the vast majority of the totally disabled rehabilitation is possible and great encouragement to the restoration of these people to useful and gainful employment will come from this measure. Their morale will be lifted knowing that the economic

needs of the family are being met, at least in part.

Assistance as well as encouragement will come from the provision to retain the benefit status for a maximum of a year for getting started in a new occupation or employment. I look for the greatest advancement in the field of rehabilitation that we have seen in many years.

Mr. Speaker, I have dwelt upon the disability benefits aspect of this legislation which is, of course, a most important aspect of the bill, and one often misunderstood. However, H. R. 7225 does much more than provide disability benefits.

The bill also provides for lowering the retirement age from 65 to 62 for widows and surviving dependent mothers. The bill provides that insurance benefits for children who were disabled before they reached the age of 18 may be continued so long as their disability remains, which I feel is perhaps the most humane and desperately needed amendment contained in the bill.

The bill provides for a more liberal coverage for migrant agricultural workers, and for Ministers working outside the limits of the United States. The bill has many other provisions worthy of merit, but the ones that I have listed should serve to show the great good that this legislation will do for so many Americans.

I feel confident that the provisions of H. R. 7225 will become part of our social security laws. I am also confident that the liberalization of our existing social security laws provided for in this humanitarian legislation will be welcomed by the American people as one of the outstanding achievements of the 84th Congress.

H. R. 7225, To Amend Title II of the Social Security Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H. R. 7225 to amend and liberalize the Social Security Act. I am extremely pleased to note that the conferees included the provision which will allow women to become eligible for benefits at age 62 rather than 65 under the present law. This was one of the provisions of the bill that I introduced, H. R. 6783, and was incorporated by members of the Committee on Ways and Means into H. R. 7225 with modifications. Although I would desire to see the age eligibility reduced to 60 for women, I accept the modification to age 62 by committee members and wholeheartedly support the recommendations in the conference report.

I am also pleased that this bill includes dentists and lawyers in the social-security program and that provision has been made for the continuation of monthly benefits for mentally and physically retarded children after age 18.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is fast approaching when the 84th Congress will pass into history. During both sessions these needed and desirable amendments to the Social Security Act have been studied and debated. The House-Senate conferees are to be commended for working out an agreement on this important measure so that we could have this report before us today. I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly adopt this report so that we may have a liberalized social-security law this year.

Little Progress Made in Developing Safer Vehicles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article on safety as concerns automobile passengers, which was written by Sid King, editor of the Oregon Motorist, and which appeared in the July 1956 edition of that publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE PROGRESS MADE IN DEVELOPING SAFER VEHICLES

(By Sid King, editor, the Oregon Motorist)

Last year, some of the automobile manufacturers introduced safety features in their 1956 models following several years of sharpshooting on the part of safety people, medical practitioners, and others who repeatedly pointed out that many of our traffic deaths and injuries were the direct result of unsafe features of the cars themselves. Protruding knobs and "gismos" were present in every car to hook and pierce passengers as they were knocked about the interiors in an accident. Doors flew open and spewed the occupants about the countryside, or if the passengers weren't pitched out, they often were slammed against the instrument panel, the windshield, or the sides of the vehicle.

So when foam rubber instrument panels and sun visors, crash steering wheels, and safety door catches appeared, safety people began looking hopefully toward a car that might be considered a reasonably safe vehicle in which to ride. They expected more safety engineering in design for 1957.

LITTLE IMPROVEMENT SEEN

However, to date, there seems to be no strong indication of further developments along this line. The AAA reports that the 1957 models will have radical changes in body styles, with lower front-end silhouettes and a variety of colors. But protruding knobs and decorations will still be there for passengers to bump into, unless, of course, they have safety belts, which not many do.

Some manufacturers, according to the AAA, are thinking about offering automatic transmissions, power brakes, and power steering as standard equipment, but so far none has suggested building a bumper with some spring in it to absorb some of the shock of a collision.

WHERE ARE THE MERCURY SWITCHES?

The word is out that at least 2 or 3 car makers will replace the carburetor with a fuel injector, but no one has said anything about installing mercury switches so that, when a car rolls over, the engine will cut off and the danger of fire will be abated.

The station wagon is increasing in popularity and the hardtop will almost replace the sedan in 1957, but no manufacturers are talking about a built-in roll bar through the top, despite the fact that the so-called hardtop is not so hard after all in the event of a roll.

Some manufacturers are claiming increased horsepower, but no one says anything about installing automatic governors to place a reasonable top on speed.

GOVERNORS SPEAK OUT

In the United States Governors' Conference in Atlantic City this summer, the State governors accused automobile manufacturers of hindering rather than helping safety campaigns by engaging in a race for more horsepower and speed. Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, for example, pointed out that States are reducing road grades to lessen the need for excessive power and speed, but manufacturers continue to build more potential speed in each new model. He deplored the fact that automakers demonstrate the fast pickup and speed in television and thus encourage carowners to emulate the demonstration by driving at a dangerous pace.

The American Automobile Association adopted a resolution at its last annual meeting urging manufacturers to "tone down their increasing emphasis on more and more horsepower and higher and higher speed potentials in their new models, and to devote more thought and emphasis upon ways and means of protecting the driver against his own mistakes."

Now that Congress has taken a historic step which will mean better and safer highways in this country, it is time the auto manufacturers got in step. No better slogan could be thought up for this movement than the last words of the AAA resolution quoted above:

"Let's protect the driver against his own mistakes."

Activities of the House Committee on Government Operations During the 2d Session of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations continued its efforts to make itself a more effective instrumentality of the House of Representatives. No matter is more basic to the preservation of the checks and balances of our constitutional form of democracy than continuous and comprehensive review of executive and administrative actions by the Congress. The committee's activities, therefore, have been directed toward assuring responsible, efficient, and economical administration of the laws in addition to its role in the enactment of legislation.

OVERSIGHT OF AGENCY EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS—GENERAL OVERSIGHT OF EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS

Just 10 years ago the Congress enacted the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. By its terms the Committee on Government Operations was required among other things to evaluate the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

As an incident of such evaluation the committee has had a review made of the evolution of the powers and duties of the committee and summarizes such a review for this report.

As early as 1816 Congress recognized its inherent right and responsibility to follow the appropriated dollar by creating a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. At that time the only executive departments were State, Treasury, War, and Navy. As new departments were created corresponding new committees on expenditures in the executive departments were added until they became 11 in number.

These committees had no established means of getting information about expenditures. None of their data came to them automatically—everything had to be in the nature of a special investigation. The result was that their work was necessarily limited in effect.

This situation was in a large measure responsible for the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

The hearings and debates on that measure so clearly reveal the intent of Congress in respect to what is now the Committee on Government Operations as to merit quoting at length. Prof. W. F. Willoughby, a prominent political scientist was called upon to assist in this study. His testimony was voluminous and received by the legislative committee hearing the bill with every evidence of respect and agreement. After outlining a parallel in the British Parliament, Professor Willoughby went on to say:

Congress is a fund granting authority. No organ that grants funds has fulfilled its obligation until it follows up and sees that the orders it has given have been carried out * * * [It should be the duty of the Comptroller General to] give Congress as complete a report of the way its agent, the administration, has carried out the orders given to it as possible. * * * [I would have a public accounts committee created.] I think if you merely provide for this Comptroller and auditor general submitting a report, and stop there, you do not get very far. We know the end of most official reports. They are filed and dismissed. * * * Congress should make provision for a committee on accounts, whose duty it would be to receive this report, examine it, take up all the points that were mentioned for examination, and if the criticism was of the Bureau of Fisheries, for example, in respect to the exercise of its discretion in the establishment of a station where it was not needed, or what not, the committee could call the director of the bureau before it, or any other officials. It would have the comptroller and auditor general right at its elbow to act as its technical adviser, and they would track that right out and report the results to the House. That committee ought to be a very serious-minded and a very important committee. It would assume all the functions of [the numerous committees on expenditures] and perform them in a much more efficient way, because it will get the information automatically rather than as the result of a special investigation.

A month later these views were reflected in the debate in the House where Mr. Byrns said:

The control of expenditures should properly be vested in the fund-granting rather than the fund-spending department. No private business of any magnitude would permit its executive officers who are charged with the duty of handling its finances, to audit its own accounts. And yet that is exactly the course pursued in our Government under the present system. * * * Congress has no control over expenditure. It cannot have complete control of expenditures without some system whereby the expenditures may be subjected to an examination by independent officers for the purpose of seeing whether or not the wishes of Congress in making the appropriations and any conditions imposed in making the grants are carried out in good faith. * * * The pending bill seeks to [provide] an officer, responsible only to Congress, whose duty it shall be to audit and pass on the legality of all Government expenditures.

Mr. Madden recognized the necessity for a strong single committee of the Congress to receive reports from the Comptroller General and make recommendations based on them.

Mr. Madden said:

If I have my way, when this legislation is completed, I shall propose the creation of a great committee of the House, to be known as the Committee on Expenditures, consisting of the best men in the House—because it is to be a great committee if it is created—to whom this auditor and Comptroller General may report from day to day, and through this medium supply the House of Representatives and the Senate with such information as to what is being done with the money appropriated as to keep the Congress advised in connection with every step taken. In this way we will have a check against the executive branch of the Government not only as to the methods of appropriating, but as to the method of expenditure, and my judgment is that the foundation of the future financial system of economy could not be so well laid in any other way as by the adoption of the bill, which is now before you for consideration.

However, it was not until 1927 that action was taken to consolidate the 11 expenditure committees. The next year Congress clarified and made specific the power of the committee to obtain information from the executive department and independent establishments.

Every executive department and independent establishment of the Government shall, upon request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives, or any 7 members thereof, or upon the request of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Senate, or any 5 members thereof, furnish any information requested of it relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of said committee. (May 29, 1928, ch. 901, No. 2, 45 Stat. 996.)

But even then there was no clear delineation of function or jurisdiction directly reflecting the intent of the Budget and Accounting Act. This delineation awaited the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. In the studies that accompany the report on that act the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is not even listed among the hitherto important committees of the House. Small wonder, since in the preceding Congress it had held 19 hearings.

For the 2d session of the 84th Congress, lasting some 230 days, the committee has held 206 days of investigative hearings in addition to its legislative hearings. This growth in committee activity, in large part, may well be due to the definition of its jurisdiction adopted as a House rule pursuant to the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1946.

REVIEW OF AUDITS BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

During the past year the General Accounting Office has stepped up the number of its audits. More important, it has now adopted a policy of making comprehensive audits as distinguished from a mere dollar-and-cents reconciliation. As stated by the Comptroller General:

A comprehensive audit includes consideration of the following:

1. That the agency is carrying out only those activities or programs authorized by the Congress and is conducting them efficiently and in the manner authorized by the Congress.

2. That expenditures are made only in the furtherance of authorized activities and in accordance with the requirements of applicable laws and regulations, including decisions of the Comptroller General.

3. That the agency collects and accounts properly for all revenues and receipts arising from its activities.

4. That the assets of the agency or in its custody are adequately safeguarded and controlled and utilized in an efficient manner.

5. That reports by the agencies to the Congress and to the central control agencies, such as the Bureau of the Budget, disclose fully the nature and scope of activities conducted and provide a proper basis for evaluating the agencies' operations.

The Committee on Government Operations is rearranging its work program so as to receive these comprehensive audits, and, in terms of the legislative intent, examine them, question the officials concerned, get the technical advice of the Comptroller General, and then make its recommendations available to subject-matter committees, the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress. To this end an analysis of the latest comprehensive audits is now being made.

STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

It is only within the adult life of most of the Members of Congress that the growth of recourse to administrative agencies has made the Federal agencies assume such great importance. This growth has been so phenomenally rapid that the attention of Congress to matters of administrative procedure has lagged behind the growth. Yet more and more our daily lives and economic activity are influenced or directly regulated by procedures within Federal agencies.

The Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman of the committee, recently made the following comment on this subject:

The calculated executive expropriation of direction and control in the administrative agencies tends to obscure the fact that these rulemaking functions are derived solely from the Congress in the exercise of which

the administrative agencies are responsible to the Congress.

The remedy for the resultant administrative irresponsibility is a conspicuous and unequivocal precept that these agencies are conformably accountable to the Congress. As Elihu Root said, "these agencies of regulation must themselves be regulated."

And the application of this remedy is exclusively in the hands of Congress. Professor Schwartz has appositely pointed out, "the role of the courts is to grant relief against administrative action which is ultra vires—that is, which exceeds the limits of the powers delegated by law."

The question of the propriety and effectiveness of the utilization of the powers thus delegated is solely the concern of the Congress as is also the precision with which the agency to which the power is delegated exemplifies the legislative intent which prompted the delegation.

As a means of implementing these views a questionnaire is being sent to each administrative agency in the Government. This questionnaire is prepared by experts in the field and covers every aspect of the numerous questions that arise. The purpose is to examine whether the laws enacted by the Congress are being efficiently administered so as to serve the public purposes embodied in the statutes while incorporating the elements of fair play to our citizenry which the courts long ago characterized as the due process necessary to the preservation of our system of government.

The answers to this questionnaire will be published this year. It is expected that they will serve to disclose places in the present law which need amendment, instances which require administrative remedial action and areas not covered by any law or regulation.

This may well be one of the most useful and far-reaching studies made by this Congress.

SAVINGS IN GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

By subjecting the activities of the various departments and agencies to a continuous review, the committee has laid the foundation for, and actually brought about considerable dollar savings in Federal expenditures. The greatest savings come when the agencies are made conscious of the fact that a committee of the House, such as the Committee on Government Operations, is always scrutinizing the expenditures authorized by the Congress and the operations conducted by the agencies in connection with such expenditures.

For example, the reports of the Commission on Organization on certain supply activities in the Department of Defense called attention to the fact that the congressional mandate for unification of supply activities largely was being ignored. The Commission's reports estimated that more than half a billion dollars annually could be saved if the congressional policy of unified supply services for the military departments was followed. As a result of the committee's studies and investigations the Department of Defense installed a single manager system for supply which may result in the savings in the near future.

The committee's activities have resulted in very specific and very tangible savings in a number of areas. More important, the fact that the committee caused the savings of specific sums will undoubtedly lead the departments and agencies concerned to save many times the amounts involved in the specific situations called to their attention by the committee's investigations. Some examples of these kinds of specific savings which should have salutary effects upon departmental operations leading to even greater savings are as follows:

Approximately $14 million had been earmarked for contracts for survival studies by the Federal Civil Defense Administration. Only slightly in excess of $1 million had been obligated for these contract studies. Before the hearings of the committee were completed the FCDA began a critical review of these studies. There is good reason to believe that a review of these studies in the light of what the committee's report recommended will result in these contracts not being awarded as planned. If the FCDA suspends these contracts, the savings will approximate $13 million.

The committee's investigation of Commodity Credit Corporation transactions in butter and cheese have led to legal action by the Attorney General to recoup approximately $2½ million paid out to processors of such commodities. Similarly, the committee's investigation into the distribution costs connected with the school lunch program in the State of Illinois resulted in a new contract which saved taxpayers about $150,000 in a period of about 8 months.

The committee's investigation into the use of experts and consultants will result in a more judicious use of this authority. In the case of individual experts and consultants, if the committee's recommendations are followed, there should be an annual reduction of costs in the amount of approximately $25,000. Several million dollars a year will be saved as a result of a probable curtailment of the use of contracts with firms or organizations of such experts or consultants.

A good example of how the committee's investigation of one instance will result in the savings of millions to the Government can be found in connection with the disposal of surplus property by the General Services Administration. The committee found that General Services Administration was about to dispose of an alumina plant at Laramie Wyo., at a proposed sale price of $1.2 million. The committee's investigation of the matter resulted in a higher bid by the same high bidder yielding $173,000 more to the Government.

The committee's legislative actions were also directed to the savings of specific sums of money wherever possible. An example of this can be found in H. R. 9593, Public Law 798, which would set up an entirely new method of paying claims out of appropriations which have lapsed. It is estimated that once this system has been placed into operation there will be an annual saving of some $600,000.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

In order to carry out its responsibilities of regular oversight of agency activities as well as the study of special problems, the committee has functioned during the 2d session of the 84th Congress through a number of subcommittees as follows:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.

Public Works and Resources Subcommittee, Hon. EARL CHUDOFF, chairman.

International Operations Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.

Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN, chairman.

Special Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman.

Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman.

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

Special Water Resources and Power Subcommittee, Hon. ROBERT E. JONES, chairman.

LEGISLATION

The committee has had studies made of the several score bills referred to it in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. Hearings were held on many of the bills and a number of important pieces of legislation were reported favorably to the House.

First. Budget and accounting legislation:

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee receives budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations. Legislation governing the budget and acccunting system of the Government is basic both to congressional control over the purse and to efficient management in Federal administration.

A major change in the governmental accounting system is incorporated in H. R. 9593, which was reported by the committee. This legislation will permit each agency to consolidate obligated balances in merged appropriation accounts and pay obligations chargeable against such accounts without prior reference to the General Accounting Office. This simplified procedure will save Government service hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. It will also clarify expenditures by the various agencies inasmuch as the obligations will be paid by the individual agency rather than out of a central certified claims account maintained by the Treasury Department. H. R. 9593 became Public Law 798 of the 84th Congress.

A long step toward improving budgeting and accounting in the Federal Government was taken when the committee favorably reported H. R. 11526 to the House. This legislation will not only promote simplification in reporting the complex financial operations of the Government but will also lead to greater congressional control over appropriated funds. The legislation should also contribute to reducing the large carryover of funds from year to year which has reached tremendous proportions and

over which the Congress has become increasingly concerned in connection with request for new appropriations. H. R. 11526 would accomplish these results by requiring that budget estimates be predicated on a cost basis and that Government accounts be maintained on an accrual basis. In the interest of expediting congressional action H. R. 11526 was substituted by the House as the text of S. 3897, and S. 3897 became Public Law 863 of the 84th Congress.

Second. Disposal of Federal property:

The committee has general legislative jurisdiction under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 over disposals of Federal surplus property. Under this statute, Congress has laid down certain general rules and created administrative machinery for disposals of Federal surplus property pursuant to article 4, section 3, of the Constitution, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States.

From time to time legislative proposals are made for disposals of individual parcels of property as exceptions to the general laws enacted by the Congress. The committee has had a substantial legislative workload in considering and passing upon many bills for such disposals. In each case the committee has had to consider the particular details and circumstances of the proposed disposal of real property belonging to the United States. The particular circumstances have to be weighed against considerations of national policy and national interest to see whether there is a justification for departure from the established general statutory procedure. In the 2d session of the 84th Congress the committee reported favorably to the House approximately a score of bills providing for disposals of real property. Eighteen of these bills passed the House and 17 bills became law.

Third. Amendment of Employment Act of 1946:

One of the most important pieces of legislation recommended by the committee in the past became the Employment Act of 1946. This legislation provided, among other things, for systematic and continuous attention by the Congress to economic indicators through the medium of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, established by the 1946 act. That act also required the President to transmit his economic report to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session. H. R. 9764, reported favorably by the committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress, changes the name of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Joint Economic Committee and provides a more specific date for the submission of the President's Economic Report to the Congress following upon the transmission of the President's budget. The latter provisions will enable the Council of Economic Advisers to take budget proposals into consideration in the preparation of the economic report. This bill became Public Law 591 of the 84th Congress.

Fourth. Travel expenses of Federal employees:

In connection with its continuous interest in, and responsibility for, the efficiency of general administrative procedure in the Federal agencies, the committee reported favorably to the House, H. R. 11515. This bill would permit the payment of expenses of travel of persons selected for appointment in manpower shortage occupations and would authorize the payment of expenses of transportation of their immediate families and household effects. In addition the bill would authorize the payment of travel expenses of persons in manpower shortage categories who are invited to visit a Federal establishment for purposes connected with employment. This legislation was intended to enable the Government to recruit enough scientists, engineers, and other technically trained personnel in manpower shortage categories to provide for our military preparedness and efficient conduct of the Government. H. R. 11515 was passed by the House on July 26, 1956.

Fifth. Improvements in paperwork management:

In order to achieve economies in the field of paperwork management, the committee favorably reported S. 2364. This legislation would remove any doubt about the authority of the Administrator of General Services to promulgate policy and principle pertaining to records management which would be binding on the various Federal agencies. In addition it was expected that the legislation would promote a greater utilization by the agencies of the talents of the records management specialists now employed by the General Services Administration.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee receives all proposed legislation and other matters relating to "reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government." Pursuant to this rule the committee received and acted upon Reorganization Plans Nos. 1 and 2 of 1956, and their pertinent House resolutions.

First. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956:

On May 16, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress of the United States Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. The plan was referred to the committee for consideration and action. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956 would have created an additional position of assistant secretary for research and development in each of the three military departments within the Department of Defense. Chairman VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services, introduced House Resolution 534 to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. This resolution was also referred to the committee and the committee held hearings, considered and acted upon the resolution, together with the reorganization plan.

On July 3, 1956, the committee reported favorably to the House House Resolution 534, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956. The committee found that the reorganization plan was not a valid reorganization plan under the Reorganization Act of 1949 which limits the creation of new positions to those made necessary by a reorganization made in the plan. The committee found and so reported to the House that the plan merely created new positions without any accompanying reorganization. In addition, the committee found that the purpose of the plan was one that could and should be accomplished by the regular legislative process.

On July 5, 1956, the House, following the recommendation of the committee, adopted the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 by a majority of the authorized membership as required by the Reorganization Act of 1949. This action had the effect of preventing Reorganization Plan No. 1 from becoming effective.

Second. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956:

On May 17, 1956, the President transmitted to the Congress Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956. The plan was referred to the committee. Also referred to the committee was House Resolution 541 introduced by Mr. FASCELL, of Florida, a member of the committee. House Resolution 541 disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 provided for separating the management of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation from the management of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The plan would have created a new and separate Board of Trustees to manage the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation although the Chairman of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board would have been a member ex officio of the new three-man Board of Trustees.

The committee considered Reorganization Plan No. 2 and House Resolution 541 together. On July 3, 1956, the committee reported favorably to the House, House Resolution 541, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2. The committee found that Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 was deficient in a number of respects including the following:

First. Separation of the two institutions would not necessarily accomplish the results which the proponents of the plan assumed would be accomplished.

Second. There was no complete separation of the agencies as suggested since the Chairman of the Home Loan Bank Board would also be a member of the new Board of Trustees of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Third. The new Board of Trustees was not created on a bipartison basis. At the same time the President was given specific direction and control over the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.

Fourth. No economies or savings were shown to be involved in the reorganization.

On July 5, 1956, the House adopted the recommendation of the committee by approving House Resolution 541 by a majority of the authorized membership as required by the Reorganization Act of 1949. This action had the effect of

preventing Reorganization Plan No. 2 from becoming effective.

INVESTIGATIONS

The committee is the major overall instrument of the House of Representatives for legislative oversight of the operations of Federal departments and agencies. Pursuant to rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee has the duty of studying the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency. The committee has organized its activities so as to follow and review the operations of all the major departments and agencies as well as activities which involve and cut across the jurisdiction of more than one department or agency. In the course of its review of Federal activities a number of major investigations have been made, the results of which have been reported to the Congress.

In connection with reports made by the committee at this session of the Congress, more than 200 days of hearings were held. The magnitude of the effort devoted by the committee members to these hearings can be appreciated by the fact that the second session of the Congress lasted some 230 days—only slightly more than the number of days hearings conducted under the aegis of the committee. In addition, during the 84th Congress the committee made a record number of intermediate reports to the House—31 in all.

First. Post Office Department—(a) Post Office Department procurement of motor vehicles:

The committee investigated the action of the Post Office Department in negotiating 3 contracts in 1954 with the Twin Coach Co., of Kent, Ohio, for the purchase of 250 trucks purportedly for experimentation and tests at a cost of nearly three-fourths of a million dollars. The payments under these contracts exceeded by almost $175,000 the Department's total expenditures for experimental purposes under 96 separate contracts with other companies during the 4-year period, 1951 through 1954.

As a result of its investigation of these matters the committee found that in departing from competitive procurement procedures and in negotiating contracts involving nearly three-fourths of a million dollars, the Department had failed to demonstrate that the procurement had been done for a bona fide experimental purpose. It was concluded that the role played in the so-called experiment by Robert Heller & Associates, management consultants, was highly questionable and that activities pertaining to Government procurement should be handled by responsible Government employees rather than by temporary special consultants. Moreover, in the opinion of the committee the weight of the evidence indicated an attempt to avoid competitive procurement by designating the vehicles as experimental.

In order to avoid a repetition of the evasion of procedures laid down by the Congress, the committee recommended stronger controls by the General Services Administration over the negotiation of contracts for experimental purposes and the enactment of legislation to prohibit the inclusion of purchase options in Post Office Department contracts for the lease of new vehicles unless an emergency of indefinite duration requiring the immediate acquisition of vehicles is shown to exist. The committee's report to the House on this matter is House Report No. 2951, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Post Office Department's public opinion survey to influence postal rate legislation:

The committee investigated the circumstances surrounding the execution, conduct, and use of a public opinion survey made for the Post Office Department by the Wengel Service Corp. in December 1953. This investigation was one part of the committee's overall study of the use of experts and consultants by the Federal departments and agencies.

The committee found that the public opinion survey had been conducted with great haste in order to make the results available for the Post Office to use with Members of Congress when the new session of Congress convened in 1954. In view of the fact that the Post Office Department had unsuccessfully urged the adoption of higher postal rates by the Congress in 1953, all the circumstances indicated that the Post Office Department had entered into the contract for the public opinion survey with the definite purpose of influencing the Congress to act favorably on the Post Office Department's recommendations.

The committee found that the actions of the Post Office Department in having the public opinion survey conducted for the purpose of influencing the Congress were open to question under section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, which prohibits the use of appropriated funds for lobbying. The committee also concluded that the Bureau of the Budget had discharged its duties under the Federal Reports Act of 1942 in a perfunctory manner and had not attempted to ascertain whether the collection of information through the survey was necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the Post Office Department. A full report on these matters was made by the committee to the House in House Report No. 2914, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Second. Department of Justice—Immigration and Naturalization Service:

The committee investigated reports it had received on the improper use of Government equipment and Government personnel for hunting trips to Mexico by Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization. The committee's investigation showed that General Swing's hunting trips were improper and contributed little if anything to the effectiveness of his agency's operation. The committee found that General Swing's use of appropriated funds was improper including particularly his movement of 3 trailers over 1,500 miles when adequate hotel facilities were available.

The committee recommended that the General Accounting Office conduct a survey of the expenditures of the Immigration and Naturalization Service and that the Attorney General examine the record developed by the investigation. The latter recommendation was made in view of the conclusion of the committee that the conduct of General Swing was not consistent with his office. These matters were covered in the committee's report, House Report No. 2948, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Third. Department of Commerce—Civil Aviation:

The committee conducted an investigation covering all facets of civil aviation. Hearings were held at which principals in the aviation industry as well as representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Civil Aeronautics Board, Department of Commerce, and State and local aviation officials were heard. The hearings were perhaps the most extensive study of aviation ever undertaken by the Congress. In the course of the hearings the committee also considered H. R. 11065, to create a commission to study executive agencies handling problems in the field of aviation with a view to reorganization and greater efficiency.

As a result of the hearings and investigation the committee concluded that a drastic reorganization of agencies in the Federal Government having responsibilities in the field of aviation is urgently required. It was further concluded that the present Federal organizational structure in civil aviation is inadequate in that it merely attempts to provide a forum or bargaining table where conflicts can be settled and compromised. There is an obvious need for leadership and planning in addition to a means for a possible resolution of differences among agencies.

In order to achieve a better organizational structure for civil aviation the committee recommended:

(a) The prompt completion of the study being conducted under the aegis of the President's Special Assistant for Aviation Facilities Planning, Mr. Edward P. Curtis.

(b) Termination of Civil Aeronautics Board and Federal Communications Commission membership on the Air Coordination Committee.

(c) Clarification of the so-called authority of the Air Coordinating Committee.

(d) Avoidance of military domination of the Air Coordinating Committee and the Air Navigation Development Board.

(e) Acceleration of the 5-year Federal airways plan.

(f) Resolution of the TACAN–VOR/DME controversy.

(g) Review of air traffic control requirements within the Civil Aeronautics Administration before airport aid projects are finally approved.

A report on the Federal role in aviation was made to the House as House Report No. 2949, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Fourth. Department of the Interior—(a) Federal timber policies:

The committee investigated the administration of Federal timberlands in the Pacific Northwest, including timber sales policies. The investigation covered the timber operations of the Forest Serv-

ice, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. Recommendations were made for the coordination and consolidation of the administration of Federal timberlands under the Forest Service. The investigation also covered problems of equal access to Federal timber; the need for up-to-date timber inventories and revision of the allowable cuts; the need for more access roads and increased salvage operations; the underpricing of Indian timber; the acquiring of timber under the guise of mining claims; the stifling of competition through huge long-term sales and other alleged favoritism to large operators; and instances of alleged abuse of administrative powers. Recommendations were made to bring about improvements in these various aspects of Federal timber management.

The recommendations were contained in House Report 2960, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Al Sarena case:

The committee investigated the matter known as the Al Sarena case. The investigation and hearings disclosed that the Secretary of the Interior had acquiesced in a giveaway of valuable national forest timber on certain mining claims located in the Rogue River National Forest in southern Oregon. The Al Sarena Mines, Inc., had acquired mining patents on these claims from the Department of the Interior in order to obtain title to the timber, and not for the bona fide purpose of conducting a mining operation. The timber was valued at approximately $325,000.

The committee recommended that the record of the case be sent to the Attorney General with a formal request that he take appropriate steps, including action to cancel these patents and to investigate the truth or falsity of statements relating to the extent of improvement work that had been allegedly performed on five of the contested claims.

The committee also recommended that the Department of the Interior take appropriate steps to insure observance of the Administrative Procedure Act, including the adoption of regulations to assure that, in the case of a contested mining case located on land administered by an agency outside the Department of the Interior, such other agency be given notice and an opportunity to be heard. The committee report on Al Sarena case is contained in House Report No. 2408, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Private electric utilities' organized effort to influence the Secretary of the Interior:

The committee held hearings on an alleged effort by five Rocky Mountain power companies to influence the Department of the Interior in the administration of the Federal power laws.

(d) Virgin Islands Corporation:

The committee has conducted a preliminary investigation into the Virgin Islands governmental operations and the Virgin Islands Corporation. The Virgin Islands have been faced with an acute and recurring water problem which had deeply affected the economy and general welfare of the area. Notwithstanding numerous surveys and recommendations made by various governmental agencies and private firms, no concrete action, looking to a permanent solution of this problem has been undertaken by the Department of the Interior. It is believed that as a result of informal hearings conducted in the Virgin Islands action will be taken leading to a permanent solution of the water problem.

The informal hearings also received testimony on the activities on the part of the recent Gov. Archiband A. Alexander. The loan program of the Virgin Islands Corporation which was to provide credit facilities in that area for agriculture, livestock, commercial, and other purposes is open to severe criticism. It appears that, as of June 30, 1954, approximately $30,000 had been loaned to small borrowers. Two $100,000 loans have since been made—one to a distillery and the other for the building of a golf course on a private project, while at the same time an application for a $60,000 loan for a chicken farm which had the approval of the officials of the Virgin Islands Corporation was summarily turned down by the Board of Directors of VICORP, headed by the Secretary of the Interior.

(e) Changes in powerline regulations by Department of the Interior:

The committee investigated the circumstances surrounding, and the results of changes in, powerline regulations covering rights-of-way for electric powerlines across Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. As a result of the investigation, the committee concluded that the changes made on August 11, 1954, in these regulations, and the actions of the top officials in the Interior Department in connection with the changes, demonstrated that those officials willfully followed policies and practices at variance with Federal laws designed to give preference to rural electric cooperatives and public agencies in the marketing of power generated at Federal dams. It was also concluded that the changes in the regulations were adopted by the Interior Department verbatim from an anonymous document delivered personally without a covering letter or memorandum by a registered lobbyist of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. to the then Solicitor and now Under Secretary of the Interior.

The committee recommended, in part, as follows:

First. Congress should enact legislation to put into statutory form the basic principles of the eliminated wheeling provision.

Second. In view of the increasing importance of the natural resources owned or controlled by the Federal Government to the economy and well-being of the Nation and in view of the widespread interest in the administration of those resources, Congress should enact legislation requiring the Secretary of the Interior and other officials having jurisdiction over such resources to publish notice of proposed regulations in the Federal Register at least 30 days in advance of their adoption. This would give the public an opportunity to present arguments favoring or opposing the proposed regulations. The period of notice could be shortened or eliminated where the responsible official finds in writing that an emergency exists and states the reasons for such finding. The issuance of regulations relating to federally owned resources is not covered by the advance notice provisions of the Administrative Procedures Act.

The report of the committee on these matters is contained in House Report No. 1975, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(f) Effect of Department of Interior and REA policies and public power preference customers:

The committee investigated the effect of policies of the Department of Interior in the last 3 years on statutory preference customers in the Southeast, the Southwest, the Intermountain States, the Central Valley of California, and the Pacific Northwest. In the course of the investigation the committee demonstrated that the present administration of the Department of Interior has followed a policy of withdrawing from its responsibilities for comprehensive river-basin programs and of taking actions designed to minimize its duties under various statutes to insure the most widespread use of federally generated electric power by giving preference to cooperatives and public bodies. The effect of the present policies of the Department of the Interior was shown to be that of enabling private utilities to gain an advantage over the preferred customers designated by Congress in various statutes. Included in the Department's action were the suppression of an Attorney General's opinion which in effect warned the Department of Interior against pursuing a proposed policy in contravention of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The committee's findings and recommendations designed to reaffirm the intent of Congress as stated in existing law are filed in House Report No. 2279, 84th Congress 2d session.

(g) Contract for rental of automobiles by Bureau of Indian Affairs:

The committee investigated a series of actions by the Bureau of Indian Affairs designed to circumvent requirements for competitive bidding in the leasing of passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee found that open competition would have resulted in substantial savings to the Government and that the Bureau of Indian Affairs had not availed itself of the results obtainable from a competent inquiry as to possible sources of supply from automobile-rental concerns. There was also an apparent disregard of normal time elements in contract negotiations indicating that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was intent on avoiding competitive bidding in the leasing of vehicles.

It also appeared that under existing Government discounts on automobiles it is cheaper for the Government to own rather than to lease passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee's conclusions were affirmed by the action of the Comptroller General in prohibiting an award under certain contrived invitations to bid issued later by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Complete findings and recommendations of the committee designed to improve acquisition and utilization procedures in connection with motor vehicles are contained in House Report No. 1892, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Fifth. Department of Agriculture—(a) Purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation:

The committee investigated the simultaneous purchase-resale transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation involving cheese and butter in the early part of 1954. In carrying out price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, the Department of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, is authorized to purchase butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk solids. The intent of Congress in enacting this legislation was solely to aid dairy farmers of the Nation.

In 1954, the Commodity Credit Corporation paid nearly $2,500,000 to cheese and butter dealers as a result of purchase-resale transactions involving their commodities. In the transactions, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased approximately 85 million pounds of cheese and 5 million pounds of butter which it simultaneously resold to the original owner. The cheese and butter was never moved from the warehouses in which it was stored but the Commodity Credit Corporation paid the difference between the purchase and resale price to the so-called owners.

The committee investigation discovered that this Commodity Credit Corporation program proved of little benefit to the dairy farmers, but resulted in substantial windfall payments to business firms. As a result of the committee investigation, the General Accounting Office ruled that the transactions were unauthorized and improper. Also, as a result of the committee investigation the Attorney General has filed suit for recovery of a number of the illegal payments and has demanded return of the others. The committee also called attention to the use of industry advisory committees in programs of this type and recommended that the Department of Agriculture take immediate action to eliminate possible conflicts of interest in connection with the use of such industry advisory committees. The committee's report is House Report No. 2952, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) School-lunch program in Illinois:

The committee investigated the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities in connection with the school-lunch program in the State of Illinois. The committee investigation showed that the State superintendent of public instruction was a political associate of a member of the firm of Dunbar & Co., a firm which was selected by negotiation to distribute surplus agricultural commodities for the school-lunch program.

It was disclosed that the contract with Dunbar & Co. was made under circumstances which indicated an intent to favor this firm to the exclusion of others even though Dunbar & Co. had only a limited experience in handling commodities. Moreover, the investigation showed that under the contract Dunbar & Co. made inordinate profits which constituted the major portion of the excessive costs of distributing donated commodities in Illinois.

Dunbar & Co. used its company income for a large number of questionable expenditures, showing a return of money to the political group in Illinois which undoubtedly arranged for Dunbar & Co. to obtain the contract.

Finally, the investigation demonstrated that the Department of Agriculture did not perform its functions in such a manner as to encourage maximum economy, since the Department was aware of some of the circumstances involved and could have known most of the others had the Department shown any positive interest in the matter.

The committee report covering these matters is House Report No. 2893, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Sixth. Department of State—(a) Foreign Service promotions under the Wriston program:

The committee investigated the implementation of the report of the Secretary of State's Public Committee on Personnel, known as the Wriston Committee. The Wriston Committee report recommended a series of measures to strengthen the United States Foreign Service. The report had been accepted by the Secretary of State, and the Congress enacted implementing legislation in the form of Public Law 759, 83d Congress, and Public Laws 22 and 250, 84th Congress.

The objective of the Wriston report and the ostensible policy of the State Department pursuant to the report have been to integrate some 1,200 former departmental officers together with some 1,200 former Foreign Service staff and reserve officer personnel into the Foreign Service Officer Corps without any discrimination or inequitable treatment with regard to assignments, frequency of transfers, or promotions.

The committee investigation showed that the State Department had been lagging far behind its ostensible acceptance of the Wriston report objectives and that the system being employed by the State Department gave a heavy advantage to former Foreign Service officers.

The committee recommended that the Department bring its actions into conformance with the basic premises of the Wriston report or else seek approval to revise it.

The results of the committee investigation are contained in House Report No. 1663, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) United States technical assistance in Latin America:

The committee studied the technical assistance program in Latin America. It found a lack of full coordination between the Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration. The committee also found that many projects were being engendered in Washington rather than being requested by the recipient country. Furthermore, too little attention has been given to the objective of transfer of projects for continuation by the host countries. In addition, certain projects have been developed beyond the technical assistance phase to actual economic aid.

Finally, the committee found that the Congress was not being presented with the necessary information for evaluation and approval of projects proposed by the executive branch.

The committee report on this subject is House Report No. 1985, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Administrative management of the Department of State:

The committee investigated the administrative structure of the State Department and disclosed substantial weaknesses. In effect, the committee concluded that in terms of administrative management there are now five departments of State rather than one, since administrative management operations have been decentralized from the Department to four powerful regional bureaus which tend to hold aloof from accepting policies and services from the administrative area of the Department.

The committee study also showed that the expenditure of more than $250,000 for a 10-month study of administrative management of the Department by Robert Heller & Associates brought about no significant results.

Finally, the committee investigation disclosed that the funds used for the survey were those appropriated by Congress for emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular services and that, therefore, the use of these funds for the study was of doubtful propriety.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2172, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(d) Foreign aid operations in Iran:

The committee has been making an extensive investigation of foreign aid operations in Iran. The investigation has been directed toward establishing the economy and efficiency with which some $206 million of technical and economic assistance has been furnished Iran in the period through 1955.

This inquiry is intended to serve as a case study of the administration of foreign aid programs.

Seventh. Department of Defense—(a) Unification of supply systems within the Department of Defense:

Based on certain findings of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—Hoover Commission—in its reports on food and clothing and depot utilization, the committee investigated the actions of the Department of Defense with regard to unification of the supply systems of the three military departments. It was disclosed that until the committee's investigation was started and for some time thereafter some of the highest officials in the Department of Defense had been engaged in an effort, starting in 1953, to reverse steps which had been taken to unify the supply systems of the three military departments as directed by the Congress.

As a result of the committee investigations, the Department of Defense seems to have dropped its policy of ignoring the congressional mandate for integration of supply services. Starting at the end of 1955, the Department began to evolve its single manager system for

handling various commodities and supplies.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2013, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(b) Merger of certain naval supply activities:

The committee investigated the disestablishment of the San Pedro Naval Supply Depot and its merger with the supply department of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard located at Terminal Island, Calif. The committee investigation showed that the merger was not based on an accurate determination of economies, but rather on a casual speculation sought to be fortified after the action had been taken.

While interested in economies through elimination of duplication of activities, the committee recommended that more accurate determinations of economies be made in justification of such mergers.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 1662, 84th Congress, 2d session.

(c) Navy jet aircraft procurement program:

The committee investigated the expenditure of more than $500 million for 280 aircraft in the Demon fighter program. It found that the first 60 aircraft costing at least $154 million will be limited with 4 exceptions to nonflying uses. The committee also found that the other 220 aircraft had not been tested in fleet use and might soon become obsolete.

The committee concluded that the expenditures were excessive when judged by the end results. While the committee found that there are no indications of dishonesty or improper influence in the awarding or termination of contracts, it was concluded that all three parties involved, the Navy Department, Westinghouse Corp., and McDonnell Aircraft Corp., shared responsibility for errors in judgment and waste of public funds, although the Navy Department bore final responsibility as the Government procurement agency.

The committee made a series of recommendations designed to improve procedures and to avoid repetition of fiascos of this sort.

The committee report covering these matters is House Report No. 1891, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Eighth. General Services Administration—(a) Government nickel plant in Nicaro, Cuba:

An investigation was made by the committee of the expansion and operation by the General Services Administration of the Government nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba. The committee investigation found that political and private influence had played an active role in the award of a subcontract in the construction project and that similar influence caused an award of an insurance brokerage contract to an insurance agency in Chicago, Ill.

Political influence combined with a passive attitude on the part of General Services Administration officials caused a large unnecessary expenditure to the Federal Government as well as a loss of about 10 million pounds of critically needed nickel of a market value of about $6,500,000. The committee recommended certain actions designed to cut down on the loss to the Government and also called certain matters to the attention of the Department of Justice for possible legal action.

The committee report on these matters is House Report No. 2390, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Ninth. Government information:

The committee has conducted a study of one of the most basic problems in our society, that is, the availability of information from Federal Government agencies. In the course of the investigation the information policies of every major department and agency have been thoroughly scrutinized. In addition, the views of eminent lawyers and other authorities on the problem of availability of governmental information have been obtained.

The legal aspects have been thoroughly researched and the legal and constitutional problems involved in the right of Congress to obtain information from Federal agencies have been summarized and documented in a committee print, "The Right of Congress To Obtain Information From the Executive and From Other Agencies of the Federal Government"—dated May 3, 1956.

The committee investigation has grogressed to the point where two things are obvious:

First. A custom and orientation has grown up in the agencies leading to a strong tendency to withhold information. So strong has this orientation become that the custom itself is viewed as so-called law by many agency officials.

Second. The courts have recognized that congressional enactments govern information function and policy in the agencies. Consequently it is up to the Congress to take action to bring up to date various statutory provisions governing withholding and release of governmental information.

The report of the committee on this subject is House Report No. 2947, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Tenth. Experts and consultants:

For the first time since the enactment of section 15 of Public Law 600 in 1946, the committee has made a study of the employment and utilization of experts and consultants by the Federal Government. The study has been concerned with three different aspects:

First. The use of individual experts and consultants.

Second. Contracts with firms or organizations of such experts or consultants.

Third. The use of advisory committees.

The committee found a number of abuses in the use of individual experts and consultants, particularly as regards public relations activitives, lobbying within the Government, the use of trade association officials, and political and private influence.

The committee recommended the repeal of the blanket exemptions from conflict of interest statutes for certain experts and consultants and also an aggressive and positive role by the Civil Service Commission in preauditing instead of postauditing such appointments. The committee investigation has progressed to the point where it is obvious that Congress also must exercise a closer control in the case of contracts with firms or organizations. These contracts enable agencies to pay out sums without any limitation for services whose utility and necessity is highly questionable in too many instances.

With reference to advisory committees, the committee investigation has resulted in the publication of a number of committee prints listing for the first time the membership of all of the advisory committees being utilized by the major Federal departments and agencies. The committee study has also disclosed that there are no uniform practices governing the use of such advisory committees and that such uniform practices are probably a matter for legislation centralizing control over use of such committees and defining standards governing their activities.

Less than one-half of the advisory committees subject to the standards recommended by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice are complying with those standards. Consequently, the committee recommended as a starting point that the President take immediate steps to obtain Governmentwide compliance with these standards by advisory committees.

The report of the committee on these matters is House Report No. 2894, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Eleventh. Civil defense:

One of the most comprehensive and far-reaching studies and investigations undertaken by the committee has been its investigation of the problems of civil defense. After many months of hearings and studies which disclosed that our country is woefully unprepared, the committee has recently reported to the Congress its recommendations designed to provide a sound approach to civil defense.

In the course of its hearings, 211 witnesses were heard including the highest officials of the Federal Government and of various State and local governments as well as experts and scientists of national and international renown.

As a result of its investigation, including hearings extending over a period of 5 months, the committee recommended:

1. Federal civil defense legislation should be redrafted to vest the basic responsibility for civil defense in the Federal Government, with the States and local units of government having an important supporting role.

2. The new legislation should create a permanent Department of Civil Defense, combining the civil defense functions—broadly defined—of the Office of Defense Mobilization and those of the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

3. The Department of Civil Defense should consult with the Department of Defense and be required to formulate a master plan for nationwide civil defense. Plans for each target area should

be made and protective measures initiated after careful determination of their respective priority importance to national defense and survival.

4. The master plan for civil defense should be pointed toward the establishment of an integrated nationwide civil-defense system based on the key civil-defense measure of shelter protection against the blast, heat, and radiation effects of nuclear explosions.

5. Studies under the survival-planning contracts should be suspended, pending a reformulation of the criteria for the expenditure of the funds Congress authorized and appropriated for this purpose. A local or regional survival plan study should be concerned only with the adaptation and application of the national plan and of basic studies to a local situation.

6. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to finance the construction of shelters in all target areas, with the cooperation of State and local authorities.

7. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to institute all other measures necessary to establish an integrated nationwide civil-defense system, and to utilize toward this end such available resources and facilities.

8. The Department of Civil Defense should be authorized to strengthen State and local civil-defense organizations by contributing equipment, supplies, and funds for administration, training, stockpiles, and other necessary civil-defense uses, subject to the supervision, inspection, and approval by the Secretary of Civil Defense of the civil-defense programs of State and local authorities.

9. The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Civil Defense, should establish and implement an effective program of training active and reserve military personnel in civil-defense duties as a defined part of regular military training.

10. The Secretary of Civil Defense, in behalf of the President, should have defined statutory powers to act in an emergency and to mobilize all civilian resources for minimizing the effects of enemy-caused disaster upon the national economy and the people of the United States.

11. The Secretary of Civil Defense, in behalf of the President, should have greater statutory authority to carry out plans and operations in peacetime, under preattack situations, particularly before declarations of emergency have been made, in order to minimize the effects of enemy-caused disaster upon the national economy and the people of the United States.

12. The role of the military forces in civil defense should be clearly defined. The State governors should be fully informed as to the terms and conditions under which military assistance to civil-defense authorities will be rendered in the event of widespread disaster and the breakdown of civil government.

13. The studies of martial law conducted by the Attorney General, the Department of the Army, and other Federal agencies should be made public promptly upon completion to assist the Congress and the public in understanding the contemplated role of the military forces in civil defense.

The committee report on civil defense is House Report No. 2946, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Twelfth. Inventory of Federal real and personal property:

On March 21, 1956, the committee released, "Real and Personal Property Inventory Report (Civilian and Military) of the United States Government, Located in the Continental United States, in the Territories and Overseas as of June 30, 1955." This report represented an attempt, for the first time in the history of our Government, to record—in report form—an inventory of realty and personalty assets of the United States Government. Inventory figures were at acquisition cost and the finished product was a result of coordinated efforts on the part of all Government departments and agencies, including the Department of Defense, working closely with the committee.

Since March of this year, considerable effort and time has been spent with Government representatives outlining the scope of activities and additional data to be included in the 1956 property inventory report which the committee expects to release in December of this year. The next property inventory report, which will include real and personal assets of the United States Government, located in the United States, its Territories and possessions and overseas, as of June 30, 1956, will again list Federal real estate, excluding public domain properties, at acquisition cost and personalty inventories will be listed at acquisition cost. Public domain properties—with separate listings of land, buildings, facilities, and so forth—will be shown at current or estimated market value. This will be the first time an accurate up-to-date, or estimated, value has been published on public domain properties. As a result of revised and improved accounting control procedures, it is expected that the inventories of the Department of Defense for the current report will be substantially increased from those reported last year.

It is the desire of the committee, at an early date, to have all Federal real property listed in a comprehensive inventory report at an "in use" value. In this connection, assistance has been offered the committee by representatives of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers. However, until criteria is developed and put into effect—which will involve assistance from all departments and agencies having real estate under their control—acquisition-cost figures will be used. In the meantime, however, a step in the direction of meeting this goal is being taken in the forthcoming report by having public domain properties listed at current market, or estimated, value.

A need continues to exist for a comprehensive reporting and accounting of this country's assets so as to afford the Members of the Congress and the taxpayers of this country with up-to-date figures on what this country owns. Such data will be vital in the issuance, one day, of an annual report of the Government which will reflect a true balance sheet approach of assets and liabilities of the United States Government.

The report of the committee is House Report No. 1930, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Thirteenth. Surplus donable property:

In the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the committee reported H. R. 3322 to the House of Representatives and this bill subsequently became Public Law 61.

The objective of this legislation is to insure that surplus property which should be donated for the purposes directed by the Congress is not withheld by the agencies from such donation. The committee is able to report that Public Law 61 has been effective as follows: The total surplus personal property transfers from January through May 1956 according to reports received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare amounted to $87,370,-177.

Fourteenth. Study of reorganizations:

Under rule XI–8 of the House of Representatives, the committee has the duty of studying the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the executive branch of the Government.

A study of the effects of past reorganization plans has been in process based on reports received from the various agencies which have been affected by such plans. The committee has sought to follow the reorganization plans and their effects after they have been adopted so that it can be prepared to recommend continuation or abolition of the extraordinary authority given the President under the Reorganization Act of 1949 and also to determine if the plans have been carried out in the manner the Congress has approved.

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH (HOOVER COMMISSION)

As reported at the close of the 1st session of this Congress, 13 of the 18 subject-matter reports made by the Commission on Organization were referred to the committee for study. Since that time a substantial number of bills designed to implement some of the Commission recommendations also have been referred to the committee. The committee has given the Commission reports serious consideration and has taken action on those recommendations and suggestions of the Commission which appeared to be meritorious. The budget and accounting legislation, which was reported favorably by the committee at this session, is based on recommendations of the Commission amended by the committee to accord with the needs of the Government after careful study. The committee's investigation and report on the unification of supply services in the Department of Defense are based on the findings of the Commission in its Reports on Food and Clothing and Depot Utilization.

In addition, the committee has had under study other Commission reports, including Transportation, Business Enterprises, and Paperwork Management, parts I and II. Hearings were held on a number of bills to eliminate certain

commercial-type activities from the Government. This proposed legislation was based on certain recommendations of the Commission. After careful consideration, however, the committee decided not to report any of these measures for the elimination of certain commercial-type activities, since no case appears to have been made for the achievement of greater economy and efficiency.

A special and exceedingly comprehensive study and investigation has been made by the committee of the Commission on Organization's report on water resources and power. Hearings were held at 15 different cities in various parts of the United States, and the record made at these hearings consists of more than 5,500 pages. Nine volumes of these hearings already have been printed. These hearings covered every phase of the use of our water resources, including tolls on inland waterways, hydroelectric power, forestation, and flood control. A report is being prepared which will evaluate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on water-resource development in the light of the information gained in the extensive hearings and studies of the committee. This report should serve as a valuable permanent work of reference on matters relating to the multiple-purpose development and use of the Nation's water resources.

REPORTS OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (KESTNBAUM COMMISSION)

At the first session of this Congress the reports of the Kestnbaum Commission were referred to the committee for study and consideration. These reports consist of 16 separate volumes including the overall report. They represent 2 years' work by the Kestnbaum Commission and its many subcommittees and study committees composed of Federal, State, and local officials and private citizens.

Since the receipt of the report the committee has been making an intensive study of this important aspect of Government. There is probably no other aspect of Government which is so complex, involving as it does the Federal Government and all levels of State and local government.

Methods and coverage of study: In an effort to obtain a complete picture of the operation of Federal programs involving intergovernmental relations, two separate questionnaires were developed—one for Federal departments and agencies and the other for State and local governments. These were distributed in December 1955.

The questionnaire for Federal departments and agencies was designed to obtain, first, a detailed description of programs involving intergovernmental relations; second, departmental and agency judgments of program adequacy; and, third, the position and action of each agency with respect to recommendations of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which are applicable to its programs.

Replies to this questionnaire have now been received from all 62 of the Federal departments and agencies to which it was sent. These replies are being analyzed by the staff and a staff report is being prepared for the committee on this phase of the study.

The second questionnaire was sent to each of the State governors, to the District of Columbia, and to a representative sample of cities and counties. Special effort was made to obtain the participation of local governments representative of all sections of the country as well as of the communities of differing sizes. This questionnaire was designed to give State and local government considerable latitude for identifying and evaluating those intergovernmental programs regarded as most important to them.

Comparison of the number of questionnaires sent and replies received, by type of government unit, is presented in the following table:

Government unit	Number of—	
	Questionnaires sent	Completed replies received
Total	305	115
States	48	[1] 39
District of Columbia	1	1
Counties	146	[2] 34
Cities	108	[3] 47
City-county units	2	2

[1] Includes 3 States which provided no data and 3 States that have transmitted reports prepared by special State study groups in connection with the work of the Federal Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.
[2] Includes 4 counties which provided no data.
[3] Includes 3 cities which provided no data.

NOTE.—In addition to the 39 States shown in the table, 2 States have advised that replies are being prepared. The remaining 7 States have indicated, in our most recent contact (June 15), a willingness to participate in our study but require more time.

It will be seen from the table, above, that replies have been received from four-fifths of the States, almost half of the cities, but less than a fourth of the counties to which the questionnaire was sent. The staff is continuing its efforts to secure the cooperation of those which have not yet replied.

Content of State and local replies to committee questionnaires: The intergovernmental programs identified as of primary importance by State government are welfare, highways, health, and employment security—in that order. Other programs frequently mentioned in the State replies are education, school lunch, fish and wildlife restoration, civil defense, and tax relationships.

The highway, health, and welfare programs are also regarded as of major importance by cities and counties. Other activities involving intergovernmental relations which were frequently mentioned by local governments include housing and urban renewal, Federal payments in lieu of taxes, air and water pollution control, law enforcement and narcotics control, and flood control and harbor development.

Related projects initiated: To supplement the data being provided by the questionnaire method, two related projects have been initiated.

First. The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress is preparing for the committee a comprehensive but selective bibliography of literature available in the field of intergovernmental relations. Since no similar bibliography is presently available this document should serve a very useful purpose and will likely be in great demand. It is expected that this bibliography will be printed.

Second. In response to a committee request addressed to the President's Special Assistant for the Hoover Commission and Commission on Intergovernmental Relations Reports, the Bureau of the Budget has prepared a compilation of the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Each recommendation is annotated to show the method of implementation and the Federal department or agency and program affected. It is anticipated that this document will also be printed.

Projected work program: Plans are being formulated for a series of hearings to be held in connection with the committee study of intergovernmental relations. The data obtained through the questionnaire surveys should provide valuable background for conduct of these hearings. It is expected that separate hearings will be arranged for the Federal departments and agencies and for representatives of State and local governments. Such hearings should serve to, first, provide a medium by which the views of Federal, State, and local officials might be focused on common problems with the objectives of finding solutions to existing difficulties and pointing the way toward more effective methods of cooperation; and, second, increase public awareness of the character of our Federal system and the problems inherent in the operation of programs involving intergovernmental cooperation.

The committee staff is making preliminary study of several areas where intensive studies may be valuable. An example of such a project is study of the feasibility of further delegation of responsibility for auditing and other administrative controls to the States in Federal-grant programs. It is contemplated that the General Accounting Office and other experts will be invited to participate in this project if undertaken.

Other activities under consideration include the establishment of closer and continuing liaison with quasi-official agencies and associations which serve State and local governments.

STUDY OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

In recognition of the importance of the General Accounting Office as an arm of the Congress, and particularly of the Committee on Government Operations, the committee has made a comprehensive study of the organization and functioning of the General Accounting Office. The report of the committee study traces the history and functions of the General Accounting Office. The report also recommends changes in organization and procedure designed to improve the usefulness of the General Accounting Office to the Congress and the committee as well as to achieve economy and efficiency in the operations of the General Accounting Office.

The committee report on the General Accounting Office is House Report No. 2264, 84th Congress, 2d session.

Register-Guard's Capital Reporter Bob Smith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many residents of different cities in Oregon, as well as elsewhere in the Pacific Northwest and in Alaska, get their news about events in the Nation's Capital which will affect their own communities and region under the byline of A. Robert Smith, a young journalist who covers the Washington beat for 10 western newspapers. Many of the people who read Bob Smith's stories, however, know very little about the man who digs up these stories which are of importance to the Northwest and reports them in articles which are interesting and readable as well as factually correct.

Recently, Bob Smith himself became the subject of a column by Mr. Warren C. Price, professor at the University of Oregon School of Journalism, who is currently spending a year on the staff of the Washington Post and Times Herald. As Warren Price reports to the readers of the Eugene Register-Guard, Bob Smith has proved the significant point that there is still an opportunity in the newspaper business for a young man who has the ability, the energy, and the imagination to stake out for himself a new field in which he can provide a segment of the public with interesting and accurate information not otherwise readily available to them.

I ask to have included in the RECORD this column about Bob Smith by Mr. Warren C. Price, from the Eugene Register-Guard of July 25, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REGISTER-GUARD'S CAPITAL REPORTER PROVES SIGNIFICANT POINT

(By Warren C. Price)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Here in Washington reporting the national scene for the Eugene Register-Guard is a young newspaperman who has proved a significant point. One can still start from scratch in this journalistic bedlam, with little experience, and make a fine success of it.

He is a A. Robert Smith, now just past 30, whose bylines on Oregon affairs in Washington frequently background the news that comes out of here and that the press associations cannot handle. Bob Smith has been corresponding for the Register-Guard for about 5 years now. He is showing that accurate, interesting, important material from Washington need not come from big-name correspondents and columnists.

Bob today is "doing Washington news" for 10 western papers in Oregon, Washington State, and Alaska, but he is fondest, perhaps, of the Register-Guard and the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun. These are the two that first had faith in him early in the 1950's to put him on assignment in Washington and to feel that good reader-information about the Northwest would come out of their reliance.

THE OTHER PAPERS

The other papers are the Oregon Statesman in Salem, Pendleton East-Oregonian, Medford Mail-Tribune, Roseburg News-Review, Portland Oregonian, Walla Walla Union Bulletin, and in Alaska the Anchorage Times and Fairbanks News-Miner.

There have been other papers in the West that have taken Bob's service from time to time, but 10 is all that 1 man can handle adequately. After all, news events covering two States and Alaska range over a wide number of problems.

The interesting thing about Bob's work for western newspapers is that he himself is an easterner who was graduated after World War II from Juniata College in Pennsylvania, a small liberal arts school with less than 1,000 students. Bob, like many other beginners in journalism, was interested in sports. But his wife made a comment on one occasion, "What's there in sports? What's the difference if it's 2 strikes and 3 balls or 3 strikes and 2 balls?"

Bob Smith thought about that and then decided that maybe there should be something more in newspaper work than sport writing. (He and his wife know there is a difference between 2 strikes and 3 balls and 3 strikes and 2 balls. However, the point is obvious. Washington correspondence is perhaps of higher level than sports writing, whatever sports devotees may say.)

Then it happened in 1950 that Mrs. Smith was doing work for a onetime Washington State Congressman and Senator named Hugh Mitchell. It was Mitchell who in 1946 was defeated for the Senate by the controversial Harry Cain.

This political development brought the Smiths on a trip to the west coast. There Bob began presenting his ideas to small newspapers of the area on the value of news coverage in Washington beyond the straight AP and UP reports.

It was an intelligent approach, too. Young reporter Smith knew there would be little opportunity trying to break in with big papers of the East, or for that matter with even the smaller eastern papers. Washington always has been well blanketed with coverage. Where but in an untapped area like the Northwest would a young reporter find a better place to get started?

KEEPING WATCH

That's how it began. Now Bob Smith is busy keeping watch on news developments relating to Hells Canyon, Oregon and Washington State agriculture, Alaskan statehood, and particular operations of the congressional contingents that are important out West but of no meaning to the press associates.

No single newspaper could do this job alone without maintaining an expensive bureau in Washington. But Bob, on his own as an individual contractor, can pool the region for 10, serve all with what they would not otherwise get, and carve for himself a useful career.

Bob spends most of his time on Congress on the sound premise that it most represents the people of the region he is serving. His beat is, as he puts it, "anything in Washington that affects the lives of people in the Pacific Northwest—floods, schools, or whatever happens."

Now that the 84th Congress is about to wind up its session, Bob may be slightly less busy. But that is doubtful. Things happen in the United States Capital at all times. No sooner will Congress be out of here than the Washington angle on the political conventions will take its place in interest.

SHARES OFFICE

Smith shares an office on the eighth floor of the National Press Building with reporters representing the Salt Lake City Tribune, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and the Hilo (Hawaii) Herald. He is only one of hundreds of Washington correspondents in a building loaded with big stars who think they know answers. But Bob Smith does his job, for a region which he picked himself, and with no one but himself for a boss.

His is in 1956 the young journalist's dream come true—Washington reporter and his own boss. It can still be done. It takes work and brains and accuracy and fairness—along with all else.

Settle Cyprus Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I forwarded strong appeals and intercessions to the Department of State expressing my deep interest, and urging the good offices of this Government to try to settle this very disturbing issue. At the time the State Department stated in effect that the Cyprus issue involved the direct interests of close friends and allies of the United States and was, therefore, a matter which the United States views with attentive interest.

The Department declared that this Government is ready to assist its friends to work out a solution in the Cyprus question, and that it viewed present problems with sympathetic concern and confidence that a solution can be found which will strengthen overall Western interests.

I find that the State Department Bulletin of some time ago, which was formulated in response to numerous inquiries and protests, is not particularly responsive to the many urgent requests that this Nation use its good offices to bring about a settlement of this dangerous issue; nor does it adequately set forth an outline of American policy in this distressing matter.

Reading the Bulletin, I got the distinct impression that it was comprised of generalized statements that would be applicable to almost any pending diplomatic situation.

In that sense it was disappointing, because I had high hopes that the Department would take a much more active interest and play a much more affirmative and positive role in seeking to bring about a satisfactory solution.

It would appear that the Department is more concerned about the feelings of some of our allies than it is about the settlement of this great human question which affects the claims to freedom of a historic and honored people, and which day by day is causing the deterioration of the attitude toward the western democracies in the Middle East. Cyprus is the type of question that should be approached not on the basis of the interests of allies alone, but on the basis of great fundamental principles to which this Na-

tion is historically and unalterably pledged.

I believe that under the circumstances this Government, which is frequently making pious and understandable professions concerning its interest in world peace, should recognize that the issue of Cyprus is not only measurably disturbing world peace but it is gravely and seriously affecting our own interests and prestige in the Middle and Near East and throughout the world.

As the leading world democracy we above all should recognize that this question of Cyprus involves the sacred principle of self-determination to which Americans have been committed since before the founding of this Nation and which has been reiterated so very strongly during and following two great world wars as well as at many other times.

There is another very serious question involved here and that is the rights of religious minorities—a question which is very dear to the hearts of all true believers in freedom. This question relates not alone to freedom of worship which should be respected everywhere but also as it bears upon this issue, full respect for religious personages.

The callous treatment accorded Archbishop Makarios by the British Government was shocking to the conscience and moral instincts of the Christian and non-Christian world. It was an affront to all followers of religion. I hope and urge that our Government may take vigorous, affirmative steps to acquaint the British Goverment with the fact that oppression of the kind that is being practiced in Cyprus is offensive to the moral sense of enlightened mankind and will not be condoned by democratic, freedom-loving peoples.

Clearly Cyprus is having most unfortunate, adverse effects upon the cause of the free Western nations. Our Government should, therefore, use all means at its disposal to bring the issue of Cyprus to an early, just, and permanent solution. The free world as a whole will think the better of us for it.

Hon. F. Ertel Carlyle

SPEECH
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, North Carolina has lost a most able legislator and lawyer from their congressional delegation in the person of the Honorable F. ERTEL CARLYLE.

It was my pleasure to serve with this gentleman in this legislative body for the past 10 years during which time he more than once demonstrated his ability in legislative matters. The service which he has rendered to not only the people of the Seventh District of North Carolina, but to the people of the United States, is a matter of record.

I sincerely wish that he will enjoy a most lucrative law practice during his coming years and hope that some day he will once again serve with us here in the Congress.

Is the Southern Pacific Ready To Quit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a forthright editorial from the Medford Mail-Tribune of July 22, 1956, entitled "Is the Southern Pacific Ready To Quit?"

The editorial quite rightly emphasizes the fact that our railroads, which often enjoy a monopolistic position with respect to freight hauls, have an obligation to give the American public adequate and efficient passenger service.

The author of this editorial is the distinguished journalist, Robert W. Ruhl, former winner of the Pulitzer prize for outstanding journalistic attainment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC READY TO QUIT?

If we were the board of directors of the "friendly Southern Pacific"—too bad we aren't—we would fire D. J. Russell, president of the billion dollar corporation, even though he is a highly-successful ex-Jacksonville boy.

We would fire him for one good, and we believe, sufficient reason, namely: no man should direct the destiny of an important business who no longer believes in that business.

President Russell doesn't believe in the railroad business—at least as far as passenger traffic is concerned. We quote:

"In 20 years Pullman travel will be a thing of the past and there will be little if any passenger business for long distances at least."

Small wonder that a railroad directed by a person holding such views should have deprived all of southern Oregon of passenger service by rail, and defied all orders of the public utility commissioner to restore it.

For this, according to the Russell philosophy, is just "good business." When a department in any corporation starts to lose money, don't waste time trying to improve it and make it—drop it. That is what United States steel or any other billion dollar concern would do, why shouldn't Southern Pacific? So goes the Southern Pacific story.

There is only one reason and the Russell school of thought refuses to consider it. That reason is—the railroad business, unlike United States steel, is a public utility. It enjoys a monopoly in southern Oregon and northern California. According to the terms of its original franchise, it agreed in return for tremendous grants of valuable public lands and this monopoly privilege to provide a continuous service to the people of the areas involved, passenger and freight.

But what is a franchise between a billion dollar corporation and a hundred billion dollar Government when there is no profit in it? Let the long-hairs and the egg-heads talk about the obligations of public service, the rights of the "dear people," etc., etc.—such obligations and rights end in the Southern Pacific philosophy today as they did in the "public be damned" days of Commodore Vanderbilt, several generations ago.

Fortunately, however, all railroad presidents do not share President Russell's defeatism regarding the passenger department of American railroads. The passenger departments for many years have not been profitable, the railroad freight traffic has literally "paid the freight" since the war with Spain. But such directing heads as those of the great New York Central system and the Santa Fe, believe they owe a certain obligation of service to the traveling public and they are making a determined effort to meet it, not by dropping passenger service entirely and becoming freight lines only as S. P. proposes—but by improving both.

These two railroads have improved their service to passengers materially, provided better cars and more modern diesels, offered special family rates, and increased speeds. They have not put on more trains, but better schedules. It is doubtful they expect to make their passenger traffic pay a profit, but they are obviously doing their best to so improve the service that the losses, if any, will be so slight the large freight profits can carry them.

In the end they may fail. No one can be sure about the future. But at least they are not quitting. They are making a fight for it, which is more than can be said for the friendly Southern Pacific.

And we have a hunch they won't fail.

Motor and air transportation are growing by the proverbial leaps and bounds, and this growth as the country grows will continue. But both are based very largely on the American mania for speed, and more speed. Because of increasing congestion on land as well as in the air both casualties and discomforts in these areas of transportation are on the increase also.

In far greater comfort and safety, and in a free and exclusive right-of-way, with terminals in the business sections of cities instead of miles away, the railroads, we believe, enjoy an advantage the importance and value of which will increase as time goes on. After all, there is a limit to this passion to pass the car ahead.

In other words, the people of this country as they grow more mature, will—or at least should—not care so much about how fast they can get somewhere else, as how safely, how comfortably, and with how little stress and strain.

When they do arrive at this point, the "friendly S. P." may find that becoming a freight line only, putting the almighty dollar above goodwill and public service, did not add up to such a smart business move after all.—R. W. R.

Activities of the House Committee on Public Works, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 84th Congress the Committee on Public Works left behind it an outstanding record of legislative enactments which, without doubt, is the most important program of public works that has ever come from this committee during any session of the Congress.

Six hundred and twenty bills were referred to the committee during the first and second sessions. Eighty-six of these measures were acted upon favorably by the committee, 72 of which were passed by both Houses.

In addition, the committee adopted 74 river and harbor resolutions and 65 flood-control resolutions. These resolutions authorized review survey studies by the Corps of Engineers that will ultimately result in project reports submitted to Congress if the projects are found worthy and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Chief of Engineers.

The committee also approved 141 post office and Federal office buildings for construction under the Lease-Purchase Act—Public Law 519, 83d Congress—involving a total estimated cost of $753,040,994. Of this number 88, at a total estimated cost of $516,532,540, carried budget approval; 22 at a total estimated cost of $11,662,954 were revised projects with budget approval; and 31 at a total estimated cost of $224,845,500 were approved subject to budget approval.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 627)

Probably the most outstanding piece of legislation handled by this committee is the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, providing for a $25.5 billion construction program on the Interstate Highway System through fiscal year 1969, and $2.5 billion for Federal-aid highways through fiscal year 1959. The States will provide matching funds in the amount of 50 percent on the Federal-aid highway system and 10 percent on the Interstate System. As a result of this legislation, the 48 States of the Nation are about to embark upon the largest highway building program in the history of the world.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS ACT OF 1956 (H. R. 12080)

Equally important to the Nation is the Omnibus River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1956, H. R. 12080. The committee gave detailed consideration to the needs of every section of the country in formulating this bill, especially with respect to flood control remedial works necessary as a result of the disastrous floods in the Kansas River area in 1954, and the northeast floods induced by hurricanes which occurred last fall and the west coast floods of last December and January. The bill contains 108 project authorizations in 37 States.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1956 (PUBLIC LAW 660)

This legislation is designed to strengthen and extend the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. It authorizes funds for research, investigations, training, and information programs, and provides financial assistance to States and Territories to assist them in meeting the cost of establishing water pollution control measures. In addition, it provides, for the first time, financial assistance to States, cities, and municipalities for construction of sewage treatment works. Fifty million dollars annually is authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, with a maximum of $500 million for 10 years. The Federal grant for any project will be 30 percent of total cost, or $250,000, whichever is the smaller. The measure provides that 50 percent of the funds must be used for communinties with less than 125,000 population. The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1957 carries a $50 million appropriation for the start of this program.

Below is a brief summary of other general bills acted upon favorably by the committee and enacted into law during the 84th Congress:

Small flood-control projects—Public Law 685: Authorizes the Secretary of the Army to allot not to exceed $10 million in any one fiscal year for construction of small flood-control projects not specifically authorized by law, when in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers, such work is warranted, with not more than $400,000 to be allotted for any single locality. Will permit immediate construction of flood-protective works in many areas which might otherwise be unduly delayed awaiting the usual detailed survey and authorization process.

Federal participation in protection of private as well as public shore property—Public Law 826: Extends the policy of Federal participation in the construction of shore-protection measures to shores of privately owned property under certain circumstances, as well as the shores of publicly owned property. Also clarifies existing policy with respect to periodic placement of sand fills, and eliminates the presently unnecessary seawall proviso.

Hurrican damage study—Public Law 71: Authorizes Chief of Engineers to make an examination and survey, together with the United States Weather Bureau and other agencies, along the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States to secure data on movement of hurricanes, forecasting their paths, and investigating possible structural improvements which may be provided to prevent loss of life and property damages during the occurrence of hurricanes.

Following is a list of lease-purchase public buildings projects approved by the committee in the 84th Congress:

Public buildings approved, lease purchase program

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Albuquerque, N. Mex.	Federal office building	$6,227,300
Atlanta, Ga.	Communicable disease center	12,330,000
Omaha, Nebr.	Post office and courthouse	9,579,823
Brunswick, Ga.	do	1,431,000
Carthage, Tenn.	Post office, etc.	272,000
Biloxi, Miss.	Post office and courthouse	1,110,000
Durham, N. H.	Post office, etc.	433,600
Jefferson, Ohio	Post office	78,125
Houston, Tex.	do	7,100,000
Richmond, Va.	Federal office building	7,410,000
New York, N. Y.	United States mission to U. N.	3,300,000
Burlington, Vt.	Post office and courthouse	2,830,000
New Orleans, La.	Post office, etc.	14,200,000
Minneapolis, Minn.	Courthouse and Federal office building	5,877,815
Burlington, Iowa	Post office, etc.	1,328,987
Lafayette, La.	do	1,095,000
Washington, D. C.	Federal office building and Civil Service Commission building.	9,850,000
Gainesville, Tex.	Post office, etc.	645,036
Toronto, Ohio	Post office	53,125
Fort Mill, S. C.	do	49,800
Wayland, N. Y.	do	56,250
Parkersburg, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal office building	3,045,000
San Francisco, Calif.	do	45,300,000
Minden, La.	Post office, etc.	412,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	Post office garage	1,805,000
Sioux City, Iowa (Morningside).	Post office station	85,500
Sheboygan Falls, Wis.	Post office	105,000
Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 6	16,275,000
Do.	U. S. Geological Survey Building	22,260,000
Sparta, Mich.	Post office	103,400
Hudson, Mass.	do	198,789
Kingsport, Tenn.	Federal office building	1,146,000
Sacramento, Calif.	Courthouse and Federal office building	10,210,000
Bellflower, Calif.	Post office	297,500
Tupper Lake, N. Y.	do	107,554
Lansford, Pa.	do	94,000
Teaneck, N. J.	do	385,500
Greenville, Miss.	Post office and courthouse	1,200,000
Washington, D. C.	Meteorological center	30,990,000
Oklahoma City, Okla.	Courthouse and Federal office building	$7,140,000
Los Angeles, Calif.	Customhouse and Federal office building	30,800,000
Houston, Tex.	Courthouse and Federal office building	15,300,000
Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 5	25,250,000
Boston, Mass.	Federal office building	28,150,000
Guilford, Conn.	Post office, etc.	154,500
Helena, Ark.	do	1,020,000
Camden, Ala.	Post office, etc.	$272,000
Ronceverte, W. Va.	do	255,000
Marshfield, Mo.	do	324,000
Winnetka, Ill.	Post office	326,000
Gering, Nebr.	do	136,915
Phoenix, Ariz.	Courthouse and Federal office building	8,600,000
Little Rock, Ark.	Federal office building	9,150,000
Emporia, Kans.	Post office, etc.	600,000
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Homewood).	Post office	238,500
Pittsford, N. Y.	do	135,395
Leavenworth, Kans.	Post office and courthouse	968,000
Mount Hope, W. Va.	Bureau of Mines	700,000
Sisseton, S. Dak.	Post office, etc.	530,000
Greenwich, N. Y.	Post office	112,890
Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 8	12,190,000
Smithville, Tenn.	Post office, etc.	283,000
Rittman, Ohio	Post office	136,775
National City, Calif.	do	376,800
Detroit, Mich. (North End Station).	do	525,877
Newark, N. J. (Roseville).	do	227,675
Jersey City, N. J. (Bergen).	do	268,609
Waukesha, Wis.	do	408,000
Livingston, Ala.	Post office and Federal office building	279,000
Miami, Fla.	Federal office building	8,875,000
Breese, Ill.	Post office and Federal office building	271,000
Jonesboro, La.	do	365,000
Moorhead, Minn.	do	555,000
Laurel, Miss.	do	829,000
McKinney, Tex.	do	480,000
Terrell, Tex.	do	392,000

Public buildings approved, lease purchase program—Continued

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Washington, D. C.	Federal Office Building No. 7	$27,450,000	Redwood Falls, Minn.	Post office and Federal office building	$440,000
Do.	Federal Office Building No. 10	40,900,000	New Orleans, La.	Post office and garage facilities	19,670,000
Do.	Federal Office Building No. 9	22,115,000	Beaver, Pa.	Post office and Federal office building	310,000
Martinsburg, W. Va.	Post office and courthouse	1,400,000	Manning, S. C.	do	364,000
Dallas, Tex.	Courthouse and Federal office building	24,490,000	Hot Springs, Ark.	Post office and courthouse	1,729,000
Sedan, Kans.	Post office and Federal office building	218,000	Victoria, Tex.	do	1,563,000

Public buildings approved, subject to budget approval

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
Hartford, Conn.	Federal office building	$8,350,000	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Federal office building	$23,960,000
Denver, Colo.	Courthouse	6,420,000	Sharon, Pa.	Post office and Federal office building	898,000
Monticello, Fla.	Post office and Federal office building	310,000	Lafayette, Tenn.	do	275,000
Milledgeville, Ga.	do	502,000	Daingerfield, Tex.	do	216,000
Fort Dodge, Iowa.	Post office and courthouse	1,980,000	Orange, Tex.	do	620,000
Baltimore, Md.	Federal office building	19,170,000	San Marcos, Tex.	do	576,000
Denton, Md.	Post office and Federal office building	415,000	Salt Lake City, Utah	Federal office building	7,600,000
Bemidji, Minn.	do	1,200,000	Portsmouth, Va.	Post office and Federal office building	3,575,000
Brainerd, Minn.	do	612,000	Waynesboro, Va.	do	380,000
Moberly, Mo.	do	487,000	Franconia, Va.	Warehouse building	7,500,000
St. Louis, Mo.	Federal office building	13,760,000	Charleston, W. Va.	Courthouse and Federal office building	3,820,000
Do.	Federal records office	6,740,000	Wailuku, T. H.	Post office and Federal office building	757,000
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Courthouse and Federal office building	15,200,000	Ocala, Fla.	Post office and courthouse	1,580,000
New York, N. Y.	Customhouse and Federal office building	65,100,000	Benton, Ill.	do	1,100,000
Cincinnati, Ohio.	Federal office building	21,700,000	Toledo, Ohio.	Federal office building	4,950,000
Portland, Oreg.	do	5,092,500			

Projects approved on which revised specifications have been submitted

Location	Type of building	Estimated cost	Location	Type of building	Estimated cost
St. Mary's, Ohio	Post office	$126,400	Grundy, Va.	Post office	$106,000
Point Pleasant, N. J.	do	536,500	Newkirk, Okla.	do	98,100
Oxford, Pa.	do	109,000	Refugio, Tex.	do	117,700
East New York Station (New York).	do	491,300	West Memphis, Ark.	do	138,045
Denver, Colo.	do	8,209,000	Cashmere, Wash.	do	97,200
Atlanta, Ga.	Motor vehicle shop and garage	252,644	Madison, Tenn.	do	138,000
Scranton, Pa.	Post office	94,300	Camden, N. Y.	do	147,300
Garland, Tex.	do	183,450	Maplewood, N. J.	do	357,600
Grand Prairie, Tex.	do	245,000	Skaneateles, N. Y.	do	103,500
Two Harbors, Minn.	do	107,400	Newtown, Pa.	do	150,915
Ontonagon, Mich.	do	106,000	New Richmond, Wis.	do	147,600

Textile Enigma Under the Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, are we not shocked by recent figures indicating that from 1947 to 1955 textile jobs in New England declined from 301,000 to 172,000? Do we not realize that this means a loss of 43 percent in the largest manufacturing industry in our region? How long can this continue, I ask in all reasonableness, without completely wrecking this vital industry?

What is the remedy? Well, a large part of it lies in checking cutthroat foreign competition. Rapidly growing imports from Japan added to the rest, now create a great additional threat.

Now we are selling surplus cotton to Japan 25 percent below domestic prices. If this continues, it will provide us with another fantastic, crazy-quilt economic pattern—American cotton purchased and stored with money of American taxpayers, sold at reduced prices to foreign nations, converted under sweatshop and coolie conditions into textile goods and shipped back into the United States under the terms of the Geneva agreement to compete with high-standard, high-cost American labor and goods. The conclusion is inescapable that the New England textile industry under this agreement is made to bear the brunt and become the goat of the help-Japan policy now being followed at Washington.

Is it wise for us to give ourselves a knockout, economic blow in order to help other nations? Yet that is just what is happening under the current policy. It is interesting to note that not a single European country granted comparable concessions to ours in the 1955 parleys. How long can this Nation pursue this policy without most serious impact upon our economy?

We can ill afford to overlook the importance of attacking the problems presented by cut-throat competition in textiles by Japan and other nations, and I hope that satisfactory agreements may be reached at an early date and, if not, that Congress will go forward with appropriate legislation to check these injurious imports.

By all means, let us be friendly and helpful in every practicable way to Japan and other free nations. But let us, in that process, in carrying out that aim of good will and cooperation, let us avoid measures that will inevitably destroy our own industries and seriously impair the overall strength of our own economy.

American Music at Home and Abroad—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we in America can be proud of our country for a great many reasons, reasons which have been stated often on the floor of the House during this session of the Congress. It does seem to me, however, that there is a tendency on the part of our fellow citizens to overlook one aspect of American life of which we have every right to be proud. I refer to our cultural attainments. In this area we sometimes tend to think that we are weak and must look to other countries for leadership. America is, of course, greatly indebted to Western Europe for a great deal of its cultural heritage and we should be thankful for it but, at the same time, we have contributed a great deal that is of outstanding and lasting value to Western culture in the field of the arts and crafts.

Of all these contributions none is more important than our jazz music. This musical form has been developed fully

in the United States in recent years and it has been one of our most successful exports abroad. Of this export I should like to speak in a moment. At this point, I should like to discuss briefly the state of music in America in 1956.

For many years our musicians who played American music played to very small audiences, and, as a result, many a fine American musician was forced either to give up his music or starve. Of course, a few musicians whose names were widely known were extremely well paid from the beginning but those musicians who were less well known, while in many cases they were equally gifted as musicians, found it extremely difficult to make a living at all.

Today, we have begun to appreciate our music on a much wider scale and it is possible to hear it in many cities of our land. It is played by our symphony orchestras of which there are more than 900. It is played over the air by radio and television stations. We hear it on records, long playing and short, classical and jazz. We hear it in our night clubs and in our fine hotels. We hear it in our theaters, especially the living theater, and in our movies. In many, many places—but so much of it is recorded and played by only a few name bands, and our symphony orchestras devote less than 10 percent of their programs to our own music. So, while Americans in all walks of life are now beginning to appreciate our own music it is still very hard for a musician to earn a living, and if something is not done soon to correct the situation, it may soon reach a point where it is not possible for more than a few musicians to make a living at all.

One of the principal reasons for this unfortunate situation is very simply that the places where music is being played are finding it increasingly difficult to stay in business. Cabarets and night clubs, hotel dining salons, and so on are all existing on the slimmest of profit margins or going out of business. All too frequently they are being forced by high taxes, among other things, to drop live entertainment and living musicians in order to stay in business. Thus at place after place throughout our land music is being heard increasingly on records and the living musician is finding it increasingly difficult to make a livelihood—and this is in the wealthiest nation in the entire history of the world.

In a speech before the New Jersey Hotel Association I attempted to develop the background information supporting a bill I have introduced in the Congress to help keep music alive in our land. My measure would eliminate the entertainment or cabaret tax. I am confident that the elimination of this tax would help relieve a deplorable unemployment situation which is facing many thousands of good American musicians and I should like to see the Congress adopt this legislation during the next session.

I include here my speech before the New Jersey Hotel Association in which I set forth my concern for American music and American musicians:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN FRANK THOMPSON, JR., DEMOCRAT, NEW JERSEY, AT THE 38TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERSEY HOTEL ASSOCIATION, ATLANTIC CITY, N. J., APRIL 23, 1956

Many hotel people in New Jersey and particularly in my district have complimented me on my sponsorship of H. R. 8403 to repeal the so-called 20 percent cabaret tax. I am deeply appreciative of the support you and your national office in Washington are giving me and others who seek to abolish this uneconomic and wholly repressive tax, I am conscious that your industry has been one of the chief sufferers under this misguided Federal tax policy. In the last 6 years, I am informed, fully two-thirds of all of the hotel rooms throughout the country formerly devoted to dine-dance entertainment have either been darkened or converted to other uses. I am conscious, too, of the unemployment this tax policy has occasioned among service people, entertainers and particularly musicians.

Down in Washington where the administration continues to proclaim this as a "no-tax-cut-year," we are told that it would cost the Treasury $40 million a year to abolish this tax. I do not accept that kind of schoolboy mathematics or economics. Recently I have seen the findings of a national survey conducted by a responsible independent fact-finding agency, the Research Company of America. It was made at the instance of the American Federation of Musicians. During the course of this survey the researchers talked to many hotel people like yourselves and to hundreds of others in the entertainment business. They came up with a finding that if this prohibitive 20 percent tax is repealed the Treasury will actually benefit to the extent of some $12 million annually over and above the $40 million which this tax now turns in to the Treasury. These extra accruals would come, of course, from increased business taxes and largely increased personal taxes resulting from more business and more employment.

It would be pure political "bunkum" for me to tell you today that my sole motivation in sponsoring repeal of the 20-percent cabaret tax was to help the hotel industry. That would be only half the truth and half truths are half lies. There was an added motive that cuts much deeper than the economics of any industry. That motive concerns our future as society which can hold its head high as a leader of the free world.

I imagine that many of you know that, in addition to my sponsorship of legislation to repeal the cabaret tax, I am the author of several other proposals to safeguard music and the arts. It happens that the cabaret tax is probably responsible for fully half of the wide unemployment existing among musicians, a critical situation that now threatens the very existence of musical culture in our Nation. In a country which has done so much in the past to overcome its inferiority complex regarding its musical creativeness and appreciation, this is a tragic situation.

I am concerned, too, that the weakest link in our defense against communism, the puniest effort in our all-important contest to win the hearts and minds of free men, lies in the fields of our cultural relations with other nations. The administration in Washington confesses that the Russians are spending more than $3 billion annually on direct propaganda designed to communize the free world. Yet we have matched this mammoth effort with something like $5 million a year over the last 2 years to display our cultural attainments abroad.

Presently we have the advantage of great talents for export. The timid, parsimonious experiments our State Department have made have paid off handsomely. I refer to the tours of some of our great symphonies, the triumphal appearances abroad of the American folklore classic, Porgy and Bess, and yes, to the American jazz presentation of "Satchmo" Armstrong and his lusty hornblowers. I repeat that presently we have great talent for export. But the wells of great talent, particularly in the field of music, are fast drying up. Why? Because I am forced to admit reluctantly there is some merit to the Russian claim that we are a materialistic people bent on corraling a fast buck while we let our great heritage in the arts exist in a garret, and the garret, I fear, is about to be foreclosed by the United States Treasury unless the present tax policy is modified.

In spite of an outmoded, uneconomic Federal tax policy the hotel industry still is a large employer of musicians. If we are successful in abolishing or reducing substantially the 20 percent cabaret tax your industry will become a much larger employer of instrumentalists. It is from employment pools such as you create and maintain that great talents in music emerge, just as the sandlots of America supply the great stars of the baseball diamond.

Unless we can awaken the Federal Government to its responsibilities with respect to music and all of the cultural arts the vaunted "American way of life" will become a very dull and pallid export product indeed. Take the field of music alone:

While most occupational groups have enjoyed a great expansion of job opportunities since 1930, musicians have suffered a 40 percent job loss. There were enough jobs in 1930 to provide full-time work for 99,000 musicians. By 1954 there were full-time jobs for only 59,000. The instrumental musicians lost 20,000 man-years of work between 1930 and 1940 due to the advent of mechanical music. Since 1943 an additional 25,000 man-years of work has been lost in places subject to the 20 percent cabaret tax which you and I seek to abolish. Average earnings for instrumentalists in 1954 were $3,454. Little wonder the profession of music attracts fewer newcomers each succeeding year.

My concern for the shrinking field of music and musicians lies in the area of jazz and theater music as well as "longhair" or cultural instrumentation. I realize that we cannot continue to have great musicians in America unless we have great numbers of musicians gainfully employed. Nor can we continue to create a great American musical idiom of our own unless we encourage the dance and jazz musicians which you largely employ.

The one consoling aspect of this glum story of the decline of music in America is that the public is not to blame. Indeed, there are significant signs that public demand for good msic is beginning to tax the dwindling supply of skilled instrumentalists. Between 1945 and 1954 this public demand created new part-time jobs for some 7,500 players of symphonic music. Unfortunately, our major symphonies operate for an average season of only 22 weeks per year and the secondary orchestras average no more than 8 weeks a year. Although the major symphonies require the finest in musical talent and training, the minimum scale for instrumentalists of many years' training averages only $89.02 per week. No fond father is going to willingly consent to son John perpetuating his horn-blowing career in college unless the economics of professional musicianship improve.

As people in the hotel business many of you are acutely conscious of the importance of our natural resources as an attraction for tourists. As a Congressman, I have frequent occasions to vote upon bills devoted to the conservation of natural resources. It re-

minds me that there are more natural resources for us to be concerned about than our forests and our minerals and water supply. None of us in Congress or here in this room would willfully destroy valuable timber lands by lighting a forest fire. I see no reason why we should be less concerned about our cultural resources. The depletion of our musical profession is more insidious than a great forest fire because it takes place slowly and it doesn't throw up a great light. For this reason it is more difficult to fight. The reduction of the present cabaret tax, however, is as clear a bit of fire prevention as I can think of in this area of conservation, and I urge your support of our efforts in Congress to reduce this destructive bit of taxation.

American Music at Home and Abroad—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, while the American jazz musician is finding acceptance difficulties at home, his reception abroad has been overwhelmingly favorable. The tours undertaken by our outstanding artists, such as Louis Armstrong and Dizzy Gillespie, have been unqualified successes whether appearances were made in France and Italy or in Liberia and Indonesia.

Music is, of course, a medium that needs no translation from one language to another. It speaks to all who will listen in the same voice. Yet, I can think of no better way of making friends for the United States in other lands than by letting people overseas have an opportunity to hear exponents of a musical form which has grown and developed entirely on American soil.

To illustrate just how valuable our own music can be, I should like to include an article which appeared in the Saturday Review of July 14, 1956, entitled "Is Jazz Good Propaganda?—The Dizzy Gillespie Tour." The article was written by Marshall W. Stearns, one of America's leading authorities on the jazz idiom, who accompanied the band on its tour. The article follows:

IS JAZZ GOOD PROPAGANDA?—THE DIZZY GILLESPIE TOUR

(By Marshall W. Stearns)

During the past few years the number of jazzbands touring abroad has swollen mightily while stories of their incredible success have multiplied. Louis Armstrong, Stan Kenton, Lionel Hampton, Woody Herman, Count Basie, Jazz at the Philharmonic, and many others have racked up impressive scores. The demand is great and the profit considerable. But early last spring, through the international exchange program which is run by ANTA (American National Theatre and Academy), the State Department helped to send a jazzband abroad without thought of profit and to countries where no jazzband has ever played. The tour, which covered eight Middle Eastern and Balkan countries, lasted from approximately the middle of March to the middle of May, and I went along as a sort of combined artistic adviser, bandboy, and lecturer on jazz.

The idea was simply to make new friends for the United States, especially in those critical nations which Russia, at enormous expense, is flooding with free but strictly supervised talent. The American approach was different—a sort of do-it-yourself plan with emphasis upon free enterprise. The band did its own booking, with the help of the American Embassies and the United States Information Service, and the Government more or less guaranteed it against loss. The band was paid a reasonable minimum, no matter how financially successful the concerts might be, and no more. It was a sparkling new idea in the jazz world, and it worked out famously.

After careful consideration the musicians for the modern-styled Gillespie band were selected from those available. The group rehearsed for a month in New York a program which illustrated the history of jazz as well as the latest experimental music. They played Abadan, Dacca, Karachi, Beirut, Damascus, Aleppo, Ankara, Istanbul, Zagreb, Belgrade, and Athens. In some places the people had never heard of jazz—let alone Louis Armstrong ("Then I knew I had to work," moaned Gillespie), but the music was received with wild enthusiasm and the musicians were treated like heroes.

Why? On the surface, everybody—even the old folks—seemed to want to love jazz, even before they heard it. They definitely associated jazz with the cheerful, informal, and generous side of American life, and they were bowled over by its spontaneity and vitality. The stereotype notion that jazz is lowbrow never got in the way of their enjoyment. On the contrary, the folk origins of jazz were considered a high recommendation. "Jazz is fun," they said admiringly, and even respectable middle-aged citizens were transformed into rabid jazz fans in the course of one concert.

Beneath the surface, we bumped into more complicated reasons for this love of jazz. Our stay in Yugoslavia, where the Communist government has only recently permitted jazz, furnished the most illuminating evidence. In Belgrade and Zagreb we found some of the best jazzmen and most devoted fans. They knew the birthplace, age, and recordings of every member of the band, but they begged desperately for more recordings. A process involving several consecutive stages seemed to be at work: Yugoslav jazz musicians had been trying to leave the country for the United States—a dangerous move in their country—for many years; the jazz fans had been applying for American visas when we arrived. And the newly converted fans, young and old, were beginning to think the same way. Their admiration for the United States was unbounded.

What made them think this way? The concerts were a resounding success. In Zagreb the militia dumped members of the audience back into their seats when they tried to jump up on the stage during the concert, and they formed a cordon across the stage at the end of every performance to let the musicians escape from the admiring crowds. Even the militia seemed to enjoy the music. But one repeated observation by our most devoted fans furnished a clue: "You are all so unorganized," they said, "until the band begins to play."

Other episodes helped to fill in the picture. A minor incident occurred in Zagreb, where a member of the band toasted his local colleagues a little too thoroughly. The press might have used it to discredit the band, but when a well-known native journalist was asked if he would print the story, he replied, "Don't worry, after last night's concert I am a jazz fan first and a newspaperman second." He didn't bother to mention how his government might feel. That night a lady from a fine old family staged a jam session for some members of the band. "The local musicians got down on their knees and salaamed," says Ernet Perry. When the party broke up at dawn, Yugoslav jazzmen serenaded the Americans as they straggled back to their hotel. "What this country needs," the lady was heard to observe, "is fewer ambassadors and more jam sessions."

After some negotiations, the first lecture on jazz to be heard in the sacrosanct halls of the famous Zagreb Music Conservatory was arranged. An audience of 50 students and faculty members concentrated on every word—translated by an interpreter—with an intensity that was frightening. In the following discussion, the group agreed that jazz symbolized an element of unconscious protest which cut through the pretenses of tradition and authority. It spoke directly and truly of real life. Such honest discussion in a country known to be infested with secret police must have taken real courage and conviction. When we were leaving, trumpeter-arranger Quincy Jones remarked casually to a local musician that he hoped to see him someday in New York. The man burst into tears. "It is my dearest wish," he said, "but I haven't a chance."

Did the Gillespie tour create good will? There was no conscious attempt to do so. The musicians just had "a mighty fine time" being themselves and making friends with everyone who seemed interested. In Abadan, Bandboy Marion Frazer, who is a disk jockey back home, gave away two suits to a needy native. Later he didn't have a dark suit to wear to the dinner parties. Clarinetist Jimmy Powell found a local musician who had been using the same clarinet reed for a year. "I laid a couple of reeds on him and he almost cried," Powell recalls cheerfully, although he ran out of reeds himself in Athens. Quincy Jones bought a complete outfit for a sailor in the Pakistan Navy. "Why, he only got $1.50 a month," said Jones.

In Dacca, where there are no jukeboxes and few radios, the audiences didn't know how they were supposed to express their delight. They sat wide eyed on the edge of their chairs at the first concert, and applauded politely as if the noise might interfere with the strange and wonderful music. By the third concert, however, they were participating fully—clapping on the right beat, yelling, and whistling like any college crowd at home.

At the Shahbaugh Hotel, Gillespie set off a near riot by taking a flute-playing snake-charmer to his room for a duet. The management was flustered but Dizzy remained unmoved: "The man's a musician, isn't he?" You could hear the bellboys spreading the news outside the hotel. In Ankara, Gillespie produced another crisis. At an outdoor concert, sponsored by the Turkish-American Society, he noticed that a horde of ragamuffins had gathered outside the walls to hear him. Every now and then a youngster would sneak over, only to be thrown back by a cop. Dizzy forthwith announced that he would rather not perform unless everybody was admitted: "I came here to play for all the people." But the refreshments, he was told, were insufficient. Dizzy wasn't hungry. So the kids were admitted, the refreshments disappeared, and Gillespie played far into the night.

The impact went deep. In Karachi, Mrs. Lorraine Gillespie, who spent much of her time in the hotel room taking care of correspondence, gained the confidence of the chambermaid. The chambermaid had been hammered with tales of the terrible fate of dark-skinned people in the United States. She would bare her own arm, compare it with the similar shade of Mrs. Gillespie's, and jump back in wonder. "Are you ordered to come here and play? Do they really pay you? Is the trombone soloist, Melba Liston, really a woman or a man dressed like a woman? Are those white men in the orchestra or do they cover their faces with

chalk?" To the chambermaid, the jazzmen seemed like a gang of wealthy and eccentric capitalists and her conversion to capitalism was complete. The musicians hardly realized the close scrutiny they were receiving.

The austere Conservatory of Music in Ankara—a topnotch incubator of great Turkish musicians—was approached about a lecture on jazz. The dean replied hesitantly that he would rather have the lecture given someplace else because his students spent too much time with jazz anyway. So a well-received lecture was given in the political science auditorium. That evening, however, the dean went to the Gillespie concert. The next morning he phoned excitedly and begged for a lecture. "This is wonderful modern music," he said. Anyone who knew anything about jazz would have been an overwhelming success on that occasion, for the students were ecstatic and they insisted upon a 5-minute standing ovation.

Later, in Istanbul, the musicians noticed a pretty girl who attended every concert and sat in the front row. She turned out to be a famous ballerina who swore that she had sold her slippers in order to pay for the tickets. "This music can even make dance the seats in the hall," she said excitedly. An elderly Turk in charge of lighting backstage memorized the band numbers and was soon conducting the orchestra from the wings. He brought two bottles of Turkish cognac with him every night—with a vile concoction called Kola-Koka for a chaser—and wound up manipulating the lights and conducting from a sitting position. He referred to the orchestra as "his band."

The only thing that might be called trouble came from American tourists. Americans abroad seem to consider themselves automatic authorities on jazz by right of birth, and they would take it upon themselves to tell Gillespie either that he wasn't playing jazz or to request some tune such as "Deep in the Heart of Texas." Gillespie was patient and continued to astonish the members of his own band with new variations on his own tunes. At that, the band educated a few Americans. One wealthy dowager from Arizona, staying at the Hilton Hotel in Istanbul, was gently persuaded by one of the musicians with whom she had fraternized to attend a dinner dance. By midnight she was stationed in front of the band. "If I had been at home and not terribly upset in this foreign country," she boasted, "I never would have discovered jazz."

The acid test of jazz as an ambassador of good will came in Athens. We arrived just after the rioting, and anti-American feeling was real and intense. Although the band had been booked months in advance, newspaper editorials asked why the United States was sending jazz bands to Greece when they needed arms against Britain. The USIS Office had been stoned and there was a rumor that the Greek Government had suggested that the Gillespie tour might be postponed. New arrangements for rooms and transportation were impossible and the band flew into town to play a scheduled matinee for students only. They were the people, we were told, who had hurled the rocks.

The success of the concert was unbelievable. The Greek students danced in the aisles with the local gendarmes who were there to preserve order. They drowned out the large and powerful band, playing fortissimo, with a solid wall of applause. They chanted "Dizzy, Dizzy, Dizzy" over and over again. After the concert they carried Gillespie home on their shoulders. Traffic was stalled for a half hour and several blocks. Even the traffic cops danced in the streets. It was like a Greek Mardi gras. "Greek Students Lay Down Rocks and Roll With Diz," ran the headlines.

Backstage, members of the Russian folk dance troupe, which alternated with us at the same theater, were jitterbugging quietly, deadpan. We were told that they could not speak to anyone without permission and that their director locked them up every night. On the afternoon of the second concert, however, they came and sat in two rows near the front. During intermission, after the band had finished illustrating the history of jazz, several of them came backstage. They wanted to shake hands.

The spokesman for the group played accordion and looked just like a movie version of a commissar: chunky, determined, and grumpy. He let us know that the Gillespie band has "colossal technique and ensemble precision," but his expression told us that this was not enough. He wanted more "piano," meaning less volume, and more melody—in fact, the music lacked "sentimentality." Then he went back to his seat for the second half of the program when the band played its modern compositions. Gillespie even inserted some improvised phrases from "Ochy Chornia" in honor of the occasion.

The next time I saw the commissar he was rushing backstage at the end of the concert. I arrived in time to see him bow low from the waist, blow Gillespie a kiss, and speak his first word in English: "Master." Then came a barrage of questions: "How high does Dizzy go?" He was thunderstruck when I diagramed A-flat above high C. Impossible. "Was the phrase from 'Ochy Chornia' written out for Gillespie and was he commanded to play it?" He wouldn't believe me when I said "No," and pointed to my forehead to indicate that Gillespie had improvised it. When I added that the band would love to play in Moscow, he said that it would be a great success and clapped his hands to show me what would happen. At that point the frowns of his colleagues silenced him.

What are the lessons to be drawn from the Gillespie tour? There is the old one, of course, that many people in many lands and for many reasons enjoy jazz tremendously. But that is not all. People said to me, "We are sick to death of propaganda about democracy. We want deeds and people, not words and theories. We are convinced that you have many bathtubs, skyscrapers, and automobiles, but we have real doubts about your culture. Send us true examples."

At this point in the conversation the American of good will speaks anxiously about American opera, painting, theater, symphony, poetry, sculpture, and the novel. Great as they are, however, these arts were born in Europe and Europeans judge them by their own high standards. In a very real sense they are partly derivative and sometimes competing arts, not new contributions to the culture of the world.

It has never dawned upon Americans that many people in foreign lands consider jazz a new and impressive contribution to culture. It is the old story of finding the bluebird in your own garden. Thus the concrete example of one good jazz band may communicate more of the sincerity, joy, and vigor of the American way of life than several other American creations inspired by Europe. Jazz was born and grew up in the United States and nowhere else. As a European composer remarked to me, "Jazz is one of America's best-loved artistic exports."

Zirconium, Titanium Open Fresh New Industrial Vistas in Linn County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, new industrial vistas are opening in Linn County with the reactivation in Albany, Oreg., of the United States Bureau of Mines zirconium production facilities by the Wah Chang Corp. of New York. The newly formed Oregon Metallurgical Corp. plant is due to go into operation in August with 50 employees and will engage primarily in production of titanium and zirconium ingots and castings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Zirconium, Titanium Open Fresh New Industrial Vistas in Linn County," published in the monthly newsletter of the Oregon Development Commission, Progress in Oregon.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZIRCONIUM, TITANIUM OPEN FRESH NEW INDUSTRIAL VISTAS IN LINN COUNTY

Any reference to the Pacific slope as the Golden West is strictly old hat, as far as Albany's Chamber of Commerce Industrial Committee is concerned.

The metals that really count nowadays—to hear it from an Albany resident—are zirconium and titanium. The two are opening up a fresh industrial vista for the Linn County seat and environs.

TWO PLANTS INVOLVED

The Wah Chang Corp., of New York, has reactivated the United States Bureau of Mines zirconium production facilities at Albany and may eventually build a larger plant of its own.

The other local development tending to make Albany citizens metals-minded is the new operation of the new Oregon Metallurgical Corp.

The latter is due to go into operation in August. Its 50 employees will represent a monthly payroll of $25,000. They will be engaged primarily in production of titanium and zirconium ingots and castings. Their output also will include ingots of such rare (and dictionary busting) earth-metal alloys as tantalum, columbium and hafnium. The program will include extensive research.

Sixty percent of Oregon Metallurgical's stock is held by Eugene and Reedsport lumbermen and Albany residents. Dale Fischer, Eugene, is president, and S. M. Shelton, Albany, vice president and general manager, of the undertaking which was formed only this year with an authorized initial issue of 1 million shares of $1 par value stock.

The Wah Chang Corp., established in New York 42 years ago, is recognized as one of the world's foremost manufacturers and fabricators of tungsten. It maintains large reduction and fabricating plants at Glencove, N. Y., and Union City, N. J., and tungsten mines in this country and abroad.

Since 1949 Wah Chang engineers have been conducting research on the so-called rare metals for the purpose of determining their commercial feasibility. As a direct result of this exploration, the company entered into agreements with the Federal Government to operate United States Bureau of Mines properties at Albany, and Boulder City, Nev.

Under its contract with the United States Atomic Energy Commission, Wah Chang will produce approximately 300,000 pounds of high-purity zirconium sponge annually at the Albany plant for at least 2 years.

NEW FACILITY POSSIBLE

In the event of increased commercial demand and a contract extension, the corporation would construct a larger plant of its own in Linn County. The Albany layout employs 130 at present, and the general manager there and at Boulder City is Stephen Yeh. James McClain, former Albany Bureau of Mines production engineer, is

plant superintendent for the Oregon operation which employs 4 ex-Government engineers, in all, and more than 60 percent of the production crew of the one-time Federal plant.

Timber

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, when an arrow, swift in flight, "hits ye mark," the shaft may very well have been cut from Port Orford cedar found on the Oregon coast. The cedar from which these arrows come, interestingly enough, represents in part a salvage operation that is significant from the standpoint of both economy and conservation. The story of it all, Mr. President, is told by Roy Hoff in the July 1956 issue of Archery. I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Appendix of the RECORD this article from the July issue of Archery.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIMBER

(By Roy Hoff)

McKinney "scooped" me when he wrote the text for his last month's ad. But there were a few details he overlooked.

After hearing a considerable number of stories regarding the Port Orford cedar shortage in southwestern Oregon, we decided to take a run up to McKinney's bailiwick and take a look-see for ourselves. What we learned was very interesting to us, and I hope it will be to you.

Supposing you and I have decided we want to go primitive and make up our arrows from "scratch." Where would we go to find some Port Orford cedar, and how would we know it was Port Orford when and if we did find it? We'd first have to go to southwestern Oregon, because that's the only place in this country where this species of cedar grows. Upon arrival, the first thing we'd have to do would be to find some cedar, then determine if it were red, white, or Port Orford. Southwestern Oregon covers a huge area, and we might drive for days before we found what we were looking for. During our recent trip to Oregon we didn't have to follow this procedure because we had a very competent guide in M. L. McKinney, one of the early pioneers in the Port Orford cedar-cutting industry, who spent considerable time taking us back into the woods so we could see for ourselves what goes on in the cedar business.

Early one morning, "Mac" hitched up his pickup and we drove from his home in Oakland, Oreg., to Coquille, a distance of about 40 miles. On the way I asked many questions in regard to the species of trees in this heavily wooded area and wondered how come we didn't stop to examine some Port Orford. Mac explained that most of southern Oregon's forests consist of Douglas-fir, and that Port Orford cedar is found only in certain spots. He pointed out that there was no explainable reason why Port Orford could not be found most anyplace, as it has often been transplanted in other areas and always seems to flourish.

Shortly after we had passed through Coquille, we turned onto a dirt road which wound its way deep into the forest and to an elevation of several thousand feet. After about an hour of bouncing and sliding over this rough, rutted, and muddy logging road, Mac stopped the truck near a recently logged-over area.

"See those tall, barkless, white, skinny, pointed-tip snags over there," Mac suggested, pointing his finger at some long-ago-fire-killed snags in the distance. "Well, that's Port Orford cedar which has been left by the loggers as being of no value."

We got out of the truck. Mac took his double-bitted ax and we started a trek toward the snags. When we reached the first one he chopped a chip out of the side of it and held it out to me. "Smell, it," he said, "there's no mistaking the odor of Port Orford cedar." I agreed with him, for this chip smelled just like your arrow shaft when it is fractured.

After we had tramped a couple of hundred yards farther, Mac stopped in the middle of scattered slash and explained: "Here's a dandy." I took one look at what resembled a log, and the thought occurred to me that Mac perhaps should have his head examined. "A dandy," he says. What I was looking at wouldn't even make a good stovewood. This deadfall had been lying there for perhaps a hundred years, all moth-eaten and covered with moss. Mac chopped away about 2 inches of the moth-eaten part which he pointed out was formerly the sap wood, and then split off a sliver a couple of feet long and an inch thick. To my astonishment, the heart of that old log was absolutely perfect, straight grained and without a blemish of any kind.

We spent a fascinating 2 hours on that mountain. It was much like prospecting for precious metals. You never could tell what you'd find just beyond the next rise. We'd sometimes spot what looked like a bonanza of Port Orford only to find, after testing, that it was some other kind of cedar, worthless insofar as material for arrow shafts.

When we returned to the truck I asked Mac, "How come you haven't purchased this tract?" His answer was, "I already have, and as soon as this rain stops, we're going to start cutting."

"How many cords would you estimate can be taken from this tract?" I asked.

"About 50 cords," said Mac.

"Well, that should just about last you for a year," I suggested.

Mac looked at me in disgust and said, "You're kiddin', I presume. Why that's not much more than a 6 weeks' supply. We need a minimum of 300 cords a year to supply the demand for arrow shafts."

Mac explained that this tract was one of those lucky finds, a tract owned by private interests who, after having logged the valuable fir, are willing and eager to pick up some extra money for what, to them, is worthless down timber or fire-killed snags. Mac continued:

"See those white snags on that mountain? (Approximately 2 miles distant.) I estimate there are 100 cords in that stand, but I can't buy it."

"How come?" I queried.

"Well, that section is owned by the Wilson Box Co. (a tremendous big plywood manufacturer) and they won't even listen to a sale. They explain that in their holdings in that area, and adjacent to this stand of Port Orford, are millions of board feet of grade A fir, and they're not taking any chances on some small outfit going in there and causing a fire which would wipe them out."

This explained one of the headaches the cedar-cutters have to suffer. The cedar is there, but you can't buy it.

We then cranked up the truck and drove to another area. We drove to the end of the road, then hiked to the top of a ridge for a better view. Mac pointed out two stands of fire-killed timber and explained that he had spotted this from the air during one of his exploration trips in his private plane. After he had discovered this spot and located it on the map, he reported it to the Forest Service and asked to buy it. Incidentally, to locate a plot of forest land, you must first survey it from the nearest section line marker post. The Forest Service, as requested, put it up for sale, but there was a slight hitch. They offered it for sale to the highest bidder, and all were sealed bids. As a result, another guy got the land and all Mac got for the discovery, research, and survey was a lot of good exercise.

After that experience Mac got a little more cagey, and when he'd locate a stand of timber he'd go to the Forest Service, ask to buy it and try to persuade them to do the surveying and mapping. The Forest Service's answer to this was that it was impossible; that they did not have the funds nor the manpower to do this work.

Summing up our experiences in the cedar area, I'd say there is definitely a shortage of down and fire-killed Port Orford cedar, regardless of who owns it, private parties or the big lumber interests. If all the known Port Orford were heaped in one pile and made available to the dowel manufacturers, I'd venture to say that it would all be gone in 5 years, 10 at the most.

But, all is not lost. There are many fine stands of green cedar, and available to the cedar-cutters. Of course, this is an unexplored field, but one which the cedar men must take cognizance of and immediately start experimentation and development.

The recent hassle with the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, emanating from McKinney's article in Archery magazine and his appeal to you fellows to write your Congressmen, has done a lot of good. As a result, the Forest Service promised to put up 500 cords of Port Orford cedar for sale this year. And they have kept their promise. I have just received a Notice of Timber Sale Prospectus from the United States Forest Service. Though most of it is Greek to me, some of it seems significant. For one thing, there will be no tracts sold under sealed bids; all will be sold by oral auction to the highest bidder. Provided, however, that no one may enter a bid in the oral auction who has not first submitted a sealed bid, together with a deposit to show good faith. Five different tracts will be placed on the auction block. These tracts vary in size from 37,000 board-feet to 60,000. The Forest Service figures there are 2 cords per 1,000 board-feet. McKinney tells me it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get that many cords of usable arrow wood stock out of 1,000 board-feet. Here is an example of a parcel which is up for sale:

"Tract 1, section 22, Eden Valley: A sale consisting mainly of live green Port Orford cedar, primarily suited for use as arrow wood. All trees live, dead, or windfall which are to be cut are marked. Located in South Fork Coquille River drainage. Area approximately 3 acres * * *. Conditions of sale: All equipment will be restricted to the South Fork Coquille Road. Falling and bucking will be conducted in a manner which will allow all logs to be yarded from the road. Operator shall not block the South Fork Coquille Road to traffic."

McKinney is wondering how the cedar cutters are going to yard from a heavily traveled road without blocking it. Well, that's his department. I'm sure I wouldn't know.

In this prospectus every sale is subject to $4 per thousand board-feet to pay the cost of slash disposal. Here is a new development which is hard to understand. In the past, the charge for slash disposal on arrow wood has been 25 cents per cord, and 25 cents per 1,000 board-feet on merchantable timber. The cedar men are wondering what caused the terrific jump in this cost. From what I observed, there shouldn't be any slash disposal cost for salvaging down and fire-killed cedar. After an area has been logged for fir timber, all slash has been disposed of, even though down cedar is still left. So, when the cedar cutters get through there remains much less of a fire hazard than when they started.

Here is something interesting: On tract 1, which is green cedar, the least acceptable bid is $17 per thousand board feet. In tract 4, down and dead cedar, the least acceptable bid is $20 per thousand. In other words, the Forest Service believes that old dead stuff is worth more than brand new. I'd hesitate to say they were wrong in taking this stand, but it doesn't sound right.

In reminiscing, McKinney tells of the early days in cedar cutting. How, when he found a stand of snags or down timber, all he had to do was ask the Forest Ranger for permission to take it out. He not only received permission to salvage the timber but was commended for cleaning up the forests and reducing the fire hazard.

At McKinney's factory in Oakland, Oreg., it was fascinating to watch cedar bolts go in one door and come out another in the finished dowel. A giant circular saw cuts the bolts, with the grain, into half-inch slabs. They are then "gang-sawed" into squares ready for the doweling machine. This machine is automatic. An armful of squares are placed in a hopper and automatically feed into the dowler. An attendant never gives it more than an occasional glance to see if the hopper needs refilling. The high speed cutters make the dowel as smooth as glass. Incidentally, this machine runs constantly two shifts a day.

You may not believe it, but figures I have at hand show there are more than 25,000 dozen arrows manufactured and sold each day by the tackle makers.

Tribute to Hon. Brady Gentry

SPEECH
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to frame all of one's feelings toward another in words. Insofar as I am able, however, I want to pay my tribute to a true statesman, BRADY GENTRY. The accolade of statesman is richly deserved in this instance, and though I wish this occasion had not arisen, I relish the opportunity to pay this highest compliment of all to a fellow Congressman.

It is difficult, as we all know, not to bow at times to political expediency. BRADY GENTRY has never given way at any time, to my knowledge, to political expediency. I know this as a fact because I have been fortunate enough to work with him on two subcommittees of the Public Works Committee. Our efforts there plus work in the House, where our attendance records parallel each other, has permitted such frequent association that I know BRADY'S voting record and the principles underlying this record. He is a gentleman, scholar, and statesman of the old school. Old-fashioned in the sense that he epitomizes the abiding principles that do not change, being honest, sincere, straightforward, conscientious, and hard-working beyond question.

BRADY GENTRY'S departure from Congress is a great loss to our country. His voluntary withdrawal, while in keeping with his ideology, is very disappointing to his friends, including myself.

I recognize in BRADY a kinship of belief that goes far beyond and transcends party politics, and for this reason I admire and esteem him, and value his friendship. Only in Congress can such a relationship exist between men, I suppose. The politics, conflicting pressures, demanding decisions, and ceaseless round of work—all create a way of life in which each man is tested and tests his fellow Congressmen in a way that builds a different relationship than I have ever previously experienced. In this congressional world, my association with BRADY GENTRY has been a rewarding experience, for I have seen reflected in him and in his conduct the principles in which I believe. BRADY, you will be missed in Congress.

While I might attempt to say much more, probably little could be added where words somehow seem inadequate. I simply wish BRADY Godspeed and happiness in the days ahead and that his continued success reflect the rewards he so richly deserves. When I leave this Congress, I would like others to feel about me the respect which I feel for BRADY GENTRY.

Fundamental Differences Between the Democratic and Republican Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following in the RECORD.

Before this 84th Congress fades into history, before we go home to account for our stewardships and begin our campaigns, I should like to say that never before have I felt so proud to be a Democrat.

For the accomplishments of this 84th Congress are Democratic—not Republican—accomplishments; and the failures of this 84th Congress are Republican—not Democratic—failures.

I am, of course, partisan. Yet all Democrats are partisan—consistently partisan—in their beliefs. For Democrats are consistently partisan to people, and to the things people need for richer, happier, healthier lives.

But the distinction between this Nation's two major parties is far greater than a simple matter of consistency.

The Republican Party is the party of property values.

The Democratic Party is the party of human values.

And no matter where you encounter the members of one party or the other—whether at the local, State, or National levels—you will find this same sharp cleavage, this same basic difference in approach to government.

I feel that I am in a particularly good position to make the comparison, for I not only served in the Senate of Pennsylvania under four Republican governors, but I just recently served in my State's senate under a Democratic governor.

The comparison is as stark as the difference between day and night.

If I ever had illlusions about the Republican Party—and it must have been long ago since I do not recall them—I have none now.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you this: Reaction is reaction wherever you find it. There is only a difference of degree between the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association and the National Association of Manufacturers; there is only a difference of degree between reactionary government in Harrisburg and reactionary Government in Washington.

At long last Pennsylvania has a Democratic governor in George M. Leader. And in the short year and a half since his inauguration, our Commonwealth has taken giant strides into the 20th century.

Governor Leader took office with a positive, constructive, forward-looking program. He wanted to put unemployed men and women back to work; he wanted to ease the plight of the mentally ill, which was scandalous; he wanted to rebuild Pennsylvania's school system and, especially, to lend a hand to his State's crippled, retarded, and otherwise handicapped children.

He has done these things and more. But he had to do it the hard way, because a Republican-controlled senate booby-trapped every inch of the road toward humane accomplishment.

Among other things, Mr. Speaker, Governor Leader concerned himself and his administration with the problem of the totally disabled worker. Why, he wondered, should a totally disabled man be disqualified for workmen's compensation after a prescribed period of time? Should a disabled worker be forced to beg until 65, when he would be eligible for social security?

Mr. Speaker, Pennsylvania now has a revised workmen's compensation law. It is among the best in the Nation, and it provides—among other things— that a totally disabled worker will henceforth receive compensation as long as he lives.

Such legislation has been overdue since 1800. Certainly it poses no moral or ethical problem to anyone who believes in decency or fairness.

Yet in 1955 the Republican senate in Pennsylvania fought tooth and nail to keep that law from passing. Big business opposed it, you see, and big business calls the shots for Pennsylvania's Republican Party just as big business calls the

shots for the Republicans right here in Congress.

Governor Leader got the workmen's compensation law he wanted by going to the people. The people spoke—and in no uncertain terms, for human beings think in terms of humanity, and not in terms of profit and loss statements.

I mention this one law passed in Harrisburg because the Democratic Party in Washington has long fought to give the totally disabled worker his social security at the age of 50.

We have finally won that fight, but only by the hardest effort.

President Eisenhower opposed it, and expressed his administration's opposition through Marion Folsom, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Folsom, testifying against the amendment said:

> We should be careful not to take any step which might reduce the incentive for rehabilitation.

Now if a disabled worker has been certified by doctors as permanently disabled, what, in the name of all that's holy, are his chances for rehabilitation? Does medical opinion have no validity?

The point is timely, Mr. Speaker, for no administration in this country's history has ever set more store by medical opinion, has ever claimed for the physician the infallible powers of the oracle.

And while we are on the subject of social security, what of the amendment which reduced, from 65 to 62, the age at which a woman can retire? The Democratic Party passed that amendment, Mr. Speaker, and President Eisenhower's Republican stalwarts fought it all the way.

Mr. Folsom had something to say about that amendment too.

> Such a change—
>
> He pontificated—
>
> would actually be a disservice to many thousands of older women by reducing their opportunities for employment.

Does it take a degree in sociology to know that a woman's chance of getting a job at 62 is one in a million?

Ask the working women of America how easy it is to find work at 52, or even at 42. They know how to answer Mr. Folsom.

Yet, Mr. Folsom's pious nonsense is not surprising. Unless, of course, we are still capable of being surprised at Republican thought processes. For Mr. Folsom is simply expressing what his party believes, and what the President believes.

But let us continue our parallel between Harrisburg, Pa., and Washington, D. C. Let us discuss taxes.

When the Democrats took office, we Pennsylvanians inherited a financial mess that beggars description. We also inherited a tax dear to the Republican heart—a tax absolutely guaranteed to milk the many and spare the few. For the reverse-English Robin Hoods of the Republican Party had placed a sales tax on the people of Pennsylvania.

The Governor took it off, pointing out its unfairness, and asked for a tax based upon a person's ability to pay. Specifically, he requested a classified income tax.

The Republican Party would have none of it, and months dragged on. Governor Leader proposed a manufacturer's excise tax. The GOP, ever alert to the dictates of big business, killed it. Governor Leader offered a compromise proposal in desperation. The answer was still "No."

To make a long story short, Governor Leader—the Republican pistol at his back—was finally forced to swallow another sales tax. It was that or nothing, said the GOP, and either the Governor would or the Commonwealth could go broke.

I should like to remind the House, however, that Pennsylvania's Senators of the Republican Party were merely taking their cue from the Republicans of the 83d Congress, whose view of taxation was identical.

All of us, I think, remember that tax-relief bill.

What a bill it was. It filled every Republican heart with nostalgia for the good old days of Andrew Mellon.

Some $7.4 billion was slashed. And what happened to each tax-relief dollar? The corporation got 73 cents; families earning more than $5,000 a year got 18 cents; and families earning less than $5,000 got 9 cents.

Working mothers got less than a nickel. Families with heavy medical expenses got less than a dime. In other words, 80 percent of the people got only 9 percent of the tax relief.

Yet when the Democrats tried to correct the unfairness of the 1954 tax bill by giving every taxpayer a $20 tax cut, the Republican Party called them irresponsible.

How long can this Republican double-talk go on? Does the GOP think the American people will mistake the word for the deed indefinitely? Does President Eisenhower's administration believe that the ever-widening gap between promise and performance will go unnoticed?

One last example, Mr. Speaker.

In Pennsylvania, a Democratic administration has just passed the most extraordinary school-construction program in Commonwealth history. It makes available $500 million for new building.

Here in Congress we have just seen a Federal school-construction bill go down the drain—thanks to the Republican Party.

No one will argue with the critical need for schools in every 1 of these 48 States.

Yet, despite the President's specific request for the school bill, his own party preferred to sabotage the future schooling of future citizens by voting against it.

Why, the Powell amendment, to deny aid to any State where segregation exists, was supported by 148 members of the Republican Party. Would it not be reasonable to expect that, having voted for the Powell amendment, all 148 would vote for the entire school-construction bill?

They did not, of course. Of those 148 Republicans, 96 voted against the bill in its final version, thus killing it for this session. Their reason is plain: They expect to tell their Negro constituents that they supported the Powell amendment in their campaigning this fall.

In all of my political experience, Mr. Speaker, I have never encountered a lower brand of politics nor a more sickening instance of hypocrisy.

Yet, this being an election year, every Republican who seeks reelection will declare that he likes Ike, will claim that he has followed him faithfully, will insist that he and Ike both think alike—and that both of them are rock-ribbed liberals.

It happened 4 years ago, and it will happen again.

From the drab, dreary cocoons of reaction will crawl the Republican butterflies of liberalism—to flutter briefly across the political landscape and die conveniently on November 6.

But I do not think they will dazzle the voters again.

Yet we must expect them to try. And make no mistake about it: They will try their best to fool the people once more.

Tambourines will rattle and bass drums will boom; radio, television, and the press—primed with advertising dollars—will sound the jamboree; and the techniques of revival tent and medicine show will once more be used to paddle the snake-oil liberalism of the Republican Party in an election year.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, is to becloud the issues. For if the issues are sufficiently smogbound, they think, all a candidate will have to do is say the magic works: "I like Ike."

But does the Republican Party really like Ike?

I say it does not—except in an election year. They will follow him merrily to the polls, but not one step further.

As a military man, General Eisenhower must realize that the possibilities of maneuver are limited when the awkward squad you command disobeys any order but "squads right."

And the Republican Party, Mr. Speaker, turns to the right just as inexorably as a compass needle turns north.

So where is this vaunted Eisenhower leadership? It ended, I think with World War II. Nor is the President entirely to blame.

For you cannot lead Republicans unless you carry the Dun and Bradstreet seal of approval.

I think that the voters know that now.

I do not think that they will forget the lesson quickly despite all the ballyhoo the GOP will generate.

I think that this will be an election in which the issues will determine the results.

And speaking as a member of the Democratic Party, I think the issues tell the story.

I think the record speaks for itself.

It is a Democratic record of man's responsibility to man.

Congressman Young Supports Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in 1955 there were more new businesses incorporated than in any previous year in the Nation's history.

At the present time there are 4,225,000 business units, one-third more than in 1939. Of these, more than 98 percent are small-business units.

In 1939 there were 14,768 failures.

In 1955 there were 10,969 failures—more than 3,700 fewer than in 1939, although there were about a million more businesses in existence.

Since 1900 the average failures per 10,000 units of business number 70. The rate of failures in 1955 was 41.6 per 10,000 units of business—which is the lowest rate of failures during any normal year.

More important than the figures and percentages is the knowledge that the Nation's business community is healthy, that it is more prosperous than ever before, and that it is growing faster than ever before.

Wage earners have more to spend, inflation has been stopped, more people are working. There is a new confidence among the business community because the Eisenhower administration has demonstrated its confidence in the American system of rewarding enterprise.

As a member of the Eisenhower team, I am extremely pleased to see these results. Small business is the foundation of the American way of life. As long as a man with good ideas and hard work can create an enterprise and be proportionately rewarded for his effort, we can be sure of a dynamic and lasting democracy.

Critics of President Eisenhower's administration have called it a businessman's administration. It would be more accurate to say it is a businesslike administration and that is why more people than ever before are enjoying peace and prosperity.

Republicans have balanced the national budget. Inflation has been stopped. You can plan your business operations with more reliability.

Under President Eisenhower we have created the first peacetime agency exclusively devoted to small-business needs.

We have provided a larger share of defense contracts for small firms—25 percent and 22 percent of military prime contracts in fiscal 1954 and 1955, compared to 21 percent, 17 percent, and 16 percent in 1950, 1951, and 1952.

Wage, price, and materials controls have been removed.

The excess-profits tax was ended, new depreciation rules voted to foster expansion.

In the past 3 years under President Eisenhower, there has been a 27 percent rise in gross private investment, reflecting the new climate of encouragement to personal incentive and enterprise.

We have systematically inventoried Government commercial activities; sold or terminated many of them; and are steadily withdrawing from others—until hampered by the present Democratic-controlled Congress.

In Nevada we have felt the impact of the expansion in residential building.

We will feel even more the new Federal highway program, which will create many new opportunities for business within our State.

As the Congressman from Nevada, I have worked to bring proper industry to our State. We are on the threshold of our greatest growth. The national climate will undoubtedly have its effect upon our efforts here in Nevada.

Continuation of the record prosperity we now enjoy throughout the Nation will mean more prosperous times in Nevada.

Voting and Attendance Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 2d session of the 84th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

It will be noted that there were 132 rollcalls and my attendance record was 100 percent.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Quorum call	Present.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780. To amend the Internal Revenue Code to exempt farmers from paying the Federal excise tax for gasoline used on their farms. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yes.
4	...do	H. R. 8796. To provide $275,000 for expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 386 to 1.)	Yes.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993. To authorize the construction of 23 new naval ships and the modernization of 23 vessels at an estimated cost of $1,414,662,000. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yes.
6	Feb. 2	Quorum call	Present.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396. To disapprove the sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant, Plancor 980 (rubber-producing facility). (Defeated 61 to 309.)	No.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710. To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947	Yes.
9	Feb. 28	Quorum call	Present.
10	...do	H. Res. 311. To provide 4 hours of debate on H. R. 3383, to authorize construction of the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 354 to 26.)	Yes.
11	...do	Quorum call	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Quorum call	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
14	...do	H. R. 3383. To authorize the construction and operation of the Colorado River storage project. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Yes.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739. An amendment to delete language authorizing 11 supergrade positions for the General Services Administration. (Defeated 150 to 229.)	No.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166. To suspend rules and pass the bill to extend to Apr. 1, 1957, the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates. (Passed 366 to 4.)	Yes.
17	Mar. 20	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Quorum call	Present.
19	...do	H. R. 8320. To adopt the conference report on the bill extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956. (Defeated 195 to 215.)	No.
20	...do	H. R. 8320. To increase by $10 million the funds available for a school-milk program this year, and to extend and expand this program for next 2 years, and to extend and expand the brucellosis-eradication program for 2 years. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yes.
21	...do	S. 1271. To recommit to Committee on Armed Services the bill to authorize appointment of 2 retired military personnel to civilian positions in Department of Justice. (Defeated 80 to 310.)	No.
22	Apr. 11	Quorum call	Present.
23	...do	H. R. 12. To recommit the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956 to the committee of conference with instruction to alter the bill. (Defeated 181 to 238.)	Yes.
24	...do	H. R. 12. To adopt the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956. (Passed 237 to 181.)	No.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yes.
26	Apr. 18	Quorum call	Present.
27	...do	H. R. 12. To override the Presidential veto of the Agricultural Act of 1956. (Defeated 202 to 241, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
28	Apr. 23	H. R. 7228. To amend the act authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Potomac River near Jones Point, Va., by transferring responsibility from the Interior to the Commerce Department and altering the design of the bridge. (Passed 282 to 8.)	Yes.
29	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
30	...do	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
31	Apr. 24	Quorum call	Present.
32	do	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 25	Quorum call	Present.
34	do	H. R. 10721. An amendment to appropriation bill for Departments of State and Justice fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration Service. (Defeated 174 to 184.)	No.
35	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
36	do	H. R. 10660. To adopt the Federal Highway and Revenue Acts of 1956. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yes.
37	May 2	Quorum call	Present.
38	May 3	Quorum call	Present.
39	do	H. R. 10875. To adopt an amendment to earmark $50 million for payments for reduction of grazing land for 1956–59. (Passed 199 to 195.)	No.
40	do	H. R. 10875. To adopt an amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price of upland cotton. (Defeated 186 to 208.)	No.
41	do	H. R. 10875. To recommit the bill for incorporation of provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Defeated 184 to 211.)	Yes.
42	do	H. R. 10875. To enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). (Passed 314 to 78.)	Present.
43	May 9	Quorum call	Present.
44	do	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 10	Quorum call	Present.
46	do	H. R. 10986. To delete sec. 633 which would require congressional approval of disposal by the Department of Defense of business-type operations which can be handled by private enterprise. (Passed 222 to 156.)	Yes.
47	do	H. R. 10986. To approve the bill for Department of Defense appropriations for fiscal 1957 totaling $33.63 billion. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yes.
48	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
49	do	Quorum call	Present.
50	May 17	H. R. 8901. To recommit to committee the bill which would provide for restoration of a franchise to Capital Transit Co. with several charter revisions. (Defeated 161 to 172.)	Yes.
51	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
52	do	H. R. 11124. To suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges. (Passed 237 to 52.)	Yes.
53	May 22	H. R. 11319. To amend the public works appropriation bill to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Passed 174 to 148.)	No.
54	May 23	H. R. 10875. To adopt the conference report on the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). (Passed 304 to 59.)	Yes.
55	May 24	S. J. Res. 135. To adopt the conference report providing payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River Basin project. (Passed 176 to 126.)	No.
56	May 31	H. R. 10285. To enact the Farm Credit Act of 1956. (Passed 246 to 4.)	Yes.
57	June 6	Quorum call	Present.
58	do	Quorum call	Present.
59	June 7	Quorum call	Present.
60	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
61	do	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
63	do	H. R. 11356. To extend the mutual security program for 1 year and authorize an appropriation of $3,563,475,000. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yes.
64	do	Quorum call	Present.
65	do	H. R. 1804 (also H. R. 11). To strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. (Passed 393 to 3.)	Yes.
66	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
67	do	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	Quorum call	Present.
69	June 13	H. R. 5881. To recommit the conference report on the bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. (Defeated 179 to 209.)	Yes.
70	do	H. R. 4090. To recommit to committee for certain alterations the bill which would require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector of United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators. (Defeated 151 to 228.)	Yes.
71	do	H. R. 9540. To recommit to the committee in order to delete section 6, which provides Federal grants for construction, from the Water Pollution Control Act. (Defeated 165 to 213.)	Yes.
72	do	H. R. 9540. To pass the Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yes.
73	June 20	Quorum call	Present.
74	June 25	Quorum call	Present.
75	do	S. 3295. To extend daylight saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yes.
76	June 27	Quorum call	Present.
77	do	H. R. 7886. To recommit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs the bill to liberalize the non-service-connected pension awards for certain World War I veterans. (Defeated 110 to 305.)	Yes.
78	do	H. R. 7886. To pass the bill to liberalize the basis for and extend the monthly rates of non-service-connected pension awards for certain World War I veterans. (Passed 364 to 51.)	No.
79	June 28	Quorum call	Present.
80	do	Quorum call	Present.
81	do	H. R. 9852. To adopt the conference report extending provisions of the Defense Production Act and including a requirement that the procurement of goods and services be dispersed geographically. (Passed 200 to 197.)	No.
82	do	H. Res. 554. To adopt a rule providing for 6 hours of debate on H. R. 7535 to provide for Federal aid for school construction. (Passed 327 to 7.)	Yes.
83	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
84	do	Quorum call	Present.
85	July 2	H. R. 9801. To suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa. (Passed 325 to 59.)	Yes.
86	do	S. 2379. To suspend the rules and pass the bill to promote the fishing industry by providing for the training of needed personnel. (Defeated 133 to 254, a ⅔ vote being necessary.)	No.
87	July 3	Quorum call	Present.
88	July 5	Quorum call	Present.
89	do	H. R. 7535. To amend the bill for Federal aid to school construction by allowing States to retain 1 percent of their Federal income taxes for school construction. (Defeated 168 to 250.)	No.
90	do	H. R. 7535. To amend the school bill to provide that no Federal funds should be allotted to any State which fails to comply with decisions of the Supreme Court. (Passed 225 to 192.)	Yes.
91	do	H. R. 7535. To recommit the school bill in order to change the formula for distribution of Federal funds so to consider need and demonstrated effort of the States. (Defeated 158 to 262.)	Yes.
92	do	H. R. 7535. To pass the bill for Federal aid for school construction. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	No.
93	July 6	Quorum call	Present.
94	do	H. R. 11380. To pass the bill readjusting postal rates. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Yes.
95	July 9	H. R. 9893. To recommit the conference report on the military construction bill in order to substitute Kalkaska for Manistee as the site for airbase in northern Michigan. (Defeated 29 to 343.)	Yes.
96	do	H. R. 11967. To pass the bill reactivating the National Memorial Stadium Commission and designating a site for the stadium. (Passed 287 to 80.)	No.
97	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	H. R. 12130. To pass the mutual security appropriation bill. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yes.
99	July 12	H. Res. 584. To approve a rule providing for the consideration of the supplemental appropriation bill and waiving all points of order. (Passed 361 to 30.)	Yes.
100	do	H. R. 12138. To recommit to committee the supplemental appropriations bill to strike out $14,325,000 for the Jones Point Bridge. (Defeated 24 to 370.)	No.
101	do	H. R. 12038. To pass the bill to provide for a 10-percent increase in service-connected disability compensation for veterans. (Passed 391 to 0.)	Yes.
102	July 17	Quorum call	Present.
103	July 18	H. Con. Res. 265. To adopt the resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the U. N. (Passed 391 to 0.)	Yes.
104	do	H. R. 11708. To amend the Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of title I of the act. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yes.
105	July 19	Quorum call	Present.
106	do	On motion to lay on table motion to dispense with further proceedings under call (Yes vote would permit filibuster). (Defeated 104 to 290.)	No.
107	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
108	July 21	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR., 5th District of Michigan, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
109	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
110	...do	H. R. 627. To recommit civil-rights bill to Committee on the Judiciary	No.
111	...do	H. R. 627. To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights within United States jurisdiction. (Passed 279 to 126)	Yes.
112	...do	S. 1644. To suspend rules and pass bill prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. (Defeated 245 to 145, ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Yes.
113	...do	H. R. 12227. Motion to suspend rules and pass H. R. 12227 to provide a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool and hair. (Defeated 216 to 123, ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Yes.
114	July 24	Quorum call	Present.
115	...do	H. R. 7992. A bill to enact into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Appropriations Act. (Passed 201 to 185.)	No.
116	...do	H. R. 12061. On motion to strike out enacting clause on bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program. (Defeated 195 to 199.)	Yes.
117	...do	H. R. 12061. On motion to recommit bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program. (Passed 203 to 191.)	Yes.
118	July 25	Quorum call	Present.
119	...do	H. Res. 618. An amendment to the rule providing for offering an amendment to H. R. 11742 (housing bill). (Defeated 92 to 299.)	No.
120	...do	To adopt 8 resolutions citing witnesses for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before Committee on Un-American Activities. (Passed 373 to 9.)	Yes.
121	July 26	Quorum call	Present.
122	...do	Quorum call	Present.
123	...do	H. Res. 641. On rule to provide for consideration of and 2 hours of debate on H. R. 412, to authorize construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project. (Defeated 179 to 194.)	Yes.
124	...do	H. Res. 602. On agreeing to resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8002, a bill to amend Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. (Defeated 184 to 178.)	No.
125	...do	H. R. 8002. On motion to recommit relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from sale or other disposition of certain property (Civil Aeronautics Act). (Passed 196 to 153.)	Yes.
126	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
127	...do	H. Res. 625. To adopt resolution providing consideration of S. 3338, a bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. (Passed 219 to 126.)	No.
128	...do	S. 3338. On passage of bill relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. (Passed 201 to 140.)	No.
129	...do	Quorum call	Present.
130	...do	Quorum call	Present.
131	...do	H. Res. 604. On resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7850, a bill to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance of Little Wood River reclamation project. (Passed 173 to 168.)	Yes.
132	...do	Quorum call	Present.

Sara Little Wins $50 Savings Bond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the winning essay by Mrs. Sara Little, of Newport, Wash., in a contest sponsored by the Pacific Northwest Ruralite, official monthly periodical of the rural electric cooperatives in my home region. The Ruralite is edited at Portland, Oreg., by Henry Alderman, former official of the Bonneville Power Administration.

The essay by Mrs. Little answers some of the misleading advertisements recently placed by private power companies, at vast expense, in an effort to prevent full Federal development of the great hydroelectric and flood-control site at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SARA LITTLE WINS $50 SAVINGS BOND

The response to Ruralite's offer of a $50 savings bond for the best letter pointing up to deceptions in the power company advertisement carried in the May issues of many national magazines relative to Hells Canyon has been a stimulating eye-opener to the Ruralite editor.

Every letter received shows an awareness of the Ruralite editors.

As a sample, they show that the "big lie" technique fails to charm our people.

The letters we received uniformly showed a depth of honest indignation at such political tactics.

We had letters from housewives, farmers, businessmen in small towns. Some of them said they could not help but write, it did them good to relieve their feelings, but that they would have to ask that we not use their names for fear of business reprisals.

It was with great difficulty we selected the winner. We're not at all sure justice was done in our selection, there were so many good ones.

The $50 savings bond goes to Mrs. Sara Little, of Newport, Wash.

Following is her letter:

"DEAR SIRS: This letter may not win me a savings bond, but I shall certainly derive a great pleasure from writing it. I have been so irritated by the ads of the private power companies with their misrepresentations, that it will be a joy to strike back at them. My only regret is that I am limited to 500 words.

"In the first place their statement that the taxpayers are being saved $465 million is the same as telling the people how much money they will save by not buying United States saving bonds. I'll not deny that the United States taxpayers will furnish the money to build Hells Canyon or any other Government financed dam, but they are not giving the money, they are investing it in a good sound business proposition which will repay their investment with interest. It seems that private power companies would deny the people of the Nation the privilege of making this investment.

"The investment of the taxpayers' money in Government-financed dams not only repays in interest money, which should eventually result in lower taxes, but assures an abundance of cheap electricity which attracts business and industry; this same business and industry increases payrolls which increases consumer purchasing power which in return benefits everyone, I dare say, even the private power companies.

"The private power companies brag of how many dams they can build and how much electricity they can produce, but the power sites in this country have been here since the beginning of time and I can't see that they have broken any records in developing them. In fact, I wonder just how many of us would still be packing water and burning kerosene lamps, not to mention the other hundreds of drudgeries and inconveniences eliminated by electricity, if the Government had not stepped into the power picture. All the private power companies were doing was to practice dog in the manger tactics by filing franchises on all likely power dam sites and then sitting by not doing anything with them. What assurance have we today that if power development were left in their hands again that they wouldn't resort to these same tactics? After all, why build a lot of new dams when by controlling existing power you can just raise the price of electricity to obtain a nice profit anyhow?

"I also doubt very much if the plans of America's 400 independent electric light and power companies exceed the plans laid by our own Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, for the all-over-development of our water and power resources. It is true that there has been difficulty in obtaining appropriations for public power projects, but this has been due to the successful campaign on the part of private power which through pressure at the top and misrepresentation of facts, has kept the truth from the people. We desperately need a counter advertising campaign to educate the people with the true facts about public power and its benefits.

"Let us all keep our eyes open and not be misled by the statements of private power companies. Let us not forget while we are enjoying the benefits of electricity on our farms and in our houses and through the prosperity brought to our communities from aluminum plants and other industries that these same enjoyments and benefits might still be things of the future, not the present, if it were not for the event of plentiful low-cost electricity supplied by Government-financed dams. The dams that were built by the people of the United States for the people of the United States, at a profit to all.

"I remain yours for better and bigger public-financed power dams.

"Sincerely,

"(Mrs.) SARA LITTLE.

"P. S.—These paragraphs are just a few more of the things I would like to have said if I had been able to use more words. Please don't feel that I resent your limitation, I do understand it, I'm just all wound up is all.

"Another one of private power's arguments to try to discourage the building of Government-financed dams is that taxpayers all over the United States are being forced to pay for cheap electricity for a privileged few. In the first place, as I said before, the taxpayers are investing in and not just paying

for these dams and what the private power companies are really saying to the people is this, 'We have most of you in our clutches and are forcing you to pay high electricity rates so why should you help the rest of the people have cheap electricity. They should have to pay as much as you do.'

"Still another argument is that they pay more local taxes to support schools and etc., than public power does. A lot of people have had the wool pulled over their eyes by this argument, such as the people around Colville, Wash., when they voted in favor of private power last winter. The people forgot to stop and realize that private power companies are run for profit, and profit alone, and that if they pay a higher rate of taxes it will be added to the power cost and the rest of the taxpayers will pay the cost of these taxes when they pay their electric power bills.

"It is true that in some cases where competition between private and public power is keen that private power has cut their prices as low if not lower than public power, but they have not gone out into the country to build long transmission lines to service isolated customers so they can keep their line cost much lower. Should private power ever get a monopoly again, heaven forbid, you will see the cost of electricity jump to as high as it was before the inroad of public power and perhaps even higher.

"S. L."

Voting Record of the Honorable Irwin D. Davidson, 20th Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the last vote of the 84th Congress has been cast and the record of the legislation which has either been enacted into law or defeated is now complete. When I campaigned for the office of Representative for the 20th Congressional District of New York, I made a pledge to the voters in my district that, if elected, I would make a full report to them at the end of each session on both my voting record and my legislative activities.

Reports of that nature were made at the end of the first session, and I wish at this time to place once again, in the public record, the stand which I have taken and the vote which I have cast on every major issue presented to the House, since we reconvened on January 3, 1956. I do so with pride, because I know that each vote was cast after earnest consideration and attention to the issues involved, and because I feel that I have reflected in my vote the sentiments of the over 350,000 persons whom I have had the privilege and honor to serve since taking office.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, we passed many bills during this session without resorting to a rollcall vote. I should like to list the issues involved in those measures and the position which I supported and voted for on each of them.

SOCIAL-SECURITY AMENDMENTS

This was perhaps the most humanitarian piece of legislation passed by this Congress, and a bill which I was happy to support and cast my vote for. It provided for a reduction in the retirement age for women from 65 to 62 years and provided further for pensions to all totally disabled workers at age 50. These provisions were objected to by the administration but were supported by enough Democrats, myself included, to pass the bill. In addition, the bill broadens the coverage of the Social Security Act.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT

This bill provided for a major revision in the pensions paid to civil-service employees. I not only voted for this measure, but made a statement in support of it, before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives, in which I requested that the committee report the bill favorably to the House without amendment. The annuities of present employees and their widows will be increased by about 25 percent and those of children by about 150 percent. This is the first major revision of the civil-service retirement system since 1948, and the increases that have been provided for by it will help bring the pensions paid under the act more into line with today's cost of living.

HIGHWAYS

Another one of the bills passed in the second session without a rollcall vote was the multibillion-dollar road program for an intracontinental highway system. The Democratic leadership was able to include in this bill provisions calling for a pay-as-you-go financing system which I wholeheartedly supported. The administration's alternative was to finance the program by a bond issue which would have put millions of dollars of interest into the hands of the purchasers of the bonds rather than into the road system.

FLOOD INSURANCE

The Congress passed, in the closing hours of the session, a $7.5 billion program of Federal flood insurance and loans. I supported that bill with my vote when it was acted on in the House, just as I had earlier supported the principle of this legislation by my introduction of bills designed to bring the Federal Government into this field. The flood losses of a year ago and the reluctance or inability of private insurance companies to write this type of insurance made the passage of this bill mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, on the other major issues of this session, rollcall votes were requested. The following is a summary of the issues involved in each of those major votes, and the position which I took on each. I have arranged this summary under the appropriate headings.

TAXES

January 31, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 8780, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on farms for farming purposes. On passage: Yeas 387, nays 0.

March 13, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 9166, a bill providing for a 1-year extension of the corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates. On passage: Yeas 366, nays 4.

RUBBER PLANT DISPOSAL

February 8, 1956: Voted "yea." House Resolution 396, a resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of the sale of a West Virginia rubber plant as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. On agreeing to the resolution: Yeas 61, nays 310. Here, again, as was the case on two occasions during the first session, a giveaway advocated by the Republican leadership was permitted to be approved.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

March 1, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 3383, legislation authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. On passage: Yeas 256, nays 136. This bill provided the basis for a vast irrigation and land reclamation project in the western and southwestern part of our Nation.

SCHOOL-MILK PROGRAM

March 21, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 8320, a bill extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for the fiscal year 1956. There were two separate votes on this bill. The first was on agreeing to the report of the House-Senate conference on the bill. This was rejected by a vote of 195 to 215. A motion was then made to agree to the Senate amendments to the bill, and on that motion I again voted "yea"; this motion carried: Yeas 406, nays 0.

FARM LEGISLATION

April 11, 1956: Voted "nay." H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956. This vote was on a motion to recommit the House-Senate conference report on the bill and return it to committee with instructions to substitute an 82.5-percent parity figure for the 90-percent figure agreed to. This motion was defeated: Yeas 181, nays 238.

April 11, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote followed the motion to recommit and was on the question of passage of the conference report. The report of the conferees was agreed to: Yeas 237, nays 181. This bill was vetoed by the President.

April 18, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote was taken on the question of whether or not to override the President's veto of the bill. The two-thirds majority vote could not be obtained and the veto was sustained: Yeas 202, nays 211.

May 3, 1956: Voted "nay." This vote was cast on the new farm bill which was prepared after the President's veto. It abandoned or watered down the high parity provisions that had caused the veto and established a $1.2-billion farm subsidy in the form of a soil bank. This vote was on a motion to recommit the bill to committee and thus prevent its enactment. The motion was defeated: Yeas 186, nays 208.

May 3, 1956: Voted "yea." This vote followed the motion to recommit and was on the question of passage of the bill. The measure was passed: Yeas 314, nays 78.

FOREIGN AID

June 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act of 1956. This bill provided the authorization for all of our foreign-aid programs. The authorization approved by this bill was $3.8 billion. On passage: Yeas 275, nays 122.

July 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 12130, the foreign-aid appropriation bill. This bill appropriated the funds to carry on our foreign-aid programs within the authorization permitted by the Mutual Security Act. The amount appropriated by the House in this bill was $3.4 billion. On passage: Yeas 234, nays 120. In the closing hours of the session, a conference report was agreed to in the House on a voice vote. I supported that report which appropriated almost $3.8 billion for our foreign-aid programs.

SMALL BUSINESS

June 11, 1956: Voted "yea." H. R. 1840, a bill to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and to amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. On passage, yeas 393, nays 3.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

June 27, 1956: Voted "nay" on motion to recommit the bill and voted "yea" on passage. H. R. 7886, a bill, which, after a part was stricken on a technical point of order, amended part III of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to liberalize the basis for, and increase the monthly rates of, non-service-connected disability pension awards. The motion to recommit the bill to committee was defeated: Yeas 110, nays 305. On passage: Yeas 364, nays 51.

July 12, 1956: Voted "yea," H. R. 12038, a bill to increase service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances. On passage: Yeas 391, nays 0. The Senate allowed both of these bills to die in committee.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

July 5, 1956: Four separate rollcall votes were cast on H. R. 7535, a bill to provide Federal aid to education through grants to finance school construction. The first vote came on an amendment to alter the formula for allocating funds to the States. On that amendment, I voted "nay." The amendment was defeated: Yeas 168, nays 250. The next vote was on the Powell amendment to bar funds to those States which fail to comply with the Supreme Court decision declaring segregation in public schools unconstitutional. I voted in favor of that amendment and it was adopted: Yeas 225, nays 192. A motion was then made to recommit the bill to committee with instructions that the bill be again reported to the House with amendments. On that motion, I voted "nay"; the motion was defeated: Yeas 158, nays 262. Finally, the question was put on passage of the bill. I voted "yea," but the bill was defeated: Yeas 194, nays 224.

POSTAL RATE INCREASE

July 6, 1956: Voted "nay." H. R. 11380, a bill to readjust postal rates and establish a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates. On passage: Yeas 217, nays 166. This bill would have caused the average citizen to bear the cost of subsidizing the great deficit caused by second-class mailing privileges granted to large magazine publishers. This, it seemed to me, was patently unfair and not the proper way to cure the annual deficit of the Post Office Department. The bill died in the Senate Post Office Committee.

COMMUNIST CHINA

July 18, 1956: Voted "yea." House Concurrent Resolution 265, a resolution expressing the sense of Congress against the admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations. On agreeing to the resolution: Yeas 391, nays 0.

CIVIL RIGHTS

July 23, 1956: Voted "yea" on passage of the bill and voted "nay" on a motion to recommit the bill to committee. H. R. 627, the civil-rights bill, was a watered down version of a bill introduced by myself and several other Congressman. The bill as presented to the House for consideration was the very least that the Congress could have approved and still be labeled "civil-rights legislation." Opponents of the bill moved to recommit it to committee in an effort to kill the measure. I voted against the motion and the motion was defeated: Yeas 131, nays 275. The question was then put on passage of the bill, I voted "yea" and the bill was passed: Yeas 279, nays 126. Unfortunately, parliamentary maneuvering in the Senate prevented this bill from being considered in the upper House.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

July 24, 1956: Voted "yea." S. 1644, a bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. The measure would provide orderly procedures to curb abuses which had arisen in connection with such contracts. The bill was presented to the House on a motion to suspend the rules of the House in order to consider and pass the bill. Such a motion requires a majority of two-thirds of those voting, and such a majority could not be obtained. On the motion, yeas 245, nays 145.

CIVILIAN ATOMIC POWER ACCELERATION PROGRAM

July 24, 1956: Voted "nay" on motions to strike the enacting clause and on the motion to recommit the bill to committee. H. R. 12061, a measure to provide a program to accelerate the construction of atomic reactors. The purpose of this bill was to help our country to increase or at the least to maintain our lead in the field of atomic energy. My negative votes on the two motions were voted in favor of the bill, since both the motion to strike the enacting clause and the motion to recommit the bill were designed to kill this legislation. The motion to strike the enacting clause was defeated: Yeas 195, nays 199; the motion to recommit was, unfortunately, adopted: Yeas 203, nays 191.

HOUSING

July 25, 1956: Voted "nay" on motion to amend the rule so as to strike out title V of the bill, the title which authorized public housing. H. R. 11742, a bill to amend and extend the laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities. The only rollcall on this bill was on the motion to prevent consideration of the public housing sections of the measure. On that vote, I opposed the motion and it was defeated: Yeas 92, nays 299. The House then passed on a division vote an amendment to provide only 35,000 units of public housing in each of the next 2 years. This provision I opposed, feeling that a minimum of 200,000 units for each of the next 3 years was essential to win the race to provide decent public housing before the blight of slums overtook many areas. The Senate, however, agreed to the 35,000 units figure, and just before final adjournment, a conference report was approved by both Houses, thus preventing the termination of many of the Federal housing programs. On the voice vote to agree to the conference report, I voted to pass and adopt the report, since it was better to have some housing rather than to vote in favor of the death of many housing programs.

FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT

July 26, 1956: Voted "nay." House Resolution 641, a resolution permitting limited debate on H. R. 412, a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado. On the resolution to grant the rule permitting consideration of the bill: Yeas 179, nays 194.

AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

July 26, 1956: Voted "nay" on a resolution to consider this measure and voted "yea" on a motion to recommit. H. R. 8902, a bill to amend the Aeronautics Act of 1938 to give valuable tax concessions to already subsidized airlines in the purchase of new equipment. My votes on this measure opposed the bill. I voted against the resolution to consider the bill, but the resolution was adopted: Yeas 184, nays 178. I then voted in favor of a motion to recommit the bill to committee, and that motion was adopted: Yeas 196, nays 153.

ELECTRIC POWER RATES AT FEDERAL PROJECTS

July 27, 1956: Voted "yea" on both the adoption of the resolution permitting consideration of this measure and on passage of the bill. S. 338, a bill providing that the rates charged for electric power and energy by the Southwest Power Administration shall not be revised before July 1, 1957. On adoption of the resolution permitting consideration of the bill: Yeas 219, nays 126. On passage of the bill: Yeas 201, nays 140.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT

July 27, 1956: Voted "nay" on resolution to consider the bill out of order. H. R. 7850, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho. My vote was cast against the resolution because it was an attempt to disrupt the orderly program set out by the majority leader who had already scheduled an identical bill, passed by the Senate, for consideration. On adoption of the resolution:

Yeas 173, nays 168. The Senate-passed bill was actually the measure considered and passed by the House and I supported that bill on a voice vote.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the voting record that I leave behind as the session closes. So that the record of my activities is complete, I shall shortly present a record of my legislative activities, that is, a full report on the bills and resolutions that I have introduced in this session of the Congress as well as a summary of the other activities that have occupied my time as the Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. I hope that together with the record of my votes, that document will paint a complete picture of the Congressman that I have tried to be.

Congressman Young Active in Wildlife Improvement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the State of Nevada—fastest growing in the Union—typifies the problem all of us interested in preserving the pleasures of hunting and fishing face. The westward population movement has meant increased demands on our present hunting and fishing areas and has pointed up the need for protection of our present wildlife and recreation resources and the development of new wildlife areas.

During the 84th Congress considerable progress was made along these lines.

WASHOE PROJECT

Foremost in this new appreciation of the esthetic and economic benefits of protecting and improving our wildlife resources was the $2 million authorized for this purpose in the Washoe reclamation project to be constructed on the Truckee and Carson Rivers.

I am proud to have sponsored this bill in the House and to have first introduced the wildlife provisions which were subsequently sustained by both Houses of Congress and the President.

Not only will this provision do much to protect and enhance the portions of these river systems which have appealed to sportsmen from all over the world, but it serves to write a new page in the history of reclamation and wildlife development.

It was on this same river system that the first Federal reclamation project was built shortly after the turn of the century. The lack of planning at that time resulted in the faulty constructed Derby Dam, which aided substantially in destroying the fabulous fishing at world-famous Pyramid Lake. As the new dams are constructed under the authorized Washoe project, we can now be assured that proper attention will be paid to enhancing the fishing and wildlife resources in that area.

MILITARY LANDS

Considerable progress was made in the House this past year with regard to hunting and fishing on military reservations. The measure I coauthored requiring congressional approval of any proposed military land withdrawal or reservation from the public domain in excess of 5,000 acres passed the House in the closing days but did not get through the Senate. I am confident, however, that it will be reintroduced next year and in the meantime will greatly influence the Defense Department in its improving attitude on this important subject.

As it passed the House, the bill would require compliance with State fish and game laws on military areas and cooperation with State conservation officials in the management of wildlife resources.

Through continuing negotiations with the Department of the Navy, I have been assured of written agreements to allow hunting on the Navy aerial gunnery ranges in Nevada. With proper management, the wildlife resources of this area can be improved under the multiple-use arrangement I have proposed.

DESERT GAME RANGE

In the case of the Air Force versus the Desert Game Range in southern Nevada, I have asked that the Department of Defense study possible location of their proposed gunnery range expansion to the north of the Desert Game Range. This study is now in progress.

PREDATOR CONTROL

The wildlife resources of Nevada will be better protected by the increased funds for predator control we were able to obtain this year. A total of $96,710 in Federal funds for control of predatory animals and injurious rodents on Nevada rangeland was approved—a hundred percent increase over last year.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service will spend $655,680 in Nevada during the next 12 months. Of this amount $275,000 will be in Federal aid payments to States for wildlife restoration projects.

DUCK STAMP

Although legislation I sponsored last year provided substantial funds for wetlands acquisition, much remains to be done in this important field. It is my feeling that a greater portion of duck-stamp revenues should be spent for wetlands acquisition, and perhaps the duck-stamp price should be increased to make sure we acquire enough breeding grounds to keep apace with our skyrocketing population.

If an increase in the duck stamp cost occurs, it should be specifically earmarked for waterfowl habitat acquisition, and nothing else till the acreage so badly needed is acquired. As most sportsmen are so keenly aware, one of the serious defects of existing law is the fact that duck stamp funds can be and are being used for other purposes than acquisition of land and water resources. If waterfowling is to remain a sport for the average American citizen who does not belong to a private club, it is important that we speed up the rate of obtaining waterfowl habitat. It has been gratifying to see the interest on the part of sportsmen in Nevada in this regard and the progress made. The Mason Valley Ranch in Lyon County, acquired last year by the Nevada State Fish and Game Commission, is an excellent example of what can be done with foresight and determination.

FISH HATCHERY

I have been in close touch with the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, urging establishment of a fish hatchery in the vicinity of Glen Canyon Dam for the purpose of stocking the Colorado River.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

H. R. 9540, the water pollution control bill, passed both Houses and was signed into law. It should be of considerable aid in the nationwide effort to improve our fishing resources.

BONNER BILL

Although there was opposition from Nevada to the original proposal to this measure, it was reshaped in committee and has generally met with favor by conservationists. It would create an Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fisheries and Wildlife as a primary step in strengthening the whole program. Under the Assistant Secretary, it would establish the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, headed by a single administrator, thus preserving machinery for the necessary integration and coordination in the many places where fish and wildlife problems overlap.

COORDINATION ACT

I was disappointed to see that the efforts to revise this important law so as to insure a broader recognition of fish and wildlife values in reclamation projects met with no success. It was most gratifying, however, to see the enhanced awareness of recreational values reflected in the Washoe project, where $2 million was authorized for fish and wildlife purposes.

Farewell to Retiring Colleagues

SPEECH
OF
HON. PATRICK J. HILLINGS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to join in the tribute being paid to our retiring colleagues.

It is with much sadness that we face the realization that many familiar, friendly faces will not be seen in the hall of the House of Representatives next year.

We from California shall miss particularly our colleague, JOHN PHILLIPS, who has represented the 29th District since 1942. JOHN has been a friend and advisor to so many of us who because Members of this body subsequent to him. His incisive power of analysis and his pleasant wit will be difficult to replacee. His

service as a member of the Committee on Appropriations helped save taxpayers billions of dollars. The Eisenhower administration can credit him for much of the work which made a balanced budget possible.

My best wishes to JOHN and Mrs. Phillips as they begin a well-earned retirement.

To all others who are leaving us, good luck and Godspeed.

Showdown With Bricker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from chapter XVII, entiled "Showdown With BRICKER," of the book, Eisenhower—The Inside Story, written by Robert J. Donovan.

In this chapter, Mr. Donovan gives a heretofore untold and illuminating story concerning the position of President Eisenhower and his White House aids on the Bricker amendment and quotes from some heretofore unpublished correspondence which bears on this subject.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER 17. SHOWDOWN WITH BRICKER

SENATOR BRICKER PROPOSES TO SAFEGUARD THE CONSTITUTION AGAINST TREATY-MADE LAW—EISENHOWER FIRST SEES AMENDMENT AND SYMPATHIZES WITH ITS GENERAL AIM—DULLES WARNS THE CABINET THE AMENDMENT WOULD FETTER THE PRESIDENT IN CONDUCTING FOREIGN AFFAIRS—EISENHOWER OPPOSES THE AMENDMENT—THE EFFORTS TO GET A COMPROMISE—THE FINAL BATTLE IN THE SENATE

Almost before Congress could get started on the President's big 1954 program the session was convulsed by two of the most emotional and vexing domestic issues that have faced Eisenhower during his years in the White House.

One was the Bricker amendment, the controversy over which has been called our greatest debate about the constitutional ordering of our foreign relations since 1788. The other was the loud, lurid, acrimonious, and often venomous quarrel that raged over the person and conduct of Senator MCCARTHY.

Both issues had swirled around Eisenhower off and on since he became President and indeed even before. Both issues aroused deep political passions in America and set right against left, Old Guard against the new, liberal against conservative, internationalist against isolationist. In the final analysis both issues bore a threat to the Presidential power and prerogative.

A difference between the two problems was that in the case of the Bricker amendment no grievous personal conflict developed between the President and the senior Senator from Ohio. Between Eisenhower and MCCARTHY, on the other hand, there was intense dislike, to which MCCARTHY, but not Eisenhower, gave voice in public with ever-increasing harshness.

The showdown on the Bricker amendment came on February 26, 1954, but the issue had dogged Eisenhower since the days in the Commodore in January 1953. It was there that he first saw the amendment, which would have the effect of limiting the President's powers to make treaties and thus of augmenting congressional authority over foreign relations.

The proposal stemmed from resentment over such executive agreements as Yalta and, as BRICKER had said in a speech, from a fear that "American sovereignty and the American Constitution * * * are threatened by treaty law."

Its ostensible purpose was to provide protection against the possibility that a President, aided by an unwary Senate, would impose on the country through a treaty legal obligations which would deprive the people of constitutional rights or would invade the domain of power reserved to the States. In particular its proponents regarded it as a bulwark against international agreements drafted by the U. N. or its specialized agencies, which might, as these proponents feared, deny or abridge fundamental rights of United States citizens or interfere in purely local matters. In a nutshell, BRICKER was telling the American people that their Constitution was in danger of being contravened or superseded by treaty and by executive agreements and that they had better close the door against this menace.

His announced aim of protecting the Constitution and American liberties looked plausible and appealing to a great many people, and when the amendment was first presented to Eisenhower, he felt sympathetic toward its general purpose. He himself believed that the Constitution should not be changed by other than the constitutional process. He recognized furthermore that there was widespread anxiety over the possibilities BRICKER warned of, and he was concerned that this feeling might turn American opinion against the U. N.

Before introducing the amendment on January 7, 1953, BRICKER called the Commodore and solicited the support of Eisenhower and Dulles. Since Eisenhower had not studied the problem, the request was turned over to Herman Phleger, an attorney, who was to become legal adviser to the State Department. After looking at the complexities of the question, Phleger advised Eisenhower against taking a position until the new administration had had a chance to study the amendment. This was the course the President-elect followed.

The first report on this study was made to the Cabinet by Dulles on February 20, 1953. If it was adopted, Dulles said, the Bricker amendment would seriously curtail executive authority and make it impossible to conduct foreign affairs effectively. Brownell and Wilson both concurred in this. The President did not commit himself, although he did refer to his feeling that the Constitution should be changed only by regular procedures.

On March 13 Dulles gave a further report. This time he warned that the administration and the Bricker movement might clash head on and urged that every possible effort be made to find a safe and acceptable substitute. He characterized the amendment as "impossible" and did not see how mere revision could change matters. He said he thought that BRICKER and his supporters already had achieved their purpose in large part by calling attention to the possible danger of law made by treaty. NIXON suggested that a substitute proposal might be worked out which would express the sense of BRICKER'S argument without tying the President's hands in foreign relations.

Eisenhower, who was now coming around toward positive opposition to the amendment, remarked on the difficulty of lining up Republican Senators against it. To him, he said, this seemed to indicate that these Senators were not concentrating on writing a record of cooperation with the administration. Concern over the outcome of the congressional elections a year and a half away did not appear to be nearly so strong among Republicans on Capitol Hill, he observed, as it was in the White House. Later he commented that while some Senators might feel secure in their 6-year terms, committee chairmanships would be at stake in 1954, and a good Republican record would be essential to keep them from being lost.

On March 20 the President and the Secretary of State reported that they had talked to BRICKER. The conversation, they said, indicated that the Senator would not insist on the exact content of his amendment as it stood, but that he was very desirous of having Congress enact some amendment to this general purpose, and one which bore his name.

Dulles cautioned, however, against the administration's agreeing even to an apparently harmless amendment, especially, he said, since American history did not show that treaties had had a detrimental effect inside the country. The President said that giving Congress control over treaties would jeopardize the permanence of treaties because one Congress could nullify the action of a preceding Congress.

A way to solve the conflict over the Bricker amendment, the Attorney General suggested, might be to create a commission headed by BRICKER to make a new study of the problem. If any such group was appointed, NIXON interposed, the administration should make two things clear. One was that the administration could not support the Bricker amendment as it stood, and the other that the objective of the commission would be to find a substitute.

Despite the Vice President's statement, the administration had still not taken a formal position on the amendment.

At a meeting of the Cabinet 2 weeks later, on April 3, it was decided that any members who were called upon to testify on the amendment were to state their views as individuals. Any member who wished to do so was free to support the amendment, but the President asked that he first check with the State Department as to the facts of the case. Which way the wind was blowing, however, was shown very clearly by the President's remark that he believed that the amendment was unnecessary and would be damaging to the United States. To try to protect against a possible harmful treaty by such means, he said, would only compound the difficulty of the problem. Within a few days both Dulles and Brownell testified strongly against the amendment.

When the Cabinet met on May 8, Dulles said that the increasingly emotional nature of the controversy had been demonstrated the day before by BRICKER'S attack in the Senate on Phleger and Under Secretary of State Smith. The Senator's criticism of these two State Department officials was directed not at their opposition to his amendment but at their support of the NATO status-of-forces agreement then before the Senate. This agreement concerned the jurisdiction over crimes committed in one NATO country by personnel of another, and BRICKER was very hostile to it. He proposed a reservation which would have given the United States exclusive jurisdiction over crimes committed by American troops stationed abroad. It was finally defeated by the Senate on July 14.

The status-of-forces agreement, as it happened, had a part in turning Eisenhower strongly against the Bricker amendment. As commander of the NATO forces he had become thoroughly familiar with the problems the agreement dealt with, and he wanted it ratified. The meaning of the Bricker

amendment, therefore, struck him adversely and with great force when his legal advisers explained that if the amendment were then in effect, the Senate could not ratify the NATO agreement because it dealt with a matter outside the powers delegated to Congress by the Constitution. This seemed to give the President a sharper picture than he had had before of what was involved in BRICKER's proposal.

At this same meeting on May 8 the Cabinet talked about the hopes of the administration in preventing a debate on the amendment in the Senate, which would have opened a deep new split in the already divided Republican ranks. This was something the President and the Cabinet were very anxious to avert. Brownell suggested that the problem be brought up at the next legislative leaders' meeting. Thinking it over, the President replied that perhaps the administration was not making the best use of these meetings to achieve its ends in Congress. NIXON cautioned him, however, against expecting too much from such conferences. No one can "deliver" the Senate, the Vice President told him.

On June 5 the President, reporting to the Cabinet on his meeting with the Republican leaders the day before, said there was strong sentiment in the Senate for the Bricker amendment.

The Secretary of State responded by saying that this change in constitutional principles, if it went through, would have a disastrous effect. He defended Phleger against criticism that had been directed against him by some of the leaders, and he said that these leaders were looking for a compromise on principle on a point on which no compromise was possible.

A good deal of salesmanship would be needed to bring the Senate around to the administration's viewpoint, the President said.

The Cabinet agreed that Brownell and Phleger should set out to arrange for some substitute proposal which would offer a way out for Senators supporting BRICKER but which would avoid compromising the principle of presidential authority over foreign relations. General Persons was to work closely with members of the Cabinet to determine how their personal influence could be used most effectively in swinging support away from the Bricker amendment and to the substitute.

Benson and others in the Cabinet said that the reason the Bricker amendment had gained such widespread backing was that its dangers had not been adequately explained to the people.

A mention had been made earlier in another connection of small atom bombs. Philip Young facetiously recalled it during the discussion on the Bricker amendment, saying that maybe some of these bombs could be used now to good effect. The President took him to task for this. He said sharply that he did not wish to hear any talk of a "Pride's Purge."

(Before a vote on bringing the King of England to trial in the 17th century, Col. Thomas Pride stood outside the House of Commons with his regiment and excluded all Presbyterian and Royalist members, whose names appeared on a written list given him by the army council.)

On June 15 the Senate Judiciary Committee reported out a new version of the amendment, redrafted along the lines proposed by the American Bar Association through its Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations. BRICKER espoused this version, but to the administration it was fully as obpectionable as the original.

It gave Congress the power to regulate all executive and other agreements with foreign powers and the U. N. Furthermore it provided that a treaty would become effective as internal law only if Congress passed implementing legislation, "which would be valid in the absence of treaty." This clause went to the heart of the controversy.

Simply, the administration's objection may be summarized as follows:

Under the law as it stood, and still stands, the President may negotiate and the Senate may ratify a treaty on a subject not within the delegated powers of Congress and the President. Congress may then pass laws to implement it. The "which clause" would have prohibited Congress from passing implementing laws in areas beyond its delegated powers. Thus whether the treaty was effective in the United States would depend upon whether it conformed to the laws of the respective States or, if it did not, whether the States would pass laws that conformed to it. The President contended that this would return the country to the situation that existed under the Articles of Confederation, in which each State had a right to repudiate treaties.[1] Thus, he maintained, in dealing with foreign nations the President and the Secretary of State, instead of speaking for one government, would be saddled with the "impossible task of representing 48 governments."

The President said at his press conference on July 1 that while he did not believe a treaty could contravene or supersede the Constitution, he was willing to support a constitutional amendment containing a simple statement to that effect. Meanwhile Brownell was working with KNOWLAND and others to write a substitute that would fit this prescription.

At the meeting of the Cabinet on July 3 Eisenhower took note of charges that he had compromised his stand on the Bricker amendment. He told the Cabinet that he did not feel that he had been inconsistent. He said that he had always felt that treaties should not supersede the Constitution, that it was not necessary to amend the Constitution to insure this, but that a statement reaffirming that the Constitution was paramount would be perfectly acceptable.

In the Cabinet on July 17 Dulles suggested either that action on the Bricker amendment to be put over to another session of Congress or else, if a showdown was to come, that every Senator be acquainted in the most unequivocal terms with the President's views. Dulles and Stassen both believed that BRICKER's defeat 3 days earlier on his reservation to the status of forces agreement indicated that the Bricker amendment could be defeated. They felt that its total defeat was preferable to enactment of a watered-down substitute.

On this point the President said that public opinion had to be taken into account, and he questioned whether the fears raised by BRICKER could be quieted by the complete defeat of his amendment.

Brownell and NIXON suggested that as a result of the vote on the Status of Forces reservation, BRICKER would probably be willing to accept the language of the substitute which the administration was preparing. Brownell warned that to defeat the Bricker amendment outright and without any substitute measure would cause a serious split in the Republican Party. In the end the Cabinet agreed that he should continue working with the Senate leaders to draft a satisfactory substitute, which he did.

On July 22 KNOWLAND finally introduced it, and Eisenhower isued a public statement saying that it had his "unqualified support."

The Knowland amendment provided that a treaty or international agreement which conflicts with the Constitution would have no force. It also provided that a treaty could be ratified only by recorded vote. This meant that all Senators would be notified when the vote was to be taken and that a treaty could not be shouted through, as once happened on a minor protocol, for instance, with only two Senators on the floor.

While the President said in his statement that "the reassurances contained in the Knowland amendment meet all legitimate demands that have been made in this field of foreign relations," BRICKER flatly rejected it, and that left the issue at a dead end for the 1953 session.

This was only a respite. The full power of the Bricker movement bore down upon Congress when it reconvened in January 1954. This time it was clear that the Senate would have to act. It was also clear that the President was in for a hard fight to defend his powers against limitation of one sort or another by constitutional amendment.

The political pressure that had been built up behind the amendment and powerfully applied by heavy lobbying was immense. Arrayed in support of the amendment were the American Medical Association, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Chicago Tribune, the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law through the United Nations, the Committee for Constitutional Government, Frank E. Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, and the Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment, a "volunteer organization of housewives and mothers of boys overseas." This last group alone presented petitions to the Senate bearing an estimated 500,000 signatures.

When the original amendment was introduced in the Senate in 1953, it had 64 cosponsors—the two-thirds of the Senate needed to approve a constitutional amendment. Even within the administration, as was mentioned earlier, the Bricker amendment had the ardent support of Clarence Manion.

Opposed to the amendment were the American Bar Association's section of international and comparative law, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the American Association for the United Nations, the League of Women Voters, and many liberal organizations and independent newspapers.

Fully aroused to the danger that the amendment might be forced through the Senate under this heavy pressure, the President sent a strong letter to KNOWLAND on January 25, 1954, in which he said, in part:

"I am unalterably opposed to the Bricker amendment * * * It would so restrict the conduct of foreign affairs that our country could not negotiate the agreements necessary for the handling of our business with the rest of the world. Such an amendment would make it impossible for us to deal effectively with friendly nations for our mutual defense and common interests.

"These matters are fundamental. We cannot hope to achieve and maintain peace if we shackle the Federal Government so that it is no longer sovereign in foreign affairs. The President must not be deprived of his historic position as the spokesman for the Nation in its relations with other countries.

"Adoption of the Bricker amendment in its present form by the Senate would be notice to our friends as well as our enemies abroad that our country intends to withdraw from its leadership in world affairs. The inevitable reaction would be of major proportion. It would impair our hopes and plans for peace and for the successful achievement of the important international matters now under discussion."

Formal debate on the issue began in the Senate on January 27 and for nearly a month the battle went on. Everyone was a constitutional authority for a day. Legalisms beat down like hail. Personalities were berated. The Secretary of State was accused by BRICKER of turning legal somersaults. JENNER linked the opposition to the amendment with a "secret revolutionary corps" alined with such figures as Harry Hopkins

[1] BRICKER called this interpretation "erroneous."

and Harry Dexter White, who had been dead for years, as well as with Henry A. Wallace, Owen Lattimore, and Alger Hiss. It was all that many could do to keep up with the flood of amendments offered from the floor, and far more than most could do to grasp their possible consequences. Before the debate reached a climax the Bricker amendment had been modified in a half-dozen ways, but was still unacceptable to the administration.

The President, of course, had to sit through one session after another with his advisers to try to keep abreast of the confused developments, and the endless hauling, hair-splitting and negotiation wearied and irked him. One such meeting with Smith and Phleger on January 29, 1954, ended just before the Cabinet meeting. The President went into the Cabinet room and took his chair. After the silent prayer he said that he welcomed that quiet moment because it gave him a welcome opportunity to remove himself from the wear and tear and tugging and pulling that went on in his own office. In that minute of prayer, he remarked, he could recapture a frame of mind appropriate to a meeting around the Cabinet table where all were friends.

When the subject of the continuing Senate debate came up, Eisenhower said that it was vitally important that the administration act simultaneously to protect the President's right, authority, and responsibility in the conduct of foreign affairs and to relieve the legitimate fears of those who were supporting the Bricker amendment. The amendment, he believed, could be beaten. If this proved to be the case, he said, the next thing for the administration to do would be to take steps to keep this spurious issue, as he called it, from flaring up in the congressional election campaign. He took pride, he said, in the efforts the administration had made to be decent and reasonable throughout the controversy without having surrendered one iota on the essential points.

Wilson said that he shared the feeling of the Bricker supporters that treaties should not be allowed to take away fundamental rights and that agreements such as those reached at Yalta and Potsdam should in the future be prevented by law if possible.

Of itself, the President replied, the Bricker amendment could not serve as a guarantee against either of these circumstances.

(Eisenhower had been assured by his legal advisers that the Bricker amendment would not have applied to Yalta and Potsdam because they were political agreements and not treaties or executive agreements.)

Two days later, on February 1, the President met with the legislative leaders and told them he would have no part in upsetting the balance established between the different branches of the Government by the framers of the Constitution. His disgust with the whole business showing through, he said that something struck him as ironical. This was the way he put it: For 20 years the Republicans had been accusing the Democrats of unconstitutional actions. Then what did the Republicans do as soon as they came to power but begin trying to alter the Constitution without even being in complete agreement as to the meaning of the changes proposed.

At his meeting with the leaders the next week, February 8, Eisenhower found some amusement in the subject by repeating a quip he had heard that the Constitution was being demolished "brick by brick by BRICKER."

When at last it came, the showdown was not over the Bricker amendment but over a substitute introduced by Senator GEORGE. The oft-revised Bricker amendment was rejected on February 25, 42 to 50. For all practical purposes this narrowed the fight to the George amendment and the revised administration amendment sponsored by KNOWLAND and others.

GEORGE'S amendment eliminated the "which" clause and was milder than the Bricker amendment, but still the administration feared the limitations it might place on the President's powers. When Brownell sent a letter to the Senate opposing the George amendment, GEORGE, a man of massive dignity and voice to match, said, "I would resign my seat before I would let my vote be governed by such an odd Attorney General."

On February 26 the Senate chose the George amendment in preference to the Republican leaders' proposal and proceeded to vote on it. BRICKER and his followers threw their full weight behind the George amendment. In spite of the administration's opposition, even KNOWLAND, the Republican leader of the Senate, voted for it. (He explained that he could not ignore "a dangerous tendency toward executive encroachment on legislative powers.") As the rollcall progressed, 60 votes piled up for the amendment. Thirty-one were cast against it, and that 31st nay saved Eisenhower from a severe political defeat. Had that vote gone yea, it would have given GEORGE 61, which would have been the two-thirds needed for a constitutional amendment. The amendment would then have taken effect if approved by two-thirds of the House and by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

While the defeat of the Bricker amendment brought victory and relief to the President, any hopes he may have had that it would free Congress to concentrate on his program were quickly dispelled. Even before the final vote on it an uproar was brewing between MCCARTHY and Secretary of the Army Robert Stevens over MCCARTHY'S treatment of Brig. Gen. Ralph W. Zwicker. The troubles between the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the Pentagon were soon to explode into the political brawl and television extravaganza of the Army-McCarthy hearings.

Congressman Young Aids Nevada Workingman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the American worker is better off in every way today than at any other time in history. His wages are at record levels; his purchasing power is at an all-time high.

The working men and women of Nevada have shared in this record prosperity which is made even more of a blessing because it is accompanied by peace.

As a strong supporter of the sound and forward-looking policies of President Eisenhower which have produced this peace and plenty, I am proud to have played a part in these achievements:

Record employment: The 62.9 million men and women at work in January of this year were the greatest number of Americans ever employed in that month and represented an increase of 2.7 million over January a year ago and 1.9 million more than the previous record January in 1953.

Unemployment: The past 3 years under President Eisenhower averaged less unemployment than in the last term of his predecessor, despite nearly a 3 million increase in civil labor force and despite that fact 2½ of the years 1948 to 1952 were war years.

Wages: Both hourly and weekly wages are at all-time record highs—averaging nearly 13 percent higher in peacetime 1955 than in wartime 1952.

Prices: The 12-cent loss in buying power—nearly one-eighth of each wage dollar—from inflation in the years 1950, 1951, and 1952 has been cut to less than three-fourths of 1 cent in President Eisenhower's first 3 years.

I have supported the sound fiscal policies and the faith in basic American principles which made these achievements possible.

As Nevada's Congressman, I am also proud of the legislative achievements improving the lot of all of us who work for a living.

Social security: Because the Eisenhower administration has extended social security to 10 million additional workers and liberalized benefits for 8,100,000, 9 out of 10 workers and their families are now protected against loss of income due to old age or death. Benefits have been increased substantially. Retired persons may earn more income on their own and still draw social-security benefits.

Unemployment insurance: Four million additional workers have been covered by unemployment insurance.

Minimum wage: The minimum wage was raised to $1 effective March 1, 1956, directly increasing the pay envelopes of over 2 million workers and indirectly benefiting millions more by raising the general wage level.

Vocational rehabilitation: This humanitarian program has been improved and expanded to benefit additional hundreds of thousands of handicapped workers.

Federal workers: Armed Forces and Federal civilian workers received pay raises and insurance benefits.

Railroad retirement: These benefits were increased and tax provisions changed to aid retired people.

Nevada working men and women have shared in this nationwide prosperity. However, as your Congressman, I have worked to see that our own State is properly developed so that we will continue to hold our high position in terms of per capita income and general well-being. Here are a few accomplishments:

Sponsored the Henderson bill and other efforts to bring industry to Nevada.

Supported the new highway bill, which will bring millions of dollars to our State, thousands of new jobs, improved tourist business, opportunities for new enterprise.

Authored the Washoe project bill, which will aid the development of western Nevada and bring many new jobs to that area.

Fought for the Nevada tungsten industry to protect the jobs of hundreds of Nevada working people.

Stopped the Keating bill, which would have closed down one of Nevada's biggest

industries and left thousands unemployed.

Have seen to it that the Nevada workingman in southern Nevada has an opportunity to acquire a small tract.

Supported the tax-cut bill which reduced the taxes of wage earners by $4.7 billion—and which represented a savings of $200 a year for the average Nevada taxpaying family of 4.

Reply by Hon. Wayne Morse to Report Presented by Hon. H. Alexander Smith Defending the National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my reply to the report presented by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in defense of the National Labor Relations Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPLY OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE TO REPORT PRESENTED BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY DEFENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

On July 9, 1956, the senior Senator from New Jersey, ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. SMITH], presented to the Senate a report prepared at the direction of himself and the senior Senator from California, the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], purporting to defend the policies and conduct of the present administration of the National Labor Relations Act. The report embodies, among other exhibits, letters from Chairman Leedom and General Counsel Kammholz of the Board, addressed to the senior Senator from Alabama, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL], likewise purporting to defend the present administration. That report and these letters purport to show that the documented charges which I made in my speech on the floor of the Senate on March 23, 1956, "are not supported by the facts." In so doing, they accuse me of bias and prejudice against management and in favor of labor unions, conveniently ignoring the fact that I supported many of the Taft-Hartley Act's provisions, including two of the most important changes which imposed restrictions on labor unions and created new rights for employers. The provisions prohibiting strikes for recognition at a time when the employer was bound to deal with a rival, certified union, and the provision outlawing jurisdictional strikes. They accuse me of misapprehending "the intent of Congress and the meaning of the statute." And they accuse me of inconsistency in calling for a congressional investigation of the Board today, while I opposed a congressional investigation of the Board in 1949.

In evaluating these personal attacks upon me, as in evaluating all of the material submitted, it is indispensable to recall the precise accusation that I made against the present administration. For only in the light of the exact charge, and the evidence which I adduced to support it, does it appear that the entire defense is compounded of innumerable fallacies, distortions, and outright misrepresentations skillfully jumbled to becloud the issue and hide the relevant facts. When the fog is pierced by analysis, the defenses themselves reveal admissions of the charge.

I. POLICY OF THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION

In my speech on March 23, I said that the Eisenhower administration wanted the American public to believe that it was friendly to labor unions; that prior to his election the President had admitted that the Taft-Hartley Act, as it then stood, went too far in the direction of permitting employers to throttle, destroy, and defeat labor organizations; and that it would be the policy of his administration to reduce rather than to multiply the shackles which the Taft-Hartley Act had placed on employee self-organization and effective collective bargaining.

Of course, the Eisenhower administration would not willingly relinquish the political advantage which it gains from such a public evaluation of its aims and objectives. It has, indeed, gone to some lengths to maintain the illusion. Secretary of Labor Mitchell, for example, was permitted to advocate publicly that section 14 (b) should be repealed. That is the notorious and illogical provision which gives precedence over the Taft-Hartley Act to State laws which contain antiunion security provisions more restrictive than those of the Federal Act, but, at the same time, outlaws State laws which contain less restrictive provisions. And, as the report proclaims, the President did, in 1954, submit a proposal to delete the prohibition against treating replaced economic strikers as employees eligible to vote in an election to determine the bargaining representative of the struck plant, and to eliminate the mandatory injunction provision.

At the same time, however, the administration took steps to assure that none of these developments, favorable to unions, would occur. The President immediately disassociated himself from Secretary Mitchell's views on section 14 (b). And the bill which the administration introduced for the avowed purpose of effectuating the President's recommendation to eliminate the union-busting provisions from the Taft-Hartley Act was loaded down with other provisions, the cumulative effect of which, if enacted, would have been to jeopardize and threaten the interests of organized working men and women to an even greater extent than those provisions in the present law. That tactic was designed to assure that just what did happen would happen, namely, that the bill would be recommitted by "a solid, defectionless, party-line vote of the Democratic Members of the Senate." The purpose of the maneuver was obvious then as it is obvious now. The Democrats in the Senate could be blamed, as the report now seeks to place blame upon them, for frustrating the President's recommendation to remove union-busting provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and the administration could be praised for attempting to keep its promise to remove these provisions. The American people, it was hoped, could be misled into believing that the administration was not hostile to organized labor.

The report is correct in saying that the "question * * * concerns the attitude of the Eisenhower administration." But the record shows that the guise in which the administration would like to appear to the public is a disguise. The administration's real attitude is shown by its failure to have submitted a simple bill to eliminate the provisions which the Republicans, for public consumption, admit are union busting. Such a bill could have been enacted into law if the President would work for Republican votes to add to the majority of Democratic votes in favor of such a measure.

But the hypocrisy stands most clearly revealed, as I demonstrated in my speech, by what the Republicans have done to the National Labor Relations Act through administration. Taft-Hartley, as every Senator who was a Member of this body when it was debated and passed will recall, was enacted only after many retreats and compromises by the rightwing proponents of straitjacketing labor unions. As a result, the act did not go as far in an antilabor direction as the NAM and other reactionary employer groups wanted to go. Almost from the beginning, these groups clamored to accomplish through administration what they had been unable to accomplish in the 80th Congress through legislation. Robert N. Denham, the Republican General Counsel of the Board, constantly attacked the Board for failing to construe the act as if the Hartley bill, rather than the conference bill, had been enacted. To coerce the Board to amend the statute under the guise of construction was the object of the investigation of the Board proposed in 1949.

Of course, many Senators, I among them, opposed this blatant attempt to destroy the Board's integrity; to dictate to the Board the manner in which the Board should exercise its discretion in these areas in which the act vests it with discretion; to compel the Board members, for fear of incurring the displeasure of powerful congressional groups, to construe the statute not judicially, but so as to favor employer interests hostile to labor unions. Investigation of the Board in 1949 was not defeated because Senators deemed it beyond the realm of possibility that an administrative agency could deliberately subvert the legislative process by embarking on a large-scale program of amending the statute under the guise of interpretation. Nor was it defeated on the ground that if such a development occurred Congress should close its eyes and do nothing about it.

Investigation was defeated because a majority of the committee recognized that the charges of misconstruction of the statute which had been leveled at the Board had no more substance than the soup of which Lincoln spoke as having been concocted from the shadow of a chicken that had starved to death. Investigation was defeated because a majority realized that it was not the Board's interpretation, but the interpretations which the proponents of the investigation would have foisted upon the Board that would have perverted the statute and defeated Congress' purposes. It was defeated because a majority, including myself, saw that a congressional investigation under these circumstances, and for these purposes, could serve only to intimidate and destroy a sound administration, and could not possibly serve to protect the integrity of the legislative process from administrative abuse. I am proud of having played a part in safeguarding quasi-judicial administration from such a wholly unwarranted attack.

What happened then? The same powerful employer groups and their reactionary allies, among them Joseph C. Wells, Denham's former Associate General Counsel, who has represented employers exclusively in labor relations matters since leaving his office, and whom the report characterizes as a "highly qualified observer," kept up a constant drumfire of criticism of the Board for refusing to transform the statute into the more intensely antilabor weapon which they had tried so hard, but failed, to forge. But, I hastened to add, even they suggested no such sweeping, revolutionary, wholesale change in interpretation as the Eisenhower appointees later accomplished.

The crucial test came when the Republican administration took office early in 1953. At that time the Board was composed of members appointed by the Truman administration, and the General Counsel was a Truman appointee. The most significant rulings of the Board interpreting the provisions which had been added by the Taft-Hartley Act and the changes which Taft-Hartley made in the

Wagner Act provisions had met and withstood the challenge of court review. They were firmly embedded in the law. The terms of most of the Board members and the General Counsel would not expire for a considerable period. There was little prospect that, on the merits, any of the rulings of which the reactionary employer groups complained would be altered or reversed by the Board.

What did the administration do? Did it publicly adopt the position of the NAM that Taft-Hartley had been misconstrued by the Board; that it should be interpreted without reference to its language, legislative history, and the objectives of Congress, but only with reference to the result which would bear most strongly against unions? Did it ask Congress to amend the statute to reverse the Board's interpretations which the courts had approved? It did not. And the reason is plain. To have done that, openly and forthrightly, would have sacrificed the political advantage which the administration hoped to retain by masquerading as a friend of labor organizations. Moreover, that plan would never have succeeded. Congress would not have enacted a proposal to amend the Taft-Hartley Act to make it even more antilabor.

The administration chose another course, a course which would give its reactionary employer groups what they wanted, but, at the same time, so obscure the development from the American people that the administration could continue to pose as pro, or at least not anti, labor.

The administration waited until vacancies occurred among the Board's membership and in the Office of the General Counsel and then appointed to these posts, 1 by 1, handpicked exponents of the reactionary employer philosophy, men who could be trusted to write their antilabor prejudices into the law.

I charged that, as part of the administration's actual program to transform the Taft-Hartley Act into a more vicious antilabor instrument, the Eisenhower appointees embarked on a program of wholesale reversals of statutory interpretations which were well established and in many instances court approved; that in every instance in which these members had a real choice between following precedent or discarding it and chose to reverse, the reversal hurt labor and benefited antiunion employers; I proved that in many of these instances the antiunion decision of the Eisenhower Board was irreconcilable with the language and legislative history of the act and that, in so changing the law, these Board members had forsaken their proper quasi-judicial role and usurped the function of Congress. I charged that the Republican appointees had ruthlessly forced out from subordinate positions in Washington and in the field offices men who had devoted virtually their entire careers to the Board's service and who were uniquely qualified by their knowledge, background, and experience to administer the law effectively and impartially as Congress wrote it. I charged that the Republican appointees replaced these men with others whose sole qualification lay in their dedication to the reactionary employer antilabor philosophy of the NAM; that each and every appointee had a promanagement background, and that many did not even possess the requisite experience to qualify for the jobs to which they were appointed under civil-service standards. I charged that the purpose of these appointments was to assure that the law would be administered in the field, in the thousands of cases which never reach formal decision by the Board, not impartially, but with bias and prejudice in favor of employers and against labor unions.

I pointed out in my speech that the consequences of this usurption of legislative power by the Board, the consequences of this biased and prejudiced administration of an already biased act, have done immense harm to organized and unorganized workers alike. Men and women who sought to improve their lives and living conditions by joining unions have been fired from their jobs and been denied redress. Strikes which would have been won if the law had been fairly applied have been lost. Peaceful picketing, the only effective weapon workmen have to publicize their grievances, has been illegally enjoined, and the cause of the workers has been doomed. Everywhere, and particularly in the South, the Board has made it more difficult for employees to organize and for unions to help them do it. And the Board is assisting in the perpetuation of the discriminatory wage structure by which one section of the country lures away the industries of another.

These are the charges. What have we been offered in refutation?

II. PERSONNEL

The report states that I gave "the impression that the Labor Board has been under Republican control from the moment the present administration took office in January 1953." The learned Senators who directed that the report be prepared, to say nothing of those who prepared it, may have neglected to read my speech. For in it I said: "By March 1954 the present administration had succeeded in placing a majority of its political appointees on the Board. On March 29, 1955, General Counsel Kammholz took office."

The report alleges that many of my "charges concern events and proceedings which arose prior to the date when it could accurately be said that Republicans held an actual majority of the controlling positions at the Labor Board." The only basis for this assertion is the allegation that the first appointee of President Eisenhower, Mr. Guy Farmer, as Chairman of the Board, was not a Republican. Therefore, it is now argued, the administration may not be held responsible for decisions made by the Board while Farmer was one of the Republican-appointed majority. Under any circumstances it would be absurd for an administration to disclaim responsibility for the actions of its own appointee. In this instance, however, the absurdity is heightened by the fact that the attempt rests entirely on a flimsy technicality. If, as the report claims, Farmer was not a registered Republican at the time he was appointed, it may have been because he was a resident of the District of Columbia and therefore not registered at all. The entire county was aware that he was a strong Eisenhower supporter and in his public speeches Farmer made it plain that he was appointed to bring the Eisenhower philosophy to the administration of the Taft-Hartley Act. See Business Week, July 25, 1953, page 53. The claim of the report that the Republicans did not actually control a majority of positions on the Board as long as Farmer held office is, in fact, refuted by Chairman Leedom's own letter. He says: "The Eisenhower majority dates from March 1954 when Mr. Albert Beeson * * * took office."

Of even greater significance, however, is the fact that except for this frivolous attempt to disclaim responsibility for Farmer, the report does not even challenge my basic assertion that every appointee of this administration to a Board membership and as General Counsel was marked at the time of his appointment as a faithful follower of the proemployer, antilabor line. That charge, proved by the record, now stands admitted.

When we turn to the subordinate positions, we find again an attempt to evade the basic issue by resort to misleading technicalities. The report states that "contrary to the contentions of the Senator from Oregon there were no discharges of career civil service employees." That assertion contains two patent fallacies. The first is that employees who are threatened with demotion, transfer to lower ranking or undesirable positions, or invited to stay on only until they obtain jobs elsewhere, and who in consequence resign, have not been "discharged." The Board, at least, should know better. Long ago, the Board and the courts discovered that these were favorite tactics of employers who sought on the one hand to rid themselves of union adherents and on the other to escape retribution for doing so by pretending that the employees had not been discharged but had merely resigned. The Board and the courts were not fooled. Resignations so induced they held to be "constructive discharges." See, e. g., *East Texas Motor Freight Lines* (47 NLRB 1023, 1029, affirmed, 140 F. 2d 404 (CA5)); *Marathon Electric Mfg. Corp.* (106 NLRB 1171, 1173, 1175, 1199); *Bausch & Lomb Optical Co.* (107 NLRB 790, affirmed, 217 F. 2d 575 (CA2)). The report does not even purport to deny that these intimidating tactics—the slightly more subtle but otherwise precise equivalent of outright discharge—were used to get rid of able, highly trained employees who had devoted many years to the Board's service and whose only fault lay in their devotion to impartial administration of the statute.

Chairman Leedom's assertion that there have been only six "involuntary terminations in the entire agency" during the Eisenhower Board's administration is based on the same fallacy. The number of separations which are carried on the Board's personnel records as "involuntary terminations" proves nothing, of course, as to the number of professional career employees who resigned because they were faced with either involuntary termination, demotion or degrading transfer. As any experienced administrator knows, a long-time career employee who is told he is to be discharged, or demoted, will, if he possibly can, resign to protect his employment record.

The purpose of thus ignoring the constructive discharges is, of course, to evade the contrast between the record of the Board under prior administrations, in which employees were selected on the basis of merit and experience, without regard to political considerations, and the record of wholesale removal of competent, experienced, career people by the Eisenhower Board. I charged that the Eisenhower Board had removed many competent, qualified, efficient, and nonpolitical employees of the agency for the purpose of facilitating their distortion of the legislative scheme. Not a scintilla of evidence has been offered to rebut that charge. On the record it stands admitted.

The second fallacy is that considerations of experience, merit, and ability should control personnel policy with respect to the NLRB's professional staff only for career civil-service employees and that employees who obtained their positions on merit, who devoted a lifetime to Board service, and who performed their technical duties efficiently and well are not to be considered in that category unless they have competitive civil service or veteran's status. But, as I pointed out in my speech, the professional staff of the Board, whether it has technical civil-service status or not, cannot be treated as fair game even for the spoils system, for its function is to do impartial justice under the law. That they cannot do if their security hangs on political considerations rather than the merits of their performance. More shocking still is the decimation of that staff for the purpose of replacing it with partisans in a field where impartiality between the opposing forces is the sine qua non of fair administration. Not only is there no denial that this is just what the Eisenhower appointees have done; the report blatantly admits it. No contention is made that the removal of Murdock and Feldesman was even remotely re-

lated to any consideration of merit; the only defense is that both were admitted to stay on until they had succeeded in securing other desirable employment.

The report claims that "every personnel action taken by the present Board and General Council (sic) was in full compliance with the laws and civil-service regulations." But in the face of the chicanery involved in the shifting of job titles, which I documented in my speech, and the many constructive discharges, both of which the report ignores, the bare undocumented assertion is hardly convincing.

More important, even if civil service rules and regulations had been followed to the letter, that would be no answer to the basic charge that the persons who were appointed to vacated positions on the profesisonal staff were uniformly inexperienced men of management background, who could be trusted to bring to their jobs an antiunion bias. Neither the report, nor the Leedom, nor the Kammholz letter so much as refers to this charge, which I detailed in my speech, at all. Specifically, neither of the letters refers to the appointments of regional directors in Detroit and St. Louis, or the appointment, as associate general counsel in charge of field operations, of an attorney whose only experience in the labor relations field outside the Board was as an attorney for a division of the United States Steel Corp., and who had less than 4 months with the Board.

Chairman Leedom does say that only 27 new professional people have been hired during this period. It is unclear whether this includes all persons hired both for the Board's staff and for the staff of the General Counsel. If the figure does include both categories, it should be most interesting to obtain a list of the 27 and a statement of their professional background. If the professional background of each proved to be similar to the background of those whose appointments were heralded in Board press releases, there would be reason enough to explain the report's silence.

General Counsel Kammholz does say, and correctly, that the regional and subregional offices of the Board "represent the frontline operation of the agency in its contact with the public. In many important respects each regional director functions as an 'alter ego' of the General Counsel."

The importance of this statement is emphasized when the character of the appointments to these offices is examined. In addition to the instances referred to in my speech, there are now additional examples of the kind of qualifications which are apparently established by the Board and the General Counsel for appointments to regional and subregional offices.

A short time ago, the appointment of an officer in charge of the Indianapolis, Ind., field office, was announced. The man appointed to this important office had a total of 1 month's experience with the Labor Board. Prior to this month's experienc, he had served as assistant legislative counsel in the office of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior for a few months and before that he had served a term as attorney general of South Dakota. I know nothing of the background of this man except for these facts. He may be an entirely acceptable individual. But it is clear that his appointment, like so many others, is the appointment of a man with little or no experience in the field of labor relations, over the heads of employees of the Board of long standing who have the experience and qualifications necessary for these important offices.

Even more shocking is the recent appointment of a new regional director for the Board's regional office at Los Angeles, Calif. The man appointed to this important post as an alter ego of the General Counsel does have considerable experience in the labor relations field. He has served as industrial security officer for Consolidated Vultee at San Diego and for North American Aviation at Downey, Calif. He also has worked as assistant director of industrial relations for a large steel corporation and as director of industrial relations for the employers' section of the Printing Industries Association in Los Angeles.

How this experience qualifies a man to supervise the frontline operations of the agency in dealing, in an impartial way, with both labor and management, is hard to visualize. The enormity of this kind of appointment can be suggested by speculating as to what would happen if the Board announced that it was appointing as its regional director a man whose career, up to the time of his appointment, had consisted entirely of representation of unions in dealing with employers.

There are additional examples. On March 30, 1956, the General Counsel announced his appointment of Harold A. Boire as Assistant General Counsel in charge of the Washington branch of the Division of Operations, and John D. Stringer to be Chief of the Appeals Section. Their experience would qualify neither one of them for even a top rank and file position with the agency if the requirements stated in job descriptions remained the criteria for qualification.

In attempting to defend these personnel actions, Kammholz adopts the by now familiar device of misstating the charge. The offense charged is not "any changes were made at all." The offense is that the changes were made for political and antiunion reasons; that they were demonstrably not made to increase efficiency; and that the manner in which the changes were made and the lack of qualification of the appointees prove it. Obviously, that charge is not answered by Kammholz' bare assertion that in his "judgment" changes were necessary "to strengthen the agency and to improve performance." The word "judgment" is a convenient term under which to hide. But when it appears, as it does here, that the changes cannot strengthen but can only weaken the agency and that the common characteristic of the changes is that they replace experienced and capable men with management oriented novices, the conclusion that the changes were made for the reasons stated in my speech, and not for legitimate administrative reasons, is irresistible.

III. DISCRIMINATORY CASE HANDLING BY THE GENERAL COUNSEL

I charged in my speech that the new General Counsel had adopted a policy of issuing complaints against unions not merely in cases where the law was doubtful and unsettled, but in cases where there were Board and even court decisions, squarely in point, holding the union conduct at issue lawful. I charged also that the General Counsel's agents in the field were utilizing that policy, and the fact that once a complaint issued against a union in a section 8 (b) (4) case an injunction was immediately applied for by the General Counsel and often granted, to coerce unions to desist from peaceful picketing and other conduct which was lawful under the decided cases.

The report, again misstating the charge, attempts to make it appear that I criticized the General Counsel for adopting a policy of proceeding rather than dismissing in doubtful cases. But the validity of that policy, so abstractly stated, was never in issue. Although the report implies the contrary, the policy of proceeding in doubtful cases was not originated by Kammholz but by his predecessors. The difference lies not in the policy but in its application. And one difference is that, formerly complaints were issued in doubtful cases against unions and employers alike; under Kammholz, as I proved in my speech, where charges regarded as doubtful are filed against employers, they are dismissed. When similar doubtful charges are filed against unions, a complaint will be issued.

Although Mr. Kammholz in his letter calls the charge "ridiculous and unfounded," nowhere does he deny that he has repeatedly, as a matter of policy, issued complaints against labor organizations when the only conduct alleged to be illegal was, at the time the complaint issued, lawful under controlling Board and court decisions. There was nothing whatever doubtful about the law in these cases. The law was clear. The only reason for so proceeding was the fact that the General Counsel did not like the law as it then stood; he wanted the Eisenhower Board to change it. Far from being a proper exercise of the General Counsel's powers, that is part of the very program of amending the act under the guise of reinterpretation of which the Republican administration stands accused.

What makes the bias and prejudice even more apparent is the fact that not one case is called to our attention, by the report or by Kammholz, in which a complaint was issued against an employer under similar circumstances, that is, where an applicable outstanding Board decision held the conduct with which the employer was charged legal.

That documented charge of disparate and discriminatory treatment of unions and employers in the issuance of complaints is obviously not met by the report's technique of creating a straw man—a fictitious accusation that a policy of issuing complaints in doubtful cases against both sides is bad—and then knocking it down. Resort to that technique is itself further evidence that the charge which I actually made is valid and irrefutable.

In my speech I also documented the charge that the General Counsel and his staff had engaged in gross discrimination against employees and labor organizations in case handling both in the field and in Waashington. The report refers to Kammholz's letter for the "detailed answer to these charges." For complete understanding of these so-called answers, which I discuss below, they should be read in conjunction with the initial discussion of these cases in my speech.

A. Case No. K–42, administrative decision of the General Counsel

Kammholz devotes much of his letter to detailing issues in this case which have no relevance whatever to the charge made, namely, that the General Counsel refused to issue a complaint even though five employees testified without contradiction to conduct by the employer which, if it occurred, was unquestionably sufficient, in and of itself, to justify the issuance of a complaint. Kammholz does not deny that the only contradiction of the employees' testimony was contained in an affidavit from the employer's attorney who was not a witness to the events; nor does he deny that the General Counsel resolved the factual issue against the employees merely on the basis of the attorney's affidavit. He could not do so, for those facts are clearly stated in his own account of the administrative decision. Nothing in the remainder of the intricate situation presented in that case could possibly justify such an unfair and unwarranted resolution of that factual question. In this case Kammholz insists that it is the General Counsel's duty to weigh conflicting evidence in light of all the facts. Yet in the Banta Towing case, to which I next turn, the examiner's report clearly reveals that Mr. Kammholz's investigation must have concerned itself only with those facts which had been supplied to the regional office by the employer, and must have ignored completely all of the actual facts of the case, as witnessed by the employees involved, as well as by the union representatives who were assaulted and shot at.

B. Banta Towing Co.

General Counsel Kammholz says that the regional office's investigation of this case revealed that the captain was held a prisoner in his galley and was forced to barricade himself in the pilot house by union representatives; that the captain was "intimidated and stripped of his authority." If that is in fact what the field investigation revealed, the investigation must have been even more one sided and prejudiced than Regional Director Kennedy's decision to issue a complaint against the union and to dismiss the charge against the company. For the statements of the employees who were present, as well as of the union representatives, show that it was the captain involved who instigated the violence by assaulting one of the union representatives with a flashlight; that it was the captain who threatened to get a shotgun from the pilot house and "shoot the whole shebang"; that the captain was acting like a "wildman" and going "beserk"; that the captain "had a propensity for the use of such dangerous weapons as flashlights, meat cleavers, 15-inch butcher knives, toothpicks, or in other words any weapon he could get his hands on" and that, as the trial examiner found, the only interference by union representatives with the captain's freedom of movement which occurred was dictated by the immediate necessity of protecting themselves against the threats of bodily harm which the captain not merely voiced but repeatedly attempted to and later did effectuate. The fourth paragraph in Mr. Kammholz' treatment of the Banta case warrants close comparison with the facts as set out in my speech and with the evidence as detailed in the trial examiner's report. It is significant that Kammholz does not even suggest that the field examination revealed that the company had transported, in violation of Federal law, armed strikebreakers for the express purpose of shooting the pickets off the barges and that the pickets had come armed with toothpicks because they had been warned that the company would use firearms and other weapons to crush them. Revealing of Mr. Kammholz' own state of mind is his innocuous description of the barrage ordered by Captain Burt: "Some shots were fired from the towboat, with the result that the young union representative was wounded in the arm." One would never know from reading that statement that Captain Burt had deliberately ordered a fusillade of shots fired; that he had deliberately selected this particular union representative as the target at whom fire was to be directed; and that the violence which ensued then and earlier was, as the trial examiner expressly found, the result of the company's plan and design, all motivated by Captain J. W.'s statement, made before any union representative ever came on board any boat, and not denied, that he did not want any "damn union on his boats."

Kammholz' attempt to explain away the regional office's failure to issue a complaint against the company in this case by referring to "limited and peculiar circumstances" answers nothing. The only thing peculiar and unusual about these circumstances is that not since 1938 has an equally flagrant case of the use of weapons of warfare by an employer to throttle and defeat self-organization been spread upon the records of the Board. The viciousness of the unfair labor practices committed here by the company demanded immediate and effective correction through the Board's processes, not excuses by the regional director.

Equally unconvincing is Kammholz' attempt to defend issuance of the complaint against the union on the theory that by using force against the property of the company and the person of the captain, it allegedly interfered with the self-organizational rights of the employees. As the trial examiner pointed out, the employees involved were all members of the union before any acts of violence occurred. It was totally and utterly unnecessary for the union to use any violence whatever to induce them to join or to remain members. The entire crew voluntarily went on strike in protest against the company's refusal to deal with their duly chosen bargaining representative. On what conceivable theory could any acts of aggression which the union directed to the company's property have been designed to coerce these employees into doing something which the evidence shows they did entirely voluntarily? Moreover, the result of any investigation should have revealed even to Mr. Kennedy that the only violence which the union directed against the company or its property was designed entirely as a self-defense measure by the individuals involved who were under constant threat of bodily harm from the captain. On what conceivable theory can measures taken in self-defense be equated with unlawful aggression? And is it not startling that in a case where the complaint was issued ostensibly to protect the right of employees, not one single employee should be called by the General Counsel to support it? The reason is, as the trial examiner observed, that the regional director issued a complaint against the union in this case not to protect the rights of any employees, but entirely to serve the company's twofold purpose: (1) to deprive its employees of the rights guaranteed to them by section 7 of the act, and (2) "to protect its property in the pursuit of its business" against the economic consequences which the company feared would follow from unionization. The trial examiner observed that "Board process is available for neither of these purposes." Indeed, to use Board process as Kennedy did, for these purposes, is to subvert not only the processes of the Board but the act itself.

C. Coca-Cola

In his discussion of this case, as elsewhere, Kammholz seeks to evade the charge made by discussing different and unrelated matters. A large part of his discussion is devoted to the section 8 (b) (1) (A) and 8 (b) (4) (A) cases against the teamsters which are totally irrelevant to the 8 (b) (4) (C) case which I discussed in my speech. The attempt to drag in the other cases is only designed to create an aura of prejudice against local No. 688 and to prevent consideration on the merits of the Regional Director's malfeasance in issuing a complaint against local No. 688 under section 8 (b) (4) (C).

Kammholz devotes but a paragraph to his discussion of the facts of the section 8 (b) (4) (C) case. First he says that the association was not defunct or dissolved when the strike began on November 9. The only basis for this assertion, however, is the trial examiner's statement that the proceedings in which the association was actually dissolved "were highly irregular and, if the trial examiner were called upon to decide, illegal." But the question at issue is not whether the proceedings, attended by 185 out of 196 association members, all of whom voted to disband the association (R. 189), were irregular or illegal; the issue is whether their action left the association a functioning labor organization. The record shows that after the meeting not one employee claimed to be a member of the association or desired to participate in it (R. 227). Judge Moore held that it was not, and the trial examiner could not even infer to the contrary, since there is not a shred of evidence that the association did or could have functioned after the dissolution meeting. It had no members, no supporters, no flesh, no blood. Indeed, as the attorney for the association told the Board, the association did not even want to appear on the ballot in an election that might be ordered. It did not have even a potential future existence.

Moreover, Kammholz ignores entirely the fact that before local No. 688 struck the contract between Coca-Cola and the association had expired; that, admittedly there was at that time an existing question concerning representation; and that the company was not in fact bargaining with the association and was under no legal obligation of any kind to do so.

These facts were plainly stated in my speech to be the reasons for my conclusion that the regional director acted arbitrarily, unlawfully, and contrary to the terms and policy of the act and of the legislative history in issuing an 8 (b) (4) (C) complaint in this case. Mr. Kammholz now answers that the Board in *Lewis Food Company* (115 NLRB No. 136), decided March 22, 1956, held that an outstanding certification may support a finding that a rival union's strike for recognition violates section 8 (b) (4) (C), even though the certification is more than 1 year old. But Mr. Kammholz neglects to state that the Board's decision in the Lewis case shows on its face that the only basis for the majority's conclusion was that the certified union had a contract with the employer which was still in effect at the time the rival union struck and that, according to the Board, the employer was under a legal obligation to continue to recognize the incumbent contracting union pursuant to that contract until it expired. That decision may be right or wrong, but certainly it has nothing to do with the *Coca-Cola* case, where the contract between the company and the association had expired a week before local 688 called its strike.

D. Missouri Transit Co.

Kammholz attempts to explain away the delay in issuance of a complaint against the employer in this case on the ground that during the first 4 months after the complaint was filed his predecessor was in office and that a 3-month period elapsed thereafter before he was appointed. He implies that the case was thereafter expeditiously handled, that additional investigation was required and that after that investigation was completed the complaint promptly issued. But no amount of explanation can justify the delay between March 29, 1955, and December 23, 1955, when the complaint was actually isued, a period of 9 months from the time General Counsel Kammholz took office. No matter how complex the legal and factual issues, it should not take 9 months to decide that there is sufficient evidence to warrant issuance of a complaint, particularly where the violations are as flagrant as they were in that case. Comparison of the speed with which complaints are issued against unions in cases where the legal and factual issues are equally complex would show that during General Counsel Kammholz' tenure the lapse between filing a charge and issuance of complaint against a union has generally been countable in weeks, not months.

E. Volney Felt Mills, division of Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Co.

I charged in my speech that a Board field examiner had induced the union to withdraw its lawful picket line by threatening to issue a complaint and to obtain an injunction against the union on the employer's charges. Kammholz replies that I received "jumbled and inaccurate report" and that the field examiner did not suggest that the union should withdraw its picket line. But Kammholz does not deny that the field examiner predicted that a complaint would issue and an injunction be applied for against the union on the employer's charges, even though the union's picketing was lawful under the Board precedents as they then stood. He does not deny that the field examiner pointed out that only if the employer withdrew his charges could the union avoid subjecting itself to the burdensome litigation and

heavy costs which issuance of a complaint against it would entail. And he does not deny that the employer would withdraw the charge only if the union agreed to cease its lawful picketing. These are the facts as testified to by Mr. William Englander, counsel for the union, who personally participated in the case. His affidavit is attached hereto as exhibit A. Mr. Kammholz' vague generalities—the "conversation covered a wide range of discussion concerning various Board and court precedents"—cannot obscure the fact that by threatening to undertake proceedings against the union, the Board succeeded when the employer had failed in forcing the union to desist from a lawful course of conduct.

F. United Steel Workers of America, CIO (Metal Fabricators and Finishers, Inc.)

I charged in my speech that the handling of this case by the regional office was an example of sheer harrassment and vindictiveness toward unions. Kammholz does not deny that the facts are as I stated them, except in one particular. He says that the union "had persistently declined to enter into a formal settlement agreement * * * and reiterated its refusal to do so before the trial examiner at the hearing." This is incorrect. The union was willing to agree to a Board order against it. Indeed, it did not defend in the formal proceeeding before the trial examiner and it did not file any objection to his intermediate report or to the proposed Board order which he recommended.

There is another inaccuracy in Mr. Kammholz' reply. He attempts to justify the regional director's filing of exceptions to the trial examiner's report as an effort to preclude the establishment of erroneous legal precedents. The filing of exceptions here cannot be explained on any such basis. The trial examiner did not hold in that case that any of the conduct of the union which had been charged to violate the act did not constitute a violation. He merely refused to pass on some of it on the ground that the evidence was cumulative. Certainly, as the Board later confirmed by adopting his report, that disposition could not conceivably have been through to establish any erroneous legal precedent. The filing of exceptions by the regional office accomplished nothing but what I charged in my speech it accomplished, namely, harassment of the union.

But even if Mr. Kammholz were right instead of wrong on both counts, his replies would not touch the heart of the matter. The plain and uncontroverted fact is that the local organization in that case had ceased to exist. The strike was lost, all of the strikers had lost their jobs, and the union agreed not to attempt in any way to represent the employees during the rest of the certification year. The employer was satisfied. The employee who had filed the charges was satisfied. Everyone was satisfied except the regional director, who insisted on using the limited available Board personnel to beat a dead horse.

General Counsel Kammholz attempts to justify this by citing a case from the same regional office involving violence by an employer in which a formal settlement was insisted upon. But even if it is assumed that in that case the charging parties desired to withdraw their charges and the union was satisfied with an informal settlement, still the cases are not at all parallel. The essence of the complaint against the regional director in the Metal Fabricators case is that he insisted in going ahead with a proceeding which would lead only to a formal order directing the union not to coerce the employees of this particular company, when the union not only agreed that it would no longer engage in such illegal activities, but also had agreed that it would not represent the employees at all, and, hence, would have no relationships either with the employees or the employer which would give the Board's order any meaning. The General Counsel's action in insisting on proceeding against the union under those circumstances would be paralleled in a case in which he insisted on proceeding against the company even though the company had gone out of business. If General Counsel Kammholz can find a case in which an employer has ceased business entirely and agreed that he will not go back into business for at least a year and in which his regional director has nevertheless insisted on continuing a formal proceeding against the employer, even though the employer has also agreed to post notices or take any action requested, then he can say that the Metal Fabricators case does not show vindictiveness and harassment of unions.

The report criticizes me for suggesting that the many instances of unfairness in case handling which I documented in my speech are only illustrative and that there may be many, many others which only an investigation could uncover. The criticism implies that I have been able to review all of the cases which have been handled by the General Counsel administratively in Washington, and all of the cases which were handled in the regional offices, and that unfairness was found only in the cases which I discussed. That is not true, as I specifically stated in my speech. No single Senator, indeed, no one man, could conduct a complete investigation of the National Labor Relations Board. Indeed, it would be impossible to conduct an adequate investigation of the General Counsel's office at all without subpena powers which were not available to me, for, as I stated in my speech, the facts are buried in the secret files of the General Counsel and the regional offices. The cases I discussed were only those which were brought to my attention, fortunately, by parties who chose to seek to redress in this manner. That there were enough instances to reveal a pattern of bias and prejudice in favor of management and against unions suffices alone to prove that they cannot be the only ones who have well-founded grievances. Obviously only an investigation can bring them all to light.

Before leaving the subject of the General Counsel's administration of his office mention should be made of Mr. Kammholz's denial of my charge that he has spent an excessive amount of time away from his desk. Mr. Kammholz says that the report that he spends less than 50 percent of his time at his desk is grossly exaggerated, but he does not make any effort to tell us just how much time he has spent at his desk since taking office. These are facts peculiarly within Mr. Kammholz's knowledge, and the facts, if he supplied them, would be far more persuasive, one way or the other, than his conclusionary assertion. We may infer, I think, from Mr. Kammholz's failure to supply this evidence, that the facts would support, not refute, my position. Second, Mr. Kammholz suggests that it is part of his business to visit each one of the Board's 21 regional offices and spend time there getting to know firsthand something about these offices and the people who run them. We need not quarrel with this as a legitimate view of one aspect of the General Counsel's functions, but the question remains whether one who is appointed to a job as important as General Counsel of the Board at a time when that position had been vacant for 3 months and when the backlog of decisions which only the General Counsel is authorized by law to make had inevitably grown to overwhelming proportions, could afford to indulge in the luxury of such field trips before disposing of the backlog.

Far from being disposed of, shortly after Mr. Kammholz's appointment, the backlog of cases in the Appeals Section—cases in which unions, principally, appealed from refusals by regional directors to issue complaints on charges which they filed against employers—grew progressively larger. I am advised that by April 1956, over 100 such cases were pending and awaiting adjudication by the General Counsel. One may well ask whether the General Counsel's gathering of first-hand knowledge of the personnel of the regional offices, information which is hardly indispensable to the proper performance of his statutory task, may be regarded as taking precedence over performance of his statutory duty to determine expeditiously whether or not complaints should issue on charges which have been filed with the Board.

But this entire defense, again, misses the point. I did not charge Mr. Kammholz with dereliction of duty because he visited some or many of the Board's field offices in an effort to acquaint himself with the personnel and operations. I charged that he was abusing his office by spending an inordinate amount of time in traveling for the purpose of speech making to employer groups. Ignoring the fact that his audiences have not been the public, for whose benefit the statute was enacted, but a small segment of that public, namely, some employers, Mr. Kammholz's only answer is that he considers it part of the General Counsel's job to spend "some time and effort in acquainting the public * * * with the general operation of the agency." I suggest that Kammholz would do well to read the statute again, and particularly section 3 (d), which establishes and defines the duties of the office of General Counsel of the Board. If Congress vested the General Counsel with the duty of acting as a public information officer, I have yet to discover the language in the act by which it did so. The Board has a division of information and it has been my impression that such information concerning the agency as the public requires could be and should be supplied by it.

IV. AMENDMENT OF THE STATUTE BY DECISIONS OF THE EISENHOWER BOARD

I charged in my speech that the Eisenhower Board, while ostensibly exercising quasi-judicial power, is actually legislating. The charge is that the Eisenhower appointees regard it as their mission to overhaul the interpretations of the act which had been made by the Board since 1947. I charged that the Eisenhower Board members are actuated in making these changes in law and policy by bias and prejudice against labor organizations and in favor of management. I documented my charges by showing that in 32 major [1] precedent-setting cases, the Eisen-

[1] Chairman Leedom did discover one obvious mechanical error in my speech; but the use he made of it is characteristic of his entire reply. In discussing the Board's extention of its pre-existing jurisdictional policies to reject cases involving industrial properties, I inadvertently included the citation of the *New York Stock Exchange* case (decided in 1944, 58 NLRB 911). Mr. Leedom says that I used this case to prove that the Eisenhower Board had distorted the law. My attack was based on the action of the Eisenhower Board in the East Newark Realty Corp. case and the McKinney Avenue Realty Co. case. The text of the speech does not refer to or discuss the New York Stock Exchange case but only the extension of the rule which was accomplished by the Eisenhower Board. Aside from the date of the New York Stock Exchange decision, any intelligent reading of my speech could not possibly have failed to reveal that I was not using that case to attack the new Board, because in the New York Stock Exchange case, the old Board asserted jurisdiction over the office building operator. In their dissenting opinions in the East Newark case, Members Murdock and Peterson refer to New York Stock Exchange as a case which provides a "graphic illustration of the absurdity" of the new majority's "office building standard." Leedom's reply is a facetious

hower Board made major changes in statutory interpretation or administrative policy, which, I showed, could not be justified by the language, the legislative history, or the objectives of the statute. And I demonstrated that in each case the change operated to the disadvantage of labor unions and to the advantage of antilabor employers.

These charges have been further validated, since my speech was made, by decisions of the courts which have reviewed the Board's decisions in the cases I discussed. In my speech, I treated at length the Board's decision in the BVD case, pointing out the disastrous impact upon the statutory rights of employees which would result from the rule of law which the Eisenhower Board innovated in that case. On May 3, 1956, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the Board, for reasons virtually identical with those which I cited. *Ladies Garment Workers Union* v. *NLRB* (38 LRRM 2061). In my speech, I attacked as unconscionable the Board's refusal in the Modern Linen case, by resorting to its restrictive jurisdictional policy standards, to protect against reprisal an employee who had been discharged for testifying under subpena at a prior Board proceeding. On June 7, 1956, the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed the Board's decision, finding that the Board had acted "arbitrarily and capriciously" and that its result was "unjust and intolerable." *Pedersen* v. *NLRB* (30 CCH Labor Cases 70025).

Subsequent to my speech, the Supreme Court acted on the remaining cases in which the Board had asked the Court to review the decisions of the courts of appeals condemning the Board's attempt to expand the prohibitory sweep of the secondary boycott provisions of the act. As in the Board's earlier petitions which I cited, the Supreme Court denied review. *NLRB* v. *Sales Drivers* and *NLRB* v. *Business Machines, etc.* (certiorari denied, June 4, 1956).[2]

It is of the utmost significance that although the report was issued after these judicial developments, which so clearly confirm my charges, had occurred, the report is completely silent about them.

That silence is characteristic of all of the replies, in that none go to the meat of the issue.

My charges could be refuted only by demonstrating that the decisional and policy changes which I attacked are rooted in the language and policy of the statute, not merely in the personal prejudices and economic and political predilections of the new appointees. This the replies fail to do.

A. Evasion of the charge—the numbers game

The report says that Chairman Leedom's letter to Senator HILL contains the "detailed answer to these charges." But the plain fact is that the letter contains not the semblance of an answer in these terms. Instead of discussing the cases, Leedom attempts only to minimize their impact and importance. This he does by resorting to a peculair kind of numbers game. This is the way the game is played.

First, Chairman Leedom counts the number of leading cases discussed in my speech. Then he excludes from them all cases in which one or more of the two remaining Truman appointees on the Board concurred. This leaves only 9 cases. Then he says that the Board, in this period, decided almost 5,000 cases of all sorts. And then he concludes that the area of "purposeful distortion" (Leedom's words) covers only two-tenths of 1 percent of the whole area of Board decision.

The fallacies of this numbers game are apparent to every informed observer of this field. Indeed, they have already been exposed by at least one such observer. On April 17, 1956, Bernard Dunau, formerly an attorney on the litigation staff of the Board, and now in private practice in Washington, addressed a letter to the New York Times in which he revealed the Leedom reply as a complete sham. I quote his letter in full:

"In a speech before the Senate on March 23, 1956, Senator WAYNE MORSE accused the National Labor Relations Board, as reconstituted and dominated by a majority appointed by the Republican administration, of anti-union bias in its decisions. Three weeks later, in a letter to Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, NLRB Chairman Boyd Leedom sought to answer this charge by arguing in part that, of the cases criticized by Senator MORSE, 'only nine represent a strict division between Eisenhower and Truman appointees. These 9 comprise less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the whole body of 4,615 decisions in contested cases rendered during a period that approximates that of the Eisenhower majority, fiscal years 1954, 1955 and the first of 1956. Admittedly, two-tenths of 1 percent is a rather small area for purposeful distortion of congressional intent.'

"This attempt at statistical refutation echoes previous efforts of the Eisenhower appointees to the NLRB to find refuge in numbers. In the Georgetown Law Journal for March 1955, Guy Farmer, former NLRB Chairman, wrote that 'The Board has been unanimous in about 95 percent of its cases.' In a speech made on October 19, 1955, Philip Ray Rodgers, NLRB member and then its acting chairman, stated that of the total contested cases '94 percent * * * have been decided by a unanimous vote of the Board,' and in less than 1 percent 'has the vote of the Board been divided along so-called political or philosophical lines.'

"There is a surface plausibility in the argument but its fallacy is easily exposed. It ignores important quantitative and qualitative distinctions which, when taken into account, materially change the picture.

"1. First of all, the basis for comparison which the Eisenhower appointees take is all contested cases without differentiation as to type, difficulty, or problem. This is like attempting to show that the percentage of deaths from cancer despite surgery is small by including among the survivors those patients who were operated upon for appendicitis.

"For example, the cases decided by the Board may be divided into unfair labor practice cases and representation cases. Representation cases, which are by far the most numerous, present primarily two main questions: (1) whether the time is appropriate for conducting an election to determine whether or not a majority of employees desire to be represented by a union, and (2) what classes of employees should be grouped together in a single unit for the purpose of collective bargaining. The kind of specific issue which is likely to arise in a representation case is not unfairly illustrated by the earth-shaking question whether a receiving clerk is appropriately included in a unit of warehouse employees and truckdrivers. Yet the Eisenhower appointees include this sort of case as part of their showing that significant unanimity of opinion exists among all NLRB members.

"The distortion which results from this indiscriminate lumping together is patent. In the fiscal year 1954, the NLRB decided 1,837 contested representation cases and 258 contested unfair labor practice cases. To show unanimity of opinion the Eisenhower appointees would include all 2,095 cases in their basis of comparison. Yet in all likelihood 90 percent of the representation cases, about 1,653, presented no issues capable of provoking a significant difference of opinion. When these 1,653 cases are culled out, 184 contested representation cases are left which might conceivably be included in the basis of comparison, a very different thing.

"2. To arrive at a valid basis for comparison it is accordingly necessary to evaluate the cases and to eliminate those which do not present division-provoking questions. But that is not the whole story even quantitatively.

"The Board members ordinarily (and quite properly) follow the practice that, once a majority has decided an issue, those in dissent thereafter follow the ruling, at least until a new majority can be mustered to overturn it. For example, after an Eisenhower-appointed majority of three decided not to assert jurisdiction over a radio station with less than an annual gross income of $200,000, any subsequent case involving this issue would be decided unanimously. But the unanimity flows, not from agreement upon the jurisdictional policy, but from the practice of adhering to a previous determination of the issue. Yet the Eisenhower appointees include in their basis of comparison all such cases as among those in which there is no 3–2 division along political lines.

"3. The fundamental fallacy in the statistical justification advanced by the Eisenhower appointees is, however, not quantitative. It is qualitative. A half-dozen rulings on subjects of pivotal importance can change the character of the regulatory scheme even as a hundred others are left undisturbed. It takes only one bullet to kill or maim.

"Furthermore, the influence of pivotal rulings is not confined to the subjects to which immediately addressed. They set a tone which subtly, but inevitably and significantly, guides the host of NLRB employees, investigator, attorney and trail examiner, in the everyday performance of the agency's work. Investigative zeal is dulled, or its direction changed, as the mood of the agency heads is gauged. These consequences may not be capable of statistical demonstration, but they nonetheless exist, as everyone familiar with institutional activity knows.

"Even among the agency heads themselves a like influence exists. There is a limit to effective dissent. There is also the need to get along which not infrequently will silence a dissenter. These intangible pressures bring about concurrence in decisions which in a different climate of opinion would not command assent. And the climate of opinion is of course formed by the Eisenhower majority which dominates the NLRB.

"It is apparent, therefore, that the statistics vouchsafed us by the Eisenhower appointees cannot truly tell us what they have wrought. Guy Farmer, the first of the Eisenhower-appointed NLRB Chairmen, in an address to the Industrial Relations Institute of the University of Wisconsin on July 20, 1955, stated that: 'It is true, of course, that a host of matters that once troubled the Board have now become settled doctrine; the Board and the courts have put to rest many of the problems that formerly beset this field. But a surprisingly large number of areas remain in which the law has not jelled; or, having once appeared to be settled, has dissolved again into a sort of twilight zone.' We can best ascertain what the Eisenhower appointees are going by looking qualitatively into their performance in settling what is still unsettled and in unsettling what had been settled.

"In his letter to Senator HILL, NLRB Chairman Leedom heavily discounts the charges leveled by Senator MORSE on the ground that they are based upon an analysis by an at-

---

attempt to discredit the charge actually made by drawing from a mere mechanical error a patently false inference.

[2] In fairness it should be noted that the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia has upheld the Board in one of the cases I criticized. *Amalgamated Meat Cutters* v. *NLRB and Swift & Co.* (decided June 22, 1956, 38 LRRM 2289); petition for rehearing has been filed and is now pending.

torney representing unions (a species of name calling which perhaps itself discloses the bias it professes to deny). I hasten to add, therefore, that management no less than labor is not entirely happy with the statistics of the Eisenhower appointees. In a radio broadcast of the Georgetown University forum on September 4, 1955, Mr. Benjamin Miller, director, Industrial Relations, American Trucking Association, observed that, 'Farmer says 95 percent were unanimous. But my question is, What about that 5 percent? They seem to be the precedent cases at least vital to both' management and labor. Of course, since management as well as labor has its bias, NLRB Chairman Leedom may see fit to disregard the views of both as untrustworthy. This would leave the field to the academicians as presumably the only ones free of bias and hence free to criticize. It may therefore be appropriate to mention the views expressed by Prof. Willard Wirtz in his address on August 22, 1955, to the section of Labor Relations law of the American Bar Association: 'These 2 years have seen phenomenal changes wrought in the interpretation and application of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 by a new National Labor Relations Board majority appointed by a new administration. * * * Yet what has happened remains, by any fair appraisal, a vertiable revolution in the interpretation of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and one in which the new members of the National Labor Relations Board have acted primarily on their own responsibility.'

"Phenomenal changes have been wrought; statistics do not belie their existence; the Eisenhower appointees ought at least to face up to them rather than to pretend that nothing has happened."

There we have it. The entire defense is a skillfully woven concoction of false premises, false accusations, false inferences, and false conclusions designed to prove that the revolution in Board policy which the Eisenhower appointees have accomplished did not occur at all. Congress and the American people, I am convinced, will not be fooled.

B. The myth of prounion charges by the Eisenhower Board

Chairman Leedom also alleges in his letter, and the report repeats his charge, that the basis of my attack is unsound because the cases I selected do not fairly reflect the trend of the Eisenhower Board's decisions. He says "there are many other important decisions issued during the past 3 years in which the Board decided important questions, either not previously considered or previously going the other way, aiding organizational activities by employees and protecting the right of unions." In support of this asserttion, Leedom cites 11 cases. Leedom says that if these cases are viewed as a group in isolation from the vast number of other decisions made during the same period, "they might give rise to an inference of favoritism toward unions generally." If these cases sustained the claim made for them they would be significant. But when we examined them, we find that nothing could be further from the truth.

The first three cases cited by Chairman Leedom, Ranco, Seamprufe, and Babcock & Wilcox, all deal with the same factual situation and with the same proposition of law. In all three cases union organizers, who were not employees of the employer involved, attempted to distribute union literature to employees on parking lots adjacent to the plant. The parking lots were maintained by the companies as adjuncts of their business, for the use of their employees. In each case, the plants were located in rural areas, at a distance from any large community; in each, because of the geographical location of the plant, and proximity to a highway, distribution of union literature to the employees could be made effectively only on the parking lots. In each case the employer involved sought to prevent distribution of the union's literature on his parking lot. In *NLRB* v. *LeTourneau Company of Georgia* (324 U. S. 793) the Supreme Court had held that in circumstances such as these the right of the employees to receive union literature, which the act guarantees, outweighs the bare property right of the employer to exercise "absolute dominion" over activity which occurs on his property. The Court held that dissemination of the literature on the parking lots must be permitted to effectuate the statutory rights of the employees. The only difference between LeTourneau and the three cases cited by Leedom is that in LeTourneau employees were handing out the union literature whereas in these cases a nonemployee organizer was doing so. But the applicability of LeTourneau to nonemployees was not challenged for the first time in the three cases cited.

In *Caldwell Furniture Co.* (97 NLRB 1501), decided February 5, 1952, the old Board held that the LeTourneau rule prevented an employer from barring distribution of union literature on parking lots under such geographic circumstances when distribution was attempted by nonemployee organizers just as when it was attempted by employes. The Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit enforced the Board's order in that case (199 F. 2d 267). See also *Remington Rand* (103 NLRB 152), decided by the old Board.

Thus, when the three cases cited by Chairman Leedom came before the Board there was already well-established precedent, and, indeed, a judicial decision, dictating the result which was reached. What is interesting about it is that even under these circumstances, although the law seemed clearly settled on the basis of decisions of the Supreme Court and the fourth circuit, one of the Eisenhower appointees, Beeson, dissented and voted to hold that the employer was free to bar distribution of union literature by nonemployees on plant parking lots. (*Ranco, Inc.* (109 NLRB 998, 1001–1002).) The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on reviewing this case, sustained the majority's decision, holding that the Supreme Court's decision in LeTourneau was applicable and, of course, controlling.

It remains to add that 2 other circuits, reviewing the 2 other cases cited by Leedom, held that LeTourneau was not decisive where nonemployee organizers were involved. Certiorari was granted in all three cases to resolve the conflict. In the oral argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on these cases, as reported in Law Week (24 L. W. 3201–3202), the Board's Assistant General Counsel told the Court that in view of the rationale of the Supreme Court's decision in the LeTourneau case—that parking lots under these circumstances were appropriate places for employees to receive union literature and that protection of their right to receive literature was necessary to effectuate the statutory guaranty of self-organization—the Board regarded these cases as in no material respect different from the LeTourneau case itself.

Having told the Supreme Court of the United States that its decisions in these cases marked no change in policy, and that the Board indeed regarded itself bound to decide them the way it did by the Supreme Court's own prior decision, there seems something less than candor in Chairman Leedom's attempt now to describe these cases as ones "in which the Board decided important questions either not previously considered or previously going the other way, aiding organizational activities by employers and protecting the rights of unions." The truth is, as we have seen, that the precise question involved in these cases had been previously considered and decided, not only by the Board but by at least one court of appeals, and that the Eisenhower Board made no change in policy at all in deciding the cases as it did.[1]

The next case cited by Leedom is *Richfield Oil Corp.* (110 NLRB 356), in which the Board held that the statutory obligation imposed on employers by section 8 (a) (5) of the act to bargain collectively about all matters affecting wages, hours, and working conditions comprehends the duty to bargain collectively upon request about employee participation in stock purchase plans established by the employer as an incident to the employment relation. Although the application of the duty to bargain to such stock purchase plans was challenged for the first time in this case, the scope of the duty to bargain and the legal principles which govern it had been so well settled in prior decisions of the Board and the courts, that, as the majority opinion showed, the employer's attempt to distinguish between stock purchase plans and other types of plans for employee remuneration, which were concededly covered, was little short of frivolous. Yet here again, although the controlling legal principles were absolutely clear, Eisenhower-appointee Beeson, asserting a broad power to legislate to achieve results which conform with his particular conception of the welfare of business, dissented (110 NLRB 356, at 370). Needless to say, the majority decision was enforced by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in an opinion by Judge Danaher (37 LRRM 2327). The company petitioned for certiorari in this case, and the Government filed a brief in opposition. In that brief the Solicitor General and the General Counsel of the Board told the Supreme Court that, because of the established precedents concerning the scope of the subject matter of collective bargaining, the decision of the Board and of the Court of Appeals in the Richfield case was so "clearly correct as to obviate any need for further review." Certainly such a decision cannot be used as evidence that the Eisenhower Board is exercising its discretionary authority to expand the rights of employees and labor organizations, or that it is without antilabor bias. It proves, at most, that some Eisenhower appointees, in some cases, recognize that judicial restraints prevent them from accomplishing a total and complete reversal of whatever benefits and advantages employees and unions continue to enjoy under the law.

It should be noted in passing, however, that other high officials of the Eisenhower administration, reflecting the reactionary Republicans' determination to emasculate labor's rights under the act, recognize no limit whatever. In this very Richfield case Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks, as reported in the Labor Relations Reporter (37 LRR 455–456), wrote a letter to the Solicitor General requesting that the Justice Department consent to the petition for certiorari filed by the company, even though the Board admitted that no substantial issue warranting review of the decision against the company was presented. The Solicitor General did not accede to this unlawyerlike position, he did, however, note the Secretary's intervention in the Government's brief in opposition. This attempt by the Republican administration, through its Department of Commerce, to influence even Board litigation policy in the Supreme Court, shows the lengths to which the Eisenhower administration is prepared to go to serve the interests of management at the expense of the rights guaranteed to labor under the law as enacted by Congress.

Boston Herald-Travelers Corp. (110 NLRB 2097) and *Whitin Machine Works* (108 NLRB

[1] It should be noted that the Supreme Court held that the employer was free to prohibit distribution of literature at his parking lot by outside organizers. This reversal is, of course, not relevant to the point I am discussing.

1537) (misspelled in Leedom's letter), deal with a single issue, the duty of an employer to supply to a labor organization with which it is bargaining collectively information regarding wages and wage rates of employees which is in the employer's possession and which is necessary to enable the union to bargain intelligently on these subjects. The Whitin case was discussed in Ratner's article, which I reproduced as an appendix to my speech, in the following terms:

"It is true that in Whitin Machine Works the Board phrased the duty of the employer to supply to the union information pertinent to collective bargaining in somewhat broader terms than had earlier Board cases. And in so doing the Board reversed at least one decision in which the duty had been subjected to restrictive qualifications. But the duty itself had been held to flow from the statute in an unbroken line of court decisions handed down before Whitin. The rationale for enforcement of the Board order in those cases implied at least, that the duty was as broad as Whitin's subsequent statement of it. The alacrity with which the courts of appeals have enforced Whitin, and subsequent decisions based upon the test therein enunciated, adds weight to the view that, to the extent Whitin marked a change in Board policy, it was a change dictated not so much by the individual opinions of the Board members as by the dictates of judicial authority."

It remains to add that despite the overwhelming weight of judicial authority, precisely in point, which was deemed controlling by the majority in the Whitin case, Eisenhower-appointee Beeson dissented even from that decision (108 NLRB at 1542). And it should also be noted that in a subsequent decision, rendered after Beeson was no longer a member, Chairman Farmer and Eisenhower-appointee Rogers dissented in an opinion which, if joined in by but one more member, would have reversed completely the law on the employer's duty to supply pertinent wage data; law established by an enormous body of Board and court decisions to which the Board had only a short time earlier bowed. (*Taylor Forge & Pipe Works* (113 NLRB No. 65).)

Truitt Mfg. Co. (110 NLRB 856), also cited by Chairman Leedom, is another case dealing with the employers' duty to supply information. The issue was whether an employer who in collective bargaining negotiations, claimed that he was financially unable to meet the union's wage demands was bound by the good-faith requirement in section 8 (a) (5) of the act to permit the union to examine the evidence from which the employer drew his conclusion as to inability to pay. To hold that the employer need not permit examination of the evidence would mean that he could stifle bargaining completely merely by asserting inability to pay; by precluding the union from determining whether he was taking that position in good faith, the employer could prevent the union from deciding intelligently what position to take in the light of the company's actual financial condition. But, again, this issue did not arise for the first time in Truitt. It actually arose and was decided by the old Board in 1951, in *Jacobs Mfg. Co.* (94 NLRB 1212, 1221–1222). That case was reviewed by the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, and the Board's view of the employers' legal duty under the act to supply such information in such circumstances was sustained. (*NLRB* v. *Jacobs Mfg. Co.* (196 F. 2d 680).) Manifestly, contrary to Leedom's assertion, Truitt is not a case in which the Board decided an important question "either not previously considered or previously going the other way."

Nor is *Borg-Warner* (113 NLRB 120), also cited by Chairman Leedom, such a case. The issue there was whether the employer violated section 8 (a) (5) by refusing to sign a contract with the union unless the union agreed in the contract that it would not call a strike without taking a strike vote among the employees in the bargaining unit and securing majority approval. This very question had been decided unanimously by the old Board on August 26, 1953, in *Allis-Chalmers Mfg. Co.* (106 NLRB 939), in which it was held that the internal procedure pursuant to which the union determined whether or not to call a strike was not a matter affecting "wages, hours, or working conditions" but rather an internal union and employee affair which the employer could not insist upon controlling as a condition precedent to performance of his duty to bargain collectively. The Board's decision in Allis-Chalmers was set aside by the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on the authority of *NLRB* v. *American National Ins. Co.* (343 U. S. 395), which, however, did not involve any attempt by the employer to control internal union affairs as a condition to bargaining, but related only to the employers' insistence on maintaining unilateral control over certain conditions of employment. It was in this posture that the issue decided in Allis-Chalmers was presented to the Eisenhower Board in Borg-Warner. Two of the Eisenhower appointees, Farmer and Leedom, voted to reverse the Board's decision in Allis-Chalmers and to accept the sweeping extension of the American National doctrine which had been suggestd by the seventh circuit. Only one, Rogers, voted with Murdock and Peterson to follow the Board's prior decision. If the choice had been left to the Eisenhower appointees alone the case would have been decided differently by vote of 2 to 1. And yet a reading of the opinions in the Borg-Warner case clearly shows that to follow the seventh circuit's view would read the statutory requirement of collective bargaining about terms and conditions of employment out of the act completely. On that view employers would be free unilaterally to impose conditions upon the performance of their own duty to bargain so onerous and demeaning to unions as to preclude their acceptance, thereby frustrating union resort to the bargaining process. The stand of the Eisenhower members on this issue can hardly be said to reflect a proclivity to expand "the rights of unions."

Leedom's attempt to credit the Eisenhower Board with the decision in the *Regal Shoe* case (106 NLRB 1078) suggests that his three-page letter was prepared with far less care than my speech. The truth is that the decision was issued by the old Board, before the Eisenhower appointees became a majority, and that only one Eisenhower appointee, Farmer, even participated in it. Moreover, the decision itself was dictated, as the opinion of the Board points out, by the holding of the Supreme Court in the *Rockaway News* case (345 U. S. 71), decided shortly before, in which the Court made it clear that the Board may not deny all effect to a contract merely because a hypertechnical reading of one clause might disclose a flaw which could conceivably, in other circumstances, give rise to a charge that that provision of the contract was illegal.

Chairman Leedom's attempt to claim for the Eisenhower appointees credit for the decision in *Boeing Airplane Co.* (110 NLRB 147) is likewise at odds with the facts. In that case, 2 of the 3 Eisenhower appointees voted to hold the union activity there involved unprotected by section 7; only one, Farmer, joined Members Murdock and Peterson in holding it protected. The view expressed in dissent by the majority of the Eisenhower appointees involved, in the words of the majority opinion, "an unwarranted extension of the doctrine in the cases on which they rely, and an unwarranted intrusion on the rights of employees as guaranteed in section 7 of the act" (110 NLRB at 151). The issue in that case, in brief, was whether an employer could lawfully discharge an employee for participating in a union-sponsored plan to secure better paying jobs elsewhere for employees of the company who were dissatisfied with the wages which the company offered where there was in effect a "gentlemen's agreement" that no employer in the industry would offer a job to one employed by a competing employer without the prior consent of such employer. The two Eisenhower appointees who dissented thought that since the success of the union's plan might result in loss of employees by the company through resignations, the potential injury to the company should result in holding unprotected the union's efforts so to assist its members and to strengthen its hand in collective bargaining. The majority recognized that to adopt this approach would result in having "decisions concerning the rights of employers and employees under the act * * * controlled by subjective feelings, rather than objective facts." They felt compelled to reject this novel and dangerous approach and to rely instead on the vast body of precedent which established that where, as here, concerted activities are undertaken for the mutual aid and protection of employees, and in the interests of collective bargaining, the protection of section 7 is not to be denied merely because the activities are novel, or because they may result in injury to the employer's business (110 NLRB 149–150). The majority decision is thus no unprecedented extension of the rights of employees under section 7; it merely rejects an attempt to restrict the preexisting scope of the act's protection. Moreover, as we have seen, the Eisenhower appointees cannot claim credit even for that.

Last is *Peerless Plywood Co.* (107 NLRB 427) in which the Eisenhower Board adopted the artificial rule, of questionable efficacy, that neither an employer nor a labor organization may address massed assemblies of employees on company time and property within the 24 hours immediately preceding an election. On the face of it the rule is as restrictive of union pre-election activity as of employer prelection activity, and indeed, it has been applied to set aside an election in which a union broadcast to employees during working hours from a sound truck on the street outside the plant gates within the 24-hour period (*Repeal Brass Manufacturing Co.* (110 NLRB)).

In explaining the reasons for the rule the Board said in Peerless that a campaign speech to employees made during working hours in the plant within the 24-hour period "tends to create a mass psychology which overrides arguments made through other campaign media and gives an unfair advantage to the party, whether employer or union, who in this manner obtains the last word." Whether this reasoning is right or wrong is debatable. But it shows too clearly for argument that the rule was not adopted, as Chairman Leedom now claims, for the purpose of "aiding organizational activities by employees" or "protecting the rights of unions." Its sole avowed purpose is to safeguard employees against last-minute influences, whether pro or antiunion, of one particular type, exerted by unions and employers alike. And when that policy is related to the Board's decision in the *Livingston Shirt* case (107 NLRB 400) and the *Nu Tone* case (112 NLRB No. 143), discussed at length in my speech, even Peerless may be considered part of a pattern of retrogression from previously well established union rights and privileges.

It has thus been demonstrated that not a single 1 of the 11 cases cited by Chairman Leedom as examples of important decisions which, if read alone, might give rise to an inference of favoritism towards unions by the Eisenhower Board can conceivably be thought to sustain any such claim. The fact that only these 11 decisions could even be cited as instances of prounionism by the Eisenhower Board is itself the most eloquent

testimonal to the accuracy of my charge that each and every one of the many major policy changes accomplished by the Eisenhower appointees has restricted the rights of labor and increased the rights and immunities of management. Far from proving, as Leedom claims, that my selection of cases "creates a false impression," examination of Leedom's cases serves only to confirm that the conclusions which I drew are eminently sound.

C. The pretense that the Eisenhower Board did not really change the law

The report attempts to show that in two areas where I demonstrated that the Eisenhower Board had made flagrant changes—jurisdictional policy and secondary boycotts—they made no changes at all but merely followed precedents established by the old Board. Let's take a look.

1. Jurisdictional Policy

I charged that the reasons the Eisenhower Board sharply curtailed the area in which it would assert jurisdiction was to give effect to its view that there should be less Federal regulation of labor disputes. It sought to override the policy of Congress—to regulate labor disputes to the fullest reaches of the commerce power—by its own contrary policy—to return to the States the handling of disputes which the Board regards as local. It goes without saying that the Board has no power to displace Congress' policy with its own. It is, therefore, not strange that my charge that this is what the Eisenhower Board has done is met with complete silence. There is not even a denial that desire to pave the way for State rather than Federal regulation is at the root of the Eisenhower Board's jurisdictional policy; and that is the heart of my charge.

The report defends the Eisenhower Board's wholesale declination of jurisdiction by the policy of previous Boards not to assert jurisdiction in the building and construction industry and the hotel field. Declination of jurisdiction in the building and construction industry stopped when Taft-Hartley was enacted. It was abandoned by the old Board in obedience to the 80th Congress' obvious desire to have its regulation apply in that field. Continuing declination of jurisdiction in the hotel field conforms with the apparent intent of the 80th Congress, as revealed in the legislative history of the Taft-Hartley Act. In each of these instances there has been obedience to Congress. My whole point is that the jurisdictional standards which the Eisenhower Board initiated in July 1954, and for which it alone is responsible, are based on rejection of Congress' policy. Where is the answer to that charge?

The report defends on the ground that there has been no judicial disapproval of the power of the Board to decline jurisdiction and only one instance of judicial disapproval of a particular exercise of that power. Passing the report's neglect to mention the second circuit's very recent condemnation of the "unjust and intolerable" application of its jurisdictional policy, the report is comparing apples and oranges. Of course, the Board has power to decline jurisdiction when the reason for it is to lighten the caseload to a volume that can be handled by the money and manpower available to the Board. It is on that basis only that the courts have approved the Board's declination of jurisdiction. But budgetary and manpower considerations are not at the basis of the Eisenhower Board's jurisdictional policy. Nevertheless, I anticipated in my charge that it may well be that "the Board can escape judicial condemnation of its conduct, for the scope of judicial review in this area of case handling is narrow indeed, and the courts are loath to interfere where declination of jurisdiction can, however dishonestly, be said to flow from budgetary considerations." That is the very reason I call for an investigation by Congress. Limitations inherent in judicial review are one of the important reasons for congressional intercession.

Lastly, the report defends against my criticism of the jurisdictional standards adopted by the Eisenhower Board in secondary boycott situations, as exemplified by the *McAllister Transfer* case (110 NLRB 1769), by arguing that the standards were compelled by the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in *Joliet Contractors Association* v. *NLRB* (193 F. 2d 833). I do not believe that it has previously occurred to anyone that there was a compelling connection between the two and a reading of the two cases fails to disclose any. What is significant is that the secondary boycott situation—where the prohibition is applied against unions—is the one area in which the Eisenhower Board, instead of curtailing, expanded its assertion of jurisdiction.

2. Secondary Boycotts

The heart of the report's defense against my charge that the Eisenhower Board has interpreted the secondary boycott prohibitions of the Taft-Hartley Act to impair lawful primary picketing is that the Eisenhower Board has applied the same legal standards as its predecessor, and that it has been upset by the courts only as to matters of judgment in the application of those standards. Precisely the opposite is true.

To make it appear that the Eisenhower Board merely followed precedent the report describes the old Board's decision in the Schultz case as holding that a union could lawfully follow a struck employer's truck to its destination and picket the truck there only if there was no other place at which the union could bring economic pressure to bear on the primary employer. That is an out and out misrepresentation. Schultz did not treat the unavailability of picketing elsewhere as a condition precedent to allowing the union to picket the primary employee's truck at its destination; it merely referred to the unavailability in that case as further support for its ruling that picketing the primary employer at a secondary employee's premises is not illegal. Moore Drydock, which followed Schultz, and which formalized its doctrine, did not even mention the availability of another situs for picketing as a fact or limiting the union's right to picket the primary employer at a secondary situs.

The fact is, as I stated in my speech, that that limitation was innovated by the Eisenhower Board in the Washington Coca-Cola case, in which, however, the decision was defended and sustained on other grounds. The first case in which the new limitation became critical was *Sales Drivers* v. *NLRB* (37 LRRM 2166), and in that case the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia specifically found that the new Board had changed the prior rule by imposing a new limitation and ruled that the limitation was illegal and beyond the Board's power to impose. Every other court of appeals which has passed on this issue has come to the same conclusion. District Judge Wyzanski recently observed in an injunction case that the Board's new position was a "Procrustean rule" reflecting "some development from a rather broad permission to permit picketing at places of business other than the primary employer's, to narrower views more characteristic of a later administration" *Alpert* v. *Steel Workers* (38 LRRM 2193). The Eisenhower Board's attribution of this rule to predecessor boards is but another instance of its disingenuous refusal to stand up in defense of its own creation.

Similarly disingenuous is the report's attempts to refute my charge that the Eisenhower Board has substituted "a conclusive presumption of union guilt for the necessity of proving by evidence that the union's object is one which section 8 (b) (4) (A) outlaws." The refutation takes the form of quoting from a predecessor Board's decision that "Plainly the object of all picketing at all times is to influence persons to withhold their business or services from the struck employer. In this respect there is no distinction between lawful primary picketing and unlawful secondary picketing proscribed by section 8 (b) (4) (A)." The report deliberately seeks to confuse the finding of the predecessor Board that all picketing has as its object to dissuade persons from continuing to do business with the picketed employer, with the establishment by the Eisenhower Board of a conclusive presumption that inducement of employees of neutral employers to withhold services from the struck employer is designed to compel the neutral employer to cease doing business with the primary employer by illegal strike action.

There seems to be no end to the capacity of the draftsmen of the report to turn things upside down in order to prove that the Eisenhower Board is not standing on its head. Recognition by the predecessor Board that all picketing was designed to effect a discontinuance of business dealing led it to the conclusion that other criteria had to be relied upon to differentiate primary from secondary picketing. Observance of the same phenomenon by the Eisenhower Board leads it to reject the relevance of those other criteria which the predecessor Board thought crucial. When the two Boards thus derive precisely opposite conclusions from the same datum, it is a little difficult to believe that, as the report would have it, they are acting in the same way.

The plain fact is that the courts have differed with the Board insofar as the Eisenhower Board has attempted to innovate new and more restrictive rules of law in secondary boycott cases; not in the mere application of the old standards. The attempt of the report to prove the contrary by claiming that the second circuit upset the Board in one case (*NLRB* v. *Electrical Workers* (37 LRRM 2219)) but upheld it in another "on substantially the same facts" (*NLRB* v. *Associated Musicians* (226 F. 2d 900)), reveals more audacity than accuracy. The cases were not the same but entirely different, as the second circuit explained in its opinions, and the Supreme Court denied review in both cases.

Finally, the attempt of the report to explain away the conflict between the two Swift decisions on the ground that they involved different categories of workers is about as persuasive as attempting to distinguish two cases on the ground that in one the plaintiff was rich and in the other he was poor. The point is that in one case, where the result hurt unions, the Board held that buying was a management function and that employees who perform it are acting as agents of the employer, not as employees within the meaning of the act. In the other case, when consistency would have required dismissal of a charge against the union, the Board treated the buying function not as an employer but as an employee duty. No amount of quibbling can hide the inconsistency.

3. The Eisenhower Board Goes Far Beyond Judicial Decisions

The report states that the Eisenhower Board is now applying the law in accordance with judicial decision, and this statement is supported by reference to administrative abandonment of the per se interrogation theory and the Bonwit-Teller rule. The report thus sets up a strawman with which I am presumably supposed to take issue. But the merest perusal of Mr. Ratner's article, which I appended as an exhibit to my speech, shows clearly that I did not criticize the Eisenhower Board for discontinuing the per se interrogation theory and the broad Bonwit-Teller rule. Instead I recognized that these actions were justified by the state of judicial precedent. My basic criticism of the Eisenhower Board's actions in the free-

speech area remain unanswered. Judicial reversal of the per se interrogation rule did not require or even suggest that the Eisenhower Board embrace, as it did, a view of employer persuasion that permits all sorts of coercive and threatening statements so long as the employer is clever enough to veil his remarks in innuendo rather than to be blunt. Nor did judicial reversal of the broad Bonwit-Teller rule require or even suggest that the Eisenhower Board countenance, as it did, an employer's prohibition of the distribution of prounion literature in the plant while at the same time himself distributing antiunion literature on the same premises. Where is the answer to the charge I did make?

4. Personal Products Case

The report attaches as exhibit 3 a letter addressed to me by Mr. John T. Van Aken, attorney for the Personal Products Co., in which he claims that my treatment of that case was based on an "inadequate analysis of the facts and the law." In my speech I said that the Personal Products case was "another flagrant example of the Eisenhower Board's attempt to rewrite the law to impose on unions new legal duties." That is exactly what it is, as the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia confirmed when it reversed the Board's decision. Nothing in Mr. Van Aken's letter, or in his brief to the Supreme Court as amicus curiae, to which he refers, shows the contrary. The language of the statute, and the Supreme Court's decision in the Automobile Workers case which I quoted in my speech both show that the act does not treat slowdowns as a violation of any provision of the act and that it does not allow the Board to order a union to cease and desist from engaging in a slowdown. No Board decision, before Personal Products, held that it did. In Phelps-Dodge, on which Mr. Van Aken says the Board "based" its Personal Products decision, the slowdown was held merely nonprotected by section 7; the employer was relieved of his duty to bargain with a union while it engaged in a slowdown; the slowdown was not held illegal.

The other matters mentioned in Mr. Van Aken's letter warrant only brief comment. For example, attacking my treatment of the position which the company took in collective bargaining, he quotes me as saying that the company "refused to offer any wage increase at all." Although that purports to be a direct quotation, comparison with my speech will show that it omits a critical word, "general," which appeared immediately before the words "wage increase." What I actually said was that the company "refused to offer any general wage increase at all." Mr. Van Aken does not deny that the statement I actually made is true and he cannot do so, for the record in the case proves it. That the company offered to increase a few individual rates and grant a few fringe benefits does not change the basic picture.

Mr. Van Aken says that the location of the plant in a private industrial district could not have affected the union's right to picket and therefore could not have been influential in inducing the union not to call a full-fledged strike. To prove his point, he refers to a strike which the union called almost a year after the slowdown in the course of which the union did engage in picketing which the company did not seek to enjoin. The point is, however, that before the slowdown occurred the union did not know whether the company would attempt to invoke its property rights to interfere with peaceful picketing. The company, indeed, explicitly refused to assure the union that it would not use its ownership of the property as an excuse to enjoin peaceful picketing. The facts are not changed by Mr. Van Aken's post hoc argument.

D. The false accusation that I am biased and prejudiced

Both the report and Chairman Leedom's letter charge me with bias and prejudice in favor of labor unions and against antiunion employers. This prejudice, they say, invalidates my charges, even though I documented them in every case with cold, hard facts. The evidence which is offered, however, not only fails to support the allegation that I am biased; it provides additional proof that the Board and its defenders are guilty of the very bias and prejudice which they have demonstrated in their administration of the act.

Both Chairman Leedom and the report charge me with bias for failing to mention in my discussion of the Swift case, that the Board, at the union's request, asked the Federal court to issue an injunction to prevent enforcement of an illegal State court injunction which the company had obtained to prevent the union from peacefully picketing the plant. The report goes so far as to assert that the Board's action in seeking this injunction "demonstrates the Board's fairness and impartiality." Let us see.

In the first place, Mr. Leedom admits that the Board's application for an injunction against Swift was a "collateral action," and not part of the Swift case which I discussed.

The Board's action in bringing that "collateral" injunction suit against Swift & Co. was held to be irrelevant in the Swift case by the Board itself. As a matter of fact, the Board insisted, over the respondent union's strong objection, that its application for injunctive relief against Swift & Co. should be treated by the Federal court as an entirely separate and distinct proceeding from the proceeding which the General Counsel had brought against local 88 under section 10 (1), even though the section 10 (1) proceeding was then being tried before the same district court, and even though the union action which the General Counsel alleged to violate section 8 (b) (4) (A) was admittedly the direct outgrowth of the company's action in illegally obtaining and keeping in effect a State court injunction which prohibited local 88 from peacefully picketing the Swift plant for organizational purposes. So unrelated did the Board regard these two proceedings to be that in its decision it held that Swift's action in illegally enjoining local 88 from lawful organizational picketing did not even affect the application of the "roving situs" doctrine pursuant to which even under the Eisenhower Board's decisions, the union would have been entitled to bring pressure to bear upon Swift at the retail markets because is was not free to picket at Swift's plant.

Second, when we turn to consideration of the injunction which the Board sought against Swift, it is evident that the Board did not seek that injunction "to relieve the union involved of an improperly burdensome State court injunction." It sought the injunction because, and only because, Swift had previously filed a charge with the Labor Board alleging that the peaceful picketing of its plant by local 88 was an unfair labor practice. The General Counsel of the Board had dismissed that charge on the ground that the legislative history of the act clearly established that Congress did not intend to outlaw peaceful picketing for organizational purposes, but rather intended that that conduct be left free of judicial restraint and interference. When, thereafter, Swift maintained, in effect, its illegal State court injunction the Board felt compelled to seek a Federal injunction against Swift to prevent Swift from thus continuing to flout, undermine, and destroy the authority which Congress vested in the General Counsel to determine whether conduct of this kind should or should not be subjected to restraint. Consistent Board policy and precedent, which the Supreme Court has sustained and approved (see *NLRB* v. *Capital Service, Inc.* (347 U. S. 501)), makes it clear that the Board seeks to enjoin enforcement of illegal State court injunctions only where the party who is maintaining the injunction has sought and been denied such relief by the General Counsel on the merits. There is thus nothing in the Board's application for injunctive relief against Swift in that case which can be taken even remotely to suggest that the Board was acting in behalf of the union. It acted, as it was compelled to act, in the interest of preserving its own prestige and authority.

That this is true is shown, moreover, by the Board's insistence during the trial of the two cases before the Federal court on keeping the injunction case and the section 10 (1) proceeding entirely separate and distinct. It opposed, and succeeded in defeating, the union's motion to consolidate the cases. The Board thereby managed to create a situation in which the court could consider the one single interrelated situation which arose out of the union's picketing of Swift, the company's illegal injunction against that picketing, and the union's subsequent inducement of its buyer-members to refrain from purchasing Swift products, as if they were entirely separate and distinct transactions.

The result was that the district court not only ignored the interrelationship between the facts; it ignored, as did the Board, the basic interrelationship between the rights guaranteed unions in sections 7 and 13 of the act and the limitations imposed upon the exercise of those rights by section 8 (b) (4) (A). By this process of compartmentalizing the facts and the law, the district court was able to conclude that the General Counsel should have injunctive relief against the union in the section 10 (1) case, but that the Board should have no relief against Swift & Co. in the collateral case even though it was patent that the State court was entirely without jurisdiction to issue or maintain in effect that injunction against peaceful picketing, and that the injunction unlawfully prevented the union from exercising its statutory rights.

Moreover, it is obvious that nothing in the Board's action in seeking injunctive relief against Swift in a collateral action, on the Board's own theory, affected the rationale of the Board's decision against local No. 88 in the Swift case which I criticized. Mention of the application for injunctive relief was and is wholly unnecessary to complete understanding of each of the issues decided by the Board against the union. Leedom's attempt to make it appear relevant is simply another attempt to becloud and distort the real issues.

Finally, although the report praises the Board for appealing from Judge Moore's adverse decision in the injunction case, it neglects to add that the Board refused to request the Supreme Court to review the eighth circuit's adverse ruling, even though that Court's holding that the Board was not empowered to seek such relief was admittedly novel, unprecedented, and tremendously important, not only to the Board and to all labor organizations in the country, but to many agencies of the Federal Government as well. The eighth circuit's result, moreover, as the Board itself alleged, in its brief to that court, appears to be in conflict with the Supreme Court's decision in the Capital Service case. Yet, although the grounds for certiorari were overwhelming, the Board made no attempt to obtain Supreme Court review.

Chairman Leedom also claims that I "departed from the position of an impartial observer and critic" by relying in part upon

Mr. Ratner's article. Leedom says that since Mr. Ratner represents unions it seems "a fair assumption that his inclination would be to take the partisan rather than the purely objective viewpoint and would tend to color the total factual picture to favor labor organizations in an issue between unions and management."

Chairman Leedom appears, however, not to have thought through the implications of this attack. If what he is saying is that any attorney who represents either labor or management in labor relations cases is necessarily biased and prejudiced, then he must admit that the appointment of General Counsel Kammholz, whose background, like that of virtually every other Eisenhower administration appointee, was exclusively that of a representative of employers, necessarily foreshadowed biased and prejudiced action and judgments by that token alone. When General Counsel Kammholz was appointed, Senators DOUGLAS and MCNAMARA opposed his appointment on the ground that he lacked the capacity to be fair and impartial in the light of his exclusively proemployer background. (Views of Senators PAUL H. DOUGLAS and PAT MCNAMARA in opposition to the confirmation of Theophil C. Kammholz, 84th Cong., 1st sess.) Mr. Kammholz at the hearings declared that his background in no way impaired his ability to make fair and unbiased decisions respecting the interpretation and application of the law as between labor and management. One of the factors which apparently led the Senate to confirm the Kammholz appointment was the fact that to disqualify attorneys from serving on grounds of bias and prejudice because they represented either employers or unions would eliminate virtually all candidates qualified by experience and training to deal with the issues in this field. Leedom now appears to suggest an even broader attack, namely, that analysis of the Board's decisions is to be discounted as biased and prejudiced whenever it comes from an attorney who represents one side or the other in this field. The result of such an approach would be to insulate the Board from virtually any informed criticism whatever. I can well understand why, in the interest of expediency, Chairman Leedom would desire such a result, but I can hardly believe that anyone will be misled by his self-serving assumption.

If, on the other hand, Chairman Leedom is not making so broad an attack, but is restricting his attempt at disqualification to attorneys who represent unions, as distinguished from attorneys who represent management, then it would appear that his attack reflects a degree of bias and prejudice more patent even than appears from the decisions of the Eisenhower appointees. Thus, on either approach, Mr. Leedom's "assumption" is neither fair nor tenable.

Perhaps Chairman Leedom's misguided attack is attributable to his misconception that what is at stake here is an issue "between unions and management." That, as my speech made perfectly plain, is not the issue at all. The issue is whether the Board is performing the function which Congress vested in it—a quasi-judicial function—or is usurping legislative power under the guise of performing that function; and whether the Board is exercising its quasi-judicial and administrative powers fairly or in a manner actuated by bias, prejudice, personal views, and political considerations. This is no issue between labor and management. Any Board which usurped Congress' legislative functions, as my speech demonstrates the Eisenhower appointees are doing, would be subject to censure whether its results favored management or labor, and whether it was acting in the interest of the Democratic or the Republican Party. It happens that the Eisenhower appointees are abusing their powers in the interest of management and to the detriment of labor, because that happens to be the real policy and program of the administration which appointed them and whose interests they have undertaken to serve. But my criticism is directed primarily at the abuse of constitutional processes and misuse of official position and power whereby the Eisenhower appointees are accomplishing their antilabor purposes; not merely at the victimization of labor which results. In appraising the merits of my analysis, one need not be either prolabor or promanagement; the analysis necessarily stands or falls on its own merits. It is patent that Leedom's attack is a subterfuge designed to evade such analysis on the merits.

Finally the report claims to prove my bias and prejudice by asserting that I implied, falsely it is said, that the act confers "rights on unions." The report says that the act does not confer any rights on unions, but only on employees. That is plainly, and ludicrously, false. If the act confers no rights on unions what did Congress take away from unions which refused to comply with the non-Communist affidavit and financial reporting provisions in sections 9 (f), (g), and (h)? If the act confers no rights on unions how are we to account for the fact that the act prohibits an employer from dealing individually with employees after a majority have chosen a union to represent them, even though the employees themselves want to bargain individually?

Of course the act confers rights on unions. And it does so because Congress recognized, as the Eisenhower Board members and the draftsmen of the report do not, that unions are the very instrumentalities through which employees exercise the collective bargaining rights which the act protects. Unions and their membership are inseparable and must remain so, if the law is to have any vitality. The attempt of the report to separate them reveals where the bias and prejudice really lie.

The report claims that I misapprehended the statute and was guilty of inaccuracy, by failing to note that Taft-Hartley added to section 7 a right of employees to refrain from joining unions. That is wholly inaccurate. The fact is, as I said, that Congress did not change the terms of the affirmative guaranty one jot or tittle. I omitted the guaranty of the negative right because it was wholly irrelevant to the Board's mutilation of the affirmative guaranty, and its irrelevancy is proved by the fact that in not a single one of the section 7 cases which I cited did the Board even offer that amendment as justification for its result. To construe the amendment as the report construes it is to attribute to Congress the intention of granting a right with one breath and taking it away in the next. The truth is that the negative right is designed only to protect employees who do not choose to join unions against both union or employer reprisal. It was not designed to diminish the protection of employees who choose to join unions and engage in concerted activity.

The attempt to utilize this irrelevancy to justify the Board's denial of protection to employees who choose to exercise their right to join and support unions, speaks volumes—volumes about the attitude of those who resort to it.

V. THE REPLY ADMITS MY CHARGE THAT THE EISENHOWER BOARD APPOINTEES HAVE WRITTEN THEIR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ANTIUNION SENTIMENTS INTO THE LAW

When we have stripped from the replies all of the inaccuracies, missstatements and distortions designed to prove that what has happened did not happen, what remains is an admission of my basic charge. At the close of his letter Chairman Leedom says: "Decisions by all courts and quasi-judicial agencies reflect to a degree the economic and political views of the members. Therefore, some change constantly takes place in the interpretations of the law, not inconsistent with the statutory scheme of continuous change in the personnel comprising the tribunal."

Implicit in this statement is the view that an administration is justified in using its power to appoint the members and General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board to install in those offices men whose political and economic views accord with those of the administration and who will use the powers of their office to effectuate those views rather than the policies of the statute which Congress enacted and which it is their duty faithfully, honestly and impartially to enforce. If this view were sound, of course, what this Board has done would be no offense. And the report appears to subscribe to this view, for it contrasts my sole charge that the Board has a strong antilabor bias with the absence of any accusation of corruption, venality, bribery or any form of criminal abuse of its office, as if bias and prejudice were not enough.

Perhaps Chairman Leedom and the draftsmen of the report do not realize it, but their view is subversive of the most basic and vital principles of our system of Government. I had supposed that everyone understood that ours is a government of laws and not of men; that in that form of government quasi-judicial officers, no less than judges, are bound to respect the law as Congress writes it, and are precluded from substituting their own for Congress' judgment as to what the law should be. I had supposed that at least everyone who made even a pretense of fitness to hold judicial or quasi-judicial office under our Constitution would realize that adherence to these principles required not only that the judge refrain from deliberately injecting his personal, economic, and political predilections into his decisions, but that he make a conscious and deliberate effort to recognize and set aside, in deciding cases, whatever economic and political biases he may have brought with him to office, and which he cannot entirely escape.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in a recent collection of papers, Of Law and Men, pages 40–42 (1956), made the point this way: "Judges are men, not disembodied spirits. Of course, a judge is not free from preferences or, if you will, biases." But that is no excuse for the "cynical belief in too many quarters * * * that it is at best a self-delusion for judges to pursue disinterestedness. * * * To assume that a lawyer who becomes a judge takes on the bench merely his views on social or economic questions leaves out of account his rooted notions regarding the scope and limits of a judge's authority. The outlook of a lawyer fit to be a Justice regarding the role of a judge cuts across all his personal preferences for this or that social arrangement." It is the duty of a judge to recognize "that he is there not to impose his private views upon society, that he is not to enforce personalized justicee * * *."

Chairman Leedom's approach shows that the Eisenhower appointees regard it as their duty not to eschew but to reflect their economic and political views. That is an admission, at minimum, that the Eisenhower appointees do not have that outlook as to the role of Board members which makes them fit to occupy those offices. Mr. Leedom's attempt to justify the writing of their political and economic prejudices into the law by reference to their temporary tenure of their office is nothing less than a cynical attempt by this administration to justify on the basis of 1952 election returns its perversion of Congress' policy by administration. The defense is that since the election gave the administration power to appoint members of the Board, and since Board members are empowered to decide cases, there can be nothing wrong in the usurpation of power by which they decide cases in accordance with their political convictions, not the law.

It is this crucial difference in attitude toward their role as judges, as I said in my

initial speech, which differentiates the Eisenhower appointees from the appointees of prior administrations. Until the Eisenhower administration, Board members regarded it as their duty to effectuate Congress' policy, not their own. Those, appointed earlier, who still serve still regard that as their duty. And it is, therefore, not at all surprising that in some of the cases which I criticized, where, as I said, reasonable arguments could be made to sustain a contrary view, one or more of these men voted with the Eisenhower appointees. But these men never voted as a block, and they did not always vote on management's side in crucial policy cases, as they never uniformly voted on labor's side in crucial policy cases prior to 1953. I disassociated them from my attack on the Eisenhower Board because analysis of the critical, revolutionary changes which the Board has made shows that they are all attributable to the Eisenhower appointees; that they did vote uniformly on the critical issues to hurt labor and help antiunion employers; and that the changes taken together show that they were made because of the personal views of the Eisenhower appointees as to what the law should be, not because the law as Congress wrote it compelled these results.

This has nothing to do, as the report would have it, with whether the appointees regard the Taft-Hartley Act as a good law or a bad law. Expecting, and getting, true quasi-judicial performance, the Congress which enacted Taft-Hartley retained as Board members men who had opposed many of the provisions of that act. Congress properly regarded it as irrelevant to sound exercise of the judging function by men of judicial caliber whether they approved or disapproved of the law. Approval of Taft-Hartley, of itself, is no more a disqualication than disapproval. What does disqualify is departure from the judge's role to achieve not the objectives of the law, but the different objectives of its most reactionary sponsors, or for that matter, its opponents.

The Eisenhower appointees stand indicted by their own decisions and policies. Although they seek to evade responsibility under a multitude of guises, their reply carries an admission that they have used their powers of office to accomplish partisan and biased ends. The truly reactionary, anti-labor philosophy and program of the administration stands revealed in the abuse of governmental processes to which it resorted to achieve its objectives. Let Congress and the American people judge whether this performance is compatible with the ethics and principles of American Government.

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF NEW YORK,
City of New York,
County of New York, ss:

William H. Englander, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am assistant general counsel of the Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO. I supervised the activities of Harry A. Dower, a Pennsylvania attorney the union retained in the court case described below and I represented the union in the Board proceeding described below. Accordingly I have personal knowledge of the events described in this affidavit.

In May of 1955 the Lloyd A. Fry Roofing Co. bought the plant site in Emmaus, Pa., formerly used by the International Felt Co. Prior to its closing, the International Felt Co. had been under contract with this union.

In June of 1955, Lloyd A. Fry hired seven employees, all of whom signed TWUA authorization cards. On June 30, Pete Umholtz, an international representative of the union, called upon the company to grant the union recognition; the request was denied. Picketing of the company began on June 22. On June 27 the company applied to the Court of Common Pleas of Lehigh County for a preliminary injunction against the union's picketing.

On July 18, 1955, the court, by Judge Henninger, denied the company's application for a preliminary injunction. The court held there was a labor dispute within the meaning of the Pennsylvania Anti-Injunction Act.

Following the court's decision, the company met with union officials on July 25, 1955. We imagined the meeting was for the purpose of negotiating a contract, but we soon learned that the company was solely interested in having a written record of our claim to represent the company's future employees, as well as those currently employed.

With the transcript of that meeting in hand, the company went into court on August 9 and moved again for a preliminary injunction. In addition to holding the phony bargaining session with us, the company also took pains before renewing its motion to advise our members that they were laid off.

By a decision dated November 14, 1955, the court, by Judge Henninger, again denied the company's motion for an injunction. It was held there was nothing illegal in our demand to represent future as well as present employees, and that we had a free speech right to advertise the dispute through picketing.

After the company wrote to six of our strikers that they were on "indeterminate layoff," we filed charges in the fourth regional office of the National Labor Relations Board against the company. We claimed that the company had discriminated against the six employees because of their union activities; also, that the company had unlawfully refused to bargain with us. Our charges were assigned Case No. 4–CA–1319.

On December 5, 1955, the company filed unfair labor practice charges against the union. The charges alleged we demanded that the company hire only union employees; that we demanded an unlawful union-shop agreement; and that we were guilty of committing a secondary boycott in that we had induced the employees of secondary employers not to deal with the company.

On December 20, 1955, I received a call from Bernard Samoff, field examiner in the fourth regional office of the NLRB. He told me he expected that the charges we filed against the company would be dismissed.

On the other hand, he stated that he thought there was a great deal of merit to the charges the company had filed against us. He said he was satisfied that Pete Umholtz, our international representative, had requested business agents of various AFL Metal Trade Unions to instruct their members not to cross our picket lines; that these members, employees of secondary employers hired to do various preparatory construction work at the plant, had respected our picket lines in accordance with instructions given them. He said he thought this set of facts could very well make out a secondary boycott. He added that the potential illegality is further compounded by our demand for an overall production and maintenance unit union-shop contract, at a time when we represented just a few maintenance men. He said that this demand, supported by picketing, is per se illegal.

He added that such a contract, if granted, would not be a bar to an election and also since such contract would be coercive of other emlpoyees, it would follow that the demand for such a contract is illegal.

I pointed out to him that even if it were assumed that the unit we requested was inappropriate, I was quite certain there was not a single decided case which held that a demand for an inappfopriate unit supported by picketing was an unfair labor practice per se. I also stressed the fact that the type of contract we demanded was simply an initial proposal for bargaining, and that during the course of bargaining we might very well take some other type of contract for some other unit.

Moreover, I told him that I had found a decision which dealt precisely with the facts that he alleged in his assertion that Pete Umholtz requested the business agents of AFL Metal Trade Unions to instruct their members not to cross our picket lines. This case dealt with the identical situation; namely, where the picketing union went to another union and requested the other union to respect the first union's picket lines at the primary premises of the primary employer. The rationale of that decision was that a union may lawfully request, away from the situs of the primary picket line, what it may lawfully request at the primary situs of the picket line: that employees of secondary employers respect the picket line. I was referring to the *Interborough News Company* (90 NLRB 2135 (1950)).

In reply to my insistence that we had a perfect legal right to continue picketing even if the facts he claimed had been true, he urged me to consider the practical aspects of this situation. He noted that we had our picket line in front of this plant for a long time without any success; he expressed his opinion that the company was not likely to succumb to our picket line; that it would be to our advantage to withdraw the pickets, allow the company to attempt to get the plant going, and when the plant had hired additional employees, a new organizational situation will have been created.

He stated his belief that if we withdrew our charges and our picket line, the company would withdraw its charges. On the other hand, should we fail to see the practicalities of the situation and persist in our picketing, then, apart from any merit in our legal position, we would be faced with legal difficulties far beyond any value that this organizational situation could have for us. He noted that under the act an injunction would issue first, and only later would we have an opportunity to persuade the Board that we had a legal right to picket. He reminded me that there have already been many cases in which the charged party had proved to the Board its innocence of a secondary boycott violation. But all during the period of litigation the injunction remained in effect. He emphasized that fighting a court and a Board case hardly seemed to be merited by the organizational possibilities of the situation.

He also stated that the new General Counsel of the Board has taken the position that in all cases of doubt relating to possible new unfair labor practices, charges were not to be dismissed by regional directors but instead were to be brought to his attention for possible decision in favor of issuing complaints in circumstances that had not theretofore been regarded as unfair labor practices.

I made it clear to him that I had no jurisdiction over any decision regarding the wisdom of withdrawing our picket line at this time; I would be consulted only as to the possible legal consequences in the event we chose to maintain our picket line. I told him Pete Umholtz would have to consult his superiors for a policy decision on withdrawing the picket line.

I learned that Samoff had gone to Pete Umholtz's office that day, along with Bernard X. Alsher, another field examiner from the fourth region of the NLRB.

The next day, December 21, 1955, I received a letter from Pete Umholtz, forwarding to me a copy of the affidavit he signed for Samoff and Alsher the day before. It states in part:

"At no time did any member of the Textile Workers Union, AFL–CIO, or I ever communicate with any officers of the Building Trades

Council of Allentown, or any business agent of any of the building trades requesting that our picket line be honored at Volney Felt Mill in Emmaus, Pa."

It is difficult to resist accusing these Board agents of overreaching and attempting entrapment in their interview of Umholtz. Apparently they were not satisfied merely to swear that he did not communicate with any officer of the Building Trades Council; they also had him swear to what he could not possibly know of his own knowledge, namely, that "at no time did any member of the Textile Workers Union ever communicate with any officer of the Building Trades Council."

On December 22, Bernard X. Alsher called me; he stated that he had spoken to Brandschain, the company's attorney, who said that if we withdraw the picket line, the company will withdraw the charges. I asked him whether the company would withdraw the charges with prejudice. I pointed out that once we removed our picket line, the company could complete the repairs required to put the plant into full operation, hire a full complement of employees and get production started. If, after that had taken place, the company thereupon refiled its charges, we certainly would have played the role of fools. Of course, it might be possible at that juncture to put a picket line up again, although that could be very difficult. But by then the horse would have escaped from the barn. I urged that we had a right to insist that the company withdraw its charges with prejudice in the event we chose to enter into any such arrangement.

Alsher told me that he had not and will not tell Brandschain that the regional office either requests or recommends that he withdraw his charges with prejudice. He said that he had not felt it would be proper for a Board agent to make that recommendation.

I told him I was exceedingly surprised at this position. I pointed out that he and Samoff had done a very excellent job in pointing out to us the practicalities of the situation, even to the extent of considering with me the possibility that we had every legal right to picket, while yet urging that Court and Board action against us should deter us from continuing an unprofitable organizational situation. I noted that the same persuasive powers exerted upon the company could very likely result in similar cooperation on that side.

Alsher repeated that as a matter of Board policy he would not urge Brandschain to withdraw his charges with prejudice. I asked him whether the problem of Board policy could be avoided if he relayed to Brandschain our message that we request him to withdraw with prejudice. He said he would do that.

He called back and advised that Brandschain had stated that he would not withdraw with or without prejudice—he would just withdraw, if we withdrew our charges and withdrew our picket line. Alsher told me that he understood this reply of Brandschain's to be negative, i. e., he would not withdraw with prejudice. Alsher suggested the parties work the problem out at a meeting between them.

Responsible union officials conferred concerning the situation. Thoughout our assumption was that we had a legal right to picket, even if the facts claimed by the Board agent were true. Nevertheless, the threat of prosecution by the Board, and the expense, time, and trouble it entailed, was considered by us dispositive of the situation. We withdrew our charges and our picket line. On January 9, 1956, we were advised that the company had withdrawn its charges without prejudice.

WILLIAM H. ENGLANDER.

Sworn to before me this 17th day of April 1956.

ANN WARSHAUER.

Congressman Young Aids Nevada Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years Nevada has had the greatest mining production record in its history—far outstripping the days of the fabulous Comstock Lode.

Although we have had weak spots with respect to certain metals, our overall production has reached a new peak.

The Bureau of Mines reports that in 1955 we had a total production amounting to $105,400,000.

This is 164 percent of the amount produced in the war year of 1952.

These are the Bureau of Mines figures on Nevada's total mineral production since 1945:

1945	$31,300,000
1946	35,400,000
1947	40,900,000
1948	42,500,000
1949	37,400,000
1950	48,500,000
1951	57,700,000
1952	64,200,000
1953	73,500,000
1954	88,800,000
1955	105,400,000

Just what is responsible for the great spurt since 1952?

There are good reasons why the minerals industry, by and large, is experiencing prosperity. The most important, I believe, is that this administration has restored the vital element of confidence in business planning, confidence that there will be no unnecessary intervention by the Government in the everyday activities of our citizens, confidence that there will be no effort to impose more controls over industry, confidence that business will no longer be the whipping boy of Government. As our economy expands, the demand for raw materials, including our mineral resources, increases in proportion. A healthy, growing economy in the years ahead will mean a steady, increasing need for our Nation's minerals and a strong domestic mining industry.

These policies are, of course, directed toward the maintenance of peace. War inevitably brings about high prices, but the aftermath generally brings about chaotic conditions. This administration's policy is clear. It will leave no stone unturned in its foreign and domestic policies in the search for peace.

TUNGSTEN

Nevada has experienced a particular boom in the tungsten industry. Let us look at the Bureau of Mines report on our tungsten production in recent years:

1951	$4,800,000
1952	8,800,000
1953	13,800,000
1954	19,800,000
1955	23,000,000

Nationwide, domestic production of tungsten since 1952 has been nearly six times what it was in the entire period 1944–52. In short, the domestic tungsten industry productionwise has grown 600 percent in the past 3½ years.

After considerable difficulty we were able to obtain approval of an extension of the domestic minerals purchase program to assure continuation of the tungsten industry in Nevada.

As a result of these efforts, hundreds of Nevada mines have been saved the tragedy of shutting down completely.

I have been personally assured by the Honorable Fred Seaton, Secretary of the Interior, that the long-awaited long-range minerals program will be ready for Congress in January.

In the meantime, I am continuing my efforts to see that the Defense Department encourages use of tungsten in the aircraft and other defense industries and that a tungsten research program is inaugurated to insure the continuation of the tungsten industry in Nevada that has been developed in the past 3 years.

GOLD

In my opinion, the first step to further a return to the gold standard would be to make it possible for American citizens to buy and sell gold like any other commodity. We are working diligently, although without notable progress, to accomplish this end. I have introduced legislation to effect this in both the 83d and 84th Congresses, but no legislative action was taken.

BUREAU OF MINES

An estimated $918,700 is planned for expenditure by the Bureau of Mines in Nevada in fiscal year 1957. Activities will continue to center at the Bureau of Mines stations in Reno and Boulder City.

DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION AGENCY

Nevada ranks sixth among the States in terms of funds received from the Defense Minerals Exploration Administration. As of June 30, 54 contracts had been entered into involving Nevada mining explorations. These contracts had a total estimated cost of $2,561,052 with maximum Federal participation of $1,563,221.

From War Criminal to World Savior?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an important article that appeared in the current issue—No. 48, summer 1956—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, N. Y. I regard this publication as extremely important toward a clear understanding of the complex German problem. It is an unfortunate fact that, while Congress has had numerous opportunities for re-evaluating practically every phase of

American foreign policy, United States policy toward Germany has remained sacrosanct and beyond the pale of soul-searching debate and questioning. Yet I believe that reexamination of our German policy by Congress is an urgent matter.

The article From War Criminal to World Savior? deals with the latest efforts of the Krupp interests to expand their economic penetration in the underdeveloped countries. Krupp's so-called point 4½ program envisages financial assistance from the United States. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM WAR CRIMINAL TO WORLD SAVIOR?

CAVALRY TACTICS

As avid students of the art of warfare, Prussian strategists valued highly the role of the cavalry. They found that an objective which could not be seized by frontal assault, might be more susceptible to capture by the outflanking maneuvers of the cavalry.

Judging from the methods employed by present-day German statesmen, it would seem that they have been applying the lessons of Prussian military tactics to the field of politics The imperative need "to overcome the catastrophe of 1945" and to reinvigorate the German powerhouse, required deftness and flexibility. A head-on attack against the policies proclaimed by the Allies at the end of the war, would have been a hazardous undertaking. Consequently, German leaders "brought up the cavalry." The results were successful beyond all expecations.

Thus, when the Germans decided to undermine the policy of reparations, they began to spread stories about mass starvation in Germany. They knew that if these tales were acepted as the gospel truth, they could plead that only the scuttling of reparations would enable German industry to export in sufficient quantities in order to import necessary foodstuffs. It worked.

When the Germans decided that the time had come to rearm, they resorted to the device of the European Defense Community. Time magazine (January 4, 1954) noted that the EDC idea came "providentially" from France. "Germans could not propose it without risking the impression that it was simply a cunning maneuver to unlock the occupation shackles and revive the Wehrmacht. But when the enemy from across the Rhine proposed it in 1950, Konrad Adenauer could more easily champion it."

We find the Germans employing similar tactics when they sought to liquidate the decartelization and decentralization program. The instrument which played a major role in bringing this about was the Schuman plan, which was also initiated by the French. Yet, as to the origins of the Schuman plan idea, the authoriative magazine Business Week (May 20, 1950) reported: "The story going the rounds among French businessmen is this: The Schuman pool project is really a German scheme. It was first sold to Secretary Acheson and then forced down the throat of the French Government in exchange for a promise of the promise of United States aid to Indochina. The scheme gives the Saar back to Germany."

SCHACHT'S BLUEPRINT

Recent developments indicate that the Germans are about to employ the cavalry again, this time in their quest for a decisive role in the markets of the colonial world. A hint that this was the next major item on the German agenda, can be found in a little publicized book called Gold for Europe, written by Hjalmar Schacht in 1950. Schacht, Hitler's financial expert on rearmament and an articulate spokesman for Germany's overseas ambitions, suggested that Germany should play a leading part in the underdeveloped countries of the world. He said that the number of tasks to be performed in such countries were practically unlimited "and it would be easy to give Germany a special task in the development of one of them." To make this scheme of German penetration more acceptable, Schacht magnanimously proposed that "the industrial nations would have to carry out such work in common, or split it up between themselves geographically or by quotas." He assured his readers, as if to sugar-coat the pill, that Germany's activities would not be imperialistic and could be controlled by the U. N. if necessary. The Schachtian concept seems to have prepared the groundwork for recent developments.

Writing from Berlin (November 28, 1955), the chief foreign correspondent of the New York Times, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, warned the West that Chancellor Adenauer's leadership was being subjected to severe pressures by those who wanted to do business with the Russians even at the expense of West Germany's present ties with the West. He painted a dark picture of Soviet blandishments and tempting offers to the Ruhr. He admonished his readers that German big business might fall in with the proposition to participate in developing the markets of the Soviet bloc including Communist China. This great danger, Mr. Sulzberger declared, must be counteracted vigorously. In his opinion this could be done by increasing Bonn's role in the potential development of free Asia. "The Western powers," he wrote, "have not yet faced up to the necessity of coordinated economic action in that vast area." Mr. Sulzberger observed that it was high time to enlist Bonn in this project because "any West German share in an allied program to raise Asian living standards should be far more profitable than politically controlled trade with China." Concluding his analysis, he noted that since Moscow approached the German problem on a long-range Eurasian basis, "it is time we approach it (the German problem) on a world basis." It therefore follows, according to Mr. Sulzberger, that "a specific share in global economic development should be offered to this industrious nation."

Mr. Sulzberger's thesis was in substance reaffirmed in a special editorial published in the New York Telegram (November 30, 1955). Once again we are told that Germany may be lured into the Soviet camp. The solution? "Finding a plan for West Germany to participate in some of the western world's global problems—economic aid, free world trade, technical assistance. Germany has the resources and skills to contribute to such projects." Only by reassuring the West Germans that "will stand with them," can we be sure that Germany will stand with us.

BONN REACTS

While articles of this kind were beginning to appear more frequently in the American press, the Germans, too, were thinking out loud. For example, Business Week (December 24, 1955) reported that Foreign Minister von Brentano was "unofficially advocating that the West European members of NATO should consider an integrated aid program for Asia and Africa." According to this same report, the German Foreign Minister was anxious to tie up this proposition with British and United States foreign aid programs. On January 14, 1956, the New York Times reported that von Brentano had succeeded in winning a group of German leading industrialists to support his long-range foreign plans. In that connection the Times stated that the Bonn government was "giving full support to a proposal submitted at the last meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Paris for joint commiercial and financial policies" vis-a-vis the uncommitted countries of Asia. A subsequent dispatch to the Times (February 1, 1956) elaborated still further on this subject. It noted that leading Ruhr industrialists were enthusiastic and had very definite ideas as to how this so-called aid project could be implemented: "One of the leading industrial figures in the Ruhr said he thought the economic program should be in the nature of a vast Marshall plan to which all the members of the Atlantic Alliance would contribute part of their production and their skills." NATO, these industrialists said, must not take a narrow view of the world situation. One of their spokesmen assured the Times correspondent that West Germany was ready to roll up its sleeves and put across a global economic program with great energy.

When Chancellor Adenauer's Minister for Economic Affairs Erhard visited London in January of this year, he repeated the same line. The Chancellor himself, in a special interview with the German newspaper General Anzeiger (March 2, 1956), called for a united front of the West to meet the Soviet economic challenge. He declared that article 2 of the NATO Treaty enabled that organization to coordinate economic and political policies of the Western Powers. Thus, we find the Germans working very diligently to impress upon the United States of America the need for a grand global economic program.

When we compare Mr. Sulzberger's approach to the program with that of the Germans, we find the following: Mr. Sulzberger insists that the Germans must be given more elbow room for their industry and energy to prevent their forsaking the West for the blandishments of the East. The Germans, on the other hand, posing as the great anti-Red crusaders, emphasize the need to thwart Soviet penetration in Asia and Africa. It goes without saying that the combination of these arguments cannot help but attract many supporters. Yet, trying as hard as they could to maintain a posture of disinterested generosity, without any thought of special advantage, the Germans have let the cat out of the bag. The blundering in this case is the handiwork of Herr Krupp von Bohlen & Co.

KRUPP'S "POINT 4½"

In March the New York Times reported that Krupp's chief lieutenant, the rather dashing, glamorous Berthold Beiz, had a delightful discussion with our Deputy Undersecretary of State Robert D. Murphy. Herr Beiz and his associates briefed Mr. Murphy on a Krupp plan supposedly aimed at thwarting Russian penetration in Asia and Africa. Using all of the tricks of slick advertising and public relations, the Krupp program was dubbed by its sponsors as the "point 4½ program," named after the well known American point 4 project to help underdeveloped countries. Krupp proposed that a syndicate of German, British, French, and American firms be formed to exploit important areas of Africa and Asia. According to one report (La Tribune des Nations, March 23, 1956), Krupp's representative told Mr. Murphy "that the remarkable success recently achieved by my firm in Asia and the Middle East especially qualify it to become the basic center for the preparation of the projects to be realized by the industrial syndicate." Without batting an eyelash, Herr Beiz declared that the choice of Krupp as the director of the syndicate "would eliminate all accusations of a new colonialism * * *" In commenting on Krupp's magnanimous offer, this same French journal noted that his anti-imperialism was fraudulent and was nothing more than a "well chosen perfect pretext to obtain the confidence of Washington." What has bothered Herr Krupp and is temp-

ting his colleagues to dip their hands in the till of the United States Treasury, is the fact that interest on credits for German export run as high as 6 to 9 percent. It is these rates of interest which hamper Herr Krupp and impel him to run to Washington. That Herr Krupp and his associates are banking on Uncle Sam to foot the bill was admitted by the Economic Minister of the Bonn government, Ludwig Erhard: "The master plan is apparently based on the assumption that the Americans will give the credits and we Germans will get the contracts." (London Financial Times, May 1, 1956.)

KRUPP AND THE RUSSIANS

The fact that Krupp, a major war criminal and a devoted Hitler supporter, should now pose as the great benefactor of the colonial peoples should in itself cast suspicions on the motives which guide the Germans. Equally fraudulent are the Krupp interests' efforts to affect the role of a long-term foe of Communist imperialism. It was the Krupps who played a leading part in developing Russia's industrial war potential after World War I. With the aid and cooperation of the German General Staff and the Weimar Republic Krupp established a number of factories in Russia which were related to armament production. While Krupp was actively collaborating with the Russians via the German General Staff, one of his directors, Dr. Wiedtfeld, was appointed Ambassador to the United States. In this important position, Wiedtfeld helped to bring about successive waves of American investments in Germany. Thus, Krupp specifically and German industry in general had the best of both worlds: money from the United States and military cooperation with the Russians. Through these contacts with the East and the West, Krupp and his Ruhr friends were able to revive Germany's power, thereby laying the groundwork for the resurgence of German militarism under Hitler. One might say that Herr Beiz has been appointed to play the same role as Herr Wiedtfeld in the 1920's.

Krupp's love affair with the Russians is by no means dead and buried. On the contrary, the romance appears to have received new life. According to the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (February 10, 1956), one of Germany's leading newspapers, representatives of Krupp and of the Soviet Embassy have been discussing "the question of delivery of Krupp locomotives to the Soviet Union." This newspaper further states, "business talks had already been carried on previously between representatives of the firm of Krupp and Russian economic authorities by way of the Russian delegation to the Federal Republic and in Moscow."

It is noteworthy that at the Leipzig Fair, held in the Soviet zone a few months ago, 1,589 West German concerns participated, a number far greater than that of any other western country. The New York Times correspondent, reporting on the fair noted: "By way of introduction to Soviet visitors there is a discreet notice next to the Krupp office explaining the company's operations. The notice is written in Russian and is entitled 'From our production program.' It lists the numerous articles produced in the factories of the Krupp empire. Even more discreet is a smaller notice set in what resembles a restaurant menu stand. It contains a handsome photograph of Alfred Krupp, the present owner. There is a brief description of him followed by the names of the board of managers and a list of the principal divisions of the Krupp enterprises." (New York Times, February 27, 1956.)

Alfred Krupp himself has stated unequivocally that Germany's economic progress and interests are closely bound up with the markets controlled by the Soviets. In an interview with the magazine World (May 1954) he said: "In the long run West Germany cannot continue her economic advancement without being reunited with East Germany, because both parts of Germany must be considered an organic whole. An expansion of trade volume (with East Germany and Soviet-bloc countries) would without doubt contribute considerably to a solution of West Germany's export problems."

THE DOUBLE GAME

Just as Herr Krupp has been playing both sides of the street, so have his fellow industrialists. Ordinarily, the German press tries to becloud Germany's trade relations with the East including Communist China. Nevertheless, trade with that area of the world has been growing rapidly. The West will never know the value of such trade because official figures are misleading, to say the least. Yet, it is a fact that this trade is attaining decisive importance to the Germans and they are busily working behind the scenes to undermine present Allied restrictions on this traffic.

On the eve of Adenauer's visit to Moscow, a New York Herald Tribune report (September 4, 1955) disclosed that important German businessmen were beginning to drum up a campaign for a more active eastern trade policy. One of the chief arguments put forth by these interests, was that the destiny of Germany depended on the eastern markets. "It is their special preserve. There is a great tradition of German-Russian trade. It is the duty of this generation of German businessmen not to allow the preeminent experience of their forefathers in the Slav market to go down the drain."

Following Adenauer's trip to Moscow, the New York Times revealed that important sections of German industry looked hopefully for the revival of trade with the Soviet bloc. The pressure of these interests, the Times reported, "gave rise to the suspicion that there was perhaps more interest in the Soviet market than the Bonn Government, for political reasons, was prepared to admit." In this connection, studies were made which indicated that German exports to the east could go as high as $1 billion annually, and the Times correspondent noted that these ambitious plans have not been discarded. He observed that, since the German Government's experts drew up the plans in the first place, "it would appear to contradict the * * * propaganda line that trade with the Soviet Union does not have a future" (September 18, 1955).

A few months ago, prominent German indutsrialists made a highly publicized trip to key areas of Asia and Africa. Among the bigwigs on this German junket was Alfred Krupp. An Associated Press dispatch (February 6, 1956), discribing the venture, declared that it was a drive "designed to encounter the Soviet bloc's economic overtures in Asia and Africa." The report which seemed to bear the earmarks of a handout from the public relations machine of the Ruhr industry designed for American consumption, emphasized that "Communist China is being bypassed by the German industrial visitors." However, the German people have been given a far different version of the meaning and objectives of this trip.

While the German industrialists did not visit China proper, they did stop at Hong Kong. According to the Stuttgarter Nachrichten (February 11, 1956), information on trade, etc., with regard to Communist China "can be obtained directly from the German businessmen located in Hong Kong.. In the final analysis Hong Kong, the direct gate to Red China, is the most important port for transshipment in the Red China trade." The story that the trip was aimed at countering the Soviets does not carry weight with the Germans. The same newspaper declared that "it would be misjudging the purpose of the Asian trip of the German industrial delegation to assume that it was primarily designed to counteract and attack the trade-political offensive of the East bloc." Indeed, this influential paper did not seem to be at all disturbed about the inroads made by the Soviet Union in Asia and Africa. It expressed the belief that there was sufficient room for German expansion in these regions and that the Soviet trade offensive should not be regarded as though it had inexhaustible resources. "Thus, this Asia trip primarily serves the preparation for participation of German industry in the coming business for development in Asia."

It is interesting to note that this German newspaper envisaged not only Soviet competition but also strong competitive activity by the Western Powers. In spite of these difficulties the paper is confident that the Germans will grab their share, come what may. The tone of the article is one of optimism. There is no dark picture of the Soviet Union approaching the point of swallowing up all of Asia and Africa. This is good propaganda for America, but the Germans who look upon the eastern markets as their special preserve have other ideas.

"PARTNERSHIP"

The spurious character of the so-called economic partnership proposed by the Germans, may also be seen by the fact that they are doing everything possible to undermine the position of the United States in other world markets. In the No. 43 issue of Prevent World War III, the society analyzed the Krupp economic offensive against the West. We noted that Krupp together with other industrial warlords of the Ruhr were undercutting the United States and her allies in India, the Balkans, and in South America. In the No. 46 issue of Prevent World War III we returned to the subject pointing out that Krupp's economic penetration throughout the world was strongly backed by the Bonn Government. It was stated that much of this financial assistance to Krupp and his cronies was made possible through the Marshall plan aid.

The economic offensive continues. The attack is becoming more formidable by the retrustification and recartelization of German heavy industry. In South America, the Krupps, the Mannesmanns, the Siemens, and other members of the German monopoly "club" are grabbing one market after another. The New York Herald Tribune, January 30, 1956, describes the drive as follows: "West Germany has already recaptured a large slice of the Brazilian market. Establishment of Krupp iron, steel, and other heavy industrial plants will extend Germany's position in Brazil still more." The same situation holds true for Argentina, Colombia, Venezuela, and Mexico. Thus, the U. S. News & World Report, February 17, 1956, notes: "Trade offensives are not a monopoly of the Soviet bloc. * * * West German businessmen—groups of them—are mounting an offensive of their own. You run into a group drumming up business in Mexico and Central America and heading toward South America."

A heavily trustified industrial Ruhr backed by the full support of the Bonn government and taking advantage of the extreme low living standards of the German workers, has made the German trade assault a reality in the grimmest sense of the word. No wonder, American businessmen are showing concern and Business Week (May 12, 1956) admits that the Germans are "becoming a real challenge to American companies in international markets."

THE REAL OBJECTIVE

It is against the background of these facts, incomplete as they are, that one must weigh the proposals to enlarge the economic mission of NATO. In principle, this is a praiseworthy objective. It is clear that Soviet tactics are now of such a character that purely military remedies no longer suffice. There is no doubt that the free world could accomplish much in terms of the extension of democracy through a bold program of aid

to countries which are less fortunate economically than ourselves. On the other hand, it would be well to bear in mind Germany's "cavalry" tactics. A columnist in the German-language newspaper Aufbau, Joseph L. Oppenheimer, described the maneuver in these words: "Germany, eyeing overseas potential as its industry continues to rebound remarkably, would like nothing better than the backing of a western alliance of some type for its foreign business activities. NATO sponsorship, possibly under the guise of need to keep West Germany as a strong anti-Moscow force, would be ideal" (May 11, 1956).

Does Germany hope to undermine the economic position of her neighbors on the world markets and to achieve a predominating influence in Asia and Africa with the financial help of the United States? This is the key question that must be answered with regard to plans to enlarge NATO's economic role. In this connection we are reminded of an observation made by Sefton Delmer, the noted British journalist, when he was in Moscow during Adenauer's visit there. He wrote that the Chancellor would like to get an agreement with the Russians which "while leaving the Americans confident of his loyalty to them, would nevertheless make it clear that he is more valuable to the Russians and that the United States must pay more to keep them loyal" (September 12, 1955). If Germany's ambitions, as described in this article, are realized, then Adenauer's mission to Moscow will have paid off.

Agreements Reached in Organizational Meetings of Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to report to the House membership that the subcommittee held a series of organizational meetings prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress and reached preliminary agreement with respect to subcommittee plans. For the information of my colleagues and others interested persons, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point a press release announcing agreement reached in the subcommittee's organizational meetings:

HON. HALE BOGGS, DEMOCRAT, LOUISIANA, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CUSTOMS, TARIFFS, AND RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT REACHED IN SUBCOMMITTEE'S ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS

The Honorable HALE BOGGS, Democrat, Louisiana, chairman of the Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements, of the Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that prior to the adjournment of the 84th Congress the membership of the subcommittee had held a series of organizational meetings and had reached preliminary agreement with respect to subcommittee plans. The subcommittee has reached agreement on the subcommittee's activity during the period from the adjournment of the 2d session to the convening of the 85th Congress.

It is expected that staff study will occupy a substantial portion of the subcommittee's activity during the adjournment period. This study will include detailed consideration of specific aspects of foreign trade matters. In addition to the public hearings by the subcommittee described below, the views of interested organizations and individuals will be solicited in regard to various aspects of the subject matter coming within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has tentatively agreed to conduct 2 weeks of public hearings during the month of September in Washington, D. C., and 2 weeks of public hearings beginning in late November at selected locations abroad. The details of these hearings are yet to be developed and they will be announced as they are determined.

In the short-range study scheduled to take place during the present adjournment period, the subcommittee and its staff will endeavor to investigate and study various aspects of our customs, tariff, and trade agreement laws and the administration of the agreements entered into thereunder as they relate to particular industries. Special emphasis will be placed during the inquiry on the relationship and effect of these matters on the foreign economic policy of the United States and their effect upon domestic producers and employment.

The subcommittee will select for study and review typical cases involving efforts of domestic industries to secure relief from imports through administrative and statutory procedures available to a domestic industry. This study will cover all aspects of these relief provisions, including their operation, adequacy, and effectiveness, the factual situations existing in the selected industries as to employment, production, and the impact of imports, the foreign trade and foreign economic policy implications involved, the relationship of the particular industry to our overall national economy, including trends and consumption of the items produced, the role of domestic production, the role of imports, and the role of the items in world trade.

Chairman BOGGS stressed the fact that this review and study will be limited to typical cases which will result in the development of information by the subcommittee which would be of general applicability. In this connection the chairman announced that such staff studies will be directed to the development of objective and factual information for subcommittee consideration.

Staff studies along these lines will proceed immediately. The subcommittee will announce at a later date the specific areas of inquiry and its further agenda.

The subcommittee has directed that the annual report of the Tariff Commission be evaluated by the staff to determine its adequacy for the purpose of informing Congress and interested persons with respect to tariff matters. In announcing the subcommittee hearing schedule, Chairman BOGGS stated that if the time of the membership permits additional hearings may be scheduled in October.

Persons having suggestions for improving our customs and tariff laws and comments with respect to specific aspects of the operation of these laws are invited to submit their written views to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C. Such expression of views will be given careful staff study and will be reviewed by the subcommittee.

Requests to be heard before the subcommittee in public hearings should be held in abeyance until a specific hearing announcement is made.

The members of the subcommittee are: HALE BOGGS, Louisiana, chairman; CECIL R. KING, California; BURR P. HARRISON, Virginia; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; DANIEL A. REED, New York; JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin; ANTONI N. SADLAK, Connecticut; THOMAS B. CURTIS, Missouri; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Congressman Young Supports Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, as one of those Members of Congress who voted in favor of President Eisenhower's civil rights proposal, I would like at this time to outline it briefly for the people of Nevada.

In recommending the creation of a bipartisan civil rights commission, President Eisenhower said in his State of the Union message:

"It is disturbing that in some localities allegations persist that Negro citizens are being deprived of their right to vote and are likewise being subject to unwarranted economic pressures. I recommend that the substance of these charges be thoroughly examined by a bipartisan commission created by Congress."

The six-point program advocated by President Eisenhower contained these provisions:

First. Establishing a six-man bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights with subpena power to investigate voting rights abuses and unwarranted pressures aimed at denying basic rights.

Second. Providing new post of Assistant Attorney General to head a special Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department.

Third. Allowing Federal prosecution of individuals—as well as officials—who try to intimidate voters in any election for a Federal office.

Fourth. Allowing Justice Department to seek Federal injunctions on behalf of United States or persons deprived of civil rights.

Fifth. Permitting private citizens access to Federal courts in civil rights cases without exhausting State steps.

Sixth. Permitting Justice Department to bring civil suits against civil rights conspiracies like hooded gangs, and so forth.

Although we were successful in passing this proposal through the House, it was defeated in the Senate by the southern chairmen of the key committees.

These same gentlemen will continue to control Congress and to bottle up civil-rights reforms unless Republicans are elected in November.

President Eisenhower has taken the lead in making democracy apply to everyone. The greatest civil rights gains since the Civil War have occurred under the Eisenhower administration. Equality of treatment is being achieved by deeds and action, not empty talk. President Eisenhower has carried out his cam-

paign pledge to use all the power of the Chief Executive to work toward elimination of segregation and discrimination.

Here are some specific points of anti-discriminatory action taken under President Eisenhower and his team:

First. Elimination by ICC of "Jim Crow" in bus and interstate travel.

Second. Abolition of segregation in schools on military posts by executive action.

Third. Elimination of discrimination among civilian employees at naval bases.

Fourth. Completion of end to segregation in the Armed Forces, VA hospitals, and so forth.

Fifth. Establishment of a Committee on Government Contracts—headed by the Vice President—to help prevent discrimination in Government contract jobs and a President's Committee on Government Employment Policy to assure nondiscrimination in Government jobs.

Sixth. Requirement that new contracts for services to the District of Columbia must include pledges of no discrimination in employment.

Seventh. Elimination of segregation in the Nation's Capital by executive action.

Eighth. A new era of equality has begun through Supreme Court decisions outlawing segregated schools and providing equal access to other public areas.

No End to Broken Pledges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an important article that appeared in the current issue—No. 48, summer 1956—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. I regard this publication as extremely important toward a clear understanding of the complex German problem. It is an unfortunate fact that, while Congress has had numerous opportunities for reevaluating practically every phase of American foreign policy, United States policy toward Germany has remained sacrosanct and beyond the pale of soul-searching debate and questioning. Yet, I believe that reexamination of our German policy by Congress is an urgent matter.

The article in Prevent World war III is entitled "No End to Broken Pledges." It analyzes the failures of the Bonn government and its leadership to live up to its pledges to the Allies over the past 10 years. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO END TO BROKEN PLEDGES

"If there is anything to be gained by being honest, let us be honest; if it is necessary to deceive, let us deceive."—Frederick the Great (1712–86).

Hitler's seizure of power in 1933 caused much concern in foreign capitals over Germany's willingness and determination to abide by its international obligations. Aware that the Nazis' intentions were suspect, Hitler tried to create the impression that his gangster tactics in domestic affairs would have no effect on Germany's behavior toward other countries. Thus, on May 21, 1935, Hitler told his rubber stamp Reichstag, "the German Government will scrupulously maintain every treaty voluntarily signed, even though it was concluded before its accession to power and office."

Of course, Hitler's real attitude toward pledges and treaties was basically no different from preceding rulers of Germany who regarded treaties as "scraps of paper." Four years after his public promise that the Nazi Government would be faithful to its commitments, Hitler told his military commanders in a secret speech, "agreements are to be kept only as long as they serve a certain purpose." The Fuehrer kept his word on that score. At the Nuremberg war crimes trials it was revealed that the Nazis broke at least 69 treaties to which Germany had subscribed between the years 1933–41.

One of the fond hopes entertained by the Allies in giving all-out support to the present Bonn government, was that this melancholy record of broken treaties would not be repeated. Indeed, many people accept as fact that the German Federal Republic has scrupulously adhered to its promises since the end of the war. Yet, even a brief survey of how the Federal Republic has comported itself in carrying out its obligations, will show that past practice is very much alive.

In this connection we recall a report appearing in the New York Times, August 3, 1951, disclosing that the Bonn government had failed to live up to its commitments on the delivery of steel scrap to the Allied Powers. This particular incident, according to the Times, increased the concern of Allied officials over the fact that the Germans were "welshing on agreements." The Times report mentioned that there were "frequent complaints that the Germans are slow to make any sacrifices themselves for European integration and persistently attempt to whittle down commitments made in the past." One Allied official, speaking about these broken agreements, said: "Are we growing too cynical to remember that one of the reasons we went to war with Germany in 1939 was because we believe such agreements should be kept?" Another Allied official put it this way: "I am pretty tired of seeing the occupation powers make all the compromises. The Germans just never are satisfied." This particular complaint reminds us of Britain's Foreign Minister Austen Chamberlain's reproach to Foreign Minister Stresemann during the 1920's: "Whenever we make a concession to you, instead of acknowledging it, you ask for more."

We have not taken the trouble to tally all of the agreements and pledges which have been vitiated by the Bonn government, but in any event we can cite some glaring examples of how the Adenauer regime has backtracked more than once on obligations it has assumed.

REPARATIONS

From the very beginning of the occupation the Germans vigorously and even violently opposed the Allied policy of reparations and the dismantling of her industrial war potential. In the summer of 1948 the German steel magnates notified Allied officials that they would no longer cooperate in the dismantling of certain plants which had been regarded by the Allies as excessive in terms of Germany's peacetime requirements. The struggle against the reparations policy became even more intense following the establishment of the Bonn government under Adenauer's leadership. Because the British zone was highly industrialized, the English became the main target of this attack. In October 1949 the Chancellor himself accused the British Government of "a high degree of stupid stubbornness." One newspaper correspondent observed: "Familiar echoes in this speech of the diplomatic practices of Ribbentrop and Hitler were further enhanced by the fact that the nonofficial new German news agency DPA carefully omitted mention of Chancellor Adenauer's attack in its report of the speech" (ONA, October 24, 1949).

That Chancellor Adenauer was using his high position to further the interests of the German steel monopolies was reported in the New York Times (November 21, 1949). The man who was particularly influential with Dr. Adenauer was Robert Pferdmenges, one of his close advisers and a bigwig in the Vereinigte Stahlwerke (the German Steel Trust). It was pointed out that Adenauer, in trying to protect the steel interests, sought to tie up the dismantling of plants belonging to the Vereinigte Stahlwerke. The Chancellor's efforts to sabotage the Allied program was partially successful when in the Petersberg agreement of November 24, 1949, the Allies consented to cut down the dismantling program in favor of the Germans. Commenting on the agreement, the British High Commissioner Sir Brian Robertson declared: "We are clearly not expecting that this agreement should be regarded as a stepping stone for further demands. * * * The Chancellor also gave us an assurance that the Federal Government would use its influence and authority to insure that the balance of the dismantling program proceeds expeditiously without obstruction."

The High Commissioner's optimism, however, was unwarranted. Within 2 months after Adenauer had signed this agreement, he appealed to the Allied Powers to halt the shipment of machine tools from the Krupp steel works which were intended as reparations. In April 1950, less than 5 months after he pledged to cooperate with the Allies, Adenauer publicly attacked Allied policy. He not only complained about alleged mistreatment by the Allies, but assailed the dismantling program. (New York Times, April 4, 1950.) Exactly one month after Adenauer aired his latest complaint, sweeping concessions were granted to the Germans as the Allies stopped all work on the dismantling of the Hermann Goering combine. The Goering works had been regarded by the Allies as a key factor in Germany's war potential. Consequently, they were not included among the plants which were to escape dismantling under the Petersberg agreement. In submitting to the agitation of Adenauer and his fellow politicians, the British High Commissioner, Sir Brian Robertson, said: "I must emphasize that these concessions can be granted only on the understanding that they are regarded as a final settlement." A New York Times reporter noted with irony that the same Allied spokesman "made a similar statement the day following the proclamation of the Petersberg agreement." (New York Times, May 3, 1950.)

CARTELS

As in the case of reparations and dismantling, the Bonn government showed no enthusiasm for the Allied policy to decartelize and deconcentrate German heavy industry. In view of the notorious record of the German cartels and monopolies, the Allies planned to break them up. This did not deter the Germans from utilizing every means available to emasculate the program. They even employed American lobbyists and lawyers to plead their case. Although the program was crippled by their efforts and by the unsympathetic attitude of certain Allied officials, it managed to survive.

When the Germans began negotiations with the Allies toward the granting of sovereignty, they publicly pledged that they would continue the anticartel policy of the Allies even after they had achieved full sovereignty. Chancellor Adenauer made this clear in a letter to James B. Conant, then United States High Commissioner for Germany: "The Federal Government will also oppose efforts to repeal or modify Allied legislation which now prohibits restraints of competition and monopolies before the coming into force of a German law containing general provisions against restraints of competition" (October 23, 1954).

It turned out that there was a yawning gap between promise and fulfillment. The bills presented to the Bundestag on monopolies and cartels have been so full of loopholes and qualifications as to make Bonn's anticartel posture a gigantic farce. Thus, the London Financial Times (January 20, 1956) reported that pending legislation provided for the setting up of German export and import cartels. Other legislation encourages the reestablishment of the German banking monopolies. The New York Times (April 17, 1956) reported "Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's government hopes to legalize by 1957 a rebirth of the three great commercial banks that dominated the financial life of Germany during the Hitler era and before."

It is not only the German banks and the export cartels that are given a new lease on life by the Bonn Government. As a matter of fact, Dr. Adenauer has given his blessings to the rebirth of the entire structure of German monopolies and other economic concentrations. The New York Times (March 22, 1956) noted that the Bonn Government had announced its intention "to open negotiations with the Allies to permit the reconstitution of the great German industrial empires." In point of fact, the reforming of these conglomerations of economic power had been going on even before Germany was granted sovereignty. Today the Bonn regime is merely trying to legalize its violation of a solemn pledge and agreement.

In previous issues of Prevent World War III it was noted that, as the situation is now developing, these monopolies will be even more powerful than they were under Hitler. It is noteworthy too that the principal beneficiary of Adenauer's attempt to make unlawful acts respectable would be Krupp. Chancellor Adenauer himself has gone out of his way to support Krupp's effort to nullify the pledge that he would sell part of his properties.

REARMAMENT

Following the end of the war there was little public talk among the Germans about reviving the Wehrmacht. Perhaps this was due to the psychological impact experienced by the utter defeat of Hitler's armies. This is not to say that hope did not exist that some day, somehow, the Germans would have a brand new army. As a matter of fact, in January 1949, before he became Chancellor, Dr. Adenauer told a group of American correspondents that he would not oppose "a forward looking" German army. Of course, he assured his listeners that he objected to the revival of the traditional military caste, but this did not mean that he would be against the formation of a new Wehrmacht as such. It is not known whether this was a trial balloon or a slip of the tongue, but, in any event, the Chancellor changed his mind 10 months later. In an interview with a correspondent for a Paris newspaper he said, "I have absolutely no desire for a German army" (November 28, 1949). Whether this was intended to assuage the feelings of the French is not known. He repeated the same thought in an interview with the Cleveland Plain Dealer (December 4, 1949): "It must be clear once and for all," he said, "that I am fundamentally opposed to the rearmament of the German Republic and therefore also against the creation of a new Wehrmacht."

The supposed opposition to the remilitarization of Germany was officially acknowledged by the Bonn government in the Petersberg agreement. There it was stated that the Bonn government pledged "its earnest determination to maintain the demilitarization of the Federal territory and to endeavor by all means in its power to prevent the recreation of armed forces of any kind. To this end the Federal Government will cooperate fully with the High Commission in the work of the Military Security Board."

Two months after Adenauer had signed the Petersberg pledge, the New York Times (January 14, 15, 1950), revealed that he had requested a group of German generals to draw up a schedule and a plan for German rearmament. It was noted that these German military officers were organized in the so-called Brüderschaft (Brotherhood) which had chapters in various cities. The Brüderschaft was one of the first paramilitary organizations to reappear in Germany after the end of the war. Its connections with the Federal Government were not a secret and its policies definitely contemplated the revival of Germany's military might. The militaristic character of the Brüderschaft was analyzed in Prevent World War III (No. 31 issue, September–October 1949). The New York Times, February 22, 1950, noted that the "Brotherhood" was sending "plans and mobilization schemes to Dr. Adenauer, Chancellor of the Bonn government, and other members of his Cabinet."

This particular episode was only the beginning. Additional facts continued to leak out of Germany concerning rearmament and militaristic activities. Thus, the New York Staats-Zeitung (September 9, 1953) reported a speech made by Willy Messerschmidt, the German airplane manufacturer, before the Rhine-Ruhr Club. In this speech Messerschmidt boasted that the Germans could initiate the mass production of airplanes with a minimum of investment. He declared that a great deal was being accomplished for the construction of airplanes, since the beginning of the occupation. He further mentioned that these developments were facilitated by the application of German know-how in foreign countries. It is a fact that Spain was one of the countries which became a laboratory for Germany's rearmament plans.

The New York Times, September 25, 1953, carried a dispatch from Germany describing "an exhibition of German-made military equipment." The Times report observed that "some of these items caused eyebrows to rise for Germany is prevented by the Allied occupation statute from manufacturing arms or exclusively military equipment." Among the German firms which displayed military equipment, was none other than Krupp whose leaders today tell the world that they are through making war material.

The Associated Press (September 18, 1953) reported that the Swiss Government had rejected an application to export hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of military equipment which had been ordered by the Bonn government. To top it all, the German language newspaper Aufbau (September 25 and October 2, 1953) carried an exposé detailing the existence of a powerful German armaments ring operating in Germany, Switzerland, and the State of Liechtenstein. Among the ringleaders were the accused war criminal Hjalmar Schacht, Rudolf Ruschewey, a former German officer who was wanted by the French for war crimes, and an individual by the name of Klein, father-in-law of the late General Von Seeckt, who helped build up the Red army.

It should be borne in mind that these activities went on during the same period when Germany had pledged to adhere to the program of demilitarization and disarmament.

GERMAN ASSETS

A major policy pursued by the Allies at the end of the war was to prevent Germany from regaining assets and loot hidden abroad. The Allies knew that the Germans wanted to keep this wealth under cover and intact until such time as it could be employed again to further Germany's predatory designs. On the other hand, the Allies sought to use these assets to compensate, at least in part, the nations victimized by German aggression.

As in the previous cases mentioned above, the Germans employed every trick imaginable to prevent this program from being implemented. Officially, at least, the German Government pretended that it bore no responsibility for this sabotage. Indeed, the contractual agreement granting sovereignty to the Germans contained the following clause: "The Federal Republic shall in the future raise no objections against the measures which have been, or will be, carried out with regard to German external assets or other property, seized for the purpose of reparation or restitution, or as a result of the state of war, or on the basis of agreements concluded, or to be concluded, by the three powers with other Allied countries, neutral countries, or former allies of Germany."

However, it was not long before Chancellor Adenauer turned his coat again. Directing his request to the United States in the hope that he would receive the necessary support from certain pro-German groups in Washington, he asked President Eisenhower to return these assets, alleging that they belonged to Germans who "were always the traditional promoters of friendship between the two nations." While the Chancellor spoke about the need for the return of these assets to foster good will and as a token of appreciation for Germany's "brave role" in the struggle against communism, West German direct exports to Red China were soaring to record heights.

Even before the Chancellor had made public his approach to Washington, one of his chief advisers, Herman J. Abs (Hitler's paymaster), had hinted that, unless these former assets were returned, Germany might not be able to carry out the bargain with respect to the repayment of Germany's postwar debts. This was in sharp contrast to Adenauer's pledge to fulfill the debt obligations in return for a revision of the occupation statute in Germany's favor. That Adenauer succeeded in reducing Germany's postwar debts by $2 billion despite this pledge, did not faze Herr Abs. Now the Germans wanted the United States or, to be more precise, the American taxpayers, to turn over additional hundreds of millions of dollars in the interest of German-American friendship.

RELATIONS WITH SOVIET RUSSIA

One of the favorite boasts of the Bonn government is the contention that the Germans have steadfastly rejected Communist blandishments. Time and again, Bonn politicians have assured United States policymakers that the Federal Republic could be relied upon to reject any thought of bilateral negotiations at the expense of Allied Powers. Thus, when the Secretary of State for the Bonn government, Prof. Walter Hallstein, visited the United States in 1953, he categorically declared that Chancellor Adenauer would "never, never" negotiate with Russia. The Chancellor himself told American audiences during his visits here that the Bonn government would have nothing to do with the Soviets. In October 1953 he told a correspondent for the United Press that the allies must not crawl after the Russians. "There is no point in continuing to chase after them (the Russians). We merely hurt our own objective of reaching an understanding with the Russians." As for the

Germans, Dr. Adenauer told his interviewer that "he most certainly would not go to Moscow himself to try to reach a direct agreement with the Russians. Prior to his trip to Moscow in September 1955, Adenauer repeated this line. What happened in Moscow needs no further comment.

SO IT WAS, SO IT IS

In other instances the Germans have used surreptitious means to escape from their solemn commitments and obligations. They undermined the Allied program to limit Germany's steel capacity by helping to build up steel production in the Soviet zone; they made enormous profits through the sale of strategic materials to the Soviet bloc; they secretly gave aid and comfort to the neo-Nazi and anti-French elements in the Saar; and even today when they are granted the right to rearm, they find all sorts of excuses to justify their stalling tactics. The fact is that the patch of Germany's resurgence to power is strewn with broken pledges and agreements. Of course, when the situation suits their purposes, the Germans demonstrate a marked fidelity to commitments. Thus, they give full support to the clause in the contractual agreement whereby the Germans are no longer obligated to give financial support to Allied forces in Germany after May 1956. On this head they are insistent that the agreement be carried out to the letter—but not the spirit.

The German record of broken pledges would not be complete without some comment on Allied responsibility. It cannot be maintained that the Allies were unaware of Germany's propensity to tear up agreements. Thus, there was no valid reason why the Allies could not have coped with German duplicity. The fact is that from the very beginning of the occupation, certain Allied officials in high places connived with the Germans behind the backs of their own governments. There were other officials in key posts who "looked the other way" while the Germans and their friends in military government were sabotaging Allied policies. This tolerant attitude was defended on the grounds that Germany was indispensable to western civilization. Those who provided this rationale, forgot that one of the basic principles of a civilized community is faithful adherence to contract. Nor did these same people bother to explain how respect for international obligations and lawful agreements is strengthened against totalitarian attacks from the outside if aid and comfort is given to lawlessness from within. By permitting the Germans to run roughshod over their obligations, these "practical realists" have encouraged the rebirth of that German spirit which never felt bound by the norms of civilized communities.

Ninety-first Infantry Division Completes 2 Weeks of Active-Duty Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the 91st Infantry Division recently completed its 2 weeks of active duty training at Camp Roberts, Calif., under the command of able Maj. Gen. C. Lyn Fox, United States Army Reserve.

General Fox has done a splendid job in building up the 91st. He has not only given unstintingly of his own time and energy but he has encouraged others to join with him. He has demonstrated his ability as an organizer and leader.

The 91st Infantry Division has a proud history. It was first organized in 1917 at then Camp Lewis, now Fort Lewis, Wash. It has many battle scars on its proud record. As a young man I was one of the group of officers who established this division.

I have before me a letter written by Maj. John B. May, artillery, United States Army Reserve, in which he enthusiastically tells of this year's tour of active duty. It is worth your reading:

I thought you might like to hear about my recent tour at Camp Roberts with the 91st Division from July 8 to 21. As you know, I am the division artillery communication officer and really enjoyed my 2 weeks of Reserve training this year.

Everyone worked hard and put in long hours, however, I heard very few complaints. The training went fine, the food was good and we all felt it was one of our most successful camps. We had plenty of equipment this year and one of the most important things was the cooperation we received from our Regular Army support from personnel of the Second Division out of Fort Lewis, namely the 38th.

I had a second lieutenant and 10 communication personnel to assist me in addition to our own reservists, and these regulars really helped to make our tour a success. I had a total of 29 men and officers and we installed over 35 miles of wire in addition to keeping radio communication during our artillery service practice at Hunter Liggett Military Reservation. Both our daylight problems and night occupation were hampered by tanks and engineer's bulldozers cutting our wires, but the entire communication personnel enjoyed servicing the breaks and reestablishing communications.

We had sufficient transportation and best of all had some of the latest in radio equipment installed in the vehicles. To save gasoline and wear on vehicles for our overnight problem, we left the vehicles and equipment at Hunter Liggett, some 35 miles from Roberts, and returned to camp by bus leaving guards to watch the equipment. The following day all of the artillery returned by bus and began our overnight problem which lasted for 2 days. We then returned with equipment to Camp Roberts.

Our service practice with artillery lasted for 2 days with subcaliber (37 millimeter) at Camp Roberts range, and for 3 days with 105 and 155 millimeters at Hunter Liggett. The balance of our time was spent in training for our field work, servicing equipment, drawing and turning in equipment. Incidentally, out of thousands of dollars of communication equipment I drew, we turned in all but some seven test clips which were used in line of duty. These are expendable and cost only some 6 cents apiece.

I've told you mostly of the artillery phase at Roberts, but overall the entire division spent an excellent 2 weeks from various reports I received. Morale was excellent and the Regular Army personnel took care of our mess and other duties which have slowed down training in past years. This year was really the best of the past seven camps I have attended at Fort Lewis, Camp Cooke, Hunter Liggett, and Camp Roberts with the 91st Infantry Division.

I have been in the Reserve since 1946, after 4½ years active duty, and can truthfully say that the Reserve is continually improving and doing an excellent job in training our youth for the future welfare of our country.

I am sorry to say that this will be the last year our commanding general, C. Lyn Fox, will be with us as he is retiring in October. He has done an excellent job in building up the 91st and his loss will be felt by all. His foremost thought has been building the 91st Division and the Reserve as a whole, and all of us will miss him when he leaves for a well-earned retirement.

Sorry I must close station at this point, but I think you will get somewhat of a picture of my 2 weeks training. I have given you my viewpoint but have merely skimmed the surface of the entire division's training. It is really hard to believe how much can be done in so short a time by really a small percentage of civilian soldiers who make up the 91st.

JACK MAY.

The Reserve program can and will work. We need more men like C. Lyn Fox and dedicated Jack May.

Seventh United States Cavalary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, dear to all Americans are the traditions of our country that one generation passes on as an enriching heritage to a succeeding generation.

For 90 years the 7th United States Cavalry has been famed in story and in song. It is an inspiring part of our American tradition. My colleagues will be interested, I am sure, in a letter from Forrest M. Beeson, commander of the 7th United States Cavalry Association, which I am extending my remarks to include, as follows:

DEAR SIR: Kenneth E. Crouch, editor of the Bedford (Va.) Democrat, who by the way, is an associate member of this organization, has sent me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, No. 105, Monday, June 25, 1956, in which you had inserted an article from the Chicago Tribune in regards the 80th anniversary of Gen. George A. Custer's "last stand."

I wish to extend to you the sincere thanks of our entire membership for your action in helping to keep alive the traditions and glory of the famous old 7th United States Cavalry Regiment.

This organization was founded in 1932 for the sole purpose of perpetuating the traditions and memories of the gallant old Garry Owen Regiment, as well as to continue the proud memories of our own service with the outfit, and at the same time to contribute in any possible way to the morale and esprit de corps of the active regiment now on duty in Japan. The organization is composed of men whom have served with the 7th from 1898 on down through the so-called police action in Korea, as well as those now on active duty with the regiment.

Unfortunately there are those among us to whom history, traditions, and glory seem to mean nothing, as a matter of fact around the end of the year an order was issued to deactivate the famous 90-year-old 7th, however, after considerable hassle the outfit was saved by a whisker.

In respect that order I must say: Modernize as we must in today's world, yet one thing we must never loose is pride and loyalty to our combat units. It is difficult to love a guided missile or a nuclear weapon, but men have and always will fight to the end for a cause and the regiments that support that cause. Some of our modern day planners

often seem to forget that the basic foundation of any top outfit centers around its traditions. Discard these and you soon have only a group of men with little to hold them together when the going gets tough. Skillful use by the leaders of traditions that have been fostered and preserved will always produce a unit that will stand and fight come hell or high water. The 7th Cavalry has proved this axiom down through the years from Custer to Korea, and will prove it again whenever called upon to do so. It, then, is no mystery why those of us who love the regiment fought to maintain it on the active rolls of the Army.

Sincerely,

FORREST M. BEESON,
Commander.

Commander Beeson encloses a letter from Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, which follows:

DEAR MR. BEESON: Permit me to thank you for your letter of January 30 and for the kind words of appreciation which you extended on behalf of the 7th United States Cavalry Association for my efforts to retain the 7th Cavalry Regiment as an active regiment in the United States Army.

I admit that I, too, as well as many other officers in the Far East Command, was genuinely disturbed by developments which could have led to the deactivation of this splendid regiment. I want you to know that General White, commanding general, AFFE/8A, and I did all in our power during the weeks when this matter was under consideration to retain this fine regiment as well as its sister units, the 5th and 8th Cavalry Regiments as essential units of the Far East Command. We fully share your pleasure that the proper adjustments could be made so successfully.

I have read with interest, the inclosures of your letter which included the bulletin of the association as well as copies of your recent letter to General Taylor, and Colonel Thomason's letter to you of September 7, 1955. I believe that you and the members of this association are doing a fine job in keeping alive the justly celebrated record of Garry Owen and in contributing in a vitally important way to the morale and welfare of the present 7th Cavalry Regiment by transmitting to it the many values of its proud and historic past.

With regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

L. L. LEMNITZER,
General, United States Army, Commander in Chief Far East Command and United Nations Command.

Report to the People of Berks County—Part II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity at this time to continue my report to the people of Berks County on the record of the 84th Congress.

In the first section of my report I discussed social security, railroad retirement, civil service retirement, income-tax legislation, small-business problems, health legislation, school construction, farm legislation, and the challenge of surpluses and abundance.

Here are additional important issues which came before this Congress:

PUBLIC WORKS LEGISLATION

Highways: A long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and tires. I gave my support to this legislation.

Water-pollution control: A program to assist States in research and water-pollution control was enacted. I voted for the proposal which I believe is important in guaranteeing future supplies of water to meet the growing needs of our people.

Economically depressed areas: The 84th Congress took a big step toward the enactment of legislation to provide long-range Federal assistance to sections of our country suffering from chronic unemployment and economic distress. I strongly support this type of program to help people and industry in depressed areas to help themselves in developing new skills, attracting new industry, and diversifying the types of products manufactured.

The bill, because of administration opposition, was killed by delay in the House.

AUTOMATION

A Joint Economic Subcommittee conducted a study of the problems created by increased automation in our industrial society. Its report stressed the possible impact of automation on future employment opportunities and emphasized that a healthy, dynamic economy is needed to form a bulwark against increased unemployment caused by automation. Liberal Democrats approve the report. If Government policies promote an expanding economy, displaced workers can be retrained to fill new jobs at good wages and the impact of automation thus can be considerably alleviated. This Democratic view is opposed by those who support curtailment policies of the administration.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The House passed a bill designed to protect the civil rights of all Americans by establishing a bipartisan commission to investigate alleged violations of civil rights. I supported this important legislation. The bill, however, died because the Senate failed to act.

ATOMIC POWER

Key members of the Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee warned of the lack of progress being made in this country toward the development of atomic energy power reactors. Other nations, including Soviet Russia, are making significant advances. Many experts feel that our country will fall behind in the atomic power field unless action is taken. Legislation to direct the Atomic Energy Commission to build power reactors at our atomic energy installations was passed by the Senate. Strong opposition from the administration and Chairman Strauss of the AEC was exerted on House Members and, as a result, the atomic power reactor bill was killed by a narrow margin.

I favored and voted for this important legislation to stimulate the peacetime development of atomic power.

SHORTAGE OF SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS

Many Members of Congress have been alarmed at recent figures which show that during the past year the Soviet Union graduated more than twice the number of scientists and engineers graduated in the United States. Our very survival in the critical years ahead may well depend on our ability to retain world superiority in technological and scientific deevlopments. The Congressional Joint Atomic Energy Committee conducted important hearings on this subject and made a number of recommendations to arouse increased interest in science and engineering as a career for our young people. Legislation to promote this interest through the awarding of Federal scholarships, teacher's fellowships, and other similar programs was introduced in the House. This program had my full support.

NATURAL-GAS REGULATION

The controversial bill to exempt natural-gas producers from regulation by the Federal Power Commission was vetoed by the President after the revelation by Senator CASE of South Dakota, that he had been offered $2,500 by oil lobbyists for his support of the bill. I opposed the gas bill in the House because I was convinced that it was special-interest legislation which could cost the gas-consuming public hundreds of millions of dollars annually in higher natural-gas rates. Despite the veto, President Eisenhower stated that he supported the bill in principle.

POSTAL RATES

The administration's attempt to increase first-class postal rates from 3 to 4 cents was blocked in the Senate after having passed the House. Democrats opposed the bill because it would place a disproportionate burden on users of first-class mail who already pay more than their share of the postal costs.

Last year profit in first-class mail was $63 million. The administration bill would have imposed an additional $296 million burden on first-class mail users. It would also have made more secure the subsidies to giant magazine publishers. Life magazine, as an example, got a subsidy of nearly $10 million last year.

I opposed the bill because I believe postal subsidies to Reader's Digest, Saturday Evening Post, Life, and others should be substantially cut before a first-class rate increase is adopted.

Postal subsidies are now costing the taxpayers far more than does the entire agricultural conservation program.

FISCAL POLICIES

The national debt: It has increased $6 billion during the last 4 years. Interest on the debt now amounts to $7 billion, or more than 10 percent of our total budget expenditures. Finally, this year, a balanced budget was achieved. This was done by making sharp cuts

in the Armed Forces, by reducing payments into the civil service retirement trust fund, and by economic curtailment policies. The cuts in the armed services caused heated debate and brought warnings that the Nation's security was being imperiled. The curtailment policies which adversely affected small business and employment opportunities was also the subject of bitter debate. Some of these cuts merely shift until a later date payments that the Government is obligated to meet.

Economic policies: White House policymakers who advise and influence the President have introduced and supported policies which resulted in higher interest rates, reduced farm income, discriminatory taxes, increased living costs, unemployment, and a serious business recession in 1954. These policies have caused higher public and private debt, exploitation of our natural resources by special interests, an alarming number of small-business failures, and a reduction of essential Government services. They also meant the blocking of public-works programs, more subsidies, tax loopholes, and writeoffs for big business, and other policies which discriminate against the average citizen and bring about dangerous curtailment of our national economy. Democrats strongly opposed these policies.

PROBLEMS OF THE AGED

In addition to my efforts to liberalize the social-security program, I sponsored legislation to permit single aged persons or couples to occupy public-housing units and also worked for inclusion of special housing-for-the-aged provisions in the overall housing legislation passed by the 84th Congress. The conservative coalition succeeded in blocking the type of housing-for-the-aged program which many of us felt was necessary to meet the growing needs of our elderly citizens.

I also joined in sponsoring legislation to establish a Bureau of Older Persons in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Its duties would be to formulate and carry out broad new types of programs to give older citizens the opportunity to enjoy more productive and independent lives, with adequate income, medical care, housing, and the chance to participate more fully in community activities. This legislation would provide the logical first steps in providing for the necessary Federal-State and private organizational cooperation in the development of plans and projects to assist older persons toward the attainment of these humanitarian objectives.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Pensions: The House of Representatives passed a bill to grant a $90-a-month pension at age 65 to World War I veterans whose maximum income does not exceed specified levels. It would have also provided increases for totally disabled World War I, World War II, and Korean veterans receiving non-service-connected pensions. The bill was blocked in the Senate Finance Committee. It was strongly opposed in a personal letter from President Eisenhower prior to the House action on the compromise bill. The bill was a moderate approach toward meeting the problem pertaining to the economic well-being of our older veterans, many of whom are no longer able to find suitable work. I supported the World War I pension bill before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and voted for the bill which passed the House.

Service-connected benefits: I also supported a bill passed by the House providing a 10-percent increase in compensation for veterans suffering service-connected disabilities during World Wars I, II, and the Korean conflict. In addition, it would have increased by 10 percent the allowances paid to disabled veterans with dependents when such veterans are 50-percent or more disabled. This bill was also opposed by the administration and it failed to receive Senate approval.

GI loan extension: The 84th Congress enacted a bill to extend the World War II GI loan program to July 25, 1958. There are still more than 10 million such veterans who have not used their GI loan entitlement to purchase homes, farms, or businesses. About 4,400,000 veterans have already taken advantage of this provision of the original GI bill.

Veterans' widows compensation: An important provision of the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survior Benefits Act enacted by the 84th Congress increased the payment of VA benefits for widows of veterans who died as a result of service-connected injury. The new rates will be $112 a month, plus 12 percent of the adjusted basic pay of the deceased veteran.

Veterans' insurance: World War II and Korean War veterans who let their Government life insurance lapse get a chance to reinstate their policies under a law passed by the 84th Congress. The law applies only to 5-year term policies that have lapsed since July 23, 1953, because the holders failed to pay either or both of the final two premiums. Eligible veterans will be sent notices.

LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

A subcommittee of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee conducted a study of the problems of low-income families in the United States. One out of every five families now has an income of less than $2,000 a year. Despite increases in our economic resources, surpluses, and material abundance, millions of American families are forced to live on income too low to provide for their everyday needs. Some sections of the country have been hard hit by unemployment and depressed economic conditions. I presented a statement to the subcommittee describing the economic problems of Reading and Berks County and stressed the need for implementing the Employment Act of 1946 to provide maximum employment opportunities and for adopting policies to provide for the economic rehabilitation of low-income families.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The problem of juvenile delinquency has received considerable attention in the 84th Congress. An exhaustive study by the Kefauver Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency in the United States has produced a number of valuable reports discussing the causes, extent, and possible action necessary to alleviate this problem. Legislation to authorize joint Federal-State-local programs to combat the juvenile-delinquency menace was favorably reported to the Senate. While no action was taken on the bill in this Congress, it will undoubtedly be considered further next year. Other bills were enacted to tighten up the law against selling narcotics to minors and against the shipment of obscene materials through the mails.

HUMANE SLAUGHTERING

The Senate passed legislation encouraging the use of humane methods in the slaughter of animals in our Nation's packinghouses. I supported this legislation. In a speech on the House floor I called attention to the shocking and unnecessary brutality in transporting of animals and in methods of slaughter. I urged the use of modern devices now available to guarantee humane slaughtering practices. The bill was not acted upon by the House in this Congress but Senate action was an important step forward.

NEWS CENSORSHIP

Members of Congress as well as newspaper editors, writers, educators, and many other Americans have become aware of the recent trend in the suppression of legitimate news concerning vital subjects of interest to the American people. In some instances security reasons are cited, but more often, ways have been found to restrict the flow of nonclassified information which administration leaders feel might be politically embarrassing if made known to the public.

The Moss investigating subcommittee has made startling discoveries of abuses of this type in its study of news censorship by the executive branch. The committee insisted that the American people have a right to know all of the facts about public business. The "paper curtain" of news censorship, the committee asserted, has no place in our democratic form of government.

COMMUNITY SWIMMING POOLS

I introduced legislation to repeal the 20-percent Federal tax on fees and dues paid to private, nonprofit swimming pool associations. I feel that tax relief for these worthwhile community projects would encourage the organization of more such groups. Neighborhood swimming pools play an important role in curbing juvenile delinquency. They provide needed recreational facilities in the neighborhood to encourage clean, wholesome, and healthful family-type activities. My bill received favorable reaction from people in many parts of the country who are interested in the development of swimming pool projects. It was approved by the House Ways and Means Committee and placed in an overall excise-tax readjustment bill which will be considered next year.

NATURAL RESOURCES

The 84th Congress approved a rivers and harbors and flood-control program costing an estimated $1.5 billion, authorized a research project on the use of saline water for human and commercial purposes, and voted a number of reclamation projects.

Conservation: The 84th Congress took action to protect national forests, parks, and wildlife refuges from further exploitation after House Democrats revealed that oil leases on these refuges had been granted to private drillers by the Interior Department. I joined the Members of Congress in protesting this invasion of wildlife refuges and other administration policies which I considered contrary to sound conservation practices.

A vigorous investigation was also conducted into the activities of the Interior Department in the granting of mining leases in a national forest. These leases were used instead to cut valuable timberland owned by all our citizens.

Violations of fish and game laws by high-ranking military personnel and Government officials also brought strong protests from conservationists and Members of Congress, but legislation to outlaw these practices failed to pass.

HOOVER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Legislation to provide reforms in the Government's accounting and budgeting practices, recommended by the Hoover Commission, was enacted by the 84th Congress. Numerous other recommendations did not require congressional action. Unlike recommendations of the earlier Hoover Commission, the second Commission proposed many sweeping cutbacks in many services of the Federal Government affecting veterans, small businesses, and farmers.

Legislation offered to put these drastic cutbacks into effect received little serious consideration by the 84th Congress. While I have supported many recommendations of both the Hoover Commissions to eliminate waste and inefficiency in Government, I oppose such far-reaching efforts to curtail essential social and economic programs enacted over the past years to protect the average citizen and to promote the general welfare.

REGULATORY COMMISSIONS

Presidential appointments to the various regulatory commissions have shown a shocking disregard of the public interest and have brought repeated congressional protests. These commissions are obligated to protect the public against exorbitant utility rates, fraudulent stocks, false advertising, monopolistic corporate mergers, antitrust violations, and perform other similar important functions. Commission members who were vigilant in protecting the public interest were replaced by individuals coming out of the ranks of the businesses being regulated. Congressional critics referred to one lawyer who, before his appointment as chairman of a commission, spent his life arguing cases before the very same commission in behalf of big businesses accused of monopolistic practices. I joined in protest against such appointments which are very costly to the consumers and against the public interest.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

Administration foreign policies have been challenged in Congress because of indecision, rash slogans, pious declarations, meaningless conferences, and aimless drifting. Chinese Communists have entrenched themselves in North Korea and turned the force of their aggression to the south, gobbling up a part of Indochina.

Despite heroic revolts by workers in East Germany and Poland, the Russian grip on the Iron Curtain countries remains tight. The NATO alliance of free nations has been weakened. The Middle East, with its rich oil reserves, remains a trouble spot. The Israeli Republic is threatened by aggression by its Arab neighbors, armed by the Russians. Communist propagandists have capitalized on our lack of a positive program.

United States prestige has declined in the free world and among uncommitted nations. American soldiers still face the Communists in Korea. The Suez Canal situation is another danger spot. The world situation is far from good and ground has been lost by the United States in the cold war.

TRADE POLICY

The 84th Congress voted a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade program requested by the administration, authorizing the negotiation of trade agreements with other countries. Peril-point and escape-clause provisions to safeguard American industry from unfair foreign competition were included in the bill.

EUROPEAN TRIP

As a member of a Post Office and Civil Service subcommittee, I visited a number of Government installations in various cities of Europe. The report of our subcommittee recommended certain steps to improve the status of civil service personnel in Europe. The largest and most interesting installation was at Frankfort, Germany, headquarters of the United States Forces in Europe.

While in Europe, I had the honor of representing the Reading YMCA at the world conference in Paris. Here I came into contact with people from all lands, who were working together in the interest of humanity, world brotherhood, and peace. It was an inspiring event for those of us who see and recognize the need for high moral principles and spiritual values as the foundation for lasting peace in the world.

MORALS AND ETHICS

During the 82d and 84th Congresses, I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Morals and Ethics. Our committee recommended a code of ethics for Federal employees and Members of Congress.

While it is obvious that morals and ethics cannot be guaranteed through legislation, this code of conduct was presented as a guide which the committee believed would do much to improve the moral climate in government.

I am indebted to Rabbi Norbert L. Rosenthal, of Tulsa, Okla., for the following set of principles to which I fully subscribe:

To thyself be true.
To thy family, be affectionate.
To thy neighbor, be generous.
To thy community, be serviceable.
To mankind, be just.
To every living creature, be compassionate.
To the world, be courageous.
To the past, be understanding.
To the future, be hopeful.
And to God, be humble.

AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS

In concluding this report, I renew my willingness to appear before any group of Berks County citizens to answer questions, debate public issues, or to speak on any subject in which you may be interested.

Eisenhower Crusaders in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on July 26, 1956. Entitled "Role of Governor Stratton," the editorial follows:

ROLE OF GOVERNOR STRATTON

The editorials reprinted under the cartoon today, on the $1 million scandals in the Republican State administration in Illinois, take 2 contrasting views of the role of Gov. William G. Stratton in the ouster of Orville E. Hodge.

One view is that Governor Stratton moved swiftly and surely to get Hodge out of the office of State auditor for which he was renominated without opposition last April. The other view is that the Illinois Governor was most reluctant to take steps against this popular member of his team, that he waited as long as he could in the hope the storm would blow over.

The Chicago Daily News began its investigation of irregularities in the auditor's office in May and the first firings of dubious employees on the Hodge payroll came in that month. The scandal broke into print early in June. Then State's attorney of Sangamon County, George P. Coutrakon, started his investigation. He had been digging into the mess for 3 weeks when Governor Stratton, on July 4, requested the Illinois State Budgetary Commission to make a full study.

After that Hodge continued in office almost 2 weeks more, until July 16. By that time the disclosures of public looting were so shocking that it was only a matter of hours until he would be forced to run for cover. With the scandals still ballooning, Hodge resigned his office, withdrew as nominee for reelection, and gave up his seat as Illinois delegate to the GOP National Convention in San Francisco.

On this record it is clear that the sands were running very fast when Governor Stratton decided the time had come to drop Orville Hodge from the team.

Actually what else could he have done with the biggest set of scandals in Illinois' 138 years of statehood breaking all over the place?

Moreover, Governor Stratton is a full-fledged member of the Illinois Budgetary Commission, which screens proposed appropriations over which the Governor also has veto power. Thus in 1955 Governor Stratton had 2 chances to question the emergency appropriations bill for $525,000 for the Hodge office, in addition to the regular appropriation of $6,659,000. The emergency bill for more than a half million dollars additional did not have a committee hearing in either chamber of the legislature. Why?

When this extra Hodge appropriation came before Governor Stratton for approval he might very well have decided that it had not been sufficiently explained. Had he vetoed it on the grounds that an adequate case had not been made for it, his indignation at Hodge now would be more impressive.

In this connection the people of Illinois are entitled to know the names of the members of the budgetary commission during the last session at Springfield. Here they are and their party affiliations:

Gov. William G. Stratton, Republican.

State Senator Everett R. Peters, Republican, St. Joseph.

Representative Ora D. Dillavou, Republican, Urbana.

Representative Charles K. Willett, Republican, Dixon.

Senator Frank Ryan, Democrat, Chicago.

Representative Paul Powell, Democrat, Vienna.

The conclusion is inescapable that Governor Stratton and these legislators on the commission could have asked more questions than they did when Orville Hodge suddenly needed an extra half million dollars from Illinois taxpayers.

Statement on Reorganizational Meetings of Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means, I recently issued a press release following a series of organizational meetings of the subcommittee. For the information of the membership and other interested persons, I would like to insert that press release in the RECORD at this point:

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS, OF ARKANSAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, ANNOUNCES AGREEMENT REACHED IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the subcommittee had completed a series of organizational meetings and has reached unanimous agreement with respect to the subcommittee's tentative program for the adjournment period of the 84th Congress.

In announcing the subcommittee plans, Chairman MILLS pointed out that due to the fact that the subcommittee has only a short time available for its work, it will be necessary for the subcommittee to concentrate its efforts on a limited study of the matters coming within its jurisdiction so that the study can be completed by the end of this Congress and a report made to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Accordingly, the subcommittee has agreed to concentrate its efforts on reviewing the new provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as well as those provisions carried over into the new code without substantive change to determine what technical and substantive corrections and changes may be necessary. This review will be primarily concerned with technical and clerical errors, with ambiguities, with instances in which unintended hardships are imposed on taxpayers, and with instances in which unintended advantages are given to taxpayers. A number of cases involving such situations have already been brought to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means by the Treasury Department, by the staffs of the congressional committees, and by the interested public.

The revisions of the Internal Revenue laws which were involved in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 necessitated the promulgation of new implementing regulations. In addition, the subcommittee has been advised that the Treasury Department reviewed regulations in those instances where no substantive changes were made in the Internal Revenue laws and attempted to coordinate the old regulations with the new regulations and to bring them into line with judicial precedents handed down subsequent to the initial promulgation of the regulations. The subcommittee will also study the correlation between the statute and the regulations promulgated thereunder to determine the extent of uniformity in substantive meaning and presence of clarity.

The subcommittee will inquire into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws under the Reorganization Act of 1951. Some work in this field has already been done by an advisory group at the direction of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. It is expected that the subcommittee will review the report of this advisory committee to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation dated July 25, 1955, and make such other inquiries as may appear necessary to the subcommittee. With respect to the inquiry into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws, the subcommittee will place particular emphasis on assuring that the administration of our tax laws is being conducted in such a manner as to promote efficiency, to protect the revenues, and to provide equity and fairness to all taxpayers.

Chairman MILLS stated that the above program is not necessarily the complete program for the subcommittee for the remainder of this Congress. Other plans and agenda of the subcommittee will be announced if and when they are decided upon. This, of course, will depend upon the progress of the subcommittee in considering the agenda set forth above. The chairman stated that additional specific problems requiring study by the subcommittee which may come to the attention of the subcommittee membership would be added to the agenda if circumstances warrant.

It is the desire of the subcommittee that legislative recommendations which its studies indicate to be necessary be drafted and submitted to the full committee before the end of this Congress.

Chairman MILLS stated that it was the unanimous intent of the subcommittee to direct this study in such a way as to assure the American public that the subcommittee is interested in achieving tax laws and applicable regulations that are understandable and certain, that are fair in their impact on the American taxpayers, and that are properly administered. Chairman MILLS added that the nature of the subject matter to be reviewed by the subcommittee would require substantial staff study preliminary to formal subcommittee action and that in this connection the staffs of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and the Treasury would be utilized with such recourse to outside individuals and groups as the subcommittee may decide to be necessary.

Chairman MILLS expressed the hope that the subcommittee will be reestablished in the 85th Congress so as to conduct a broader inquiry into the technical adequacy, the substantive policy, and the administration of the internal-revenue laws.

Formal announcement with regard to subcommittee hearings will be made at a subsequent date following the further development of staff activity.

The members of the subcommittee are: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Arkansas, chairman; NOBLE J. GREGORY, Kentucky; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; FRANK IKARD, Texas; RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; HOWARD H. BAKER, Tennessee; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Atoms in Your Kitchen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Dr. Robert R. Baldwin, laboratory director in the chemical research area at General Foods' Central Laboratories, which appeared in Unquote's issue of the summer 1956. The article, entitled "Atoms in Your Kitchen," follows:

ATOMS IN YOUR KITCHEN

Food irradiation has recently received a great deal of publicity, although actually at present we don't know too much about it. We think it has great promise; but like the chances on a blind date, we may be expecting more than we will get—or we may get much more than we expect.

Although certain aspects of food irradiation are unpredictable, one prediction can be made. You will feel some impact of atomic energy in your kitchens—and not too far in the future.

But before looking into that future, let me give you a little history and define a few terms. Over 2,000 years ago the Greek philosopher, Democritus, claimed that all matter was made up of tiny particles. He called them atoms, from the Greek word meaning "indivisible." He said an atom was about the size of a dust particle in a ray of sunshine.

This idea was not taken seriously until about the beginning of the 19th century. At that time it was reasonably well established that there were about 90 elements in nature and that each element was made up of its own particular kind of atoms, different from those of all other elements.

From 1850 to 1900, scientists tried to explore inside the atom. These attempts led to the belief that the atom, once thought to be the smallest particle, was itself made up of smaller parts held together by electrical attraction.

Niels Bohr, a Danish scientist, suggested in 1913 that an atom was like a miniature solar system, with electron planets whirling around a nucleus sun. The suggestion is now generally accepted.

The solar system Bohr described is ultratiny. No one has ever seen an atom. If the cap of your fountain pen were enlarged a billion times, it would be big enough to put the earth in it. But if you enlarged an atom a billion times, you still couldn't see it.

MAKEUP OF THE ATOM

And if you think an atom is small, imagine the size of the atom's nucleus. It's 10,000 times smaller than the atom itself—like a raspberry in relation to the Grand Canyon. This nucleus is made up of two types of particles: Protons, which have a plus electrical charge, and neutrons, with no electrical charge but which weigh about as much as the protons.

With these primary particles—protons with a plus charge, neutrons with no charge, and electrons with a minus charge—you can make any substance on earth if you get them in the right order. Or to put it another way, we now know that all atoms are made up of the same basic building blocks—protons, neutrons, and electrons. The variations in the chemical and physical properties of different elements such as gold, uranium, and iron merely represent variations in the number of protons, neutrons, and particularly electrons in the atom.

Sometimes two or more kinds of atoms have been found in the same element. Chemically they are identical, but they may have a greater or lesser number of neutrons in their neucleus. These almost identical atoms are called isotopes. Uranium 235, which you may have heard of, is the isotope from which atom bombs or atomic plants are made.

When an atom bomb goes off it's an uncontrolled chain reaction—a series of splitting of atoms which produces a tremendous amount of energy in the form of heat and radiation. We can now control that chain reaction.

The controlling equipment is an atomic furnace, known as a reactor, which operates very like an ordinary furnace which uses oil, gas, or coal as fuel. These common fuels are combined with oxygen in the air to produce heat. In a nuclear power plant, however, the fuel is uranium, and neutrons are used in place of oxygen. The amount of energy released per pound of fuel consumed is several million times greater in uranium than from conventional fuels.

What does all this have to do with atoms in your kitchen? The answer is that from these atomic furnaces or reactors we get a material which may play an important part in the food industry.

Like any other fuel, an ash remains after the atom is split. But ash from an atomic powerplant has a property not common to the ashes from other fuels. Atomic ashes are radioactive. Of prime importance is the fact that the radiation has bactericidal properties, which means it will kill bacteria, yeasts, and molds. Any food product can be completely sterilized by placing it in a field of radiation and leaving it there for the proper length of time.

IRRADIATION HOLDS PROMISE

Meat, milk, fruits, and vegetables, among other foods, have all been successfully sterilized by radiation. Sterilization can be carried out at any temperature from freezing to boiling. Obviously, however, if this method of processing food is to have any advantage from the standpoint of maintaining a garden-fresh texture and appearance of fruits and vegetables, the irradiation should be carried out at room temperature or lower.

Products sterilized through irradiation are in no way radioactive, just as you are not radioactive after a chest X-ray. Unfortunately, there are some difficulties with the process as it stands today. The potential value is so great, however, that a comprehensive research effort is being made both by Government and industry to overcome the difficulties.

The new process is not radically different from today's production-line methods of food processing except in one way—replacement of the heating or freezing section of a food line with an irradiation chamber. The processing system will remain the same. Food will still enter in a raw state for cleaning, grading, packing into a sealed container, then irradiation, and warehousing.

The irradiation chamber must have a strong enough source of rays to sterilize the product almost instantaneously to keep up with modern food production rates. And herein lies a most important problem.

Until more atomic-power plants are built, there will not be enough radioactive ashes to irradiate food products in anything more than laboratory quantities. There is a bright side to this picture, however. When, in the future, as little as 4 or 5 percent of our power requirements are supplied by atomic energy, the quantity of radioactive ashes produced will be sufficient to sterilize all the food used in the United States.

While radiation has the virtue of sterilizing or pasteurizing food without heat, it also has a vice. It not only strikes bacteria, molds, and yeasts, but also all the rest of the food. In doing its job of killing bugs, it can also harm the food itself by changing its chemical constituents. That is the heart of the problem.

ARE IRRADIATED FOODS SAFE?

While the change in the food's chemical constituents has been estimated to be only 0.003 percent, even at this low concentration some foods become unacceptable; they develop off-flavors or off-aromas, different colors or textures. In other foods the change is not noticeable.

After all we have heard about the dangers of radiation, a natural question to ask is, "How safe is it to eat irradiated foods?"

Experimental work is still in progress to establish their safety. So far, there has been no indication of any danger. The Quartermaster Corps of the United States Army together with the Surgeon General's office has started a program which, when complete, should clarify nearly all questions as to the suitability of such processed foods. Tests include feeding irradiated foods both to test annmals and humans.

How the public will react to irradiated foods is another question and the answer is difficult to predict. However, that's true of anything new. Many will recall the attitude of people when the automobile was introduced. "They ain't here to stay" was a common viewpoint in those days.

Let me add another problem to the list on the negative side. The cost of irradiating food today is really unknown. Estimates vary from a fraction of a cent per pound to several cents per pound. Naturally, if food irradiation costs considerably more than freezing or canning, it would no longer be in the realm of the practical. However, it would seem that sometime in the future the cost of food irradiation would come within the area of being the economic thing to do.

Now let's turn to the positive side of this question. What are the potential advantages of this new food processing method?

Maj. Gen. K. F. Hartford, Chief of Research and Development in the office of the United States Army's Chief of Staff, has prepared an impressive list. Although military applications are stressed, they can be translated into civilian advantages:

Cost reduction in food handling.
Less refrigeration facilities.
Less maintenance support.
Reduced food losses.
Improved food acceptability.
Meal-type assemblies—like complete dinners.
Increased use of fresh foods.

If these advantages can be realized by irradiation processing, they will be of considerable value to the food industry.

SOME RESULTS EVALUATED

From Quartermaster Corps studies we find a list of foods which have been sterilized by radiation, and the results evaluated. The results show promise for storing perishables without refrigeration. Two million r. e. p. (units of irradiation strength) were given the items listed.

The foods are divided into three classes—good, fair, and poor. Good means there was no change noticed by those who tasted the irradiated food. Fair is a general area of disagreement. Some people did not like the resulting food for some reason. However, in this category, the tasters did not say the food was really objectionable but simply that a change was noticed. Poor means the product was objectionable either in flavor, odor, color, texture, or any and all combinations of the four.

Flavor change is a major problem for irradiation of many foods. Recent studies underway at Massachusetts Institute of Technology have indicated that asparagus, brussels sprouts, green beans, spinach, chicken, and codfish cakes may get a dose as high as 2 million r. e. p. without a significant flavor change. Both beef liver and pork sausage can withstand even higher doses without appreciable off flavors.

EXTENDED SHELF LIFE

The University of Michigan has reported promising results with fresh peaches and dark sweet cherries, since their flavors were least affected by gamma radiation. Cooked applesauce was not changed by radiation processing.

The group at Michigan also found that packaged cabbage cut for coleslaw irradiated to 50,000 r. e. p. could be stored at refrigerator temperatures for as long as 25 days without noticeable change.

As I mentioned earlier, another of the great promises of food irradiation is increased storage life. The prospects for irradiation-pasteurization to lengthen shelf life are of interest to all.

PROSPECTS FOR IRRADIATION-PASTEURIZATION LENGTHENS REFRIGERATOR SHELF LIFE 100,000 TO 500,000 R. E. P.

Bacon; beef; brown-and-serve items; cabbage; cherries; luncheon meats; chicken, whole roast; fish; ham; peas, blanched; tomatoes; waffles.

The foods listed which have been irradiation pasteurized will last from 2 to 10 times as long as the nonirradiated control materials, both of which were kept in refrigerators.

The refrigerator storage life of freshly cut meat, for example, is usually a few days. With small pasteurizing doses of irradiation, however, storage life can be prolonged several weeks.

Increased storage life of meats could have special significance. If the irradiation process becomes commercially feasbile, it could well result in new methods of meat handling and distribution. It would make a system of centralized meat cutting and distribution far more practical.

I have already mentioned that irradiation of food destroys bacteria, yeasts, and molds. In addition, with a comparatively low irradiation dose, there are prospects for benefits other than sterilizing. For example, such parasites as flukes and trichina, and cereal and grain insects can be destroyed; potato and onion sprouting inhibited; bitter flavor suppressed in the juice made from navel oranges.

More specifically, very low doses of irradiation will eliminate all trichinae from pork products. Small doses of radiation will kill both inserts and their eggs in grain elevators and conceivably reduce the 10- to 12-percent loss of the United States grain crop due to insect infestation.

When ways to apply radiation directly to cereal crops are found, the irraidation dose will be so low that off flavors and off colors will not develop. The technological problems of irradiating all the grain in the country, however, are tremendous.

When treated with a small dose, potatoes will no longer sprout and can be stored for much longer periods of time. About 10 percent of the potato crop is lost each year because of sprouting and subsequent spoilage. If the process could be applied cheaply to all potatoes other than seed stock, the savings would amount to millions of dollars. Potatoes can be stored now for about 9 months at the most; with irraidation, potatoes could be stored considerably longer than a year. Potatoes could then be processed on a year-round basis.

QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

Government, industry, and universities are trying to solve the problems associated with the irradiation of foods and bring the process into practical application. Current experimental work at General Foods may help point out some major problems. Here are the broad questions we are trying to resolve:

1. What types of food products or food ingredients cannot now be sterilized satisfactorily by conventional means such as heat? Would irradiation or cold sterilization afford potentials for new product development?

2. What is the nature of the chemical changes produced in food materials by radiation? Can undesirable changes be avoided or counteracted?

3. To what extent can we take advantage of the chemical changes produced by radiation? (Radiation effects on flavor and texture of some foods have been considered desirable rather than undesirable.)

4. What are the best conditions for irradiating specific food materials—total dose, dose rate, temperature, moisture content, presence of air, oxygen, or inert gases? What sort of conclusions can we draw about the future of food irradiation?

Many million of dollars are being spent right now by research people in Government, education, and industry to find answers to these and other important questions. Here's my speculation on the answers, for what it's worth.

Foods completely sterilized by irradiation will not be available to the public for some years, probably 8 to 10. Even then, they will be specialty food products like dessert mixes, special meat products, complete dinners, and sandwiches.

THE BIG IF

Commercial application of the process, from the viewpoint of killing insects, preventing sprouting, and pasteurizing meats for centralized cutting, will quite likely come into limited practice within the next 3 to 5 years. This is true if—and it's a big if—we have enough radioactive ashes to do the job.

The cost of irradiated foods should be competitive with frozen foods. It does not necessarily follow that this process will replace freezing, because some foods react better to freezing than to irradiation. In other words, each will have a place in the food industry.

Those foods completely sterilized by irradiation will not have to be kept in the refrigerator if they are properly packaged. You can see what this will mean to the Armed Forces alone while in the field. However, foods pasteurized or otherwise treated with small doses of irradiation will be merchandised under refrigeration just as pasteurized milk is now marketed.

There will be some advantages. Irradiation-pasteurized fruits, vegetables, and meats will stay fresh considerably longer, and losses due to spoilage will be reduced to a minimum. When irradiation-sterilized foods are taken from their containers they will, of course, be subject to spoilage just as with any garden-fresh vegetables or fruits. Like heat sterilization, radiation sterilization is good only as long as the food is protected.

As far as new and exotic foods are concerned, we may have to look quite a way into the future. Because irradiation-pasteurized fruits and vegetables stay fresh longer, we may have on our tables a greater variety of tropical foods and foods from mny foreign countries. Irradiation could overcome the fear of importing some products from tropical countries because they might contain undesirable insects or eggs.

The tool of irradiation in the hands of ingenious food technologists should eventually bring us a wide variety of new food products ranging from appetizers to entrees to desserts. This will come because many delicate and heat-sensitive raw materials for food formulations could then be sterilized and built into new food products.

WAIT FOR RESEARCH

I might sound a bit too optimistic about irradiation processing and putting the atom to work in your kitchen. But it is really the potential that I see rather than the accomplished fact which makes me look at this new field through rose-colored glasses.

Before industry can make use of this process, scientists will have to obtain, interpret, and integrate the facts so that commercial application may become technically and economically feasible. We must curb our mania to get everything done yesterday and wait until indispensable researches have run their proper course.

The challenge which faces us is formidable and the stakes are high. The atom which can blast us off the face of the earth is the same atom which can give us a new world. Whether we make use of this new knowledge as civilized adults or crude barbarians is the crux. It's up to each one of us to see that the atoms for peace will be the atoms in your kitchen.

RESULTS OF IRRADIATION STERILIZATION—1 TO 3 MILLION REP

Good: Bacon; beans, green; beef liver; broccoli, brussels sprouts; carrots; chicken; codfish cakes; peas, fresh; waffles.

Fair: Applesauce; asparagus; beefsteak; cabbage; cherries; corn; eggs, dried whites; frankfurters; halibut; pork sausage.

Poor: Bananas; cantaloupe; celery; cheese; lemon juice; lettuce; milk; squash; strawberries; tomato.

Public Hearings Scheduled by Subcommittee on Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes, Committee on Ways and Means, I recently issued a press release announcing that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on Federal excise-tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems to begin on November 26, 1956. For the information of the membership and other interested persons, I would like to insert that press release in the RECORD at this point:

HON. AIME J. FORAND, OF RHODE ISLAND, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXCISE TAXES, ANNOUNCES THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S AGENDA FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE 84TH CONGRESS

The Honorable AIME J. FORAND, chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes of the House Committee on Ways and Means, today announced that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on Federal excise tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems to begin on November 26, 1956.

It is expected that the subcommitete will conclude the hearings in not to exceed 2 weeks.

Representatives of the Department of the Treasury will be invited to open the hearings and to present to the subcommittee the Department's views on Federal excise tax policy, rates, and technical and administrative problems which have come to the attention of the Treasury Department, including those arising in the collection and administration of the various Federal excise taxes. Representatives of the Department of the Treasury will also be invited to comment on the provisions of H. R. 12298, the omnibus excise tax bill introduced by Chairman FORAND on July 18, 1956, which incorporates the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems as embodied in the subcommittee's report dated April 20, 1956, as modified by the Committee on Ways and Means in its review of these recommendations. Following the testimony by Treasury representatives, public witnesses will be scheduled and are invited to present their views on the subject matter falling within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee in the order of the following excise tax categories in which they may be interested:

1. Retail excise taxes;
2. Manufacturers' excise taxes;
3. Excise taxes on facilities and services (admissions communications, transportation, etc.);
4. Documentary stamp taxes;
5. Excise taxes on wagering, coin-operated devices, bowling alleys, etc., and regulatory taxes (except those on narcotics).[1]
6. Import taxes;
7. Excise taxes on distilled spirits, beer, and wines;
8. Excise taxes on tobacco products; and
9. Other excise taxes.

Within each of these categories industry representatives and others desiring to testify on an entire category will be scheduled for first appearances. Other witnesses will be scheduled according to the numerical order of the section numbers in which the taxes and related provisions on which they wish to testify appear in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. In the interest of avoiding duplication of testimony, it is requested that to the maximum extent possible an industry group select one spokesman to present the views of that industry.

To facilitate orderly consideration by the subcommittee, witnesses are requested to divide their prepared testimony into four broad groupings to the maximum extent possible. These broad groupings are:

1. Rates and problems relating to the level of rates.
2. Technical and administrative problems relating to broad groups of excises such as, but not limited to, the treatment of leases in the case of the manufacturers' excise taxes and the publication of rulings.
3. The technical adequacy and substantive sufficiency of the provisions of H. R. 12298.
4. Questions of Federal excise tax policy such as, but not limited to, whether or not too large or too small a portion of the total revenues of the Federal Government are derived from excises.

Witnesses may testify on one or more of these groupings, but it is requested that each grouping be clearly separated and captioned in the prepared testimony of each witness.

Persons interested in appearing at these hearings may arrange to do so by writing to the clerk of the Committee on Ways and Means, room 1102, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C., by not later than November 10, 1956. It is requested that prospective witnesses indicate in their letters to the clerk the categories on which they will testify and where pertinent the sections of the 1954 code on which they will address themselves. Witnesses should also indicate the minimum amount of time required for their testimony.

Statements may be submitted (in triplicate) for the record in lieu of an appear-

[1] The subcommittee will not consider regulatory excises on narcotics in view of the existence of another subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means with jurisdiction over this subject.

ance. As an alternative to multiple appearances by a witness who is interested in one or more categories, testimony may be given on subjects of major importance to the witness and briefs submitted for the record concerning other topics of interest.

Witnesses will be notified of the scheduled date of their appearance. The hearings will be held in the hearing room of the Committee on Ways and Means in the New House Office Building and will begin each day at 10 a. m.

It is requested that witnesses submit 40 copies of their prepared statements to the committee clerk at least 4 days in advance of their scheduled appearance. In the event that a witness desires to make copies of his testimony available to the press, it is suggested that an additional 40 copies be submitted to the clerk for that purpose.

Chairman FORAND also announced that the congressional staffs and the staff of the Treasury Department have been requested to begin studies designed to develop the necessary facts and statistics on which to base an appraisal of Federal excise-tax policy, the levels of rates, and the technical adequacy and the administration of the Federal excise-tax law. The staffs have also been instructed to prepare legislative drafts incorporating the recommendations of the staffs for the subcommittee's consideration.

The members of the subcommittee are Hon. AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island, chairman; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; FRANK M. KARSTEN, Missouri; A. S. HERLONG, JR., Florida; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois; HAL HOLMES, Washington; ex officio, the Honorable JERE COOPER, chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.

Report and Review of the Major Activities of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. BEAMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report and a review of the major activities of the 84th Congress. It is felt that such a report is due the people of the Fifth Indiana Congressional District.

A review of the 84th Congress necessarily must be brief, even to touch upon the most important topics. The second session started very slowly, but finally, after being prodded as a do-nothing Congress, the Democratic majority in control of this Congress pushed nearly every conceivable type of legislation to the floor.

Due to early inactivity, some good measures were not considered and, due to the rush in the closing weeks, many good measures were lost. At the same time, some unnecessarily bad measures were passed by both the House and the Senate. As a nation, we can be grateful for the bicameral system which made it possible for one body to either defeat or improve certain undesirable legislation.

Two thousand eight hundred and seventy-eight bills and resolutions were passed by the 84th Congress. This is the largest number of any Congress since the 71st Congress—1929–30.

Nineteen thousand and thirty-nine bills and resolutions were submitted. There is a total of 531 Senators and Representatives, which would make an average of 36 such bills and resolutions for each Senator and Representative.

One of the outstanding accomplishments of this administration was the balancing of the budget, which also provided a surplus of nearly $2 billion. This surplus will be available to help reduce the national debt and is the accomplishment of which the administration can be justly proud. However, even if we are able to reduce the national debt $2 billion per year, it will require a long time to bring the debt down to a sum that would not be a deterrent, as it is at the present time, to the general economy.

The appropriations amounted to $52.2 billion in the first session and $59.8 billion in the second session. This was an increase over the Republican 83d Congress. Some people have said that this was one of the most extravagant Congresses of peacetime years.

Remember that the large balance of this year was made possible by the Republican 83d Congress that attempted to practice some economy in appropriations and efficiency in Government agencies. The huge sums appropriated during these two sessions will make it increasingly difficult to secure a balanced budget and a surplus next year.

A highway bill was passed which provides $33 billion to be spent over a 13-year period. This is on a pay-as-you-go basis which means that everybody helps to pay with increased Federal tax on gasoline and auto accessories. Some have referred to this as a huge public-works project, but it is not to be compared with the old WPA program because highways are needed for an expanding economy and for safety measures.

A postal-rate increase was passed by the House. Nearly four decades had passed since changes had been made in certain postage rates. All operating costs of the Post Office Department had increased and, consequently, that agency was operating at a terrific loss each year. However, the Senate failed to act on this bill and, therefore, an annual deficit of nearly half a billion dollars will continue in the Post Office Department.

Natural resources presented the recurring question of public versus private power. By a small margin the House passed the Hells Canyon public-power project, but the Senate defeated it. The Senate action reaffirmed the action of the 83d Congress which saves the taxpayers millions of dollars and, in addition, will produce nearly $10 million in tax revenue each year.

A proposal to spend $440 million for federally owned atomic reactors was passed by the Senate but defeated by the House. This action further confirmed the principles of private ownership instead of more creeping socialism.

The Arkansas-Fryingpan reclamation project in Colorado was defeated.

The Natural Gas Act was passed by both Houses but vetoed by the President. The purpose of this law was to establish State instead of Federal regulation of natural gas. The net result would have been more and cheaper natural gas for the consumers.

Increased rates were predicted if this bill failed. Already $923,000 boost has been requested for a portion of southern Indiana. In addition, it is predicted that rates will continue to increase if Federal control is pressed upon the producers of natural gas. Indiana, especially, was greatly benefited when it received an increased supply of natural gas several years ago. As a result of this increased supply of natural gas, the quality of the gas for the consumer was improved and the rates were lowered. Indiana consumers of natural gas would benefit very materially if the provisions of the Natural Gas Act had been permitted to become law. Of course, the President's veto was not based on the fact that the principle itself was in question, but rather that certain lobbying tactics were deplored by the President.

Federal aid to education was presented in the form of Federal aid for school construction. This proposal was defeated in the House of Representatives. Some observers credited the inclusion of the segregation issue as a cause of the defeat of this measure. Actually, most of the Congressmen were opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education, and it is felt that the bill would have been defeated even if the Powell segregation amendment had not been offered. The desire to retain public schools instead of Government schools remains predominant especially in view of the many letters that were received from the fifth district in opposition to Federal aid to education.

Civil rights was one of the big debates of both sessions. The bill that was proposed really was the recommendation of the administration and received bipartisan support. It would have set up a commission to review questions and problems of segregation. Actually, it was an implementation of the rights guaranteed in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments. This bill passed the House of Representatives but no action was taken in the Senate.

Foreign aid was another issue that is a constantly recurring problem. There are many of us who have had the opportunity of witnessing the work of several of the foreign-aid programs with the result that many people begin to wonder whether or not the huge sums of money being spent for foreign aid really are producing the desired results. The foreign aid again was increased to a total of $3.8 billion. Many billions of dollars also remain unexpended for this purpose.

The foreign policy was implemented by certain types of legislation, but in general it still retains peace and a recognized leadership in international understanding and determination for national sovereignty.

Defense appropriations totaled $66½ billion, plus $5 billion more for atomic-energy development. This is the largest in peacetime.

In keeping with further expansion of the military services the number of Army officers will be increased from 30,600 to 49,500 and the Air Force officers from 27,500 to 69,425.

Farm bill—the first one was vetoed because the 90-percent high parity was included. This system was the one previously used that had brought only lower prices to farmers, higher costs to consumers and increased taxes to all.

The second farm bill, though delayed nearly 4 months was a reasonable compromise. Its principal feature is a soil bank providing $1.2 billion for conservation purposes of removing certain crops presently in surplus from production.

Health bills: Reinsurance was defeated in the first session. A bill to provide funds for medical research was passed and the polio vaccine program was continued for 1 more year.

Social-security contributions were increased and benefits were broadened. Two new features—totally disabled may draw benefits at 50 years of age, and widows and working women now can get pensions at 62 instead of 65 years of age.

Minimum wage was increased to $1 per hour.

Veterans will be receiving increased pensions and, with limitations, will have age 50 considered for total disability, service connected.

I also wish to comment briefly on certain bills that I submitted. One bill that would have made the provisions of the Hatch Act—participation by Federal employees in political activities—inapplicable to State employees, passed the House unanimously but was not considered by the Senate committee. This is a very worthwhile measure for those who believe that all power should not be concentrated in the Federal Government. The provisions of the Hatch Act were to apply only to Federal employees and my bill would have corrected some of the recent applications of this measure to State employees.

I also introduced a bill that would validate the sea duty pay which was promised to the men who served in the Navy on the Great Lakes and on the steamship *Sequoia* during World War II. This bill was passed by both Houses and has been signed into law by the President.

I also introduced another bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the interstate transportation of migratory farm labor. Senator MAGNUSON introduced a similar bill in the Senate. Each bill passed its respective House and also has been signed into law as one of the labor reform proposals of the administration.

I also introduced legislation that would not permit the Federal Communications Commission to discriminate against newspapers or other organizations engaged in the gathering and dissemination of news in the allocation of television channels and radio wave lengths. This bill had hearings in the House, but no action was taken. It is a field that should be explored and studied.

In the field of agriculture, I introduced one bill that would have set up a soil-bank program and another that would exempt the farmers from paying the tax on gasoline used for purely agricultural purposes. Similar bills were passed and enacted into law by this Congress.

I also introduced a bill to provide for agricultural research in the marketing and additional uses of agriculture products. This seems to be a very important requirement today, because agriculture is faced with an overproduction problem. It seems much wiser to increase the consumption of agricultural products than to reduce their production.

It has been my privilege to serve on the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Our subcommittee made extensive studies in the field of operations of the Securities and Exchange Commission and also in the field of war claims. These war claims present a very important problem that must be settled.

Recently I also was appointed to serve on the Traffic Safety Subcommittee. This committee is charged with the study of the many traffic accidents that are occurring on our Nation's highways. The Nation was shocked recently when 128 passengers were killed in an airplane crash over the Grand Canyon. However, 115 people are killed every day in automobile accidents. Thus it is felt that this committee is charged with a grave responsibility of making some studies in the hope that recommendations may be made to decrease this terrific toll of lives.

As mentioned in the first part of my comments, 2,873 bills and resolutions were passed by this 84th Congress. Thus it is hoped that individuals and groups who may be studying the voting records of any Congressmen will not select any small group of bills—20 or 30—as often is the case, to determine a voting record. Each Representative is charged with the obligation of representing all of the people in his district with a full understanding of the needs and requirements of the entire United States.

The many requests that came through the mail daily to our office were handled promptly by a very efficient staff. I wish to pay tribute to the staff members and all others who cooperated in making it possible to render a service to the people of the Fifth District.

The American Character: Strength or Weakness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very disturbing statement recently made by Maj. William E. Mayer, described as a top Army psychiatrist, relative to the brainwashing of American soldiers captured in Korea.

I may say very frankly that I am astonished by the results of Major Mayer's findings concerning the results of Communist brainwashing.

The major states that "the effectiveness of the Red program points up basic defects in the American character that should cause searching self-examination by all Americans." If the conditions found by Major Mayer are at all extensive among our armed services, we have great reason to be gravely concerned.

I have great faith in the young men and women of this generation. They are sound, ambitious, loyal Americans, able and willing to fulfill their duty, defend the Nation and carry the burden of future leadership.

The fact remains that, if we are to have members of our armed services as indicated by Major Mayer's report lacking that historic stamina, courage, and tenacity which American fighting men have always displayed, clearly the Congress should take action as soon as possible to ascertain the degree and the cause of these conditions and try to rectify them.

My concern regarding this problem which involves the possible lessening of the vitality, endurance, and capacity in Americans of this generation was first deeply aroused by the results in the field of international athletics. As I pointed out in a speech last year, the Soviet is making great headway in athletics and is developing well-trained athletes in practically every field of great skill and ability who have in many instances demonstrated superiority over the athletes of the Western World.

It is true that the Soviet approach to organized athletics is on a different basis than our own and our friends of the free world, and that the training and education athletes receive under communism amounts, in effect, to professionalism as we know it. Their athletes are unquestionably professionals.

Nevertheless, the Soviet and the Iron Curtain countries are steadily building up and increasing the number of trained athletes who are able to outscore those of the free world. The winter Olympics was another example of this newly developed prowess of Communist nations.

It is my studied opinion that this fact, coupled with observations like Major Mayer's and other developments we are all aware of, should put this Nation sternly on notice that all is not well in our current social and educational life.

In my opinion, it is not principally the youth who are responsible for these conditions. It is primarily those who are responsible for bringing them up, for training them, for making them useful, ambitious, courageous members of the American society. Juvenile delinquency, so called, is only part of the picture. It is merely the symptom of an underlying social plague which is spreading in America, which is breaking down moral, physical, ethical, and cultural standards and subjecting the young folks of the Nation to the paganism and materialism that obtain in some other countries of the world where people have turned away from fundamental precepts of God, nature, and freedom and hence have declined in physical and moral strength, in political stability, in prestige, and national vitality.

Can this trend be stopped? Can these tendencies be checked? Can these instances of disloyalty and softness in the

armed services be ended? These are grave problems for America and their solution must be seriously sought not only by Congress alone but in the States, in the local communities, in the homes of the Nation.

How long can we continue to ignore these problems deriving from modern life? How long can we permit debilitating influences to spread in the Nation and still retain the basic values and strength of body and character we need in order to cope with current threats to our way of life?

Let me reiterate: Despite what social commentators may say, fundamentally our American youth is sound, ambitious, and patriotic. It is morally and spiritually sound on the whole, and I personally see little evidence that in many respects it differs basically from the youth of previous generations. The youth of today may have more material means, more opportunities, more comforts and conveniences than those of former years. But essentially human nature has not changed very much, and I seriously doubt that modern-day youth, taken as a whole, is very different from its predecessors.

There is great good, splendid morality, fine spirit, commendable zeal, and loyalty in the present generation. Our young people are living in a vastly changed world; consequently their approach—their habits, their outlook, their attitude toward many things are bound to be different.

It must be noted also that they are living in a world where the poison of godlessness, paganism, materialism, skepticism and doubt and all the destructive philosophies are spread everywhere by Communists and other radical cultists endeavoring to destroy our religious beliefs, our culture, and our free society.

For these reasons, it is all the more important and vital that the young people of today be given very special guidance and direction in the homes, the schools, and the churches of America, for it is primarily in these great institutions of our God-fearing Nation that the American character of which we are so proud, and which has contributed so significantly to our national life and national success, is molded and developed and comes to its finest flowering.

It is to these institutions that we must look with increasing faith now for the proper guidance, direction, and training of new generations. The Bolsheviks are trying to destroy the family which is the basic social unit of civilization. But they will never be able, try as they will, to destroy the American family or the universal idea and ideal of family life.

It is for the homes of America to make sure that they are assuming and discharging their full responsibility toward the youth. A college friend of mine, Mr. N. V. "Swede" Nelson, Harvard football great, nationally known wit, pundit, and patriot, who is, among other fine things, a great worker among young people, put it well in a recent talk before a parent-teachers group when he asked the question: "Where is your boy or girl tonight?" For that is the plainest responsibility of parenthood—to know the companions, the whereabouts, and activities of young people who live in our American homes. If all parents made it a point to know "where their son or daughter is tonight," there would certainly be less delinquency, less maladjustment.

The part the school plays is also most important and vital. Upon the educators and teachers a great responsibility rests, not merely to perform the routine tasks of teaching, but to guide, to inspire, and to infuse the youth with love of learning and culture, with ambition and the spirit of civic and patriotic devotion. The cultivation of high ideals is most essential.

Above all comes the church, and there will be few so bold as to doubt that in this field is found the greatest source of moral teaching and spiritual enlightenment. And it is for this reason, because the church is the foundation stone of religious morality and virtue upon which loyal citizenship depends, that the fanatical charlatans of the communistic world direct such blasphemous attacks against it. Though they fall as upon some great indestructible rock, constantly dripping water in time wears away the hardest stone. We must insulate our religious institutions against these wanton attacks. This can be done by an enlightened, militant public opinion.

The atomic age, in its social, economic, political, and moral aspects, requires a firm sense of responsibility, individual and collective. It must be accepted and shared by all. It must rest as before on fundamental principles and truth. If we but put our interests and our energies loyally behind the great trilogy—the home, the school, and the church, which has so notably and indispensably contributed to the national greatness, this Nation will grapple with and solve its problems and find the road to security and peace in a free world.

Doctor Reports Many Captured United States Troops Yielded to Brainwashing

Washington.—A top Army psychiatrist said today that nearly one-third of all American soldiers captured in Korea yielded to Communist efforts to sway their loyalty by brainwashing.

Maj. William E. Mayer declared that the effectiveness of the Red program points up basic defects in the American character that should cause searching self-examination by all Americans.

He said: "The behavior of too many of our soldiers in prison fell far short of the historical American standards of honor, character, loyalty, courage, and personal integrity."

Mayer, a foremost authority on brainwashing, based his views on a 4-year study of the experiences of 1,000 POW returnees. His opinions were expressed in a copyrighted interview with the magazine U. S. News & World Report.

The psychiatrist said that of about 4,000 GI's who returned from Korean captivity, nearly 1,000 admitted becoming progressives.

He added: "By the Communists' own definition, this meant that a man was either a Communist sympathizer or a collaborator—or both—during his stay in a prison camp."

Mayer stressed that these soldiers, by their own admission, were not subject to any physical torture.

Many Americans magnificently resisted Red attempts to change their beliefs, Mayer said.

He added: "But even granting that two-thirds of the men remained stanchly loyal Americans, still the fact that so many yielded to the degree that they did presents a problem of fantastic proportions and should cause searching self-examination by all Americans, both in and out of uniform."

Mayer said the Red brainwashers exploited three basic defects in the captive GI's—faulty character development, ignorance of American democracy, and lack of military toughness.

Many POW's, Mayer asserted, "had not been taught a sense of personal responsibility for the welfare of others" and failed to take care of sick comrades. As a result of this "every man for himself behavior," he added, "some ailing Americans needlessly died."

The expert said the Chinese Communists had a pretty low estimate of the American soldier, which was borne out to a certain degree by the behavior of the soldiers who bowed to Red psychological pressure.

Mayer charged that American schools are failing miserably to prepare youths for survival in a tense and troubled international society.

The psychiatrist also decried a lack of toughness in military training and said that the attitude of the parents of soldiers seems to be responsible.

United States Crime Drop Cited—Warning Sounded by FBI

(By Frank R. Kent, Jr.)

The Nation's crime rate has shown signs of a slight drop for the first time in 7 years, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has informed Congress.

Hoover, however, called the indicated decrease of 0.5 percent for 1955 "negligible when considering the country as a whole." If the present trend of reports continues, he said, the year 1955 will represent the fourth consecutive year in which the number of major crimes has exceeded the 2-million mark.

Figures based on reports for the first 6 months of 1955 show "that crime has taken on such proportions that 1 out of every 17 homes will be victimized this year," he asserted.

Hoover's statements were included in testimony before a House appropriations subcommittee on February 1 and released yesterday. The subcommittee was conducting hearings on the budgetary requests of the Department of Justice.

Hoover said there were an estimated 1,128,350 major crimes committed during the first 6 months of 1955. This was only 7,790 fewer than the number committed during the same period of 1954, he said.

He listed the following highlights:

A major crime was committed every 13.9 seconds.

Every 4.2 minutes there was a crime of murder, manslaughter, rape, or assault to kill.

Victims of killers totaled 6,240.

Other individuals feloniously assaulted by rapists and potential killers totaled 55,410.

The lives of 284,590 other persons were jeopardized by crimes of robbery or burglary.

In 1954, Hoover said, 9.7 percent of persons arrested were under 18 years of age. Yet this percentage, he told the committee, was responsible for: 57 percent of all auto theft arrests, 49 percent of all burglary arrests, 43.6 percent of all larceny arrests, 26 percent of all arrests for violations involving receipt of stolen property, and 18.7 percent of all robbery arrests.

Hoover said the fundamental principle was that "We have to look to the home to correct this problem." Too often, parents resent and reproach the police officer who brings their child home after he has engaged in wrongdoing, Hoover said.

"It is that kind of softheadedness which contributes to delinquency," he declared.

Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., in his general statement, disclosed that the Department was asking for two new institutions to cost an estimated total of $17 million. One would be an Alcatraz-type maximum security prison. The other would be an institution to enable the Department to carry out provisions of the Youth Corrections Act in judicial districts west of the Mississippi.

The act permits a youth correction board to study the cases of offenders under 21 and to put them on parole, or send them to a farm, camp hospital, training school or prison, rather than incarcerating them with hardened criminals.

George J. Reel, chairman of the Board of Parole's Youth Division, said during the past year the Youth Division granted parole under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act to 53.2 percent of the juveniles in that category. Of the juveniles from the District of Columbia sent to the National Training School under a District statute 78.9 percent were granted parole, and 14.6 percent of those committed under the Youth Act were paroled.

District juveniles averaged 17.2 months in the institution here, Richardson said. Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act cases averaged 14.7 months and youths under the Youth Corrections Act 10 months.

Richardson told the committee that under the first year of operation of the Youth Act, the number of juveniles committed under it and those committed under District law who violated parole decreased from 48.2 percent in 1954 to 42.9 percent last year. He remarked that the percentage of violations among the District juveniles at the school has been high, but it decreased by 5½ percent last year.

Dissenting Opinion of Texas Supreme Court on Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the RECORD for July 24 the argument of the attorney general of Texas, Hon. John Ben Sheppard, before the State supreme court in support of the validity of a right-to-work law. Since that time the court rendered its opinion. In order that the fullest information can be available on the subject involved I believe it would be in the public interest for the dissenting opinion in that case to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS, NO. A-5061—M. E. SANDSBERRY, JR. ET AL. AND GULF, COLORADO & SANTA FE RAILWAY CO. ET AL., PETITIONERS *v.* INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, ET AL., RESPONDENTS—FROM POTTER COUNTY, SEVENTH DISTRICT

DISSENTING OPINION

I believe that the opinion of the court of civil appeals should be reversed and that of the trial court affirmed, and therefore respectfully dissent.

While this case involves the application of the first amendment to compulsory membership in modern labor unions, the question presented is as old as American history. The first amendment was adopted in 1791 after a continuous struggle, beginning in 1607, against compulsory membership in private organizations and compulsory support thereof. "The language of the first amendment is to be read not as barren words found in a dictionary but as symbols of historic experience illumined by the presuppositions of those who employed them." (*Dennis* v. *United States* (341 U. S. 494, 523, 71 Sup. Ct. 857, 95 Law Ed. 1137)).

It will be recalled that in nine of the original American colonies an established church existed and was supported by public funds until the time of the American Revolution. During the first half of the 17th century these established churches were the most influential organizations in the lives of the colonists. Three requirements were made by law of all persons, that they (1) attend the official church, (2) pay church taxes to support the official church, and (3) subscribe to the ideology of the official church. Dissenters were persecuted and punished by the colonial governments in a variety of ways. They were fined, deprived of civil rights, imprisoned, whipped, banished, and hanged. However, the unremitting struggle against such compulsion soon compelled the established churches to make compromises such as the New England halfway covenant of 1657, which required only formal membership and financial support but dispensed with the necessity of ideological conformity.

By the time of the Revolution only financial support by way of special taxes was required of those not members of the established organization. The crucial struggle came in the Virginia House of Delegates in 1784 over a bill for a general assessment for the maintenance of religion. No less an orator than Patrick Henry urged that since religion promotes happiness and prosperity for all, every citizen should be compelled by law to contribute to the support of his church. Proponents of the bill advanced the original form of the argument against free riders. Since all citizens benefitted from the program of the church, all should help pay therefor. (In the majority opinion and in the Hanson decision Senator Hill is quoted: "The question in this instance is whether those who enjoy the fruits and the benefits of the unions should make a fair contribution to the support of the unions. If "churches" is substituted for "unions," it will be seen that the Senator parroted an argument long ago repudiated by Americans).

The opponents of the general assessment bill led by James Madison supported an opposition bill drafted by Thomas Jefferson, entitled "Statue of Virginia for Religious Freedom," which declared in its preamble "That to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves and abhors is sinful and tyrannical." The general assessment bill was defeated and the statute for religious freedom adopted in 1786, and Madison wrote Jefferson: "I flatter myself we have in this country extinguished forever the ambitious hopes of making laws for the human mind." (Apparently the gift of prophesy was not among Madison's endowments.)

It was upon this issue of compulsory support of private organizations that the dissenters in Virginia in 1788 led by Elder John Leland resisted the movement to adopt the proposed Federal Constitution until its proponents agreed to a Bill of Rights, including as its first provision of the first amendment the guaranty that there would be no establishment of religion. It is well to remember that at the time of the adoption of the first amendment that neither ideological conformity nor even formal halfway covenant membership was any longer being demanded. The chief evil to be forever prohibited was compulsory financial support of a private organization by those who did not subscribe to its program.

Today various forms of the ideology of materialism command the allegiance and support of half the world. This ideology has its own varied organizational forms, one of which is the labor union, that in some instances exercises as great an influence over the lives of its members as did the established churches of colonial days. By the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act Congress provided for a new type of establishment suitable to the modern ideology. The authority of the Federal Government is enlisted in support of compulsory membership in private labor organizations and compulsory support thereof. The statute does not require ideological conformity but merely harkens back to the halfway covenant and requires merely formal membership and financial support of the unions. In *Railway Employees' Department et al.* v. *Hanson et al.*, the Federal Supreme Court seems to construe the amendment, section 2, 11th of the act, as requiring not even formal membership but only that the nonmembers pay to the organization such dues, fees, and assessments that are reasonably allocable to the cost of collective bargaining. Thus the new halfway covenant is not upheld but the taxes for the new establishment are declared not violative of the first amendment.

The question in the present case is whether the contract demanded by the labor unions in their negotiations calls for (1) ideological conformity, (2) formal membership, or (3) financial support. Petitioners argue that the record supports the trial court findings that respondents, the unions, are demanding a contract which provides for (1), (2), and (3). Respondents argue that "full membership" with ideological conformity is not being demanded, but only items (2) and (3). They argue that the contract in this case is literally the same as in the Hanson case, which used the words of section 2 eleventh of the Railway Labor Act that "all employees shall become members of the labor organization." In my opinion the contracts are not necessarily the same because some of the labor organizations are not the same. A contract to become a member of the political party will have widely different meanings as it is applied to the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, the Prohibitionist Party, and the Communist Party. Indeed, today such a contract entered into with the representative of the last party above mentioned for even formal membership in the party is so radically different that it often gets the new member into serious trouble, including expulsion from some of the above unions, or in some cases loss of employment.

Almost a score of labor organizations are here involved, varying from boilermakers to bartenders. The requirements of membership as evidenced by their constitutions and bylaws are different. There are as many different contracts here as there are labor organizations. I believe that the evidence in this case supports the judgment of the trial court that the contracts demanded, when interpreted in the light of the record in this case, call for at least compulsory formal membership. The modern version of the ancient "test oath" set forth in the dissenting opinion of Justice Smith requires a pledge of ideological conformity for even formal membership.

The majority opinion of the court interprets the Hanson case as sanctioning only compulsory financial support of the new establishment, and that support limited to just the collective-bargaining activities of the labor organization. With this interpretation I agree but am of the opinion that the effect of the judgment in this case, in the light of the record herein, is an extension of the rule of the Hanson case to cover at least formal membership. Judicial duty compels this court to follow the Hanson case, but does not require us to make the slightest extension thereof.

I believe that under the Hanson case the only relationship required of the nonmember to the union is that of debtor and creditor. It is the same relationship against which Jefferson, Madison, and Leland fought—that the nonmember owed the established organization for his proportionate share of the expense of the program from which he allegedly derived benefit and the State compelled payment of this debt. The unions under the Hanson case are entitled to demand that the railroad, by a checkoff system, collect the debt which they claim the nonmembers owe them. Since the unions have demanded much more, they were properly enjoined.

ABNER MCCALL,
Associate Justice.

Opinion delivered: Justice Griffin joins in this dissent.

The Suez Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the Suez situation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUEZ SITUATION

Before the 24-nation conference on the Suez situation is a good time to assess and evaluate the Suez incident on the basis of the known facts. President Gamal Abdel Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal has posed a difficult question to which the whole world must find an answer. There is no doubt but that President Nasser had the right to nationalize the canal. There is no question but that since the seizure, with one exception, normal transit of vessels through the canal has been allowed to continue in the same old pattern, which is in accord with the Constantinople Convention of 1888. The one exception is the continuation of the 8-year-old Egyptian boycott of Israeli ships. There is a question as to the threats used by the Government of Egypt to keep the foreign technicians on the job in the Canal Zone, and there is a question of legality insofar as taking over the assets of the Suez Canal Co. are concerned. The Suez Canal Co. has a lease with the Egyptian Government which expires in 1968, at which time its holdings automatically revert to the Government of Egypt. President Nasser's reported contention that the receipts from the Suez Canal tolls will average $100 million a year, and that this $100 million could be used on a yearly basis, to build the Aswan Dam is incorrect on the face of it. The fact is that the yearly gross proceeds from the canal average somewhere in the vicinity of $100 million, while the net proceeds are approximately $30 million a year. There is, it must be remembered, a constant drain on the toll funds to dredge the waterway to keep it in operation, and with the building of bigger tankers it will have to be further widened and deepened in certain localities.

I believe that Secretary Dulles did the right thing in finally turning down the Aswan Dam proposal because it would have meant the creating, on a gratis basis, of a moral commitment to the tune of hundreds of millions of United States dollars to build this project. This project, if it is ever to be built with United States contributions, should be on a long-term loan low-interest rate basis and in accord with and in line with the objectives of American foreign policy. The mistakes leading up to the Suez crisis must, in part, at least, be credited to the United States. I say this, not so much in criticism but on the basis of hindsight which, while a convenient peg to hang on to, does not excuse anyone personally for not recognizing the possibility of a mistake at the time of the event. We know now that—

1. We should not have exerted the pressure we did to get the British out of the Canal Zone although at the time it was done, I considered it a good policy.

2. We should not have made the proposal last January to begin the financing, on a grant basis, of the Aswan Dam with this country contributing $56 million toward the start of this project and the British offering $14 million. However, that is water over the dam.

We are now faced with a reality which calls for cool and considered action on the part of the Western Big Three and by all other nations as well. Neither the West or Nasser can afford a defeat on the question of the Suez Canal. The answer to this difficult question does not lie in the use of aggressive tactics or in war. The answer lies in the use of diplomacy and the development of new policies and ideas. The emphasis on rearming and the calling up to the colors of reserves by both Britain and France is understandable in view of their economic interest and dependence on and in the Middle East, as well as other factors, but their emotionalism in this situation is, in its own way, as bad and as dangerous as Nasser's.

To illustrate the importance of the Suez Canal and the questions related to it, it is well to keep in mind that Western Europe depends for 90 percent of its oil needs on the Middle East and that in the next 10 years those oil needs will be doubled. Seventy percent of the world's oil reserves are in the Middle East; the loss of Mid-East oil either through closure of the Suez Canal or by nationalization or expropriation of the Middle East wells and pipelines would bankrupt Western Europe, bring about its economic collapse and pave the way for Moscow to move in. We must remember that through the Marshall plan we have spent $15 billion to rehabilitate Western Europe; we have been responsible for and have to a large extent spent a great deal of our treasure in keeping NATO functioning; we have, through the use of Mutual Security Administration, Foreign Operations Administration and International Cooperation Administration—all successors to the Marshall plan—poured additional billions of dollars into Europe to keep it a going entity. Surely, we do not want to see what we have contributed to the welfare of Western Europe, in our own defense and in our own security, go down the drain because of the situation in the Middle East. We cannot afford it.

President Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal Company was not a move made on the spur of the moment. Nor was it made only because of the United States refusal to make a grant to Nasser to allow him to start on the Aswan Dam. It appears to be that Nasser's seizure was a carefully worked-out plan which was moved ahead of its scheduled timetable and used as a means of offsetting the United States refusal to grant funds for the Aswan Dam. In other words, in my opinion, even if the United States funds had been granted, it would have only been a question of time before the seizure of the Suez Canal Company would have taken place. We cannot afford to become hysterical or emotional over Nasser's action because we have to remember that out of his seizure may come events which might imperil the Middle East oil and pipelines. Therefore, what we should do is to go slow, tread water cautiously and plan now for the future. Serious consideration should be given to the following possibilities:

1. The London Conference called for August 16. Secretary Dulles is to be commended for pouring oil on the troubled waters of the Suez question when he visited London on August 1 to confer with Foreign Minister Pineau of France and Prime Minister Eden of Britain. He was able, at that time, to quench some of the fire which these and other leaders were fanning and to come up with a proposal for a 24 power conference to convene on August 16 in London to consider the question of the Suez. His success in this matter did much to calm the situation and to allow Messrs. Nasser, Eden, Mollet, and Pineau, as well as others, to take a second look at their hole cards; to reassess the situation and to revise their original views. The purpose of the conference beginning August 16, as I understand it, will be to try to modernize the Treaty of 1888 and to make sure that, if possible, internationalization of the Suez Canal is made secure. It is to be noted that both Indian and the U. S. S. R. have accepted invitations to attend the conference. Even though they have expressed reservations it is significant of their interest in this particular question and an awareness, on their part, of its ramifications and complications. It is significant to note that this is the first invitation, to my knowledge, to the U. S. S. R. to participate in a conference affecting this particular area and a recognition of the fact that the Soviet Union has penetrated the Middle East. In my opinion, it is there to stay. Incidentally, we must recognize that the U. S. S. R. is now an exporting oil nation entirely on the basis of its own oil production and exclusive of the Rumanian fields at Ploesti. We should recognize that the cold war has now developed into an economic struggle between the U. S. S. R. on the one end and the United States on the other. We should not try to outbid or outbuy the U. S. S. R. We should do only what is primarily in our own interest.

2. There is a question in my mind as to whether President Nasser or Egypt alone can be absolutely depended upon to keep the canal open from here on out. As an illustration, all Israeli ships for the past 8 years, as well as other nationalities carrying goods to Israel, have been refused transit through the Suez Canal.

3. The Western World, including ourselves, must begin to lay emergency plans now to export oil, if necessary, from the United States, Canada, and Venezuela to Western Europe:

(a) We should allow United States oil companies to expand and develop their oil production in the United States.

(b) We should encourage, through subsidies and otherwise, the building of 70,000- to 80,000-ton tankers. With their speed, tonnage, and reduced comparative costs, they could go around the Cape of Good Hope and nullify, in part, dependence on the Suez Canal. They could also be used to export oil from the Western Hemisphere.

(c) We should give consideration to the possibility of the construction and support of a new canal from the Mediterranean through Israel to the port of Aquaba off the Red Sea.

4. We should recognize Egypt's right to nationalize the Suez Canal; but if no solid international agreement can be worked out, we should begin work on the alternatives already suggested. Even if an agreement can be worked out, we must be prepared to have

an alternative very possibly along the lines already suggested.

5. The stakes connected with the question of the Suez are of the greatest importance because they affect the economic welfare and security of a large part of the rest of the world. Some of the grave questions raised are:

(a) The canal itself and all it means to the economic lifeblood of the world.

(b) Mideast oil and all its implications and complications.

(c) North Africa and its effect on France's future.

(d) Europe's economy and its dependence on the Suez Canal and Mid-East oil.

(e) The possibility that the Mid-East situation may, if it expands, either bring a final breakdown of NATO or at long last, a final recognition that if it is to survive it must pull itself together, reassess its condition and recognize its importance as a European defense alliance and its possible significance as an economic unit.

(f) The question of Israel.

(g) The question of Cyprus.

(h) South of the Sahara Africa is and will be affected more by events growing out of the Mid-East crisis.

War is not the answer to the Suez incident. While the exasperation and emotionalism of France and Britain is understandable, it should be recognized that gunboat diplomacy in this day and age would only exacerbate the situation and make it worse. What we have to do now is to work with the present, but think and plan for the future.

We should in addition to the conference to be held in London, consider the possibilities, in the light of subsequent circumstances, of referring the Suez question to the International Court of Justice in the Hague and, if aggressive action is undertaken by, either side on an unwarranted basis, taking the question immediately to the United Nations Security Council.

Aggression and force are not the answers. Reason, not passion—restraint, not fireworks—must prevail.

Report to My Constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DeWITT S. HYDE
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, at the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress, I believe it is my duty to make a report of my voting record to the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland. An analysis of this report will show that I cast my vote on every bill that was brought to a vote except one. My voting record for the 1st session of the 84th Congress was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 16, 1955.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Date	Measure	Vote
Jan. 31	H. R. 8780. To exempt farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and fuels used for farming purposes. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 352. To authorize expenditures for expenses of Un-American Activities Committee. (Passed 385 to 1.)	Yea.
Feb. 1	H. R. 7993. To authorize construction and conversion of certain naval vessels. (Passed 359 to 3.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. Res. 396. Resolution disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant. (Failed 62 to 310.)	Nay.
Feb. 20	H. R. 8710. To amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
Feb. 28	H. Res. 311. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3383, a bill to authorize Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain Colorado River storage project. (Approved 354 to 26.)	Yea.
Mar. 1	H. R. 3383. To authorize Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain Colorado River storage project. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Yea.
Mar. 7	H. R. 9739. To make appropriations for independent executive offices. On Dowdy amendment to delete language of bill authorizing 11 supergrade positions with GSA. (Failed 151 to 231.)	Nay.
Mar. 13	H. R. 9166. To provide a 1-year extension of existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 366 to 4, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Mar. 21	H. R. 8320. To amend the Agricultural Acts of 1949 and 1954 with respect to special school-milk program and brucellosis program. On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 8320. On motion to recede and concur in Senate amendments to above bill. (Passed 406 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	S. 1271. To authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard. On motion to recommit. (Failed 80 to 311.)	Nay.
Apr. 11	H. R. 12. To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to high rigid price supports for basic commodities and milk. On conference report, motion to recommit. (Failed 181 to 238.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12. To amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 with respect to high rigid price supports for basic commodities and milk. On conference report, adoption. (Approved 237 to 181.) (Vetoed by President.)	Nay.
Apr. 18	H. R. 12. On question of passing the above bill, over the President's veto. (Failed 202 to 211, ⅔ vote required.)	Nay.
Apr. 12	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
July 9	H. R. 9893. To authorize certain construction at military installations. On motion to recommit conference report to substitute Manistee for Kalkaska as a jet base. (Failed 29 to 343.)	Nay.
Apr. 23	H. R. 7228. To authorize construction of bridge over Potomac River. (Passed 284 to 9.)	Yea.
Apr. 25	H. R. 10721. To make appropriations for Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary and related agencies. On Murray amendment fixing salaries of certain employees at Department of Immigration. (Failed 179 to 184.)	Nay.
Apr. 27	H. R. 10660. To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act to authorize appropriations for construction of highways and to provide additional revenue from taxes. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
May 3	H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). On the Albert amendment to earmark funds for reduction of grazing land acreage. (Approved 199 to 195.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10875. A bill to enact the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank). On Abernethy amendment to fix at 84 percent the parity for upland cotton. (Failed 186 to 208.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10875. On motion to recommit the above bill with instructions to incorporate provision to authorize prepayments up to 50 percent o. 1957 program to producers. (Failed 184 to 211.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 10875. On passage of above bill. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Yea.
May 23	H. R. 10875. On adoption of conference report on above bill. (Adopted 305 to 59.)	Yea.
May 10	H. R. 10986. A bill making appropriations for Department of Defense. On Allen amendment to delete sec. 633 which requires congressional justification prior to disposal of work done by Department of Defense. (Passed 222 to 156.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 10986. On passage of above bill. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yea.
May 17	H. R. 8901. To restore franchise to the Capital Transit Co. On motion to recommit. (Failed 161 to 172.)	Yea.
May 21	H. R. 11124. To provide for payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 238 to 52, ⅔ vote required.).	Absent.
May 22	H. R. 11319. To make appropriations for public works. On Abernethy amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Passed 179 to 170.)	Nay.
May 23	S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution for payment to Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer rights-of-way for Yellowtail Dam unit. On adoption of conference report. (Approved 176 to 126.)	Nay.
May 31	H. R. 10285. To merge production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks and for other purposes. (Passed 247 to 4.)	Yea.
June 11	H. R. 11356. To amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954—1 year extension. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 1840. To amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination. (Passed 394 to 3.)	Yea.
June 13	H. R. 5881. To provide for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. On motion to recommit conference report. (Failed 179 to 209.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 4090. To require installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators. On motion to recommit. (Failed 151 to 228.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 9540. To extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act. On motion to recommit with instructions to delete sec. 6 which provides Federal grants. (Failed 165 to 213.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 9540. On passage of above bill. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yea.
June 25	S. 3295. To allow the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time for 1 month. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 7886. To increase monthly rates of pension awards for veterans (point of order deleted disability provisions). On motion to recommit. (Failed 110 to 305.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 7886. On passage of above bill. (Passed 365 to 51.)	Yea.
June 28	H. R. 9852. To extend the Defense Production Act. On conference report which contained amendment authorizing Congressional approval of dispersal policies. (Approved 200 to 197.)	Nay.
Do	H. Res. 554. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7535, to authorize Federal assistance to States for financing school construction on the basis of population. (Approved 327 to 67.)	Yea.
July 5	H. R. 7535. To authorize Federal assistance to States for financing school construction on the basis of population. On amendment providing 1 percent of income taxes be turned back to States as method of financing. (Failed 168 to 260.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 7535. On Powell amendment to above bill which would prevent Federal funds from being allocated to States practicing segregation. (Passed 225 to 192.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 7535. On McConnell amendment to above bill which would allocate funds to States on basis of need rather than population. (Failed 158 to 262.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 7535. On final passage of above bill. (Failed 194 to 224.)	Nay.

Voting record of Representative DEWITT S. HYDE, 6th District, Maryland, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Date	Measure	Vote
July 2	H. R. 9801. To authorize and direct the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal at Balboa. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 325 to 59, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Do	S. 2379. To promote the fishing industry in the United States and Territories by providing needed training for personnel. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 256 to 133, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 6	H. R. 11380. To readjust postal rates and establish congressional policy for determination of rates. (Passed 217 to 166.)	Yea.
July 9	H. R. 11967. To provide for District of Columbia National Memorial Stadium. (Passed 288 to 80.)	Yea.
July 11	H. R. 12130. To provide appropriations for mutual security. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yea.
July 12	H. Res. 584. Resolution waiving all points of order against H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 362 to 30.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12138. To provide supplemental appropriations. On motion to recommit. (Failed 25 to 370.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 12938. To provide increases in service-connected disability compensation and increase dependency allowances. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 391 to 0; ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 18	H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China to the United Nations. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 391 to 0.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 11708. To amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 to increase amount authorized for appropriation under title I. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
July 19	On motion to lay on table. Motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call of roll No. 105. (Failed 104 to 290.)	Nay.
July 23	H. R. 627. To provide for protecting civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. On motion to recommit. (Failed 131 to 275.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 627. On passage of above bill. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
Do	S. 1644. To prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 264 to 145, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12227. To amend provision of Tariff Act relative to import duties on wool. On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Failed 216 to 123, ⅔ vote required.)	Yea.
July 24	H. R. 7992. To enact certain provisions now included in Department of Defense Appropriation Act. On committee amendment (point of order) on transfer of commercial operation by Department of Defense. (Passed 201 to 185.)	Nay.
Do	H. R. 12061. To authorize and direct Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with construction of power reactors and give Government exclusive right to develop atomic power for peacetime use. On motion to strike out the enacting clause. (Failed 195 to 199.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 12061. On motion to recommit above bill. (Approved 203 to 191.)	Yea.
July 25	H. Res. 618. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 11742, to extend and amend Housing Act. On Colmer amendment to the rule providing an additional amendment to public housing section. (Failed 92 to 269.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 638. Resolution certifying report of the Committee on Un-American Activities as to refusal of Arthur Miller to answer questions before subcommittee. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 373 to 9.)	Yea.
July 26	H. Res. 641. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 412 to authorize construction, operation, and maintenance by Secretary of the Interior of Fryingpan project. On agreeing to resolution. (Failed 179 to 194.)	Yea.
Do	H. Res. 602. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 8902, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. (Approved 184 to 178.)	Yea.
Do	H. R. 8902. To amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, relative to reinvestment by air carriers of net gains from sale or disposition of certain property. On motion to recommit. (Approved 196 to 153.)	Nay.
July 27	H. Res. 625. Resolution providing for consideration of S. 3383, relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 219 to 126.)	Nay.
Do	S. 3383. Relating to rates charged to public bodies and cooperatives for electric power generated at Federal projects. On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Nay.
Do	H. Res. 604. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 7850, to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation. On agreeing to resolution. (Approved 173 to 168.)	Yea.

The Problem of Racial Discrimination and Segregation in the Housing Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Frances Levenson, executive director of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, addressed to the Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH, United States Senator from Connecticut, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Miss Levenson's letter is in reply to a letter which Senator BUSH received from Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole, and which was placed in the RECORD of June 21, 1956.

I believe that this letter will be of interest to all who are concerned with the facts that relate to the problem of racial discrimination and segregation in the housing field.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE AGAINST
DISCRIMINATION IN HOUSING,
New York, N. Y., July 23, 1956.

Hon. PRESCOTT BUSH,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: An Associated Press story of June 27 reported that you have inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 21 a letter from Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole, commenting upon a letter of mine to you. My letter had been written over a year ago, on June 16, 1955. I trust you are interested in my appraisal of Mr. Cole's reply.

Mr. Cole makes abundantly clear that he is not only familiar with our assertion "that racial segregation continues in housing built under the Federal housing programs, and that the Federal Government is actually supporting the spread of segregation," but that our charge is correct. He reports attempts by the Housing and Home Finance Agency to foster the production of Negro housing or minority housing. Nowhere does he mention efforts to assist in opening up the housing market—wherever Government aid is involved—to free bargaining of all families, regardless of race.

Mr. Cole's report of Agency accomplishments is inaccurate and ambiguous. He cites a conference he held in December 1954 with the real estate, lending, building, and public-interest groups. The purpose of the conference was to develop Federal housing policy with regard to racial factors. The homebuilders, seconded by the lenders and real-estate interests, and with the tacit approval of the Government representatives, offered to devote 10 percent of their next year's anticipated production to minority-group housing if they could obtain suitable sites. All the public-interest groups rejected this racially segregated housing plan. They supported instead a policy statement that all housing built with Federal aids be open to all who qualify, regardless of race.

No report on the conference has been made nor any policy statement issued by the Housing Agency. In answer to a question asked by Senator HERBERT LEHMAN at hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Cole stated, "Nothing tangible came out of the conference. * * * I * * * set up a committee to help me * * * determine what could be done. The committee never met. * * * That was the end of that conference." Nothing like 10 percent of new building has been available to minority groups, even on a segregated basis. Practically none has been available on a nondiscriminatory basis.

Mr. Cole further reports in his letter that he and other housing officials have exhorted builders, lenders, and FHA district offices during 1954–55 to step up the production of housing for minorities including "emphasis on the development of demonstration open-occupancy projects in suitable key areas." Neither in Cole's letter to you nor at any other time, are any specific results of these exhortations, speeches, and directives presented or stated in statistical or any other form.

Mr. Cole tells you that "I am convinced that the efforts of these leaders on a national scale are being reflected locally in an increasingly substantial volume of production of housing for these families." Where are the facts and figures? How many homes were actually produced? In what cities? At what prices? And how does the number compare to those made available to whites but closed to Negroes?

The Administrator makes much of the voluntary home mortgage credit program. But let us look at the facts: The program is available to assist only FHA- or VA-aided housing. Since Negroes already are largely excluded from both of these programs, the availablity of VHMCP to them must be severely limited. For the whole country, for the 1½-year period, through May 1956, only 1,085 individual loans (to minority families) and 1,938 to builders for housing available to minority groups were placed. Mr. Cole admitted to Senator LEHMAN at the subcommittee hearings, "The applications are extremely small." Furthermore, I am sure that an analysis of the loans would reveal that most, if not all of them, are in areas already occupied by minorities, or in neighborhoods already in racial transition. The builders' loans are mainly for Negro housing. We have received many reports that local correspondents of VHMCP lenders are refusing loans except for homes in Negro neighborhoods.

Mr. Cole's statements regarding the Public Housing Administration policy and program serve only to reemphasize that agency's application of the discredited separate-but-equal doctrine to publicly subsidized housing. The statement that local housing au-

thorities are encouraged to admit tenants without regard to racial considerations is revealing. Mr. Cole went further in statements at the Senate subcommittee. He said: "This is the problem of the people in the locality. If they want integrated housing, they have it. If they don't want it, they don't have it." This is a clear abdication of Federal responsibility. The projects he is speaking of are directly subsidized by Federal funds. The notion that the locality may determine for itself whether to obey the law and Constitution is quite fantastic. The President has stated firmly that public funds and powers are not to be utilized to foster racial discrimination or segregation. Yet, 85 percent of federally subsidized public housing remains segregated. New segreated projects continue to be approved. In addition, projects actually owned by the Federal Government continue to be operated on a segregated basis.

It is a shocking fact that Federal policy permits entire Negro neighborhoods to be cleared under the urban renewal program to make way for housing—usually FHA-aided—from which the developer, with local and Federal sanction, may exclude all Negro families. An official report as of December 1954 shows 13 federally approved projects under this program were replacing racially integrated sites with new segregated housing. At the same time the racial relations staff attached to the urban renewal program has been reduced from 5 persons to 1 person.

A basic reason that many of the promising urban redevelopment plans have either been stopped cold or inordinately delayed is the failure of the Federal agency to insist that the total supply of housing available to minorities be increased. Almost two-thirds of all families displaced are nonwhite, but additional living space, either on a segregated or integrated basis, is not being opened to them.

Mr. Cole's statement of our case is in itself an effort to prejudice against it. Mr. Cole says that we are asking as a condition to all types of Federal assistance in housing; a rigid agreement, that the recipients of this aid agree to limit racial segregation, and to require integration. What we ask is stated very simply: As a condition of Federal assistance, recipients agree to make the housing available to all eligible families on exactly the same basis, and without regard to race.

The FHA commitments already require two agreements from the recipients during the life of the mortgage: (1) that no racial restrictive covenants will be recorded against the property, and (2) that no lease or other instrument will be executed which would restrict occupancy on the basis of race. These agreements with FHA are formal but meaningless. Builders of FHA developments simply do not admit Negro families. We are asking that the Federal Government render these two agreements meaningful and require a commitment that housing produced through FHA insurance is to be available to all eligible families on the same basis without regard to race.

Mr. Cole argues that under such a condition, private builders and local communities in various sections of the country would reject FHA assistance. This would be their privilege. Federal aid is not obligatory and is supposedly available only where a need exists which is beyond local and State ability to meet. Further, Mr. Cole is not called upon to be either prophet or spokesman for what builders or communities will do. This will be a question for each builder for himself and each community for itself to decide. Experience in New York State, however, where discrimination in Government-insured housing is barred by State law, has not shown any drop-off in FHA applications.

We believe that the decisions of the United States Supreme Court during the past several years require that the Federal Government refuse to support segregated housing. The briefs amicus curiae filed by the United States Government in such cases as those on racial covenants, segregation in transportation, and segregation in public schools, clearly affirmed the doctrine that racial segregation imposed or supported by law or public powers is per se unconstitutional. Mr. Cole's homily upon local rights and privileges to exercise racial discrimination in varying degrees, smacks of the same argument completely rejected by the United States Supreme Court in the public school cases. It is evident that these are the principles which have guided Mr. Cole during the past 3 years. It is simply not true that he has taken vigorous steps against racial discrimination in housing. Vigorous words have been spoken, but action has been meager and even then directed toward the expansion or reinforcement of racial segregation in housing. Mr. Cole quotes the President in behalf of moderation in the enforcement of the Supreme Court's decision regarding public schools. He seems to forget that the President has unequivocally stated on many occasions that it is his determination that public funds will not be used under his administraiton to foster racial discrimination or segregation.

Either Mr. Cole does not understand what the President has declared or the President has not been adequately advised as to the implications of his stated policy in the field of federally assisted housing.

The HHFA has reproduced and given wide circulation to Mr. Cole's letter containing my name. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should like to ask your consideration in inserting this letter also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that all sides of the issue may be presented to the American people.

Your interest in the matter is very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES LEVENSON,
Executive Director.

Appreciate Passing of H. R. 1840

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter which was addressed to me by Mr. R. H. McVay, regional director for the National Food Brokers Association, Oklahoma City, Okla. The letter follows:

Hon. WILLIAM H. AVERY,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AVERY: We are writing this letter to you to say how much we appreciate your actions in helping to make H. R. 1840 pass the House with the greatest majority that we have had in a long time of any bill. It is very heartening, indeed, to see that the gentleman that the people of the State of Kansas have sent to the House of Representatives is so earnest in his ideas as to what should be done for the small-business man.

You have been very cooperative with this office and we wanted to thank you for your cooperation, and if in the future we have a like thing confronting us we would like very much to have the privilege and pleasure of contacting you again in that behalf.

Thanks again, Mr. AVERY. We appreciate all that you have done for us and the small-business man, because we are a small-business man.

Yours very truly,

R. H. MCVAY,
Regional Director.

Summary of Eisenhower-Republican Administration Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower-Republican administration achievements is a record of surpassing importance to the welfare of all our people. A summary of it from 1953–56 is as follows:

REPUBLICANS WAGE PEACE

First. Ended Korean war in July 1953, as promised.

Second. Secured United States prisoner release from Reds.

Third. Strengthened American defenses with powerful new weapons; lowered costs.

Fifth. Closed gaps in collective defense ring around Communist countries eignty—NATO membership, Austrian Peace Treaty.

Fifth. Closed gaps in collective defense ring around Communist countries through SEATO, free China and Korea treaties.

Sixth. Deterred Red seizure of Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa; helped end Communist control of Guatemala in this hemisphere.

Seventh. Helped settle Iranian oil disputes—aiding free world.

Eighth. Initiated atoms for peace development.

Ninth. Furthered disarmament prospects through air reconnaissance and blueprint exchange proposals accepted by U. N.

Tenth. Improved world trade relations, while safeguarding United States industry.

REPUBLICANS ADVANCE PROSPERITY

Eleventh. Achieved war-to-peace conversion of economy with greater than ever prosperity, while freeing the Nation from wage, price, rent controls.

Twelfth. Stabilized cost of living. In 3 Republican years, held dollar to within 1 cent of its January 1953 value compared to 12-cent loss in last 3 years of previous administration.

Thirteenth. Halted spiral of inflation that was robbing people's savings.

Fourteenth. Attained highest employment in history—currently 2 to 3 million higher than ever reached.

Fifteenth. Encourage record-breaking building of homes and other construction.

Sixteenth. Reduced labor strife significantly. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five

strike losses down 53 percent from 1952.

Seventeenth. Pushed wages and take-home pay to record heights. One thousand six hundred and sixty-four dollars annual per capita disposable income means each American now averages $127 more per year to spend than highest ever reached before.

REPUBLICANS ASSURE PROGRESS

Eighteenth. Restored honesty and prestige to Government.

Nineteenth. Ended Communist influence in Government policy; tightened security standards.

Twentieth. Reversed 20-year trend to centralization of power in Washington. Reduced Government competition with industry.

Twenty-first. Cut Government spending and waste by over $10 billion from Truman's budget. Cut payroll by 275,000 Federal jobs, thereby reducing cost of Government.

Twenty-second. Provided history's biggest tax cut—$7½ billion a year, 62 percent to individuals, only 38 percent to corporations. Saved each family about $100 a year.

Twenty-third. Achieving balanced budget for 1956 despite defense demands and $80 billion IOU's inherited from previous administration.

Twenty-fourth. Established Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Twenty-fifth. Extended social security to 10 million; liberalized benefits for all. Reduced eligibility age for women from 65 to 62 years of age.

Twenty-sixth. Increased railroad retirement and unemployment benefits. Extended unemployment insurance to 4 million Government and small-business workers.

Twenty-seventh. Improved postal, Government, military pay structures with generous raises; greater benefits and security.

Twenty-eighth. Set up Small Business Administration.

Twenty-ninth. Advanced civil rights of minorities.

Thirtieth. Provided record highway aid.

Thirty-first. Initiated and expanded conservation and wise development of natural resources. Added to national parks, wildlife refuges.

Thirty-second. Helped farmers expand markets. Disposed of $4.7 billion of surpluses. Established sounder support program. Proposed soil banks and aid to low-income farmers.

Thirty-third. Proposed to Congress new programs for school construction, highway expansion, medical research, aid to depressed labor areas, and so forth.

Nixon's Warning on Neutralism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Daily Sun-Times of July 9 entitled "NIXON's Warning on Neutralism."

As the editorial points out, Vice President NIXON's speech was indeed an excellent one and I believe both the speech and this editorial constituted a distinct contribution to a better understanding of our foreign policy. I am inserting this in the RECORD with a view to bringing this to the attention of as many people as possible.

NIXON'S WARNING ON NEUTRALISM

By word and action Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON has been reassuring our Asian friends that alliance with the United States against communism will not compromise their hard-won independence.

This is an assurance that many newly founded nations need to have. For too many years their association with the great western powers has been in the role of a colonial subordinate. In their new role of self-government some are inclined to confuse neutrality in the cold war with independence. They believe they can better assert their independence by assuming neutrality.

The perils of such a course were forcefully pointed out in an excellent speech by NIXON in Manila last week. He pointed out that association with the United States has strengthened the Philippines' independence. But there is no independence for those countries associated with Russia behind the Iron Curtain.

Agreements NIXON reached in the Philippines with President Ramon Magsaysay gave depth and strength to his speech designed for Asian ears. It was agreed that the Philippines have sovereignty over United States bases and that title to the bases eventually would be turned over to the island republic.

The status of the bases had been a factor in the recent deterioration of United States-Philippine relations. United States Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., has been of the opinion that the United States held perpetual ownership rights over the base areas by virtue of previous United States sovereignty over the islands. The NIXON agreement scuttled this opinion.

In his speech, NIXON said:

"In our dealing there is not now and there must never be any so-called big power-little power or big brother-little brother relationships. Our alliance has not infringed upon your independence. On the contrary it has strengthened it.

"I hope that other nations will study this example carefully and realize what it means to walk side by side with the United States of America. Let them contrast your strength and security with the fate of small nations who were not united with us in mutual alliances. You are independent. But are Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania independent? Is there any freedom in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania? How much liberty is there in North Korea or North Vietnam? What has happened to ancient Tibet?

"We must all frankly face this question: Where there is a threat of Communist colonial imperialism, is a nation really safe in striking out alone? * * * In modern times the really cruel colonialism has been the colonialism of the Communist world. It has enslaved over a dozen nations and has left hundreds of millions to suffer the hardest forms of tyranny."

NIXON forthrightly explained that Western Europe was saved from this fate by United States intervention to protect Greece and Turkey, by NATO and by United States aid. He asked who would feel safe in Asia today if the freee nations had not joined to defend Korea.

To those nations who believe their internal problems compel them to abstain, for the moment, from pacts with the West, or who feel they are too close geographically to the Iron Curtain to risk provoking the Communists, NIXON had this advice:

"We in the United States can understand the attitudes of such powers. For over a century we tried to avoid being identified with any of the warring power blocs in Europe. But we learned from hard experience that policies which worked well in the 19th century were completely inadequate in the 20th. In 1917 we were forced to enter a terrific world war. Again in 1941 we were plunged into the blood bath of the Second World War.

"Finally we learned our lesson. Together with most of the other nations of the world we joined in a world organization designed to promote justice and insure peace. In addition, we joined regional alliances permitted under the Charter of the United Nations. We found that the world is too small today for effective isolation."

NIXON drew a bead on one kind of neutrality that is unacceptable to the United States: that which makes no moral distinction between the free world and the Communist world. And for those who believe a friendly neutrality toward the Kremlin might spare them, he quoted the proverb: "He who sups with the Devil must have a long spoon." Communists, he said, have no memory of former favors, no kindness toward those who tried to be friendly.

NIXON is reflecting the consensus of Americans that the New Look in Russia has not changed communism or its goals. He also is reflecting the new Republicanism of President Eisenhower which acknowledges that the Marshall plan, the Korean war, and regional alliances within the United Nations have been instrumental in protecting the free world from communism. Some of the Old Guard Republicans who stanchly support NIXON, but who still live in the 19th century he says we have left behind, ought to study this speech. It is consistent with NIXON's well-known views concerning the wisdom of foreign aid, particularly to India, which so many Old Guarders suspect of being pro-Communist.

NIXON's speech should help dissipate any lingering doubts about America's attitude toward neutrals that might have been raised by President Eisenhower's off-the-cuff remarks about neutrals 2 days before he was stricken with ileities. It should receive wide circulation in the neutral countries as a fine statement of America's aims and ideals concerning other peoples.

Tribute to Joseph F. O'Hern, Manager, Veterans' Administration Regional Office, Newark, N. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to pay tribute to a public servant who is faithful, conscientious, capable, and personable. He is Joseph F. O'Hern, manager of the Veterans' Administration's regional office, Newark, N. J. Too often in life, we pause to complain rather than give praise where praise is due.

Since I have been elected to Congress, I have come to learn what a trying job it must be to be a Regional Manager of the Veterans' Administration. I know I

have called on Joseph O'Hern an infinite number of times to help my constituents. I have called Mr. O'Hern morning, noon, and night, and have always found a courteous reply and ready response to be of assistance.

I felt it my duty to make these remarks so that his faithful service might be brought to the attention of the Congress and be recorded on the records of Congress. His superiors should be proud of Joseph O'Hern. I know I am grateful to him and so are the constituents of the 14th District, whom he has served so well.

I think he is typical of many faithful Veterans' Administration employees and so that they may not feel that their work goes unsung, these words of praise stand as a tribute to them and their excellent performance.

Correspondence in Relation to Small Business Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Mr. Charles E. Hutchins, president of Price-Hutchins Co., Marion, Ind., and Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRICE-HUTCHINS CO.,
Marion, Ind., July 19, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURGER: As the head of one of the good small business organizations will you please be kind enough to advise me your opinion of Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART and his voting record in respect to small business?

Thanks kindly in advance for your cooperation.

Quite sincerely,
CHAS. E. HUTCHINS,
President, Price-Hutchins Co.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1956.

Mr. CHARLES E. HUTCHINS,
President, Price-Hutchins Co., Marion, Ind.

DEAR MR. HUTCHINS: I am in receipt of your letter of the 19th, and note the question that you put to us as to Senator CAPEHART'S actions with reference to help to small business.

You realize that the National Federation of Independent Business must always remain neutral on the political scene, and when we are called upon for such information by independent business we must answer on the record alone, as it goes without saying that in our daily activities in behalf of independent small business of this Nation we call on Members of Congress every so often from both political parties.

Checking back on the record of Senator CAPEHART, my first experience with the Senator's help to small business was just about 10 years ago when a bill was pending before the Senate Banking Committee, which provided for the elimination of tire manufacturers owning and operating retail stores. Such legislation had been pending before the Congress beginning in 1942.

At the time of the public hearing before the Senate Banking Committee the Senator showed his sincerity in the interest of independent business when he made the motion to the committee to report the bill out to the floor of the Senate. So on this score his actions spoke louder than words, and it was no fault of his that the committee did not follow through at that time.

His second major action in behalf of small business—and independent bankers of this Nation will verify this—was his cosponsorship of legislation commonly known as the Bank Holding Act which is now law, and it speaks for itself.

Senator CAPEHART supported the action in having the Senate Small Business Committee made a continuing committee of the Senate, which action was taken on July 1, 1955.

These are the major items pertaining to the Senator's help in the overall pertaining to small business.

Of course in our daily grind here on requests coming from our members, and particularly those in his own State of Indiana, when we in turn call upon the Senator for assistance to these problems he and his staff have always been most cooperative and helpful.

We are very pleased to be able to give you this information in answer to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

An Open Letter to the Perplexed Among Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a self-explanatory open letter prepared and issued recently by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order. This foundation understands that political and social movements have their origin in the faiths that men hold; and faiths that are strong enough to produce sweeping changes in the social and civil order, here or elsewhere, generally have their roots in religious or antireligious experiences. The unique and driving force behind todays world communism is not its economic theories, but its atheism. The "god" to whom Communists by the million dedicated themselves has failed. The faith that communism is a fool-proof system which by its very nature makes dictatorship impossible is in ruins. The things reported in Khrushchev's speech proclaim the bankruptcy of the Communist religion. To what or whom are the faithful now to turn.

This open letter, signed by many outstanding Americans and beamed by radio to the Communist-controlled countries seeks to open to the perplexed and disillusioned a new door, a true door, through which they can walk from darkness into light, from enslavement into freedom—if they will.

The letter and signatures follow:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PERPLEXED AMONG COMMUNISTS

DEAR SIRS: Since the death of Stalin in March 1953, and more especially since the official move 3 years later by Khrushchev and his colleagues to desanctify the foremost tyrant of Russian and world history, you have experienced a soul searching of the most fundamental character.

Khrushchev's secret speech on February 25, 1956, and its publication in copious if possibly incomplete form by the United States Department of State has brought into the open the moral crisis which for long has been latent and suppressed in the deep recesses of your conscience.

You have poured forth your misgivings and gnawing doubts in letters, columns, and editorials in the Communist press. An example is Mr. Howard Fast's column in the Daily Worker of New York on June 12, 1956, in which he says of the Khrushchev speech on Stalin that "it itemizes a record of barbarism and paranoic blood lust that will be a lasting and shameful memory to civilized man."

Another example is the Polish Communist engineering student, 18 years of age, who in a moving human document published in Nowa Kultura of April 22, 1956, said:

"When I was 15 I ceased to believe in God. * * * Three years have passed. * * * It has turned out that what my family said was true—about the cruelty of secret-police investigations and the dictatorship of Stalin. It has turned out that history was really forged * * * and I? I do not know how to change my soul for the fourth time without fear that it will become a rag. * * * My head is bowed. Because of my older colleagues and because of the whole party. Because of all those who waited, spied * * * deceived. Because of those who consciously or unconsciously helped evil * * * I am ashamed of all of you and above all of myself for my stupidity and credulity. I can no longer lift my head * * * it's impossible since I have no basis for believing anything."

We urge you not to evade or silence these doubts and promptings of conscience but to face them manfully. They are not just in your minds. They are not an expression of weakness. They inhere rather in the objective contradiction between your aspirations for a better, freer world and the unspeakable reality of the terror-ridden Soviet land, revealed not by enemies of communism but by the first secretary of the CPSU in person.

What is the good life for man and for society What is its ultimate test? This test, as every honest human being knows, the Communist as much as the non-Communist, is not the number of tons of steel or kilowatts of electricity produced in a given society. It is the climate of freedom and hope in which people live, the degree of self-respect and sense of dignity which they enjoy, the possibilities open to all for personal development and fulfillment.

We who are concerned particularly with spiritual values and society have followed your perplexities with sympathy and understanding. We know that it is not easy to admit that the sacrifices of a lifetime have produced not the heaven on earth you had expected from communism, but a dictatorship of terror and slavery.

We ourselves are not Marxists and cannot accept as true the philosophy of dialectical materialism. Even so, we submit that this philosophy cannot explain in its own terms the transformation of a revolution of workers and peasants into the brutal and systematic counterrevolution that has been going on in the Soviet Union for more than

three decades. Nor can the monstrous evils painted by Khrushchev himself with a realism surpassing a Koestler or an Orwell be explained as deviationist works of a single individual, namely, Stalin.

Khrushchev would have you believe this. He seeks to exalt Lenin to the skies and glorify him at the same moment that he portrays Stalin as a Caligula, an Ivan the Terrible, and a Hitler all rolled into one. Yet it was a Bolshevik leader to whom the October Revolution and its aftermath owed much who many years earlier had warned that Lenin's theory and plan of organization fitted a party which would substitute itself for the working classes. The methods of Lenin, he continued, would "lead to this: the party organization at first substitutes itself for the party as a whole; then the central committee substitutes itself for the organization; and finally a single dictator substitutes himself for the central committee."

Those words were written in the year 1904. Has any human prophecy ever proven more accurate?

You as Communists are critical of capitalism, political democracy, and representative government. You may say what you want about these institutions, but can you cite a single capitalist government that has committed the crimes now officially admitted by the Communist successors and former colleagues of Joseph Stalin? Here is an objective fact which requires some explaining on your part and which it is very wrong to ignore.

The crisis you face is one that goes down to bedrock. It is fundamentally a moral and spiritual crisis. It has to do not so much with organization or politics as such but with man and the relation of ends and means in ethics and then in social and political thought. To put the matter another way, the issue before the world and preeminently in the minds of all sincere, decent human beings is the inalienable rights of man versus the totalitarian state. It is justice and freedom versus arbitrary might and a new form of human slavery.

This issue can be put in the form of a very simple question: Is man made for the state or is the state made for man?

The answer is self-evident. But what will you do about a system which, professing to be of the workers, by the workers, and for the workers, has produced the most evil and inhuman organization of state and police power known to history? What will you do about a system which, claiming to respect all cultural traditions, national minorities, and ethnic groups, has in fact savagely trampled upon such loyalties, even to the point of deliberate extermination in whole or part of many ancient races and nationalities? What has gone wrong? Will you be fooled and betrayed again into believing that good can come out of a one-party dictatorship or out of the denial to men as men of elementary respect and universal human rights?

In facing these questions, please do not feel that non-Communists are necessarily hostile or harsh in their judgments. Remember that there are those outside the party who understand that the aspirations which in the past attracted many to communism are common human ideals held by all men of good will. But if anything is sure, it is that the totalitarian way is the graveyard of human values and human hope.

There is no reason for shame in the fact of having made a mistake. To err is human. But it is shameful to go on in an evil course and to persist in the betrayal of man's highest ideals simply because one lacks the courage to go to the bottom and uncover the source of fatal error.

In this task you need the help and understanding of those who share your aspiration toward a better world but reject the totalitarian road. Those of us associated with FRASCO—Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order—who are initiating this appeal are persons of varied backgrounds and differing creeds, from diverse walks of life. We were brought together, first of all, by the terrible danger that faces our generation. This danger is partly physical. But still more dark and appalling is the abyss of the mind and spirit which yawns on the very edge of history in our time. We are determined with all that in us lies to resist the slide of humanity toward the bottomless pit in which animal craft and power are total and man is no longer recognizable as man.

Positively, we are all united in the conviction that democracy and an ethics based on spiritual values belong together. This is the ideology of the future.

Material greatness is not enough to save man. Indeed, it may prove the direct path to his damnation. The new technology must be accompanied by a strong, creative development in the intellectual and ethical spheres. Men must find a great spiritual vision which will inspire in them a love for their fellows and a will not to destroy but to save the world.

In this spirit we plead with you not to turn you backs on the modern martyrs of the working class—the sailors at Kronstadt; the peasants of the Ukraine, the Baltic lands, and Great Russia; the mechanics and miners of East Germany daring to advance on Soviet tanks; the faceless slaves of Vorkuta and a thousand similar labor colonies; and now the toilers of Poznan, men in overalls, marching in solid rank in the face of machinegun fire and crying for bread and freedom.

These and many, many others whose voices speak only out of the silence are the waking conscience of humanity. Their flesh is the soil, their blood and tears are the moisture, out of which a new plant of freedom must grow. They ask for your help as well as ours in the struggle to lift our staggering world back on to its true foundations.

We beg of you mercy and pity for the third of humanity which in this advanced age has been set on by thieves and which lies in a ditch, wounded and gasping for breath. May we together bring healing and relief to the bruised and oppressed and start in anew to build a better world.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Wesley Lowry, chairman, Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order; Maxwell Abbell, former president, United Synagogue of America; Hurst R. Anderson, president, American University; Most Reverend Athenagoras, Greek Orthodox Bishop of New England; A. L. Brosio, president, Religious Emphasis Foundation, San Diego, Calif.; Hon. William R. Castle, former Under Secretary of State; Wilson Compton, president, Council for Financial Aid to Education; John F. Cronin, S. S., assistant director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference; Rt. Rev. Angus Dun, Episcopal Bishop of Washington; William W. Edel, president, Dickenson College; William Yandell Elliott, professor and dean, Summer School, Harvard University; Edward L. R. Elson, minister, National Presbyterian Church; Christopher Emmet, chairman, American Friends of the Captive Nations; Louis H. Evans, minister at large, Presbyterian Church, United States of America; Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, consultant, American Jewish Committee; Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister emeritus, Riverside Church, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister, Washington Hebrew Congregation; Kenneth S. Giniger, vice president, Prentice-Hall and Hawthorn Books; John H. Hallowell, professor, Duke University; Albert J. Hayes, president, International Association of Machinists; Will Herberg, author and lecturer, New York, N. Y.; Sal B. Hoffman, president, International Upholsterers' Union of North America; Stanley K. Hornbeck, former Ambassador to the Netherlands; Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University; Jerome G. Kerwin, professor, Chicago University.

Frank C. Laubach, honorary president, World Literarcy, Inc.; Rev. Frank C. Leeming, headmaster, St. Peter's School, Peekskill, N. Y.; Isaac Don Levine, commentator and news analyst, Waldorf, Md.; S. M. Levitas, executive editor, the New Leader; Marx Lewis, general secretary, United Hatters, Cap, and Minninery Workers International Union; Eugene Lyons, senior editor, Reader's Digest; Benjamin E. Mays, president, Morehouse College; Arthur G. McDowell, director, civic and governmental affairs, Upholsterers' International Union of North America; Ralph McGill, editor, Atlanta Constitution; A. T. Mollegen, professor, Virginia Theological Seminary; John Courtney Murray, S. J., editor, Theological Studies; Gerhart Niemeyer, professor, Notre Dame Univeristy; Thomas W. Pangborn, president, Pangborn Corp.; Willard S. Paul, president, Gettysburg College; Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York, N. Y.; James A. Pike, dean, Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, N. Y.; Rabbi David de Sola Pool, minister, Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue, New York, N. Y.; Liston Pope, dean, Yale Divinity School; John G. Ramsay, international representative, United Steelworkers of America; Most Rev. Michael J. Ready, Catholic bishop of Columbus, Ohio; Mrs. W. L. Rogers, president, San Francisco Federation of Churches; Francis B. Sayre, former High Commissioner to Philippines; Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean, Washington Cathedral; George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College; Joseph R. Sizoo, professor, George Washington University; Ralph W. Sockman, minister, Christ Methodist Church, New York, N. Y.; D. Elton Trueblood, professor, Earlham College; Rt. Rev. Henry St. George Tucker, former presiding bishop, Protestant Episcopal Church; James Twohy, Catholic cochairman, National Conference of Christians and Jews; Dewitt Wallace, editor, Reader's Digest; William R. White, president, Baylor University; Richard S. Zeisler, New York, N. Y.; Francis P. Gaines, president, Washington and Lee University; D. Crena de Iongh, former Executive Director, International Monetary Fund; George C. McGhee, former Ambassador to Turkey.

Article From Kansas Pharmaceutical Association News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that small business is the backbone of our Nation. Our country has grown strong in the atmosphere of free and independent competition. It is important that we exert every effort to allow small business to expand, but at the same time not enact legislation which would control and hinder rather than assist small business in its desire to expand. It has been my aim to support legislation which I believe will promote rather than obstruct the opportunity for the small merchant and manufacturer to expand his business.

In addition, I have attempted to cooperate with our various State organizations, whose primary interest is small business, to aid them in their activities. The following article appeared in the

July issue of the Kansas Pharmaceutical Association News. The statement is made by Clara Miller, secretary-manager of the association:

CONGRESSMAN BILL AVERY PLACES KPHA'S TAX BRIEF IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

It took a bit of legislative know-how on the part of Congressman BILL AVERY to get KPHA's excise tax brief into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The brief was too long for the space allotted a Congressman. BILL asked permission—and obtained it—to record the material, without deletion.

This important step in our fight to obtain relief for our harassed retailers in the collection of this tax was essential. We thank BILL AVERY for it.

George Frates, NAARD's Washington representative, will take the work from there, with Congressmen and Senators from the States working with him.

Views of Hon. Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee, on Dixon-Yates Staff Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the Dixon-Yates staff report.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the conclusion of the Dixon-Yates hearings conducted by a panel of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, Senator O'MAHONEY instructed the subcommittee staff to prepare a draft report. We have reviewed the report and have approved its release.

In addition, there are certain aspects of the Dixon-Yates matter which I feel it is necessary to comment upon briefly.

This whole plan was crudely conceived in darkness for the base and ulterior motive of destroying the Tennessee Valley Authority. Then Director of the Bureau fo the Budget, Joseph M. Dodge, brought Adolphe H. Wenzell, vice president and director of the First Boston Corp., a private investment firm, into the Budget Bureau for the purpose of studying TVA in May 1953. He worked in secret. Employees of the Budget Bureau were warned not to mention Wenzell or reveal his presence in the Bureau or the task to which he was assigned.

In this case there exists substantial evidence indicating that Mr. Adams, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Strauss deliberately attempted to conceal the conflict of interest growing out of Mr. Wenzell's dual role in the Dixon-Yates deal—a conflict which the President's own Attorney General now labels so contrary to public policy as to render the agreement null and void.

WENZELL'S PLAN

At the conclusion of his initial period of work Mr. Wenzell produced a plan, one part of which was the Dixon-Yates proposal. This, too, was held in secret by the Bureau. A copy of the Wenzell plan was withheld from this committee, upon a plea of executive privilege by Rowland R. Hughes, then Director of the Bureau, despite the fact that it had been shown to Herbert Hoover and to Mr. Wenzell's superior in the private firm of the First Boston Corp., George D. Woods, who recognized in it a vast field for exploitation by his and similar firms.

Mr. Woods was frank to admit that he saw in it not only an opening wedge into the TVA, but also the opening of all public-power investments of the Federal Government for private exploitation. Mr. Woods testified before our committee:

"I was impelled to come down here (to see Dodge) because my business is the security business and I thought it would be fine if there were untold millions or billions of dollars of securities sold on the market at a profit to security dealers" (p. 512).

PLEAS OF PRIVILEGE

Mr. Hughes was not alone among Government officials in pleading privilege and thus conspiring to conceal the facts. It will be recalled that our investigation was obstructed by numerous pleas of executive privilege. As a result we were impeded in developing the facts with respect to certain actions taken by White House representatives, by Mr. Hughes, and by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, and by the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, J. Sinclair Armstrong. I call attention to this aspect of our hearings at this time because there exists persuasive evidence that various high officials in the Eisenhower administration have violated the criminal code.

The Government's answer in the suit filed by Dixon-Yates in the Court of Claims now alleges that the contract was illegal because it violated the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and the Public Utility Holding Company Act. The Government has also taken the position that the contract was null and void and against public policy because of the conflict of interest growing out of the dual capacity in which Adolphe H. Wenzell served during the negotiations of the power contract.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

From the standpoint of legal propriety, the conduct of the Department of Justice is highly questionable. In October of 1954 Attorney General Brownell advised the Comptroller, Joseph Campbell, then an Atomic Energy Commissioner, that the Dixon-Yates contract was a legal one for the Commission to execute under the Atomic Energy Act.

In opposition to the State of Tennessee both before the SEC and in the United States court of appeals, the Department argued the Dixon-Yates contract was valid under both the Atomic Energy Act and the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

Now the Department, in its present answer, takes precisely the opposite position.

The Justice Department's own answer to the Dixon-Yates suit in the United States Court of Claims also asserts:

"The alleged agreement set forth in the petition is in violation of the statutes and laws of the United States and is unlawful, null and void, and contrary to public policy, for the following reasons, among others:

"(A) * * * by reason of the activities of one Adolphe H. Wenzell. * * * The role played by Wenzell in consulting with and advising and representing the Government, the First Boston Corp., and plaintiff (Dixon-Yates) with respect to the same project and the same alleged agreement with contemplated benefits to the First Boston Corp., as well as to plaintiff, involved a conflict of interest so contrary to public policy as to render the alleged agreement null and void."

POSSIBLE CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS

The allegations in the Government's answer thus give a new meaning to the various pleas of executive privilege which were asserted by the Chairman of the SEC, by Mr. Strauss, and by Mr. Hughes. They also give new meaning to the refusal by Mr. Sherman Adams to testify when Chairman Armstrong disclosed that Mr. Adams had intervened in the hearings before the SEC at the very time Mr. Wenzell was scheduled to testify. And finally, the answer throws new light upon the concealment by Mr. Hughes of Mr. Wenzell's activities in the Bureau of the Budget and the elimination of his name from the published chronologies.

Indictments and convictions have been obtained under section 371 of title 18 of the United States Code, which provides:

"If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both."

The offense under this section of the criminal code is that of conspiring to defraud the United States Government or any agency thereof. The essential ingredient of the criminal offense is the failure of a Government official to discharge conscientiously the duties of his office or his failure to administer Federal law in an unbiased manner. The crime is one of exercising improper influence. I believe that even with the limited facts available to us it is clear that the Dixon-Yates deal involved actions on the part of public officials which should be presented to a grand jury without further delay.

Briefly, the facts are these:

Mr. Adams, assistant to the President, telephoned the Chairman of the SEC and asked him to postpone the appearance of Mr. Wenzell. The reason Mr. Adams gave, according to Mr. Armstrong, was that he wanted to consult counsel on whether the Government should object to Mr. Wenzell's being called as a witness. Mr. Adams also stated at the time he requested the postponement, according to Mr. Armstrong, that he had a problem in Congress that week—the problem was the appropriation for the TVA transmission line which was scheduled for a vote within a day or two after Wenzell was first scheduled to appear.

WHY?

Why did Mr. Adams want to consult counsel about Wenzell's scheduled appearance? What bearing did Mr. Wenzell's testimony have on the problem which Mr. Adams faced in the Congress that same week? Did Mr. Adams know at the time he telephoned Armstrong what Wenzell's testimony would disclose?

What reason could he possibly have had for intervening in the SEC proceeding if it was not to prevent the disclosure of Wenzell's role, which the administration's own lawyers now say rendered the contract illegal? And if this was his purpose, it is obvious that Mr. Adams—had he succeeded—would have concealed information concerning the legality of a contract to which the United States Government was a party.

If Mr. Adams had a simple and proper explanation for his actions and his conduct, why didn't he avail himself of the opportunity to advance it when the panel asked him to appear following Chairman Armstrong's testimony? Nor is it too late even now for Mr. Adams to explain his actions. But if he fails to give a satisfactory explanation, the Attorney General, it seems to me, has no alternative but to present the case to a grand jury.

POSITION OF INFLUENCE

Mr. Adams' position and influence is well known. He holds a position of great power and importance. The facts show that he first used his office to push through a deal which his own administration now says is against the public interest. He later used his high office to try to prevent public disclosure of wrongdoing, and he finally used his position as Assistant to the President to frustrate the efforts of a congressional committee to develop fully and completely all the facts surrounding this affair.

Mr. Adams was not alone in perpetrating and carrying out a deliberate plan of con-

cealment to avoid public disclosure of wrongdoing in the Dixon-Yates case. Mr. Hughes, the former Director of the Bureau of the Budget, insisted when he first appeared before our panel that he knew nothing about the First Boston Corp.; he knew nothing about any question of conflict of interest having been raised; and knew nothing about Mr. Wenzell's activities in the Dixon-Yates affair.

Consider his testimony against the testimony of Mr. Dixon, Mr. Wenzell and Mr. James, Mr. Dixon's counsel. Before the hearings were concluded these individuals and others testified that the question of a conflict of interest was discussed with Mr. Hughes as early as February 1954. Now Mr. Hughes is not a stupid man. How could he possibly forget, in a matter as important as Dixon-Yates, that on several occasions at least three different people discussed with him the seriousness of the situation created by Wenzell's dual position. Moreover, the two letters Hughes wrote Senator LISTER HILL were calculated to deceive. And his testimony that Wenzell was not a negotiator of the Dixon-Yates proposal is flatly contradicted not only by Wenzell and AEC but also by documents that it took us almost 6 months to get Hughes to produce from his own files.

Was President Eisenhower aware of these facts? Was he aware of Sherman Adams' activities and Mr. Hughes' concealment of Wenzell's name when the chronologies were issued by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission? We must assume that the President knew nothing about these matters. Otherwise it is difficult to explain why the President would have stated at a press conference (July 6, 1955) that Mr. Wenzell's role in the Dixon-Yates affair was a proper one.

But now the facts are available to the President. Our investigation developed them for him. They have now been confirmed by his own Attorney General. But still there is no indication that the President will insist upon punishment for those who abused his trust and breached their oath of office. If he is still unconvinced that Mr. Adams betrayed him and the American people, the President can quickly resolve the question if he would direct his assistantant to comply with our request that he testify under oath.

The American people are entitled to the full facts. The President is justified, under certain circumstances and the course of normal Government administration, particularly where the security of the Nation is involved, to protect the papers and persons of the executive branch from unwarranted disclosures. But it is well established—and the Teapot Dome case is an important precedent—that executive privilege cannot be sustained and should not be used for the purpose of concealing fraud, wrongdoing, or crime.

Comments on Interstate Power Co. Report on TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, earlier this year, a mimeographed report on The Facts About TVA was presented by a local representative of the Interstate Power Co. to a Kiwanis Club in Minnesota. This report was so distorted and constituted such a misrepresentation of the facts that I sought the advice and counsel of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee, Senator ALBERT GORE, in preparing a reply so the record may be set straight.

Senator GORE'S comments should be read by every American who has been inclined to take at face value the claims of certain groups who have fought TVA from its very inception.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks Senator GORE'S Comments on Interstate Power Co. Report on TVA.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON INTERSTATE POWER CO. REPORT ON TVA

The mimeographed report on The Facts About TVA presented by a local representative of the Interstate Power Co. to a Kiwanis Club in Minnesota follows the general pattern of misrepresentation of TVA which has been spread nationwide through almost every media available to the free-spending private utilities.

The origin of the TVA idea is misrepresented. The power provisions of the TVA Act are completely distorted. The report glaringly omits any mention of TVA's national defense contributions, although more than one-half its power output today goes to the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal defense agencies. The statements concerning TVA power finances bear hardly a remote resemblance to truth, depicting an enterprise earning a 4 percent annual return as subsidized. No reference whatever is made, of course, to the positive benefits to electricity consumers and taxpayers in the Nation resulting from TVA power operations.

These points are supported factually in the following analysis:

POWER IN THE TVA ACT

The development of power was one of the major purposes in the TVA Act, which set up TVA as an agency for unified development of natural resources along principles developed in the conservation movement under President Theodore Roosevelt 30 years earlier. In fact, Roosevelt set the stage for TVA when he vetoed a bill turning over the Muscle Shoals, Ala., site of what is now Wilson Dam to private interests. In the course of similar vetoes on other streams, he declared "I esteem it my duty to use every endeavor to prevent this growing (power) monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the people of this Nation."

The historical facts thus effectively dispose of the claim in the report that TVA was presented to the public in 1933 "as a noble experiment—a new idea in river development that would show how the Federal Government could be a real help to a large depressed region." The idea that TVA was a kind of charity for a depressed region, instead of an application of conservation principles long established, is further discounted by the fact that the first act aimed at the development of the Tennessee Valley was passed in the economic boom year of 1928, only to be pocket-vetoed by President Coolidge.

Similarly, the provisions of the TVA Act itself completely controvert the assertion that the Congress of 1933 intended that "TVA dams would also generate a little electricity for local consumption."

Rather, section 9 of the act provided that TVA was to generate electricity "so far as may be consistent" with the requirements of flood control and navigation in the operation of its multiple-purpose dams. Section 23 removed any possible misunderstanding on this score by declaring the objective to be "the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation."

The act transferred to TVA a Government-built steam plant and clearly contemplated the construction and operation of additional steam plants when needed.

The power provisions of the act were specific. They required that power operations be "self-supporting and self-liquidating," but emphasis was on maximum service rather than maximum profits. TVA was expected to seek the wide and abundant use of electricity for the "fuller and better balanced development of the resources of the region." The act gave preference in the sale of electricity to nonprofit municipal and cooperative organizations operating "primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity" to citizens or members. TVA was directed to keep accurate records to accumulate data on costs of power generation and distribution for the benefit of the Congress, Federal and State agencies, and the public. The act, in short, shows that power in the unified development was a major consideration.

Finally, the act made clear that TVA's power facilities, as well as the chemical plants at Muscle Shoal, were to be available always for national defense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND TVA POWER GROWTH

The report is accurate in saying that the TVA power system has grown into the largest integrated power system in the country and similarly accurate in saying "TVA did not grow like Topsy. It grew by design." In the fiscal year 1956, the system generated more than 57 billion kilowatt-hours in a region where production in 1933 was only 1.5 billion kilowatt-hours.

Completely lacking in the report, however, is any reference to the major factors in development of the design—that during the life of TVA the Nation has engaged in the greatest war in history, that scientists have split the atom, that since 1951 the Nation has been engaged in a tremendous national defense effort based on atomic weapons, accompanied by atomic development for peacetime use, and requiring hitherto unheard of amounts of electricity.

During World War II, from 1939 to 1945, TVA raised power production from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to 12 billion kilowatt-hours by rapid construction of dams and hydro plants. During the war three-quarters of TVA's power was used for war purposes—to produce aluminum for airplanes, chemicals for munitions, fissionable materials for the atomic bomb, and other war materials. Beginning with the hostilities in Korea in 1951, an even vaster expansion of power has been demanded and met.

Since 1951, TVA's power output has been multiplied 3 times, from 18 billion kilowatt-hours to 57 billion kilowatt-hours. More than half TVA's power sales—56 percent in 1956—goes to the Atomic Energy Commission's huge plants and to other Federal defense installations. Between 1950 and 1956, these Federal agencies multiplied their demand for TVA power 15 times—from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to more than 30 billion kilowatt-hours.

At the same time, TVA has had to meet the normal growth in power demand in the region it serves in the same way that other power systems do. TVA power is distributed in an area of 80,000 square miles by 98 municipal, 51 cooperative, and 2 small private utilities. In this area, which has remained stable geographically since 1945, power use has continued to grow rapidly.

THE JOB OF ELECTRICAL DEVELOPMENT

The report falsely seeks to convey the impression that in 1945 the job of TVA, under the act, was finished, saying "TVA itself declared that the job of harnessing the Tennessee was complete." It is true that TVA in its 1945 report said rapid wartime construction

had advanced its project so that "no other major stream was so completely controlled for the protection and benefit of man." About 11 million acre-feet of flood storage had been provided and a 630-mile channel substantially achieved.

But the same report also made clear that the TVA job was not complete, that with the end of the war "emphasis could again be directed toward the job of building a stronger and more fertile valley through the development of its basic resources of soil, forests, and minerals."

Power, one of the resources, was needed for that development, for farms, factories, and homes. The TVA report made clear that normal power use during the war had been retarded by lack of manpower, materials, and appliances.

That the electric-power job was not complete in 1945 is amply demonstrated by what has happened since, keeping in mind that the geographical area served has remained virtually unchanged. In this area, the municipal and coperative systems increased their total sales from 3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1945 to more than 14 billion kilowatt-hours in 1956. The number of customers more than doubled, from 600,000 to 1,425,000. Where a quarter of the farms had service, the proportion today is 93 percent. The average home in the region used 1,750 kilowatt-hours a year in 1945, today the average is nearing 5,800 kilowatt-hours. Industrial sales by the local distributors increased from 2 billion kilowatt-hours to 7 billion kilowatt-hours in 1956.

This growth has been the work of the people in the valley region since they elected, by municipal referenda and by formation of rural cooperatives in areas long ignored by the private utilities, to own and operate their own electric systems. In this they followed a long-established American tradition, for publicly owned systems have existed since 1882, the birth date of the electric industry.

The report claims TVA "seized and put out of business 20 electric companies." This is a curious way to describe a change in ownership in which municipalities and cooperatives joined with TVA in purchasing the privately owned electric facilities, paying their full value of $127 million (the local agencies paid nearly $69 million for distribution properties, TVA over $58 million for generating and transmission facilities). About 350,000 customers, one-fourth the present number, were involved in the transfers.

WHY TVA BUILDS STEAM PLANTS

The vast increase in the demand for power, and particularly the tremendous requirements of the AEC and other Federal defense agencies, answers the question raised in the report: "Why does TVA need steam plants when it has 30 major dams?" (TVA has constructed 20 dams, acquired 5 from a private company plus Wilson Dam taken over from the War Department, and directs the operation of 5 major privately owned dams as a part of the integrated system, with benefits to both TVA and the company.)

The fact is that the power requirements of the region, including requirements of Federal installations for the common defense of the Nation, have far outrun the hydroelectric resources of the region. Some sites remain that may be developed for flood control and other purposes, as well as power, but even with total development of all available hydro, steam plants will be required to meet the total power demand.

The fear expressed in the report that TVA could expand its steam generation in an unlimited manner without regard to the region it is in is entirely unjustified; while no precise boundaries are set, TVA is limited in its sales of power to the economical transmission distance from its hydroelectric projects. The location of steam plants does not affect that limitation.

Similarly, the charge that TVA has been buying its coal at nonunion rates is without foundation. TVA can set neither the price of coal nor miners' wages. It buys its coal—about 18 million tons a year—in the competitive, free-enterprise market. Obviously, it buys its coal just as cheaply as it can, as any other well-managed enterprise would do, letting contracts to the lowest bidders. Under the law, TVA cannot differentiate between mines which pay high or low wages, or which are union or nonunion, except to require bidders to pay the minimum wages required on production for Federal agencies. Such minimum wages are established for each coalfield by the United States Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act. Private utilities are subject to no such requirement and can buy coal where they will, regardless of the Walsh-Healey Act.

All TVA's coal contracts provide for escalation in price to compensate for general wage increases.

TVA POWER MORE THAN PAYS ITS WAY

The consumers of TVA power pay for it without subsidy from taxpayers anywhere. Power revenues cover all costs of operation—the cost of coal and materials, wages and salaries, maintenance—and straight-line depreciation, together with payments in lieu of taxes to States and counties. In addition those revenues have provided a margin which amounts to an average annual return of 4 percent on the power investment over the entire 23 years of operation. An operation which earns a 4 percent annual return on the investment obviously is not subsidized.

Sometimes attempts are made as in this report to disparage the financial record of TVA power operations by declaring that TVA does not pay interest. Interest, of course, is paid on debt, and the interest payments of any private business vary with the size of its debts. TVA, like any utility, has paid interest on its outstanding bonds. Sixty-five million dollars in bonds were originally issued, but the last $14 million outstanding were retired in August 1955, and no interest has been paid since that date. What the report is contending in effect is that because TVA does pay interest not on debt, but on equity capital, that money made available for investment by the Government as owner of the system, its financial record is unsound. There is no basis for such a conclusion. It is, of course, entirely fair to examine the extent to which TVA power system earnings have been adequate to cover the cost of money to the owner (the Government), assuming that the Government borrowed the funds to invest in the power system. The answer to this fair question is clear. The 4 percent return which the TVA power system has earned on the investment, after paying all costs of operation including depreciation, is about double the cost of money to the Government during the period in which the system was built.

TVA PAYMENTS ON INVESTMENT AHEAD OF SCHEDULE

Under a provision of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, TVA is required to pay into the United States Treasury, including retirements of bonds, amounts which will equal the Treasury funds invested in the power system within 40 years from the time electric facilities so financed are placed in operation.

TVA is well ahead of schedule on these payments, which amount to an average annual requirement of 2½ percent, thus disposing of the claim in the report that "TVA has at no time repaid more than 1.4 percent of its total investment in any one year."

On the basis of paying 2½ percent, or one-fortieth, of the Treasury investment each year, TVA should have paid by the end of the fiscal year 1956 about $115.6 million. The actual payments to that date were $186.5 million, about 60 percent ahead of the requirement. Prior to the 1948 act, TVA had paid $23.6 million to the Treasury. This brings the total payments from power revenues to more than $210 million at the end of fiscal 1956. (An additional $34.8 million of nonpower proceeds has also been paid, bringing the total to nearly a quarter of a billion dollars.)

It should be pointed out here that no shift in ownership is involved. After the Treasury has received the equivalent of the Federal investment in the facilities, the Government continues to own them and is entitled to the earnings from them.

TAX PAYMENTS ON TVA POWER

The report includes the standard misrepresentations of the payments in lieu of taxes made by the TVA and the taxes and tax equivalents paid by the local distributors, and adds a new one. In the first place, it attempts to compare the State and local tax payments on TVA power with the total taxes of electric utility companies, including income taxes. In addition, it gives the impression that the payments on TVA power simply replace the taxes formerly paid by the private utilities at the time their facilities were purchased.

This is not true. The fact is that the State and local taxes of about $11 million paid by TVA and the distributors in the fiscal year 1956 was about 225 percent greater than the total of State and local taxes paid in 1937, when the production and sale of electricity was substantially in private hands. In the rest of the country the State and local taxes of private utilities in 1955 were 203 percent above 1937, a differential in favor of the TVA area of 22 percentage points.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Payments in Lieu of Taxes and Shared Revenues in June 1955 recommended that the provision for payments in lieu of taxes by TVA remain undisturbed, since "the present system is working to the general satisfaction of the State and local governments in the TVA area."

"This payment arrangement," the task force report said, on page 62, "conceptually reimburses the recipient governments not merely of potential property tax receipts but of all potential taxes of those governments referable to the power property and its operation."

Under section 13 of the TVA Act, TVA pays 5 percent of its revenues from sale of power, excepting from sales to agencies of the Federal Government itself, to the States and counties in which it owns property or sells power. The electric cooperatives, on their operations, pay the applicable State taxes, and the municipal systems make tax equivalent payments generally based on the combined State, county, and local tax rate applied to the net value of their systems.

In the fiscal year 1955, the $10 million of tax payments by the TVA and the distributors amounted to 6.2 percent of the combined power revenues, save those from sales to the Federal Government which are exempt by law. In comparison, the State and local taxes of a dozen private utilities adjacent to the TVA area ranged from 4.8 percent to 11.3 percent, averaging 7.9 percent, according to data of the Federal Power Commission.

TVA's in-lieu payments make it the largest single taxpayer in the State of Tennessee, according to State records. In the four largest cities using TVA power, and probably in many smaller cities, the publicly owned electric systems are likewise the largest taxpayers.

With State and local taxes disposed of, Federal income taxes can be considered. TVA is not required to pay Federal income taxes, since it is a Federal agency and the income from the power system belongs to the Government. The important fact is that the return on the investment is sufficient to

cover the cost of money by a substantial margin. Although there would be no advantage to designating a part or all of this margin as income taxes, perhaps a hypothetical illustration will be helpful. In the fiscal year 1955 the net income from power operations was $47.9 million, representing a return of 4.2 percent on the net average power investment of $1,130 million. An allowance for the cost of money at 2 percent on this investment, amounting to $22.6 million, would leave $25.3 million. On this profit a private company would have paid an income tax of a a little over $13 million to the Government. In the case of TVA the total income belongs to the Government.

THE TVA YARDSTICK

The report displays the usual reluctance of TVA critics to discuss the real yardstick, the public demonstration of economical power production and distribution. "Where the average cost per kilowatt-hour for the Nation's residential customers in 1954 was 2.69 cents, TVA consumers pay only 1.24 cents," says the report. "This is what TVA and its public power advocates call the TVA yardstick—the low rates that are supposed to set an example to the rest of the private electric industry."

The yardstick has often been thus misinterpreted to indicate that TVA was intended to arrive at rates which would then become a precise measure for electric rates everywhere. On the contrary, TVA has always recognized that conditions of power generation and distribution vary from region to region. However, the careful records which the Congress directed TVA to keep can be a source of information for purposes of comparison to weigh likenesses and differences.

But the yardstick has other useful and more general applications, based on the congressional criteria for success of power operations geared primarily to maximum service rather than maximum profit. The report points this up when it mentions only the comparative costs per kilowatt-hour for residential service between the TVA area and the Nation at large. It leaves out the other side of the equation—the effect of low rates on electrical use.

In the TVA area, average annual use by homes in the 12 months ending with May 1956 reached 5,778 kilowatt-hours per customer, more than double the national average home use—a demonstration of the well-known American industrial principle of mass, low-cost production and distribution inducing mass consumption.

Again, the TVA experience, in which the TVA costs of generation and transmission are reported separately from the costs of local distribution, gave a new insight into one of the mysteries of electric service—the costs of distribution as distinguished from the costs of generation and transmission.

The practical effects of the rate demonstration were revealed in a recent study which showed that the closer private utilities were to the TVA area, and to the public power demonstrations in the Pacific Northwest, the lower their residential rates tended to be. Consumers served by private utilities neighboring TVA, for example, are saving millions of dollars annually because of the TVA demonstration. The more remote they are, the higher their rates. Similarly, rural electric cooperatives buying wholesale power from private utilities pay lower rates per kilowatt-hour the closer they are to the public power areas.

The TVA area, in another demonstration, led the Nation in rural electrification, which was virtually nonexistent in 1933; in the Nation, only 11 percent of the farms had service, and in the present TVA region the proportion was 3 percent. In 1934 and 1935, the first cooperatives to offer service on a broad area basis were formed in the Tennessee Valley region, demonstrating that widespread rural electrification was feasible. They became the model for the REA cooperatives which, beginning in 1936, have brought electric service to more than 2.5 million farms in the Nation and have spurred private utilities to provide service to an additional 1¼ million farms.

All the Nation's taxpayers are benefiting through lower national defense power bills, not only from the low-cost power supplied by the TVA to AEC and other national defense agencies, but also because the TVA demonstration provided a lever which enabled the AEC to contract for large supplies of power for its atomic plants from privately owned public utilities at rates well below the rates of ordinary industrial service, even in large amounts. AEC is buying more than 50 billion kilowatt hours a year from TVA and two private utilities; this means that for every mill per kilowatt hour of saving, compared with what AEC would have had to pay in the absence of TVA, the Nation's taxpayers are benefiting to the extent of more than $50 million a year in reduced defense power bills. Over the 25-year periods of the contracts, every mill of annual saving per kilowatt hour will add up to $1¼ billion, a sum equal to the total TVA power investment, including construction in progress, at the end of the 1955 fiscal year.

These facts may suggest why the TVA yardstick or demonstration is attacked so bitterly, why the facts about it are consistently distorted, and why the private utility industry is determined to destroy it.

TENNESSEE VALLEY NOT A FAVORED REGION

Contrary to the impression sought to be conveyed in the last paragraph of the report, the Tennessee Valley region is not favored in Federal expenditures. The Federal Government spends money for a wide variety of purposes intended to advance the general welfare, and not primarily to benefit particular States, regions, or groups. However, since the report raises the point, it can be answered. The fact is that in the years 1934-54, total Federal expenditures amounted to $5,850 per capita in the country; in the Tennessee Valley region, where the TVA expenditures were only a small proportion of the total, Federal expenditures per capita were only $2,840, less than half the national figure.

Even so, the price is further distorted by the use of the figures purporting to show how much TVA has cost Minnesota and Iowa. Most of the appropriated funds of TVA have been invested in power facilities and, as has been shown, will be returned to the Treasury in 40 years. A large proportion of the power investment is devoted to the national defense, which is as important to these States as to the rest of the country. Some of the funds have been used for TVA's fertilizer and munitions development, with strong benefits to midwestern agriculture and to national security. The Tennessee navigation channel has expanded the opportunities for interregional commerce, as for example—expanding the southeastern market for midwest grain.

At the same time, the flow of taxes and Federal expenditures is not a one-way street, taxes from the Tennessee Valley region contribute to the expenditures in the rest of the country for various projects and activities in the general welfare. Moreover, the valley region is contributing a proportionally larger share; in 1933, when TVA was created, the seven Tennessee Valley States contributed 3.4 percent of all the individual income taxes collected in the Nation; in 1954, the proportion was more than 6 percent. In 1954 taxpayers from these States paid $986,069,000 more than they would have paid had the proportion remained constant.

Polish Courage Displayed at Poznan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, at Poznan the Polish people gave unmistakable evidence of a spirit that is willing to assert itself against oppression no matter how strong the adversary may be.

Time and again in the long history of Poland its people have shown a willingness to face death in its effort to be free. No people in all of Europe have fought more relentlessly nor shown greater courage in the cause of freedom. They have won the admiration of all free people.

When the people of Poznan cried out for bread, they were met by tanks that gave them death instead. This was the Communist answer to the cry of starvation. No matter how strong the language used by the present leaders in Moscow in denunciation of Stalin and his regime of cruelty, the fact remains that they are attached to and carry out the same kind of cruelty for which they have criticized him. All of this goes to show that at heart communism is the same no matter who the Soviet leaders are, and, that when the mask that covers their faces is removed we see the same hideous face of communism depicting the same cruelty that has always been the case.

The Communist government in Poland would like us to believe that their so-called workers' government in that country is all that its name implies. But the incident at Poznan clearly shows that it is in no true sense a workers' government. It is nothing other than a dictatorial government that is using the workers as slaves to strengthen the Moscow leadership and to strip Poland of its resources for the benefit of maintaining the Soviet rule in Russia. No matter how loud the claim of the Communist rulers that they have the situation well in hand, the true fact is that they do not have any such hold on the Polish people.

The Polish people are not the kind that will submit to despotic rule, and Soviet Russia will never be able to truthfully say that they have them in hand. Beneath the domination that now prevails in Poland there is a determination upon the part of the people to again enjoy freedom and liberty. That spirit will never die. Oppression will make it stronger and shorten the time when it will assert itself again. There is nothing more certain in the history of any nation than that love of freedom, both political and religious. In Poland it cannot be killed; it cannot be held down, nor for any great length of time be denied to its people. Freedom is the heart and soul of Poland.

This is no new element in the character of the people of that land. It has

always been so, even in the darkest days of its history. There is no people of any nation who have fought longer, endured greater hardship, and surmounted more obstacles in the fight for freedom than Poland and its people. The spirit of Poland will never die.

It is my opinion, and I am strongly convinced, that the free nations of the world through the United Nations Organization should take a strong stand in support of Poland, reestablish its sovereignty as a free nation, and return to it the land that was so unjustly taken from it. It is time that acts of oppression such as were displayed at Poznan should be denounced in no uncertain terms and the rule of justice established.

Resolution of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on July 21 the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, at their 21st annual convention, adopted a resolution endorsing basic revisions in the McCarran-Walter Immigration and Naturalization Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED JULY 22, 1956, BY THE 21ST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WORLD WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, INC., SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Act is still in effect and is still the law of the United States; and

Whereas the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act has proved by service and experience to be unfair to many countries and particularly to Italy; and

Whereas the quota system as set forth in the McCarran-Walter Act is inadequate, antiquated, and discriminatory against certain races and peoples; and

Whereas the President of the United States has often indicated and recommended to the Congress of the United States that this act be revised and rewritten so as to eliminate such discrimination; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now considering the so-called Lehman bill which will amend the present law and eliminate the discriminatory provisions; and

Whereas the said Lehman bill is now in, and for many months has been in, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee under the chairmanship of Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi; and

Whereas Senator EASTLAND has apparently made no effort to report this bill, either unfavorably or favorably, out of his subcommittee so that it might be discussed and voted on by the United States Senate: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., go on record as favoring the adoption of the Lehman bill; and

Resolved by the delegates of the Department of Massachusetts, Italian-American World War Veterans, in convention assembled at Springfield, Mass., on July 21, 1956, That this Department of Massachusetts as being in favor, and it is the fervent hope of the delegates present that the McCarran-Walter Act will be modified, revamped, and become more liberal so that the many inequities now contained in the act be removed; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization with the recommendation that the said Lehman bill be voted out of the committee so that it may be discussed on the Senate floor and some action be taken on this bill.

The Outlook in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, once in a while it is useful, in trying to understand the future, to take a look into the past. So many people in these troubled days seem to be so surprised at the acute difficulties that continually boil up in the long slumbering countries of Asia. But the developments there were clearly foreseeable. They are the result, first, of ideas let loose in the world by the American Revolution of 1776, and, second, of the perversion of those ideas by the concepts and methods of the Communist counterrevolution in Russia of October 1917.

The losses that the cause of freedom has sustained in Asia since the war are not so much the result of Communist activities, brilliant and tireless as they are; rather, they are due to ignorance, indifference, and default by the forces of freedom—including our own country.

During the last year of World War II and for 3 years thereafter, I gave one speech, with variations, scores of times all over the country and to anyone who would listen. I was trying my best to prevent just what we now have on our hands—and with no good way to deal with it now.

I remember giving it at a meeting of the Yale Club in Washington in May 1946—with Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson on one side of me and Senator Robert Taft and Ambassador Spruille Braden on the other. I was honored when Mr. Acheson said at the end, "I would not have you change a word of it." But, somehow or other, nothing much ever seemed to get done, with vigor and in time, along the lines urged.

Mr. Speaker, recently I ran across a copy of the speech, condensed to meet the time limitations of a Town Hall broadcast in Newark, N. J., on March 4, 1946—just 6 months after V–J Day. Already the dearly bought victory in Asia, and for that matter, in the world, was on the verge of being lost—while America and the West slumbered.

Some of us who had watched the revolution growing in Asia were dismissed as alleged Asia-firsters, partisans of Chiang Kai-shek, emotional about Asia, and so on. No, we were trying to save our own beloved America from the terrible travail through which, barring a miracle, we must now pass for long, hard years ahead.

But the joy of freedom and the blessings of liberty are worth the price, whatever it be. We look back momentarily, only in order to look ahead and to march steadfastly on.

The speech of 1944–48 follows:

THE OUTLOOK IN ASIA

(Address of Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, Member of Congress, Town Hall broadcast, March 4, 1946, Newark, N. J.)

Only the shooting part of World War II has ended. A world-shaking ideological and political war is raging—a war to determine who really won the shooting war. No matter who defeated the Germans and the Japanese, the real victor in World War II depends on whose ideas ultimately dominate in the reconstruction of Europe and in the development of the gigantic manpower, resources and potential markets of Asia.

I believe that eventually it will become generally recognized that World War II all along was a war, more than anything else, to determine who is going to control the development of Asia.

Hitler knew that. He understood clearly that conquering Europe was merely the first step necessary to enable him to get control of the undeveloped areas of the world, most of which are in Asia.

Japan knew it. Her militarists openly admitted more than a decade ago that they had to get control of the manpower, resources, harbors and bases of east Asia to provide the springboard of their program of world conquest.

England, France and Holland have known it. Witness their feverish efforts to reestablish their empires in Asia.

Russia has known it. Over a period of more than 2 decades she poured more money and effort into the Communist movement in China than into any other country in the world. Undoubtedly she has hoped and still hopes to win control of Asia by propaganda and political agitation. But the drastic steps she has taken in Manchuria, for example, make perfectly clear that she intends to get control by other means if propaganda fails.

Only we Americans, even though we live on the same ocean with Asia, and its problems are in our front yard, seem not to realize fully that our own future in a large degree depends on the kind of ideas which guide the development of Asia.

There are four major possible ways Asia could go.

The first is a return to colonialism. Sections of Asia can be forced back into the old colonial pattern under the empire-building nations of Europe. If that is done, Asia will explode. And it will explode as violently against the United States as against England, France, and Holland.

I suspect future historians may record that the single most significant battle of World War II was the fall of Singapore. A billion Asiatics saw the white man's empires go down like a house of cards before the onslaught of an oriental country, Japan. Actually, the empires had been doomed since July 4, 1776; but it did not become clearly apparent to the people of Asia until 1942. They now know full well the weakneeses of those empires and they know that if they are forced back into that pattern it can only be because of the tacit approval, or at least the acquiescence, of the United States.

Through two centuries the Asiatics learned what attitude to expect from the European empire builders. The people of Asia are real-

istic and have not expected any such miracle as a right-about-face in that attitude.

But on the other hand, they certainly have not expected that the United States, which got its own independence by fighting a war against that same imperialism and which established a totally different pattern in dealing with the Philippines, might now appear to reverse its historical attitude and allow its strength and influence to be on the side of the empires.

This puts a very difficult decision before us. Our interests are essentially identical with, or at least parallel to, those of the British, French, and Dutch—in Europe. We need them as much as they need us, and it is imperative that we hang together—for reasons too plain to need mentioning here. But our intrests are not identical with or even parallel to what many seem to regard as the legitimate interests of Britain, Holland, and France—in Asia.

I see no way out except for us to make unmistakably clear to all concerned that we will stand by the democracies in Europe; we will not support their empires in Asia.

That is the right position; it is also the expedient position. For if our choice is between having on our side in Asia the old decadent empires, or the hearts of the billion people who live there—then by all means let us have the hearts of the people.

The second possibility in Asia is racialism.

The basic thesis of the Japanese policymakers was that white men would never treat Asiatics decently and that, therefore, the Asiatics had no hope except to unite under Japan's leadership and expel the white men and all their interests from Asia. The thing that prevented the Japanese propaganda of "Asia for the Asiatics" from succeeding was the incredible folly of the Japanese militarists in treating the Asiatics even worse than the white man had. But let nobody think that because Japan's initial effort failed, her idea did not take root.

If attempts are made to reimpose the old colonial pattern in Asia, vigorous and magnetic leaders will arise in the Philippines, or Malaysia, or Indonesia, or Burma, or India, or China with a new totalitarianism of the racial pattern, urging the people of Asia to unite with all the colored peoples of the world in one solid bloc against the white man. Such a movement will not be good for anyone, but it is almost inevitable if we fail to provide adequate leadership in other directions.

The third possibility is the new imperialism of Russia. Let no one be no naive as to imagine that the unity pact between Chinese Communists and the Central Government of China means the Communists will not, just as soon as there is a chance of success, make a strong bid for complete control of China—a development which would tend to swing all of east Asia into the Communist column.

At San Francisco, at the meetings in London and Paris of the Security Council, at the Assembly of the UNO, and on a dozen other occasions, skillful Russian maneuvering coupled with our own diplomatic ineptness has managed to get us before the world on the side of imperialism in Asia, and Russia before the world in the apparent role of liberator. The fact that Russia is herself actually imposing a new and utterly ruthless imperialism on her neighbors is kept partly obscured by her effective attacks on the old European imperialisms.

Why did we get into World War II? Because we finally realized that we could not afford to let one totalitarian militaristic nation, Japan, get control of the manpower, materials, and potential markets of China and of Asia.

Yet a good many Americans have been trying for over a year to get us to abandon our ally, China, to the control of another totalitarian militaristic nation, Russia. It is an almost incredible performance.

They seem to assume that the only way we can have good relations with Russia is by always yielding to her; that we must either appease or go to war.

But surely we should have learned by now that appeasement does not prevent war. It always leads either to war or to abject surrender. And surely we know that when it comes to a showdown, we will not abjectly surrender.

We spent 10 years appeasing our enemies. It did not give us peace. It led straight to war.

Are we now to spend the next decade trying in vain to get peace by appeasing our allies?

I am utterly opposed to any such policy because it would lead only to Russia becoming incomparably the strongest power in Asia as well as in Europe. This would be as bad in the long run for Russia as it would be for Asia and for ourselves and for world peace. It would compel all the democracies to get together in an alliance against such an unprecedented concentration of power. It would divide the world into two great armed camps with constant tensions and suspicions. Some day an inevitable spark would set off world war III.

It is not because we want war with Russia but precisely because we don't want war with Russia that we must reject any fallacious notion that trying to appease her by giving her other people's territory will bring peace.

Shortly after Yalta, at a time when most Americans were profoundly disturbed by Russia's action in Eastern Europe in violation of that agreement, a Russian in Washington said, "You folks do not understand us Russians. We never take any seats that are not empty. When did we ever push anybody out of the seat he was firmly occupying? But, if you leave a seat empty, and we take it, then don't you come along and try to push us out."

As nearly as I can figure out Russia's foreign policy, that is the best description I have heard of it—taking empty seats.

We left a political vacuum in Eastern Europe. We had leaders who insisted political deicsions must be postponed until all military questions were settled. But political decisions could not wait. And Russia could not and did not wait. When empty seats were left in Eastern Europe, Russia moved in, and I don't see how anyone could rightly blame her or have expected anything else. She was realistic while we daydreamed.

Manchuria has now become almost a second Poland—because once again we didn't exercise vigorous and steady leadership in time. We left the seat empty. The same will happen to all of north China and then to other parts of Asia, if we do not stand firmly now—not against Russia, but for the sovereignty, independence, territorial and administrative integrity of China—the same sound policy we have had in Asia since 1898, the objective for which we fought Japan, and which we reaffirmed in unequivocal terms in the Cairo Declaration to which Russia also gave her approval.

It is not a new policy, something hastily cooked up to checkmate Russia. It is merely continued adherence to our historic policy, the thing for which we fought Japan for 4 years—to maintain the open door in China—"equality of opportunity in China for all friendly nations; dominance by none."

Thus our alternatives are not just either appease Russia or go to war. There is another. We can stand firmly by our commitments in Asia and by the commitments of the Atlantic Charter everywhere. We can exercise positive, consistent, effective leadership for the pattern we ourselves established in the Philippines—the pattern which the overwhelming majority of the people of Asia wants.

That is the fourth possibility—not the old colonial imperialism of Europe; not racialism; not the new Communist imperialism of Russia; but genuine democracy and independence of the sort we helped establish in the Philippines.

All Asia observed that when we took the Philippine Islands we did not make them the first colony in a great new empire, but started immediately to help them build a republic and trained their people for the independence we promised and delivered. That is the pattern which the rest of Asia wants.

Why do we Americans sometimes seem to be the only people in the world who have so little idea of the strength of our own country? We are inclined to ask with fear and trembling, "What will this nation or that leader think or do?" I sometimes wonder why in the world we don't decide what we ourselves believe and stand for. Why do we so underestimate the soundness and the appeal to the oppressed peoples of the earth of the democratic system and ideology? Why do we hesitate to make our own position forthright and clear to all?

It is reckless irresponsibility as well as plain distortion of the truth for anyone to misrepresent such a foreign policy as one of "getting tough with Russia." On the contrary, it is a policy of standing firmly for the principles which have been the foundation of America's foreign policy for 50 years, while extending our hand in good neighborliness to all other powers, including Russia, and bending every effort to help iron out international differences.

How can anyone consider it unfriendly to Russia for the United States to continue supporting policies in Asia to which Russia herself has given written agreement? The United States must cling tenaciously to the principles and policies laid down in the Atlantic Charter.

The white man's prestige in Asia was at its all-time low after Pearl Harbor and Singapore. To regain respect he had to demonstrate power—and he did. But power alone will not restore confidence. That can come only as he demonstrates for what purpose he intends to use that power in the future.

The original relationship of the western nations to Asia was one of overlordship. It is now in various stages of transformation into one of trusteeship. But that is not enough. It must go on to independence; and then, if the new countries desire, to partnership.

The peoples of Asia and Europe are on the move. We cannot hold them back. We cannot drive them. What, then, can we do? We can lead them—if it be on a basis, not of superior and inferior, but of full partnership in working together for the good of all as the true way to promote the good of each. If the democracies fail to exert vigorous leadership in that direction, there are others able and eager to lead them in other directions.

There is no more important task in the world than that of making sure the western democracies and the peoples of Asia are on the same side, the side of freedom and democracy.

We defeated Japan's Army and Navy—but her ideas or those of Russia will have won the war in Asia unless all its people are assured, beyond any question, of their ultimate freedom as they work and struggle and grow to full nationhood and independence.

The Communists in China can start really serious civil war there only if they know Moscow is ready to back them. Thus what happens in China in the near future depends on what is decided in Moscow. But what is decided in Moscow depends on what happens in Washington. Fortunately, the United States of America is one of the few remaining places where what happens in its Capital City still can be determined by its citizens—just like ourselves—if we will.

Flood Insurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the flood-insurance bill which we have passed in the closing moments before adjournment, in my opinion, will be remembered as one of the great achievements of the 84th Congress.

I believe that Congress in passing this bill has provided the American people with a flood-insurance program which, if properly administered, should promptly offer a high degree of security to potential flood sufferers. It should eventually offer a program of insurance against flood damage as readily available and as inexpensive as fire insurance is today. I believe the time will come when private insurers will find it a profitable business.

Flood-insurance legislation has had a long and hard fight through the 84th Congress. The problem that had to be overcome in getting a flood-insurance bill through Congress was apathy rather than opposition.

I believe that there is one Member of the House who deserves to be singled out for destroying this apathy through his persistent efforts and persuasive speech in behalf of the flood-insurance bill. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to our able colleague from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I heard Mr. DODD testify on behalf of flood-insurance legislation. I read his earlier statement before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. In all of his statements he vividly portrayed the terrible destruction that he personally witnessed in Connecticut. He clearly depicted the economic chaos for individuals and communities that such destruction inevitably brings. His statements vigorously supported the need for and the merits of flood insurance.

This gentleman did more than just convincingly support this legislation. It was Mr. DODD who introduced the unique loan feature which was made a vital part of the flood-insurance bill by the House, and kept as an essential feature in sections 5 and 6 of the bill we have just passed.

The loan feature of this bill was original and imaginative. It demonstrates Mr. DODD's ability to produce a solution to a most complex problem, as well as his consistent concern for the people in Connecticut and elsewhere in the Nation who have suffered such terrible destruction from floods.

Without the efforts of this eloquent and able gentleman from Connecticut, I believe that we would not have passed a flood-insurance bill in this Congress. Most assuredly, without his courageous and persistent fight on behalf of the people of Connecticut and other potential flood victims throughout our Nation, the loan feature would not have been adopted; and, without the Dodd loan plan, I feel that the flood-insurance bill which we have passed would not be as effective.

Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the House is about to lose the services of TOM DODD, but I expect that his ability and integrity will not be lost to the Congress. I understand that his sights are now set on a seat in the other body. If his goal is reached, I know that this outstanding legislator will continue to serve the people of Connecticut and the entire Nation with great distinction, reflecting credit upon them as well as upon himself.

Many Individual Countries of Europe Are Better Off, but the Kremlin Has Made Net Overall Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, each year for several decades a friend of mine has made annual visits to many countries of Europe in connection with his business. He is a very astute observer, and his vast experience make his observations and interpretations unusually important.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following short summary of his impressions and suggestions following his recent trip to Europe:

The intense diplomatic and subversive activity of the Russians in the past year has brought them gains—in Egypt and the Arab world, in India and Ceylon, in Burma, in Singapore, and has added to neutralism in Iceland, Yugoslavia, France, even in West Germany. All this reveals again the fraud of any professed new Russian Geneva spirit.

The downgrading of Stalin should be considered a clever propaganda political device for internal Russian home consumption, and particularly for its influence on the fear-ridden Europeans, and Communist and pink-minded people everywhere. Its effect on the declining resistance morale in the satellite countries and East Germany is not to be overlooked.

Since the new Kremlin rulers have chosen to make the dead Stalin their whipping boy, the West may be able to use this opening to our advantage. I believe there is a big potential here. The denial of freedom to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, Romania, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, in violation of agreements with Stalin's Russia should be the basis of our position. A clear, detailed case should be spelled out, and rectification of these treaty and agreement violations demanded of the Russians, with United Nations supervisions of free elections in all these territories. This charge could be placed against Stalin Russia. This Russian type of colonialism is a great tyranny, and to highly educated people experienced in freedom, and we have let this issue be overlooked. Instead, George Kennan even advocates accepting the status quo. If the present Russian rulers want to bargain about it, as they surely will, a comprehensive appeal should be spelled out in terms of a big improvement in a Russian standard of living, with technical assistance from the West, a golden age of peace and progress etc., in exchange for ending the present Russian tyranny over occupied countries, and the fear and hatred tensions, and armament burdens.

This peaceful proposal should appeal to President Eisenhower.

The enormous size of Russia and Siberia and the potential of their undeveloped and undiscovered resources would permit such extensive development with peaceful use of atomic energy that an appealing alternative to Russian tyranny over foreign peoples, as well as their own, would spark the imagination of people everywhere. The unwillingness of the Russians to respond to such an appeal would put them on the spot in the eyes of the world and tremendously so in the eyes of the satellite countries. Such an approach by the West might appeal to many of the Russian people, too. If the Russian leaders would not respond, world public opinion would greatly respond to our side. A Russian refusal might be followed up by a request to Russia to submit some specific situations to World Court jurisdiction for decision, instead of the heretofore futile negotiation efforts, or U. N. debates and veto use.

A major element in our thinking should be the pursuit of positive objectives appealing to all freedom loving peoples as our American program. We are the leaders of the West, but have been handicapped by the tragic hangovers of British and French colonialism. A much more effective degree of consultation, or a joint staff for political and diplomatic efforts in NATO on common problems appears to me to be an urgent need. Our U. S. A. objectives are being clouded, and our efforts thwarted by tragic incidents in Cyprus, north Africa, and elsewhere. One year ago in Europe there was much confidence in our leadership. This year I regret to report a considerable decline in that confidence, and the emergence of real doubts. Yet our chance for potential success, I believe, is now greater than anytime since the war.

COMMENTS ON INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES

Finland: Hard working, confident, proud of their achievement in paying off their heavy reparations. Their helpful, courteous, cooperative spirit and courage is stimulating. They are cautious but very prowestern.

Sweden: Prosperous, almost too prosperous. High priced, self-reliant, well armed, wary of Russians; but feeling prevails that Russia is no immediate military threat.

Denmark: Big improvement in business prosperity over earlier postwar years. Exports have increased considerably, but strong neutralist sentiment.

Germany: Very strong business activity, budget surplus, good export trade, business confidence, modernization, expansion prevalent, rising standard of living in all strata, labor getting pay increases. Politically, Germans are worried about United States objectives and policy and about France. The Geneva Conference and our passivity thereafter, in face of numerous Russian moves, plus our silence following Mollet's interview, and Khrushchev's 24-hour response to it, have combined to establish doubts as to our determination to promote German unification, NATO, and generally speaking, continue our resistance to Russian aggressive subversion.

France: Morale of people not good. North Africa a serious problem. Some business improvement. Budget and tax problems remain very serious. No signs of French people making extra efforts to cope with their heavy problems. On the contrary, one hears expressions of despair, reads of troop mutinies, Communist opposition, etc.

Italy: Making progress in expanding exports. Unemployment problem remains. Better feeling apparent, recent elections encouraging.

Austria: A bright spot, economic recovery, and recent elections giving conservatives vic-

tory over Socialists on showdown issue of nationalization of oil industry, etc., is encouraging. Much better feeling with widespread rise in standard of living.

Spain: Making steady economic progress, much industrial and residential building. Our military program coming along satisfactorily, but not as fast as originally planned. Widespread slight improvement in housing and standard of living gives encouragement.

England: Production and modernization problems and inflation problem. But British determination with new budget is indication of their courage. Much criticism of outmoded or self-defeating tax schedules is heard. Many lines of production show progress; others like autos, show decline in exports. Eden does not appear to have the drive or punch which had been expected. His Cyprus policy considered unwise in many quarters, especially as to exile of the religious leader.

Switzerland: Prosperous, hardworking, progressive.

East Germany: Based on visits with East Germans I met in West Germany: Food supplies declining, controls and oppression increasing. Many people losing faith in liberation, in western leadership. One man said they are near the end of their hopes.

Antitrust Subcommittee Issues Staff Report Critical of Dixon-Yates Contract Maneuvers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me as acting chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in releasing the staff report on the Dixon-Yates contract.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As acting chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I am releasing a staff report which characterizes the Dixon-Yates contract as violating every concept of decent government and fair and impartial administration of applicable law.

The report emphasizes the role of the administration in encouraging and cooperating with private power interests to finance projects for the Tennessee Valley Authority and for other new power developments.

The document covers hearings held between June 27 and December 5, 1955, by a special subcommittee panel consisting of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, as chairman; myself; and Senator WILLIAM LANGER, Republican, North Dakota.

The report tells the story of the collapse of the Dixon-Yates maneuver, which is describes as the effort of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget to make a contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., a newly incorporated organization created as a subsidiary of two private utility holding companies, headed by Mr. Edgar H. Dixon and Mr. Eugene A. Yates. It was a contract to furnish electric energy, not primarily for the use of the Atomic Energy Commission, but rather to prevent the Tennessee Valley Authority from increasing its capacity to meet normal growth in the Tennessee Valley, and to accomplish this objective by special concessions on the part of the Government without notice to Congress.

After summarizing in detail all the circumstances involved, the report reaches this conclusion:

"The Dixon-Yates contract provides a dramatic case study of the waste, disorder, and confusion which inevitably surround governmental action which is calculated to serve big business interests rather than the public generally. From its very inception, Dixon-Yates was destined to end in public disgrace and disrepute. Its purpose was unwholesome; the methods used devious, and in carrying out the scheme every concept of decent government and fair and impartial administration of applicable law was ignored. Even a partial listing of the wreckage left strewn in the path of Dixon-Yates will demonstrate the damage that has been done.

"(a) The independent character of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was brought into serious question.

"(b) Officials of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission were placed in the position of having been persuaded to take legal positions which ran counter to precedent of many years standing.

"(c) The administration of law by SEC was brought into disrepute because of SEC's flagrant departures from accepted interpretations of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and its succumbing to pressures from higher authority emanating from the White House.

"(d) AEC was forced to execute and sponsor a contract which the Department of Justice has since asserted violated the Holding Company Act, the Atomic Energy Act, and the conflict of interest statutes."

The report presents a detailed analysis of a number of documents submitted to the subcommittee, following the last public hearing on December 5, by Rowland R. Hughes, then Director of the Budget. These documents, made public for the first time, "make clear that the policy of the Dixon-Yates sponsors of substituting private power for any new installations needed by TVA was forcing the Dixon-Yates contract against the objections of the career men at both the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget."

From a reading of the report, one is inevitably forced to conclude that Adolphe Wenzell, of the First Boston Corp., was sent to the Bureau of the Budget in 1953 to assist it with respect to a plan for eventually turning over to private power companies the attractive investment the American people have in the TVA. Through the guise of a power contract, our Government would have guaranteed very substantial profits with a minimum of private investment.

The report charges that "the administration forced the approval of the Dixon-Yates contract. Pressure of this magnitude must have been directed by the White House." The report presents "persuasive evidence" to support this conclusion.

The report notes that "there is no way that we can ascertain the full facts" because "the subcommittee has been completely blocked from getting to the bottom of the Dixon-Yates contract by the very men in the White House who were involved in these negotiations."

The report cites information leading to the conclusion that private-power officials, with the coming of the Eisenhower administration, had their eyes on power projects such as TVA and were thinking about how they could be taken over by private enterprise.

The report analyzes the evidence produced by the subcommittee "as a result of which the project was abandoned by order of the President and the Dixon-Yates group brought suit against the Government, which the Department of Justice is now resisting upon the ground that the contract was illegal, a conclusion which was presented to the committee by its staff early in the proceedings."

The report contains a legal opinion by the staff concluding that "the Dixon-Yates contract is void under section 434 of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code because of the fact that Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, an officer and director of the First Boston Corp., of which his wife was a stockholder, participated in the negotiations for the contract, although he was at one and the same time a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget and an officer of the First Boston Corp., one of the beneficiaries of the proposed proceeding, inasmuch as it was a financial corporation dealing in corporate securities."

The report also includes a chronology of all the events throughout the Dixon-Yates contract indicating "how incomplete and inaccurate were the releases to the press by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission."

Private Property Rights Inviolate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News Sentinel on July 26, 1956, entitled "Private Property Rights Inviolate."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS INVIOLATE

It is only to be expected that when a Communist country vanquishes another nation that the Communists would confiscate private property. That is one of the fundamental tenets of the Communist world conspiracy. It is in violent contrast to the traditional principles of western civilization. It is in particularly shocking conflict with our American concept of individual rights and freedom.

Recently News-Sentinel Foreign Correspondent John B. Crane, authored a challenging article on this subject. He cited the alarmingly growing tendency, since the war, of non-Communist countries to confiscate private property in such non-Communist countries, belonging to aliens. Cited particularly were the recent taking over of foreign properties by the Argentine Government, the confiscation of foreign-owned private property by the Guatemala Government, and the decision of the Austrian Government last year to retain private property of German citizens, confiscated after the war. Soundly, Mr. Crane's article declared that:

"Western civilization is based on the protection of the rights of individuals and private property, and will not succeed in its struggle with the Communist bloc, unless it vigorously and faithfully defends these rights."

Mr. Crane does not merely lament this increasingly alarming situation. His article also offers a remedy for it when it declares that:

"The Western World badly needs a special Magna Carta to protect private property

rights to help it win the struggle against communism."

The subject of the article in question is the alarm the author entertains over the most recent instances of non-Communist countries confiscating private property, which he enumerates.

Collaterally, incidentally, and logically, he examines the causative fatcors contributing to this increasing practice of flagrant disregard of private property in the non-Communist world today. In this connection he cites that:

"The refusal so far of the United States to return some $260 million worth of German private property in the United States confiscated during the war is not helping the Western world in its struggle against communism."

"On the contrary," the Crane article continues, "it is actually encouraging other nations to violate private property rights and engage in policies of confiscation. With American ctiizens having $25 billion (not million) invested abroad, it would be appropriate if America would take the lead in promoting a new international organization to work out effective devices for protecting private investments in foreign countries."

To this article by Crane, a New York lawyer, Victor C. Folsom, exercises his right to register strong objection in a letter to the editor, which we are pleased to publish on this page today. Mr. Folsom condones the retention by the United States of private property owned in this country by German citizens by the fact that "the United States agreed with allies and Germany to retain the seized property in lieu of reparations."

As a defeated nation Germany could scarcely do other than agree to whatever terms it was given by the victors. But entirely aside from that, the agreement to such retention of confiscated private property, by whatever regime might for the time be in control of the German Government, does not, in any moral sense at least, abrogate any of the inherent rights of private German citizens to title to their own private property situated in the United States. These private citizens were not parties to any such agreement. They did not renounce their private property rights, and that leaves the situation as a bald violation of private property rights.

Illustrating how callous our official thinking on such rights has become, Mr. Crane cites how Dulles Townsend, Director of the American Office of Alien Property, during hearings on a bill to return German properties in America to their owners, declared:

"You heard a lot of nonsense about the sanctity of property as such. As a matter of fact, property as such does not have any sanctity. Only the right to hold property is protected by the Constitution."

We are obliged to go along with Mr. Crane that "America, the leading country in the Western world in preaching individual freedom and private property rights, should practice what it preaches."

For individual private property rights are sacredly inviolate and cannot be morally or legally abrogated, except by the express uncoerced assent of the owner—not even by his own government.

One Man Speaks Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to say that, as a member of the special House Subcommittee on Merchant Marine Safety, I am able to report that the various charges contained in certain newspapers that the crew of the *Andrea Doria* panicked are false. My investigation shows that the crew of the *Andrea Doria*, as well as the crew of the *Stockholm*, covered themselves with glory and effected a miraculous rescue when the ships collided at sea not too long ago.

The people of Italy can be pround of the heroic crew of the *Andrea Doria* and its gallant captain in effecting one of the most miraculous sea rescues in history. The following editorial from the Newark Star Ledger, one of New Jersey's most distinguished newspapers, is on this point:

ONE MAN SPEAKS UP

New Jersey's Congressman T. JAMES TUMULTY is not a man to allow an injustice to stand unchalienged and he is to be commended for his insistence in having something to say about the crew of the *Andrea Doria*.

TUMULTY is one of the House committee investigating that sad affair and he rises to defend the men of the sunken liner. Passengers arriving soon after the sinking cried negligence but time has not bolstered their accusations.

On any large passenger ship there are a number of crews—on deck, in the engine room, and in the steward's department. All do not share equally the skills and traditions of the sea. Many a passenger is a better sailor than the cook, the pantryman, or the barber—yet all the service personnel are crew.

By rising to the defense of the men of the *Andrea Doria*, Representative TUMULTY helps keep the record straight. It would be most unfair to stigmatize an entire crew for the ineptness of a part of it. In the last analysis, the key fact is the great number of passengers saved.

Another Anti-Nixon Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in the Wednesday, July 25, 1956, issue of the Topeka Daily Capital, Topeka, Kans., speaks for itself. There is not much that one can add to the thought which is conceyed by this editorial. In my opinion the editorial sets forth the general consensus of opinion in the great State of Kansas.

The editorial follows:

ANOTHER ANTI-NIXON MOVE

Harold Stassen has joined the pack of political hounds barking at the heels of Vice President NIXON. This will encourage the Democrats who expect to concentrate their campaign fire on the Californian, who has the blessing of President Eisenhower.

The former Minnesota Governor is the President's special assistant on disarmament. He has been mentioned by the anti-NIXON crowd as a possible candidate for the vice presidential nomination. But the conservative Republicans would never stand for him, since he leans too far toward the left in his political thinking.

Just why Stassen, or anybody else, believes that replacing NIXON would strengthen the Republican chances of victory in November is an enigma to the average party member. NIXON is more popular with folks in general than Stassen, Herter, or any potential candidate.

It is understandable why the Democratic leadership hate DICK NIXON. He pulled no punches in the 1952 campaign when pointing out how the Truman regime tolerated, even encouraged, the employment in Government of persons known to be sympathizers, if not outright Communists.

Judge Harlan G. Palmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, July 27, 1956, I called the attention of my colleagues to the passing of Judge Harlan G. Palmer. His contribution to the community which I represent in Congress, the city of Los Angeles, entire State of California, and our country earned him the respect and admiration of all citizens.

His contribution went far beyond that of being editor and publisher of the Citizen News. He personally participated actively, day and night, in making our community a better place to live. Most folks, when they talk of Hollywood, speak of movie stars and the entertainment world. Judge Palmer was a vital part of this entertainment world, but, even more important, he was vitally interested in good, honest government and a clean, healthy city. His strong moral fiber served as a guiding light for me on many occasions. We shall miss him.

Judge Palmer had been a resident of Los Angeles for the last 45 years, all of which were spent as a newspaper publisher and active participant in the civic life of the city.

A drafted candidate for district attorney to oppose underworld forces in 1936, he received 48½ percent of the total votes cast, although he had not actively sought election.

In 1929 Judge Palmer was appointed to the Los Angeles Board of Water and Power Commissioners. This was at a time when contracts were being drawn between the southland and the United States Government for water and power from Hoover Dam.

As the commission's delegate chosen to achieve peace with the citizens of Owens Valley, his services were hailed as invaluable.

He later served without compensation as special attorney for the city council in an investigation of the water and power department.

Again, without fee, he successfully represented Dr. John P. Buckley, foreman of the 1934 county grand jury, in a libel action brought because of a report the grand jury had prepared against the county purchasing department.

Hollywood's first practicing attorney, Judge Palmer was appointed in 1915 as 1 of the 6 judges of the Los Angeles Jus-

tice Court, forerunner of the present municipal court system.

He was born in Le Roy, Minn., March 19, 1885. He received his elementary and high school education in his hometown, later attending the University of Minnesota, College of Liberal Arts, and the University of Southern California, College of Law.

During his boyhood, he worked at such jobs as driving the neighbors' cows to pasture, pulling mustard out of oatfields, and picking up potatoes after the plow. Judge Palmer's father was a lumber and coal merchant, so his early duties also included shoveling coal out of flatcars and piling lumber.

At the age of 14, he went to work in a country general merchandise store in the afternoons after school, on Saturdays, and during the summer vacation months. During the summer, the hours were from 6:30 a. m. until 10 p. m. on the first 5 days of the week and on Saturday nights until the last farmer had left town some time between midnight and 1 a. m.

When he graduated from high school, he was offered the management of a similar store in another country town 8 miles distant.

But Mr. Palmer had decided to go to university and start a 6-year law course. He worked his way through 2 years of university by carrying a morning newspaper route, working as a janitor and printer's devil in a printshop, waiting table in a nearby restaurant, and working full time during summer vacations.

At the start of his third college year, he was given the opportunity to purchase his hometown newspaper, the Le Roy Independent. The idea appealed to him and he hoped to earn enough to insure the completion of his education at a later date.

Judge Palmer published the paper for a little better than 2 years when his father was ordered to California for his health. The young publisher sold his paper and went into his father's retail lumber and coal business. Three years later, in 1911, came the decision to sell out and join the rest of his family in California.

During his 5 years as a businessman in Le Roy, he was an unsuccessful candidate for Represenative, 1908, and State senator, 1910.

After his arrival in Pasadena, he looked for a business that he might operate while going to law school.

At the suggestion of Dr. E. O. Palmer, a second cousin in Hollywood, he bought a small weekly newspaper, the Hollywood Citizen. He took possession of the Citizen on April 1, 1911, starting operations with 1 printer and 1 half-time reporter.

During the fall of 1911, he entered law school at the University of Southern California, attending classes during the late afternoon and at night. In 1913, after a year and a half of schooling, Mr. Palmer passed the State bar examination and opened the first law office in Hollywood.

The next year he was named president of the Southern California Editorial Association, the forerunner of the present California Newspaper Publishers Association. He served as president of the SCEA for 3 years, later serving as legal adviser to the CNPA for many years.

In April of 1915, Mr. Palmer was married to Ethelyn Hunkins, formerly of Minneapolis. Later the same year, the supervisors appointed him judge of the Los Angeles justice court, the forerunner of the present municipal court. He was reelected to a 4-year term in 1918.

In the latter part of 1920, the Citizen started construction of a four-story concrete building at Hollywood Boulevard and Cosmo. This project, coupled with the conversion of the weekly to a daily, forced Judge Palmer to resign from the court and devote full time to his business.

The Citizen began daily publication on October 1, 1921. Ten years later the Citizen purchased the Hollywood News and became known as the Citizen News.

In recent years, Judge Palmer served as a director of the Audit Bureau of Circulations, representing as such all newspapers in the mountain and Pacific time zones.

At the time of his death, he also was serving as a director of the Hollywood Chamber of Commerce.

He had been a past president of the Hollywood Business Men's Club, and a member of the Hollywood Round Table, Hollywood Masonic Lodge, Los Angeles City Club, Los Angeles Municipal League, Los Angeles Advertising Club, Malibu Lake Mountain Club, Los Angeles and Hollywood athletic clubs, and Wilshire Country Club.

His membership in the Los Angeles City Club had been presented for life, in recognition of his management of the club's membership campaign in 1920, which increased membership from 300 to 2,000 and enabled the club to obtain its own permanent quarters.

Judge Palmer is survived by his wife, Ethelyn H.; his children, Harlan, Jr., Byron, Ralph, and Peggy; 2 brothers, Judge William J., and Orlando T., and his sister Zuma, and 9 grandchildren.

The following first-person résumé of Judge Harlan G. Palmer's career was written in 1950 for inclusion in the Citizen-News' 50 years of progress edition, commemorating Hollywood's golden anniversary:

I wish that it might have been my privilege to have been connected with the entire history of the Hollywood Citizen and the Hollywood Citizen-News. However, I am grateful for the nearly 40 years that I have been associated with these publications.

I came to California from Minnesota in January of 1911. For 5 years my college education had been interrupted. Two years had been spent as publisher, editor, reporter, and typesetter of a country weekly at Le Roy, Minn. Three years had been spent in the retail lumber and coal business that my father had been obliged to abandon when sickness overtook him and he moved from Le Roy to Pasadena.

I had started at the University of Minnesota with a course that offered a bachelor of arts degree and a bachelor of laws degree upon completion of 6 years of work, 3 in the liberal arts college and 3 in the law school.

I had returned several weeks late for the start of my third year at the university in 1905. I was grappling with the problems of making up for the lost period, working 3 hours a day in a restaurant, and playing basketball, when a letter came from my father with the information that the publisher of the hometown paper at Le Roy had come to him with the proposal that I buy the paper as he had bought a larger newspaper elsewhere.

COULD SWEEP FLOOR

The publisher had convinced my father that I could operate the business. I knew how to do janitor work in a printing office, having worked the previous year from 4 to 7 each morning in sweeping the floors, cleaning linotype machine space bands and melting linotype metal in a Minneapolis commercial printing plant located near the university.

I was not qualified as a writer. My father had promised me $10 for the first letter I should write home that was free from spelling and grammatical errors. Two years of higher education had not equipped me to earn the award which to both my father and me represented a magnificent sum. (At jobs I could get in those days my earnings were 15 cents an hour.)

But the country-editor idea appealed to me nonetheless. I thought that I might make enough from the undertaking in a couple of years to insure the comfortable completion of a college education at a later date.

The price of the newspaper business was $2,150. How the seller happened to put that extra $150 onto the price I know not, but $150 happened to be just the amount of money I had saved up from a summer's work on farms. My father went on my note at the bank for $2,000 and I was in business.

LEARNING TO SET TYPE

My first job was to learn how to set type since all the reading matter in the paper was handset. I had to learn fast in order to get out the paper. In a few weeks I was setting as much type as the best printers set. My one printer set the ads and took charge of the job printing. I learned quickly to feed the job press and the larger press which printed 4 pages of the newspaper at 1 time. My young brother, Bill (now a Los Angeles County Superior Court judge) helped in his spare time from high school.

I gathered most of the local news items by running to the two depots when I heard incoming passenger trains whistle for town. I seldom had to ask questions. I knew everyone in town and could safely guess where the most of them were going or whence they were coming. In those days, train travel was the means for going more than 10 miles. The horse and buggy or sleigh served on the short trips.

I seldom took time to write the local news. I just got up on the stool at the type case and put the story in type.

OUT OF DEBT

I got the paper paid for in 2 years and was considering its sale and my return to college with the money in my jeans when my father was stricken and the doctor ordered him to go to California. The only way we could get him to break from home ties, from all his friends, and from the source of a modest livelihood was for me to step into his shoes in the lumber and coal business.

There wasn't much activity in lumber during the winter months so I started the study of a correspondence course in law.

When my father was finally convinced that I might run a small business in California as well as one in the hometown, he consented to the sale of his partnership interest. Then I came to Pasadena and began a search for a business that I might run while going to law school.

Finding such a business began to look hopeless until one day I came across a classified advertisement for the sale of the Whittier newspaper. I believed that I could manage such a publication. The streetcar service was such, I figured, that I could commute daily between Whittier and the USC Law School, then located at First and Broadway. I was keen for buying it.

SEEKING ADVICE

My cautious father then said: "You have a second cousin over in Hollywood, Dr. E. O. Palmer, who has been in southern California for 10 years, is connected with a bank, and is posted on business matters. You better go over and ask him what he thinks of the Whittier proposition."

I went to over to see Dr. Palmer. In substance I got this comment: "You don't want Whittier. Hollywood has a bigger future than Whittier has. Though Whittier has a daily newspaper today and Hollywood has only a weekly newspaper, one of these days Hollywood will outdistance Whittier. I know that you can buy the Hollywood newspaper at a good price. The man who bought both the Hollywood Citizen and the Hollywood Sentinel 2 months ago is sick of his bargain and ready to sell."

Since Hollywood was closer to law school and the demands of a weekly less than the demands of a daily, and since I didn't know that Dr. Palmer had a mortgage on the Hollywood Citizen, I took his advice. For several years, I blamed myself for doing so but in the course of time reached the conclusion that the advice had been good.

ORIGIN IN 1900

I took possession of the consolidated Hollywood Citizen and Hollywood Sentinel on April 1, 1911. The name of the Sentinel had been dropped in the consolidation. The Citizen was exactly 6 years old on April 1, 1911. The Sentinel was 5 years older, having been started in January 1900.

Before the consolidation the Sentinel had been the champion of the Highland Avenue and end of Hollywood Boulevard. The Citizen had been the champion of the Cahuenga Boulevard end. Each of those two ends had considered itself a rival of the other.

It was my job to overlook the past and to see the two ends as growing together.

THE VISIONAIRES

During the first week of my activities as Hollywood publisher I attended a meeting of the Hollywood Board of Trade and heard a discussion of the future of the boulevard. One man was bold enough to predict that eventually there would be solid business between Highland and Cahuenga. Most of the members of the board differed from the optimist but they finally settled on the vision of solid business on the south side of the boulevard between Highland and Cahuenga and apartment houses on the north side. None visualized any development at Vine Street and Hollywood Boulevard, where the Jacob Sterns home was located at the center of a 4-acre orange grove.

At the time of my advent it seemed to me that there could be no finer residential area in the world than was Hollywood. As I think back upon those days, when beautiful homes and gardens lined the boulevard, I am convinced that this was a correct conclusion. To me, coming from a small country town, it was like a dream.

And the people were such wonderful folks. Most of the prominent residents had their businesses in downtown Los Angeles. When all got together in Hollywood they had the common interest of maintaining a beautiful residential district.

The post office was located alongside the Citizen office on Cahuenga just south of Hollywood Boulevard. The morning greetings as folks came for their mail were bright spots in the day.

I sarted off with one printer and one half-time reporter. That reporter was Mabelle Lewis, now Mrs. Ward Heinzman, who was recommended to me as the person who knew the history of every woman and man in Hollywood. She never let any local news escape her.

The front section of the building, in which we housed our printing equipment and editorial desk, was occupied by an ice-cream parlor.

It was that ice cream parlor that led to my falling into the notion that Ethelyn Hunkins was the most exciting girl I ever met. She migrated with her parents from Minneapolis a year after I had arrived. Her father, W. S. Hunkins, looked around for former Minnesotans and made my acquaintance. Thereafter, the daughter came to the ice-cream parlor as an excuse for looking me over. We've been married over 35 years now.

IN LAW SCHOOL

I started in law school in the fall of 1911. It was tough going. I went into school for an early morning class and then back for a late afternoon class, until pressure became so great I switched all classes to late afternoon and night.

In those early days there was no place in Hollywood where a person could buy a large envelope or a sheet of cardboard or blotting paper, except at the printing office. Every time a customer came in for such stationery supplies, a printer would have to leave his work, wash his hands, and deliver a few cents worth of merchandise while losing a greater amount of money in the value of the time taken from mechanical work.

I finally decided to take over the space occupied by the ice cream parlor, install some shelves for stocking the called for stationery supplies, employ a girl to keep the books and wait on newspaper and stationery trade. That's how the Citizen Stationery Store got its start.

LAWYER AND JUDGE

Our business grew slowly. I passed the State bar examination, after a year and a half of schooling and 6 weeks of special cramming of the bar examination, and opened the first law office to be opened in Hollywood. There were a number of successful laywers living in Hollywood at the time but their offices were in downtown Los Angeles.

We moved to two storerooms on Hollywood Boulevard, between Wilcox and Cahuenga, used part of the space for a law office, part for the stationery store, rented a part for real-estate offices, and used the entire basement for printing machinery and stock.

I had always figured that when I got a law business established I would sell the newspaper. But in October of 1915, the supervisors made 2 appointments to fill 2 offices additional to 4 in the court when designated as the Justice court of Los Angeles Township and since consolidated with the Los Angeles police courts into the Los Angeles Municipal Court. One of the appointments was given to me.

I had an idea, regardless of qualifications, I wouldn't have gotten the appointment if most of the weekly newspapers of the county had not favored it. I was then president of the Southern California Editorial Association, the forerunner of the present California Newspaper Publishers Association. I decided that being both a lawyer and a newspaperman wasn't a bad idea.

GETTING IN DEEP

In the latter part of 1920 we undertook the construction at 6362 Hollywood Boulevard, of a four-story concrete store, office, and newspaper building. The site had formerly been occupied by the freight yard and depot of the Pacific Electric. The undertaking took on what to us were large responsibilities. I decided that I owed it to the folks who had loaned the money for the building to resign from the court job and devote my full time to business. I had enjoyed the 5 years on the bench but circumstances forced me to quit. The complimentary title of "Judge" clung long after the resignation.

WEEKLY TO DAILY

On October 1, 1921, 10½ years after acquiring the weekly newspaper, we changed it into the Hollywood Daily Citizen. We didn't care to do it at that time for the new building wasn't completed and we had no press capable of handling the daily. But the owner of the Los Angeles Express was setting up an extensive plant for the publication beginning November 1 of a new daily, the Hollywood News, to be circulated free with the Express.

For a period we had to have our presswork done at Glendale or in Santa Monica. The experience was trying when the type forms broke or other accidents happened en route to the presses. We got our own press installed in the new building before the building was completed but when the basement was covered. We slid the type forms into the basement on skids. Only the most loyal group of subscribers and advertisers in the world could have carried us over those trying days.

Ten years to a day after the start of the Hollywood News, November 1, 1931, in the midst of the depression, it was purchased by the Hollywood Citizen on an installment plan that held over our heads for a period of 12 years the possibility of our losing everything.

STILL ALIVE

When we launched the Daily Citizen, experienced newspapermen predicted failure. When we purchased the Hollywood News experienced newspapermen again predicted failure. They are still predicting failure. They say that a daily newspaper cannot be successfully operated in one section of a big city. They are doubtless right.

We merely believe that our job is to keep on going so long as conditions permit and be very thankful for the years we have been permitted to stay in business and to make our contributions to the cause of good journalism and to the cause of better government in the city, the county, and the State.

Reduced Airline Rates to Clergymen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me from Mr. James B. Hoge, vice chairman of the Interchurch Transportation Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTERCHURCH TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE,
Chicago, Ill., July 26, 1956.

The Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: We are informed that Senator MAGNUSON's bill, S. 3149, has passed the Senate and the House and is on the President's desk for signature. Everyone to whom we have talked feels that the President will sign the bill.

S. 3149, as you know, allows airlines to grant reduced rates to clergymen on a space-available basis under regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

This is a culmination of many years' work on your part. We all recall the fact that on

July 4, 1952, you got a similar bill through the Senate with a large number of co-sponsors. Unfortunately, the House did not act that year or in succeeding years.

This bill should be of considerable value to the religious, charitable, educational, missionary, and other work of the churches of America, and also to the airlines themselves through considerably increased business.

All of us send our thanks and best wishes for your long-continued and gracious help to our committee.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES B. HOGE,
Vice Chairman.

The St. Lawrence Seaway Will Bring a New Era of Prosperity to Detroit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the dream of a deep-draft route from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean is on the way to becoming a reality. We in Michigan and the surrounding area have fought for many long years to achieve access to world ports.

It is most fitting and proper that the Great Lakes region, wherein is concentrated a tremendous agricultural and industrial capacity, have available the transportation necessary to market this vast production.

With the coming of the St. Lawrence seaway, access to all of the seaports of the world by deep-draft ships is made possible. This low-cost water transportation route will be an important factor in the ability to sell and meet competition in the markets of the world where the products of the Great Lakes area must compete with those produced by low-priced labor in other countries.

The Middle West will be freed from the necessity of paying tribute to higher cost forms of transportation to the seaboard. It will be free from the pilferage so common to the seaboard ports, and their high-cost shipping services.

What is said of all of the Great Lakes ports is true, with added emphasis, of Detroit. The products of Detroit and the surrounding area are of a general type peculiarly adapted to water transportation. A larger proportion of its products are of the heavy, large bulk type which offers greater opportunity for savings in transportation costs by cutting down on the number of times it must be handled. Direct loading at shipside and unloading at destination from vessels which are able to make the entire trip and complete delivery will save Detroit's industries millions of dollars annually.

The Motor City is already the greatest single producing center for foreign cargo in the United States. It thus stands to gain much by use of the St. Lawrence seaway. Not only will its competitive position be improved by savings in transportation costs but there is a possibility of further savings in lower costs for much of its raw materials, particularly those which must come from overseas.

Much of Detroit's industry is based on utilization of metals. The coming of the Seaway has fortunately coincided with an increasing dependence upon foreign sources for iron ore and other minerals. The availability of the seaway will for all time put a stopper to the long-dreaded possibility of the steel industry having to migrate to the seacoast. This might have taken place as the direct-shipping high quality iron ores of the Mesabi range became depleted. The industry must, of course, have easy access and at lowest possible transportation cost, to the raw materials required. It would have had little choice other than to move closer to these sources. In that event, Detroit would have been placed in a precarious position. Its metal fabricating industries would then have to choose between following steel's example or paying the penalty of greatly increased transportation costs. Fortunately, that possibility will be banished forever when the St. Lawrence seaway is open to traffic in 1959.

With the steady increase in recent years of availability of overseas shipping services via the present shallow canals, such commerce in Detroit has increased rapidly. In the last 10 years services offered by small freighters carrying general cargo have increased from a handful of vessels and a few hundred tons to nearly 400 vessel arrivals and over 97,000 tons of cargo in 1955. The Port Commission of Detroit estimates that this will increase tenfold in the first 10 years following the opening of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Already in anticipation of increased offerings for shipping by water, several railroads and trucking firms are preparing special export-import rates to lake ports. Since Detroit is one of the best situated cities in the world so far as inland transport is concerned, the breadth and extent of such services will expand as time goes on.

The business of freight forwarders, freight agents, and other accessories of commerce such as banking, marine insurance, warehousing, and the other manifold servants of foreign commerce will all expand considerably—thereby creating thousands of new jobs.

All of these elements add up to more efficient handling of a trade that is certain to expand rapidly when the Seaway makes it all possible.

Detroit, over the years, has built up a well-deserved reputation for fast and efficient cargo handling. When this is made available to shippers from overseas seeking to reach the rich midwestern market, it will be a great inducement to increased commerce which cannot help but have an almost immediate impact on the volume of general cargoes.

It is fortunate that Detroit has an alert port commission which is aware of the potential value of general cargo. I am sure that when the seaway is completed, Detroit will have available the public, general cargo facilities that will be needed. It is my understanding that $15 million is being spent to provide 10 new berths especially designed to handle up to 1 million tons of foreign commerce. So it now appears that Detroit will be prepared.

Another result of the seaway in Detroit undoubtedly will be the establishment of new industries. They will choose this location because their market is here, and their raw materials will reach them cheaply and directly by water. They will be able to take advantage of all the varied mercantile services available in such a highly industrialized area as Detroit.

An authority in the field envisages Detroit as an important export center for packaged food products moving to northern Europe from as far south as St. Louis and as far west as Davenport, Iowa. It is quite likely that cargoes like furniture from Grand Rapids, chemicals from Midland and Wyandotte and farm machinery from Battle Creek will reach points all over the world through the Detroit gateway and the St. Lawrence.

It has been estimated that 1 million tons of foreign trade through Detroit's port would save shippers up to $14 million per year in transportation costs over present methods of shipping.

Present users of the shallow St. Lawrence canals are planning to expand their use of the route when the 27-foot channel becomes available.

All in all, it is a pleasant prospect to contemplate. Detroit and its citizens will be the major beneficiaries of the St. Lawrence seaway. It will require some positive effort, some salesmanship, imagination, and cooperation to make the most of it. Fortunately, those are characteristics that have long been identified with Detroit and its dynamic producers of the past two generations. The new generation now has an opportunity to extend its horizons. If the past is any indication, then Detroit is all set for a new and even more prosperous era, spurred by the coming of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Aaron Riche

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 10, 1956, the Los Angeles Jewish community honored Aaron Riche for his 50 years in B'nai B'rith in the Embassy Room of the Hotel Ambassador in Los Angeles, Calif.

Testimonial resolution plaques from both the city council and the county board of supervisors were also presented to Riche at the banquet.

A native of Colorado, Riche joined B'nai B'rith Denver Lodge in 1906. He was a newspaper reporter and editor in Denver and in New York City, and did publicity and public relations work in both those cities and in Los Angeles. He came to Los Angeles in 1924.

In addition to the United States Treasury Medal, he holds citations from the Red Cross, Jewish Welfare Board, Zionist Organization, Mount Sinai Hospital, Bonds of Israel Government, Key Men of the Welfare Fund, California Safety Council, United Jewish Appeal, United States Savings Bond Campaign and the Jewish National Fund.

The city's citation, which was in the form of a framed plaque, was presented by Fifth District Councilwoman Rosalind Wiener Wyman.

Joe Herman, Jr., was chairman of sponsors for the testimonial.

Report to the People of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan by Congressman John D. Dingell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, now that the second session of the 84th Congress has become history, I am making a report to my people of the 15th Congressional District of Michigan on my stewardship and program in this 84th Congress.

I was first elected to Congress by a special election held December 13, 1955, to fill a vacancy left by the death of my late father, Congressman John D. Dingell, who represented this district for 23 years from its founding until his death.

I have served my constituents on the Public Works Committee, where I helped frame the great Federal Highway Construction Act passed by this Congress. It was as a member of that committee that I joined other liberals in the successful fight for the so-called Bacon-Davis amendment which guarantees that the prevailing fair wage in the area be paid on any highway construction project in which Federal funds are used.

I am also a member of that committee's Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors and have worked to help secure a number of important harbor improvement projects in the Great Lakes areas.

I maintain an office in the district, to serve my constituents, located at 7310 Grand River Avenue, Detroit, staffed by my able legislative assistant, Mr. Charles S. Brown, and Mrs. Theresa Tabin, my secretary in the district.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

SOCIAL SECURITY

I have worked on a number of legislative projects including the improvement of the social security program by reduction of age requirements for men and women, increase in benefit schedules, free hospitalization for all recipients of social security benefits, and by extending permanent disability benefits to persons covered by social security at any age. I supported the improvements in the social security amendments passed by this session of Congress, and authored a number of bills on these and other related subjects.

TAXATION

During this session I introduced bills which provided for tax relief for low-income groups and small business. Under my program these things could have been accomplished by a revision of existing laws to close tax loopholes and by increasing individual exemptions from $600 to $700. Tax relief of $80 to $120 per year to an average family of four with an income of $5,000 per year would have been possible, together with a balanced budget and reduction of the national debt.

I also introduced a bill to revise corporate tax rates to permit fairer treatment of small firms by revising taxes to benefit small business. This would be accomplished by raising taxes slightly on large firms on a graduated scale. This bill was aimed not only at helping small business, but also at preventing the mergers which are leading our country to economic rule by huge corporate giants.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Shortly after coming to Congress I introduced a series of bills aimed at guaranteeing to all Americans the full exercise of the rights given them by the Constitution and laws of the United States. The most comprehensive of these, H. R. 8989, outlawed discrimination in public facilities, transportation and housing, and provided for protection of citizens from violence and lynching. These bills would also protect citizens in their right to vote, create a Commission on Civil Rights, and establish a Civil Rights Division within the Department of Justice with broad enforcement powers.

I was among the sponsors of H. R. 627, the civil-rights bill of 1956, and was one of the leaders in the small group who filed the discharge petition that brought the matter to the floor of the House for debate and passage.

IMMIGRATION

I joined in the sponsorship of an omnibus immigration bill eliminating discriminatory immigration quotas, and removing inequities in the present McCarran-Walter Act. I also introduced bills to extend the Displaced Persons Act and permit 45,000 more displaced persons, including orphans, to enter this country. These bills also eliminate the mortgage imposed on quotas of immigrants and help persons in need of reguge to find haven in the United States.

EDUCATION AND HOUSING

I supported the Federal aid-to-education bill which would have provided for over $4 billion in Federal aid for construction of schools. I voted for the Federal housing bill which passed both the House and Senate and which will provide for liberalized home-improvement loans under title I and the continuation of the liberal FHA loan guaranty provisions for purchase and construction of homes.

Mr. Speaker, this is a part of my stewardship to the people of my district and my legislative action on their behalf during this 84th Congress.

It is my sincere hope that future sessions will see the completion of this program, and it is my prayer that my humble efforts will contribute to bring it about.

Conservation Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 84th Congress shows that it was one of the most conservation-minded assemblies ever to grace these halls. Natural resources management has been a legislative subject of major importance. And the record is one that we can take proudly to the American people. New and constructive conservation laws were written into the statute books. Beyond that, by its alertness, the 84th Congress was able to ferret out and to expose the giveaway policies of the Republican administration—an administration which believes natural resources should be granted, leased, reserved, and exploited for the profit of the privileged few rather than conserved and wisely used for the benefit of all the people. Mr. Speaker, we were able to stop some of the giveaways dead in their tracks. Some we slowed down, but some are still going on.

But back to the conservation record of the 84th Congress. Here are some of the positive achievements:

First. We adopted a soil-bank law which, if properly administered, will save and build up the Nation's soil, water, timber, and wildlife resources while cutting down the troublesome crop surpluses. I am proud to say that, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I had some part in the shaping and final passage of this important and far-reaching legislation.

Second. Amended the Small Watershed Act of 1954 in order to broaden its purposes, slash through the redtape and speed up the work. Now a watershed project can include municipal water supply, stream-flow regulation, wildlife conservation, recreation, and other benefits as well as flood prevention and agricultural purposes. A watershed is not merely an area of land and water, the drainage basin of a stream. It also is a community of human beings, and usually includes towns and cities as well as farmers. All of these people are dependent upon the resources of the watershed for their health, wealth, and security, and none of the opportunities for wise use of those resources must be overlooked or neglected.

Perhaps the major improvement written into the Watershed Act by the 84th Congress was that all the costs allocable to flood control shall be paid for by the Federal Government. This is in line with long-established policies laid down by the Congress in connection with flood-control projects of the Corps of Engi-

neers. It is recognized that flood-control benefits accrue to the economy of the whole Nation, and therefore the Federal Government has paid for them.

The local sponsoring watershed district or organization and the landowners will share the costs of land-treatment measures and of water storage and utilization for farming purposes, as before. For some of the other community benefits which may now be included in a watershed project, such as impoundment of municipal water supply, will be paid for by the local interests. This bill will be of great benefit to my district, the Ninth District of Wisconsin.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, to help formulate and support the amendments which have broadened and liberalized the watersheds conservation program.

Third. This Congress adopted a new water-pollution control law with teeth, and for the first time in history appropriated enough money to start a first-class pollution-abatement program. While I was not the first Member of this Congress to introduce pollution-control legislation, I was the first to sponsor a bill containing authorization of incentive loans and grants designed to speed up the construction of sewage-treatment plants. This was the key new feature of the improved Blatnik bill that finally became law. The legislation sponsored by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] and by the Committee on Public Works, sets up a program of $50 million per year and a total of $500 million over a period of years for grants to municipalities that are hard-pressed to finance sewage-treatment works. It also authorizes $3 million annually in grants to State water agencies to help them build and strengthen the State pollution-control programs.

The new law also gives the United States Public Health Service a better tool with which to clean up stubborn cases of pollution in interstate waters. Now the Federal Government can instigate abatement proceedings without first securing the consent of the State where the pollution originates; this was a fatal weakness of the old law.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a pollution-control law on the Federal books since 1948, but Congress never before appropriated enough money to fulfill its authorizations. To the everlasting credit of the 84th Congress, we not only passed the law, we appropriated the necessary funds. We voted the full $50 million for the construction grants, $2 million for grants to State and interstate agencies, and $1 million for administration and enforcement. If I am privileged to be a Member of the 85th Congress, Mr. Speaker, I shall work to increase the State grants appropriation to the full $3 million, and I shall advocate more money for research and enforcement.

Fourth. We passed legislation to stop raids on, and despoilation of, the national forests and other public lands through abuses of the outmoded mining law of 1872. Public Law 167 of the 84th Congress, 1st session, probably will go down in history as our outstanding contribution to the management of the public lands. It does not go quite far enough, however. It is still possible for an administration devoted to special privilege to give away fabulous timber resources under pretext of granting a mining claim, as occurred in the notorious Al Sarena case in Oregon. I shall discuss this case later in more detail.

Fifth. We appropriated funds to start mission 66 for the national parks. This is a 10-year program of rehabilitation and improvement of our great national park system. If subsequent Congresses follow through, the parks will be safeguarded and equipped to accommodate the 80 million visitors annually which are anticipated by 1966.

Sixth. Of special interest to sportsmen, we passed legislation to release $13½ million of Federal-aid wildlife funds that had been tied up in the Federal Treasury for 10 years. This is money paid into the Treasury by sportsmen through an excise tax on their guns and ammunition. It was earmarked for Federal aid to the States in game-restoration projects. The $13½ million accumulated during the war years when the States could not use the full annual receipts under the Pittman-Robertson Act. But once accumulated in the Treasury, it took special legislation to release the unappropriated surplus for its intended purpose. It is a good thing this Congress acted, Mr. Speaker, because the administration budget balancers had their eye on that chunk of the sportsmen's money. They wanted to use it for other purposes so they could brag on an economy record.

Seventh. We enacted a bill to assist distressed segments of the commercial fishing industry and at the same time to elevate and strengthen the whole fish and wildlife program in the Department of the Interior. Key accomplishment here was the creation of an Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish and Wildlife. In the past, wildlife interests have often been overlooked in bureaucratic competition for the attention of an Assistant Secretary who handled all public land matters.

In amending and then passing S. 3275, Mr. Speaker, we also headed off an ill-advised drive by commercial fishing interests to dismember the Fish and Wildlife Service and to put recreational fishing under the domination of a commercial-minded commission. We insisted upon the sound principle that fish and wildlife are related resources that, for true conservation, must be administered and coordinated in a single agency.

Eighth. We authorized far-reaching reclamation power and flood-control programs, including such major developments as the upper Colorado storage project.

The foregoing were the major positive achievements in the field of natural resources management. There were other momentous, and some small, conservation victories. A grave threat to the national park system was eliminated when Congress rejected an adminstration proposal to build Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. This not only would have despoiled one of the grandest areas of wild canyon country in the national park system, it would have established a precedent that would have made it virtually impossible to resist similar invasions of other national parks.

Among other lesser, but by no means unimportant, conservation enactments was the bill implementing the Great Lakes Fisheries Treaty with Canada, the major objective of which is control of the destructive sea lamprey, and a measure authorizing acquisition of private holdings within the famous Quetico-Superior wilderness canoe country of the Superior National Forest in Minnesota.

A great deal of time was spent investigating and exposing the giveaway policies of the Republican administration. The name Al Sarena became notorious as it was disclosed how lieutenants of "generous Doug McKay" resorted to highly unorthodox methods to overrule career conservationists in the Forest Service and approved dubious mining claims in the Rogue River National Forest in Oregon. As a result of this giveaway, documented carefully by the Public Works and Resources Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations in House Report No. 2408, Al Sarena Mines, Inc., secured title to 475 acres of highly valuable timber. While Al Sarena company has taken practically no minerals from the area, it has been mining rich stands of timber estimated in value at more than $500,000.

Investigations by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries disclosed the machinations of another McKay-sanctioned giveaway, this one gravely endangering the national wildlife refuges.

On August 31, 1953, Secretary McKay announced a stop order suspending action on applications for oil and gas leases on national wildlife refuge lands while the Department worked out new regulations for such leasing. Some 27 months later, on December 2, 1955, Secretary McKay announced and published the new regulations and it was immediately apparent that, while pretending to protect the wildlife values, they amounted to little more than an outright invitation to the oil and gas operators. Conservationists both within and outside of Congress protested and the Commmittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries started an investigation of this peculiar situation. Among other startling facts it was disclosed that during the 27 months of the so-called stop order, more than 550 leases were granted on wildlife lands. While the general public assumed the door was closed to oil exploitation in the wildlife refuges, a favored group of operators and manipulators were sneaking in the back door of the Department of the Interior and sneaking out again with oil leases in their pockets. When is a stop order not a stop order?

During all the years since Congress passed the Mineral Leasing Act in 1920, only 11 oil leases had been granted on national wildlife refuges until Mr. McKay's stop order went into effect.

As for the new regulations promulgated by the McKay administration, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee issued a highly critical report which was approved unanimously by Re-

publicans and Democrats alike—House Report No. 1941. The committee had this to say:

The new regulations fall far short of providing the degree of protection to the refuges which the activities of recent years prove to be necessary. Superficially these regulations appear to give a veto power to the Fish and Wildlife Service. However, under applicable laws, oil and gas leasing in wildlife lands is a matter solely within the discretion of the Secretary of Interior. Consequently, the veto power exists only so long as, and to the extent that, the Secretary permits the regulations to control.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, the danger of raids on the National Wildlife Refuges remains with us. The hearings and the forthright report of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee undoubtedly slowed down the oil exploiters, but they are not enough to stop them. The pressures for mining and grazing privileges, for homesteading on some of the western wildlife refuges, for transfer of lands to the military departments, and for other exploitive uses, continue to threaten our wildlife resources. In my opinion, it will be necessary for the Congress to enact some kind of protective legislation for the Wildlife Refuges, erecting the same kind of legal safeguards that now keep the raiders out of the National Parks.

Still another kind of giveaway has recently come to light, this one affecting and restricting the opportunities of the taxpaying public to enjoy recreation on Federal reservoirs that their money helps to build. It started with a new joint land acquisition policy agreed to by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Interior, and said to have originated in orders from the White House shortly after the Eisenhower administration took over. The new policy, approved January 13, 1954, and published in the Federal Register as Order No. 2744, provides that the Corps of Engineers or Bureau of Reclamation, in building flood control, power or irrigation reservoirs, shall acquire in fee title only the bare minimum of land needed for construction purposes. Much of the area may be only partially controlled through flowage easements, and most of the shorelines are to remain in private ownership. The effect of this policy is to sacrifice opportunities for fish and wildlife development, which requires the management of shoreline areas, and to restrict public access for recreational purposes. On the other hand, this policy favors the few—usually real estate speculators—who manage to get their hands on the shoreline areas and can cash in on commercial developments.

Now the joint land acquisition policy of January 13, 1954, is being applied retroactively to Federal reservoirs started before that date. Several bills have come before this Congress with administration backing, proposing to sell reservoir lands back to the former owners at a special low price that fails to take into consideration the greatly increased values resulting from the expenditure of public funds. Once again, in most cases, it will not be the former owner who benefits, but the real estate manipulator who had "inside information" and has managed to corner the options.

Mr. Speaker, the special-privilege land acquisition policy at Federal reservoirs has got to be changed in the public interests. This is another task left over for the 85th Congress.

In conclusion, I want to comment briefly on the biggest giveaway among all the giveaways of the Eisenhower administration. I refer to the gift to favored private power combines of the Nation's finest remaining public power sites. At the same time, the administration has tried to hamstring, if not destroy, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Rural Electrification Administration, and other agencies created by Congress in the past for the purpose of extending the blessings of electric power at reasonable rates to all of the people in all parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the fact that this Congress would not stand for it, TVA and REA would be in bad shape today.

Under the whiplash of the White House and the private power lobby, working together like a well-oiled team, the Senate voted down a bill to authorize a great Government dam on the Snake River in Oregon and Idaho. Hells Canyon is the finest public power site remaining in the land. The Republican administration has given it away to a private power combine which, under Federal Power Commission license, will build 2 or 3 little dams accomplishing only part of the tremendous power and water-storage potential of the Hells Canyon site. The balance of the Hells Canyon potential, unless this giveaway is reversed, will be lost to the public forever.

No, Mr. Speaker, we may have slowed down, but we have by no means stopped all of the giveaways of the Republican administration. It takes time to ferret them out, time to overcome and defeat the well-heeled lobbies of special privilege. But if the facts are made clear to the American people, if the conservation issues are widely debated and clearly defined, I have no doubt of the final outcome. The American people believe in the wise use of our natural resources for the greatest good of the largest number, in the long run.

Statement on Small Business by Mr. George J. Burger, Vice President, National Federation of Independent Business, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, has supplied me with an advanced copy of a formal statement on the subject of small business, which he will make before the platform committee of the Republican National Convention sometime during the third week in August. Under general leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the full text of Mr. Burger's proposed statement. The statement follows:

I am George J. Burger, vice president in charge of Washington, D. C., activities of the National Federation of Independent Business, whose head office is located in Burlingame, Calif., with division offices in Washington, D. C., New York, N. Y., Cincinnati, Ohio, and Chicago, Ill.

We are a national organization of small, independent business and professional people in all types of vocations. We have the largest individual membership of any business organization in the United States.

We have a single aim. As expressed simply, yet forcefully, on the masthead of our publications, it is "That our Nation remain the land of opportunity by giving small business fair consideration."

By "fair consideration" we mean that our members want from Government only full, honest enforcement of the rules of business fair play, as little Government interference and competition as possible, and equal consideration from Government with all other segments of our Nation in making policy.

Let it be clear our members seek no special privilege or handouts.

They are independents, and they want to remain that.

I am here today for one reason only: To ask that you commit your party in the Congress and the executive branch over the next 4 years to a program that will assure independents this fair consideration.

But before I go into the specific recommendations, let me make one important point clear: Every one of the recommendations I will read has been studied and voted favorably in personally signed ballots by a majority of our members. These are merchants and professional men on the Main Streets and in the industrial areas of our thousands of towns, cities, and rural areas across the length and breadth of this Nation. Some of them undoubtedly are located right in your own hometowns. I'm not speaking for myself or any other officer or group of officers of the federation but for these members.

ANTITRUST

First and foremost, they want Government to enforce fully and firmly the rules of fair play for all business. These rules are found in our antitrust laws—the Sherman, Federal Trade Commission, Clayton, and Robinson-Patman Acts. Our members want both the Justice Department Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission staffed with able, devoted and energetic men, furnished with adequate staffs and appropriations. They want these officials granted laws which are strong and that have penalties which really bite. Their position is that there should be no roadblocks along the highway of American opportunity and prosperity.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEES

Second, they urge that Congress maintain strong, active small business committees in the House and Senate to watchdog independent business interests on the legislative side of Government. They urge that Congress strengthen these committees and take immediate action to advance them to full standing committee status so that they may study, as central agencies of the Congress, and report bills required for small business welfare directly to the floor of the Congress rather than at present having to go through some standing committee for additional studies and possibly adverse recommendations.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Third, they recommend that Congress continue the Small Business Administration as a permanent agency to speak independently

for independent business in the councils of the executive side of Government, as well as to backstop smaller firms in their quest for financing and fair consideration in Government contracting. They recommend also that full control of this agency be vested in the appointed Administrator only, with no interference or control from any other member of the President's official family. They want the administration subject only to the Congress itself as should be the case with any independent agency.

TAXES

Fourth, they want reduction of overburdensome taxes. They know spending cuts must come first. They feel a start can be made on foreign aid, followed by tightening of social welfare and subsidy expenditures. Same time they feel Government can increase its income by closing tax loopholes, particularly those by which cooperatives escape full corporate levies. And they urge adoption of changes recommended by the Hoover Commission, to give taxpayers better service for fewer dollars.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH BUSINESS

Fifth, they urge Government to increase independents' sales potentials by closing as rapidly as possible business-type operations.

TARIFF

Sixth, they favor tighter tariff laws to promote fairer international competition. They hold that many American firms tied to a high wage-cost economy just cannot compete with prices offered by foreign firms, or giant American firms, operating in low cost-low wage areas.

LABOR

Seventh, they urge full enforcement of all laws which offer smaller firms a better chance to deal equally and fairly with powerful labor unions. They favor application of antitrust laws to unions the same as to business. They want greater local control over labor problems. Same time they ask that Government refrain from adding to cost burdens which would follow extension of wage-hour controls to exempt independent retail establishments.

GOVERNMENT FORMS

Eighth, they want Government to let them use more of their time for productive effort. They want reduction in the many varied reports which Government requires of them now.

PROFESSIONAL AND SELF-EMPLOYED

Ninth, they desire the same freedom and fair play for professional people as for independent businessmen. They want Government to steer entirely clear of any programs that would open the door for socialized medicine or Federal tinkering with medicine. They want enactment of bills which would help professional self-employed and employees not covered by public retirement programs to build their own private program by temporary tax exemptions.

These are the highlights of the independent enterprise action program we ask your party to back during the 4 years to come, not only for the sake of our members, but for the sake of the Nation and larger business as well. Remember, a healthy independent business system is the backbone of our economy.

It's been a pleasure to give you these recommendations, just as it was a pleasure to appear before your party in 1948 and 1952. It's even more of a pleasure to recall the many things that have been accomplished along the lines of our independent business and professional man recommendations at both previous conventions. This is to the credit of those of you who helped write the independent business planks in the platforms of your party, and to the credit of those who followed through in Congress and the administration.

We have every hope and confidence that you will accept these recommendations the same as your colleagues did in earlier conventions, and that your party will commit itself to this program aimed at keeping open, and opening even wider in the years to come, the doors of opportunity to independent enterprise.

I thank you.

One Hundredth Centennial for Frank Bender Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER R. JOHNSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the 100th anniversary of the Frank Bender farm in the town of Caledonia, in Trempealeau County. The Galesville Republican recently wrote a very interesting article on this farm which has been in the possession of the Skilton-Bender family for 100 years. With real pioneer spirit, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Skilton settled in Trempealeau County in the Ninth District of Wisconsin and built the farm which still is farmed by their descendants, the Frank Bender family. The article from the Galesville Republican follows:

CENTURY YEAR FOR BENDER FARM IN THE TOWNSHIP OF CALEDONIA—DATES BACK TO TIME OF OX TEAMS, COVERED WAGONS, TRAILS, NO BRIDGES

In the month of June, this year, 1956, a 100th anniversary went into the record at the Frank Bender home in the town of Caledonia. But it wasn't the centenary birthdate of Mr. Frank, who has to wait another year before he gets into the Biblical allotted term of threescore years and 10, through which period of time has been on the farm on which he was born, and which has been in the Bender family a full century.

Ownership of the farm dates back to the days of pioneers, ox teams, and covered wagons. It was by this mode of transportation that Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Skilton and their brood of 3 arrived in the Caledonia settlement on a day in June in the year 1856, bought an 80-acre tract and settled down for permanency.

The Skiltons were English. Mrs. Skilton before her marriage was Martha Miller, born in Surrey. At the age of 24 she married Thomas Skilton, and in 1837 they came to this country and settled in the State of New York. Five years later they were caught with the western movement and came on to the then Territory of Wisconsin, remaining in Dodge and Rock Counties until 1856, when with other families of that area seeking farmlands they trekked northward with covered wagons, in which were their children and personal possessions, moving slowly along over miles of hastily constructed road, and often in clouds of dust from shuffling oxen hoofs, and fording streams where there were no ferries.

In the Skilton brood was a 5-year-old daughter, Jennie, destined to become the wife of Frank Bender and to succeed to the ownership of the farm founded by her parents. Her father died in 1881. Her mother lived on to 1905, when in her 96th year, enjoying a remarkable physical condition, she suffered a fall a few months before her death. Two of her children survived her. A son, George, enlisted in the 36th Wisconsin for the Civil War, was wounded in the battle of Cold Harbor in Virginia and died 5 months later in a Washington, D. C., hospital. Thirteen grandchildren and 29 great-grandchildren descended from her.

In 1867 Jennie Skilton became the bride of Frank Bender, then a youthful Civil War veteran, who had served with the 20th Wisconsin Infantry. Eventually they took over the Skilton Farm, which had been increased to 160 acres. Some of this is bottom land through which Beaver Creek runs. The iron bridge crossing it was known in earlier days as the Skilton Bridge.

Frank Bender in his active years was a popular thresher. His horse-power rig for many years served his community and over a wider area. Not until the last few years did he use an engine for power. In his time, threshing started early in the fall and continued often until snow was in the air. Stacking grain was then the general rule, and when a job could not be completed in a day the crew would remain overnight. On such occasions Frank was an entertainer. Possessed of a good voice, he was a songster of merit, and frequently the compositions were his own. He long served the town of Caledonia as chairman and representative on the county board of supervisors. He died in 1916, Mrs. Bender survived him 28 years, living, as did her mother, to a great age, passing on at 93. Seven children were born to them. Surviving their parents are two daughters, Mrs. Martha Hutchinson, of Webster, S. Dak.; Mrs. Alice Rifenberg, Trempealeau; and two sons, Warren, of Trempealeau, and Frank, on the old farm. The last, upon the death of his father dropped the junior from his name. He married Miss Anna Sandbergen in 1912, and in time succeeded to the farm. They have one child, the son Leonard, who now occupies the old Hess Farm in Caledonia, and they are grandparents to three.

After a century of time the Bender Farm continued to yield abundant crops. No longer do oxen plod its fields turning furrows. The cradle has no place in its sheds. The tractor has supplanted the horse, as has the automobile the buggy and surrey. Grandpa and Grandma Skilton would recognize the old farm, but the new methods and equipment would be strange to them.

Small Business Legislation Pleases Kansas Motor Car Dealers Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is a letter addressed to me by Mr. Roscoe Hambric, secretary-manager of the Kansas Motor Car Dealers Association, Topeka, Kans. The letter is with reference to legislation which affects small business. The letter follows:

JULY 26, 1956.

Hon. Representative WILLIAM H. AVERY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR BILL: In behalf of the franchised dealers of new cars and/or new trucks in the State of Kansas, we wish to express to you our sincere thanks for supporting and voting for the O'Mahoney-Celler good-faith and day-in-court bill.

You have done a great service for the franchised dealers of Kansas and of the United States and also for all small-business men. Kansas dealers truly do appreciate your help and you have every right to expect an outstanding vote of confidence for the fine job you have been doing for us in Washington.

Best regards,

KANSAS MOTOR CAR DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
ROSCOE HAMBRIC,
Secretary-Manager.

Record of Activity of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a review of the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, 84th Congress, reveals the major role the committee played in the legislative history of this Congress. Statistics tell only a part of the story.

Of the 14,104 bills introduced in the House in this Congress, 5,327 were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Thus, the Judiciary Committee handled 37.6 percent of the legislative work of the House of Representatives.

Major legislation of vital importance to the Nation kept public interest focused on the activities of the committee. Among such bills can be found those dealing with the vital issues of civil rights, the strengthening of antitrust laws, the "good faith" bills, the automotive dealers franchise bills, the Federal Construction Contract Act, and the subject of conflict between State and Federal jurisdiction.

In addition to the 5 standing subcommittees, there were appointed 3 special subcommittees of particular note and significance.

The Special Subcommittee on Presidential Inability, composed of Messrs. CELLER, chairman, WALTER, LANE, KEATING, and MCCULLOCH, made an exhaustive study of this subject which is deeply vested with public interest. In addition to the hearings, the subcommittee compiled a document setting forth the views of eminent political scientists and constitutional lawyers on how best to meet the situation that arises when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. In addition thereto, it prepared legislation, not as yet introduced, setting forth the alternate suggestions with a view toward direct action in the forthcoming session.

The Special Subcommittee on Administrative Procedure Act, composed of Messrs. ASHMORE, chairman, BOYLE, and CURTIS of Massachusetts, directed its attention to legislation concerning administrative procedure to insure that the integrity of the Administrative Procedure Act is preserved. The subcommittee completed a study concerning deviations from the Administrative Procedure Act. This study not only indicates instances where Congress has provided express exemptions from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act but also indicates instances in which Congress has provided procedural requirments which are more strict than those prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act.

The special subcommittee also assisted in the formulation of committee views on House Resolution 462, a resolution to create a new standing Committee on Administrative Procedure in the House of Representatives. In conjuction with its study of House Resolution 462, the special subcommittee analyzed and examined the work of the Judiciary Committee regarding administrative procedure, the staff study on the Hoover Commission Report on Legal Services and Procedure and the testimony before the Rules Committee concerning House Resolution 462. The fruits of this analysis and examination were made available to the full committee and served as a basis for the statement made by the Judiciary Committee and forwarded to the Rules Committee which was considering House Resolution 462.

The Committee on the Judiciary received complaints concerning a controversy between the press of the Boston area and the Shubert theatrical organization. It was alleged that actions taken by the Shubert organization in the course of a controversy with the Boston Post had infringed upon freedom of the press. A special subcommittee was appointed to hear and weigh the testimony of those who were involved in the controversy. Representative FRANK CHELF, of Kentucky, was designated as the chairman of the subcommittee, and Representatives HAROLD D. DONOHUE and LAURENCE CURTIS, both of Massachusetts, were appointed to serve as members. The subcommittee held public hearings on the matter in Washington on May 2, 1956, and June 27, 1956.

A series of editorials in the Boston Post had charged that the Shubert theatrical interests in Boston had infringed upon the freedom of the press when, after a dispute concerning the paper's reviews of its plays, the Shubert organization reduced its theatrical advertising in the Post and refused to accord the paper's drama critic the customary complimentary press tickets to its productions. On the other hand, the Shubert organization contended that it acted with sound business justification, and that there was no issue of civil liberties or other public policy involved.

The subcommittee found that there was no actual violation of the constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of the press, since those provisions insure that the press of the United States will be free to function without being limited by laws imposing previous restraints on publications. The subcommittee, therefore, found that there did not appear to be any immediate need for Federal legislation. However, the subcommittee concluded that the economic pressure exerted by the Shubert organization in this instance was subject to criticism in that it must be recognized that such measures do in fact operate to limit freedom of expression as it has traditionally been recognized in the United States, and it is this freedom of expression which is protected from governmental interference by the guaranties of the Constitution.

In addition to the bulk of public legislation, it is altogether proper that we direct attention to the number of private bills which were referred to this committee: 3,827 immigration bills and 1,059 claims bills, giving a total of 4,886 private bills. It must be emphasized that each one of these bills, though private, requires active consideration in the same measure as do many of the public bills before the committee. Reports are requested, hearings are held, subcommittee deliberation and full committee deliberation are in order for each individual bill, and the appropriate report is filed.

The Subcommittee on Antitrust held exhaustive hearings in a serious effort to preserve the principles of free enterprise. The record of that subcommittee is one of which the committee is justly proud. The subcommittee sat mornings and afternoons in 88 hearings, issuing 6 special reports, and coming to grips with the grave economic problems attendant upon monopolies and monopolistic practices.

The members of the committee and the staff worked together in maximum effort to discharge their responsibilities on the issues that were placed before them, and the record speaks for itself.

To understand more clearly the nature of the activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have set forth below the activities of each subcommittee so that the total picture may emerge in greater detail and with sharper clarity:

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Subcommittee No. 1 had 150 public bills referred to it for action.

A group of nine bills dealing with the transportation and distribution of obscene matter was considered by the subcommittee. H. R. 3333, amending chapter 71 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the provisions barring the transportation of indecent and obscene matter, was reported by the subcommittee. A similar Senate bill, S. 600, was amended on the floor of the House by the substitution of the provisions of H. R. 3333. That bill, approved by both Houses of Congress and signed by the President, became Public Law 95.

The subcommittee drafted and recommended for enactment a bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of wives and children of Spanish sheepherders who had been admitted under laws authorizing the admission of such sheepherders. The legislation also provided for a more humane approach to the waiver of minor criminal offenses of persons seeking to enter the United States. The subcommittee incorporated into the bill an amendment to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, so as to apply that law to refugees in Spain. An additional committee amendment was designed to correct a situation involving a number of aliens admitted under the displaced persons laws, who misrepresented their na-

tionality or country of birth to avoid forced repatriation to Communist-controlled countries. The bill, H. R. 6888, was reported to the House, and was passed on July 30, 1955. The Senate passed an amended version of the bill on July 27, 1956, the last day of the Congress, but the Senate amendments were not agreed to by the House prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee considered a group of three bills proposing an amendment to section 2314 of title 18, United States Code, dealing with confidence game swindles. The committee reported S. 997 which added an amendment making it unlawful to transport or induce a person to travel in interstate commerce in the execution or concealment of a confidence game swindle. The bill passed the House and became Public Law 661.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress the subcommittee considered legislation proposing a commission to study problems in the field of international legal practice and procedures. After hearings at which representatives of the American Bar Association, and the Departments of State and Justice appeared, the subcommittee recommended an amended bill to provide for a commission to conduct a study of problems in the field of international legal procedure. A clean bill was introduced embodying the recommendations of the subcommittee, and that bill, H. R. 7500, was reported to the House by the committee. During the second session a rule was granted, and the bill passed the House. The bill was not acted upon by the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee held hearings on H. R. 3 and related bills dealing with the question of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws. The subcommittee recommended an amendment to H. R. 3 so as to limit the application of the bill to the field of sedition and subversion, and to provide for concurrent jurisdiction in the States and the Federal Government in that field. The committee reported to the House H. R. 3 amended to provide for such concurrent jurisdiction.

The bill H. R. 2854, increasing the penalties for seditious conspiracy and advocating the overthrow of the Government, was considered by the subcommittee, reported by the full committee, and passed the House, and then the Senate with an amendment during first session of the Congress. This bill was the subject of a conference during the second session at which the Senate receded from its amendment and the bill was subsequently approved as Public Law No. 212.

The subcommittee held hearings on problems being encountered in connection with the issuance of United States passports. After the consideration of the matters brought out in the hearings, the subcommittee favorably recommended to the full committee, H. R. 11582, a bill providing for passport review procedure. That bill was pending at that point at the conclusion of the Congress.

HOUSE BILLS, 84TH CONGRESS

Public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 1	150
Public bills subject to hearings	11
Public bills reported to the full committee	16
Public bills reported to the House	5
House bills pending in the Senate at close of session	1
House bills which became public laws	1

SENATE BILLS, 84TH CONGRESS

Public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 1	4
Public bills subject to hearings	3
Public bills reported to the full committee	2
Public bills reported to the House	1
Senate bills pending in the House at closing	0
Senate bills which became public law	2
Total referred	154
Total hearings held	14
Total reports to full committee	18
Total bills reported to House	6
Total bills pending in Senate	1
Total bills enacted into law	3

84TH CONGRESS, PRIVATE BILLS (IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY) SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

Introduced in the House	3,243
Enacted into law	780
Passed by the House	67
Tabled by the committee	653
Senate bills referred	584
Enacted into law	420
Tabled by the committee	93
Total House and Senate bills	3,827
Total enacted into law	1,200
Total tabled by the committee	746

In addition, congressional action on individual cases referred to Congress by the Attorney General under the provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, is set forth as follows:

Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	474
Cases referred during the 84th Congress	407
Cases approved on H. Con. Res. 99, 110, 168, 202, and 221	766
Not approved	54
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	3
Held for further information	10
Left in process at close of 84th Congress	48
Disposition of immigration cases referred to Congress under the provisions of sec. 6 of the Refugee Relief Act, as amended:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	41
Cases referred during the 84th Congress	4,767
Cases approved on H. Con. Res. 98, 167, 201, 228, and 246	2,740
Not approved	330
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	24
Held for further information	31
Left in process at close of 84th Congress	1,683
Disposition of suspension cases referred to the Congress under sec. 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917 and under sec. 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952:	
Cases pending at the beginning of the 84th Congress	537
Cases referred to the Congress	2,029
Total	2,566
Cases approved—S. Con. Res. 66, 67, 68, 76, and 84	1,550
Withdrawn by the Attorney General	12
Not approved	39
Total	1,601
Cases pending at close of 84th Congress	965
Disposition of six suspension cases referred to the Congress under sec. 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, in 1952: Cases approved—S. J. Res. 163	6

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS, AS ASSIGNED SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the Congress the subcommittee conducted hearings on 28 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

The subcommittee processed S. 1077, a bill to recompense, to a limited extent, those persons or their survivors, who suffered death, personal injury, and property losses as a result of the explosions and fires at Texas City, Tex., in April 1947. This was a manmade disaster. Loaded bags of ammonium nitrate fertilizer forming a part of the United States Government's program of foreign aid to war-ravaged and famine-stricken foreign countries, blew up in the holds of 2 ships at Texas City killing over 750 persons and injuring 3,500 more. This bill became Public Law 378.

The subcommittee also processed H. R. 7763, a bill to expedite the final settlement of Japanese-American evacuation claims which resulted from the Army's evacuation of over 100,000 persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast areas during World War II. The claims program has been underway for some 7 years, and implementing legislation was needed to help expedite the final settlement of the remaining claims—Public Law 673.

Another bill on general legislation which the subcommittee favorably considered was S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure for the letting of lump-sum Federal construction contracts. After extensive hearings, the subcommittee adopted this Senate bill which, among other things, was designed to conform Government procedures for the letting of construction contracts to those followed by many prudent organizations in private industry, and at the same time eliminate unfair trade practices of bid shopping.

One of the public claims bills favorably considered by the subcommittee and enacted into law was H. R. 3996. This amends the Military Personnel Claims Act, as amended, to remove the $2,500 limitation upon the amount to be recovered under the act, and to permit settlement of claims not in excess of $6,500. Several House-passed private bills and one Senate-passed private bill are being settled administratively under the amended act—Public Law 571.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connection with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:		
Private, House bills	874	
Private, House resolutions	29	
Private, Senate bills	63	
		966
Public, House bills	87	
Public, House joint resolution	1	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		93
Total		1,059
Reported to committee:		
Private, House bills	345	
Private, House resolutions	22	
Private, Senate bills	38	
		405
Public, House bills, favorably	23	
Public, Senate bills, favorably	5	
		28
Total		433
Private, House bills, adversely	93	
Private, Senate bills, adversely	2	
		95
Public, House bills, adversely	5	
Public, Senate bills, adversely	1	
		6
Total		101
Reported to House:		
Private, House bills	348	
Private, House resolutions	22	
Private, Senate bills	44	
		414
Public, House bills	23	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		28
Total		442
Passed House:		
Private, House bills	345	
Private, House resolutions [1]	22	
Private, Senate bills	44	
		411
Public, House bills	22	
Public, Senate bills	5	
		27
Total		438
Pending in Senate:		
Private, House bills	132	
Public, House bills	6	
Total		138
Public laws enacted		19
Private laws enacted		228
Bills vetoed		9

[1] Sent 22 private claims bills of the House to the Court of Claims.

Two House-passed private claims bills sent to the Court of Claims by Senate resolutions.

Two public claims bills of the House settled administratively.

Three House-passed private claims bills were settled administratively under provisions of Public Law 365, 84th Congress.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

In addition to claim bills, subcommittee No. 2 handled a significant number of pieces of general legislation. These included civil-rights bills, bills to establish a public-defender system in the courts of the United States, legislation concerning criminal laws, mileage allowance increases for marshals and their deputies, proposed modification of the Lucas Act—Public Law 657, 79th Congress—and bills to provide a remedy for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress.

H. R. 627, a civil-rights bill, passed by the House of Representatives on July 23, 1956. It included four main provisions, namely, establishment of a Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government, creation of an additional Assistant Attorney General to be in charge of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, provision for a civil remedy at the behest of the Attorney General to protect the right to vote and provision for a civil remedy on the part of the Attorney General to further strengthen civil rights presently protected by the Ku Klux Act—title 42, United States Code, section 1985.

H. R. 627 was one of 70 civil-rights bills considered by subcommittee No. 2. Others called for the following: The creation of a Fair Employment Practices Commission to eliminate racial and other discriminations in employment, prohibitions on racial and other discriminations in federally supported housing, federally supported education, interstate transportation and the armed services, prohibitions on interference with the right to vote, and other rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, and antilynching, antipoll tax, and antipeonage legislation.

H. R. 5205, a bill extending the protection of certain Federal criminal laws to all members of the armed services also passed the House. It would provide Federal protection against murder, manslaughter, or assault for all servicemen if the attack took place while they were engaged in their duties.

Hearings were held on other legislation concerning the criminal law. H. R. 4930 and H. R. 4932 would provide the defendant with an appeal against an excessive criminal sentence. H. R. 799 and H. R. 5264 would establish the making of contradictory statements under oath as perjury.

Subcommittee No. 2 held hearings on two bills, H. R. 271 and H. R. 641 to provide remedies for persons who are slandered or libeled by Members of Congress. These two bills were adversely reported by the subcommittee and tabled by the full committee.

In view of the fact that all other Federal employees received increases in mileage allowances for travel on official business Subcommittee No. 2 favorably reported H. R. 4019, to authorize an identical mileage-allowance increase for United States marshals and their deputies. This bill passed the House on July 25, 1955, and an identical bill, S. 2592—Public Law 228—was then substituted for it.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee No. 2	100
Number of bills on which hearings were held	88
Number of public bills reported to full committee	85
Number of reports filed	3
Number of public bills passed House	3
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	2
Number of Senate bills disposed of	1
Number of public bills approved by the President	1

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS—GENERAL STATEMENT

The principal functions of this subcommittee may be divided into three categories. It processes all general legislation bills which are assigned to it. It also handles all legislation relating to patent, trademark, and copyright laws. In addition, it has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws, classifying all laws of general and permanent nature as they are enacted into the 50 titles which comprise the United States Code.

During the 84th Congress the workload of Subcommittee No. 3 was substantially increased. In all, 98 bills were referred for processing. Forty-two bills were handled in the 1st session of the 84th Congress and are not discussed here since they are covered in an earlier report made at the end of the first session of this Congress. During the second session of the Congress the subcommittee processed 56 bills. These included such subjects as foreign agents registration, habeas corpus, juvenile delinquency, national Federal probation, wire fraud, aircraft destruction, and interstate compacts. A statement (a) pointing up the functions of the subcommittee and (b) highlighting some of the legislation processed by it follows.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Because of the many recent aircraft disasters the subcommittee favorably reported H. R. 319—provisions of H. R. 319 were incorporated into S. 2972, which became public law—making it a Federal offense to place explosive substances near or on an aircraft with the intent of disabling or destroying it or any of its passengers. The subcommittee also broadened the scope of this legislation to include buses and other motor vehicles which move in interstate commerce—see S. 2972. In connection with aircraft, H. R. 6805 was also processed, prohibiting in any lawsuit the use of evidence obtained in military aircraft investigations conducted in the interest of air safety.

Due to the expansion in oil and gas leases, timber sales, and other activities of Indian tribal organizations, it became necessary to consider Federal legislation setting up safeguards to protect the funds and other assets belonging to the tribes which are entrusted to the care of its officers and Federal officials. H. R. 6403 was favorably considered by the subcommittee, and, if enacted, will make theft or embezzlement of tribal funds a Federal criminal offense.

The subcommittee also took action on legislation making the Federal Probation Act applicable to the District of Columbia. The courts in the District of Columbia have a greater number of crim-

inal prosecutions, perhaps, than any other district since, by statute, the Attorney General is authorized to institute prosecutions in a wider range of criminal cases here in the District of Columbia. Favorable consideration was given to H. R. 6870 to bring the district courts in line with other Federal districts so that Federal probation laws will now be uniform throughout all district courts.

A bill designed to close the loophole in the present law which presently limits the prosecution of frauds involving wire, radio, and television communication to interstate transactions was approved by the subcommittee so as to cover foreign communications as well—S. 3674. Persons seeking to circumvent Federal criminal statutes have been crossing the border into Canada and Mexico and by telephone and other communications promoting false stock and other transactions to victims residing in the United States.

The subcommittee took favorable action on several pieces of legislation which grant the consent of Congress to the States concerned, to enter into interstate compacts. Some of these bills were H. R. 6623, permitting States sharing common boundaries with New York or New Jersey to enter into mutual military aid compacts, H. R. 9314, an education compact between Wisconsin and Illinois, H. R. 11911, boundary relocation compact between Arizona and California, House Joint Resolution 511, New York-New Jersey air pollution compact, H. R. 5274, extending the crime control compact to Federal territories and possessions.

In addition to the above legislation, the subcommittee held hearings on a number of other important bills on which further action is contemplated. For example, as a result of hearings, the subcommittee decided to publish a committee document on H. R. 6682, affecting the judicial review of administrative decisions, so that the views of interested persons and agencies may be obtained during the recess and further action taken next Congress. Similarly, hearings were held on juvenile delinquency—House Joint Resolution 290, House Joint Resolution 291—and it is hoped that during the recess the staff of the subcommittee will secure data on several of the problems brought out at the hearings so that it may be studied next Congress. Hearings were also held on the disclosure provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act, H. R. 4105. This bill, among other things, would require foreign agents outside of the United States who use the United States mails to circulate propaganda to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. Hearings on this legislation will be printed, and made available for public comment and suggestions.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS

The subcommittee during this Congress devoted a substantial portion of its time to patents, trademark, and copyright bills. Probably the most significant piece of legislation regarding patents and trademarks was H. R. 7416, which would increase certain patent and trademark fees in the Patent Office. This bill was favorably reported to the House. The subcommittee also favorably considered H. R. 10263, a bill adjusting certain fees in the Copyright Office. Another bill of substantial interest was H. R. 6716, which would provide a remedy against the Government for its infringement of any work protected under the copyright laws.

Legislation which was also favorably considered by the subcommittee and which affects the copyright field generally was contained in H. R. 781, setting up a 3-year statute of limitations on civil copyright infringement actions.

The foregoing bills, together with such items as patent extension, H. R. 2128, inventive contribution awards, H. R. 2383, and several other bills which passed the House during the first session of this Congress, gave the subcommittee two very active work years on patent, trademark, and copyright legislation.

REVISION OF THE LAWS

The principal work of the subcommittee with regard to the revision of the laws is the classification and codification of the public laws, as they are enacted, to the appropriate titles of the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. In this Congress over 1,050 bills will have been enacted into public law, and because of the great number of these bills which were passed during the last days of the present session the subcommittee staff will be required to continue diligently in this work of classifying and codifying the laws for the next several months. The laws of the second session of the 84th Congress, which has just ended, will be set forth in supplement IV of the United States Code and supplement V of the District of Columbia Code.

The law-revision functions of the subcommittee include the enactment into positive law of the various titles of the code. To date, 13 of the 50 titles have been so enacted, with several titles now in various stages of process for enactment into law.

With regard to this particular phase of the work, there was cleared for Presidential approval H. R. 7049, a bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces" and title 32 entitled "National Guard." The enactment of this bill is one of the major legislative accomplishments of this Congress. In size alone it ranks as one of the largest bills ever enacted by the Congress. It consists of more than 800 pages of type printed in smaller than normal style. If printed in the usual style it would undoubtedly comprise more than 2,000 pages. The work on this legislation commenced more than 8 years ago and in the intervening period there has been almost daily liaison between the officials in the Pentagon and the subcommittee staff with regard to the thousands of provisions in the bill. With its enactment it will be possible to find and keep up to date all of the laws relating to the Armed Forces and the National Guard. These laws are now scattered throughout some 70 volumes of the Statutes at Large and although they were classified into titles 10, Army; 32, National Guard; 34, Navy, of the United States Code, until enactment of this bill those titles were only prima facie evidence of the law. Now titles 10 and 32 constitute the law per se and may be amended directly. This legislation will be of tremendous help to the Congress, the Armed Forces, and the public generally.

In this Congress, H. R. 6991—title 21, United States Code—relating to food, drugs, and cosmetics, received the favorable action of the House of Representatives. In addition work has progressed steadily on the preparation of material for the enactment into law of Title 16: Conservation and Reclamation; Title 20: Education; Title 23: Highways; Title 43: Public Lands. During the last several months the subcommittee staff has been working with the members of the Solicitor's Office of the Post Office Department with a view to enacting Title 39: The Postal Service, into law. Preliminary work on this proposed legislation is now completed and a bill will be ready for introduction and early committee action when the Congress convenes next January.

In addition, progress has been made on a draft of a bill to enact Title 44: Public Printing, into law.

The subcommittee has continued its daily function of cooperating with other committees of the Congress with respect to the form and style of legislation affecting titles of the code. In addition, it has received and considered numerous suggestions from individuals, Government agencies, and other organizations relating to corrections, discrepancies, and conflicts in our Federal laws. Work to correct or reconcile these conflicts or discrepancies in the law is now, as always, being processed.

Subcommittee No. 3, Committee on the Judiciary

Bills referred	98
Bills on which hearings were held	59
Bills favorably reported to full committee	31
Bills reported to House	30
Bills tabled by full committee upon recommendation of subcommittee	22
Bills passed House	28
Senate bills processed	4
Bills pending in Senate	10
Bills which became public law	19

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED, SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPT AND REORGANIZATION

During the 84th Congress, subcommittee No. 4 handled a number of bills designed to improve the administration of the bankruptcy laws. H. R. 4791, Public Law 518, and H. R. 5047, Public Law 543, provide for increases in the compensation of referees and trustees in bankruptcy. These laws are designed to make highly qualified persons available as referees and trustees. Another bill, H. R. 9956, improves the administration of the bankruptcy laws by eliminating the mailing of certain unnecessary notices, while H. R. 6247 contributes to this goal by conforming the handling of unclaimed bankruptcy funds with the handling of other unclaimed funds of district courts. H. R. 256 clarifies the definition of "salesmen" in the priorities section of the bankruptcy law. H. R.

6681 is designed to improve chapter XI proceedings dealing with arrangements. This bill, making a number of technical changes in chapter XI, passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

General legislation assigned to subcommittee No. 4 has covered a wide range of subjects. For example, there have been before the subcommittee more than 175 bills concerning holidays, celebrations, and the incorporation of patriotic and other organizations. In addition, action has been taken on general legislation dealing with the temporary extension of various emergency statutes, the amendment of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and the amendment of criminal laws.

The emergency legislation on which Subcommittee No. 4 took action concerns title II of the First War Powers Act and certain legislation dealing with benefits to employees for mishaps arising out of war-risk hazards. Public Law 58 extends to July 30, 1957, the effectiveness of title II of the First War Powers Act, which authorizes expeditious contracting procedures essential to national defense. Public Law 125 and Public Law 679 provide temporary extensions to July 1, 1957, of legislation providing benefits for civilian employees who are injured, killed, or captured by enemy or other military action. These war-risk hazard and detention benefits are essential for effective recruitment of qualified civilian personnel for overseas employment, such as construction work on military installations. Permanent legislation in this area was proposed to Congress by the Department of Defense late in the session. However, hearings on these proposals indicated that significant changes in the temporary legislation were contemplated which would require extensive and careful consideration by Congress. For this reason the temporary legislation was extended for 1 year.

Subcommittee No. 4 handled a number of bills amending the Federal criminal laws. The laws concerning threats against the President were amended by S. 734, Public Law 53, to include the President-elect and Vice President in their protections. Subsequently, the House passed H. R. 6621 to include the Vice President-elect in this protection but the Senate took no action on the bill.

H. R. 9257, Public Law 544, and H. R. 10111 close gaps in the criminal laws. H. R. 9257 provides punishment for one who instigates, aids, or assists an attempted but unsuccessful escape from custody. Prior to this, the law appeared to punish assistance in conjunction with completed escapes only. H. R. 10111 added federally insured, State-chartered savings and loan associations to the protections of the Federal criminal law as to theft, embezzlement, misapplication of funds, and the making of false entries.

Another bill amendatory of the Federal criminal law, H. R. 6997, would have added certain Federal officers and employees of the Departments of Labor and Commerce, the General Services Administration and Federal probation officers to the protection of Federal criminal laws relating to murder, manslaughter, and assault. This bill passed the House but was not acted on by the Senate.

Subcommittee No. 4 handled legislation in other areas also. H. R. 10417, Public Law 619, amended the Federal Register Act to provide emergency means for the publication of Executive proclamations, regulations, orders, and other documents in the event of attack or threatened attack on the United States. H. R. 9038, Public Law 808, expressly provided for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in section 1332 of title 28 of the United States Code conferring jurisdiction on district courts in diversity of citizenship cases.

Number of public bills referred to Subcommittee No. 4	269
Number of bills on which hearings were held	76
Number of bills reported to full committee	67
Number of reports filed	38
Number of public bills passed House	37
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	6
Number of Senate bills disposed of	5
Number of public bills approved by the President	31

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

This subcommittee exercised jurisdiction over a variety of subjects with special jurisdiction over antitrust matters. Under its general jurisdiction, the subcommittee considered legislation relating to the Federal judicial system in which it covered subject matters as additional circuit and district judges, additional places for holding terms of court and the creation of new judicial districts and divisions. It also considered such matters as an increase in the fees paid to witnesses in the Federal courts, the increase in court costs, and the fees charged by United States commissioners and marshals. The subcommittee devoted considerable time to the problem of wiretapping. It also considered legislation raising congressional and judicial salaries and creating a Commission on Government Security. It provided for a system of annuities for the widows and dependent children of Federal judges.

During the 84th Congress this subcommittee had referred to it 119 bills—114 being House measures, 5 being Senate measures. Hearings were conducted on 59 of these bills. It disposed of 96 bills of which 25 were favorably reported to the House of Representatives by the full committee. There were 15 bills enacted into public law during the 84th Congress. One of the first bills enacted into law in the 84th Congress was the bill which increased congressional and judicial salaries. Another was the bill which created a Commission on Security which is making a study of the Government's security program both within the Government itself and in private industry insofar as national defense and security are concerned.

Another bill enacted into law established a system whereby annuities will be paid to the widows and dependent children of the Federal judges.

Several bills relating to the Federal judicial system were also enacted into law.

The committee reported to the House a bill which would have created 21 new judgeships throughout the United States. However, the bill was never considered by the House since no rule was granted. The committee also had enacted into law a bill which established the United States Customs Court as a constitutional court and also a bill improving judicial administration in the court of claims.

The subcommittee made an extensive study and conducted lengthy hearings on the problem of wiretapping. Several bills were considered in this connection and the subcommittee finally reported a bill to the full committee. Under that bill, all wiretapping would have been made a Federal crime except when it was done in accordance with the law of the State wherein the act was committed. It would also ban the use of any evidence obtained by wiretapping except where wiretapping was done under a court order which cases were limited to specific Federal crimes dealing with national security. Possession of wiretap equipment under certain circumstances was also made a crime. The full committee considered the bill at several executive sessions but the bill was not reported at the close of the Congress.

ANTITRUST JURISDICTION—LEGISLATIVE

Early in the first session the subcommittee recommended two antitrust bills which were enacted into law. Public Law 135, approved July 7, 1955, increased the maximum fine for violations of the antitrust laws from $5,000 to $50,000. Public Law 137, approved July 7, 1955, provides a uniform statute of limitations in private antitrust litigation, and in addition, creates a right of action on the part of the Government to recover actual damages for injuries to the business or property of the United States by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws.

Another bill referred to the subcommittee, S. 3879, which is designed to supplement the antitrust laws, passed the Senate as amended by the House, on July 26, 1956. This bill permits a franchised automobile dealer to bring suit for damages against an automobile manufacturer in United States district courts for the failure of the manufacturer to act in good faith in performing or complying with any of the terms or provisions of the franchise, or in terminating, canceling or not renewing the dealer's franchise. S. 3879 creates a cause of action where none previously existed in that, irrespective of contractual provisions, it grants a right of review in Federal courts of disputes between automobile manufacturers and franchised dealers which involves the good faith of the parties. The bill, in its definition of good faith, imposes the duty on each party to act in a fair and equitable manner so as to guarantee the the one party freedom from coercion, intimidation, or threats of coercion, or intimidation, from the other party.

Three additional antitrust bills referred to the subcommittee and passed by the House were pending in the Senate when Congress adjourned. Two of these bills, H. R. 5948 and H. R. 9424, resulted from the subcommittee's investigations into the administration and enforcement of the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950. The other bill, H. R. 1840, originated in complaints from rep-

resentatives of the small business community that the Supreme Court's interpretation of section 2 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, has frustrated effective enforcement of the antiprice discrimination law.

The purpose of H. R. 5948 was to prevent bank mergers achieved by acquisition of assets where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any section of the country. Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act, covers bank mergers achieved by stock acquisitions, but fails to include bank mergers accomplished by means of asset acquisition.

H. R. 5948 was passed by the House on February 6, 1956, to close the gap in existing law and to provide the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General with the same authority to move against asset acquisitions by banks as against stock acquisitions.

H. R. 9424, which passed the House on April 16, 1956, had two purposes. First, to require parties to a proposed merger, where the combined capital structure would exceed $10 million, to notify the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission—or the appropriate commission or board vested with jurisdiction—90 days in advance of the transaction. Together with the notice, the bill would require the acquiring corporation to supply specifically enumerated information which would enable the Attorney General and the appropriate agency to assess the merger's probable impact on competition. Willful failure to submit the notification or to furnish the required information would be subject to a civil penalty of from $5,000 to $50,000.

Second, H. R. 9424 amended the Clayton Act to provide the Federal Trade Commission with authority to seek a district court order preventing and restraining a merger in violation of Clayton Act section 7 pending issuance of a complaint and the completion of the Commission's administrative proceeding. This amendment would give the Federal Trade Commission, which has concurrent jurisdiction with the Attorney General to enforce the merger provisions of the Clayton Act, authority similar to that now possessed by the Attorney General to seek a preliminary court injunction to restrain the consummation of a merger pending adjudication of its legality.

H. R. 1840 was one of an important series of bills referred to the subcommittee which were designed to modify the doctrine enunciated by the Supreme Court in *Standard Oil Company* v. *Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231 (1951)), which holds that, regardless of the injurious effect on competition, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for a seller to show that his differential was made in good faith to meet the lawful and equally low price of a competitor. The bill, which was passed by the House on June 11, 1956, would have amended section 2 (b) of the Clayton Act as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act to provide that unless the effect of a discrimination prohibited by section 2 of the act may be substantially to lessen competition or to tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, it shall be a complete defense for a seller to show that his lower price or his furnishing of services or facilities was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor.

INVESTIGATIONS

Early in the first session, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted a comprehensive series of hearings on current antitrust problems. In these hearings the subcommittee studied antitrust enforcement procedures, recommendations made by the Attorney General's Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws, the forces involved in the merger movement, the growing problem of an industry concentration, and secured up-to-date information from political, industrial, agricultural, and labor leaders concerning the antitrust problems posed by new forces active in the economy. Hearings on these matters extended over a period of 17 days in the course of which 55 Government officials and leaders in the fields of business, labor, farming, and banking, testified.

These exploratory hearings resulted in the introduction of bills to amend the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950 subsequently considered by the House, and the publication by the subcommittee of two reports on the current merger movement. The subcommittee's interim report, Corporate and Bank Mergers, issued September 27, 1955, criticized the record of the agencies responsible for enforcing the Celler-Kefauver Antimerger Act of 1950, and reported on the forces active in the extensive merger movement now underway as well as the adequacy of existing legislation. The subcommittee's staff report, The Merger Movement in the Textile Industry, outlined the background of recent mergers in the textile industry and analyzed the scope of the current merger developments and their effect on the pattern of concentration in the textile industry. The report gave a comprehensive description of certain specific mergers, primarily those involving Textron American and Burlington Industries.

Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee during the first session on the problems involved in the Government's use of businessmen serving in key positions without compensation as well as the problems involved in the organization and operation of advisory groups by Government officials to assist in the exercise of administrative responsibilities. Hearings on WOC's and Government advisory groups extended over a period of 15 days during which the subcommittee received testimony from officials of the Departments of Commerce and Justice, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the Civil Service Commission, and WOC's who formerly had served in the Government.

Testimony adduced at the hearings by the subcommittee in its investigation of WOC's and Government advisory groups demonstrated the dangers presented by conflicts of interest inherent in the use of WOC's by the Government. The subcommittee's investigation underscored the necessity for careful safeguards to avoid any possibility of Government abdication of policymaking functions to private bodies in its use of advisory groups. From the standpoint of public policy enunciated in the antitrust laws, and the enforcement of those laws, there is not only the danger that Government advisory groups may abuse the circumstances which cause the Government to authorize meetings of competitors and use such meetings to commence or continue overt antitrust violations, but there is also the effect the activities of such private groups may have on governmental decisions bearing directly on industrial growth and concentration of economic power.

Two interim reports resulted from the subcommittee's investigation. The first report, The Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, issued December 12, 1955, analyzed the operations and activities of a special advisory group created to assist the Secretary of Commerce. The second report, WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, issued April 24, 1956, examined in detail the practices and procedures of the Department of Commerce in the Business and Defense Services Administration, and its predecessor, the National Production Authority, in the utilization of WOC's and advisory groups.

In its investigation of conflicts of interest involving full-time Government employees, the subcommittee conducted a 3-day hearing concerning the activities of Peter A. Strobel, Commissioner of Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration. As a result of disclosures uncovered in this investigation, Mr. Strobel resigned his position. The subcommittee's report, Activities of Peter A. Strobel, published April 10, 1956, affords a detailed analysis of the relationship maintained by Mr. Strobel between his private business and his Government position.

During the second session of this Congress, the Antitrust Subcommittee has undertaken an investigation of monopoly problems in industries which are under the jurisdiction of Federal regulatory agencies. Testimony has been received by the subcommittee from representatives of the Department of Justice, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Communications Commission, various academic specialists in the antitrust problems of regulated industries, and representatives from the airlines and television industries, in a series of hearings extending over 31 days.

This investigation was instituted as a result of frequent allegations made in the subcommittee's hearings on current antitrust problems, that, in operation Federal regulatory bodies have become unduly industry-oriented and have sanctioned excessive economic concentration in the industries subject to their jurisdiction. The purpose of the investigation is to determine the validity of the contention that public regulation has gradually shifted the objectives of regulation from protecting the public interest to protecting the monopolies created under its aegis.

The subcommittee's extensive hearings on the airline industry included testimony from the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, representatives from the Air Transport Association, a trade association representing the scheduled air carriers and representatives from nonscheduled air carriers. The subcommittee also heard the Director of the International Air Transport Association testify with respect to air carrier problems and operations in the foreign field as well as the Comptroller General, representatives from Pan American World Airways, North American Airlines, and National Airlines, travel agents, and representatives from travel agents' associations.

One result of the committee's study of the airlines industry has been the reinstitution by the Civil Aeronautics Board of its general passenger-fare investigation. The value of this investigation is demonstrated by the fact that in the 17-year history of the Civil Aeronautics Board there had never been a formal investigation of the level of airline rates and as a consequence, the CAB has lacked the detailed information necessary to determine whether or not the level of fares presently being charged the traveling public is unjust or unreasonable. At various times the CAB has started three such general passenger-fare investigations but for one reason or another none has ever been completed, notwithstanding the fact that passenger revenues account for 80 percent of all revenues received by domestic airlines.

Another result of the subcommittee's airlines investigation has been an overall reexaminaiton by the CAB of the procedures promulgated by the certificated airlines' trade association with respect to the qualifications and eligibility of travel agents to serve the airlines. The subcommittee found that although Congress has given no authority in the Civil Aeronautics Act to the CAB to regulate directly the travel agent business, in practice the airlines' trade association has inaugurated what amounts to a licensing system to control travel agents' business operations. At the present time, CAB is conducting an investigation into the necessity for, and propriety of, the trade association's activities in this area.

In its investigation of the television-broadcasting industry, the subcommittee has interrogated the Federal Communications Commission with respect to network pratcices which contribute to alleged domination by the networks in the production, distribution, and exhibition of television programs. The subcommittee has been particularly interested in the antitrust problems inherent in the network "must buy" arrangements with their affiliates which require advertisers to contract for a minimum television network of some 50 stations, as well as the so-called option time practice which secures to the network first refusal of the best hours of the affiliate's broadcasting day. In addition, the subcommittee has studied in detail the activities of the Federal Communicaitons Commission in discharging its responsibilities to maintain a competitive nationwide television industry in an effort to determine the extent to which the Commission pays heed to the antitrust considerations implicit in the Federal Communications Act.

As part of its investigation of regulated industries, a staff report has been issued which analyzes the general antitrust implications in railroad mergers and consolidations. This report, Merger in a Regulated Industry, is a case study of the proposed merger of the Louisville & Nashville and the Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroads. This case study provides a brief survey of the concepts, standards, issues, and arguments which are involved in considering a merger transaction in the railroad industry, which, upon approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission is exempted from the antitrust laws.

In conjunction with its investigation of regulated industries, and the Government agencies responsible for activities in the industries, the chairman introduced H. R. 9762 which would amend the Sherman Antitrust Act to have Congress declare it is the policy of the United States to maintain, to the maximum extent practicable, in regulated industries the American system of free competitive enterprise embodied in the antitrust laws. The purpose of this bill is to establish a guide for regulatory bodies and the courts in the exercise of their powers over business and arrangements involving exemption from the antitrust laws. In the investigation representatives from Government regulatory agencies and from the industries concerned have testified with respect to this bill.

During the recess the Antitrust Subcommittee will continue its study of the airlines and television industries. Representatives from certificated air carriers and varioius segments of the television broadcasting industry will be heard.

DOCUMENTS ISSUED BY ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

Hearings: Current Antitrust Problems, serial No. 3, 3 volumes; WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, serial No. 12, 3 volumes; Conflict of Interest (Full-Time Government Employees), serial No. 14, 1 volume.

Reports: Merger Movement in the Textile Industry, August 1, 1955, staff report to Subcommittee No. 5; Interim Report of the Antitrust Subcommittee—Subcommittee No. 5—on the Business Advisory Council for the Department of Commerce, December 12, 1955; Interim Report of the Antitrust Subcommittee—Subcommittee No. 5—on Corporate and Bank Mergers, December 27, 1955; Merger in a Regulated Industry, March 30, 1956—a case study of proposed merger of Louisville & Nashville and Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis Railroads; Activities of Peter A. Strobel, April 10, 1956; WOC's and Government Advisory Groups, April 24, 1956.

Subcommittee No. 5

Number of bills referred to the subcommittee:	
House bills	114
Senate bills	5
Total	119
Number of bills on which hearings were held:	
House bills	58
Senate bill	1
Total	59
Number of bills reported to the full committee:	
House bills	91
Senate bills	5
Total	96
Number of bills reported to the House:	
House bills	20
Senate bills	5
Total	25
Number of bills pending in the Senate	9
Number of bills enacted into public law	15

Report to the People of the 22d Congressional District of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH F. HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the folks of the 22d Congressional District of California on my voting record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress. The purpose of this report is to collect and put in one place some 25,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This information is not generally available to the people of my district, and I believe it should be made available to every citizen.

It has been my policy, and shall continue to be, through the mediums of weekly news columns, reports from Washington, and legislative questionnaires to keep the folks I represent in Congress informed as to what I am doing as their Representative and to give them every opportunity to participate in their Government.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions as contained in the report are for the purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

I just add this word of explanation as sometimes the official descriptive titles do not always reflect the entire purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I of course will be pleased to furnish detailed information concerning particular legislation and the reasons for my vote.

An explanation of the terms used below will be found at the end of the report.

It is my suggestion that readers look this résumé over before continuing.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1955		
Jan. 25	H. J. Res. 159, authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area: On passage. (Passed 409 to 3.)	Yea.
Jan. 27	H. R. 587, providing that servicemen on duty on Jan. 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952: On passage. (Passed 366 to 0.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years: On passage. (Passed 394 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
Feb. 16	H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress: On passage. (Passed 283 to 118.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	H. Res. 142, providing for 2 days of debate and prohibiting amendments on H. R. 1, extending authority of the President to enter into trade agreements: On motion to end debate and vote on resolution. (Rejected 178 to 207.)	Nay.
Feb. 17	On amendment making amendments to H. R. 1 in order and limiting debate to 5 hours. (Rejected 191 to 193.)	Yea.
Feb. 17	On passage. (Passed 193 to 192.)	Nay.
Feb. 18	H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements: On motion to recommit with instructions to report back with amendment requiring President to comply with recommendations of the Tariff Commission except when national security is involved. (Rejected 199 to 206.)	Nay.
Feb. 18	On passage. (Passed 295 to 110.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing normal corporate tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates, and providing a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption: On motion to recommit, deleting the provision for a $20 tax credit. (Rejected 205 to 210.)	Yea.
Feb. 25	On passage. (Passed 242 to 175.)	Nay.
Mar. 1	H. R. 3828, adjusting the salaries of justices and judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 223 to 113.)	Yea.
Mar. 10	H. R. 4720, providing incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pay and allowances: On passage. (Passed 399 to 1.)	Yea.
Mar. 18	H. R. 4903, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955 (second supplemental appropriation): On passage of amendment restoring a provision authorizing transfer of $4 million of unexpended funds to the United Nations technical assistance program. (Passed 174 to 107.)	Paired.
Mar. 21	H. R. 4644, increasing the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service by an average 7.5 percent and eliminating certain salary inequities: On motion to suspend the rules and pass H. R. 4644. (Rejected 120 to 302.)	Nay.
Mar. 21	H. R. 4951, directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year: On motion to suspend the rules and pass with committee amendments. (Rejected 260 to 151; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension of the rules.)	Nay.
Mar. 22	H. Res. 170, declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to Congress on Jan. 24, 1955: On passage. (Rejected 132 to 283, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
Mar. 23	H. Res. 171, disapproving proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic-rubber-producing facilities as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On passage. (Rejected 137 to 276, thereby approving sale.)	Nay.
Mar. 30	H. R. 4259, providing a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 386 to 8.)	Yea.
Mar. 30	H. R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956: On amendment limiting to $1 per month the fee to be paid to educational institutions for reports on veterans enrolled therein. (Rejected 156 to 226.)	Yea.
Apr. 20	H. R. 4644, the postal employees' pay increase and classification adjustment bill: On amendment increasing postal salaries by an average of 8.2 percent in lieu of 7.5 percent as provided by the bill. (Passed 224 to 189.)	Paired against.
Apr. 20	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 125 to 287.)	Paired for.
Apr. 20	On passage (8.2 percent increase). (Passed 324 to 85.)	Not voting.[1]
Apr. 21	H. R. 4393, providing for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 373 to 3.)	Not voting.[1]
May 5	H. R. 12, amending the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by restoring 90 percent mandatory price supports for wheat, cotton, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts: On amendment eliminating peanuts from the list of basic commodities. (Rejected 193 to 215.)	Yea.
May 5	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 199 to 212.)	Yea.
May 5	On passage. (Passed 206 to 201.)	Nay.
May 9	S. 1, the postal employees' pay and classification adjustment bill, providing an average 8.8 percent increase: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 118 to 275.)	Yea.
May 9	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 328 to 66.)	Yea.
May 9	H. Res. 223, rule providing 7 hours of debate on, and the limiting of amendments to, H. R. 2535, admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union on an equal footing with the original States: On passage. (Passed 322 to 66.)	Yea.
May 10	H. R. 2535, the Alaska-Hawaiian statehood bill: On motion to recommit. (Passed 218 to 170.)	Yea.
May 12	H. R. 6042, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1956: On amendment deleting language requiring approval of a congressional committee prior to disposal or transfer of work traditionally performed by civilian employees of Department of Defense. (Rejected 184 to 202.)	Yea.
May 12	On passage. (Passed 382 to 0.)	Yea.
May 23	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia: On passage. (Passed 282 to 32.)	Yea.
May 25	H. Res. 244, creating a select committee to investigate the financial position of the White County Bridge Commission in connection with operation of bridge and approaches near New Harmony, Ind.: On passage. (Passed 205 to 166.)	Nay.
May 25	H. R. 2851, making agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress: On passage. (Passed 343 to 1.)	Nay.
May 26	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of judges in the District of Columbia: On motion to recommit to conference committee with instructions to insist on House amendments providing for lower salary increases. (Passed 170 to 165.)	Yea.
May 26	H. R. 5881, supplementing the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects: On motion to recommit designed to limit the scope of the bill to the 17 western reclamation States. (Rejected 62 to 229.)	Nay.
June 1	H. R. 3990, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 79 to 278.)	Nay.
June 7	S. 2061, increasing the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department: On suspension of rules and passage. (Passed 409 to 1.)	Yea.
June 8	H. R. 5923, authorizing the completion within the next 3 years of the construction of the Inter-American Highway: On passage. (Passed 353 to 13.)	Yea.
June 14	H. R. 1, extending the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 347 to 54.)	Yea.
June 14	H. R. 6227, providing for the control and regulation of bank holding companies: On passage. (Passed 371 to 24.)	Yea.
June 15	H. Res. 210, authorizing Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board: On passage. (Rejected 178 to 214.)	Nay.
June 20	S. 67, adjusting the rates of basic compensation of Federal employees: On passage. (Passed 370 to 3.)	Yea.
June 20	H. Con. Res. 109, authorizing the appointment of a congressional delegation to attend the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Parliamentary Conference: On passage. (Passed 337 to 31.)	Yea.
June 20	H. R. 6295, amending the Travel Expense Act of 1949 to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses: On passage. (Passed 320 to 41.)	Yea.
June 21	H. R. 4663, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws: On passage. (Passed 231 to 153.)	Yea.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Congressman JOE HOLT, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1955		
June 22	H. R. 6040, amending certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and repealing obsolete provisions of the customs laws: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section making export value the primary basis for assessing duty. (Rejected 143 to 232.)	Not voting.[1]
June 23	H. Con. Res. 149, expressing sense of Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism: On passage. (Passed 367 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
June 27	H. R. 6992, extending for 1 year the existing temporary increase in the public debt limit: On passage. (Passed 267 to 56.)	Not voting.[1]
June 27	H. R. 6829, authorizing certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations: On passage. (Passed 316 to 2.)	Not voting.[1]
June 28	H. R. 3005, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years and extending for 2 years the Doctors-Dentists Draft Act: On motion to recommit conference report. (Rejected 171 to 221.)	Not voting.[1]
June 28	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 388 to 5.)	Not voting.[1]
June 29	S. 727, adjusting the salaries of the judges of the courts of the District of Columbia: On motion to recommit conference report and insist upon original House amendments. (Rejected 157 to 227.)	Yea.
June 30	S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program: On passage. (Passed 273 to 128.)	Yea.
July 6	H. R. 3210, authorizing the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to increase the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 74 to 316.)	Yea.
July 7	S. 2090, authorizing the mutual security program: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 262 to 120.)	Yea.
July 11	H. R. 7224, making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year 1956: On passage. (Passed 251 to 123.)	Yea.
July 13	H. R. 6766, the public works appropriation bill, providing funds for rivers and harbors projects: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 315 to 92.)	Yea.
July 13	H. Res. 295, providing for consideration of H. R. 7089, providing benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans: On passage. (Passed 376 to 24.)	Yea.
July 18	H. R. 7225, amending the Social Security Act providing disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, reducing to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are paid to certain women, providing for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, extending coverage, and increasing social-security tax: On motion to suspend the rules and pass. (Passed 372 to 31.)	Yea.
July 20	H. R. 7214, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective Mar. 1, 1956: On amendment to increase minimum wage to 90 cents per hour	Yea.
July 20	On passage. (Passed 362 to 54.)	Yea.
July 25	H. R. 7000, providing for strengthening of the Reserve Forces: On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 315 to 78.)	Yea.
July 26	H. R. 314, providing for 3 hours of debate on H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill: On passage. (Passed 274 to 129.)	Yea.
July 27	H. R. 7474, the Federal-State highway construction bill: On motion to recommit to incorporate bonding provisions of Dondero substitute (administration program) into bill. (Rejected 193 to 221.)	Yea.
July 27	On passage. (Rejected 123 to 292.)	Nay.
July 28	H. Res. 317, providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, removing natural gas producers from Federal regulation: On passage. (Passed 272 to 136.)	Yea.
July 28	H. R. 6645, removing natural-gas producers from Federal regulation: On motion to recommit. (Rejected 203 to 210.)	Nay.
July 28	On passage. (Passed 209 to 203.)	Yea.
July 20	S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955: On amendment removing public housing provisions and extending FHA mortgage insurance authority. (Passed 217 to 188.)	Yea.
July 29	On passage. (Passed 396 to 3.)	Yea.
Aug. 1	H. Res. 299, providing $35,000 for further expenses of the Select Committee on Small Business: On passage. (Passed 231 to 134.)	Nay.
Aug. 1	S. 2576, repealing the franchise of Capital Transit Co., operating in the District of Columbia: On suspension of rules and passage. (Rejected 215 to 150; a ⅔ majority is necessary for passage under suspension or rules.)	Not voting.[1]
Aug. 2	S. 2126, the Housing Act of 1955: On adoption of conference report providing for construction of 45,000 public housing units in 1 year. (Adopted 187 to 168.)	Paired against.
1956		
Jan. 31	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes: On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
Jan. 31	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1.)	Yea.
Feb. 1	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yea.
Feb. 8	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 309.)	Not voting.[1]
Feb. 20	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947: On passage. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
Feb. 28	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26.)	Nay.
Mar. 1	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On passage. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Nay.
Mar. 7	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act: On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 150 to 231.)	Nay.
Mar. 13	H. R. 9166, extending to Apr. 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4.)	Not voting.[1]
Mar. 21	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for fiscal year 1956: On motion to agree to the conference report (thus rejecting Senate amendments to extend these programs for 2 years). (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Paired against.
Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0.)	Not voting.[1]
Mar. 21	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 310.)	Not voting.[1]
Apr. 11	H. R. 12, the Agriculture Act of 1956, providing rigid 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains, and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Yea.
Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181.)	Nay.
Apr. 12	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments: On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
Apr. 18	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing rigid 90-percent support for basic crops: On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211.)	Nay.
Apr. 23	H. R. 7728, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce: On passage. (Passed 284 to 8)	Yea.
Apr. 25	H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill: On amendment fixing at grade GS–16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184.)	Yea.
Apr. 27	H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956: On passage. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
May 3	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank): On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195)	Nay.
May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of parity the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208.)	Nay.
May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211.)	Yea.
May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Nay.

Footnotes at end of table.

Voting record of Congressman Joe Holt, 22d District, California (84th Cong.)—Continued

Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1956		
May 10	H. R. 10986, the Defense Department Appropriation bill: On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Yea.
May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Yea.
May 17	H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172.)	Paired.
May 21	H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges: On passage. (Passed 238 to 52.)	Paired.
May 22	H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for fiscal year 1957: On amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170)	Paired against.
May 23	H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank): On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 304 to 59.)	Paired.
May 24	S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming: On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 176 to 126.)	Paired against.
May 31	H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956: On passage. (Passed 246 to 4.)	Paired.
June 11	H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act: On passage. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Nay.
June 11	H. R. 1804, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination: On passage. (Passed 393 to 3.)	Yea.
June 13	H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects: On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected 179 to 209.)	Nay.
June 13	H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators: On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected 151 to 228.)	Yea.
June 13	H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected 165 to 213.)	Yea.
June 13	On passage. (Passed 338 to 31.)	Yea.
June 25	S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October: On passage. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
June 27	H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of non-service-connected veterans' pension awards: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 110 to 305.)	Yea.
June 27	On passage. (Passed 364 to 51.)	Yea.
June 28	H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950: On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department dispersal order. (Agreed to 200 to 197.)	Nay.
June 28	H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction: On adoption. (Adopted 327 to 67.)	Yea.
July 2	H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 325 to 50.)	Paired.
July 2	S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 254 to 133.)	Paired.
July 5	H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction: On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.)	Nay.
July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Yea.
July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 262.)	Yea.
July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Nay.
July 6	H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates: On passage. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Yea.
July 9	H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956: On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected 29 to 343.)	Nay.
July 9	H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site: On passage. (Passed 287 to 80.)	Yea.
July 11	H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957: On passage. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Yea.
July 12	H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957: On adoption. (Adopted 361 to 30.)	Yea.
July 12	H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957: On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. (Rejected 24 to 370.)	Nay.
July 12	H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
July 18	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations: On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.)	Yea.
July 18	H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act: On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
July 23	H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
July 23	S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 245 to 145.)	Yea.
July 23	H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123.)	Nay.
July 24	H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act: On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private businesses. (Adopted 201 to 185.)	Nay.
July 24	H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors: On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199.)	Yea.
July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191.)	Yea.
July 25	H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956: On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299.)	Nay.
July 25	H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9.)	Yea.
July 26	H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado: On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194.)	Nay.
July 26	H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines: On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178.)	Nay.
July 26	H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines: On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153.)	Yea.
July 27	H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration: On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126.)	Nay.
July 27	S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration: On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Nay.
July 27	H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7850, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho: On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168.)	Yea.

[1] Not voting. Would have voted "yea" if present.

[2] Not voting. Would have voted "nay" if present.

AN EXPLANATION OF TERMS

First. A bill may pass, or be defeated, by one of the following kind of votes:

1. Voice vote: The Speaker first asks all in favor to say "aye" then those opposed to say "nay." If there is no question as to the result, this is sufficient.

2. Division: If the result of the voice vote is in doubt, the Speaker asks those in favor to stand, then those opposed to stand. He counts in each instance and announces the result. If he is in doubt, or if demand is made by one-fifth of a quorum, then—

3. Tellers are ordered. A Member on each side of the question is appointed as teller, and they take their places at each side of the center aisle. Those in favor walk through and are counted. Those opposed do likewise. The result settles most questions, but any Member, supported by one-fifth of a quorum, can ask for a rollcall. This privilege is guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. Rollcalls place each Member on record on the particular measure involved. Each Member's name is called and his vote recorded. Rollcalls constitute the official voting record of the House.

Second. The type of bill can be determined by the letters which precede its number. All bills that originate in the House are designated by an H; those that originate in the Senate by an S. There are four main types:

1. H. R. (S.) designates a bill which, when passed by both Houses in identical form and signed by the President, becomes law.

2. H. J. Res. (S. J. Res.) designates a joint resolution which must pass both Houses and be signed by the President before becoming law. It is generally used for continuing the life of an existing law, or in submitting to the States a constitutional amendment, in which case it does not require the signature of the President but must be passed by a two-thirds majority of both Houses.

3. H. Con. Res. (S. Con. Res.) designates a concurrent resolution. To become effective it must be passed by both the House and Senate but does not require the President's signature. It is used to take joint action which is purely within the jurisdiction of Congress. Many emergency laws carry the provision that they may be terminated by concurrent resolution, thus eliminating the possibility of a Presidential veto.

4. H. Res. (S. Res.) designates a simple resolution of either body. It does not require approval by the other body nor the signature of the President. It is used to deal with matters that concern one House only, such as changing rules, creating special committees, and so forth.

Third. Recommittal: Generally, on all important bills, a motion to recommit the bill to a committee, with or without instructions, is voted upon by the House before it votes upon passage of the bill. If such a motion is adopted, it means that the bill will be changed, delayed, or even killed. However, when a motion to recommit is accompanied by instructions, the vote generally indicates whether the Member is in favor of or opposed to the change in the legislation proposed by the instructions and does not necessarily indicate his position on the bill as a whole. A motion to recommit with instructions, if adapted, does not kill the bill.

Fourth. Conference: Representatives from both Houses of Congress meet in conference to work out differences existing in the legislation as passed by the two bodies. Upon conclusion of their conference, a report is submitted to each House setting forth the agreements reached. Each House then must act by way of adopting or rejecting the report in whole or in part.

Fifth. A quorum call consists of a calling of the roll of Members to determine whether or not a quorum—a majority of Members—is present. No business may be conducted when it is found that a quorum is not present.

TRANSACTION OF SENATE BUSINESS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 7, 1956,

The following enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed by the Vice President on July 30, 1956, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to the strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Commmittee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Leith, Robert Arndt, Rose

Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the north branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, Puerto Rico, to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Barks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission, and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An Act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilitates, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget;

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 630. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on July 31, 1956, the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2903. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oathe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and for other purposes;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an advisory committee on Soil and water conservation;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Leith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4053. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4223. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

On July 27, 1956:

S. 1777. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to authorize common carriers to carry a disabled person requiring an attendant and such attendant at the usual fare charged for one person; and

S. 4256. An act to authorize the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from the State of California, to accept and wear the award of the Cross of Grand Commander of the Royal Order of the Phoenix, tendered by the Government of the Kingdom of Greece.

On July 28, 1956:

S. 2216. An act to amend the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1086, 1101; 16 U. S. C. 497); and

S. 3481. An act to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

On July 30, 1956:

S. 849. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, so as to provide for grants-in-aid to non-Federal public and nonprofit institutions for the constructing and equipping of facilities for research in the sciences related to health;

S. 3458. An act to grant leaves of absence to homestead entrymen and to permit suspension of cultivation and improvement operations on homestead and desert land entries, and for other purposes;

S. 3592. An act to provide in certain additional cases for the granting of the status of regular substitute in the postal field service;

S. 3926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to charge for special services to purchasers of timber from Indian lands.

S. J. Res. 183. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 11th World Health Assembly in the United States in 1958; and

S. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for expenses of the Pan American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1959.

On July 31, 1956:

S. 1893. An act for the relief of Harold D. Robison; and

S. 3768. An act to amend section 158 of the Revised Statutes, of the United States, as amended, so as to include the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare among the executive departments there listed, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1956:

S. 497. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California;

S. 985. An act to establish an Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission;

S. 1161. An act to abolish the Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak., and for other purposes;

S. 1400. An act to protect the integrity of grade certificates under the United States Grain Standards Act;

S. 1873. An act to increase the minimum postal-savings deposit, and for other purposes;

S. 2569. An act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State;

S. 2634. An act relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes;

S. 3009. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3116. An act to provide for the promotion and strengthening of international relations through cultural and athletic exchanges and participation in international fairs and festivals;

S. 3149. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to permit air carriers to grant reduced rate transportation to ministers of religion;

S. 3195. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Rhode Island to the town of North Kingstown, R. I.;

S. 3316. An act authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain property which has been declared surplus to the needs of the United States to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.;

S. 3361. An act for the relief of Egbert Carlsson;

S. 3658. An act to amend the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), so as to authorize, by agreement, the subsurface storage of oil or gas in restricted Indian lands, tribal or allotted;

S. 3820. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 3897. An act to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and procedures, and for other purposes;

S. 3970. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 3998. An act to provide for the development of the Federal fish hatchery known as the Holden Trout Hatchery, at Pittsford, Vt.;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4060. An act to amend section 607 of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, to include employees in the Motor Vehicle Service;

S. 4215. An act to amend the act of July 15, 1954, authorizing the sale of certain vessels to Brazil;

S. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution approving the relinquishments of the consular jurisdiction of the United States in Morocco; and

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget.

On August 2, 1956:

S. 218. An act for the relief of the town of Clayton, N. Mex.;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended;

S. 1637. An act to extend the time limit within which awards of certain military and naval decorations may be made;

S. 1915. An act to provide for further effectuating the act of May 15, 1862, through the exchange of employees of the United States Department of Agriculture and employees of State political subdivisions or educational institutions;

S. 2887. An act to further protect and assure the privacy of grand or petit juries in the courts of the United States while such juries are deliberating or voting;

S. 3259. An act to amend the act to promote the education of the blind, approved March 3, 1879, as amended, so as to authorize wider distribution of books and other special instructional material for the blind, to increase the appropriations authorized for this purpose, and for other purposes;

S. 3556. An act to amend Public Law 551, chapter 616, 83d Congress, 2d session;

S. 3779. An act to amend the act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868), with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah;

S. 3958. An act to improve the health of the people by assisting in increasing the number of adequately trained professional and practical nurses and professional public health personnel, assisting in the development of improved methods of care and treatment in the field of mental health, and for other purposes;

S. 3968. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Peoria Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution to commend the foundation known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for its project to establish a permanent memorial in honor of the North American Indians;

S. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution authorizing the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as Constitution Week.

On August 3, 1956:

S. 898. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to regulate the use by motor carriers (under leases, contracts, or other arrangements) of motor vehicles not owned by them, in the furnishing of transportation of property;

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes";

S. 1154. An act for the relief of Hal A. Marchant;

S. 1243. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1324. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 1833. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended;

S. 2060. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the Working Capital Fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2834. An act for the relief of Yue Yin Wong (also known as William Yueyin Wong);

S. 3266. An act to authorize officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to act as notaries in places outside the United States;

S. 3314. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay the expenses of an Advisory Committee on Soil and Water Conservation;

S. 3347. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. H. F. Webb;

S. 3391. An act to provide for the regulation of the interstate transportation of migrant farm workers;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3430. An act to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3650. An act for the relief of the town of Freeport, Maine;

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill;

S. 3821. An act to authorize the construction of one prototype ship and the conversion of one Liberty ship, by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce;

S. 3875. An act to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended;

S. 3903. An act to amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act, and for other purposes;

S. 3969. An act to provide for the termination of Federal supervision over the property of the Ottawa Tribe of Indians in the State of Oklahoma and the individual members thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4221. An act to amend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to change the name of Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor to Liberty Island; and

S. J. Res. 177. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain war-built vessels.

On August 6, 1956:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1184. An act for the relief of Frank R. Davis;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2419. An act for the relief of Dr. Anton M. Lodmell;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2823. An act for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady;

S. 3064. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Smith;

S. 3101. An act to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) (2) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3255. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3363. An act for the relief of Miroslav Slovak;

S. 3386. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Theodore Roosevelt," approved July 28, 1955.

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954.

On August 7, 1956:

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3616. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; and

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund.

On August 8, 1956:

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3879. An act to supplement the antitrust laws of the United States, in order to balance the power now heavily weighted in favor of automobile manufacturers, by enabling franchise automobile dealers to bring suit in the district courts of the United States to recover damages sustained by reason of the failure of automobile manufacturers to act in good faith in complying with the terms of franchise or in terminating or not renewing franchises with their dealers; and

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION DISAPPROVED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had disapproved bills of the Senate of the following titles, together with his reasons for such actions:

On July 31, 1956:

RECONVEYANCE OF MINERAL INTERESTS IN CERTAIN LANDS TO THE FORMER OWNERS THEREOF

I am withholding my approval of S. 1384, a bill to provide for the reconveyance of all mineral interests in lands acquired by the United States for certain reservoir projects to former owners thereof, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this measure is to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army, when he determines that the exploration for or exploitation of mineral interests underlying lands within the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoir projects in Mississippi will not be incompatible with the development, maintenance, and operation of these projects, and that the reconveyance of such mineral interests to former owners thereof will be in the public interest, to convey such interests to the former owners thereof or to their legal heirs upon application made within 3 years and upon payment to the United States of an amount equal to but not in excess of the purchase price for which said interests were acquired by the United States.

The Department of the Army is nearing the completion of the acquisition of approximately 283,000 acres of land for these 4 reservoir projects in northwestern Mississippi which are an integral part of the Yazoo River Basin headwater project authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 15, 1936. Approximately 62,000 acres have been acquired subject to retention of oil and gas and minerals of like character by the owners thereof and approximately 106,000 acres of the 218,000 acres acquired in fee simple for 3 of the reservoirs are available for leasing pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands approved August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913). Therefore, there is no objection to the enactment of legislation which would provide for the conveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests of like character underlying some of the lands within these reservoirs to the former owners thereof under conditions provided for in section 2 of the bill.

On March 29, 1956, I approved H. R. 7097, 84th Congress, which provides for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in lands within the Demopolis lock and dam project, Alabama, by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reconvey oil and gas and mineral interests to former owners thereof at the current fair market value of such oil and gas and mineral interests and subject to such reservations and restrictions as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary. However, S. 1384 differs significantly from this legislation in that it provides for "payment to the United States of an amount equal to but not in excess of the purchase price for which said interests were acquired by the United States." This provision constitutes a departure from the principle established in other legislation requiring payment of fair market value for minerals disposed of by sale or lease. Furthermore, it is predicated on the fallacious assumption that there was a determination of the "purchase price" of the minerals separate and apart from surface and other interests at the time fee title to the land was acquired by the United States. While the known presence of minerals and any trading in oil and gas leasehold interests were considered in arriving at the appraised fair market value of lands acquired in fee simple for these projects, no separate valuation was assigned to minerals except in those few instances in which a separate estate in minerals had been previously created. Therefore it would be impossible at this time to determine, in most instances, the "purchase price" paid for the minerals. Under these circumstances, I believe that the job of administering this legislation would be confusing and unsatisfactory to all concerned. However, in withholding my approval, I am hopeful that the Congress may yet enact legislation relating to the mineral interests in these lands similar to H. R. 7097, 84th Congress (Public Law 459, 84th Cong.), referred to above.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1956.*

On August 1, 1956:

JEAN PFEIFER

I am withholding my approval of S. 277, for the relief of Jean Pfeifer.

The bill would permit the payment of a lump-sum death payment under section 202 (i) of the Social Security Act to Mrs. Jean Pfeifer in connection with the death of her son, John S. Inches, without regard to the statutory limitation on the period within which an application for such payment may be filed.

The facts in the case are as follows:

Mr. Inches died on August 7, 1951. His mother, Mrs. Pfeifer, paid burial costs in connection with her son's death. She

did not, however, file an application for the lump-sum death payment until September 21, 1953, more than 2 years after the death of her son. Mrs. Pfeifer states that she or another surviving son had telephoned to the local office of the Social Security Administration on different occasions before the period had elapsed asking for application forms, but there are no records of such calls in the Social Security Administration files. In view of her failure to file application for the lump-sum death payment within the time fixed by law, the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance of the Social Security Administration held that Mrs. Pfeifer was ineligible for the payment. This action of the Bureau was affirmed, after a hearing, by a referee of the Appeals Council in the Social Security Administration.

I am reluctant to deny relief in a case of this kind, but there are at least two persuasive considerations which compel me to withhold my approval: (1) A much more desirable remedy is provided for in the revision of the Social Security Act that I approved today, and (2) enactment of S. 277 would establish for the social security program an undesirable precedent which until now has been avoided.

Since 1939 the Social Security Act has required that an application for the lump-sum death payment be filed within 2 years of the death of the individual involved. The courts have held that failure to file application within this period may not be waived or excused, even though it arises from misunderstanding or unawareness.

This bill would provide special relief permitting one individual to receive a social insurance benefit under conditions identical with those under which, under the basic law, the same benefit must be denied to others similarly situated. Such special legislation, as I stated in vetoing H. R. 1334, 83d Congress, is undesirable and contrary to sound principles of equity and justice.

This is not to say that there may not in some cases be equities which warrant extending the statutory time limit. But any modification in the provisions of the Social Security Act that might be desirable to allow for such cases should, I believe, be made in the basic law and stated in general terms so as to be applicable to all persons similarly circumstanced, rather than requiring claimants who believe that they have such equities to seek individual relief through the process of private legislation, which is both burdensome and hazardous to the claimant and costly to the public. The revision of the Social Security Act approved today contains an amendment to the basic law which would afford an opportunity, not only to Mrs. Pfeifer but to all claimants similarly circumstanced, to become entitled to a lump-sum death payment under the Social Security Act upon showing good cause for the belated filing of an application.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 1, 1956.*

On August 3, 1956:

CITY OF ELKINS, W. VA.

I have withheld my approval from S. 2182, a bill for the relief of the city of Elkins, W. Va. This bill would relieve the city of Elkins of all liability to repay a $75,000 loan (and all unpaid accrued interest) which it received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The facts on this bill are clear. Under the World War II defense area landing program, the Federal Government undertook, under certain circumstances, to build airports for communities which would provide appropriate land. In July 1943 the city of Elkins agreed with the Civil Aeronautics Administration to furnish land for an airport. The United States Government agreed to pay the cost of constructing the airport. Elkins then applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and was granted a loan of $75,000 to purchase the land. The loan was evidenced by $75,000 of 4 percent airport revenue bonds issued by the city. The city has made no payment on principal and is now in default on bonds aggregating $24,000. Some interest payments have been made but the accrued and unpaid interest as of May 1, 1956, amounts to $22,400. Through the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Government has expended over $1 million on the airport.

The issues involved in the bill are likewise clear:

1. The original agreement was and Elkins has received and will continue to receive benefits at least proportionate to its relatively small share of the airport's total cost.

2. The bill would give special treatment to a single community and thereby discriminate against other communities which built airports during World War II with Federal assistance. Of over 500 municipalities, representing every one of the 48 States, which entered into similar contracts with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the city of Elkins is the only one which applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan to finance the purchase. The proposed legislation would relieve the city from any obligation to repay the loan. Thus, in effect, the Federal Government would have both constructed the airport and provided the land. No other municipality has received such special treatment.

3. The bill would set a precedent which could be used by many other communities to urge cancellation of their obligations held by the Federal Government. In all, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made loans to over 6,000 municipalities and other public bodies. Of these, there are still outstanding 75 issues of municipal obligations totaling approximately $7 million. To relieve Elkins as provided in this bill would be to give that city a preference which was not given to any other city granted loans by the Corporation. Undoubtedly, special circumstances exist in many of the communities whose obligations remain unpaid. Testimony presented to the House Committee on the Judiciary suggests that the case for relief from their obligations might be as persuasive as in the case of Elkins. The precedent set by this bill could, moreover, adversely affect collections on loans to local governments under several other continuing Federal programs.

This bill involves one community and a relatively small amount of money; but it would establish undesirable principles and precedents affecting many other communities and many millions of dollars. I have, therefore, withheld my approval of S. 2182.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 3, 1956.*

On August 8, 1956:

DATE OF MEETING OF 85TH CONGRESS

On recommendation of the majority and minority leadership of both the Senate and House of Representatives, I am withholding my approval of Senate Joint Resolution 203, fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress. January 7, 1957, the date fixed in the resolution, is the date prescribed by law for the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice President. I am informed that the Congress cannot conveniently count those votes on the same day that it assembles.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 8, 1956.*

On August 9, 1956:

RATES CHARGED FOR ELECTRIC POWER BY SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

I have withheld my approval of S. 3338, an act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes.

The only purpose which this legislation could accomplish would be to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from fulfilling the obligations imposed upon him by section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, to establish rate schedules which will return sufficient revenue to amortize the investment in Federal multiple-purpose projects allocated to power, and to pay the necessary costs incurred in operating and maintaining power projects. By its terms, S. 3338 grants a legislative moratorium which prevents any rate increases for power sold by the Southwestern Power Administration to any public body or cooperative until June 30, 1957. This would result in a loss of $2,167,000 revenue during the present fiscal year.

Sound management requires that the Federal Government fix rates for electric energy and power from Federal projects which will return the taxpayers' investment, with interest, within a reasonable period of time. Revenues from power sales by the Southwestern Power Administration in 1955 were not sufficient to pay even the interest on the portion of construction costs allocated to power. Furthermore, these revenues have been insufficient to provide any return of the capital investment in power facilities since 1953. Enactment of the

bill will prevent the establishment of compensatory rates until July 1, 1957.

Fears have been expressed that the increased rates, which I am informed amount to approximately 40 cents per month for the average rural customer, proposed by the Department of the Interior will force upon preference customers—public agencies and cooperatives—the burden of absorbing the deficit in power revenues brought about by the delivery of power to a nonpreference customer under a 1952, 30-year contract at unrealistically low unit rates. However, the fact is that under the proposed schedule of rates, these preference customers will pay for power at rates determined upon the assumption that all power users must pay the rate necessary to retire the capital investment allocated to power on these multiple-purpose projects. The preference customers will not pay any of the deficit resulting, during the repayment period, from the 30-year contract.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS, WYOMING

I am withholding my approval of S. 3941, an act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming.

S. 3941 provides an additional period of time for the validation of mining claims held by certain specified persons in New Mexico and Wyoming, which could have been validated under the act of August 12, 1953, but which were not validated thereunder solely because of the failure of the holders of the claims to take the necessary steps.

This bill was originally introduced as a general measure, but, after the Department of the Interior recommended that it not be enacted, it was amended so as to be a private relief bill. This was done because the Department of the Interior pointed out that S. 3941 was really of the nature of a private bill, and that, if the bill were amended along such lines, reasons justifying the special treatment of the specific claimants might, perhaps, be produced. Justification for such unusual treatment has not been shown. The 12 persons named in the bill as having claims in Wyoming justify their failure to validate their claims under the act of August 12, 1953, on the grounds that a search of the records at a land office failed to show the existence of an oil and gas lease at the time of the location of their claims. However, a more diligent search of those records subsequently revealed the existence of an oil and gas lease. One of the persons named in the bill as having a claim in New Mexico based his right upon the fact that a search of the records at a land office failed to show the existence of an oil and gas lease because there had been a delay in making entries in the land office records. There was no evidence that the claimant had taken all possible steps to ascertain the existence of an oil and gas lease. The information on the other three claims is limited.

Under the circumstances, I have no recourse but to withhold my approval of S. 3941. To approve S. 3941 would, I believe, establish an undesirable precedent, encouraging others to seek relief from laws of general applicability on expired mining claims.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

REPORT ENTITLED "SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF NICKEL" (S. REPT. NO. 2826)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1956,

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on August 1, 1956, submitted a report entitled "Supply and Distribution of Nickel," relating to the impact of the nickel shortage on small electroplaters, which was ordered to be printed.

REPORT ENTITLED "GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT—1956" (S. REPT. NO. 2827)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 26, 1956,

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Select Committee on Small Business, on August 1, 1956, submitted a report entitled "Government Procurement—1956," relating to small business participation in Government procurement, which was ordered to be printed.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on the following dates that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance as deductions of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attainage age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the city of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the city of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and habors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 277, 84th Congress, he did on the following dates, sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United State Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard";

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 277, 84th Congress, he did on the following dates sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

S. 267. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 912. An act to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel;

S. 1012. An act for the relief of Juan Jose Moya Ramirez and George Nakamura;

S. 1355. An act for the relief of William Luke Phalen;

S. 2226. An act to authorize the Attorney General to dispose of the remaining assets seized under the Trading With the Enemy Act prior to December 18, 1941;

S. 2567. An act to authorize the appointment and retirement of Darrell C. Williams as a lieutenant commander, United States Navy;

S. 2585. An act to authorize an exchange of land at the Agricultural Research Center;

S. 2916. An act to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

S. 3101. An act to authorize the construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

S. 3113. An act to amend section 9 (c) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended;

S. 3196. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

S. 3227. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho;

S. 3275. An act to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with respect to fish and wildlife; to strengthen the fish and wildlife segments of the national economy; to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife; to establish a United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and for other purposes;

S. 3338. An act relating to rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration, and for other purposes;

S. 3416. An act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations;

S. 3467. An act to authorize the conveyance of tribal lands from the Shoshone Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming to the United States;

S. 3468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to amend certain contracts providing for the furnishing of water to the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for municipal purposes;

S. 3594. An act to reauthorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Farwell unit, Nebraska, of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 3831. An act to provide for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of West Virginia;

S. 3881. An act authorizing the demolition and removal of certain greenhouses and other structures on square 576 west in Washington, D. C., and the construction of other facilities in place thereof, at the Botanic Garden Nursery, and for other purposes;

S. 3927. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to Indian tribes certain federally owned buildings, improvements, or facilities on tribal lands or on lands reserved for Indian administration;

S. 3941. An act to provide for the validation of certain mining claims owned by Arthur W. Hyde, John H. Gossett, Clyne A. Bailey, and Manuel Silva, all of the State of New Mexico, and Thelma Arndt, Wallace (or Wally) Lawson, Richard L. (or R. L.) Greene, Elden F. Keith, Zola Keith, Leon Keith, Lee E. Keith, Robert Arndt, Rose Greene, Ferne Cressy, Marjorie Lawson, and Frank Cressy, all of the State of Wyoming;

S. 3956. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 4011. An act to amend section 650 of title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," relating to the Coast Guard supply fund;

S. 4058. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to extend and renew to Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co. for the term of 10 years a lease of a tract of land in the United States Department of Agriculture Range Livestock Experiment Station, in the State of Montana, and for a right-of-way to said tract, for the removal of gravel and ballast material, executed under the authority of the act of Congress approved June 26, 1946;

S. 4099. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. for the construction of a dam on the North Branch of the Potomac River;

S. 4116. An act to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission;

S. 4164. An act to provide for the appointment of a Federal Highway Administrator in the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 4184. An act to incorporate the Boys' Clubs of America;

S. 4203. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 4228. An act to provide for a President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space;

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954;

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution to authorize an additional position of Assistant Director in the Bureau of the Budget; and

S. J. Res. 203. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the 85th Congress.

On July 30, 1956:

S. 938. An act to provide for the payment and collection of wages in the District of Columbia;

S. 2093. An act to provide compensation for certain property losses in certain reservoir projects and for the replacement of school facilities of the Pollock Independent School District, Pollock, S. Dak., acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir;

S. 2379. An act to promote the fishing industry in the United States and its Territories by providing for the training of needed personnel for such industry;

S. 3732. An act to provide insurance against flood damage, and for other purposes; and

S. 3787. An act relating to the management of the Red Lake Indian Forest and sawmill.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, reported that, on the following dates, that committee had presented to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 7643. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Amphitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America"; to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold;

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Fla. and Ga., being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in District of Columbia;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Nuezler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules.

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relie of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

On July 31, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 3210. An act to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 4392. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real estate investment trusts;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe-last roughing or for shoe-last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10468. An act creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said sommission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.;

H. R. 10662. An act creating the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing the commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky., to purchase and operate a ferry at such location, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12080. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fugencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 1, 1956:

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 27, 1956:

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Sam H. Ray;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda;

H. R. 1971. An act for the relief of Leila Park;

H. R. 2121. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2325. An act for the relief of Joseph Santo;

H. R. 7121. An act to validate payments of mileage made to the United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8047. An act granting authority to the Secretary of the Army to renew the license of the Ira D. MacLachlan Post, No. 3, the American Legion, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., to use a certain parcel of land in Saint Marys Falls Canal project;

H. R. 8617. An act to validate certain payments made to members and former members of the naval service.

H. R. 8971. An act for the relief of Hamazasp Psakian, Mrs. Varsenick Psakian, and Nune Nona Psakian;

H. R. 9029. An act for the relief of John L. Hughes;

H. R. 9081. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 3-acre tract of land situated about 6 miles south of the city of San Antonio, in Bexar County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

H. R. 9842. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to hold and detain mail for temporary periods in certain cases;

H. R. 10679. An act granting the consent of Congress to the establishment by the States of Mississippi and Arkansas of a bi-State commission to investigate the possibilities of constructing a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River;

H. R. 10983. An act for the relief of P. R. Cox;

H. R. 12138. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 549. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the State of New York to negotiate and enter into an agreement or compact with the Government of Canada for the establishment of the Niagara Frontier Port Authority with power to take over, maintain, and operate the present highway bridge over the Niagara River between the city of Buffalo, N. Y., and the city of Fort Erie, Ontario, Canada;

H. J. Res. 604. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from April 14 to April 27, 1957, and in the Oklahoma semicentennial celebration to be held in various communities in the State of Oklahoma from January 1 to December 31, 1957; and

H. J. Res. 664. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

On July 28, 1956:

H. R. 1952. An act for the relief of Clarence Christensen;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 6376. An act to confer upon Alaska autonomy in the field of mental health, transfer from the Federal Government to the Territory the fiscal and functional responsibility for the hospitalization of committed mental patients, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10088. An act for the relief of Rupert Waltl;

H. R. 10111. An act to amend sections 657 and 1006 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to include certain savings and loan associations within its provisions; and

H. R. 11861. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946.

On July 30, 1956:

H. R. 256. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and certain salesmen;

H. R. 1739. An act for the relief of William J. Bohner;

H. R. 1774. An act to abolish the Verendrye National Monument, and to provide for its continued public use by the State of North Dakota for a State historic site, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2712. An act for the relief of Emanuel Mathes;

H. R. 4127. An act to exempt courses leading to standard college degrees offered by nonprofit educational institutions of higher learning from the provisions of section 227 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 prohibiting the enrollment of eligible veterans under that act when such courses have been in operation for less than 2 years;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Maria Pintos and her daughter, Eugenia Pintos;

H. R. 4635. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Robert T. C. Rasmussen, the right, title, and interest of the United States, in foreign countries, in and to certain inventions;

H. R. 5256. An act to provide for the redemption by the Post Office Department of certain unsold Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps, and to clarify the requirements with respect to the age of hunters who must possess Federal migratory-bird hunting stamps;

H. R. 5337. An act to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities;

H. R. 6081. An act for the relief of Patricia May Stevens;

H. R. 6243. An act to amend title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7290. An act to authorize female Reserve officers of the Army or Air Force appointed as nurses or women medical specialists to be members of the Army National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States, as appropriate;

H. R. 7888. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Weliweli, Island of Kauai, to certain claimants;

H. R. 7891. An act to authorize and direct the exchange and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for the relief of persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic activity;

H. R. 8265. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Buford Reservoir for the purpose of providing Gwinnett County, Ga., a regulated water supply;

H. R. 8940. An act relating to the use of storage space in the Hulah Reservoir to provide water for the city of Bartlesville, Okla.;

H. R. 9918. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate and execute a contract with the Riverside Irrigation District, Ltd., of Idaho, relating to the rehabilitation of the district's works and other matters;

H. R. 11706. An act for the relief of Kim Chung Hi;

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution designating the week of November 16 to 22, 1956, as National Farm-City Week; and

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution to establish a national motto of the United States.

On July 31, 1956:

H. R. 7619. An act to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12130. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12350. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

On August 1, 1956:

H. R. 3832. An act to require the registration of certain persons who have knowledge of or have received instruction or assignment in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a foreign government or foreign political party, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4096. An act to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska, subject to appropriate easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4899. An act for the relief of Helmut Klestadt;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5488. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Gilbert Henkens, Jr., star route, mile 17½, Anchorage, Alaska.

H. R. 5738. An act to authorize flight instruction during Reserve Officers' Training Corps programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6024. An act to withdraw and restore to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain land at Kaakaukukui, Honolulu, Oahu, T. H.;

H. R. 6247. An act to amend subdivision a of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 6403. An act to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations;

H. R. 6595. An act to amend certain provisions of law relating to the estate tax;

H. R. 7089. An act to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7225. An act to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7552. An act to amend sections 220 and 221 (d) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920;

H. R. 7887. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands under certain circumstances without public auction;

H. R. 7890. An act to authorize the commissioner of public lands to sell public lands located at Kaeohe Bay, Oahu, to certain persons;

H. R. 7893. An act to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act;

H. R. 8008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Warren D. Cooper and her son Teddy Devere Cooper;

H. R. 8110. An act to incorporate the National Music Council;

H. R. 8474. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property in the State of Alabama;

H. R. 8837. An act to amend certain sections of the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 9260. An act to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9265. An act to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act, as amended, relating to the audit of Government (Territorial and county) accounts;

H. R. 9547. An act to amend sections 401 and 701 (e) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to simplify the procedures governing the prescribing of regulations under certain provisions of such act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9699. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Oregon of the land and improvements known as the Clackamas National Guard target range, at Clackamas, Oreg., to be used for National Guard purposes;

H. R. 9947. An act for the relief of the estate of William Edward Wine;

H. R. 9970. An act to provide for the disposition of the Stockton Air Force Station and the Stockton Annex, Sharpe General Depot, Calif.;

H. R. 10946. An act to provide for the disposition of surplus personal property to the territorial government of Alaska until December 31, 1958;

H. R. 11024. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska," approved March 15, 1948 (62 Stat. 80) as amended by the act of July 12, 1952 (66 Stat. 592, 48 U. S. C. 116a);

H. R. 11254. An act to amend section 104, title 4, United States Code;

H. R. 11522. An act to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11544. An act to improve and simplify the credit facilities available to farmers, to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11636. An act to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, relating to animals, birds, and fish;

H. R. 11653. An act to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11947. An act to extend and amend the Renegotiation Act of 1951;

H. R. 12034. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a contract with the Tule Lake Irrigation District, California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12170. An act to remove the present $1,000 limitation which prevents the Secretary of the Navy from settling certain claims arising out of the crash of a naval aircraft at the Wold-Chamberlain Air Field, Minneapolis, Minn.;

H. J. Res. 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce;

H. J. Res. 642. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim certain property in Coahoma County, Miss., to the Home Demonstration Club of Rena Lara, Miss., Inc.;

H. J. Res. 643. Joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the need for a geophysical institute in the Territory of Hawaii; and

H. J. Res. 661. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On August 2, 1956:

H. R. 604. An act to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3489. An act to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 to bring employees of Gallaudet College within its coverage;

H. R. 5299. An act to authorize the establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5519. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain tracts of land in El Paso County, Tex., to the city of El Paso, Tex., in exchange for certain lands to be conveyed by the city of El Paso, Tex., to the United States Government;

H. R. 5712. An act to provide that the United States hold in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez a part of the Ojo del Espiritu Santo Grant and a small area of public domain adjacent thereto;

H. R. 6040. An act to amend certain administrative provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 and to repeal obsolete provisions of the customs laws;

H. R. 8068. An act for the relief of Elma Agnes Gibson Hollingsworth;

H. R. 8226. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915, as amended (48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 9956. An act to amend subdivision (e) of section 58, notices, of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. R. 10432. An act to amend further the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to authorize the Administrator to pay travel expenses and per diem allowances to trainees in attendance at the National Civil Defense Staff College, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11207. An act for the relief of Cyrus B. Follmer;

H. R. 11696. An act to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska;

H. R. 11969. An act to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

H. R. 12254. An act to provide additional time for the Tariff Commission to review the customs tariff schedules;

H. J. Res. 636. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 650. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 651. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 683. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On August 3, 1956:

H. R. 2845. An act to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-incurred

disability of loss or loss of use of both buttocks;

H. R. 3062. An act for the relief of Paul H. Sarvis, Sr., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4090. An act to provide for a study by the Federal Communications Commission, the United States Coast Guard, and the Federal Maritime Administration with respect to the need for automatic radio-telegraph call selectors and other such safety devices on certain cargo ships of the United States;

H. R. 5274. An act extending to Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H. R. 5808. An act for the relief of Judith Kao;

H. R. 6709. An act for the relief of Harry M. Caudill;

H. R. 6794. An act to authorize certain members and former members of the Armed Forces of the United States to accept and wear decorations, and supporting documents conferred upon them by the Government of the Philippines;

H. R. 7728. An act to provide that the Department of the Navy shall not be required to reimburse the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the transfer of certain real property at Columbus, Ohio;

H. R. 7855. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to extend until July 31, 1958, the period during which disposals of surplus property may be made by negotiation;

H. R. 8157. An act to provide for the burial in the Memorial Ampitheater of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Va., of the remains of an unknown American who lost his life while serving overseas in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict;

H. R. 9314. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Illinois and Wisconsin to enter into a compact relating to interstate public school districts where an educational community extends into both such States;

H. R. 9631. An act to ratify and confirm the sale of certain real property of the United States;

H. R. 9810. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the State of Indiana;

H. R. 10383. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the city of Vero Beach, Fla.;

H. R. 10898. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Randall McMahon;

H. R. 10984. An act for the relief of Nikolai E. Khokhlov;

H. R. 11090. An act concerning gifts of securities to minors in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11124. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of judges;

H. R. 11489. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the American Institute of Architects in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11548. An act to provide for the establishment of a new fish hatchery in the vicinity of Paint Bank, Va.;

H. R. 11613. An act to extend the time limit within which naval vessels may be loaned to friendly Far Eastern nations and to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly European nations;

H. R. 11682. An act to facilitate the control and eradication of certain animal diseases, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural and related programs, to facilitate the agricultural attaché program, to facilitate the operations of the Farmers' Home Administration, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and the Forest Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11695. An act to extend until June 30, 1958, the programs of financial assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities under the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain other changes in such provisions;

H. R. 11821. An act for the relief of Esterlee Hutzler Weinhoeppel;

H. R. 12270. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12354. An act relating to clerk hire of Members of the House of Representatives;

H. R. 12396. An act to authorize the Honorable BARRATT O'HARA to accept and wear the award of the Medal for Distinguished Military Service in white tendered by the President of the Republic of Cuba, Maj. Gen. Fulgencio Batista y Zaldivar;

H. J. Res. 511. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935;

H. J. Res. 615. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 620. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 639. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 649. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 662. Joint resolution for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens;

H. J. Res. 680. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H. J. Res. 695. Joint resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 331 and House Resolution 606, 84th Congress.

On August 6, 1956:

H. R. 800. An act to amend section 1201 of title 18 of the United States Code to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to initiate investigation of any kidnaping in which the victim has not been released within 24 hours after his seizure;

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman E. Mosley, as natural parents of Herman E. Mosley, Jr.;

H. R. 5881. An act to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects;

H. R. 6283. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Tierney;

H. R. 6586. An act to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands;

H. R. 7181. An act to provide for the designation of Mikveh Israel Cemetery, in Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of the Independence National Historical Park;

H. R. 7536. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, so as to require that certain vessels carrying passengers for hire be fitted with radiotelephone installations;

H. R. 7596. An act to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9348. An act to amend the act entitled "An act incorporating the Archaeological Institute of America" to increase the value of real and personal property that such institute may hold;

H. R. 9396. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place guar seed on the free list;

H. R. 9506. An act to provide for the conveyance of La Puntilla Military Reservation, San Juan, P. R., to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 9591. An act to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1037), relating to the acquisition of non-Federal land within the existing boundaries of any national park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9640. An act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to release certain restrictions on the real property heretofore conveyed to the West Marks Baptist Church of Quitman County, Miss.;

H. R. 9679. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to dispose of a certain parcel of land, a part of Fort Belvoir Accotink Dam site military reservation;

H. R. 9875. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall apply only if the amount paid for the admission exceeds 90 cents;

H. R. 10006. An act for the relief of Vincent P. Svelnis;

H. R. 10177. An act to suspend for 2 years the import duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to permit substitution for drawback purposes in the case of printing papers;

H. R. 10184. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to convey property to the county of Pierce, State of Washington;

H. R. 11002. An act to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 11197. An act to provide for the retention in public ownership of certain lands around the Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Florida, and Georgia, being administered by the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission;

H. R. 11702. An act to provide for the sale of lands in reservoir areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army for cottage site development and use;

H. R. 11709. An act to amend Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, to increase the authorization for appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11834. An act to allow a charitable deduction for certain bequests;

H. J. Res. 472. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the act of August 20, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton;

H. J. Res. 617. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 618. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 637. Joint resolution to waive certain subsections of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens;

H. J. Res. 667. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies; and

H. J. Res. 681. Joint resolution to waive the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens.

On August 7, 1956:

H. R. 3957. An act for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett;

H. R. 7634. An act to provide that amounts which do not exceed 60 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons;

H. R. 8750. An act to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act;

H. R. 9874. An act to authorize Canadian vessels to be employed in the coastwise transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y.;

H. R. 11554. An act to amend certain provisions of title XI of the Merchant Marine

Act, 1936, as amended, to facilitate private financing of merchant vessels in the interest of national defense, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11677. An act to provide for the advancement of Maj. Gen. Hanford MacNider, Army of the United States (retired), to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list;

H. R. 11742. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the conservation and development of urban communities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 11833. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for a Great Plains conservation program; and

H. R. 12152. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the allowance, as deductions, of contributions to medical research organizations.

On August 8, 1956:

H. R. 11911. An act to authorize negotiations with respect to a compact to provide for a definition or relocation of the common boundary between Arizona and California, and for the appointment by the President of a Federal representative to the compact negotiations.

On August 9, 1956:

H. R. 10624. An act relating to intercorporate relations between the General Public Utilities Corp., a corporation organized and operating in the United States, and the Manila Electric Co.

On August 10, 1956:

H. R. 7049. An act to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard."

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following bills of the House; his reasons for such actions are as follows:

On July 31, 1956:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 4993, to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia.

The two properties involved, owned by private corporations, are occupied as gasoline filling stations in a residential use district. Under the zoning regulations promulgated pursuant to the act of March 1, 1920, as amended by the act of June 20, 1938, the two stations may be continued as such in the category of nonconforming uses because they were in existence prior to the enactment of the zoning statute. However, except under certain conditions, these nonconforming uses cannot be physically extended, enlarged, or improved. At present there are approximately 5,000 nonconforming uses in the District of Columbia.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the National Capital Planning Commission have had underway for the past 3 years a study looking to a complete revision of the zoning regulations for the District of Columbia. That study is almost completed, and when completed will doubtless include provisions dealing with the problem of nonconforming uses. We should not single out two of these now by special legislation and provide benefits for them which cannot be enjoyed by any of the other many nonconforming uses. To do so would constitute an invitation for other special legislative exceptions which, if enacted, could frustrate comprehensive planning and make impossible the orderly development of the Federal City.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 31, 1956.*

On August 9, 1956:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 3210, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes.

This bill is substantially the same in purpose and effect as H. R. 3300 of the 83d Congress from which I also withheld my approval in that it would authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago to increase from 1,500 to 2,500 cubic feet per second the diversion of water from Lake Michigan to the Illinois Waterway for a period of 3 years. H. R. 3210 would also direct the Secretary of the Army to make a study with respect to the effect of the diversion and to make recommendations regarding its continuance. While certain conditions and limitations are imposed that were not in the earlier bill these do not deal with the fundamental reasons for my withholding approval of that measure.

In my memorandum of disapproval of H. R. 3300 I stated, among other things:

I am unable to approve the bill because * * * (2) all methods of control of lake levels and protection of property on the Great Lakes should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion, (3) the diversions are authorized without reference to negotiations with Canada, and (4) the legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversion may be adversely affected.

A comprehensive report by the Corps of Engineers which will include consideration of the best methods of obtaining improved control of the levels of the Great Lakes and of preventing recurrence of damage along the shores is nearing completion. I am asking the Secretary of Defense to expedite completion of this report. This report is in addition to the technical report on the effects of an increased diversion into the Illinois Waterway which has been made by the Joint Lake Ontario Engineering Board to the International Joint Commission. I think it would be unwise to proceed with the diversion in the manner proposed in H. R. 3210 until all relevant information has been obtained, particularly since objections to the proposed diversion have been registered by the Canadian Government in its note dated February 13, 1956, and additional objections filed by legal advisers of the States of Wisconsin, Ohio, and New York.

Although I am fully aware of the seriousness of some of the problems confronting the Chicago area and the State of Illinois, the record on H. R. 3210 affords no basis for me to change my position in this matter. Accordingly, under the circumstances, I am convinced that the bill should not be approved.

I am asking the State Department to engage in discussions with the Canadian Government in an attempt to work out a solution to these problems as soon as all pertinent facts are available.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 9, 1956.*

On August 10, 1956:

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 4392, entitled "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a special method of taxation for real-estate investment trusts."

Under existing law, real-estate trusts and associations with transferable shares are generally taxed as ordinary corporations on their entire taxable income. The enrolled bill would extend to such organizations, under certain conditions, the conduit or pass-through method of taxation which present law provides for regulated investment companies. The effect would be to exclude from the corporate tax all but a small margin of retained earnings of real-estate trusts.

While the bill assumes a similarity between real-estate trusts and regulated investment companies, there are important differences between the two situations. The income of regulated investment companies is generally derived from the securities of corporations which are fully subject to the corporate income tax. In the case of regulated investment companies, therefore, the conduit treatment merely avoids an additional level of corporate taxation, which for dividend income consists of the tax on the portion of dividends remaining after the 85 percent intercorporate dividends deduction. By contrast, the conduit treatment proposed for real-estate trusts would entirely remove the corporate income tax from much of the income originating in their real-estate operations.

It is by no means clear how far a new provision of this sort might be applied. Though intended to be applicable only to a small number of trusts, it could, and might well become, available to many real-estate companies which were originally organized and have always carried on their activities as fully taxable corporations.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

On August 10, 1956:

I am witholding my approval of H. R. 7643, "An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to foreign tax credit for United Kingdom income tax paid with respect to royalties and other like amounts." This bill would extend to firms with a permanent establishment in the United Kingdom that receive royalties there a credit for taxes imposed by the United Kingdom on the payor of the royalties. This provision would be retroactive to 1950.

Under the income tax convention with the United Kingdom royalties received by a United States licensor are not sub-

ject to tax in the United Kingdom if the recipient has no permanent establishment there. If it does have a permanent establishment, the royalty is subject to British taxation. The American recipient reports the net amount of royalties from British sources and receives no United States tax credit for the British tax paid. This treatment under United States law arises from two court decisions (*Trico Products Corp.* (46 BTA 346, affirmed 137 F. (2d) 424, cert. den. 320 U. S. 799, reh. den. 321 U. S 801); *Irving Air Chute Co. Inc.* (1 T. C. 880, affirmed 143 F. (2d) 256, cert. den. 323 U. S. 773)).

The combined effect of the United States income tax law and the income tax convention with the United Kingdom is to produce a different combination of British and United States taxes on the royalties paid some American recipients than on others. However, the United States tax law is not the cause of this difference in treatment. It is caused by the provisions in the convention itself. The appropriate way to correct the situation would be modification of the convention. The Treasury Department currently is conducting discussions on the convention with the British and will add this problem to the agenda.

The present status of royalty payments from the United Kingdom to the United States has been well known to interested parties at least since the convention was adopted in 1945. Many arrangements between licensees and licensors have reflected existing law and the burden of British tax may not rest on United States licensors in such cases. Consequently, to allow the British tax as a credit against the United States tax on a retroactive basis would give a windfall gain to some American licensors.

The proposed change would single out for special relief a small group of taxpayers whose need for relief has not been demonstrated. Tax relief should not be given in this way.

For these reasons, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

On August 10, 1956:

I have withheld my approval of H. R. 12080, which would authorize appropriations totaling about $1.6 billion for 99 projects or project modifications and 14 river-basin authorizations involving improvements for navigation, shore protection, flood control, and related purposes. I regret that this action is necessary, because I believe that the periodic enactment of river and harbor and flood-control legislation is an important step in the formulation of a sound Federal program for the wise development of the Nation's water resources.

This bill does not appropriate funds. It only authorizes certain projects or project modifications, so that the next Congress can consider them for appropriation. So my action on the bill need cause no delay in starting the many worthwhile projects in the bill.

While the majority of the projects which this bill would authorize have been given adequate study and review within the executive branch and by the affected States, there are still a large number which have not been reviewed in accordance with the orderly procedures set forth in the applicable laws. Therefore, it is not possible at this time for me to determine whether their authorization would be in the public interest. Still others have, after review, been found not to be in the public interest.

Existing law requires that before a report of the Chief of Engineers recommending authorization of a project is submitted to the Congress the affected States be afforded an opportunity to comment on the proposal. In addition, procedures for review consistent with other statutory requirements have been established under Executive Order 9384. These procedures provide for review of project reports within the executive branch before they are submitted to the Congress. For 32 of the projects which the bill would authorize, involving financial commitments of over $530 million, all of these requirements have not been met. Without such review, the Congress must necessarily have acted on the basis of incomplete information. Some of these projects have not even been studied and reported on by the Chief of Engineers, and in a few cases field studies have not yet been completed.

Section 202 of the River and Harbor and Flood Control Act of 1954 declares it to be the policy of Congress that:

> No project or any modification not authorized, of a project for flood control or rivers and harbors, shall be authorized by the Congress unless a report for such project or modification has been previously submitted by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in conformity with existing law.

I regard this as being a wise policy, and I believe that it is very unfortunate that this traditional statement was not followed in H. R. 12080.

In various messages to the Congress I have clearly stated my view that our vital water resources can best be conserved and utilized in the public interest if the Federal Government cooperates with State and local governments and with private interests in the development of those resources, and does not undertake such development as though it were a matter of exclusive Federal interest. In order to carry out such a policy properly and effectively, it is necessary that the views of affected States be given adequate consideration in formulating proposals for water resources projects. This has not been accomplished for a number of projects included in this bill.

In addition, other projects in this bill would be authorized on a basis which would result in a lesser degree of local participation than was agreed to by the local interests and recommended by the executive branch. I believe that authorization of water resources projects on such terms would represent a serious backward step in the desirable development of the Nation's water resources, and would result in the loss of the best test yet devised for insuring that a project is sound—the willingness of local people to invest their own money in a joint enterprise with the Federal Government.

In the weeks before the Congress convenes a careful, orderly review will be undertaken of those projects and other provisions of the bill which have not been fully studied or reviewed at the present time. This should enable the Congress to base its action on a full knowledge of all the facts involved. I believe that the people of the United States are entitled to expect that these procedures will be followed before new water resources projects, involving large future financial commitments, are authorized in law.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

On August 10, 1956:

I am withholding my approval from H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662, bills creating the City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission and the City of Cannelton Bridge Commission, respectively. The City of Lawrenceburg Bridge Commission would be authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Lawrenceburg, Ind., and Boone County, Ky., and to purchase and operate a ferry at this location. The City of Cannelton Bridge Commission would be granted comparable authority with respect to a bridge and a ferry at or near Cannelton, Ind., and Hawesville, Ky.

On July 26, 1956, I approved H. R. 11010, creating a Muscatine Bridge Commission and authorizing it to perform functions similar to those contemplated by H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662. At that time I indicated that I would not be inclined to approve the creation of bridge commissions of the type contemplated by that bill in the absence of special emergency circumstances. Because the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and the town of Drury, Ill., were confronted with a serious disruption of traffic as a result of the collapse of the center span of an existing bridge, and because it appeared that a bridge commission could most quickly undertake the construction of a new bridge, I signed the bill.

I am unaware of any circumstances which would make the provision of bridges at Lawrenceburg and Cannelton so urgent as to justify special Federal legislation creating additional bridge commissions. The construction and operation of interstate bridges, as I stated on July 26, has traditionally been a State rather than a Federal responsibility. The General Bridge Act of 1946 facilitated State action by granting blanket authority for the construction of bridges over navigable streams without the enactment of special authorizing legislation. In those cases in which the States choose to create special interstate agencies to build, maintain, and operate toll bridges, they may do so at any time through the negotiation of suitable interstate compacts. I am, therefore, unwilling, under ordinary circumstances, to have the Federal Government take away from the States and their highway agencies the responsibility for providing bridges of concern primarily to the residents of the immediate area to be served.

Bridge commissions of the type provided for by these bills also give rise to serious legal and administrative problems. Because they owe their creation and all of their powers to acts of Congress they cannot be State or local agen-

cies. Yet they are not considered to be instrumentalities of the Federal Government. One result of this uncertainty is the lack of adequate provisions for supervising the activities of bridge commissions in the public interest. No State or Federal official or agency is empowered to see to it that the commissions proposed by H. R. 10468 and H. R. 10662 carry out their responsibilities in a faithful and efficient manner.

This lack of supervision can lead to serious mismanagement and injury to the public interest, as was recently disclosed by a congressional investigation of the affairs of the White County Bridge Commission. That investigation documented questionable expenditures of many thousands of dollars and led a select committee of the House of Representatives to propose drastic measures to prevent future abuses.

I, therefore, suggest that if the States of Indiana and Kentucky determine that these two bridges are needed, they enter into appropriate agreements to proceed with construction under the authority conferred by the General Bridge Act.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1956.*

APPOINTMENTS BY THE SPEAKER SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER, pursuant to the provisions of section 2, Public Law 954, 84th Congress, and the order of the House of July 27, 1956, empowering him to appoint commissions, boards, and committees authorized by law or by the House, did, on August 7, 1956, appoint as members of the President's Advisory Commission on Presidential Office Space the following members on the part of the House: Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Mr. MCGREGOR of Ohio.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, a report of committee was delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[*Omitted from the Record of July 27, 1956*]

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Report on study of manpower utilization and personnel management in the Federal Government pursuant to House Resolution 304 (84th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 2961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*——The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bender, George H., *Ohio*——120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*——The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*——The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Daniel, Price, *Tex*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Duff, James H., *Pa*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*——
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
George, Walter F., *Ga*——The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*——
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Jenner, William E., *Ind*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*——
Langer, William, *N. Dak*——2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*——Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*——
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*——
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*——The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Edward, *Pa*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*——
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*——
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*——
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*——
Purtell, William A., *Conn*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*—Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*——
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*——
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*——4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*—Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, and Cramer.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, ———, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	Circuit Judges	
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*____
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*__6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*_____4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*___
Albert, Carl, *Okla*_____
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*__
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*_____
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*___
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*_____University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*__4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*_
Andrews, George W., *Ala*__3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*____
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*_____4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*___
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*___
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*__Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*_113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*___
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*___

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*_
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*___
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*_
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*__2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*____
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*_____
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*_____
Bates, William H., *Mass*____
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*_
Beamer, John V., *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*_____
Belcher, Page, *Okla*_____
Bell, John J., *Tex*_____
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*__1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*___5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*___
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*_____2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*____
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*____
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*__
Boggs, Hale, *La*_____
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*___
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*_____3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*__2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*____
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*__The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*____
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*_____4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*_____
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*____The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*_____
Bray, William G., *Ind*_____
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*_____
Brooks, Overton, *La*_____4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*__Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*_____Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*_
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*_____
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*__
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*___
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*__
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*_____2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*____
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*_____
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*____
Byrne, James A., *Pa*_____
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*____1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*____
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*_____
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*_____The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*____
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*____
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*_
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*___Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*_
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*_____
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*_
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*__1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*_____
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*_____3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*____The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*____1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*__
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*____2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*_____
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*_____The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*____
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*____
Cramer, William C., *Fla*__Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*__
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*__
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*____3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*____

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*_____
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*___
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*_____4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*_____2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*_____
Dawson, William A., *Utah*__
Dawson, William L., *Ill*___
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*____
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*____
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*__2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*__
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*_
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*_
Dies, Martin, *Tex*_____
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*_2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*_____
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*_
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*____
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*____
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*____3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*__The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*_
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*__
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*____
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*____
Dowdy, John, *Tex*_____
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*_____3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*_____The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*_3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*_____
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*_____
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*____4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*_____3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*_____5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*_____

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*_____
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*_
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*_____3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*__200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*_____
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*_____Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*_____
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*_____The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*____
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*_____3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*_____4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*__514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*_____
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*_____The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*__Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J*. 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*____
Fulton, James G., *Pa*_____

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*___
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*___
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*_____
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*_____6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*_____
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*_____
George, Myron V., *Kans*___3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*____
Grant, George M., *Ala*_____4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*_____
Green, Edith, *Oreg*_____
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*__
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*_____2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*_
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*_____
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*___
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*____

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*_____
Hale, Robert, *Maine*_____2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*_____
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*___4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*_____
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*_____The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*_____
Harris, Oren, *Ark*_____1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*_____4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*__
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*_____314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*_____Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*_____
Healey, James C., *N. Y*_____
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*_____104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*__
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*_____
Heselton, John W., *Mass*___
Hess, William E., *Ohio*_____
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*__
Hill, William S., *Colo*_____110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*__
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*_____
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*__100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*___Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*___
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*_____
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*_____
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*_____
Holt, Joe, *Calif*_____
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*____
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*____3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*_____
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*_____
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*_____
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*_____

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*_____

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*__
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*____200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*_____
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*__The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*_____
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*_____2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*_
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*_____630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*____3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*_
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*_____3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*___
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*__
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*____3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*____
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*_____2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*_
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*_____Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*_1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*_____
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*____
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*_____
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*____The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*_The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*_____3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*_____
King, Cecil R., *Calif*_____
King, Karl C., *Pa*_____
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*__
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*_____
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*___
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*_____
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*_____
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*_____112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y.*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Long, George S., *La.*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak.*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill.*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr.*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md.*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine.*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn.*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Prost, Gracie, *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Phillips, John, *Calif.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Polk, James G., *Ohio.*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn.*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y.*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Richards, James P., *S. C.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky.*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn.*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans.*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill.*
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Short, Dewey, *Mo.*
Shuford, George A., *N. C.*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill.*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis.*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa.*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill.*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio.*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill.*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla.*
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass.*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y.*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich.*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J.*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev.*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), *Alaska.*—1718 33d Pl. SE.
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 102 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, AUGUST 17, 1956 No. 135

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the second session of the Eighty-fourth Congress will be published not later than Monday, August 20, 1956. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Lt. Gen. Samuel Dent Sturgis, a Great American Soldier and Engineer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, I have had some opportunity to observe how the impact of the atomic age has affected the United States Military Establishment. I could say much about the changes that have occurred since World War II, and are still occurring, in planning, organization, and operations in all branches of the services.

At the very heart of military technology, at least insofar as the Army is concerned, is the Army's Corps of Engineers, which bears much of the brunt of modern-day changes in military concepts. The engineers must keep abreast of rapid changes in their own increasingly complex technical field. They must keep abreast of changes made in the Army of which they are a part. Finally, they bear much of the burden of helping all arms and services adapt themselves to technological change. For every new development in any branch is likely to bring about new requirements in the way of base construction, transportation, bridging, or dispersion, and it is largely up to the engineers to meet these requirements.

The Nation has been fortunate in having, at this critical stage, a chief of engineers whose capability and experience outstandingly fit him to direct the Corps of Engineers through its present crucial period. He is Lt. Gen. Samuel Dent Sturgis, Jr., the most distinguished scion of a family that has been famous in American military history for more than a century. His grandfather attained the rank of major general in heroic fighting during the Civil War, and afterward helped pacify the West. An uncle was killed with Custer. His father also reached the rank of major general and commanded the 87th Division in World War I. The traditions of this outstanding family of military leaders reached a climax with the career of the present General Sturgis, who has achieved higher rank than even his illustrious forebears.

We of the Connecticut Valley were greatly impressed with the invigorating forcefulness with which General Sturgis helped to direct the rescue and rehabilitation effort during the dark days of flood in 1955. The floods of that year in the New England and North Atlantic States were among the greatest natural disasters of American history. While the waters were still raging, General Sturgis appeared in person to help coordinate the efforts put forth under the overall direction of the Civil Defense Administration. Army engineer personnel and resources were mobilized and rushed to the spot from all over the eastern United States within a matter of not days, but hours. Bulldozers and emergency bridging appeared; roads, railways, and communications were reopened; relief and repair supplies began to flow into the area; and basic utilities were restored. It was the Army engineers who made available the bulk of the emergency funds, and under their auspices contracts for reconstruction work were let in record time.

I am in a position to know that the forcefulness manifested by General Sturgis on that occasion is typical of his every effort. He has brought the same qualities to bear in helping the Nation's Armed Forces adapt themselves to the complex problems of modern technology, and in hammering his own corps into a well-trained combat arm and a technical service of unparalleled efficiency.

The man who holds the position of Chief of Engineers, United States Army, holds one of the biggest and most important executive jobs in the world. It is a job to test the mettle of a man like General Sturgis. I know of no better way to pay him tribute than to describe that job, and then examine the way in which he has measured up to it.

The Chief of Engineers must be, first and foremost, an outstanding soldier. It is his job to counsel the Army's high command on all matters in which engineering is concerned—and in these days, when it has been truly said that modern warfare is engineering warfare, that function alone makes him one of the key commanders of the Nation's Military Establishment.

He is the general in charge of the training of 10,000 engineer officers and 100,000 enlisted men who are deployed all over the globe—which means that he is responsible for providing the Nation with some of the world's most highly skilled soldiers and making them ready to face the toughest and most intricate tasks of modern warfare. Their mission spans the entire field of war from the munitions factories at home up to and beyond the front lines of battle action. He heads a redoubtable intelligence operation and the world's largest and most scientific mapping activity, which turned out 500 million vital military maps during World War II. He directs a far-

flung research effort and a vast supply organization handling $2.5 billion worth of military stocks.

He is in charge of the biggest peacetime military engineering and construction program in history—a job which has reached its climax during the tenure of General Sturgis as Chief of Engineers. This program embraces the complex design and construction of the almost infinite range of facilities required by the Army and the Air Force, to the amount of about $1.5 billion a year, at some 700 different locations scattered from the Arabian desert to the frozen wastes near the North Pole.

But all this is only half of the job of the Chief of Engineers. Entirely apart from his military function, he has the job of directing the United States Government's rivers and harbors and flood-control programs; and in carrying out this job he is responsible not to his military chiefs but directly to the Secretary of the Army. The civil works part of his job alone would make him among the more important executives in the world. For the program calls for the expenditure of over a half billion dollars a year. It embraces the construction and maintenance of all the Nation's seacoast ports and harbors, all its Great Lakes ports, and all its inland waterways, which now total some 28,000 miles and carry an important and increasing proportion of the Nation's total tonnage of freight. It also involves responsibility for the national flood-control program, including the construction of hundreds of large and small dams, thousand of miles of levees and floodwalls, and a vast array of other engineering works. As an incidental part of the job, the Chief of Engineers is responsible for electric-power installations with a combined generating capacity of more than 4 million kilowatts—1 of the greatest power-development programs in the world.

Taking his military and civil functions together, the Chief of Engineers directs the world's largest construction program and in addition to his 110,000 engineer soldiers, is boss of 55,000 civilian employees. As part of his job, he is required to conduct the world's largest real-estate operation. The acreage under his charge is the equivalent of the combined areas of New Jersey, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maryland, and Delaware, and with improvements has a value of more than $25 billion. The variety of this real estate is astounding. It includes almost every kind of property one can think of—military bases, reservoir sites, experimental areas, farms, forests, towns, factories, utilities, highways, railroads, bridges, and even cemeteries.

Such is the job. Now what of the man who holds this job?

General Sturgis' long career has covered a truly remarkable range. He has held every kind of assignment that can normally be held by an engineer officer. This personal acquaintance of all aspects of the works of his command—combat, construction, staff, and civil works—has been one of the main assets contributing to his outstanding record as Chief of Engineers.

Born in St. Paul, Minn., in 1897, Samuel D. Sturgis was graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1918 and was promoted through the ranks of second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain all in 1 day. Though he trained with troops, World War I ended before he could be shipped overseas. He then served as company commander and received further training in military and engineering subjects, after which he taught for a time at West Point.

In 1926, young Sturgis went to the Philippines, where for a time he commanded the 14th Engineers. During the period he carried out strategic studies which were invaluable to him 18 years later, when, as Chief Engineer for the Sixth Army, he participated in the reconquest of the Philippines. As a part of these studies, he participated in the mapping of the island of Luzon and initiated work on the defenses of Bataan.

Next he was assigned to Company A, Ninth Engineers, Mounted, at Fort Riley, Kans. It was here that he outstandingly displayed the qualities of enterprise and imagination that was later to manifest on larger and more important fields. Far ahead of his time, and ahead of many of his fellow officers, Sturgis comprehended the revolution that motorization would bring about in military operations, and conceived the necessity of the modern engineer mechanical equipment that would be needed to keep military engineering abreast of mechanized warfare. He applied for and received the first such equipment made available to any engineer troop unit of the United States Army. Under his direction, this became the pilot test which resulted in the provision of bulldozers, diesel shovels, air compressors, and other modern construction equipment which played such a vital role in opening the jungles and beachheads of World War II.

It was the first, but by no means the last, time that Samuel Sturgis was to play a leading part in helping keep the Military Establishment abreast of technological change.

During the mid-1930's, Sturgis was assistant to the district engineer in charge of the Passamaquoddy tidal power development. After the disastrous, record-breaking Ohio River flood of 1937, he was sent to Huntington, W. Va., to serve as executive officer in the intensive flood-control and navigation construction effort which followed. Later, after a period in the Army War College, he became district engineer at Vicksburg, Miss., where he not only initiated work on the revised flood-control program for the lower Mississippi Valley but directed a $200 million construction program to build essential installations as part of the pre-World War II preparedness effort—installations which later contributed to rapid mobilization and the successful conduct of the war.

World War II saw him in the South Pacific as chief engineer of the Sixth Army. He directed engineer operations in a theater where his commander, Gen. Walter Kruger, said that warfare was "one-third engineers, one-third Air Force, and one-third everything else."

Under the all but impossible conditions that prevailed in the area, Sturgis manifested the qualities of initiative and resourcefulness that were to lead him to the highest command in his corps. The problems he overcame during the New Guinea, New Britain, Admiralty, and Philippines campaigns might well have overwhelmed a man of less force. Operating at the end of an immensely long supply line, helping plan operations in mud and jungles and across vast stretches of sea, fighting on little-known islands, he and his engineers had to lead the way across beaches, build all-important airstrips under fire, cut roads through jungles for the troops to follow, then build depots, hospitals, harbors, and facilities for the staging of other invasions to follow.

After the war he was the chief engineer of the Air Force until that service was separated from the Army. Then there followed other important commands. For a time he was division engineer in charge of work on the great program of dams and reservoirs for controlling and developing the Missouri River. Later, he was commanding general of the Sixth Armored Division at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. In 1952 he was appointed commander of the communications zone, United States Army, Europe, with headquarters in France, and commander of all Army Forces in France. In this post, it was his duty to prepare the entire fighting and supply line from French ports and across France to meet any threat of attack from the East. He was recalled from Europe to take his present position of Chief of Engineers.

This was the period when the Korean war had alerted our Nation to the need for worldwide defenses against the aggressive power that had come within a hairsbreadth of unleashing world war III. America had taken the initiative in building a ring of strategically located bases around the free world. The construction job—a job totaling about $10 billion—was given to the Army's Corps of Engineers. This program was still developing when General Sturgis was appointed by the President to head the Corps. Fresh from the arduous emergency construction job in France, he brought his experience and skill to bear on the problems of the worldwide effort.

As the Nation knows, he has carried it through triumphantly. At the same time, he has carried out some of the largest annual civil-works construction programs in the 132-year-old history of the Federal rivers and harbors enterprise. He coped with great floods not only in the North Atlantic area but on the west coast.

While carrying out the responsibilities of his position, he has also provided the armed services with outstanding inspiration and leadership in discerning and grappling with the problems of this age.

He has been among the foremost of the Nation's leaders in focusing attention upon the need for survival power in case of future national emergency, whether it be a natural disaster like another great flood, or the terrible disaster of war. It has been part of his doctrine that it is not enough to be able to strike heavy blows at an attacker; that America must be organized to get back

on its feet after taking the heaviest blow that the enemy can strike, and go on to outslug him. General Sturgis has not only preached this doctrine, but taken a leading part, insofar as his authority and responsibility permitted, in setting up emergency procedures to be followed in case of need.

Similarly, he has hammered away at the importance of technology in warfare. Sometimes at the risk of antagonizing his superiors, he has insisted on subjecting every theory and doctrine to the test of its technical practicality. He has pointed out the ever-increasing construction requirements imposed by new weapons, new plans, and new military concepts, and demanded that the engineer and technician be given a voice in all decisions from the highest strategic level on down. Having seen and experienced in actual warfare both the disastrous cost of failure to heed engineering principles and the remarkable achievements made possible by taking full advantage of engineering resources, he has applied his experience to the problems of the present and the future.

To help make the Army engineers into a crack force ready for any test, he has strengthened the combat effectiveness of the engineer soldier both by insistence on thorough training and by constantly seeking to improve combat engineer equipment. Under his direction, light, stripped-down bulldozers, shovels, and other heavy engineer machinery have been developed that can be dropped by parachute, and thus enable engineer assault units to carry out complex missions if necessary behind enemy lines. The search for quicker and stronger methods of bridging, of transport, of fuel supply, and of storage and supply, has been initiated and stepped up to keep pace with the modern concept of widely dispersed, highly mobile military operations.

General Sturgis has been as effective in the civil-works side of his job as in the military side. He has provided outstanding leadership in maintaining and strengthening the Nation's water-resources development programs in a troubled period, when, under the pressure of economy and the stresses of necessary reorganization and reorientation, all Federal programs were being subjected to the strictest scrutiny. He took the lead in the movement to better coordinate the many old and sometimes conflicting Federal conservation policies and agencies—the movement which led the President to appoint his Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy. And he has been one of the first to point out growing problem of water supply—a problem which some authorities consider the Nation's No. 1 natural resources problem of the future—and to suggest means of meeting it.

Finally, few men have been as effective as General Sturgis in calling attention to the vital problem the Nation faces in its shortage of engineering and technical manpower. Not content with discussing this problem before congressional committees and high-level bodies of engineers, he has gone before young people themselves in schools and colleges to urge them to develop their talents, to explain the rewards of hard work and patriotism, and to point out what the Nation needs and expects from its youth.

It goes without saying that a man who has accomplished so much both as a commander and an administrator is no ordinary personality. Not only his Army chiefs and the Nation's leaders, but the many ordinary citizens who have worked with him, know Gen. Sam Sturgis to be not only a man of great virility and ability but a man of great integrity and sincerity. One of his proudest boasts on behalf of his corps, along with its record of construction and achievement, is that it has had the courage and integrity to reject 55 percent of the project proposals brought before it, on ground that they did not represent good investments for the American taxpayers.

When he was appointed Chief of Engineers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch spoke for most of the people who knew him when it headlined the story: "General Sturgis Man of Action, No Stuffed Shirt." When he spoke his mind in opposition to a bill favored by many Congressmen and some of his superiors, the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, on the other side of the fence on that particular issue, praised him for his ability and sincerity. In an editorial headed "This Man Sturgis," it said:

> Maj. Gen. Samuel D. Sturgis * * * is no table thumper. A man of great competence, outstanding ability, real understanding, and high purposes, it has been our own personal experience with General Sturgis that when he thinks a thing is right, he says so. And he speaks softly and persuasively.

Another newspaper reporter said of him:

> Like many dedicated soldiers, Sturgis eats, sleeps, and talks the Army. A rugged 6-footer, he drives himself and others hard, and on his many inspection trips (1 year he flew 125,000 miles) often stops to go deeply in the details of a construction project or to make a careful spot check of some engineer troop unit.
>
> He likes to move fast when walking, driving, or flying, and nearly all his efficiency reports refer to Sturgis' "boundless energy and enthusiasm." A bit of a Spartan, he take a social drink and smokes occasionally. Once he startled the bartenders at a reception in Michigan by asking for a chocolate soda.
>
> Sturgis' hobbies are golf, reading military history (his "escape" reading) and doing math problems (he taught mathematics at West Point).

But perhaps the most fitting tribute and accurate summing up was made by President Eisenhower 2 years ago at the dedication of McNary Dam, the great structure built by the Army engineers on the Columbia River. The President of the United States told his audience:

> When I first met Sam Sturgis I was detailed as a young officer to coach a football team and a young hopeful lieutenant showed up. I made him an end and he worked pretty hard under me for some weeks and months. Today I think that all of you would like me to speak for you in commending him as the brilliant head of a great organization which not only here but throughout our land has built up these great works in flood control, in drainage, in water conservation, and power development, an organization of which not only the United States Army but which America is proud.

Expansion of Private Industry in the Borough of Brooklyn, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted by unanimous consent of the House, I insert herewith the text of a letter addressed to Hon. Edward T. Dickinson, commissioner of the department of commerce, State of New York, by Hon. John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn, relating to the expansion of private industry in my home Borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York, N. Y. I also include herewith three summaries which list a number of examples showing how various companies are enlarging their production facilities and plants. These summaries also list newly established enterprises and other concerns moving into Brooklyn.

The letter and summaries follow:

MARCH 23, 1956.

Hon. EDWARD T. DICKINSON,
Commissioner, Department of Commerce, State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

DEAR COMMISSIONER DICKINSON: In response to your department's request I am glad to forward to you herewith a summary which outlines the recent growth of private industry in the Borough of Brooklyn.

This summary is the result of a study I have just completed and is submitted to you in three sections, as follows:

1. An alphabetical listing of new enterprises established in Brooklyn and companies moving to Brooklyn from other boroughs or out-of-State locations during 1955 and the early part of 1956;

2. An alphabetical listing of large, medium, and small concerns which have expanded or are presently engaged in expanding their existing industrial facilities and operations; and

3. A chronological listing of occupancies and acquisitions of industrial properties as announced in the press in 1955.

Upon examining these listings you will find that they represent almost 125 definite examples which show how industry is continuing its growth and expansion in this, the largest borough of the city of New York. At this point I want to emphasize that these summaries are necessarily incomplete and are not intended, of course, to convey the impression that they represent the full extent to which industry is growing here.

The information submitted herewith is, rather, the result of a spot survey which has been compiled through the cooperation of members of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board, several other departments of the municipal government and the managements of scores of the companies mentioned herein. As you know, a complete census of industrial expansion in a community as large as this would require a great deal of time and effort and would be altogether beyond the limited means which my office has available.

Although Brooklyn has usually been known as the home and cradle of small business and industry, you will find that the summaries I am enclosing include expansions by Brooklyn concerns which rank high among the largest industrial corporations of the United States. While it is not generally realized, the fact is that approximately 40 of the 500 largest United States industrial

corporations, based on sales volume, maintain their administrative offices and/or manufacturing plants and subsidiaries in this borough.

In this summary you will find, for example, that Esso Standard Oil Co. has completed a $1,600,000 expansion and modernization of its Greenpoint terminal, which occupies more than 8 acres of property on the north side of Brooklyn. Herein also you will find that Chas. Pfizer & Co., the world's leading producer of antibiotics, has acquired additional property, and that a number of other large and nationally known companies, such as American Machine & Foundry Co., Intertype Corp., Kentile, Inc., Leviton Manufacturing Co., Mergenthaler Linotype Co., the National Broadcasting Co., and Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co. have just recently expanded or are now in the process of enlarging their production facilities. It is interesting to note, too, that Sears, Roebuck & Co. is transferring all its warehouse operations to Brooklyn from another location and will soon occupy facilities equipped with a railroad siding capable of accommodating 7 railroad cars and a loading platform capable of handling 28 trucks at one time.

In the period immediately preceding the time of this summary, other large companies, including Liebmann Breweries, Inc., expanded their facilities. The F. & M. Schaefer Brewing Co. has acquired much additional property for expansion. I am reliably informed that another large Brooklyn company is presently contemplating a new executive office building and an expansion of its production facilities at an estimated cost of $7 million.

In the matter of the Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc., one of the country's leading manufacturers of electrical equipment, which employs about 2,700 persons, the Board of Estimate of the City of New York approved an application, in accordance with law, to enable this company to undertake an expansion of its plant facilities, thereby averting the transfer of its operations to two out-of-State locations which would have involved a heavy loss of local employment as well as a substantial loss of taxes to the city.

Among other important data in these summaries you will note that the annex of the United States Coast Guard Supply Center at Second Avenue and 42d Street is being acquired by a Brooklyn metal products company from the United States General Services Administration. This acquisition consists of about 2.1 acres of property with improvements including 6 buildings having a total floor area of approximately 140,000 square feet.

Several newspapers published the announcement on February 17, 1956, that a bid of $506,000 for this property had been accepted by the GSA, and that the Classon Metal Products Corp. was the successful bidder.

The press, in publishing this announcement, quoted Mr. I. G. Kates, president of the company as stating that this firm which now occupies several adjoining buildings and a warehouse in Brooklyn, had considered moving out of town because of the necessity of obtaining sufficient space to expand its facilities.

While circumstances make it necessary at times for existing firms to transfer their operations to out-of-town or out-of-State locations, experience has shown, in practically each such instance, that the vacated property is taken over by a concern which is expanding its operations or that the property is subdivided to provide space for other diversified occupancies.

While your Department knows that such removals occur here occasionally, just as they do in other parts of the State, there is less emphasis, unfortunately, on the fact that a substantial number of new enterprises are constantly being established and also that large enterprises, formerly situated in other locations or States, are moving into Brooklyn after carefully analyzing the economic advantages Brooklyn has to offer. One of the attached summaries, even though it is only partial in scope, lists approximately 30 examples of such developments and includes a number of substantial occupancies especially in the transportation industry which shares the benefits provided by important new highways we are building such as the Brooklyn-Queens Connecting Highway.

It is significant that in the past few years Brooklyn has maintained its construction record which sees the completion of an average of at least one new factory or industrial-type building in each week of the year. The official records of the department of buildings for 1955 show that 51 factory buildings and 32 warehouse and storage-type buildings were completed in Brooklyn during the year.

If industrial expansion such as this occurred in any other community or even in a number of entire States, it would be regarded, no doubt, as phenomenal. Indeed, a number of knowledgable individuals with whom I have discussed these summaries, have expressed astonishment upon realizing the extent of Brooklyn's continuous industrial expansion which these summaries indicate. The fact remains that Brooklyn's record in this regard is a remarkable one which reflects much faith and confidence in Brooklyn's future. This is particularly true at a time when, as you know, persistent efforts are being made to induce our industries here and in other parts of New York State to move to other regions.

The suggestion has been made that because of our industry's importance not only to Brooklyn and New York City, but to the economy of the entire State of New York, you may wish to consider establishing a new regional office of your Department in the Borough of Brooklyn. This would, of course, mean much additional service and assistance to our businessmen. I am glad to transmit this suggestion to you for such consideration as you deem advisable.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN CASHMORE,
President.

NEW ENTERPRISES OR COMPANIES LOCATING IN BROOKLYN

A

Anchor Terminal Service Co., Inc., agents for Boise Griffin Steamship Lines, moved to pier 5, foot of 57th Street, from Hoboken, N. J.

Angus Packing Corp., of 79 First Avenue, Manhattan, has erected new building at 96–100 North Third Street, Brooklyn, for expansion of operations. Occupancy scheduled for April 1, 1956.

Associated Transport, Inc., one of the largest transportation companies on eastern seaboard, has arranged to transfer to Brooklyn all its terminal facilities now being operated in Manhattan and Queens. An area of vacant land consisting of about 90,000 square feet and bounded by West Street, Quay Street, Oak Street, and the East River has been acquired by this corporation, to be used for trucking terminal purposes. One-story general freight-handling terminal and two-story office building now under construction, at total estimated cost of $400,000. Occupancy scheduled by August 1, 1956, with 250 employees. Company will continue executive offices only in Manhattan.

B

Belle Doll & Toy Corp., moved from Manhattan to 33–49 Nassau Avenue.

Brooklyn Folding Box Co., formerly of Queens, now established at 35–49 Kent Avenue.

Bush Terminal Buildings Co. leased 60,000 square feet in one of its buildings to concern formerly located in Manhattan.

C

Crestline Manufacturing Corp., 58 North 15th Street, relocated from Long Island City and has expanded operations.

D

Diesel Economy Devices, Inc., relocated at 197 Bush Street from Manhattan.

E

Electronic Transformer Co., previously established in Manhattan, occupying approximately 30,000 square feet of space in Gair Building, 70 Washington Street.

Engels Trucking Co. acquired new terminal, 80 by 100 feet, at 541 Kent Avenue, and now occupies same. Company owns and operates 32 large trucks and intends soon to expand terminal. Company has discontinued terminal facilities in Manhattan.

G

Morris J. Golombeck, spices, acquired five-story loft buildings with approximately 120,000 square feet of space at 950–960 Franklin Avenue. Previously established in Manhattan.

Granett Supplies, Inc., relocated at 199 Sackett Street from Manhattan.

H

Hi-Line Co., manufacturer of children's wear, relocating production facilities, arranged to occupy new quarters consisting of approximately 44,000 square feet of space at 234 Taaffe Place.

Hi-Quality Finishing Corp., new concern, occupied approximately 10,000 square feet of space in Gair Building, 70 Washington Street.

J. B. Hirsch Co., of New York City, acquired 1-story brick and steel industrial building with 22,000 square feet of space at 2425 Pacific Street.

I

Industrial Starter Corp., manufacturer, electrical parts for machinery, relocated at 35 Dean Street, from Manhattan.

K

Kraft Foods, Inc., leased 1-story brick and steel building with 20,000 square feet of space at Calyer Street from Russell Street to Humboldt Street.

L

Lite Manufacturing Co., of New York City, acquired 2-story and basement building with 35,000 square feet of space at 307 Richardson Street.

Luchow Products Corp., 351 South 4th Street, dedicated and opened in December 1955 newly equipped $100,000 plant for preparation and distribution of frozen foods. Gross annual sales of $2 million anticipated in 1956.

M

Marlowe Handbag Co., of New York City, acquired 2-story brick and steel industrial building with 57,000 square feet of space at northeast corner of Meadow and Bogart Streets. Part of same building leased to Urb Plastics Corp., of New York City.

Metropolitan Plastics Corp., 865 Grand Street; new enterprise at this location.

Micamold Electronics Manufacturing Co., 1087 Flushing Avenue; expanding operations.

N

Charles F. Noyes Co., Inc., sold 170,000-square-foot industrial building in Bay Ridge to manufacturer who is moving from Manhattan. Noyes Co. also sold 90,000-square-foot industrial building on Duffield Street in downtown Brooklyn.

Nu-Pako Products Co., 244 Howard Avenue; new enterprise at this location.

R

Red Rope Stationery Industries, Inc., new company, occupied approximately 20,000 square feet of space in Gair Building, 70 Washington Street.

River Materials Corp., of New York City, acquired square block of property bounded by Wythe Avenue, North 13th Street, North

14th Street, and Kent Avenue, consisting of about 80,000 square feet.

Rubin Trimming Works, of Elizabeth, N. J., leased and occupied 3-story industrial building, with approximately 25,000 square feet of space, at 274 Ten Eyck Street.

S

Sandler Medical Gases, Inc., 132 Metropolitan Avenue, new enterprise for manufacture of compressed gases.

Skippy Doll Corp., relocated at 294 Graham Avenue from Manhattan.

State Pipe & Nipple Corp., 81 North 4th Street, relocated from Manhattan and expanding operations.

T

Treasure Shoe Manufacturing Co., Inc., occupied approximately 15,000 square feet of space at 456–474 Johnson Avenue.

U

Urb Plastics Corp., previously referred to above, leased part of 57,000-square-foot building at northeast corner of Meadown and Bogart Streets.

1955–56 EXPANSION OF INDUSTRY IN BROOKLYN

Companies listed as having expanded their industrial faciilties in the Borough of Brooklyn in 1955, or which are so engaged at present, include the following:

A

American Machine & Foundry Co., 5502 Second Avenue.

Aywon Wire & Metal Corp. has planned new one-story metal products plant at northeast corner of 64th Street and Seventh Avenue. Building plans filed in December 1955 for construction at estimated cost of $175,000.

B

I. Baskowitz Bottle Co., Inc., leased ground floor of three-story New York Dock Co. building at 46–54 Columbia Street.

Bush Terminal Buildings Co. leased space totaling 34,000 square feet to 2 firms which have moved to this location from other parts of Brooklyn.

Belmet Products, Inc., establishing plant at 48–50 Beadel Street, as addition to existing plant at 503 Morgan Avenue.

C

Casual Footwear, Inc., has expanded operations and is now established at 747 Belmont Avenue.

Classon Metal Products Corp.'s offer to purchase United States Coast Guard Supply Center Annex at Second Avenue and 42d Street, in Bush terminal area, accepted by United States General Services Administration. Property comprises about 2.1 acres, and improvements include 6 buildings with total floor area of nearly 140,000 square feet. Full occupation expected by June 1, 1956. Classon Metal Products Corp., manufacturers of metal houseware products, currently occupies approximately 85,000 square feet of manufacturing space in several buildings at 136 Clifton Place and 325 Greene Avenue, and warehouse building at 304 Meserole Street, Brooklyn.

Corelli Sportswear Co. has expanded operations and now occupies substantial space at 33 Flatbush Avenue.

Culver Glassware Co. transferred plant from 2967 Cropsey Avenue to 2932 West 12th Street, in expansion of facilities.

Control Instrument Co., Bush Terminal Building.

D

David & David, Inc.: This company, formerly located at 274 Morgan Avenue, leased approximately 18,000 square feet of space at 85 North Third Street for use as offices and for manufacture and distribution of their product throughout metropolitan area.

E

Electro-Knit Fabrics Co., relocating from 16 Lexington Avenue to 2201 Neptune Avenue, in expansion of facilities.

Engels Trucking Co. purchased new terminal, 80 by 100 feet, at 541 Kent Avenue, and now occupies same. Company owns and operates 32 large trucks and intends soon to extend terminal additional 60 feet. Company has discontinued terminal facilities in Manhattan.

East Coast Valve & Fittings Co., Inc., acquired building at 129–139 31st Street in order to expand operations.

Eastern Stock Food Co. relocating from 719–721 Kent Avenue, to 34–38 Steuben Street, in expansion of facilities.

Esso Standard Oil Co., which occupies approximately 8½ acres of property on north side of Brooklyn, completed and dedicated on October 14, 1955, extensive expansion and modernization of its Greenpoint Terminal. Expansion program, which represented an investment of approximately $1,600,000 by the company and which required several years for completion, included (1) purchase, clearing, and filling in of additional land; (2) construction of new dock extending along 495 feet of waterfront on Whale Creek for receiving barge shipments of petroleum products; (3) construction of large new building facilities including warehouse and garage and installation of central warehousing; and (4) modernization of loading facilities.

G

Gaetjens, Berger & Wirth, Inc., manufacturers of printing inks, occupied additional space in Gair Realty Corp. building at 35 York Street.

Gem Electric Manufacturing Co., Inc., occupied additional space in Bush Terminal Buildings at 233 37th Street.

H

Harte & Co., Inc., chemical fabricators, new plant at 26 Ash Street to be operated in conjunction with existing plant at 49 Dupont Street.

M. F. Hickey Co., Inc., building materials, with 3 plants in Brooklyn and 1 in Queens, expanding operations by reactivating former Cranford plant at 52 Ninth Street.

Highway Plating & Polishing Co. relocated plant from 1047 61st Street to 90 North Fourth Street, in expansion of activities.

Hudson Tea & Spice Co. expanded activities and moved from 201 46th Street to larger quarters at 225 25th Street.

I

Insulation Manufacturing Co., Inc., expanded activities at 11–19 New York Avenue.

Intertype Corp., which occupies major portion of New York Dock Co.'s Trade Facilities Building at 360 Furman Street, occupied additional space at this location.

K

Karp Metal Products Co. expanded operations at its plant, 211–77 63d Street.

Kentile, Inc., 46–54 Second Avenue (described in nationally circulated periodicals as America's largest manufacturer of resilient floor tiles) expanding operations.

Charles J. King, Inc., iron and steel company, expanded operations at 1301 Grand Street. Company has plant also at 1260 Grand Street.

Knight Electrical Products Corp., of 168 Van Brunt Street, enlarging facilities at 36 Summit Street.

L

Leviton Manufacturing Co., Inc., 236 Greenpoint Avenue. This company is one of the Nation's leading manufacturers of electrical equipment and employs approximately 2,700 persons in plant which occupies two square blocks of property on both sides of Diamond Street, between Calyer Street and Greenpoint Avenue. As an essential step toward necessary enlargement of its plant facilities, and in order to avert transfer of its operations to out-of-State locations, the Leviton Co., in its capacity as the owner of all the abutting property in this section of Diamond Street, applied for and, after required public hearing, received the city's approval of the closing and discontinuation of this 50-foot-wide street area to permit integration of the eliminated street area with its abutting property. Required payment for release of the city's interest in portion of street closed and discontinued, and for other incidental costs, made to city by the company.

Long Island Mattress Co., 468 Morgan Avenue, occupied 20,000 square feet of additional space.

M

Marmike Manufacturing Corp. occupied entire first floor of building at 671 Bergen Street, in expansion of its operations.

George McKibben & Son, book manufacturers, occupied additional space in Bush Terminal Buildings at 67 34th Street.

Mergenthaler Linotype Co., 43 Hall Street, engaged in nondefense work, expanding its production line.

Meyer Line, Inc., operating shipping facilities at piers 17 and 18, at foot of Joralemon Street, leased approximately 25,000 square feet of space in New York Dock Co.'s Trade Facilities Building, 360 Furman Street.

Mars Fudge & Fruit Co., Inc., expanded operations and is now located at 21 Bush Street.

Mareth Steel Co., formerly located at 639 39th Street, leased 1-story industrial building comprising approximately 20,000 square feet of space at 120 50th Street, in Bush Terminal area. Company manufactures steel cabinets and related items.

N

Naar Food Co. occupied approximately 18,000 square feet in new building at 420 East 83d Street. Company, established in Brooklyn for many years, was located in Brooklyn Terminal Market before moving to new location.

National Broadcasting Co., which announced plans in November 1955 to expand its color television facilities in New York City, Hollywood, and Chicago, has filed building plans in Brooklyn offices of department of buildings for extensive building operations at 1301–1325 Avenue M, 1262–1296 East 14th Street, 1302–1326 Locust Avenue, and 1267–1295 East 13th Street, Brooklyn. Permits issued on January 25, 1956, for excavation work. Press has announced estimated cost of NBC's Brooklyn expansion will approximate $3 million, and that borough will become one of Nation's centers in color TV broadcasting.

J. J. Newberry Co. engaged additional space in Bush Terminal Building, 87 35th Street.

North American Packing & Processing Co. leased two New York Dock Co. structures containing approximately 80,000 square feet at 200–218 King Street.

Nova Manufacturing Co. expanded operations and relocated at 89 Bogart Street.

P

Palmer Plastics, Inc., expanded operations and relocated at 300 DeWitt Avenue, from Bank Street to Van Sinderen Avenue.

Pecheur Lozenge Co., Inc., engaged additional space in Bush Terminal Buildings, 253 36th Street.

Chas. Pfizer & Co., manufacturing chemists, administration office and plant, 11 Bartlett Street (Nation's leading manufacturer of antibiotics), acquired 1-story 25,000-square-foot building, and land to meet company's need for additional space.

Q

Quaker Maid Co., Inc., occupied additional space in Bush Terminal Buildings.

R

Radio Receptor Co., Inc., leased new building 80 North 5th Street in expansion of operations.

Royal Lace Paper Works, Inc.: This company which occupies considerable space in New York Dock Co. Building, at 116–162 Imlay Street, leased 1-story building, north side

of Verona Street, between Imlay Street and commercial wharf.

Royal Switchboard Co., Inc., 460 Driggs Avenue.

Rudd Plastic Fabric Corp., 618–634 62d Street: This former distributor of sheet plastic products will now manufacture plastic materials at this location and is erecting extension to existing building to provide space for expanded operations.

S

Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co., Evergreen Avenue between Melrose Street and Jefferson Street, filed plans in December 1954 for extension to plant and began building operations in May 1955, at estimated cost of $1,500,000. Completion expected April 1956.

Sears, Roebuck & Co., leased on long term new warehouse building which was placed under construction in August 1955, at Glenwood Road and Utica Avenue, at estimated cost of $450,000. Company will have 100,000 square feet of space under 1 roof plus 31,000 square feet of open storage space with railroad siding capable of accommodating 7 railroad cars. Loading platform will accommodate 16 large trucks loading and 12 large trucks unloading. All previous activities of this type formerly conducted in Queens will be transferred to new Brooklyn warehouse upon completion expected about May 1, 1956.

Sirac Co., formerly of 198 Roebling Street, expanded activities and occupied approximately 36,000 square feet of space at new location, 251 Lee Avenue.

T

Taller & Cooper, manufacturer of toll booths and toll-checking equipment, engaged substantial additional space in Gair Realty Corp. Building, 100 Water Street, to meet heavy orders received for turnpike and electronic equipment.

Topps Chewing Gum, Inc., engaged additional space in Bush Terminal Buildings, 254 36th Street.

Towns & James, wholesale drug firm founded in 1885, occupied newly completed building at 909 Remsen Avenue. Building, covering almost square block, occupies area of 85,000 square feet and contains in excess of 1,700,000 cubic feet of space.

U

United States Tube & Foundry Co. Inc., 500–504 Wortman Avenue: This company is erecting new building for expanded operations. Existing operations at 491 Wortman Avenue to be continued.

V

Valspar Corp., now at 135–150 Jackson Street: Discontinued plant in New Jersey and transferred its equipment to Brooklyn plant.

Y

Yeselson Bros., Inc., of 698 Third Avenue, plate, window glass, and mirrors, announced transfer of its plant to new and larger quarters at 502–504–506 Third Avenue.

INDUSTRIAL OCCUPANCIES AND ACQUISITIONS OF INDUSTRIAL BUILDINGS AS ANNOUNCED IN THE PRESS DURING 1955

FEBRUARY 8, 1955

Keystone Furniture Hardware Co. leased 1-story building at 82 Jefferson Street for manufacture of furniture hardware.

One-story building at 281 Liberty Avenue, acquired by Hazel Citron for manufacture of picture frames.

FEBRUARY 22, 1955

Lou Hirsch & Co. leased 1-story factory building at 122–124 Sumpter Street for design and manufacture of plastic seats.

Parsons Express, Inc., leased facilities at 238–240 Freeman Street, for shipping and distribution of general merchandise.

FEBRUARY 23, 1955

The Comfort Chair Co. leased loft at 72 Nostrand Avenue, for manufacture and distribution of upholstered furniture.

FEBRUARY 25, 1955

J. De Marco Co. leased 1-story building at 90 Montrose Avenue for manufacture, repair, and storage of machinery used in canning trade.

Michael Rizzo acquired 2-story building at 296 Waverly Avenue for manufacture of electronic products.

MARCH 1, 1955

Zel Nee Knitting Mills leased property at 782 Wythe Avenue, for manufacture of women's knitted sweaters.

MARCH 16, 1955

Chrome Edge Distributors, Inc. leased 2 buildings and lot at northwest corner of 9th Avenue and 65th Street for manufacture of automotive novelties and automobile accessories.

APRIL 27, 1955

Three-story factory building, 60 by 100 feet at 813–817 63d Street, acquired by 60 Bolivar Corp., to be used for manufacture of burlap bags.

MAY 6, 1955

Citro Manufacturing Co. leased 1-story building, 759 Chauncey Street, for packing, shipping, and distribution of metal and glass household novelties.

JUNE 24, 1955

First Venture Corp. purchased 1-story loft building, 100 by 30 feet, at 536 Junius Street.

JUNE 30, 1955

Dumont Lamp Co. leased loft building at 100 Metropolitan Avenue, with 10,000 square feet of space, for manufacture of lamps and lighting equipment.

Yellowstone Bag Corp. leased 6,000 square feet of loft space for manufacture of shopping carts and novelty bags.

JULY 21, 1955

Lifetime Cutlery Corp. leased 1-story building at 12 Grattan Street.

JULY 23, 1955

Carnel Manufacturing Corp. leased 1-story building, approximately 32,000 square feet of space, at 450 Johnson Avenue, as general offices and for production and distribution of children's toys.

AUGUST 4, 1955

United Bottle Supply Corp. leased 23,000 square-foot plant at 667 Wythe Avenue.

AUGUST 5, 1955

Nassau County Paper Box Co. leased 5,000 square-foot plant at 240 North 10th Street.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1955

Arrow Sportswear Co. leased entire loft at 397 Bridge Street.

SEPTEMBER 7, 1955

Stacor Equipment Co. of 768 East New York Avenue, leased 1-story industrial building at 172 Empire Boulevard for expansion.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1955

Lincoln Upholstery Co. leased entire floor of 8,000 square feet at 1013–1024 Broadway.

Harry Cohon & Sons, Inc., wholesale jewelers, 1069 Utica Avenue, purchased adjoining property at 1065 Utica Avenue for expansion.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1955

Juro Sales Corp., plastics and novelty manufacturers, purchased three factory and loft buildings at 47–55 Rodney Street.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1955

B. & R. Leather Products Co., leased entire floor of loft at 206 Wallabout Street.

OCTOBER 11, 1955

Two-story building at 101 North First Street, leased for processing of fertilizing material.

Herman Novelty Co., manufacturer of brushes and mops, leased 11,000 square feet, 1st floor, of 476 Knickerbocker Avenue.

OCTOBER 13, 1955

Lenkay Sani Products Corp., leased ground floor, 6,000 square feet of space for packaging of sugar, coffee, etc.

NOVEMBER 1, 1955

Condon Trucking Co. leased 1-story building at 196 Stanhope Street for use as truck terminal.

NOVEMBER 2, 1955

Kay Drug Co. leased 9,000 square feet at 52 Bushwick Place.

NOVEMBER 8, 1955

382 Jefferson Street Corp. purchased 24,000 square-foot factory building at 382–390 Jefferson Street, for manufacture of women's coats.

DECEMBER 2, 1955

Burney Epstein & Co., distributors of sportswear, leased entire loft, 6,000 square feet, at 257 Varet Street.

DECEMBER 21, 1955

Trinac Metalcrafts, Inc., manufacturer of metal furniture, leased ground floor at 127 Withers Street.

DECEMBER 27, 1955

Greenpoint Beef Co. acquired two-story industrial building at 108 North Sixth Street.

Résumé of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the record of the 84th Congress is now history. It has been a great personal experience for me to serve the people of the Second Congressional District of West Virginia and our country for 8 years as a Member of the House of Representatives. We have spent many hours each day in committee and on the House floor in preparing and debating legislation which comprises the record of the 84th Congress. We now await the decision of the American people. We each diligently tried to do what we believe is best for our district and country and our accomplishments, or what we failed to accomplish, await the judgment of our constituency. I feel we have presented a good record and that the 84th Congress will go down in history as one of the hardest working and one of the most productive.

This was a Congress that put the future of our Nation ahead of narrow partisan considerations. We enacted a vast program of health and medical research which means hope for the stricken and for those in need in the years to come. We enacted a great highway-building program that will clear the congested arteries of commerce. It was a Congress that looked to the future in our defense and foreign policies. We have set up the framework to safeguard the security and the interests of the American people. For the workers, we increased the minimum wage to $1 an hour. We approved the flood-insurance program to help those in the areas of natural disasters.

The Democratic Party, as usual, continued to work for the benefits of the

majority of the people and stood behind legislation for the greatest good for the greatest number. We fought against special interests and supported a humanitarian program. It is my belief that the past Congress was one of the most fruitful in history because it has touched the lives of more American men and women than any Congress in the past. It was a responsible Congress which looked to the needs of all our people, as it is the people who count in the final showing.

The 84th Congress approved appropriations for more than $34 billion for the Department of Defense for the next year. Preservation of the defense strength of our country is the greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression. To help support our national-defense efforts and promote international security we have approved a total of $3.8 billion to be expended under provisions of the National Security Act. This program provides economic and military aid and assistance to our overseas allies which gives to us a better defense program and strengthens our network of defense throughout the world through the cooperation of other free nations.

For the farmers we passed the soil bank program. We enacted legislation which exempts farmers from paying the Federal excise tax on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This legislation is expected to give farmers about $60 million in tax relief. In the vital field of soil conservation we extended for 2 years the authority of the Federal Government to regulate soil conservation payments to our farmers. One of the major items was the allocating of funds to establish research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program. We approved funds for the Extension Service, watershed protection and flood prevention, marketing service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Corporation, Farm Credit Administration, and for other loan, credit, and assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

It is pleasing to know that Congress enacted legislation for public library service which is primarily designed to assist in bringing books and library services to rural families. It was disappointing to me, however, that this Congress did not pass legislation providing Federal assistance to our school systems. To me this is one of the most pressing problems confronting America today. There is a definite need in our country for better school buildings and other facilities to improve our overall school system. As our population continues to grow, more pupils are entering schools and many of our institutions are overcrowded and are in need of better schoolrooms. I am happy to report, however, that Congress passed a bill to increase the allocation for the school milk and lunch program. This is another important and significant measure approved by this Congress affecting the health and welfare of our schoolchildren.

In an effort to improve the veterans program of this grateful Nation the Congress this year granted an additional appropriation for all veterans benefits. Our Nation has the greatest veterans program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents. We failed, however, to increase pensions for disabled veterans and increase rates of compensation to veterans for service-connected disabilities.

The Water Pollution Control Act to assist States and local governments in the prevention and control of water pollution was a major step taken by this Congress. This will be helpful to the cities and communities in the construction of necessary draining works to prevent the discharge of undertreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into any waters.

I am also pleased to report that Congress amended the present narcotic laws to strengthen the penalty of unlawful acquisition, transportation, and sale of narcotics and provides a death penalty for the sale of heroin to juveniles.

One of the major accomplishments was the passage of a record $32.9 billion highway-construction program. This is the biggest roadbuilding program in our Nation's history and one long overdue.

Another major accomplishment during this Congress was approval of major innovations in the Social Security program giving additional benefits to the workers of this Nation. The two major changes in the Social Security Act would first allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; secondly, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social security coverage in the past.

The record of the 84th Congress bespeaks a deep interest in the people who work for a living. This Congress has made a magnificent record, but much remains yet to be done for the welfare and prosperity of our farm families.

Additional strides must be taken in the area of housing for the lower income groups and the aged. Additional legislation is needed in the field of labor and management relations so that these two great segments of our society engaged in production might meet across the bargaining table on an equal basis. Additional legislation is needed in the field of social security aid to our dependent children and the handicapped. Legislative progress must be made in the development of atomic energy for the conservation and development of our natural resources. In the field of foreign policy bolder steps must be taken to insure our own national security and peace in the world. It was sorely disappointing to me that the Senate did not act on the House-passed bill to increase pensions for disabled veterans and an increase in the rates of compensation payable to veterans for service-connected disabilities.

The record of the 84th Congress is something that I am proud to have had a part in since Congress more thoroughly reflects the thinking of the people than any other branch of the Government. There remain issues to be resolved before this country can be said to be directly at peace with prosperity. The rights of our individual citizens regardless of race, creed or national origin need additional legislative protection. Assistance is needed in our educational facilities. This assistance obviously must come from the Federal Government and should come in such a fashion that local control over such facilities may be retained.

Crooked River Federal Reclamation Project, Oregon

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7726) to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will today approve the Crooked River reclamation project and bring to a successful conclusion the years of effort the people of this area have spent to achieve this goal. There are over 9,000 people in Crook County; by 1975 population will probably rise as high as 15,000. Starting in 1916, these people have labored to provide, through their own efforts, adequate water for their arid farmland. Many of these farms represent the labors of several generations; through flood and drought, against all the difficulties their irrigation district has faced, they have worked to preserve and build up their farms. The Crooked River project means, to these people, assurance that their labors will not be lost, that for the future they can hope for adequate water and protection from the flood waters of the Crooked River.

The Crooked River valley depends on agriculture and lumbering for its livelihood. But the lumbering industry is contracting as the timber is cut off which means the valley must increasingly depend on agriculture. Without water, they must necessarily turn to wheat, for a cash crop, even though wheat is a surplus commodity. With water they can raise cattle and the necessary feed for cattle, as well as truck products. With adequate water, they can expand their operations to meet the anticipated pressure of population and the economy of the area can progress in stability.

The Crooked River project will supply water to 9,900 acres which are not now irrigated and to 10,220 acres which now have an inadequate supply. It will provide an additional 51,000 acre-feet against future irrigation needs. Annual benefits will exceed costs by more than

2 to 1. This is a modest investment to make in the welfare of the Crooked River Valley. It is a small investment to make in the future of this area. This bill has already been passed by the Senate, with the able sponsorship of Senator MORSE and Senator NEUBERGER. The words of the leading citizens of Crook County, who told the Interior Committee in eloquent and solid testimony what this project means to their community are a convincing proof of its importance. I hope this House will approve the Crooked River project and make possible its early construction.

Summary of the Social Security Act as It Relates to Self-Employed Professional Groups Newly Covered by the Social Security Amendments of 1956

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under general leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I insert herewith the following summary of the Social Security Act as it relates to self-employed professional groups newly covered by the Social Security Amendments of 1956, which was prepared by the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means:

SUMMARY OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AS IT RELATES TO SELF-EMPLOYED PROFESSIONAL GROUPS NEWLY COVERED BY THE SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1956

I. INTRODUCTION

The Social Security Act Amendments of 1956 (Public Law 880, 84th Cong.) extended coverage under the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System to substantially all self-employed professional groups except physicians. This part of the new law, which was merely one of many provisions contained in the 1956 Amendments which broaden and strengthen the Social Security program will be of particular interest to the estimated 200,000 additional people who during the course of a year are self-employed in the practice of certain professions. Because of the interest which this group will have in this part of the 1956 Amendments, this summary of what the Social Security coverage will mean to these individuals was prepared for use of Members of the Committee in responding to inquiries. It is not intended to be a complete statement in detail on this part of the new law, nor is it intended to cover other provisions of the law. It is merely a condensed outline applicable to these additional self-employed professional groups. Detailed information, of course, may be obtained by the individuals newly covered from the Social Security Administration or from the nearest local Social Security office.

II. SELF-EMPLOYED PROFESSIONAL GROUPS NEWLY COVERED

The 1956 amendments extended coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program to the following additional groups of self-employed persons:

1. Lawyers.
2. Dentists.
3. Doctors of osteopathy.
4. Chiropractors.
5. Veterinarians.
6. Naturopaths.
7. Optometrists.

III. BENEFITS UNDER OASI

Benefits under OASI are related to prior earnings of an individual in covered, employment or self-employment and fall within four broad categories: (a) Retirement benefits; (b) survivors' benefits; (c) disability benefits; and (d) lump-sum death benefits. A more detailed description of these benefits follows:

(a) Retirement benefits: These are payable to male workers at age 65, if they retire, and to female workers at age 62 (on an optional basis) or age 65, if they retire; to male workers between the ages of 65 and 72 when they do retire, and to female workers between ages 62 (or 65) and 72, when they do retire; and to male and female workers at age 72, whether they retire or not.

The following examples indicate the nature of these benefits: To one fully insured, whose annual average earnings have not been less than $4,200, there would be payable each month (at present benefit rates): $108.50, if the insured beneficiary is unmarried; $162.80, if he is married and his wife has reached the age of 65 (or slightly less if she is 62 and decides to accept a smaller benefit than she would receive at 65); and $200 if, in addition he has children still under 18 years of age. These retirement benefits continue until the death of the insured.

(b) Survivors' benefits: These are payable, on the death of the insured, to a person's widow (or dependent widower) or surviving parents or surviving children. As an example, where the person has enjoyed average annual earnings of not less than $4,200, a widow aged 62, or a widow of whatever age with a child under 18 years of age, would receive (at present rates) $81.40 a month; and a surviving family might be entitled to payments of as much as $200 a month.

(c) Disability benefits: The new law provides for the payment of benefits to fully insured, and otherwise qualified, workers at or after age 50 where the worker becomes permanently and totally disabled. This benefit is the same in amount, generally, as the retirement benefit, but is payable only to the disabled worker himself.

(d) Lump-sum death benefits: These are payable to the widow of an insured person or, generally, to anyone else who may pay the burial expenses. They are designed to defray such expenses, are limited to a maximum of $255, and are payable in addition to the survivor benefits.

IV. THE TAXES PAYABLE UNDER OASI

Self-employed individuals covered under OASI will pay annually, beginning with the taxable year 1956, 3⅜ percent of their first $4,200 net income from covered self-employment. This rate increases to 4⅛ percent in 1960, 4⅞ percent in 1965, 5⅝ percent in 1970, and 6⅜ percent in 1975 and after. There is no social security tax on any net income above the first $4,200.

The OASI taxes are payable at the same time as Federal income taxes are payable.

V. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

Periods of total disability of at least 6 months' duration are excluded in determining insured status and average monthly wage, provided the disabled worker has at least 6 quarters of coverage in the 13 quarters ending with the quarter in which he is disabled and at least 20 quarters of coverage in the 40 quarters ending with the quarter in which he is disabled. Determinations of disability are, in general, made by State agencies in charge of vocational rehabilitation.

VI. EMPLOYMENT PERMITTED WITHOUT SUSPENSION OF BENEFITS (CALLED "WORK CLAUSE" OR "RETIREMENT TEST")

A beneficiary can earn $1,200 in a year in any employment, covered or noncovered, without loss of benefits. For each $80 (or fraction thereof) of covered or noncovered earnings in excess of $1,200, 1 month's benefits is lost. In no case, however, are benefits withheld for any month in which the beneficiary's remuneration as an employee was $80 or less and in which he rendered no substantial services in self-employment. For beneficiaries age 72 or over, there is no limitation. If a retired worker's benefit is suspended, so also are the benefits of his dependents.

VII. EFFECTIVE DATES AND MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR COVERAGE OF ELDERLY WORKERS AMONG NEWLY COVERED GROUPS

The coverage provided by the new law for self-employed professional groups will be effective beginning with taxable years after 1955 (the calendar year 1956 will, therefore, be the first effective year.)

There is a special provision in the new law establishing special starting and closing dates intended primarily for persons first covered in 1956, whereby an individual who becomes entitled or dies in 1957, and has at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1955 can have a starting date of December 31, 1955, and a closing date of July 1, 1957, if that will yield a larger benefit amount.

Stated more simply, at least 6 quarters of coverage is required before those newly covered elderly persons now reaching retirement age, or who have reached retirement age, can qualify for benefits.

VIII. WHAT NEWLY COVERED PROFESSIONAL PERSONS SHOULD DO NOW

All newly covered professional persons should contact their nearest social security field office for details about the new law, and to obtain full information and the steps which they should take. Included among these will be making an application for a social security card and account number. It is important for these persons to remember that the foregoing is merely a nontechnical, information summary of some of the highlights of what the new law will mean to them.

Are the Wars' Disabled To Be Forgotten Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. POLK

OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, are deeply concerned about what is happening to disabled war veterans. I concur in the views expressed in the following resolution adopted by a unanimouse vote at the Ohio DAV convention. Commander H. O. Parke is to be commended for submitting this question to the convention.

ARE THE WARS' DISABLED TO BE THE FORGOTTEN MEN?

Whereas the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, charge the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, the "brass" of the Washington Pentagon and other Federal Government agencies with an

effort to destroy the established program of the Congress for the welfare and care of veterans disabled as a direct result of war service and their dependents; and

Whereas veterans' programs are now being dictated from the Washington Pentagon Building, with an all-out effort to further aid only the "brass" at the expense of the wartime disabled enlisted person and his dependents, an outstanding example of this being the passage by the Congress a few days ago of the survivors' bill, which provides that the widow of the enlisted man starts at $122 per month, while the widow of an officer will receive as much as $266 per month; and

Whereas other Government agencies, such as the Bureau of the Budget and General Accounting Office, are also on the attack against benefits for the wars' disabled, and public relations information releases are grossly misleading and sometimes inaccurate to the end that the public does not know all the true facts; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration is operating a continuing review of benefits being paid to wartime disabled veterans, with new interpretations of laws enacted by the Congress, this review already having resulted in more than 50,000 of these veterans losing their just benefits by the canceling of service-connection, or by so-called error or improvement of their condition, and this review continues, meaning that regardless of protective congressional laws enacted for the wars' disabled, no rating is secure or permanent; and

Whereas the survivors' bill will reduce benefits by eliminating indemnity insurance in cases of widows and minor children of enlisted personnel who lose their lives in service, while at the same time this bill will more than double the benefits to the dependents of certain officers who may lose their lives while in the service; and

Whereas the Bradley Commission with its Pentagon support has recommended to the President that approximately 1¼ million wartime disabled veterans now receiving compensation at 10 percent or 20 percent be removed from the rolls, including thousands of gunshot wound casualties from our several wars; that rates of compensation for the most severe and totally disabled veterans be based on industrial payments and that extra statutory awards for the blind and amputees be eliminated; and

Whereas this Commission does not consider war hazardous for the enlisted and would not differentiate between war and peacetime service; and

Whereas the hospital and medical service, now a separate branch of the Veterans' Administration, operates under the dictates of medical associations, and availability of beds for the treatment of general medical and surgical cases depends on budget status and the immediate needs for futhering the medical teaching program; and

Whereas most of the general medical hospitals are associated with medical schools in the training of physicians, which often limits admission to only certain tpyes of illness, with seldom ever a bed being available for the seriously ill or long chronic disease veterans; and

Whereas mental hospitals of the Veterans' Administration accept veterans with service connected war neuroses and other classes of psychiatric diseases, but in most all instances the new medical concept brings about a change in the diagnosis to that of a constitutional defect and payment of monthly benefits to the wartime disabled veteran is discontinued; and

Whereas the soldiers' homes or domiciliary institutions of the Veterans' Administration were provided by law enacted by the Congress and designed to offer shelter to the war veteran who is unable to work and has no home, the new policy now limits admission to the domiciliary barracks to the veteran who is able to fully care for himself and to perform certain detail labor in order to contribute to the Government institution, and the blind, paralyzed, and otherwise helpless veteran is now classed as an "intermediate" case but generally there is no bed available for him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, assembled in the city of Cleveland, July 27, 28, 29, 1956, at its 35th annual convention, protest the Report of the Bradley Commission on benefits for veterans; the unfair treatment of the Nation's wartime disabled and their dependents; that we strongly urge the national department of the DAV to exert its full influence in apprising the public of the true facts as to the treatment of the wars' disabled and their dependents and that a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of Congress from Ohio.

Submitted by:

H. O. PARKE,
Commander, the DAV, Department of Ohio.

Adopted by a unanimous vote of the convention, July 27, 1956.

A Report to My Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, following the policy of keeping the people of my congressional district informed of my activities as their Representative in Congress, I am submitting this brief review of some of the highlights of the 84th Congress. This brief report is a supplement to my weekly press, radio, and television reports presented during both sessions of the 84th Congress.

During the 2 years of the 84th Congress the authority and responsibility for the operation of the Federal Government were divided. The executive branch of the Government which administers the laws passed by Congress and operates the various governmental agencies was in the hands of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The legislative branch of the Government is the Congress of the United States which is composed of the Senate and House of Representatives. During the 84th Congress the Democratic Party controlled both the Senate and House of Representatives as well as all congressional committees. With such absolute control over the legislative activities of Congress, Democratic congressional leaders were in position to place a life or death sign on legislative measures.

Against such a background, it is little wonder that, while the 84th Congress can be given credit as being a hard-working Congress, yet vital legislation encountered political roadblocks that were inexcusable even in a presidential election year when a display of partisan politics is not wholly unexpected. During the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress, political hypocrisy was developed to a degree the like of which I cannot recall in my public career.

There were more than 19,000 bills and resolutions introduced during the 84th Congress, the largest number since the 71st Congress of 1929–30. Of this number more than 800 were approved by the 84th Congress and became public laws. In order to consider legislation and handle other congressional matters, the 84th Congress was in session a total of 224 days which is somewhat below the record established by the 76th Congress of 1939–40 which stayed on the job for 366 days.

ATTENDANCE RECORD

During the 84th Congress, despite the heavy demands on my time because of committee assignments and visiting various Government agencies on congressional business, as well as the illness and death of my mother, I maintained a commendable attendance record by answering better than 95 percent of the quorum and rollcall votes. According to the minority clerk of the House of Representatives, my overall attendance record since coming to Congress in 1939 is one of the best in the history of the Congress of the United States.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

I retained my membership of many years on two important congressional committees—the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services. Because of my length of service in Congress, my seniority on both of these important committees has classified me as a senior member of each. Both of my committee assignments, and especially my membership on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, consumed a major portion of my time and to such an extent that literally for days I found myself behind closed doors involved in discussing matters pertaining to atomic energy, national defenses, and domestic and international affairs.

LARGE VOLUME OF MAIL

Throughout the 84th Congress, my daily volume of mail continued to increase to such an extent that it was necessary to reorganize and expand the clerical staff in my Washington and Altoona offices. In Altoona, because of the desire to provide greater service, new office quarters were obtained in the Central Trust Building. Following my usual practice, I personally read every piece of mail received at my Washington office. In the majority of cases, I developed the information to answer inquiries. My files are full of letters of appreciation for services rendered to my constituents. These expressions of gratitude for my efforts to truly represent at all times the people of my congressional district are deeply appreciated.

TAX LEGISLATION

With the Eisenhower administration continuing its program of economy in government, for the first time in years the national budget was balanced for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and the surplus amounting to $1.7 billion was applied in reducing the national debt which as of August 1 was $272.5 billion. The action taken in applying the surplus of $1.7 billion as a reduction in the national debt, in lieu of a reduction in taxes, had the approval of both Republi-

cans and Democrats. As a result, it was unanimously agreed by Republican and Democratic leaders in Congress that it was not possible to reduce Federal income taxes this year. Tax relief however, was provided to farmers by granting an exemption of the excise taxes on gasoline and other fuels used in operating farm machinery. During the closing days of the 84th Congress, legislation was approved which repealed the Federal tax on amusement admission tickets under 90 cents.

APPROPRIATIONS

The 84th Congress, in considering the national budget, appropriated $52.2 billion during its 1st session and $59.8 billion during the 2d session. This was almost $2 billion less than requested by President Eisenhower for the 2-year period. The reluctance of Congress to approve the $2 billion was due to the growing opposition to foreign aid expenditures.

To give you some idea of how the Government dollar is spent and using the fiscal year of 1955 as an example, 62.9 cents of the dollar was spent on national security. The remaining 37 cents was expended in the following manner: 7 cents on veterans' services and benefits, 4 cents on labor and welfare, 6.7 cents on agriculture, 1.7 cents on national resources, 2.5 cents on commerce and housing, 1.8 cents on general government, 10 cents on interest on the public debt, and 3.4 cents on international affairs and finance. Although figures are not yet available to show the breakdown of the 1956 fiscal dollar, it is expected to be similar to that of the 1955 fiscal dollar.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND SECURITY

As a member of the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, I joined civilian and military leaders of Government in placing our national defense and security on a sounder and firmer basis. This is evidenced by my active support and my vote for the appropriation of $66.5 billion for the Defense Department and an authorization of approximately $5 billion for military and atomic energy construction programs. In addition, I supported the authorization to use United States troops to defend Formosa and voted to extend the draft law for 4 years and the doctor-dentist draft for 2 years. Congress also approved a Reserve program which had my support and which is designed to provide 2.9 million trained reservists by 1959. I also supported legislation continuing the President's power to allocate and fix priorities for critical and strategic materials. The authorization of $1.4 billion for naval construction and conversion program with emphasis on nuclear power had my support, as did the extension of the Defense Production Act and bills providing penalties for damaging aircraft, as well as strengthening the laws against sedition and conspiracy.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Continuing my active interest in improving the Social Security Act, I voted for the new amendments which have become law and which provide additional benefits to 1,225,000 persons. The two major changes in the Social Security Act are, first, allowing physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reducing the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on July 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 persons eligible for benefits. The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure further extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

The broadening and liberalizing amendments to the Social Security Act approved by the 84th Congress were in accordance with similiar amendments I have advocated over a period of years. This is especially true because of my efforts to reduce the eligibility age for retirement. For years, I have sponsored legislation designed to reduce the eligibility age to 60 years. I also strongly advocate payment of benefits to those disabled and unable to follow a gainful occupation. The reduction of the eligibility age of women to 62 years is in the form of a compromise since my amendment covered both men and women; nevertheless, it is a step in the direction of a more realistic social security program.

In regard to the need for an increase in old-age assistance benefits, the new amendments to the Social Security Act increased the Federal contribution to States by $5 monthly for beneficiaries of public assistance programs as administered in Pennsylvania by the department of public assistance. This increase of the Federal contribution will not become effective until the department of public assistance in Pennsylvania makes a similar increase of $5. In the field of old-age assistance, I continued my activities by cooperating with business, labor, and pension groups who are seeking a solution to what has become America's No. 1 problem—the adequate care and welfare of the Nation's senior citizens.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

I am greatly disappointed that the 84th Congress did not approve some of my proposals to liberalize the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and to increase benefits. There is no type of legislation in which I am more interested than amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act. As a matter of fact, I pleaded, prodded, and begged for action in my efforts to comply with the wishes of my constituents regarding their ideas as to how the Railroad Retirement Act should be amended. My proposed amendments were contained in 14 separate bills that I had pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. These bills expressed in legal language the views of my constituents regarding the manner in which they felt the Railroad Retirement Act should be amended. I was permitted to testify before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on behalf of my proposed amendments at which time it became evident that any amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act would have to be approved on a pay-as-you-go basis.

One significant development in the effort to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act was revealed by the report of a board of actuarial experts which stated that the retirement fund was operating at an annual deficit of $86.4 million and any increase in retirement benefits would require an increase in payroll taxes to cover the cost. Confronted with this insurmountable obstacle, a bill was introduced which would increase benefits by 15 percent to about 65 percent of the present beneficiaries of the Railroad Retirement Act. The cost of the increase was to be met by increasing the payroll tax on the earnings of active railroaders and then allowing them credit on their income tax for the amount of the increase in payroll tax. The Democratic-controlled House Committee on Ways and Means refused to act favorably on the bill because of the income tax proposal, with the result that in the closing hours of the 84th Congress, in a desperate effort to increase retirement benefits, a compromise bill was offered providing for a 10 percent increase without any increase in the payroll tax. This bill was approved by Congress and signed by President Eisenhower on August 7. It is estimated that it will cost an additional $83 million making a total annual deficit in the retirement fund of $169.4 million. When President Eisenhower signed the bill, he stressed the point that when Congress convenes next January some means must be found to finance the deficit of $169.4 million and any future amendments liberalizing the Railroad Retirement Act that Congress may approve.

In reporting on my activities in the field of railroad-retirement legislation, I worked in close harmony with the 21 standard railway-labor organizations that endorsed the legislation and, therefore, I yield to no one in the effort I put forth during the 84th Congress to liberalize the Railroad Retirement Act and increase its benefits.

VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

During the 84th Congress, I continued my efforts in behalf of the veterans of all wars and their dependents, an activity that I began after my discharge from World War I in 1919. Not only have I personally assisted hundreds of veterans and their dependents in obtaining benefits to which they were entitled, but I played an active role in securing congressional approval of bills, now laws, which provide an increase in benefits to the veterans of all wars and their dependents. While the 84th Congress enacted the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivors Benefits Act and a bill providing educational assistance to children of veterans who died from service-connected disabilities, the Democratic-controlled Senate took no action on bills passed by the House which would have provided benefits to widows of World War II and Korea; granted a 10 percent increase to service-connected veterans;

and provided a pension to the veterans of World War I. These bills, which we approved in the House, died in the Senate with the adjournment of the 84th Congress.

A SOUND NATIONAL FARM POLICY

During the 84th Congress, I joined with agricultural leaders in Congress in advocating a sound national farm policy for the country, the taxpayer and the farmer. The common objective was to relieve the Nation from the costly and wasteful burden of high rigid farm price supports and, at the same time, continue reasonable aid for American farmers. These rigid farm price supports were enacted in 1942 purely as a war measure at a time when the country was faced with a tremendous job of food production. The high prices were guaranteed as an incentive to the farmers to go all out in meeting the food needs of the Nation during World War II. From the very beginning of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the Democrats persisted in disregarding President Eisenhower's urgent plea to not only maintain flexible price supports but also declined to adopt his 15-point rural development program. Following the courageous veto by President Eisenhower of the bill to restore rigid price controls and after weeks and weeks of stalling in the hope of making the farm issue a political football in an election year, Congress finally enacted the Eisenhower soil bank proposal—a two-part program to pay farmers to take land out of production. It approved other bills of benefit to the farmer, with the result that farm prices are increasing and the outlook for agriculture is more promising as the Eisenhower administration continues to make headway in its determined effort to curtail annual farm surpluses and, at the same time, dispose of the mountain of surplus commodities stored all over the country and which costs the American taxpayer $1 million daily for storage charges alone.

LABOR

My efforts during my congressional career to protect the welfare of American wage earners were continued during the 84th Congress as I actively supported the effort made to safeguard the jobs of American workmen by restricting the importation of cheaply manufactured foreign goods flooding the American market place. I also voted to increase the minimum hourly wage from 75 cents to $1 which legislation was enacted by the 84th Congress.

Except for the increase in the minimum hourly wages and a few other minor measures affecting special groups, the record of the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress is sadly lacking in its concern for the interest of the workingman. Despite the oft-repeated claim that the Democratic Party is a true friend of the wage earner and although it controlled all congressional committees, legislative proposals not enacted by the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress include: First, Taft-Hartley Act revisions—even those favored by organized labor; second, extension of coverage under the minimum-wage law; third, equal pay for equal work, regardless of sex; fourth, public disclosure regarding employees' pension, health, and welfare programs; fifth, Federal assistance to areas suffering chronic unemployment—area development program; sixth, grants to the States for industrial safety programs; and, seventh, revision of labor standards on work contracted or financed by the Federal Government to provide for time and one-half pay for all hours worked in excess of 8 hours a day or in excess of 40 hours a week as the work standard. It is a significant fact that most of these recommendations were originally made in 1955, and renewed by President Eisenhower in 1956, with several new ones.

HOUSING

I supported the multi-million-dollar housing bill which has been signed by the President and which provides for the construction of 70,000 low-rental housing units for low-income groups during the next 2 years. The bill provides in general for the homeowner, the home seeker, the slum dweller, and others. The bill sent to the White House represented a last-minute compromise and, while it included rental housing for elderly citizens, it did not provide for the sale of houses to them. The overall housing program is designed to stimulate the building and repair of homes, and provides disaster relief, hospital construction, college, and farm housing, and so forth.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The Democratic-controlled 84th Congress failed to approve a $1.6 billion appropriation of Federal funds to help finance new school construction. It did approve a bill which is now a law to train more public-health specialists, and to help States train registered and practical nurses and build hospitals. In addition, Congress approved bills subsidizing insurance against flood losses, extended the polio-vaccination program and the school-milk program. It also approved a 3-year program costing $90 million for the building of non-Federal facilities for research in crippling diseases, and appropriated additional funds to help States expand vocational rehabilitation programs and to conduct research in cancer, heart disease, and other ailments. I was happy to vote for all these programs, including the new school construction bill which was defeated in the House of Representatives.

HIGHWAYS

One of the largest Public Works' measures ever presented to Congress and which had my active support was embodied in the Eisenhower highway program providing for a 13-year road-construction project involving a network of 41,000 miles of Federal Interstate Highways. The bill, which is now a law, provides that the cost of the new highway program, which will be in the neighborhood of $35 billion, will be financed from increased gas, fuel, rubber, and other related taxes.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

To assist States and local governments in the prevention and control of water pollution, the 84th Congress enacted the Water Pollution Control Act. The law authorizes the appropriation of $3 million annually for the next 5 years to be expended in grants to the various States for their water pollution control programs. Similar grants are authorized over a 10-year period to aid States in the construction of necessary treatment plants to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or waste into any waters. The act establishes comprehensive programs for water pollution control and directs the Surgeon General of the United States to support and aid technical research through investigation, training and information programs.

THE ECONOMY OF MY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

It is gratifying that the Nation as a whole is enjoying unrivaled peacetime prosperity and that recent figures released by the United States Department of Labor disclose that over 66 million are gainfully employed. There are, however, pockets of unemployment in the Nation that are of grave concern. These labor surplus areas are victims of the scourge of unemployment which brings distress and unhappiness to good American citizens who are jobless through no fault of their own.

My congressional district for the past several years has been classified as a labor surplus area because of the loss of coal business which adversely affected our two basic industries—coal and the railroads. The use of substitute fuels, especially hydropower and foreign residual oil, has destroyed our eastern seaboard coal market with the result that the decrease in the sale of coal is reflected in the loss of freight revenue to the railroads for hauling coal, which is a contributing cause for unemployment in the railroad, coal, and related industries. In a determined effort to bolster our sagging economy, I have been active for the past several years in assisting local communities with their industrial development programs designed to attract new industries and thus diversify our economy. It is pleasing to report that practically every community in my congressional district has a live-wire industrial development committee and that thousands of dollars have been raised to finance the program of attracting new industries or expanding the facilities of existing plants. In this connection, I have worked in close harmony with these community groups, both individually and collectively, in the common effort to eradicate unemployment and rehabilitate the economy of the area.

In my efforts to be of assistance in building a strong economy in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties, I have received the wholehearted cooperation of the United States Department of Commerce, the Small Business Administration, the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies. As a result, it has been possible for me to assist in securing the approval of loans for business firms from the Small Business Administration; to expedite the issuance of tax-amortization certificates totaling over $91 million for expanding existing industries and attracting new industries; to aid in obtaining the awarding of defense contracts to firms in my congressional district; to secure assistance of the Federal Government in surveying the needs and rendering practical aid in processing applica-

tions for flood control projects in DuBois, Tyrone, and Hollidaysburg; to assist in providing employment by securing the approval of my request to the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration to make needed repairs to post offices and other Federal buildings; and, finally, to secure approval from the Department of Defense for the construction during the next few months of five new military armories at DuBois, Curwensville, Clearfield, Bellefonte, and Altoona. In short, my activities are constantly directed in a sincere effort to provide employment opportunities to counteract the unemployment that is a menace to our economy which is based primarily on the coal and railroad industries.

As a supplement to my determined efforts to aid our depressed economy, for several years unemployed persons and their families in my congressional district have been receiving surplus food commodities as a result of my activity several years ago in arranging for the County Commissioners of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties to qualify as sponsors in compliance with regulations of the Department of Agriculture regarding the distribution of Government-owned surplus commodities to the unemployed and their families.

MISCELLANEOUS

In addition to rendering service to my constituents, individually and collectively, my time was devoted to the study of legislation affecting my congressional district and the American people as a whole. When you consider the time required in attending daily sessions of Congress and committee meetings, as well as interviewing constituents and reading and answering mail, it is realized that the evenings hours had to be used in studying legislation in preparation for hearings and debates on various measures. Frankly, I found myself constantly burning the midnight oil as I read volumes of the hearings on major bills pending before Congress. This action is mandatory if a Member of Congress has the best interests of his congressional district at heart and is conscientious in casting his vote in an intelligent manner.

PERSONAL SERVICES TO CONSTITUENTS

As Representative of the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I have always regarded my constituents as being in the role of an employer and that, together, we enjoy an employer-employee relationship. In an effort to give an account of my stewardship, I have tried zealously to keep in close contact with the residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties by frequently informing them of happenings in Washington. As many know, when Congress is in session, I report to you weekly by radio and television in addition to writing a column for the daily and weekly newspapers. From time to time reprints from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of statements made by me in Congress have been mailed to many of you. Although my congressional duties kept me close to Washington on weekdays, I made a determined effort to spend as many weekends as possible at my Altoona office and in visiting communities in Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties. These weekend visits made it possible for me to be available for interviews with constituents interested in legislation pending in Congress, or who had problems affecting some agency of the Federal Government.

"THANK YOU, CONGRESSMAN VAN ZANDT"

Excerpts from letters of appreciation:

COAL CAR SHORTAGE

On behalf of the coal industry in central Pennsylvania, I want to thank you for your energetic interest in our welfare. The meeting with the executive officers of Government agencies, railroads, and others which you recently sponsored and organized in Washington, D. C., was very helpful and should contribute to a large degree to alleviate the serious railroad coal-car shortage which has caused considerable distress in our area. (Eastern Bituminous Coal Association, December 1955.)

EMPLOYMENT

In grateful appreciation for your untiring and devoted service in helping further the industrial development program which has already produced several thousand new jobs for our people. (Citation from the citizens of the Altoona area, May 1956.)

RAILROAD RETIREMENT

Hon. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT was employed with the Pennsylvania Railroad 22 years and understands our problems. He has never stopped fighting to get us the best retirement system in the world. He has introduced more bills to help rail employees than any other Congressman. (Rail Pension News, May 1956.)

LABOR

Permit me in behalf of the Railway Labor Executives Association and the millions of people affected by the Railroad Retirement Act to thank you for your assistance on our railroad retirement benefit program * * * undoubtedly by now you have been informed that your candidacy in the 20th District of Pennsylvania has been endorsed by our political league (comprising 20 standard railway labor organizations). (G. E. Leighty, chairman, Railway Labor Executives Association, July 1956.)

Labor's Nonpartisan League in endorsing JIMMIE VAN ZANDT for the 78th Congress said:

You voted against the crippling Smith amendments to the National Labor Relations Act. You voted against the amendments to the Wage and Hour Act, which would have excluded 2½ million workers from benefits of this act. You voted against the May-Connally antiunion amendments. You cooperated with the United Mine Workers to secure favorable House action on the mine safety bill.

HOUSING

The CIO News, in the July 19, 1948, issue on page 4 included JIMMIE VAN ZANDT on the CIO honor roll of Congressmen, who fought for action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for housing, awarding him an "A" for his efforts in behalf of housing legislation.

INDUSTRY

I would like to express the appreciation of Veeder-Root, Inc., for all that you have done for making steel available for our new Altoona plant on schedule. (Leon J. Dunn, 1956.)

QUEHANNA CURTISS-WRIGHT CORP.

Much of the benefits that the area will receive from Curtiss-Wright's installation at Quehanna can be credited to JIMMIE VAN ZANDT's unifying efforts and counsel to the corporation as the representative of this congressional district. (Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, October 1955.)

VETERANS

As service officers of the American Legion we realize perhaps more than anyone else the great need for increased benefits due disabled and impoverished veterans to which you are constantly striving as a Member of Congress. (American Legion District Service Officers, 1956.)

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

You have helped us to expedite important electronic contracts for delivery to our Navy. It is our belief that the efforts that you and Mr. Sheridan exerted in our behalf must be considered not only a contribution to national defense but also to the unemployment problem in Pennsylvania. (Edward V. Little, executive vice president, Dumont Airplane & Marine Instruments Co., Inc., Hyde plant, Clearfield, Pa.)

A COURAGEOUS LEGISLATOR

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is known for his straight-forwardness, no pussy-footing, determined stand on national problems. His congressional record matches his war record—outstanding. (Erie (Pa.) Daily Times, 1951.)

ONE OF THE TEN

Selected as 1 of the 10 outstanding Members of Congress. Sponsored much veteran, military, old-age pension and social-security legislation. (Congressional Quarterly, Washington, D. C., 1949.)

MINUTEMAN OF CONGRESS

Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT is the "Minuteman" of Congress—whether one agrees with his political philosophy it would be hard to deny that he is one of the hardest-working Congressmen in history. (Richard H. Sarge, columnist, Harrisburg (Pa.) Patriot-News, 1952.)

CONCLUSION

My seniority on the congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the House Committee on Armed Services, together with my legislative and administrative duties as a member of the 84th Congress, fully occupied my time during the 2-year period. My congressional duties received my constant attention and wholehearted devotion as I sought to represent my constituents with fidelity, efficiency, and honesty. I have tried in a sincere manner to meet every issue fairly and squarely, and at no time did I permit narrow, partisan views to influence or hinder me in doing what I considered my duty. I gave my undivided attention to the needs of my congressional district and to rendering prompt and courteous service to all constituents regardless of their creed, political affiliation, or social position in life. To the many who over the years have written me letters of gratitude and encouragement, I gratefully acknowledge your kind expressions and thank you for your thoughtfulness. The residents of Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties have my assurance that I feel highly honored to represent the 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania in Congress. The confidence you have manifested in me is accepted as a constant challenge to continue my efforts to justify your faith in my ability to represent you in Congress. I shall always strive to merit your prayers and best wishes.

Legislative Record of the Honorable Irwin D. Davidson, 20th Congressional District, New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRWIN D. DAVIDSON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, the legislative session of the 84th Congress has come to a close. Before the record is completed, however, and because I feel that an accounting of my activities is required, I wish to take this opportunity to place before my colleagues in the House and before the people of my district, the legislative activities and duties that have occupied my time, and the bills and resolutions that I have introduced during the second session.

Since the 3d of January, 1955, it has been my very great privilege to serve as the Representative of the over 350,000 persons who reside in the 20th Congressional District of New York. The honor which they bestowed on me almost 2 years ago has given me the opportunity to render a great variety of services to my constituents. Since my term of office does not expire until the 31st of December, I wish to make it plain that I shall continue, until that date, to render such services as I am able.

Since this is the last opportunity that I shall have to address my colleagues, I feel compelled to add one personal note. As you know, I am not a candidate for reelection to Congress. Instead, I have been honored with the norimantions of the Democratic and liberal parties of New York State for judge of the court of general sessions for New York County. If elected to that office, I shall again have the opportunity to render service to the people of my State, and I am confident that my experiences here in Washington during the past 2 years will be of great help to me. I wish to thank all my good friends who have made my term of office so pleasant, and I hope that they will find this report enlightening.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, the activities and duties of a Congressman are many. Each of us serves on committees of the House of Representatives. I have had the privilege during this Congress to serve on three of the standing committees: The Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and the Committee on Banking and Currency. In my work on those committees, I have attended hearings, questioned witnesses, written reports on legislation, and helped to decide whether legislation should be reported to the floor of the House. This is a side of our life of which few people are fully aware, and in which we spend a good number of hours each day. I mention it now as a part of the total picture of our lives as the representatives of our constituents, so that, when taken together with other phases of our activities, a complete picture of a Congressman's life may be painted.

Of course, the bills and resolutions which we introduce are a very meaningful part of our activity for they reflect the views which we hold and which we feel call for legislative action by the Congress. It is because of that picture which we draw of ourselves and of our interests that I reported to the House last August my legislative record for the 1st session. It is for the same reason that I desire to make this report for the 2d session. Again, as was the case last year, I make the report with some pride, for results have been accomplished. I will discuss first the public laws which I introduced, and for convenience I have listed them under their appropriate general headings.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—WORLD TRADE

House Joint Resolution 604, introduced April 18: This resolution was ordered favorably reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and was unanimously passed by both Houses of Congress. It was signed into law by the President on July 27, 1956. The resolution authorizes the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign nations to join and participate in the United States World Trade Fair to be held in the Coliseum in my district of New York in April 1957. The States and nations will exhibit and offer for sale their respective goods and services. This fair will make a major contribution to our foreign-trade policies and will be the cornerstone and foundation of economic self-reliance for our friends throughout the world.

HOUSING

H. R. 7881, introduced January 3: This measure provided for an additional 45,000 units of public housing to be utilized by July 31 of this year and for 150,000 units during the fiscal year 1957. In addition, the bill provided for preferences to certain elderly persons in obtaining low-cost public housing.

H. R. 10295, introduced March 29: This bill would establish within the executive branch of the Government a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs to aid in and oversee the national programs for housing.

H. R. 10296, introduced March 29: This is an omnibus housing bill covering all phases of the national program. It provides for low-cost public housing, for the construction of middle-income housing and for slum clearance and urban renewal. This bill would have provided for 200,000 units of public housing in each of the fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959. Because of the administration's opposition to an adequate housing program, the Congress was forced to accept an entirely inadequate public-housing measure, one not even sufficient for the needs of the city of New York. The administration's bill called for only 35,000 units of public housing in each of the next 2 years, and this was the bill that Congress approved.

TAXATION

House Resolution 385, introduced January 19:

This resolution authorized an investigation and study of the desirability and feasibility of allowing taxpayers to deduct for income-tax purposes the expenses incurred in traveling to and from their places of employment. The provision in the Internal Revenue Code which bars this item as an expense and as a deduction in manifestly unfair. The cost of traveling to and from work is a real business expense for every wage earner.

H. R. 9329, introduced February 16: This measure would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit taxpayers with greatly fluctuating incomes to average their income for 2 or 3 years and thus avoid the harsh impact of a high tax bill in a low-income year. For thousands of persons who work on a commission basis, such as salesmen, this bill would provide much needed relief.

Though neither of these bills was acted on by the House, I have written to the chairman of the newly created Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation asking that the subject matter of these bills be among those considered this fall by his subcommittee.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

H. R. 9803, introduced March 7:

This bill provides for the conveyance of Ellis Island to the State of New York for use as a clinic for the reception, care, treatment, and rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics and narcotic addicts.

House Joint Resolution 674, introduced July 6:

This resolution would set aside the 12th day of April of each year as National Health Day to focus the attention of our Nation on the great strides that are being made in the conquest of disease. The date, April 12, was chosen because it marks the date of the passing of our late President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who, perhaps more than any President in our history, recognized the significant part that the Federal Government could play in the conquest of disease and because it was on the 12th day of April that the wonderful results of the first field trial of the Salk antipolio vaccine were announced to the world.

House Joint Resolution 597, introduced March 29: This resolution would establish a joint congressional committee to study methods of improving and obtaining the greatest benefit from the international exchange-of-persons programs sponsored and conducted by the Federal Government.

DISASTER INSURANCE

H. R. 8664, introduced January 23: This bill would amend the War Risk Insurance Act to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from the forces of nature.

H. R. 9072, introduced February 6: This bill would create a Flood Insurance Administration, to provide for the writing of insurance against flood damage.

Both of these bills were drawn up in the hope that they would help in the discovery of a suitable formula for insuring individuals and firms against the losses caused by floods such as those that occurred in the northeastern part of the country last fall. A formula was found during this session of the Congress and a bill was passed to provide a $7.5 billion

dollar Federal flood insurance and loan program.

DEPRESSED AREAS

H. R. 8877, introduced January 30: This bill would have provided relief for conditions of excessive unemployment in areas which were economically depressed. This would be accomplished by loans to assist in financing the construction of industrial plants or other industrial or commercial facilities to provide employment to persons in such areas. A similar bill passed the Senate and was favorably reported in the House, but a rule was not granted for its consideration on the floor. Thus, the bill died.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

H. R. 10102, introduced March 21: This bill provided for an increase of 15 percent in the benefits paid to retired railroad workers under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act. Such an increase would have brought the pensions paid to these persons more into line with reality in light of today's cost-of-living. The Congress passed a similar bill, except that the increase provided amounted to about 10 percent. While that is less of an increase than I felt was required, it is a step in the right direction.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA POWER

H. R. 11299, introduced May 17: I introduced this measure to reaffirm my support of the principle of public development of the Niagara electric power potential. As you know, in the first session I introduced H. R. 5878 as a companion bill to S. 1823 introduced by Senator Lehman. When the Senator's bill was passed by the Senate in an amended form, I reintroduced my bill in the identical language of the Senate-passed measure. The failure of the House Rules Committee to send this bill to the floor of the House for consideration was a great victory for the administration which had sought from the beginning to give this great power potential to the private utility monopoly in the New York State.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the public laws which I have introduced during the second session. There are however other phases of my duties as a Congressman which have occupied a substantial part of my time since I took office, and which, in order to make this report complete, must be reported to you.

For example, in addition to the public laws which I introduce, there are measures of a private nature for which I am responsible. Since I took office, I have introduced over 40 private bills. The majority of them were for the relief of aliens faced with deportation under provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act. Since bills of this type normally take at least 2 years or so to process, I am gratified to be able to report that 12 of these bills have become law, thus granting permanent residence to persons in my district. Moreover, some of the persons who were the beneficiaries of these bills have been granted relief through administrative procedures so that action on their bills was no longer necessary.

The aid given to these aliens is very gratifying. In one case, a woman, 76 years old and in ill health, was allowed to remain in our country, rather than be deported and separated from all of her close relatives. In two cases, foreign-born wives of American servicemen will be able to come to America and join their husbands. Finally, in two other cases, alien children will be permitted to remain in America with their parents.

Other private bills which I introduced involved claims of my constituents against the United States Government. One bill provided for the return of $2,500 which one of my constituents had lent to the Government so that the gold medal honoring Dr. Jonas E. Salk might be minted and presented to the doctor in time to spur this year's March of Dimes campaign. As you will remember, my resolution which passed in the first session and which authorized the medal was approved by the President after Congress adjourned and the appropriation for the medal could not be passed. This constituent was kind enough to lend the money for the medal to the Government and I am happy that his generosity was recognized by the Congress and by the President who signed my bill to repay him. Another of these bills provided for the return of $1,000 to a constituent, whose brother had been ordered deported but who had later been given the right to remain in America permanently. The $1,000 was paid for a bond to give the brother his freedom from confinement pending his deportation. The bond was forfeited when the brother failed to leave the country, even though a bill was then before the Congress for his relief. Since the brother was finally permitted to remain here the forefeiture of the bond was unfair, and I am happy that my bill was approved.

Mr. Speaker, there are still other areas to which I have devoted my attention on behalf of my constituents. I have had a great number of requests to aid families in obtaining visas to reunite husbands with wives and parents with children in this country. In these cases, my aid was sought to overcome the great time delays that are encountered in these situations, delays which cause great strains and in some cases great legal problems. In one such case, I was able to obtain visas for three minor children of a Jewish family; the children were living in Egypt. Time was extremely important, since the eldest child was just under 21 years of age. Had her birthday occurred before the issuance of her visa, she would have been placed under a heavily oversubscribed quota and would have had to wait years for a quota number before she could have joined her family.

I have also received innumerable requests for aid from constituents who desired my aid in solving personal problems. These requests required my intervention with every Federal agency: the Social Security Administration, the Veteran's Administration, the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, the State Department, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Departments of the Army, the Navy and the Air Force, to name but a few.

There were requests from constituents for thousands of Government publications and documents. I filled these requests as quickly as the publications and documents could be obtained.

Finally, there was the mail from constituents. The letters ran into the hundreds each and every week and covered every conceivable item of legislation and every phase of governmental activity. I was happy to be kept advised of the views of my constituents and I answered their letters with all possible speed.

I have proceeded at some length, Mr. Speaker, in order to set forth in detail the activities which have occupied my time as the Representative of the 20th Congressional District of New York. I have previously spread before you my voting record for the 2d session, so that that too would be available for inspection. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this record of my legislative activities, when combined with my record on major votes, will commend itself to you and to my constituents. I have endeavored to retain the trust and confidence of the kind people who gave me the opportunity to serve in this great legislative body. I hope that my record will strengthen that faith and trust as I seek to return to the judicial life which I left to serve as a Member of Congress.

Republicans in the Senate Supported Eisenhower Program 90 Percent of the Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis which I am having prepared of yea-and-nay votes in the Senate in the 84th Congress.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICANS IN THE SENATE SUPPORTED EISENHOWER PROGRAM 90 PERCENT OF THE TIME

An analysis which I have had made of rollcall votes in the Senate during the whole of the 84th Congress provides irrefutable evidence that Republicans gave far greater support to President Eisenhower's legislative program than did the Democrats.

The findings confirm statistically what I have stated before, that much more of the President's program would have been enacted and more of it in accordance with his recommendations had Republicans been in control of the Congress and its committees.

This is what the analysis shows:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

In the two sessions of the Congress there were 203 Senate rollcall votes involving the President's program out of the total of 230 votes recorded.

Fifty percent or more of the Republicans in the Senate supported President Eisenhower 183 out of 203 times, for a support record of 90 percent.

Fifty percent or more of Senate Republicans voted against the President only 21 out of 203 times, for an opposition score of 10 percent. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport exceed 203 because in 1956 Republicans were split 50–50 on 1 vote.)

THE DEMOCRATIC RECORD

Fifty percent or more of Senate Democrats supported the President's program only 108 out of 203 times, a support record of 53 percent.

Fifty percent or more of Senate Democrats voted against President Eisenhower's program 100 out of 203 times, for an opposition score of 49 percent. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport totaled 91 in 1955, and 117 in 1956 because 5 votes were evenly split 50–50.)

The above calculations are based on actual votes cast, exclusive of absences, nonvoting pairs, and announced but nonvoting positions.

The vote calculations for each session are as follows:

Out of 94 Senate record votes in the first session and 136 votes in the second session of the 84th Congress, 89 and 114, respectively, involved President Eisenhower's program.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Republicans supported President Eisenhower 83 out of 89 times for a support record of 93 percent in 1955, and 100 out of 114 times in 1956 for a support record of 87 percent. Over half of the Senate Republicans supported the Republican program during both sessions of the 84th Congress 90 percent of the time.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Republicans voted against the administration only 6 out of 89 times in 1955 and only 15 out of 114 times in 1956, for an opposition score of 10 percent for the 2 years. (NOTE.—Support and nonsupport total 115 in 1956 because on 1 vote the Republicans were split 50–50.)

Fifty percent or more Senate Democrats voted against President Eisenhower 29 out of 89 times for an opposition record of 32 percent in 1955, and 71 out of 114 times in 1956 for an opposition record of 62 percent. During the entire 84th Congress over half of the Senate Democrats opposed the Republican program 49 percent of the time.

Fifty percent or more of the Senate Democrats voted for the President's program only 62 out of 89 times for a support score of 69 percent in 1955, and only 46 out of 114 times in 1956 for a support score of 40 percent—a 53 percent support score for the 2 years. (NOTE.—In the case of Democrats, support and nonsupport total 91 in 1955 and 117 in 1956 because on 5 votes they were evenly split 50–50.)

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program[1] *(84th Cong., 1st sess.)*

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
2	Formosa resolution. Amendment barring use of U. S. Armed Forces on China mainland or islands within 12 miles of coast. Yea was against program. Rejected. 3 yeas, 83 nays	42	97.7	41	97.6	1	2.3	1	2.4
3	Formosa resolution. Kefauver substitute. Yea was against program. Rejected. 11 yeas, 75 nays	43	100.0	32	76.2	0	None	10	23.8
4	Formosa resolution. Amendment denying authority to use troops on related Formosa areas. Yea was against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 74 nays	42	97.7	32	74.4	1	2.3	11	25.6
5	Formosa resolution authorizing use of U. S. Armed Forces to secure and protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and related territories. Yea was for program. Passed. 85 yeas, 3 nays	43	97.7	42	97.7	1	2.3	1	2.3
6	Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Yea was for program. Ratified. 82 yeas, 1 nay	40	97.6	41	100.0	1	2.4	0	None
7	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Amendment that treaty did not affect legal status or sovereignty of territories to which applied. Yea was against program. Rejected. 11 yeas, 57 nays	27	96.4	30	76.9	1	3.6	9	23.1
8	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Amendment deleting sentence providing for extending treaty to other territories by mutual agreement. Yea was against program. Rejected. 10 yeas, 60 nays	27	96.4	33	80.5	1	3.6	8	19.5
9	Mutual Defense Treaty With Nationalist China. Ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 65 yeas, 6 nays	27	96.4	38	90.5	1	3.6	4	9.5
10	Congressional-judicial salaries. Amendment striking out all congressional salary increases. Yea was against program. Rejected. 3 yeas, 80 nays	42	97.7	38	95.0	1	2.3	2	5.0
11	Congressional-judicial salaries. Amendment deferring salary increases until Federal budget balanced. Yea was against program. Rejected. 15 yeas, 71 nays	34	79.1	37	86.0	9	20.9	6	14.0
12	Congressional-judicial salary increases. Yea was for program. Passed. 62 yeas, 24 nays	32	74.4	30	69.8	11	25.6	13	30.2
13	Convention with Japan on income taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 72 yeas, 0 nays	34	100.0	38	100.0	0	None	0	None
14	Convention with Japan on estate, inheritance, and gift taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 71 yeas, 0 nays	34	100.0	37	100.0	0	None	0	None
15	Convention with Belgium on estate and succession taxes. Yea was for program. Ratified. 74 yeas, 0 nays	36	100.0	38	100.0	0	None	0	None
17	Johnson $20–$10 income-tax credit proposal. Yea was against program. Rejected. 44 yeas, 50 nays	45	97.8	5	10.4	1	2.2	43	89.6
18	Finance Committee amendment to eliminate the House-approved $20 tax credit plan. Yea was for program. Adopted. 61 yeas, 32 nays	45	97.8	16	34.0	1	2.2	31	66.0
19	Confirmation of John Marshall Harlan as Supreme Court Justice. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 71 yeas, 11 nays	39	95.1	32	78.0	2	4.9	9	22.0
20	Resolution to disapprove sale of 3 Government synthetic rubber plants in California. Yea was against program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 48 nays	40	93.0	8	18.2	3	7.0	36	81.8
21	Resolution to disapprove sale of 24 Government synthetic rubber plants. Yea was against program. Rejected. 31 yeas, 56 nays	43	97.7	13	30.2	1	2.3	30	69.8
22	Cotton-marketing quotas. Amendment to increase acreage allotment. Yea was against program. Adopted. 51 yeas, 39 nays	13	28.3	26	59.1	33	71.7	18	40.9
23	Cotton-marketing quotas. Amendment to increase 1955 wheat allotments. Yea was against program. Adopted. 47 yeas, 43 nays	26	55.3	17	39.5	21	44.7	26	60.5
24	Cotton-marketing quotas. Passage. Yea was against program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 51 nays	38	80.9	13	30.2	9	19.1	30	69.8
25	Postal employees' pay increase. Motion to table substitute amendment for 7.6 percent raise plus reclassification. Yea was against program. Tabled. 52 yeas, 41 nays	38	80.9	3	6.5	9	19.1	43	93.5
26	Postal employees' pay increase. 10 percent raise. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 72 yeas, 21 nays	19	40.4	2	4.3	28	59.6	44	95.7
27	Protocol on ending occupation of West Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 2 nays	33	94.3	43	100.0	2	5.7	0	None
28	Protocol to North Atlantic Treaty on accession of West Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 2 nays	33	94.3	43	100.0	2	5.7	0	None
29	International Telecommunications Convention. Ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 74 yeas, 1 nay	33	97.1	41	100.0	1	2.9	0	None
30	Colorado River project. Amendment to strike Echo Park Dam. Yea was against program. Rejected. 30 yeas, 52 nays	29	78.4	23	51.1	8	21.6	22	48.9
31	Colorado River project. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 58 yeas, 23 nays	27	77.1	31	67.4	8	22.9	15	32.6
33	Trade agreements. Amendment to delete peril point provision. Yea against program. Rejected. 9 yeas, 82 nays	47	100.0	35	92.0	0	None	9	8.0

[1] There were 94 record votes in all. 5 votes were omitted from this analysis because they did not appear to be true tests of the Eisenhower program.

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
34	Trade agreements. Amendment requiring submission of agreements to Congress. Yea against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 73 nays	40	90.9	33	92.1	4	9.1	9	7.9
35	Trade agreements. Amendment eliminating section for determining effect of imports on domestic industry. Yea was against program. Rejected. 21 yeas, 67 nays	46	100.0	21	50.0	0	None	21	50.0
36	Trade agreements extension. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 75 yeas, 13 nays	38	91.6	37	91.4	7	8.4	6	8.6
37	Postal employees' pay. Conference report. Yea was against program. Adopted. 66 yeas, 11 nays	11	27.5	0	None	29	72.5	37	100.0
39	Constitutional amendment permitting governors to fill in House whenever over half House seats are vacant. Yea was for program. Adopted. 76 yeas, 3 nays	40	100.0	36	92.3	0	None	3	7.7
40	Postal employees' pay. Vote on passage of bill over President's veto. Yea was against program. Failed to override (⅔ affirmative vote needed). 54 yeas, 39 nays	37	82.2	2	4.2	8	17.8	46	95.8
41	Highway bill. Administration substitute (10-year, $25 billion program for interstate highways). Yea was for program. Rejected. 31 yeas, 60 nays	30	69.8	1	2.1	13	30.2	47	97.9
42	Highway bill. Motion to recommit. Yea was for program. Failed to recommit. 39 yeas, 50 nays	39	90.7	0	None	4	9.3	46	100.0
43	Postal employees' pay. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 78 yeas, 0 nays	35	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
44	Great Lakes Fishery Convention. Yea was for program. Ratified. 79 yeas, 0 nays	36	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
45	Mutual security. Requirement that 50 percent of economic aid be on loan basis. Yea was against program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 50 nays	21	48.8	29	72.5	22	51.2	11	27.5
46	Mutual security. Requirement that 75 percent of economic aid be on loan basis. Yea was against program. Rejected. 29 yeas, 52 nays	21	51.2	31	77.5	20	48.8	9	22.5
47	Mutual security. Amendment cutting by half defense support funds. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 56 nays	27	64.3	29	70.7	15	35.7	12	29.3
48	Mutual security. Recommittal. Yea was against program. Rejected. 16 yeas, 62 nays	26	68.4	36	90.0	12	31.6	4	10.0
49	Mutual security. $318,000,000 cut in overall authorization. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 53 nays	26	66.7	27	65.9	13	33.3	14	34.1
50	Mutual security. Ban on aid to countries trading with Red China while Americans are imprisoned there. Yea was against program. Rejected. 18 yeas, 60 nays	26	66.7	34	87.2	13	33.3	5	12.8
51	Mutual security. $200,000,000 cut in President's special fund for Asian regional development. Yea was against program. Rejected. 17 yeas, 63 nays	31	77.5	32	80.0	9	22.5	8	20.0
52	Mutual security. Waiver of civil-service laws regarding firing of 200 FOA employees. Yea was for program. Rejected. 40 yeas, 40 nays	40	100.0	0	None	0	None	40	100.0
53	Mutual security. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 59 yeas, 18 nays	28	71.8	31	81.6	11	28.2	7	8.4
54	Housing bill. Amendment reducing public housing authorization to 70,000 over 2-year period. Yea was for program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 44 nays	32	78.0	6	14.6	9	22.0	35	85.4
55	Housing bill. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 60 yeas, 25 nays	27	62.8	33	78.6	16	37.2	9	21.4
56	Commerce appropriations, 1956. Increase in CAB funds to pay air carriers. Yea was for program. Adopted. 51 yeas, 24 nays	32	86.5	19	50.0	5	13.5	19	50.0
57	Commerce appropriations. $38,000,000 increase for maritime ship construction. Yea was for program. Adopted. 53 yeas, 20 nays	21	60.0	32	84.2	14	40.0	6	15.8
58	Austrian State Treaty. Ratified. Yea was for program. 63 yeas, 3 nays	28	90.3	35	100.0	3	9.7	0	None
59	Defense appropriations. Increased funds for Marine Corps. Yea was against program. Adopted. 40 yeas, 39 nays	37	92.5	2	5.1	3	7.5	37	94.9
60	Defense appropriations. Deletion of ban on disposing of activities competing with private enterprise. Yea was for program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 48 nays	32	78.0	1	2.5	9	22.0	39	97.5
61	Defense appropriations. Yea was for program. Passed. 80 yeas, 0 nays	40	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
62	Resolution of Congress' sentiment that Secretary of State should obtain prior consent to discuss Soviet satellites at meeting of heads of government. Yea was against program. Rejected. 4 yeas, 77 nays	35	89.7	42	100.0	4	10.3	0	None
63	Passage of bill eliminating compulsory cumulative voting of shares of stock in election of directors of national banking associations. Yea was for program. Passed. 53 yeas, 21 nays	35	97.2	18	47.4	1	2.8	20	52.6
64	AEC construction authority. $21,000,000 for atomic-powered merchant vessel. Yea was for program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 42 nays	40	100.0	1	2.3	0	None	42	97.7
65	District of Columbia home rule. Yea was for program. Passed. 59 yeas, 15 nays	31	91.2	28	70.0	3	8.8	12	30.0
66	Geneva Convention on Armed Forces Wounded in the Field. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
67	Geneva Convention for Armed Forces Wounded at Sea. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
68	Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
69	Geneva Convention on Treatment of Civilian Persons in Time of War. Yea was for program. Ratified. 77 yeas, 0 nays	37	100.0	40	100.0	0	None	0	None
70	Resolution of Senate that self-government should be restored to enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. Yea was for program. Adopted. 89 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
72	Reserve Forces Act. Ban on stationing United States servicemen in any country which has agreement giving that country criminal jurisdiction over U. S. Armed Forces. Yea was against program. Rejected. 14 yeas, 70 nays	30	68.2	40	100.0	14	31.8	0	None
73	Reserve Forces Act. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 80 yeas, 1 nay	41	97.6	39	100.0	1	2.4	0	None
74	Defense production. Amendment to permit continued hiring of dollar-a-year men in peace. Yea was for program. Adopted. 46 yeas, 45 nays	44	97.8	2	4.3	1	2.2	44	95.7
75	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Amendment restoring $420,000,000 for military aid which was cut by the House. Yea was for program. Adopted. 50 yeas, 38 nays	29	65.9	21	47.7	15	34.1	23	52.3
76	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Reduction from $85,000,000 to $64,000,000 for European defense support. Yea was against program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 63 nays	33	79.6	30	69.8	9	21.4	13	30.2
77	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. Amendment reducing by $206,800,000 funds for Asian defense support. Yea was against program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 60 nays	30	73.2	30	69.8	11	26.8	13	30.2

Party positions on 89 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 1st sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
78	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. $10,000,000 reduction in funds for Asian development. Yea was against program. Adopted. 68 yeas, 16 nays	2	4.9	14	32.6	39	95.1	29	67.4
79	Mutual-security appropriations, 1956. $50,000,000 increase in President's fund for Asian economic development. Yea was for program. Adopted. 46 yeas, 38 nays	30	73.2	16	37.2	11	26.8	27	62.8
80	Mutual-security appropriations,1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 62 yeas, 22 nays	30	73.2	32	74.4	11	26.8	11	25.6
81	Treaty of Commerce with Germany. Yea was for program. Ratified. 83 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	42	100.0	0	None	0	None
82	Railroad retirement. Amendment deleting sections requiring positions on Railroad Retirement Board to be under competitive civil service. Yea was for program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 66 nays	24	54.5	0	None	20	45.5	46	100.0
83	Railroad retirement benefits. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 91 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	47	100.0	0	None	0	None
84	Domestic minerals program extension. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 54 yeas, 34 nays	15	35.7	19	41.3	27	64.3	27	58.7
85	Treaty with Panama. Yea was for program. Ratified. 72 yeas, 14 nays	39	97.5	33	71.7	1	2.5	13	28.3
86	Income-tax convention with Netherlands. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
87	Income-tax protocol with Netherlands. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
88	Income-tax convention with Italy. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
89	Estate-tax convention with Italy. Yea was for program. Ratified. 86 yeas, 0 nays	41	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
90	Confirmation of John A. Hall to be Director of Locomotive Inspection, ICC. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 43 yeas, 41 nays	35	85.4	8	18.6	6	14.6	35	81.4
91	Retirement of Government capital in certain institutions under supervision of Farm Credit Administration. Amendment re application of assets on liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives. Yea was against program. Rejected. 9 yeas, 80 nays	37	84.1	43	95.6	7	15.9	2	4.4
92	Motion to recommit soldier vote bill with instructions to retain ban against poll-tax requirements. Yea was against program. Failed to recommit. 22 yeas, 56 nays	32	82.1	24	61.5	7	17.9	15	38.5
93	Motion to recommit conference report on Defense Production Act with instructions to strike requirement that dollar-a-year men list assets, etc. Yea was for program. Recommitted. 36 yeas, 34 nays	36	97.3	0	None	1	2.7	33	100.0
94	Confirmation of Harold C. Patterson to be member of SEC. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 49 yeas, 29 nays	37	97.4	12	30.0	1	2.6	28	70.0

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.) [1]

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
95	Convention on slavery. Yea was for program. Ratified. 84 yeas, 0 nays	43	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
96	Protocol modifying customs tariffs publication. Yea was for program. Ratified. 84 yeas, 0 nays	43	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
104	Sugar Act extension. Amendment providing different sugar allotment and percentage formula for export quotas. Yea was for program. Rejected. 30 yeas, 56 nays	25	59.5	5	11.4	17	40.5	39	88.6
105	Convention to facilitate importation of commercial samples and advertising material. Yea was for program. Ratified. 76 yeas, 0 nays	35	100.0	41	100.0	0	None	0	None
107	Agricultural Act of 1956. Anderson amendment deleting 90 percent of parity provision on any basic commodities except wheat. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 54 yeas, 41 nays	41	87.2	13	27.1	6	12.8	35	72.9
108	Agricultural Act of 1956. Substitute amendment establishing 1956 minimum national acreage allotments for corn at 50,000,000 acres. Yea was against program. Rejected. 44 yeas, 46 nays	43	95.6	3	6.7	2	4.4	42	93.3
109	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 108). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 44 nays	44	95.7	3	6.7	2	4.3	42	93.3
110	Agricultural Act of 1956. Modified amendment to Kerr amendment providing annually incentive payments of not more than $1,200 to producers agreeing to market lightweight cattle and hogs. Yea was against program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 53 nays	41	87.2	12	25.5	6	12.8	35	74.5
111	Agricultural Act of 1956. Kerr amendment providing 75 percent price support on hogs and beef cattle. Yea was against program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 61 nays	46	97.9	15	32.6	1	2.1	31	67.4
112	Agricultural Act of 1956. Aiken amendment eliminating language providing 90 percent price support on millable quality wheat. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 45 yeas, 45 nays (Vice President voted yea breaking tie)	34	75.6	11	24.4	11	24.4	34	75.6
113	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 112). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 46 yeas, 41 nays	40	87.0	6	14.6	6	13.0	35	85.4
114	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment to Williams amendment providing 90 percent price support to producer to whom not more than $5,000 loan is made and limiting to $50,000 any price support loan to corporate producer. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 56 nays	41	91.1	15	31.9	4	8.9	32	68.1
115	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment to Williams amendment limiting to $25,000 any payment to any participating producer in soil bank plan. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 84 yeas, 9 nays	46	100.0	38	80.9	0	None	9	19.1

[1] There were 136 record votes in all. 22 votes were omitted from this analysis because they did not appear to be true tests of the Eisenhower program.

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
116	Agricultural Act of 1956. Modified Williams amendment limiting to $100,000 price-support loans that may be made to any producer, and prohibiting production of any surplus crop on leased Federal land. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 78 yeas, 11 nays	43	97.7	35	77.8	1	2.3	10	22.2
117	Confirmation of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones as Democratic members of U. S. Tariff Commission. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 92 yeas, 0 nays	46	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
118	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment establishing domestic parity plan for wheat (100 percent). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 54 yeas, 39 nays	29	63.0	10	21.3	17	37.0	37	78.7
119	Agricultural Act of 1956. Russell amendment establishing domestic parity plan for cotton (100 percent). Yea was against program. Rejected. 33 yeas, 57 nays	38	86.4	19	41.3	6	13.6	27	58.7
120	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment continuing definition of standard grade cotton as provided by existing law. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 47 nays	37	86.0	10	21.7	6	14.0	36	78.3
121	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment authorizing brucellosis control and school milk programs for a 2-year period. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 89 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
122	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment providing that other than basic commodities be made eligible for acreage reserve program of soil bank. Yea was against program. Rejected. 29 yeas, 58 nays	25	56.8	33	76.7	19	43.2	10	23.3
123	Agricultural Act of 1956. Aiken amendment eliminating provision for dual parity formula. Yea was for program. Rejected. 44 yeas, 45 nays	35	77.8	9	20.5	10	22.2	35	79.5
124	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 123). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 42 nays	38	84.4	4	8.7	7	15.6	42	91.3
125	Brucellosis control and school milk programs. Motion to recommit conference report which extended these programs for 90 days, to June 30, 1956. Yea was for program. Rejected. 46 yeas, 48 nays	46	97.9	0	None	1	2.1	47	100.0
126	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment increasing conservation reserve funds to livestock producers by $75,000,000 (to $425,000,000). Yea was against program. Rejected. 24 yeas, 63 nays	45	97.8	18	43.9	1	2.2	23	56.1
127	Agricultural Act of 1956, Morse amendment eliminating language requiring 15 percent State contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 43 nays	43	93.5	0	None	3	6.5	39	100.0
128	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment eliminating language providing reallocation of 174,000 acres among cotton States based on number of small cotton farmers in each. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 46 yeas, 43 nays	34	75.6	12	27.3	11	24.4	32	72.7
129	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment limiting imports of surplus crops to annual average of preceding 3 years. Yea was against program. Rejected. 43 yeas, 47 nays	25	54.3	22	50.0	21	45.7	22	50.0
130	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment making surplus crops grown on lands reclaimed under irrigation and flood-control projects ineligible for soil-bank benefits. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 63 yeas, 28 nays	41	87.2	22	50.0	6	12.8	22	50.0
132	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment requiring certification from beef processors that price paid to producers is not less than support price or a fair price as determined by Agriculture Secretary. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 44 nays	36	81.8	8	16.3	8	18.2	41	83.7
133	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion so table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 132). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 52 yeas, 42 nays	39	86.7	3	6.1	6	13.3	46	93.9
134	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment requiring that producer allocate certain percentage of his acreage to soil bank as a condition of elibility for price support on any crop except tung nuts. Yea was against program. Agreed to, 48 yeas, 46 nays	9	20.0	37	75.5	36	80.0	12	24.5
135	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to reconsider vote by which Morse amendment (vote No. 127) was rejected. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	42	95.5	3	6.2	2	4.5	45	93.8
136	Agricultural Act of 1956. 2d vote on Morse amendment. (See vote No. 127.) Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	42	95.5	3	6.2	2	4.5	45	93.8
137	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment making mandatory the authority for set-aside of corn at 250,000,000 bushels, and providing maximum and minimum set-aside of upland cotton at 9,000,000 and 7,500,000 bales, and of wheat at 800,000,000 and 750,000,000 bushels, respectively. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 44 nays	39	86.7	5	10.2	6	13.3	44	89.8
138	Agricultural Act of 1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 93 yeas, 2 nays	44	95.7	49	100.0	2	4.3	0	None
143	Joint Committee on Central Intelligence. Passage of resolution establishing. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 59 nays	38	82.6	21	52.5	8	17.4	19	47.5
144	Agricultural Act of 1956. Agreeing to conference report. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 35 nays	31	67.4	4	10.3	15	32.6	35	89.7
145	Convention on International Civil Aviation. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
146	Convention on customs facilities for touring. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
147	Customs convention on temporary importation of private road vehicles. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 81 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	39	100.0	0	None	0	None
148	Increased contribution to ILO and FAO. Amendment limiting United States contribution to ILO to present ceiling ($1,750,000). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 43 yeas, 40 nays	8	18.6	32	80.0	35	81.4	8	20.0
149	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment prohibiting companies from acquiring assets of bank located in another State unless specifically authorized by statute of other State. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 58 yeas, 18 nays	13	37.1	5	12.2	22	62.9	36	87.8
150	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment allowing companies to retain their nonbanking assets. Yea was against program. Rejected. 13 yeas, 68 nays	31	75.6	37	92.5	10	24.4	3	7.5
151	Definition of "bank holding companies." Amendment revising definition of company from 25-percent control of 2 banks to 25-percent control of 1 bank. Yea was against program. Rejected. 28 yeas, 51 nays	30	78.9	21	51.2	8	21.1	20	48.8
154	Federal flood insurance. Amendments en bloc requiring State participation on a 50–50 basis after June 30, 1959. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 39 yeas, 31 nays	35	92.1	4	12.5	3	7.9	28	87.5

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
155	Federal flood insurance. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 61 yeas, 7 nays	35	94.6	26	83.9	2	5.4	5	16.1
158	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment permitting CCC not to sell more than 100,000,000 bushels of milling quality surplus wheat for feed annually. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 31 nays	33	76.7	16	43.2	10	23.3	21	56.8
159	Agricultural Act of 1956. Amendment eliminating provisions for mandatory support prices for feed grains. Yea was for program. Rejected. 39 yeas, 44 nays	31	70.5	8	20.5	13	29.5	31	79.5
162	Agricultural Act of 1956. Williams amendment limiting payments to any 1 producer under soil bank and price-support programs. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 44 yeas, 29 nays	34	87.2	10	29.4	5	12.8	24	70.6
163	Agricultural Act of 1956. Motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 162). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 22 nays	19	50.0	3	9.1	19	50.0	30	90.9
164	Agricultural Act of 1956. 2d vote on Williams amendment. (See vote No. 162.) Yea was for program. Rejected. 28 yeas, 43 nays	21	55.3	7	21.2	17	44.7	26	78.8
165	Civil Service Retirement Act revision. Amendment retaining present law permitting optional retirement at 55 after 30 years' service, with reduced annuity. Yea was for program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 46 nays	30	73.2	6	14.6	11	26.8	35	85.4
166	Civil Service Retirement Act revision. Amendment retaining present law providing 5 percent reduction of first $1,500 of annuity and 10 percent reduction in excess of $1,500 where employee provides survivor annuity for wife or husband. Yea was for program. Rejected. 16 yeas, 65 nays	15	37.5	1	2.4	25	62.5	40	97.6
167	Housing Act amendments. Amendment raising interest rates on college housing loans from 2¾ to 3⅛ percent. Yea was for program. Rejected. 40 yeas, 41 nays	38	97.4	2	4.8	1	2.6	40	95.2
168	Housing Act Amendments. Motion to table motion to reconsider vote by which Senate rejected previous vote (No. 167). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 41 yeas, 39 nays	38	97.4	1	2.4	1	2.6	40	97.6
169	Housing Act Amendments. Amendment limiting public housing units to 35,000 a year for the next 2 years. Yea was for program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 41 nays	31	81.6	7	17.1	7	18.4	34	82.9
170	Housing Act Amendments. Amendment restricting new public housing to localities with a workable program for slum clearance. Yea was for program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 44 nays	39	88.2	2	4.8	4	11.8	40	95.2
171	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Substitute amendment for language in House-passed title I re prevailing wages under Davis-Bacon Act. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 39 yeas, 39 nays (Vice President voted "yea," breaking tie)	25	65.8	14	35.0	13	34.2	26	65.0
172	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 171). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 41 yeas, 39 nays	27	67.5	14	35.0	13	32.5	26	65.0
173	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table Chavez amendment. Yea was for program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 41 nays	25	64.1	12	30.8	14	35.9	27	69.2
174	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Chavez amendment providing for application of Davis-Bacon Act on Interstate Highway System in payment of prevailing wages. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 42 yeas, 37 nays	25	62.5	12	30.8	15	37.5	27	69.2
175	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Amendment setting up formula for apportioning authorized appropriations among the States. Yea was for program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 55 nays	16	39.0	11	26.8	25	61.0	30	73.2
176	Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Motion to table motion to reconsider voice vote on Fulbright amendment re appeal of wage determinations under Davis-Bacon Act. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 36 yeas, 33 nays	21	67.7	15	39.5	10	32.3	23	60.5
177	Domestic tungsten production and purchase. Amendment limiting purchases of tungsten. Yea was for program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 32 nays	19	79.2	3	10.0	5	20.8	27	90.0
179	Defense Production Act extension. Motion to table committee amendment. (See vote No. 180.) Yea was against program. Rejected. 20 yeas, 50 nays	24	64.9	26	78.8	13	35.1	7	21.2
180	Defense Production Act extension. Committee amendment declaring congressional policy to be promotion of geographical dispersal of United States industrial facilities. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 48 yeas, 13 nays	22	66.7	26	92.9	11	33.3	2	7.1
181	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts. Agreeing to conference report. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 89 yeas, 1 nay	42	100.0	47	97.9	0	None	1	2.1
182	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Bridges amendments en bloc providing total increase for Air Force of only $500,000,000 over House figure. Yea was for program. Rejected 42 yeas, 47 nays	39	92.9	3	6.4	3	7.1	44	93.6
183	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Committee amendment providing total increase for Air Force of only $800,000,000 over House figure. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 48 yeas, 40 nays	37	88.1	3	6.5	5	11.9	43	93.5
184	Defense Department appropriations, 1957. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 88 yeas, 0 nays	40	100.0	48	100.0	0	None	0	None
185	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment protecting producers of agricultural commodities that are in surplus from increased imports. Yea was against program. Rejected. 43 yeas, 45 nays	25	58.1	20	44.4	18	41.9	25	55.6
186	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment placing temporary limitation on imports of cotton and cotton textiles. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 52 nays	30	68.2	22	50.0	14	31.8	22	50.0
187	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment perfecting language proposed to be stricken from committee amendment by Bridges amendment. (See vote No. 188.) Yea was for program. Agreed to. 52 yeas, 36 nays	11	25.0	41	93.2	33	75.0	3	6.8
188	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Bridges amendment eliminating language of committee amendment—as modified by O'Mahoney amendment (see vote No. 187)—which gives President discretionary authority regarding continued aid to Yugoslavia. Yea was against program. Rejected. 38 yeas, 50 nays	21	47.7	29	65.9	23	52.3	15	34.1
189	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment limiting foreign aid appropriation. Yea was against program. Rejected. 27 yeas, 58 nays	30	71.4	28	65.1	12	28.6	15	34.9
190	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment providing establishment of Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. Yea was for program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 45 nays	41	97.6	0	None	1	2.4	44	100.0
191	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment cutting off all aid to any nation shipping strategic materials to Soviet bloc. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 60 nays	27	65.9	33	78.6	14	34.1	9	21.4

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
192	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment providing for furnishing congressional committees information, documents, etc., relating to administration of mutual security program. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 58 nays	36	87.8	22	55.0	5	12.2	18	45.0
193	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Amendment reducing from $75,000,000 to $35,000,000 development assistance and from $10,000,000 to $5,000,000 technical assistance to India. Yea was against program. Rejected. 23 yeas, 56 nays	24	61.5	32	80.0	15	38.5	8	20.0
194	Mutual Security Act of 1956. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 54 yeas, 25 nays	27	69.2	27	67.5	12	30.8	13	32.5
195	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Motion to recommit. Yea was for program. Rejected. 22 yeas, 62 nays	17	41.5	5	11.6	24	58.5	38	88.4
196	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Amendment preventing windfall benefits to any airline subtracting amount of capital gain from amount invested in new capital. Yea was for program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 46 nays	25	61.0	12	28.6	16	39.0	30	71.4
197	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Amendment denying benefits under bill to any airline receiving an annual gross income of more than $50,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 43 nays	29	78.4	14	36.8	8	21.6	24	63.2
198	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 53 yeas, 22 nays	8	21.6	14	36.8	29	78.4	24	63.2
199	International Wheat Agreement. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 85 yeas, 2 nays	41	97.6	44	97.8	1	2.4	1	2.2
200	Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights with Iran. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
201	Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with Republic of Nicaragua. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
202	Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation with the Netherlands. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 88 yeas, 0 nays	42	100.0	46	100.0	0	None	0	None
203	Civilian atomic power acceleration program. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 49 yeas, 40 nays	40	93.0	0	None	3	7.0	46	100.0
204	Confirmation of Simon E. Sobeloff to be U. S. Circuit Judge. Motion to recommit. Yea was against program. Rejected. 20 yeas, 63 nays	34	87.2	29	65.9	5	12.8	15	34.1
205	Confirmation of Simon E. Sobeloff to be U. S. Circuit Judge. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 64 yeas, 19 nays	35	89.7	29	65.9	4	10.3	15	34.1
206	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment liberalizing matching formula for old-age assistance and providing temporary extension of 1952 matching formula for dependent children. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 62 yeas, 21 nays	18	46.2	3	6.8	21	53.8	41	93.2
207	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment providing payment of social-security benefits to persons disabled at age 50. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 47 yeas, 45 nays	38	86.4	7	14.6	6	13.6	41	85.4
208	Social Security Act amendments. Motion to table motion to reconsider previous vote (No. 207). Yea was against program. Agreed to. 49 yeas, 43 nays	41	93.2	2	4.2	3	6.8	46	95.8
209	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment lowering from 65 to 62 the age that all women can claim old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 86 yeas, 7 nays	5	11.1	2	4.2	40	88.9	46	95.8
210	Social Security Act amendments. Amendment allowing recipients of old-age assistance to earn up to $50 a month without deduction. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 56 yeas, 34 nays	26	59.1	8	17.4	18	40.9	38	82.6
211	Social Security Act amendments. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 90 yeas, 0 nays	45	100.0	45	100.0	0	None	0	None
212	Construction of Hells Canyon Dam. Passage. Yea was against program. Rejected. 41 yeas, 51 nays	43	95.6	8	17.0	2	4.4	39	83.0
213	United States-France Convention to Eliminate Double Taxation. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 87 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
214	United States-Honduras Convention for Avoidance of Double Taxation and Prevention of Income-Tax Evasion. Agreeing to resolution of ratification. Yea was for program. Ratified. 87 yeas, 0 nays	44	100.0	43	100.0	0	None	0	None
215	Confirmation of Paul G. Hoffman to be a United States representative to United Nations General Assembly. Yea was for program. Confirmed. 64 yeas, 22 nays	27	62.8	37	86.0	16	37.2	6	14.0
216	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $1,735,000,000 (plus $1). Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 46 nays	31	70.5	15	34.1	13	29.5	29	65.9
217	Mutual security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $2,000,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 37 yeas, 44 nays	29	69.0	15	38.5	13	31.0	24	61.5
218	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment reducing military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $2,100,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 42 yeas, 44 nays	29	64.4	15	36.6	16	35.6	26	63.4
219	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Committee amendment increasing military aid from $1,735,000,000 (House figure) to $2,300,000,000. Yea was for program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 39 nays	32	71.1	18	40.9	13	28.9	26	59.1
221	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendments reducing defense support and development assistance funds $126,000,000. Yea was against program. Rejected. 36 yeas, 54 nays	30	69.8	24	51.1	13	30.2	23	48.9
222	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Committee amendments providing $1,175,200,000 for defense support and $293,000,000 for development assistance (increase over House figures). Yea was for program. Agreed to. 57 yeas, 33 nays	32	71.1	25	55.6	13	28.9	20	44.4
223	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Motion to suspend rules to permit vote on amendment barring use of funds for military aid to Yugoslavia under provisions of H. R. 12130 and any prior act. Yea was against program. Rejected (⅔ votes required). 59 yeas, 33 nays	14	31.1	19	40.4	31	68.9	28	59.6
224	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Amendment barring use of funds in bill for military aid or equipment to Yugoslavia. Yea was against program. Agreed to. 50 yeas, 42 nays	19	42.2	23	48.9	26	57.8	24	51.1
225	Mutual-security appropriations, 1957. Passage. Yea was for program. Passed. 60 yeas, 30 nays	30	66.7	30	66.7	15	33.3	15	33.3
227	Second supplemental appropriations, 1957. Amendment providing $15,000,000 for construction of 2d airport for Washington, D. C., at Burke, Va. Yea was for program. Rejected. 32 yeas, 56 nays	3	6.8	29	66.0	41	93.2	15	34.0

Party positions on 114 record votes in the Senate involving the Eisenhower program (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Record vote No.	Subject of vote	For Eisenhower program				Against Eisenhower program			
		Republican		Democrat		Republican		Democrat	
		Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast	Number	Percent of Republican votes cast	Number	Percent of Democratic votes cast
228	Unemployment areas. Amendment creating an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be in charge of redevelopment in United States. Yea was for program. Rejected (majority vote needed). 43 yeas, 43 nays.	43	97.7	0	None	1	2.3	42	100.0
229	Unemployment areas. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 60 yeas, 30 nays	27	62.8	3	6.4	16	37.2	44	93.6
230	Lake Michigan water diversion. Passage. Yea was against program. Passed. 43 yeas, 33 nays	30	83.3	3	7.5	6	16.7	37	92.5

Some Comments on the Differences Between the Two Parties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress prepares to adjourn and the battle lines take shape for a fateful election on November 6—an election in which every American will have a high personal stake—I should like to call to the attention of the House some facts which I think are worthy of consideration in a political campaign year.

Sometimes visitors from foreign nations, noting the high degree of unity among Americans on foreign-policy issues particularly, and noting how the Democratic Congress has been cooperating with a Republican President on international matters, ask us in surprise what is the difference between the political parties. They find it difficult to see the differences, because obviously they do not study our rollcall votes on the individual issues but look only at the final results.

Yet, of course, there are very great differences between the two parties, and those differences come to the fore each time the Congress turns its attention to legislation intended to help the vast majority of our people—to help them achieve more of the good things of life and an opportunity for a better life for their children. Let us look at some of these differences as they have come to light in the legislative battles.

When you speak of legislation affecting the people, many voters immediately think of taxes, and the heavy bite which the withholding tax takes out of the pay envelope. Are taxes too high? Everyone tends to say "Yes" to that question. The Republican approach—the GOP solution on the tax issue—has traditionally been to lower taxes for the very wealthy—to provide gigantic windfalls and handouts to big industries—but to fight bitterly against such things as the Democratic plan for raising personal exemptions from their present $600 per person. Raising exemptions is a must next step in tax reform, along with closing some of these gaping loopholes which big business and the very wealthy have been able to use to avoid paying their full share to the Federal Treasury. The Republican tax law written by the Eisenhower administration and a Republican Congress in 1954, will go down in history as one of the most flagrant instances of "class legislation" ever enacted, legislation to aid the wealthy.

A TAX BONANZA FOR BIG INDUSTRIES

The new depreciation "gimmick," for instance—written into the 1954 law over my vigorous objections and over the bitter opposition of all of the other Democrats who serve with me on the House Committee on Ways and Means—has meant, and will continue to mean, literally billions in additional tax deductions for business and industry for years to come. I do not think we can ever fully catch up with that hole in the dike, a hole through which literally billions in profits have been able to escape free from taxation.

I am sure every American family would be overwhelmed if it were handed some similar giveaway on its tax debt, in proportion. Of course, if that were done, it could very well mean insufficient revenues for the Federal Government with which to do the things which have to be done to keep our country free, to keep it solvent.

That gives you an idea, however, of the extent of the special tax treatment—the privileged tax santuary—which big industries have received as a result of the Republican tax law of 1954—the Eisenhower law. The average taxpayer would have to search very hard, indeed, not only for any comparable favors in that tax law, but for any favors at all. Some one said at the time the bill was up in the Congress in 1954 that if an average family had a run of really tough enough luck—extremely high medical bills, for instance—it woud benefit from the new law. But that was about the only way the average family could benefit from this GOP bill.

EXTREMES UNDER THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Under the Eisenhower administration, and under the Republicans, the big industries got their depreciation bonanza in the tax laws and did very well for themselves as a result; the banks reaped the benefits of a deliberate administration hard money policy which raised all interest rates, and thus made billions more for the banks and bankers; the mortgage companies got their windfalls through higher interest rates put into effect by this administration on FHA and GI mortgages—forcing every veteran and home buyer to pay more for the home he purchased for his family, and more each month to keep it; the giant monopolies in our industrial system got special favored treatment on Government contracts.

These have been some of the outstanding achievements during the 3½ years of the Eisenhower administration. On the other hand, small business has been forced more and more to the wall, with bankruptcies hitting record levels under this administration. Think of that! And while food prices went up to the consumer, farm prices went way down, and the farmers took the same licking they did under all the previous Republican administrations going all the way back to 1912.

SHADOWBOXING WITH RECESSION

Mr. Speaker, we have been lucky—mighty lucky—that the policies of the administration these past 3½ years in the economic sphere have not caused us anything even more serious than a very serious recession in 1953–54 which had the Pittsburgh area on the distress list for many, many months. While this recession was gathering momentum, and men were being thrown out of work by the millions, the Eisenhower administration was telling us each day that we just imagined there was a recession—they said everything was booming. It was hard to believe—particularly since all we had to do was look around us and see how many families depended on surplus food in order to keep going. But the administration shadowboxed with the recession, and—just as Herbert Hoover did in 1929–32—just sat and waited for things to improve. We were lucky—mighty lucky—that it did not get worse.

TO THE BRINK OF WAR

We have also been lucky—mighty lucky—that the brink of war policies of Eisenhower and Dulles have not destroyed the unity of the free world in our great alliance against communism. This alliance, formed under Harry S. Truman, stopped Communist expansionism in its tracks, finally forcing the Russians to try new tactics such as they are now engaged in. But in the meantime, the Republcan foreign-policy strategists seem to have deliberately confused and horrified our allies so often that we have inspired more and more neutralism among them—and fear that irresponsibility in our State Department high command might not only get us to the brink, but push us into the abyss.

In this connection, also, we have been lucky—mighty lucky—that the President's vague familiarity with the actions taken in his name by countless officials in his administration has not led to complete and utter administrative chaos. After all, in one great area of governmental activity after another, it was impossible for Congress to determine just who did speak for the Eisenhower administration or who did exercise the responsibility and direction which the Constitution places in the President's own hands.

CHAIN OF COMMAND THEORY INADEQUATE

This is not meant in criticism of the President for having been ill, Mr. Speaker, for illness can and does befall all of us at one time or another. I am referring instead to the whole pattern of the Eisenhower administration's concept of Government since the Republicans took office in 1953—the concept of the chain of command in which underlings take major steps on their own initiative, without even consulting the President. If things go all right, the Republicans ascribe the credit to the President. If they go all wrong, as often happens, then it is supposed to be the fault of some hapless bureaucrat down the line.

The President encouraged this concept upon taking office—it was the military concept which he knew so well. But it does not work in civil administration of a vast and complex nation such as ours. Policy must come from the top. The big decisions must be made at the top. These things—things on which our Nation's safety and future rest—cannot be left to lower echelon officials assuming vast powers on their own initiative and with limited knowledge of the overall situation. Harry Truman had on his desk a slogan "The buck stops here." He never passed it to others down the line. We do not elect the bureaucrats; we elect a President to direct them. He must be the boss.

I have never been one to attack Mr. Eisenhower on personal grounds and I never intend to. He is a decent man—a fine man. But he is less than successful as a President—that is obvious.

PRIDE IN DEMOCRATIC RECORD

Mr. Speaker, as we come to the end of this session of Congress, and of the 84th Congress, and look to the elections in November, we on the Democratic side of the aisle can take real pride, I believe, in our party's performance as a responsible party—a party of constructive criticism and affirmative solutions, a party which believes in legislating for the workingman and the average family, for the small-business man as well as the giant corporations, for the professional man, the teacher, the minister, the rank-and-file of citizens who day in and day out work hard at helping to make this a better world.

We have avoided obstructionism in this period when the political leadership of the Nation has been divided between a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. We have supported the President more effectively than his own party followers in the Congress have done on many major issues, and on all foreign-policy issues involving the Nation's safety and security.

HOUSING, CIVIL-RIGHTS FAILURES

But we have been obstructed, in that time after time the Republicans—including the Republican President—have blocked us from doing vital things in behalf of all of the people.

On housing legislation, we have had to take it or leave it on public housing—the Republicans even being willing to let Congress adjourn with no housing legislation unless we gave in on public housing on this measly 35,000-unit maximum set by Eisenhower. Obviously, he has never seen the successful housing projects in Pittsburgh, and seen how they have helped make possible the rejuvenation of our city. The Eisenhower housing record is a disgrace.

The Eisenhower administration killed public housing when it first took office. Furthermore, it appointed as the administrator of the housing agency a Republican former Congressman who had been one of the leading bitter-end opponents of all public housing. Between the administration and the Republicans in strategic committee assignments in the House, housing legislation has been kicked around and beaten down time after time. It will take a Democrat administration once again to provide the kind of housing policies we need in this country.

The glaring failure of the administration on housing has been matched, I might add, on the question of enacting needed civil rights legislation. After waiting 3½ years to propose anything at all on this front, the administration sent up a draft of a weak bill, and then sat by and watched Republicans join with southern Democrats to torpedo the whole thing. This whole maneuver was so transparent anyone could see through it. There was none of the drive, none of the sincere effort, which characterized President Truman's efforts in this field.

GREAT DEMOCRATIC VICTORY ON SOCIAL SECURITY

On the other hand, there was nothing in the nature of a failure in the final results of the new social-security bill which we have just passed. This represents perhaps the outstanding achievement among many achievements by the Democratic 84th Congress. The highway bill which will make possible a vast new network of interstate boulevards may do much to remake the face of America, the physical appearance of our countryside, but the social-security bill will have a much greater effect upon our people and upon their future happiness.

We have done a truly great thing in the social-security bill in extending coverage to virtually all groups except medical doctors—who have objected to being covered—and in establishing for the first time the principle of paying retirement benefits to persons before the age of 65. Disabled workers will be able to collect their social-security benefits in full after reaching the age of 50, instead of sitting around and waiting for 15 years. This takes effect next year. Widows will be able to begin receiving full survivorship benefits at age 62, in cases where they no longer have minor children. Up to now they have had to wait until 65 to collect these benefits once the children attained the age of 18.

Workingwomen will be able to retire at any time between 62 and 65, although I am not at all satisfied with the compromise forced upon us by the Senate on this, requiring a penalty to be assessed for each month these retirement benefits are collected before reaching 65. The survivorship benefits for widows at 62 and the benefits for workingwomen retiring before 65 go into effect November of this year.

The Eisenhower administration fought these changes; the Democrats in Congress put them through anyway. A Democratic administration would have led the way for these improvements, rather than trying to block them.

DEMOCRATS HAVE WORKED FOR ALL GROUPS

After nearly 4 years of a Republican administration, I think we can look back and honestly say that the Truman administration record looks better and better in all respects day by day; it looks positively dazzling in comparison from the standpoint of serving all of the people rather than the few. And the Roosevelt administrations show up like shining beacons of imagination and forthright action when compared to this Republican record of inaction and timidity. Just imagine Roosevelt attacking the depression the way Eisenhower attacked the 1953–54 recession; that is, by sitting and waiting for it to go away.

For me, there is deep satisfaction in being a member of the political party which for more than 20 years has promoted continuous progress in social security over bitter Republican obstructionism and opposition.

There is deep satisfaction in remembering how our party had the courage and imagination to launch the great housing and redevelopment programs of the past 20 years which, as I said, have helped to remake the face of Pittsburgh and the looks of the Golden Triangle.

There is deep satisfaction and genuine pride in recalling how our Demoratic Party developed the great flood-control projects which have made Pittsburgh safe—freed us from the specter of sudden disaster and tragic deaths from the rampaging rivers which meet at the point.

MOVING FORWARD TO A BETTER TOMORROW

I am proud to have had a part in the Congresses which have passed these and hundreds of other great Democratic programs to benefit all the people. I look forward to the 85th Congress next year, and to inaugurating a Democratic President to work with a Democratic Congress in furthering the cause of freedom and democracy—in expanding the frontiers of our economy to assure more of the good things of life for all of our people. The concept of full employment is our constant goal. Full employment does not come about merely by wishing for it—full employment must be worked for affirmatively through effective programs of government, in cooperation with industry and labor. As one of the original sponsors of the Full Employ-

ment Act of 1946, I believe this law holds within its provisions the key to our future economic development—if we have in the White House a President willing to use the tools this great law provides.

The Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, has blazed a brilliant trail toward a great future for our country. With God's help, America will move ever forward to a better tomorrow, with true brotherhood among men, and justice, dignity, contentment for all.

President Eisenhower in Opposing Communism Promotes Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, no longer does communism disturb us as it did a few years back. No longer is there any subversive element in the policymaking departments of Government. They have been sought out and dismissed from Government positions. No such have been appointed to office under the administration of President Eisenhower, nor will there be.

While the situation is much improved as I have indicated, yet the fact remains that communism is still a contending force in the world and ever alert to pressing forward its ideology whenever and in whatever way is possible. Its tone may have changed under the new leadership in Russia but the objectives remain the same. Therefore, it is necessary that we must at all times be on guard. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The policies of the Eisenhower administration have been a big factor throughout the world in off-selling and stopping the onward progress of communism in taking over nations and millions of people into its orbit and under its influence.

Immediately preceding this present administration we saw communism growing continually stronger throughout the world. Nothing that was said or done seemed to stop it.

The task of building a world force of sufficient strength to successfully meet the danger that confronted the free nations of the world was no easy task. It has required endless, and it seemed never-ending, activity upon our part in every corner of the world. Secretary Dulles has worked with zeal and ability in providing a leadership by this Nation in building a strong resistance against communism, and in working out the Eisenhower policies so successfully he deserves great credit. Never before has any Secretary of State been faced with greater responsibilities, nor has anyone performed them in every respect with more fidelity, courage, and ability.

This Nation has been particularly fortunate in having a man such as President Eisenhower at the head of our Government in this time of world uncertainty. His experience, gained as a result of his intitmate contacts with the leaders of other nations during his service as Commander of the Armies of the Allies in World War II, has been of incalculable value and help in drawing world plans. To accomplish this it was necessary to have unity of purpose and unity of understanding. With President Eisenhower as a central figure in all these negotiations, together with his acknowledged military knowledge, it was much easier to attain unity of action among the nations of the world than otherwise would have been the case. Nor, can we overlook the fact that nonpartisan support in most cases has been given to the President by Congress in the fulfillment of his plans to build a strong resistance force against the aggressive policies of communism. This in itself has been of tremendous value because it has shown to the nations of the world that unity exists in this country regardless of political affiliations. This fact has strengthened our stand abroad.

As we ponder the importance of having unity of action among the free nations of the world, as well as in our own land, the question naturally presents itself as to who, what individual in this entire Nation, could claim or be likely to receive such unified support as President Eisenhower. Without in any way disparaging the ability of others who will be presented as candidates for the Presidency, I think it will be generally agreed there is no one who can exceed, or even approach, the importance of President Eisenhower in the maintenance of world peace and the promotion of good will among the nations of the world. He is in every sense of the word a world leader of far greater importance in maintaining peace and promoting good will than can be found in this or any other nation of the world. Thus, it would seem highly important to retain his services as President to combat the extension of communism in the world and strengthen the free nations of the world, and thereby promote the cause of world peace.

Commendable Army Wildlife Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Adjutant General of the Army has prepared a most comprehensive and documented report on wildlife management and conservation within the Army. In view of the great recent interest in wildlife conservation and because of many suggestions being made both in and out of the Congress, I submit that the Army is well aware of its responsibilities in the preservation of wildlife through sound management of hunting and fishing activities at Army installations. I think the report which follows is excellent and should do much to give a factual picture in this matter, which in some instances has not been reported with fairness or accuracy. I would at this point give the Adjutant General's report in full:

STATEMENT BY THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, WITH RESPECT TO WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AT ARMY POSTS

The policy of the Department of the Army is to require the observance of State fish and game laws on all military reservations, including those which may be under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the United States. On those reservations over which the United States exercises only a proprietorial or concurrent legislative jurisdiction with the State, both State and Federal authorities enforce the State hunting and fishing laws. On such installations over which the United States exercises exclusive legislative jurisdiction, State officials do not have authority to make arrests; accordingly, military personnel have been designated to perform functions similar to State game wardens. Their duties are to apprehend all persons who violate installation and State hunting and fishing regulations, to prevent illegal hunting, and to maintain daily supervision over the fish and wildlife conservation programs which have been initiated on the reservations in question.

It is important to note that on lands which are under the concurrent or exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the United States Government, the penal provisions of State or Territorial law in such areas are adopted as Federal law, enforceable and punishable as such by appropriate Federal officials. In other words, in such areas, the State laws have been adopted by Congress as Federal laws, to be administered and enforced by Federal officials. This fact, of course, is well known and recognized by the Department of the Army, and serves as the underlying basis for the regulations requiring compliance with the penal provisions of all State fishing and hunting laws.

With respect to State licensing provisions, however, it has long been the view of the Department of the Army that such portions of State law are administrative rather than penal in nature and, therefore, do not fall within the purview of the Assimilative Crimes Act (18 U. S. C. 13). They are considered as being inseparably connected with administrative functions of State officials or agencies, and are not included within the purview of the Assimilative Crimes Act since the Federal Government is not equipped to carry out these administrative functions. Accordingly, military personnel on lands under the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the Federal Government are not required to purchase State licenses to hunt or fish on such lands. Installation commanders, however, closely control and supervise hunting and fishing on such military reservations through issuance of post hunting or fishing permits which are similar to State licenses.

Although many commanders issue instructions requiring the purchase of a State hunting or fishing license as a prerequisite to issuance of a similar post license, the Department does not make this requirement mandatory because of the legal issues that are raised. In addition, some States require waiting periods of as long as 6 months to 1 year before an individual can be considered as being a resident thereof for purposes of purchasing a State license to hunt or fish. This, together with the fact that in some such States there is as much as a 50 to 1 differential in the cost of a nonresident as compared to a resident license, would in effect make it prohibitive for many military personnel to hunt or fish, if they were required to purchase a nonresident license in such instances. Since military personnel are assigned to various installations to meet military requirements, and do not necessarily reside in a particular State of their own free will, they should not be

penalized by being required to purchase nonresident licenses under the circumstances outlined above. A recent expression of opinion on this subject by the Secretary of Defense is contained in the attached copy of a letter submitted by him to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and an identical letter to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

A number of bills presently are pending before the Congress pertaining to this same general subject. H. R. 8250, H. R. 8253, H. R. 8286, and H. R. 10371, together with a number of other related bills, all have been heard in recent sessions before the aforementioned committees. During the course of these hearings, a considerable number of charges have been made by various State officials and others, alleging serious breaches of State fishing and hunting laws by Army personnel at various military installations throughout the United States. None of these charges have been substantiated, and the Department does not concede to their being correct in fact. It is true that there have been some violations of State hunting laws pertaining to bag limits, sex of animals killed and hunting out of season. However, it may be stated that the number of such violations on Army posts are proportionately no greater, and probably considerably less, than the number which occur each year on State lands.

With respect to Army installations, all reported violations of State hunting and fishing laws are vigorously prosecuted under the applicable provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and the resulting fines and other punishments compare favorably with those given by State judicial agencies for similar offenses. In addition, they become a permanent mark on the official personnel records of the individual concerned with the consequent adverse effect upon the careers of the individual involved. Civilian violators are also apprehended and turned over to the appropriate Federal Commissioner for prosecution.

Some allegations have recently been published that ruthless extermination of wildlife on military reservations by Army personnel has been permitted. Since nothing could be further from the truth, the following information, in greater detail than was possible during the committee hearings, is provided to clarify the circumstances surrounding some of these alleged violations.

It has been reported, for example, that the Army conducted a ruthless buffalo hunt and practically exterminated the herd at Fort Huachuca, Ariz. What was not reported was the fact that prior to the reopening of Fort Huachuca in February 1954, it was determined jointly by the military authorities and the State of Arizona that the buffalo herd should be kept at an average of 225, as a larger number could not be sustained due to limited grazing facilities. On January 4, 1955, the herd consisted of approximately 300 buffalo. The reservation contained two principal grazing areas suitable for buffialo; one on the east side, in the area where the small-arms firing range is located; the other on the west side, which is generally used as an artillery range. Both ranges were actually used throughout the week, which necessitated frequent movements of the buffalo in order to accomplish the military mission of Fort Huachuca. In the latter part of 1954, officials of the State game and fish commission at Phoenix, Ariz., made arrangements with the commanding general at Fort Huachuca to conduct a buffalo hunt to reduce the herd. Two hunts were subsequently conducted by the State game and fish commission from January 12 to 25, 1955, in which the herd was reduced by approximately 135 head. The remainder of the herd was then moved to other wildlife reserves. It is important to keep in mind, with respect to this buffalo herd, that the responsibility for the reduction and removal of the herd at Fort Huachuca rested entirely with the State of Arizona, and did not in any way involve the authorities at Fort Huachuca or the United States Army.

There have also been charges that Army personnel practically exterminated the deer herd at Fort Huachuca, by willful and wanton slaughter out of season, during the month of November 1954. Although it is true that some deer were killed within a short period following the close of the Arizona hunting season (the open deer-hunting season in that area being October 29 through November 14), a study of the facts showed the necessity for the action that was taken.

Fort Huachuca was last occupied by the military authorities (February 1954) as an electronics testing and proving ground. Prior to that date, the reservation was used by the State of Arizona as a wildlife refuge, and as a result, contained an abundance of game and predatory animals. Deer in particular were most numerous; it is estimated that the total deer population on the post numbered approximately 1,500. By the summer of 1954, it was obvious to the commanding general of that installation that the deer had become a definite hazard, were endangering the safety of the women and children in the residential areas to the post, and were causing considerable destruction to newly planted shrubbery and other vegetation being planted by the Government as a part of the post relandscaping program.

Efforts were made, in conference with representatives of the State Game and Fish Commission, to arrive at a solution to the problem of large groups of deer running at will throughout the residential areas of the post, particularly in the early evening and at night. Proposals were made by the Army that representatives of the State fish and game commission enter the post with a limited number of their people to reduce the number of deer. This, the State authorities indicated, could not be accomplished because of lack of sufficient personnel; instead, it was suggested that the reservation be opened for public hunting. The Government could not consent to this because of the sensitive and classified nature of the projects and equipment being tested throughout the post. As a result, by the time the deer-hunting season opened in that area (October 29–November 14), the problem had not yet been resolved.

With the opening of the deer season in the neighboring counties, and because of the fact that no hunting was permitted on the reservation during the first week or so of this period, an additional large influx of deer entered the post from outside the reservation, further intensifying the problem. This situation became particularly acute at that time by accelerating damage to shrubbery and vegetation, and in an incident which occurred as a small child, playing in the immediate vicinity of her home, escaped possible serious injury when a deer reared up on its hind legs and stamped down so close to her, as to tear her clothing with its hoofs. This latter incident permitted no further delay. Based on the estimates of the total deer population on the post, which were later confirmed by State authorities, it was concluded that a total of 100 deer could easily be taken without endangering the herd, and that this number would tend to alleviate the problem that existed in and near the residential areas of the post. Accordingly, a post hunting season was established from November 8 to 22, 1954. Five specially selected officers were authorized to hunt with shotguns loaded with buckshot and to kill deer in the immediate vicinity of the residential areas; 98 other military personnel were permitted to hunt elsewhere on the post. State officials were advised of the action that was being taken, and a total of 68 deer were killed during this period before hunting was terminated.

Subsequent to the above, a conference was held with representatives of the Arizona Game and Fish Commission, the Arizona Game Protective Association, the Southeast Military Advisory Group, and with State senators, the Honorable Harold Giff, and the Honorable Alfred Paul, attended also by representatives of the press and various other citizens of the State. At that conference, it was mutually agreed that the State of Arizona recognized the Army's necessity and authority to permit hunting on predatory animals and other wildlife at Fort Huachuca in the interest of protection of personnel and Government property; that in the future, the amount of game to be eliminated would be determined jointly by the game commission and the Commanding General of the post; that bona-fide paid employees of the State game and fish commission would assist in such efforts, when they were available; that Fort Huachuca would not be open to the public for hunting for security reasons; and that such hunting would be confined to military personnel who could qualify for resident licenses (requiring one year's residence in the State), and that is sufficient hunters were not available under such criteria, the State would authorize such licenses without cost to such personnel to carryout these purposes. In addition, assurances were given State authorities that only wildlife that was destructive or predatory would be hunted in this fashion. Subsequent meetings confirmed these agreements.

It has also been reported on several occasions, that the Army was hunting deer by helicopter at Fort Bragg. What was not reported was the fact that the commanding general of that installation, on being initially apprised of such charges, immediately wrote to the director of the wildlife resources commission of the State of North Carolina (the agency making the allegations), stating in part "It would be greatly appreciated if specific instances by name could be brought to my attention in order that positive disciplinary action could be directed. * * * We need names, dates and places and I assure you we will go after violators". To date, however, such communication has never been answered, nor has the director of that commission seen fit to communicate with the commanding general of that installation about any other matter related to wildlife or hunting and fishing. A full investigation was concurrently made by Army authorities at Fort Bragg to determine whether there was any possible truth to these charges and it was concluded that there was absolutely no basis for even a suspicion that service aircraft have been so employed. In this regard, the present commanding general at Fort Bragg, Maj. Gen. Paul D. Adams, recently wrote to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, stating that "I can assure you that I will take prompt and forceful disciplinary action against anyone committing such an act if it comes to my attention in any way."

It has further been reported that the Army was illegally trapping deer at Fort Bragg and shipping them out of the State. I think that the whole incident should be outlined in order that you may be apprised of what actually took place. In February and March of 1954, several deer were trapped at Fort Bragg and shipped to other military reservations for the purpose of improving wildlife thereon. This was done not only to assist those other reservations, but also for the good of the herd at Fort Bragg. A Federal wildlife expert, after a survey of the post, rendered the opinion that there were too many does in proportion to the bucks on the reservation. The State game commission, however, refused to concur in the scientific elimination of the excess does. When it was learned that the game commission objected to the shipment of deer to other reservations, this practice was immediately stopped and has not been permitted again, although we have had many similar requests. In all, a

total of 14 does were so trapped and shipped to Fort Benning, Ga. A most reliable source has advised that the principal reason for the large deer population on this reservation is that the commanding general of Fort Bragg in 1920 and 1921 had deer shipped from other military reservations to this post for the purpose of increasing the herd. For a long time thereafter, commanders of this post prohibited any hunting of deer, and the herd increased rapidly. In 1930, the first open deer season, of 8 days, was permitted. By 1932, the herd had increased to such an extent that many deer had scattered to adjoining private properties and Cumberland County had its first open deer season in many years. It was only to perform a similar worthy cause that the shipments were permitted from Fort Bragg.

In the interests of wildlife and conservation further information is available concerning the programs which the Army has in effect at various installations. The program at Fort Bragg, N. C., is typical. The game conservation program at that post is supported entirely with money voluntarily contributed by personnel who are interested in game conservation. These contributions total about $5,000 annually and are administered by a fish and game board composed of officers, enlisted personnel and civilian employees of the post, and audited under the personal supervision of the commanding general. This money is used for a number of good purposes, all of which are generally accepted practices in the field of conservation. For example, considerable food and cover crops are planted at places where game will find it. In poor foraging years, grain is distributed in appropriate localities. In addition, turkey flocks are increased by buying turkeys for breeding purposes and then turning them loose in secluded areas where it is known that the wild flocks range. Predatory animals, particularly wildcats, foxes, and dogs, are constantly being trapped and disposed of. In addition, streams and lakes are constantly being restocked, water levels lowered in the lakes for proper weed control, and coarse fish seined, to produce better game fishing for all concerned. In fact, were it not for conservation measures which are in effect, there would be very little game indeed, and that which is there is protected in accord with accepted protective measures in order that it will not disappear entirely. The State gives no assistance, and the Army and the individuals who take part voluntarily and in their free time in these productive and worthwhile activities, in support of sound game management practices, are proud of the achievements made in this field.

It is the hope of members of the Department of the Army that the many sportsmen of this Nation will fully understand the true situation, namely that the Army's policy is to comply fully with the penal provisions of State hunting and fishing laws, such as those pertaining to seasons, bag limits, and sex of animals killed; to cooperate with all State and local officials interested in hunting and fishing, wildlife, and conservation, to quickly and vigorously prosecute all violators, and to engage in long-range conservation and game management programs on all military reservations.

Record of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, it is time to take stock of how well the 84th Congress has met its responsibilities to the American people and to discuss briefly the problems confronting us in this challenging period of world history. In the words of a great American of revered memory, "Let us look at the record." That record discloses a gratifying lack of petty partisanship and obstructionism on the part of the Democratic majority in evaluating the administration's recommendations and the passage of a substantial amount of legislation for the public welfare. It is a matter of keen regret to me that certain vitally important measures of deep concern to me failed of enactment. If we are to build a better America, if we are to make American democracy more healthy, more effective, more genuine, we must have vigorous and forward-looking -Government dedicated to the public interest, not dominated by a single interest viewpoint.

The traditional concern of the Democratic Party for the ordinary men and women of the country, its championship of legislation for the greatest good for the greatest number, is reflected in its fight in the 84th Congress for legislation to help the consumer, the farmer, the working man and woman, and our elderly people. As a sponsor of legislation on the subject, I am proud that the Democrats in Congress were victorious, over the opposition of the administration and their Republican colleagues, in making another advance in humanitarian progress by the modernization of the Social Security Act. Social security represents one of the greatest single advances in the history of our government—initiated and improved by the Democratic Party—and it serves a vital need that cannot be as well served otherwise. The extension of coverage, the lowering of the retirement age for women, the provision for disability benefits, and the liberalization of Federal grants for State programs will provide a greater measure of relief and freedom from anxiety for Americans throughout the land. We have not reached the goal of perfection—indeed, the newly approved amendments contain various inequities and defects—but we have made steady progress.

Another important achievement of the Democratic 84th Congress is the enactment of a vast program of health and medical research. I am pleased that Congress has extended the Hill-Burton Act for grants to hospitals, increased funds for research far above the administration proposals, and established a new system for Federal grants to private research institutes. While we spend billions of dollars each year for defense against the ravages of war, very little has been spent to find the defenses against the crippling and killing ravages of the body.

Our country's most priceless resource is our children. They are entitled to decent housing and to adequate education. As a member of the Special Subcommittee on Housing, it was my honor and duty over the past 12 months to participate in one of the most intensive studies and investigations of Government-assisted programs ever conducted. Our reports received general commendation for their thoroughness and objectivity and our recommendations were largely adopted by the full Banking and Currency Committee in the housing measure reported to the House. Republican opposition to the public housing program, including that for our elderly people, resulted in adoption of the pitifully inadequate administration proposals. I am pleased, however, that part of the fine program for elderly persons sponsored by me was saved, and I hope the relief provided them in the housing legislation will lead to further action in this important field in the next Congress. I shall continue my efforts to meet the many special housing needs of the American people, including rental housing at moderate rents in urban areas.

The housing problem of our elderly people and others on fixed income is complicated by the fact that living costs have climbed to a new peak within the past month with the end not in sight. The administration's boast of the increase in the profits of big business is small comfort to those faced with declining purchasing power. The cost of everything that goes into daily living has gone up, and this, of course, has particularly affected our low and middle income families. In this connection, more must be done to enlarge employment opportunities for older workers.

Even more regrettable than the housing outcome was the failure of the Republican Party to meet our educational needs, which is one of our greatest emergencies. How we raise our children will shape the future of our society, and yet the administration made no attempt to secure party support in final passage of this urgently needed school construction bill. As one who has been dedicated to the cause of civil rights, I resent the efforts made to place the blame for defeat of the school construction bill on this issue. The civil rights problem did not kill the bill; it was merely used by those who wanted to see the bill defeated. Ninety-five Republicans who voted for the Powell amendment then voted against the bill on final passage although the amendment had been adopted; a switch of 16 Republican votes would have cleared the measure.

Again, the Republicans attempted to make political capital out of the civil-rights legislation when it came to the floor after 3½ years of inaction by the administration. The fundamental problem of eliminating second-class citizenship and insuring equal rights to all Americans should be above politics.

I have sponsored legislation designed to establish an immigration program that is consonant with our democratic traditions and I have sought to secure the improvement of the Refugee Relief Act. I regret this humanitarian and long-overdue legislation has not been acted upon by the House. I have personal knowledge of many compassionate cases dependent upon this program, and I am confident the American people desire its continuation and liberalization.

Failure of the Congress, due to the administration and Republican leadership opposition, to enact legislation to help people and business in depressed

industrial areas is most unfortunate. I cannot accept the Republican theory that the right to suffer is one of the joys of a free economy. The House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, reported a constructive measure to cope with this grave problem which requires decisive action. The same indifference and inaction have characterized the Republican attitude toward the problems of small business in the face of a drop in small-business profits of 66 percent between 1952 and 1955 and an annual rate of business failures almost twice as great as it was under the Truman administration. Small business needs a fairer share of defense and other Government contracts, tax relief, and fuller protection against monopoly. The backbone of our economic system is small business; we must preserve it.

The Republican philosophy that big business should be singled out for special benefits is exemplified in its tax legislation which gave 73 percent of relief to corporations. I supported the Democratic proposal in the first session to raise exemptions and thus aid the average taxpayer. I also voted for the Democratic bill to increase the amusement-tax exemption.

The bill reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee to create a Federal flood-insurance system was approved. Among other constructive measures adopted by the 84th Congress were an increase in the minimum wage, improvements in the civil service and railroad retirement systems, extension of the Salk vaccine program, initiation of a huge highway program, improvement in the budgeting and accounting procedures and methods, continuation of the World War II GI loan program, extension of reciprocal trade agreements and mutual security programs, simplification of customs procedures, various benefits to servicemen and their dependents, extension and enlargement of school lunch and milk programs, and numerous other proposals pertaining to domestic and international policy. It has clearly not been a do-nothing Congress, this Democratic 84th Congress now about to adjourn.

I shall continue to seek the protection of our natural resources and the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. Our public lands, national forests and wildlife refuges belong to all the people, and I deplore the administration's giveaway policies. I shall continue to support policies designed to overcome the weaknesses in our national defense and our foreign policy programs and to meet the Communist challenge throughout the world. I have complete confidence that with the kind of leadership under which we licked a depression and won a war we will devise adequate solutions to the pressing international problems confronting us.

One of the most gratifying aspects of public office is the opportunity to help others, both in the field of legislative proposals and in the area of human problems. It has been my good fortune to be able to assist numerous constituents, and for this purpose I maintain two district offices. I have followed the principle that the people I have the honor to represent are not interested in showmanship and ballyhoo, but in honest, sincere action.

I have been deeply conscious of the high honor that the people of the 11th District have paid me in selecting me as their Representative for the past four Congresses. I have conscientiously tried to discharge my duties to the best of my ability and to consider each legislative proposal on its independent merits and from the standpoint of the public welfare. It is gratifying to me that my name was included in the group of members about whom Mr. Larston D. Farrar, in his recent Washington Lowdown, commented:

> There is a minority in the House of Representatives and, fortunately, it is a growing minority—of members who understand their constitutional role in the scheme of things. They won their offices by getting out and debating the issues with the people. The names of these men, who are greatly to be admired, are a curious admixture, showing that second- and third-generation Americans are taking an increasing interest in political matters.

Mr. Speaker, it is my earnest hope and prayer that our Nation, blessed in so many ways, will realize its great destiny and that we will build a better America and a better world for our children.

President Eisenhower a Religious Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most gratifying conditions that has resulted since President Eisenhower assumed the Presidency has been the recognition that morality should have, and does have, an important place in determining the policies of Government.

In the earliest beginnings of our Government there was an unmistakable acknowledgment of dependence upon Almighty God. In fact, in the early days of the colonies there were statutes that required officials of Government to believe in God as a requisite to holding public office. This was no empty or merely formal requirement. It was based upon the deep religious convictions of the men and women of that time. They were putting into Government the same rules of conduct that governed their own individual lives. Thus, our Government was founded in a very real sense on religious principles and such fact found expression in every conceivable way.

To look back over the history of this Nation is to be impressed with the fact that a divine hand has constantly guided and directed our course as a nation. At times questions have arisen that were fundamental to our very existence as a nation. They have touched the very foundation stones of our Government. But in each such instance there has been evidence that the divine hand that guided us in founding this great Nation and supported us in its maintenance has also directed our course in successfully meeting and overcoming the numerous and varied difficulties which, at different times, have confronted us.

Our dependence upon Almighty God as the real source of strength of this Nation has been symbolized in the words—"In God We Trust"—stamped upon our coins. As a result of our dependence upon God we have been enabled to become the moral leader of the world. Today we stand preeminent among all the nations of the world. To maintain that position of preeminence it is necessary that we continue to recognize our dependence upon God and continue to follow His guidance and direction. Otherwise, we cannot hope to lead the world in the establishment of peace and good will.

The most encouraging sign in recent days that gives evidence of an intention to continue our recognition of God in the affairs of government was the incident that occurred at the inauguration of President Eisenhower. On that day when the President-elect was about to take the oath of office, an event occurred that astonished the whole assemblage present to see the inauguration, as well as the millions of people elsewhere who viewed the proceedings on television or listened to the radio. I refer to the request of President Eisenhower that he be permitted to offer his own little prayer to Almighty God before taking the oath of office. Never before in the history of our Government had such a request been made. The inauguration proceedings are always formal with outstanding religious leaders of differing denominational beliefs present to offer the invocations. But here, in addition to all the usual formalities in this respect, the President-elect in a spirit of humility and without previous notice to anyone made his unusual request. The request struck deep into the hearts of his listeners. It created a feeling that cannot be described. A pronounced quietness immediately took possession of all who were present. The people seemed to grasp the real significance and importance of the event and entered into it in the same spirit that dominated President Eisenhower.

The prayer that the President offered was one that left a lasting impression. It was so humble, so simple in expression, so lacking in ostentation, and so deeply sincere that it made an appeal and created an influence that cannot be adequately expressed nor estimated.

The offering of that prayer in public, in my opinion, had the immediate effect of recreating the religious atmosphere that was so important in establishing a religious foundation in the beginning of this Nation, and it left no doubt that the President was a deeply religious man who recognized his own deficiencies and the need of help from a divine source to fulfill the heavy duties incident to leadership in this great Nation.

Furthermore, it cannot be other than reassuring to realize that as the President was willing to pray in public for divine guidance at the very beginning of his term of office, so we can readily believe that he continues to pray in private as each new day brings new and difficult

problems in these times of uncertainty. The example he has set in the matter of prayer together with his regular attendance on the means of worship each Sunday gives further and satisfying evidence that the words "in God we trust" as a national expression of faith is also the private and individual faith of President Eisenhower.

What could be more in accord with the high ideals and religious convictions of this Nation than to have a people, as well as a President, who by word and deed accept in its fullest significance the declaration, "In God we trust"?

Report to the People of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has joined the yesterdays in American history. Only in the passage of time can its accomplishments—or lack of them—be evaluated on the credit or debit side of the ledger. The basis for judgment here should be whether or not Congress met the challenge of the important issues in this decisive era.

It must be borne in mind that most of the major legislation is recommended to the House and the Senate by the Executive branch of our Government. In the 84th Congress the Republican Party has been charged with this responsibility under the administration of President Dwight D. Eisenhower whose recommendations for legislation have been presented to Congress.

Programs, in the form of legislative bills, are introduced and then referred to the appropriate committees. The most important phase of congressional procedure is the action by these committees. Here is where the most intensive consideration is given to proposed legislation and where the people of our Nation have an opportu- ity to be heard. When a committee favorably reports a bill, it transmits to the House—or the Senate—a description of the purpose and scope of the bill and the reasons for its recommended approval. The final draft which is sent to the President for signature is one which unquestionably reflects the sentiments of the legislative branch, and incorporates the provisions requested by the President. In other words, the final action—or lack of it—on the part of Congress is proof for the President's implementation of his own program.

In the Congress which has very recently completed its work, the Democrats were in the majority as a result of the elections in 1954. The Republican occupant of the White House predicted that because of this situation, "a cold war of partisan politics would develop." Events proved otherwise. As shown in the RECORD, on issues affecting the security and well-being of our Nation, the President received more support from the Democrats in Congress than he did from the members of his own political party.

The 84th Congress chalked up no great legislative experiments or major reforms. On the credit side of the ledger for the 84th Congress were a number of major achievements. These achievements will be discussed briefly in my report. On the debit side, were bills bottled up in committees, especially the Committee on Rules, and bills defeated on the floor. To a degree, this was due to the failure of the President to support his own recommendations, or to send at the last minute, supporting statements for legislation under consideration, thereby contributing to confusion and frustration. But—and this is even more important—this brought about a lessening of interest and vague support of legislation from members of the Republican Party and a lack of initiation of legislation by the Democrats due to the uncertainty of what the President really wanted, or would support.

I believe the foregoing will throw some light upon the report which I present to the people of the 10th Congressional District whom I am proud to represent in Congress. Although the record may not please every individual, I want my constituents to know that I have followed the dictates of my conscience and have tried to represent them to the best of my ability.

This is my sixth anual report to the enrolled voters of the 10th District. Any questions or problems within my jurisdiction will be taken care of through my Washington office which is open the entire year. A letter addressed to me at the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., will be given my immediate attention.

INTERNATIONAL

I am chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, having been elected to this post by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the fall of 1955, it was my duty, and I considered it also a privilege, to take my subcommittee to Europe in order to reevaluate the foreign policy of the United States in that area. The report of the findings of this committee is available to all who request it, either from my office or from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The adverse effect of the Geneva Conference upon the nations of Europe was shocking to me and I conveyed this to the Secretary of State at the time of his Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva. The Geneva Conference disunited the free world; it caused the rise of neutralism which now has Europe and Asia in its grip; it weakened NATO, SEATO, the Balkan Alliance, the Baghdad Pact, and other defense treaties. Under the guise of the friendly cooperation tendered the Soviet Union at this time, communism, in its Januslike character, slipped into the Middle East by giving advanced arms and war potential material to Egypt. The free world is now caught in the whirlwind as crisis after crisis continues to be the order of the day in this section. In my report to the Secretary of State, I had suggested that the United States withdraw from the conference and expose the dualism of the U. S. S. R. to the free nations of the world before it was too late.

Bearing in mind these facts concerning the European situation, the House Foreign Affairs Committee started its hearings on the mutual-security bill on March 20, 1956. The actual recommendations of the executive branch had not been sent to the committee until March 19. The recommendations carried the request for increased foreign aid to the amount of $4.7 billion, including $540 million for advanced weapons. We were told by the administration that this money represented the United States share of supporting the forces in being. The amount requested in the previous year, for the same purpose, was $3.5 billion. The original request contained a recommendation for the appointment of a commission to restudy the United States foreign policy. This provision was deleted from the bill because the power to appoint an executive commission is one of the prerogatives of the President, and further, the committee felt that its inclusion in the bill would weaken the measure. Later, the Foreign Affairs Committee adopted a separate resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to examine and reappraise the objectives, methods, and results of our foreign policies and programs involving the Mutual Security Act and related legislation. The committee will prepare its findings and recommendations not later than February 1, 1957.

The administration, however, claimed that our foreign policy was in a state of change and not yet formed. It is understandable why the House cut the President's request from $4.7 billion to $3.8 billion. Few, if any, Congressmen would authorize the expenditure of billions of American dollars without knowing the specific plan for the use of such funds.

In cutting the mutual security funds, the Congress initiated a thorough review of our foreign policy; prohibited the administration from sending further military aid to Yugoslavia, but refused to cut off undelivered military materiel from previous appropriations; adopted a series of resolutions reaffirming its opposition to colnialism and to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, supporting the right to self-determination of other peoples; urging that Spain be admitted to NATO; and stressing our determination to work for the unification of Germany, Korea, and Vietnam, and for the freedom and independence of the Communist-dominated nations.

The work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was not confined to the foreign aid bill. A statistical record of the committee's operations is being compiled and it will be sent to those who request it. Of 39 bills and resolutions favorably reported by the committee and passed by the House, 37 were enacted. Among these was my resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 265—opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations. This resolution passed the

House by the vote, 391–0 and the Senate, 86–0.

In this session of Congress, the stamp of approval was put on a new scale of salaries for more than 300 Cabinet members, White House assistants, and other officials in departments, agencies, boards, and commissions. Also the Congress provided for the disposal of alien property seized during World War I.

The House adopted House Resolution 574 expressing the sympathy and encouragement of the House of Representatives for the people of Poland in their revolt at Poznan against Communist dictatorship and urging efforts to ship food to them. The Senate passed a similar resolution.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

In the field of national defense, the Democratic majority is disturbed by the dependency put upon the H-bomb for national protection. What will happen if the Soviet continues to nibble away at the territory of the free world, knowing we will not use the bomb? Is this administration placing the United States in a position where we will fight only the big war? The so-called Radford plan must be openly discussed. Should we keep nuclear weapons at the peak of development, involving great costs, together with the reduction of men under arms? Should we have the United States quotient so low we could not defend ourselves in a small "brush fire"? With these facts in mind, and taking its inspiration from Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the 84th Congress increased the administration's request for Air Force funds by $900 million. At the same time, it expanded research facilities in aeronautics, enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for our aircraft control and warning system. It also reorganized our military Reserves forestalled Marine Corps manpower cuts, raised the officer strength of the Armed Forces by 60,000, and enacted a $1.4 billion naval construction program which included an atom-powered cruiser and supercarrier.

In addition, the Congress renewed to June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to allocate and fix priorities of critical and strategic materials and to grant defense loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act; authorized a $2.1 billion construction program at installations and bases of Armed Forces, including new housing facilities abroad; provided for housing for essential civilian employees of the armed services; authorized $295.2 million for acquisition and construction of property and facilities by the Atomic Energy Commission; extended to July 1, 1957, the authority of the Department of Defense to expand productive capacity of industrial facilities in emergency and to stockpile machine tools; authorized construction of prototype modern cargo vessels for mass production in event of emergency; strengthened penalties for seditious conspiracy and for advocacy of the overthrow of the United States Government; and granted Federal consent to agreements among New York, New Jersey, and contiguous States for mutual military aid in emergency.

PUBLIC DEBT

In commenting on our national debt, I quote from the remarks of the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations and the outstanding authority on appropriations and the budget. Chairman CANNON states—and we all agree—that the size of the national debt is appalling. "It is so huge as to defy comprehension. We are paying $7 billion a year just to carry it. But what is worse, it has consistently increased under the present administration despite repeated, categorial promises to the contrary in the campaign of 1952. These administration pledges have been broken. And they cannot possibly be redeemed in the few remaining months of the administration. In a speech at Providence, R. I., in October 1952, President Eisenhower said:

> Our children deserve a little better of us than to keep hanging bigger and better debts about their necks.

The following facts conclusively show that bigger debts have been piled upon the American people during the present administration.

The public debt during 3 fiscal years of this administration

[In billions]

	Beginning of year
Fiscal 1954 (July 1953)	$266.1
Fiscal 1955 (July 1954)	271.3
Fiscal 1956 (July 1955)	274.4
Fiscal 1957 (July 1956)	272.7
Increase during 3 full fiscal years	+6.6

CONTRAST WITH PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. Speaker, the $6.6 billion increase is in sharp contrast to the record of the previous administration under similar peacetime conditions. During 4 full peace years—that is, fiscal years in which there was no war operation—under the previous administration, the debt was reduced by $12 billions, as follows:

	Billions
June 1946	$269.4
June 1950	257.4
4-year decrease under previous administration	−12.0

The administration, 2 years running, asked that the old debt ceiling of $275 billion be raised to $281 billion. Again this year, the request was renewed, this time for $278 billion.

BUDGET

In the 2d session of the 84th Congress, enacted appropriations total $60,573,217,590, which is a net of $570,260,947 below the estimates of appropriations submitted by the President, and rescissions of prior appropriations bring the total reduction of spending authority to about $1,470,260,947. The Republican Party is, therefore, taking credit for a budget surplus but it makes no mention of the fact that the foregoing reduction in requested appropriations and the largest national income in peacetime history together with heavy taxation account for the budget surplus. Incidentally, in 1951, under the Democratic administration, there was a surplus of $3.5 billion.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

One of the most important measures enacted by the 84th Congress was the law to amend the Social Security Act. Despite vigorous opposition by the administration, the new law contains provisions lowering the retirement age for women to 62; providing benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at the age of 50; continuing benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18; increasing grants for public assistance to the needy aged, the blind, and disabled, and extending social-security coverage to many professional groups including lawyers and dentists. Space does not permit a detailed explanation of this law, but I will be glad to send it to those who request it.

In the important field of public works legislation, a long-range program to build 41,000 miles of modern, interstate highways was approved. This is one of the most far-reaching actions taken by the Congress, benefiting the motoring public and commercial users of our highways. The new roads, costing $33.4 billion for a 13-year highway construction program, will be financed on a pay-as-you-go basis through increased taxation on motor fuels, trucks, trailers, and tires. The administration advocated a separate bond issue to meet this road construction cost, but the Congress dictated the pay-as-you-go plan for which it received the plaudits of the press and the public.

Other enactments affecting our national economy include the extension to April 1, 1957, of the existing excise-tax schedule and the 52-percent corporate income tax; the exemption from Federal admissions tax of tickets of 90 cents or less; the increase from $25 million to $125 million in the Small Business Administration authorization to make disaster loans and to liberalize terms; the extension of the Renegotiation Act to December 31, 1958, to provide for recovery of excessive profits from defense contracts; the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce; the ban against the operation in coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States; and the control and regulation of bank-holding companies with the requirement that they divest of nonbanking interests within 5 years.

HOUSING

Those of us who understand the housing needs of low income families are appalled at the inadequate housing program enacted in the final days of the 84th Congress. We who have supported the public housing programs of past years recognize in them their benefit to the Nation and we realize that a vast segment of our people are still inadequately housed. The housing bill presented to us in the few days before adjournment authorized a 2-year program of public housing construction at the rate of 35,000 units per year. The original bill proposed 50,000 units per year for a 3-year period but even this was nowhere adequate when we realize there are 15 million substandard dwellings now in use in this country. In voting for the 2-year program of 35,000 units per year, we did so rather than adjourn without a public

housing program. While the need for public housing exists, I will continue my support of housing programs.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Space does not permit a detailed explanation of the enactments in respect to changes in civil service employees' retirement benefits, but I will send a copy of this law and an explanation of such benefits to those constituents who request it. Briefly, the new law liberalizes civil-service retirement benefits, increases the number of scientific positions in defense agencies, and increases salaries of certain executive positions. Another law of importance to our civil servants, is that which protects their salaries against the downgrading in their job classifications. This subject had long been of interest to me and early in this Congress I introduced a bill to protect the employees' salaries against such downgrading. Late this session I introduced a similar bill to protect the "blue collar" workers against downgrading and I shall reintroduce this measure when the Congress meets in January.

Other enactments in the field of Governmental Reorganization include those to improve governmental budgeting and accounting methods and to simplify Government accounting practices; to increase annuities under Foreign Service retirement and disability; to make the United States Customs Court a constitutional court; to provide annuities for widows and dependent children of Federal judges; to authorize the sale of the Government-owned tin smelter, and to extend the Advisory Committee on Weather Control.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Among the laws enacted in the 2d session of the 84th Congress under this title are the following:

Authorization of a training program to increase the number of public health specialists, aid to States for training nurses and practical nurses, grants for improved mental health administration, and the extension of the Hospital Construction Act to July 30, 1959;

Authorization of $378 million in Federal aid for school construction and maintenance and operating costs in districts affected by Government activities;

Authorization of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of non-Federal facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases;

Authorization permitting FHA loans for repair of homes damaged in floods and other major disasters;

Creation of a joint State-Federal flood insurance program under HHFA with the Federal Government paying 40 percent of the cost;

Fifteen million dollars for Army engineers to construct without further authorization small flood-control projects;

An extension to July 1, 1957, of the Salk vaccination program;

An increase in fund authorization and an extension of the school milk program and the inclusion of the program in camps and nurseries for underprivileged children and nonprofit child-care centers and agencies;

Authorization of a 5-year, $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas;

An increase in disability benefits under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act;

An increase in benefit payments under the railroad retirement system.

Authorization of a survey by the Public Health Service of the extent and effects of chronic illnesses;

Imposition of discretionary death penalty or life imprisonment for illicit drug peddlers who sell to children, and a provision for more effective control of narcotics;

An extension to June 30, 1957, of grants to States to aid expansion of vocational rehabilitation programs;

Authorization of $4 million for new equipment and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research;

Requirement that river steamers carry life-preservers for all passengers and crew;

Authorization for FBI to enter kidnap investigations where victim has not been returned within 24 hours;

Requirement that safety devices be placed on inside doors of refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce;

Authorization of Federal assistance to States in establishing committees on education beyond high school;

Creation of a National Library of Medicine; and

Consent to New York-New Jersey-Connecticut compact for study of air pollution control.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The 2d session of the 84th Congress enacted provisions to grant educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II and Korea; gave military personnel social-security wage credits and increased benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; increased the pay of trainees under the Reserve program; granted medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; extended the program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction to July 1958; authorized loans for the purchase of farm homes by veterans; extended to 1960 the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war; increased the pay of medical and dental officers in the Armed Forces and in Public Health Service; and extended the mustering-out pay for Korean veterans.

AGRICULTURE

Although there is no agricultural production in my district, the subject is of very grave importance to consumers. Among the agricultural measures enacted in this session were:

The law which authorized $1.2 billion for the voluntary soil-bank program to reduce production acreage of crops in surplus supply; fixed feed-grain supports at 76 percent; encouraged disposal of surpluses at home and abroad;

Extension of the Sugar Act to December 31, 1960; fixing domestic producers' quota at 55 percent and foreign suppliers' at 45 percent of the market;

Repeal of the excise tax on gasoline and oil used only in farm machinery;

An increase to $20 million in the authorization for eradication of brucellosis and extension of the program through 1958;

An increase from $1.5 billion to $3 billion of the limit on sales of surplus commodities for foreign currency under the Foreign Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. I am proud to state that Congress prevented the administration from selling surpluses behind the Iron Curtain to Russia and the satellite nations. This Congress sustained my amendment which embodies within the law a clear definition of "friendly nations";

A liberalization of terms of farm loans, authorization of aid to part-time and low income farmers under Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; authorization of $50 million increase in the emergency-loan program and its extension to June 30, 1959;

A broadening of the watershed and flood prevention program; allocating a share of costs among Federal and local interests;

A broadening of the plan of payments to farmers for water conservation practices;

An increase in the borrowing capacity of Commodity Credit Corporation from $12 billion to $14 billion;

A broadening of the licensing power of Secretary of Agriculture under the Perishable Commodities Marketing Act; and

A provision for regulation of interstate transportation of migrant farm workers.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Among the laws affecting our natural resources, the Congress achieved the following:

An increase of $1 million a year of Federal research grants to States and an expansion of the water pollution control program to $50 million a year for 5 years.

An authorization of $87 million, 2½-year program of Government purchase of tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum to assure continued production.

In the field of power development, Congress approved the Upper Colorado River storage project which was forcefully supported by the President and the administration. This project, developed by private companies at public expense, will cost the Government $760 million. Politically, this will benefit the Republicans in Congress. On the other hand, the Senate rejected the development of Hells Canyon on Snake River in Idaho which is of far greater importance to this area. This project carried plans for growth such as TVA, and would have benefited the Democrats in that area. The Fryingpan-Arkansas project was rejected in the House during the closing days for lack of time to give it proper consideration. It was fully supported by the administration and would have assisted Republican elections.

The Niagara power project, long discussed and badly needed in New York, passed the Senate under the able leadership of Senator HERBERT LEHMAN, but it

was blocked in the House Rules Committee by the administration who, no doubt, had an eye on the senatorial race in New York in November.

From this, we can see there was much needed legislation rejected by Congress, blocked in committee or killed for the session. This can be attributed to many reasons. The President carefully avoided any suggestion of pressure on behalf of his program. As a result, there was entire loss of important legislation, or such watering down of an issue that its sponsor could no longer recognize it. Another reason, called by many the basic reason, was that of partisanship in which the administration and blocs in Congress were equally involved.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

One of my major concerns has been the passage of a law to guarantee civil rights to all Americans. At the beginning of his term of office, President Eisenhower promised a civil-rights program. He delegated the Attorney General to make recommendations covering this important legislation. At the end of 3½ years, there is no evidence of a specific program in this field.

A joint group of Democrats and Republicans organized in an effort to obtain recommendations and Representative HUGH SCOTT, Republican, and I were appointed to urge the administration to fulfill its campaign promise. Our many attempts to meet with the Attorney General met with refusal. Finally, in June recommendations were sent to the Judiciary Committee where, through the great and good help of Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, a bill was reported to the floor. This bill, inadequate though it was, passed the House but it was too late in the session to obtain action in the Senate.

A similar fate met our efforts to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. I have introduced amendments to correct the inequities in this law. In my proposals, unused quotas must be redistributed to other nations in proportion to their quotas and in another amendment quotas would be based upon the 1950 census instead of the 1920 population figure, which is in current use.

The bill authorizing Federal aid for school construction was another important measure which failed of enactment in the 2d session of the 84th Congress. Although in his 1952 campaign speeches, the President pointed to the need for 340,000 new schoolrooms throughout the country, he did nothing to advance this legislation. The bill was defeated by the many crippling amendments which would have made this legislation unwieldy. The Powell amendment to the bill is one which I supported.

Despite the campaign promises of the Republican Party, the administration failed to act on many other important issues involving the people of our Nation. The lack of action in amending the Taft-Hartley Labor Act is another excellent example.

It shall be my prime consideration in the next session to force these important issues to the floor and to enactment. It it my duty to give undivided attention to each measure so that the common good will be served. In this way, I know I shall be protecting the best interests of my constituents and neighbors in the 10th Congressional District.

President Eisenhower and Republican Congress Support Negro Citizens in Demand for Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, no one can successfullly deny that there is a great need at this time for Congress to establish in plain, strong, and positive language the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to every race, color, and creed.

It seems strange that there should be any necessity for such. But that such a necessity does exist is made plain whenever a civil-rights bill comes before Congress. It is always a signal for an intersectional controversy. And, while such legislation always obtains favorable consideration in the House, notwithstanding opposition from the South, yet it can never overcome such opposition in the Senate. This is not because the majority of the Senate on a record vote would be opposed to a civil-rights bill, but because the rules of the Senate permit the opposition to talk as long as desired and thereby kill the bill by filibustering tactics without ever bringing the bill to a final vote on its merits.

The conditions that create the necessity for such legislation arise chiefly in Southern States that are unwilling to give the Negro citizens the same rights of voting as are accorded to other citizens. By one means or another the rights of Negro citizens to vote are curtailed or effectually denied altogether. This is accomplished by restrictive laws or direct intimidation. Notwithstanding, the legislation that is enacted for the purpose has always, or practically so, been declared unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Yet the time that is consumed in fighting the issue though the several courts during which the restriction is enforced, or the continual enacting of new laws on the subject, thus creating new issues and new delays, has the effect of preventing the Negro voter in such States from exercising a free right of suffrage. This, in my opinion, is not only wrong from a legal standpoint, but it is un-American and subject to condemnation of the severest kind.

The need for legislation that will protect the rights of Negroes is not limited to voting rights. There is a Jim Crow attitude not only in the use of transportation facilities in certain Southern States, in fact it is almost general, but it finds expression in numerous and varied ways of discrimination against the Negro. It is shown in limitation of employment, use of hospital, school, parks, playgrounds, and many other civic facilities that should be on an equal and fair basis for all regardless of race, color, or creed.

During my service in the Congress I have never let an opportunity to improve the status of the Negro pass by without giving it to my full-hearted and sincere approval and unlimited support. I do not mention this with any thought that thereby I am entitled to great credit. I think that my Negro constituency is entitled to such. I would be derelict in my duty and obligations to them, as a Member of Congress, were I not in full accord with all such legislation. It has been a pleasure and a privilege to do so.

To me it has been most gratifying to see the progress being made each year by the Negro citizens of our country. Notwithstanding the obstacles they have had to encounter, they have been speedily progressing in matters of higher education, in the professions, in useful vocations, and in all that pertains to useful and influential citizenship. They have shown that when given the opportunity they can progress, achieve, and accomplish that which is worth while. It is our duty to assist in this endeavor by passing legislation of whatever kind is necessary to strike off the shackles that have too often bound them and restricted this upward movement, and to adopt such measures that will be most helpful.

The Eisenhower administration, and every Republican administration within my memory or reading, has been unqualifiedly friendly and helpful to the aims and aspirations of our Negro citizens. President Eisenhower, from the very beginning of his administration, has sought not only to establish all the civil rights of the Negro but has time and again shown his confidence in the ability and patriotism of the Negro race by appointing to high office recognized Negro leaders in the field of Government. In each instance the Negroes appointed to high office have justified the confidence placed in them by the President. There is no doubt in my mind that any future Negro appointments he may make will prove equally satisfactory. There are today innumerable Negro men and women qualified by training and character to serve with honor and distinction our Government in any position to which they may be appointed.

I consider it my continuing duty to be helpful whenever and in whatever way may be within my power. I will consider it a pleasure and a privilege to do so.

Results of Annual Questionnaire Sent to Constituents by Hon. Wayne L. Hays, of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I in-

clude the results of my annual questionnaire. The office has been swamped with questionnaires ever since we distributed them about a month and a half ago and I have been quite overwhelmed with the excellent results. That you were all willing to take the time to fill them out and return them has meant a lot to me. They have helped me in my job as your Representative and I am glad that so many people took the opportunity to express their opinions both in their answers and extra comments.

As of July 30, 1956, approximately 2,100 questionnaries have been returned. The results have been compiled and below you will find the statistics on how you "voted" on the various issues. By comparing with my voting record you can see how I voted on these issues that came before the House.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Many important issues are now before this session of Congress. This questionnaire gives you an opportunity to express your views on these issues and your answers will assist me in my job as your Representative. Please mail the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-free envelope. Thank you.

	Total		Percentages	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you approve of our foreign policy as directed by Secretary of State Dulles?	771	985	44	56
2. Do you approve the raising of interest rates on loans to farmers?	291	1,697	15	85
3. Do you favor a reduction in taxes for lower income groups?	1,692	331	84	16
4. Do you favor continuing the public housing program to provide decent homes for families of low income?	1,713	314	85	15
5. Do you favor continuing a foreign-aid program under present world conditions?	839	1,052	44	56
6. Do you favor Federal aid to States to help meet the critical school classroom shortage?	1,649	393	81	19
7. Do you favor lowering the retirement age for women under the social-security law from 65 to 62 and providing cash benefits to disabled workers at age 50?	1,663	367	82	18
8. Are you in favor of an increase in the postal rate on first-class mail from 3 cents to 4 cents?	887	1,141	44	56
9. Do you favor a food-stamp plan to enable low-income families to buy more food products than they now can?	1,118	792	59	41
10. Do you favor the Bricker amendment to the Constitution which would weaken the President's authority to conduct foreign affairs?	553	1,395	28	72
11. Do you approve of trying to balance the budget at the expense of a strong national defense?	490	1,397	26	74
12. Do you favor the President inviting the Russian Communist leaders Khrushchev and Bulganin to visit this country this year?	650	1,315	33	67

Social Security: The Most Beneficial and Humane Legislation in This Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Democratic-controlled Congress has just seen enacted into law one of the most beneficial and humane pieces of legislation in this century—the 1956 Social Security Amendments. This law is an example of the continuing efforts of the Democratic Party to advance the lot of the average American—to assure him that, despite the tides of adversity that sometimes are part of the free enterprise system, he will be able to provide for self and family in a respectable, independent fashion.

It gives me great pleasure to bring to the attention of the American people who will be affected some of the more important and forward looking features of this vital legislation. While it is not as liberal as I think it should be, it is a very excellent foundation on which to build an expanded program.

An outstanding advance in the history of social legislation is the provision for insurance of the totally disabled at age 50. This is most appropriate and long overdue. In our land of plenty, it is a national disgrace to have helpless persons in desperate need. Heretofore, a working man or woman could pay into social security for years and then suffer a totally disabling injury and receive no compensation until age 65. The total disability payment was incorporated in the original House bill, but the Senate deleted it from their version. Fortunately, the House-Senate conference restored the disability clause to its rightful position in the new bill. It has been estimated by experts that 250,000 persons will benefit under the new law in the first year of its operation.

Another eminently just and necessary stipulation provides for retirement of widows and workingwomen at age 62. I have always felt that the age for both widows and wives should be lowered to 60. The average married woman is approximately 5 years younger than her husband, but cannot draw benefits until 5 years after the retirement of her husband. This is most unjust treatment of our senior citizens who are usually very much in need of the combined payments to keep abreast of modern-day living expenses. My democratic colleagues and I voted in the House for uniform reduction of retirement age for women from age 65 to 62. As I previously stated, I have always favored retirement for widows and wives at age 60, but realized that age 62 would receive more favorable consideration at this time. The House approval of age 62 was altered in the Senate to read age 62 with full benefits for widows and an accrual reduction in retirement benefits for wives and workingwomen if they retire between 62 and 65. The maximum amount receivable by workingwomen at age 62 would be 80 percent of full benefits. Payments will not be increased at age 65 for those women who elect receipt of benefits prior to their 65th birthday.

The social-security bill of 1956 has pursued a most realistic course in widening its coverage to provide protection for an additional 250,000 workers. This number may be even further increased by local referendums. Many groups such as TVA employees, State and city employees, and practically all self-employed professional people except medical doctors are now included.

In a sharp departure from precedent, payments will now be made after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker if the child has been disabled since before the 18th birthday. The mother of the disabled dependent is also eligible for payment as long as she continues to care for said child. This provision took into consideration the mentally deficient children who must be cared for long after the normal son or daughter has ventured forth to make their own way in the world. A mentally incompetent child is an additional worry when the parents realize that financial reverses or death of one or both parents will create an even worse situation for a child who cannot protect himself from the normal dangers of everyday existence. I am sure this provision will remove a certain degree of concern from the shoulders of the affected parents.

In this connection, many improvements were made for grants-in-aid for public assistance. A new provision provides matching funds for medical care furnished those receiving old-age assistance from the States. Additional funds have been made available for use in aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled up to a maximum average of $6 per adult and $3 per child. In short, more national funds will be made available than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, while I am not a member of the Ways and Means Committee which worked so long and diligently on the new social security retirement bill, I have always been most keenly aware of the problems inherent in advancing years. I supported the original Social Security Act in the thirties and have fought to keep the program realistic and in step with the times. The statement of that great patriot, Thomas Jefferson, that "laws and institutions must go hand in hand with the progress of the human mind" was never more true than in the modern application of social security.

In this day of improved diet and medical advances, our people are living many years longer than was ever thought possible. While this is good news, it has created certain problems that must be coped within the immediate future. Our older people with more leisure time than ever before are in what we might call a state of transition, facing a host of new

problems, including boredom and financial difficulties. They are naturally self-respecting people who do not desire to be a burden to anyone—especially their children who are now busily engaged in raising their own families. Many of our retired citizens face a life of loneliness as a result of a lack of national planning in their behalf. Some progress has been made in housing for the aged in community-like hotels where those of common interest might gather to enjoy their remaining years with a minimum of worry. Wherever such endeavors have been tried, they have been a huge success. However, these projects have been the unselfish labor of public-spirited individuals and do not come close to filling the needs of an ever-expanding group of retired people. It is indeed regrettable that the provision for the creation of a commission on the aging was stricken from the social security bill.

In connection with my desire to assist the older people of our country, I introduced on February 16, 1956, a bill to provide that in determining income of World War I veterans and their widows for the purpose of ascertaining eligibility for pensions, payments under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be taken into account. Under the present system, if the total return from a pension and social security exceeds $1,400, the pension is discontinued. This bill did not fare well this session due to an unexpected legislative backlog. It is my hope that I will have the opportunity and privilege to reintroduce similar legislation in the 85th Congress.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I am confident that Congress will continue to adjust social security to meet the growing needs of an ever-expanding economy.

"Jersey Joe" Walcott Solving Problem of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, today we hear much of juvenile delinquency. It is highly disturbing to read day after day in our newspapers of incidents committed by teenagers that show a growing disrespect for law and order. This lack of respect and failure to observe even the ordinary rules of good conduct is surprising. Whatever may be the cause the fact remains the condition exists. Nor is there any doubt that it needs correction. It should have the careful consideration not only of parents but also of public authorities.

It is most gratifying to realize that in many cities public authorities have taken notice of the condition and are seeking to do something about it. One of the most outstanding efforts of this kind is the program that has been carried out in the city of Washington by means of its Boys Clubs, under the supervision and direction of the Metropolitan Police Department. The result has been very satisfactory.

Another instance of a worthwhile program that is being carried on under unique circumstances is that which has been inaugurated by a city commissioner in the city of Camden, N. J. Commissioner E. George Aaron, director of public safety in that city, has engaged the services of "Jersey Joe" Walcott, former heavyweight boxing champion of the world.

The selection of "Jersey Joe" to take over the direction of programs in the city of Camden to combat juvenile delinquency has proved immensely satisfactory. When I speak of good being done, I know whereof I speak as this is my home city and, therefore, I have personal knowledge of the situation.

There are several reasons that have helped make "Jersey Joe" a success in this work among the youth of our city. First, because he has been heavyweight champion he is looked up to by every boy in the city of Camden, regardless of race, color, or creed. Second, he is looked up to as a good-living man. He is well known as such in Camden, which is his hometown. He has always been known as a man of honesty and integrity and against whom there has never been a word of scandal or reproach. Third, he knows how to talk to boys. He can give them good advice without being too "churchy." He has a friendly disposition. He is kind. He is not rough. The boys enjoy listening to him. He has a good influence over them.

In addition to the personal qualities that make for success, "Jersey Joe" knows how to address groups of boys in their meetings, whether held under the auspices of school or church authorities or otherwise. He knows what to say and how to say it to get to them and exercise a good influence over them.

I have gone into some detail in explaining the work being done by Commissioner Aaron through Joe Walcott because it already has accomplished so much good. It is a unique and new approach to the problem of juvenile delinquency and it is working out successfully. Both Commissioner Aaron and Joe Walcott are entitled to be commended for establishing this program in the city of Camden. It has been so successful that it merits a trial elsewhere by those who want to meet the problem of teen-age delinquency in a real man fashion.

The Case of the Union Shop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, here is a real good statement of the union shop theory and practice. It is an appeal to labor to use persuasion instead of force. It is moderate. It is right in spirit.

THE CASE OF THE UNION SHOP—THE TRUE FACTS ABOUT THE UNION SHOP MUST BE UNDERSTOOD BY EVERYONE CONCERNED BEFORE THIS IMPORTANT LABOR ISSUE CAN BE SUCCESSFULLY RESOLVED BY AMERICANS

(By Maurice R. Franks)

The union shop is the subject of much heated controversy these days, but to examine the arguments both pro and con is to perceive how few people truly understand the issue. This is as true of the very workers involved as it is of casual bystanders. In fact, the whole case of the union shop is in a state of confusion worse confused.

To begin with, the principle of unionism itself is in no way at stake. It is not at all a question of unions to be or not to be. That point has long been settled, in the popular mind and by law. Most workers, most employers, and most members of the general public have come to look upon unionism as a permanent fixture in American life.

The difficulty arises when the union shop, as such, enters the picture. Its very name creates the impression that it is in all ways compatible with good unionism and, conversely, that its opponents are simply anti-union in their sentiments. This just isn't true, of course, and right there is where all the confusion arises.

Thus, if we are to be realistic about the union-shop issue, it is highly necessary that we start off with an accurate definition of the terms.

UNION SHOP VERSUS UNIONIZED SHOP

Some people confused the union shop with a unionized shop, but there is all the difference in the world between the two.

A unionized shop is one wherein the majority of a given shop's employees have voluntarily banded together for the purpose of mutual benefit, aid, and protection, supported by a union that is representative of their occupation. A unionized shop is in every way wholesome and American, representing as it does the inalienable right of workers to have a union of their own free choice.

A union shop, on the other hand, is nothing more than a clause within a contract with management that compels each employee to join the union as a requisite of his employment. Whether or not an individual employee happens to believe in unionism, likes the particular union involved or approves of the character of its leadership, none of this cuts any ice. The simple fact remains that he must join the union in order to hold his job.

A BORROWED DEVICE

Now the idea of coercing workers with regard to union membership did not hatch in the brain of organized labor. Actually, the device was first developed by the employers and later was adopted by the unions, in reverse.

Back in the early twenties a system of employer-sponsored coercion was in full bloom. Popularly known as "the open shop," this system was officially referred to by employers associations as the American plan. Purportedly, this open shop of theirs enabled union and nonunion workers to work side by side with no interference from anyone. In practice, however, each job applicant was required to state in writing that he presently belonged to no union. Also that, if hired, he would refrain from joining one. The penalty for so doing, he was made to agree, would be his instant dismissal. By such a coercive contract were the terms of his employment laid down.

One applicant flung aside the proffered form with the indignant comment, "I wouldn't ask a yellow dog to sign such a contract." His words labeled for all time the yellow-dog contract as the despicable instrument of coercion it was.

Today such terms of employment are unheard of. However, their exact replica exists

in the form of compulsory union membership, the union shop being only the yellow-dog contract turned around. Either way, it is both unfair and unethical—for it imposes inhuman restraints upon the individual worker's right to earn a chosen livelihood.

THE VOICE OF SAMUEL GOMPERS

It was Samuel Gompers, founder of the American Federation of Labor and the popularly regarded patron saint of modern unionism—who first roundly condemned the principle of coercion. "It is unfair and un-American," he declared, "to deprive a man of his right to earn a living because of union membership."

OPPOSED TO ALL COERCION

Gompers was steadfast in his fight against all forms of compulsion. Here, for example, are words he uttered shortly before his death:

"So long as we have held fast to voluntary principles and have been actuated and inspired by the spirit of service, we have sustained our forward progress and we have made our labor movement something to be respected and accorded a place in the councils of our Republic. Where we have blundered into trying to force a policy or a decision, even though wise and right, we have impeded, if not interrupted, the realization of our aims.

"But the very success of our organization has brought additional and serious dangers. Office in the labor movement now offers opportunity for something in addition to service—it offers opportunity for the self-seeker who sees an instrumentality for personal advancement both in the economic and in the political field."

In those stout words, drilled into the ears of the El Paso convention of the American Federation of Labor, Gompers firmly alined the labor movement with the American principle of voluntarism and exposed the viciousness of coercion. In two short paragraphs he not only excommunicated the very spirit of the union shop, he also put an unwavering finger on the only cause it can effectively serve—i. e., the cause of the self-seeker who sees an instrumentality for personal advancement both in the economic and in the political field.

THE CONDITION OF LABOR

Even prior to Gompers, another great mind had viewed the dangers to labor of organizations feeding on the principle of forcible membership and in these immortal words anticipated the case of the union shop.

"Associations of every kind, and especially those of workingmen, are now far more common than formerly. In regard to many of these, there is no need at present to inquire whence they spring, what are their objects or what methods they use. But there is a good deal of evidence which goes to prove that many of these societies are in the hands of invisible leaders and are managed on principles far from compatible with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their best to get into their hands the whole field of labor and to force workmen either to join them or starve. Under these circumstances, the Christian workmen must do one of two things: either join associations in which their religion will not be exposed to peril or form associations among themselves—unite their forces and courageously shake off the yoke of an unjust and intolerable oppression. No one who does not wish to expose man's chief good to extreme danger will hesitate to say that the second alternative must by all means be adopted."

Thus wrote Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical letter dated May 1891, under the caption "The Condition of Labor," to this day considered to be the greatest document ever written on the subject.

LABOR LEADERS WANT UNION SHOP

It is easy to perceive why today's crop of labor leaders demand the union shop. It automatically relieves them of a lot of work and responsibility, both financial and organizational. With a union-shop clause in a contract they are assured of a 100 percent membership and full dues collection at one fell swoop. They don't have to turn a hand to win worker converts to their cause.

From the standpoint of organizational expediency there can be very little argument against the union shop. Looked at morally, however, the case against compulsory unionism is clear. For, obviously, if it is unfair to deprive a man of his right to earn a living because he belongs to a union, then it is not one whit less unfair to deprive him of that right because he does not so belong. The union-shop clause in action is in very fact the yellow dog contract in reverse; only now the leash is held by the labor leader instead of the business leader.

ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL SUBVERSION

Unquestionbly the labor movement falls far below its former high moral estate when it pursues force as the only effective means of expanding union membership. In following this route, our labor leaders of today openly admit they have rededicated the aims and aspirations of organized labor and presently seek only to build a government within the Government on these shores. By abandoning the Christian principle of fair play in their human and business relations, by turning their backs on the stabilizing effect of man's humanity to man, our labor leaders are slowly but surely turning unionism into an instrumentality of real economic and political subversion.

The injurious effect of compulsory unionism should be clear to all of us. Reduced to terms of simplest logic, it proclaims that only union members are entitled to pursue their occupations. That only union members shall contribute their efforts to the productive needs of the Nation. That only union members shall be in a position to support our Government with taxes. That only union members shall enjoy the purchasing power upon which our economy depends. In the final analysis, this means that a worker can not be a full member of society unless he carries a union card and has paid some union boss the price for this license to earn a living and contribute to our economy.

Frankly, such a philosophy just doesn't make sense—especially when related to our American scheme of things. No union, no matter how important or powerful, should have the right to supersede the national interests and reach the point where it can affect the very stability of the Nation itself. No union should be privileged to drag its potential customers into its store by their ears—any more than any business combine enjoys the right to collar the general public and ram sales down the throats of our people.

UNION SECURITY

Organized labor's quest for union security is a legitimate one—but such security is not to be found in declaring war on all the rest of society. It isn't to be found in the techniques of coercion, such as the union shop, which immediately identifies unionism with the self-seekers against whom Sam Gompers warned and exposes the invisible and un-Christian leadership identified in Pope Leo's encyclical.

Before there can be true union security there first must be full moral acceptance of unionism by the unorganized. Such acceptance cannot be coerced into being; it can only be created through delivery of generally recognized service.

When our union leaders throw off all Communist and racketeer ties, when they themselves stoutly abandon all Communist and racketeer practices—whether consciously or unconsciously indulged in—and get down to the solid business of selling the virtues of unionism to the unorganized, there will be no need whatever to force workers to join a union for the right to earn a living. For, once divorced from the vices presently attached to them, the unions have a worthwhile and quite honorable bill of goods to sell and will become highly attractive to their potential customers. It is in that direction that true union security lies—the security that must be earned.

In the light of the equity we Americans as a people uphold, unions are no more entitled to prima facie security than is any other business concern. No one guarantees the security of the haberdasher in Missouri or of the auto manufacturer in Michigan. In each such instance, security is brought about solely by customer satisfaction. And that's about the only way unions will ever acquire security—or, for that matter, should be allowed to pursue.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE MUST JUDGE

The issue is one that must sooner or later be resolved once and for all. To achieve a wise and constructive settlement, it is necessary to study well both sides of the argument. The intelligence of the people demands that we keep our minds open, free from hate and bias, and judge the situation with all the perspective and farsightedness we can possibly muster. Only thus will the American people be in a position to sit in wise and final judgment of the case of the union shop.

Why Red China Should Not Get a Seat in the U. N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article that demolishes the superficial arguments put forth in some quarters in favor of admission of the Communist Regime in China supposedly to represent the Chinese people. But in reality, instead of representing their true interests, it has enslaved them in behalf of its own master, world communism.

Dr. Stanley Hornbeck was Chief of the Far East Division of the State Department for many years, under three administrations. It is refreshing and cleansing to one's mind to read something so lucid and unanswerable from the mind of a real scholar and a trained diplomat. The article is from Foreign Affairs and republished in the U. S. News & World Report.

[From the U. S. News & World Report of December 30, 1955]

WHY RED CHINA SHOULD NOT GET A SEAT IN THE U. N.

(By Stanley K. Hornbeck, former Chief, Far Eastern Division, United States State Department)

The few Americans who urged in the aftermath of Pearl Harbor that China be treated as a great power and be included as one of the Big Four were taking account not only of actualities but of past performance and future possibilities. They contended that China's capabilities, although not at the moment obviously effective, were latently enormous, and that she should be groomed to step into the place of leadership in eastern Asia which would be rendered vacant through the defeat of Japan.

Their estimate of potentialities has been substantially confirmed by the emergence since 1945 of mainland China as a potent political entity. But their expectation that China's capabilities would be exercised within the orbit of the free nations has been dashed by the fact that the free nations both failed to do the essential grooming themselves and in effect facilitated that grooming by the Soviet-Communist regime. The result is that mainland China, under the control of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, now functions not as a free state in the free world but as a powerful ally of the Soviet Union in the Communist bloc.

A part of China, however, remains within the free world orbit. The National Government of the Republic of China still functions, on Chinese soil; and that government, still recognized by a majority of the world's states as the Government of China, speaks to and for untold millions of Chinese nationals—on Formosa, on the mainland and overseas. The beliefs and aspirations of these Chinese are on the side of freedom. They are opposed to communism and have resisted and are resisting the onward march of Communist forces in eastern Asia.

Statistically, the jurisdiction of the Central People's Government extends far more widely than that of the National Government. However, the location of the Nationalist domain, the character of its government, the qualities of its population, and the fact that it is a critical area in today's global conflict give it an importance in terms of political and military strategy and of moral values that substantially discounts the disparity between its size and that of the Communist-dominated mainland.

II

For those governments which still recognize the National Government, problems of law, of rights, of duties, and of policy in relations with and regarding China are one thing. For those countries which have recognized the Communist Government they are quite another thing.

During the years since the United Kingdom recognized the Central People's Government in 1950, British spokesmen, official and unofficial, have been explaining, defending, and praising that action; they and many others have urged that other countries, especially the United States, should take similar action, and that China's seats in the United Nations should be transferred from the National Government and be given to the Central People's Government.

They have declared variously that the Central People's Government is a fact, that its control of most of China is a fact and that those facts warrant recognition; that recognition is merely a diplomatic formality signifying awareness and establishing a political orientation but involving no implication of approbation; that the United Kingdom has economic interests which its Government must safeguard and promote; that it expects through diplomatic contacts to exert a restraining influence; and, with special emphasis that its action was and is based on principles and requirements of international law.

In this country the views which have prevailed have run somewhat as follows: Whereas the Central People's Government and its extensive control are indeed facts, such facts alone neither call for nor warrant diplomatic recognition. The principles and criteria to be applied to the question of according diplomatic recognition are many, and sound policymaking calls for weighing not only physical and political facts but legal and moral and social considerations together with a careful estimate of probable consequences.

Diplomatic recognition is more than a formality, signifies more than awareness, establishes more than a political orientation and, while it may or may not imply moral approbation, does certify to political acceptance by the according state, does give the recipient state or government a legal status, and does bring into being a set of rights and duties as between states. Especially important, the idea that there exists in the corpus of international law a principle or rule whereunder a government which exercises effective control is legally entitled to recognition—that idea simply does not prevail in the United States. There is mention of it by some American authorities on internatianal law, but not with acceptance or endorsement. It certainly has not been entertained in the formulating of American policy.

III

Diplomatic recognition obviously demonstrates awareness of a political reality, and it of course facilitates the conduct of business between the States concerned and between their respective nations. But recognition is not essential or indispensable for any of those purposes.

The Government and people of the United States were well aware of the existence of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and business was carried on between them for more than 15 years before we accorded recognition to the Soviet Government. We have carried on some business with Communist China without having recognized the Central People's Government. Business has been carried on between Great Britain and Communist China notwithstanding the latter's refusal until recently to reciprocate fully Britain's diplomatic attestations and activities. And several of the countries which have withdrawn their recognition from the National Government still communicate with that Government and carry on trade with its citizens.

Diplomatic recognition has a value—especially to the state or government to which it is accorded. In the case under discussion, the worth to the Central People's Government of recognitions already accorded it has been great, and that of recognition by the United States would be enormous. Conversely, withdrawal of recognition takes from any state or government a thing of value, and were the United States to withdraw its recognition of the National Government, the loss of that asset would be ruinous to the political credit of free China.

Diplomatic recognition gives birth to a corpus of rights and duties. In theory these rights and duties are reciprocally identical as between the according state and the recipient, but in practice the according state imposes upon itself obligations and confers upon the recipient rights without assurance that the latter will reciprocate. The consequences to the accorder may be either a gain or a loss, but to the recipient they can be only a gain.

Diplomatic recognition of a new government which is exercising undisputed control over an entire country and all its people has implications far less extensive than are those in situations where there are two governments, an old and a new, each controlling a part of a country and some of its people, each claiming right to the whole and each trying to make its claim good. In the latter situation, countries which have previously recognized the old government are under obligation to take into account the fact that it has, ipso facto, a status in international law which is not lightly to be disregarded. Some authorities on international law go so far as to say that a premature recognition of a new government constitutes a tort against the old.

Diplomatic recognition is an expression of policy. It is a fundamental belief of the American people that, as stated in the Declaration of Independence, "all men * * * are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and that "to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Generally speaking, this concept has played a substantial part in the shaping of United States policy on questions of diplomatic recognition.

It is often affirmed that Thomas Jefferson laid down as a guiding principle for United States recognition of new governments the simple test of mere de facto control. Thomas Jefferson did no such thing. Jefferson did indeed say, "We cannot deny to any nation that right whereon our own Government is founded—that every one [nation] may govern itself according to whatever form it pleases, and change those forms at its own will." But with regard to diplomatic recognition he had already written: "It accords with our principles to acknowledge any government to be rightful which is formed by the will of the nation, substantially declared"; and in the later context he went on to say: "The will of the nation is the only essential to be regarded." True to form, Jefferson emphasized not control but "the will of the nation"—which equates with his better known "consent of the governed."

Whatever may be the use or abuse of what "Jefferson said," the world has changed considerably, the foreign relations of the United States have expanded considerably and the foreign policies of the United States have developed considerably since Jefferson's time. By the end of the 19th century it had become possible and appropriate for Acting Secretary of State Hill to write officially: "When, by reason of revolution or other internal change not wrought by regular constitutional methods, a conflict of authority exists in another country whereby the titular government to which our representatives are accredited is reduced from power and authority, the rule of the United States is to defer recognition of another executive in its place until it shall appear that it is in possession of the machinery of state, administering government with the assent of the people thereof and without substantial resistance to its authority, and that it is in a position to fulfill all the international obligations and responsibilities incumbent upon a sovereign state under treaties and international law."

In 1913 Assistant Secretary of State Adee wrote officially of the "recognition necessary to the conduct of international business between two countries" as being "dependent upon the existence of three conditions of fact: the control of the administrative machinery of the state; the general acquiescence of its people; and the ability and willingness of their government to discharge international and conventional obligations."

And in 1940 the legal adviser of the Department of State, Mr. Hackworth, wrote, "It has been the practice of the Government of the United States to require fulfillment of certain conditions by new governments as a prerequisite to recognition."

All of this adds up to there having developed a tendency in the conduct of United States foreign relations for policy-makers to inquire in regard to a new government: What are the extent and the quality of its jurisdiction? Has it the capacity to fulfill the international obligations of the State in which it operates? Does it manifest a disposition to respect and fulfill those obligations?

This tendency derives not from legalistic thinking but from the influence of fundamental concepts in American political thought regarding the nature, rights and duties of men and governments. Right or wrong, American thought runs to the effect not only that governments derive "their just powers from the consent of the governed" but that moral and social as well as legal, political and economic principles and standards are involved in all relationships, and that in formulating and implementing poi-

icies with regard to any foreign governing entity all of these must be taken into account.

IV

Decisions to accord or to withhold recognition are made by political not by judicial authorities. In this country—and, of course, not here alone—those authorities are substantially influenced by public opinion. Traditionally well disposed toward China, the people and Government of the United States look at developments there and combine with a concern for American interests a concern for what they conceive to be the interests of the Chinese. During recent years they have seen two governments, and they have thought about the capabilities and performance of those governments in terms of advantage or disadvantage to the United States, to China and to the free world. What have they seen and what have been their conclusions?

China's National Government is a product of revolution and conflict internal to China. It came to power by use of armed force and skillful propaganda originally organized with Soviet assistance; but its creators had broken with Communism before victory was achieved and throughout its existence it has been under Communist attack. It gave China during the years preceding 1945 a nearer approximation to unity than that country had known since the overthrow of the monarchy in 1911. It kept China united in resistance to Japan's attacks from 1931 on. It was an ally of the United States and other powers throughout World War II. It has resisted communism from an earlier moment, more foresightedly and persistently than any other government.

The National Government retreated to Formosa in 1949 with a substantial following, and there, still on Chinese soil and functioning more liberally than before, it is keeping Nationalist China in the orbit of the free world. It is the symbol and rallying point of Chinese resistance to Communist aggression and of aspirations to freedom. It has reciprocated and fostered the spirit of good will which is traditional in the attitude of the United States toward China. In its defense of Formosa, it is serving purposes common to it and to us. It favors the "ways of life" of the free peoples, especially those of the United States. It has, generally speaking, shown respect for China's international obligations. Its representatives in the United Nations speak in terms intelligible to free peoples, and their voices and votes have been on the side of the free world.

China's Central People's Government is a product of conflict partly internal to China and partly international. It, too, came to power by use of armed force and skillful propaganda, with Soviet assistance. But its creators not only have not broken with communism, they have remained ardently committed to the Communist cause to which they are substantially indebted. This Government has employed most of the methods found useful elsewhere in the Communist empire for acquiring, exercising, and expanding political authority.

Since gaining control over most of mainland China, it has done its utmost to destroy all thought of individual freedom and to impose upon the 500 million people of China a regime modeled upon that of the Soviet Union. Associating itself with the Soviet and other Communist governments in the cold war upon the free world, it has made China a focal point for the propagation of Communist ideology and activity among the peoples of eastern Asia. It has openly declared itself indebted to the Soviet Union for its very existence. It has entered into formal alliance with that country and draws upon it for sponsorship and guidance. It employs tens of thousands of Soviet nationals, civilian and military, as advisers and technicians. It maintains a very large and ever growing military establishment which depends on the Soviet Union for most of its equipment, much of its training, and some of its operations. It abuses its own nationals and the nationals of other countries. It vilifies the United States and seeks to inflame its own and other peoples against the free world.

The Central People's Government has disregarded China's international commitments. It has become an aggressor, and the United Nations has formally declared it to be such. It was an aggressor directly in Korea, where it defied and made war upon the United Nations, and indirectly in Indochina, where it supported the Viet-Minh by supplying munitions to armed forces seeking to bring the Associated States under Communist domination. It has made mainland China an asset to the Communist world and a liability to the free world. There is ample warrant for believing that, were it given China's seats in the United Nations, its representatives would pursue the Moscow-made "line" and thereby add greatly to the strength of the Soviet-directed Communist bloc and its capacity for maneuver. And, Communist ideology being what it is, there is room for doubt whether it—or any Communist government—is morally capable of living up to its international obligations.

Recognition of the Central People's Government has thus far involved withdrawal, express or implied, of recognition from the National Government, with consequences highly advantageous to the Communist world. As matters now stand, recognition of the Central People's Government by the United States presumably would not follow exactly that pattern and would not terminate our concern for the National Government and its domain. But, no matter how achieved and with what safeguards, it would be fatal to the cause of Chinese resistance to the onward march of communism. It would estop the United States from further support to that resistance.

Followed as it would be by similar action on the part of other governments, it would shatter the morale of the National Government and its adherents. It would virtually insure consolidation of Communist jurisdiction throughout all of China and thus legally affect Chinese Nationals everywhere. It might even prove to have set the stage for an early assault upon Formosa by Communist armed forces and for the liquidation of huge numbers of those Chinese who are "oriented toward the West" and have sought to keep their country within the orbit of the free world. Whatever might be its consequences in China, it surely would tend to confirm the doubts already entertained in many quarters in Asia and elsewhere regarding the advisability of association with the United States in pursuit of a policy of resistance to Communist aggression. It thus would facilitate the onward march of communism both on the Asiatic fronts and on other fronts.

Moreover, it would bar the United States from any reasonable further opposition to the seating of the Central People's Government in the United Nations. In addition, it would give that government the right, which would surely be fully exploited, to establish diplomatic, consular, and other official agencies in the United States; and it would impose on us the obligation to accord those agencies the courtesies and immunities that are standard conventions of international intercourse.

In the light of these calculables it seems obvious that recognition by the United States of the Central People's Government would be inconsistent with and highly damaging to the overall effort in American foreign policy to contain communism and achieve security. Concomitantly, it would confer upon the whole of the Communist empire various immediate benefits.

V

Were United States recognition a thing to be bargained for—which it never should be—what may it be thought or hoped that Communist China or the whole Communist world would give in exchange? The Communists might relinquish some territory which they have taken unlawfully; they might release some foreign nationals whom the unlawfully hold prisoner. Such actions would cost them little, would be to their advantage in psychological effect, and would profit the United States little if at all in the realm of political substance. They might give promises, handsome promises, to do or not to do this or that, in Asia or elsewhere, in accordance with stipulations already or newly agreed upon. They might promise a "cease fire"; they might promise independent for Formosa; they might promise, in one context or another, nonaggression, free elections, trade, and peaceful coexistence.

The value, however, of those promises would be speculative, would depend on Communist estimates of the advantage or disadvantage of honoring them, or on the will and capability of the free world to enforce them. Latest examples: The Panmnjom promises in 1953 and the Geneva promises regarding Indochina in 1955.

Promises of commercial opportunities and hope for benefits to the American economy should not mislead the American public and should in no way distract or confuse American policymakers. Has any non-Communist country substantially improved its national economy by virtue of its recognition of any Communist government? Trade with the Soviet Union or with China could under some circumstances be of substantial value to some countries—for instance, Japan—but not, in any circumstances now foreseeable, to the United States.

The Soviet Union and China have no great purchasing power, and the Communist regimes have little desire for trade with the free world except as that trade may contribute to the Communist program. Trade with Communist China has been, is, and can be profitable for some individuals or firms, but its net value to the American or British economies is and will be relatively insignificant.

Promises purporting to put an end to the cold war might be worth having, but not on a basis of purchase and payment. They would be of no reliable value unless preceded by deeds clearly testifying to a change of heart on the part of their Communist givers. For so long as the Communist world remains committeed to the objective of world domination it will continue to make war in one form or another on the free parts of the world.

There is little or no warrant for believing that our recognition of the Central People's Government would cause the Communist world or any part of it to modify its overall objectives and thus resolve or diminish the ultimate cause of tensions in Asia. The net effect probably would be to increase the self-confidence, the will to conquer, and the capabilities of the Soviet-Communist empire. Those who think otherwise would do well to review the circumstances and the aftermath of our recognition more than 20 years ago of the Soviet Government, and of the British recognition 5 years ago of the Central People's Government.

The United States recognition of the Soviet Government was achieved in 1933 on a basis of diplomatic trading. In an exchange of notes, the Soviet Government gave promises—to desist, to refrain, to perform, and to permit—and the two Governments agreed to establish normal diplomatic relations. Which of its promises then made has the Soviet Union honored? In what respect have its Communist rulers altered their overall objectives? Of what profit has recognition

of the Soviet Government been to the United States, or to the free world?

The United Kingdom transferred its recognition from China's National Government to the newly established Central People's Government in 1950, without trading and on a basis of wishful assumption and trustful hope. In what respect has Communist China altered its objectives or shown itself to have been affected for the better by that gesture of confidence? In what context has the United Kingdom succeeded in exercising a restraining influence? The Central People's Government has, inter alia, snubbed the United Kingdom officially, confiscated British properties, destroyed British business and abused British nationals within the area over which it exercises jurisdiction. What, then, has recognition of the Central People's Government profited the United Kingdom nationally—in terms of prestige, of influence, or, on balance of pounds, shillings, and pence?

Nor is there warrant for the contention that recognition of the Central People's Government would give American policymakers and negotiators greater latitude for maneuver, greater freedom of choice. It presumably would relieve the United States of some commitments, momentarily embarrassing, to the National Government; it would reduce, at least, one of the areas of discord between the United States and some of its allies; and it would satisfy at least one of the demands of the Communist world. But it simultaneously would enmesh the United States in commitments to a government hostile to the free world and party to the conspiracy which seeks to destroy it. In total effect it would reduce rather than enlarge the area wherein American policymakers are free to make choices.

VI

It has been suggested that the United States, while continuing to recognize the National Government, should also accord recognition to the Central People's Government. Under this proposal, other states would likewise accord recognition to both of those governments, each of two Chinas would be accorded membership and seats in the United Nations, and each would agree to refrain from the use of armed force against the other and to respect the rights of the other as a sovereign state. This solution would be achieved perhaps under the aegis of the United Nations and be underwritten by the Security Council or by sponsoring powers.

The two Chinas idea has the merit of extensiveness. That it will meet with favor in the United States is not likely, primarily because it runs contrary to the traditions of American thought and policy in regard to China. This country has long been committed to a policy of respect for China's territorial and administrative integrity and of opposition to plans for partitioning that country.

The whole plan would be suspect in many circles in the United States because of skepticism regarding Communist promises and United Nations' capabilities. Were it proposed officially, the Chinese Nationalists surely would oppose it, and if it were pressed they would probably resist. It might conceivably be accepted, perhaps even be favored, by the Communists—for tactical reasons. If adopted, it would give them more than it would cost them and it would consolidate gains which are at present speculative. Were it by chance agreed upon and implemented, it might produce some momentary relaxation of tension, but because the Communist appetite increases with every concession it would make no lasting contribution to the cause of peace.

There sometimes is coupled with the two Chinas proposal the further suggestion that China's permanent seat in the Security Council be transferred to India. Were that suggestion to attain the status of a serious proposal it could be considered either in combination with the original proposal or separately. Either way, to make such a transfer possible it would be necessary to amend the Charter of the United Nations. Either way, the idea of such a transfer would be anathema to the Chinese—Nationalists and Communists alike. That fact alone should give pause to those to whom the idea seems attractive on its merits or as a contribution toward solving, by means of a package deal, a twofold problem of representation. Any government or group of governments which may think of proposing or sponsoring it in the United Nations will need to ponder the complications to which an open and official discussion of it—and still more the adoption of it, if and when—might lead in the relation of India and China, of Indian and the Soviets, and of the Soviet Union and China.

For India, the idea of having a permanent seat on the Security Council might have great appeal, but the idea of acquiring such seat at China's expense would be quite another matter. In world affairs, to impose upon China an externally devised political dichotomy would produce nothing stable; and to take China's seat in the Council from Nationalist China, withhold it from Communist China and give it to India would in no way strengthen the United Nations or add to its reputes as an instrument for collective security. What contribution, then, could this deal or any part of it, if consummated, make toward safeguarding and promoting the long-swing interest of the United States and of the family of nations?

There comes along a suggestion that the will of the people of—more accurately, on—Formosa be ascertained by a plebiscite. It may be doubted whether implementing that suggestion would be practicable or profitable. Authorities familiar with the situation on Formosa affirm that, of the nearly 10 million people there, more than 98 percent of whom are Chinese, few indeed would vote in favor of Communist China; and it is considered probable that the majority would vote for independence without in the least understanding the implications of an independent status. Their vote, while possibly informative, would solve no problem and might create new difficulties. The question of Formosa's future is a part of the far greater question: China's future. That question is of concern, conscious or unconscious, to all Chinese—and to other countries. If knowledge of the will of the people is to be sought by plebiscite, should not that procedure be applied on the mainland as well as on Formosa?

From time to time the question is asked: Having recognized the Soviet Union and having raised no objection to its becoming or remaining—together with other Communist countries—a member of the United Nations, why decline to recognize Communist China and why object to admitting it to the United Nation? If the question stood alone it would need to be dealt with in terms of a patient and extensive statement of facts; but, propounded as it has been in a context of debate, it can be dealt with briefly by asking other questions in rejoinder: Having recognized some Communist states and governments with unhappy consequences, why add to our own embarrassment and the troubles of the free world by recognizing another? And, being in no position to object to the presence in the United Nations of Communist states that are members, why not oppose admission to the United Nations of another government whose voice and votes would augment the strength of the Communist world and diminish that of the free world?

Recognition of the Central People's Government by the United States would presumably be followed promptly by its admission to the United Nations. Were this accompanied by the ejection of the National Government, it would mean one more delegation contributing to the Soviet-directed Communist effort in that forum and one less on the side of the free world. In the Security Council, that change would greatly facilitate the operations of the Communist bloc. The argument, actually advanced, that this really would matter little because 2 vetoes have no more effect than 1 is myopic, to say the least, for in any context 1 less delegation on 1 side and 1 more on another means much in the realm of maneuver and often may be decisive.

VII

In their appraisal of China's two governments and in choosing between them, some authorities give more thought than others to the ways and means by which those governments came into existence. The conflict in China is far more than a civil conflict; it is in fact a local deployment in the global conflict between the Communist world and the free world. Some authorities give great weight to the fact that the effective jurisdiction of the Central People's Government is far more extensive than is that of the National Government. Policymakers ask, of course, what action by their government will best serve their country's interest—as they see it.

Has not the time come when, in approaching this problem, all men and all governments in the free world should ask with common solicitude: Which of those governments more truly expresses the way of life, the aspirations and hopes, the undeclared but fundamental will of the Chinese people? Which government can and will most authentically represent China? With which Chinese spokesmen can the representatives of other countries most amicably and most dependably deal? Which Chinese represent a "peace-loving State," "accept the obligations contained in the * * * Charter," and are "able and willing to carry out these obligations?" Which Chinese, if given wholehearted support by the free world could contribute in greater measure to the cause of peace, security, freedom, and justice? In regard to those governments, then, what action by our country and others will most truly serve the interests of the family of nations and, in so doing, best serve our own? Are not these the most important questions that can now be asked in order to choose wisely between the two governments now functioning in China?

VIII

The American policy is rooted in a belief in the reality of a corpus of natural, moral, or divinely ordained law and a practical application of principles evolved and expounded in the corpus of Christian doctrine. Thanks to many favorable factors, the United States has become a great power. Thanks—or no thanks—to developments in world affairs, there have devolved upon it great responsibilities. Because of its emphasis on the right of men and nations to be free, and because of its possession of material and moral strength, other free peoples and peoples seeking to be free look to it today for honest leadership in the cause of freedom. To give such leadership, we must first, last, and always be true to our own heritage of concepts, principles, and commitments.

American policymakers have declared over and over, and not alone during the present administration, that the United States will judge other countries and governments by their deeds rather than by their words; and American public opinion endorses that declaration. As one judges, however, so is one judged. The world will judge the United States by its performance in relation to all of its commitments, formal and informal, multilateral, bilateral, and unilateral.

The United States must of course enter into agreements with other countries. Agreements may or may not involve trading, bar-

gaining, bartering, concessions, compromises. With the strength that it possesses and the qualities of that strength, the United States is in position to trade exclusively on a basis of fairness to itself and to all concerned. We can offer substance and we can decline anything not substantial; and above all we can refrain from trading that which is not ours to trade.

Diplomatic recognition by the United States should be regarded as a thing not tradeable, for, in American theory and practice, recognition is a certification that its accorder deems its recipient qualified and acceptable: a certification to be given, withheld, withdrawn or transferred on a basis of facts, not on a basis of barter or agreement.

Could it happen that American policy-making negotiators, intent upon particular and immediate objectives, might again make errors of oversight and misplaced faith such as were made by their predecessors 10 years ago? Before and at Yalta there was bargaining: there was exchange of substantial inducements for glowing promises.

The Yalta agreements purported to insure cooperation in pursuit of a common victory and a common policy of collective security. The Soviet Union thoroughly exploited the authorizations given it in the agreements, but after V–J Day went right on with its program of conquest. From study of that bargaining and its aftermath at least one lesson should be learned: The Communist world will bargain, but Soviet Communist overall policy is not for sale and cannot be purchased. Promises, yes; but abandonment of purposes, no. Change of heart, perhaps some day and for some reason, but not in return for concessions or to honor promises. In no transactions should the United States rob Peter to pay Paul. At no time should the United States think it possible to buy Communist basic policy.

The United States wants peace, of course; the American people and peoples throughout the world want peace. There now is talk in many quarters about the possibility of insuring peace through new agreements providing for peaceful coexistence.

The action most needed toward insuring peaceful coexistence is performance by the Soviet Union in fulfillment of the many promises which it has already given, and for which the free world has already compensated it. Among the many promises are those made to the United States in return for recognition in 1933, those made to the United States and Great Britain at Yalta and at Potsdam in 1945, and those made to the world in the Charter of the United Nations in 1945. In the absence of such action new promises would have little value, and in the presence of such action new promises would be essentially redundant. Certainly new promises not preceded by substantial indications of good faith should not be bought in terms of concessions by the United States. Nor should the United States pay in terms of inducements or compensation. Let the Communists first give evidence by simple acts of restraint and restitution that they understand peace, want real and lasting peace, and desire that there be honest coexistence on a peaceful basis.

IX

The United States cannot insist that other states subscribe to its principles or live and act as it would wish. In many instances it has to tolerate conduct of which it thoroughly disapproves. It is, however, under no compulsion to give assent to such. It certainly can refuse to authorize, it can decline to sanction, and it can withhold endorsement.

No matter by what process it might be effected, or with what guaranties, our recognition of China's Central People's Government while that Government persists in attitudes and practices utterly hostile to us and to the free world would compromise the United States in the eyes of all people—even those who urge that we take that step and those who would profit from it.

As matters now stand in world affairs, our continued recognition of China's National Government is in line with American commitments and with the overall purposes of American policy on behalf of peace, security, freedom, and justice. It serves a broad moral purpose and particular political and strategic purposes. It signifies to all concerned that the United States is truly committed to supporting free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures.

In the current quest for ways and means by which to promote the cause of peace, the question of keeping faith is of paramount importance. In the quest for new agreements, with its emphasis on the process of give and take, what could be sounder than an understanding at all stages and by all concerned that the United States, while prepared to negotiate and, if need be, to bargain, with a view to making new commitments, intends to stand by its existing commitments and will not subject them to the bargaining process?

Voting Record of Congressman Wayne L. Hays, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include my voting record on 18 most important bills to come before the House of Representatives. I have done this every 2 years since I have been in Congress and mailed out copies so that my constituents could have a convenient method of checking my record.

The matter follows:

Voting record of Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, in the 84th Cong.

How I voted	Issue	Status
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 with soil bank	Became law.
Voted for	Refund tax on gasoline used on farms	Became law.
Voted for	Lower interest rates on loans to farmers for economic disasters	Became law.
Voted for	Modernized REA loan allocation system	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	Increased railroad retirement benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Increased social-security benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Public housing and slum clearance bill	Became law.
Voted for	Interstate Federal-aid highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing veterans' pensions	Defeated.
Voted for	Veterans' farm home loans	Became law.
Voted for	Bill strengthening and improving the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted against	Bill exempting from Federal regulation certain producers of natural gas	Vetoed.
Voted for	Income tax reduction for the average taxpayer	Passed House only.
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen free world	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid for school construction	Defeated.
Voted against	Bill raising postal rates on letters from 3 cents to 4 cents	Passed House only.
Voted for	Civil-rights bill	Passed House only.

Housing: The Challenge Is Clear—Shall We Meet It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, we have seen passed in the closing days of Congress the Housing Act of 1956. This measure is a step in the right direction but falls far short of meeting the needs of the American people for low-cost housing. The population of our country is growing by leaps and bounds and the estimated census figures for 10 years hence should make any thinking person realize that this Nation is facing a critical shortage of low-cost dwellings.

I am acutely aware of the housing problem as I look at my own city of Detroit. The Motor City is a perfect example of the changing complexion of the American scene. It is but one of the many metropolitan areas throughout this Nation that must provide living facilities for the employees of local industries. I cannot help but think, as I view the substandard homes that are all too prevalent, that many of my congressional colleagues do not realize the crying need of so many American families for just a little better situation in which to raise children. The growing problem of juvenile delinquency is so intertwined with home environment that the two are inseparable.

Private industry has made a sincere effort to provide the necessary housing, but has not been able to keep pace with growing demand. The financial aspects of home construction virtually exclude the low-income groups from ever owning their own homes. These are the people the Federal Government must assist with the long-term financing that private enterprise is not able to provide. I

am not criticizing the home-building industry; I am merely stating that the monetary return from low-income housing is not enough to encourage investment capital.

The public housing bill of 1956, signed by the President on August 7, authorizes the construction of 35,000 public housing units a year for 2 years. I am quite happy that a total of 70,000 units will be built in the next 2 years, but this number falls far short of the required construction if we are to demonstrate to the world that all segments of our society share in the wealth of this great Nation. Legislation was introduced in this Congress to authorize construction of 180,000 units over a 3-year period; unfortunately, this measure was never released by the House Rules Committee and consequently never came before the House for consideration. This is the type of forward-looking legislation that we need to clear up the slums and blighted metropolitan areas. Thirty-three percent of our population is housed in quarters that are not fit for human habitation. At what point will we realize that the money spent on creating an atmosphere in which young Americans can grow up with the minimum requirements for decent living will return a hundredfold in reduction of prison and hospital operating expenses.

Several other facets of the housing problem are worthy of the most careful consideration. I was pleased to note that at least a modest amount of funds were made available this year for home-improvement loans. This will allow many homes now considered substandard because of structural conditions or lack of basic sanitary facilities to be repaired or rebuilt.

Another measure I sincerely regret was not included in the housing bill is special housing for the aged.

What do I mean by special housing for the aged? As we all know, people are living longer than ever before as a result of dietary and medicinal advances. These people are for the most part retired and living on a pension or social security. Being proud and self-respecting, they desire to live an independent, active useful life. Unfortunately, this is not always possible. Financial limitations quite often prevent the average retired persons from enjoying life in their senior years. This is most unjust treatment of those who have worked long and hard raising a family and contributing to the national welfare. Our older citizens are entitled to much more from a grateful country. The Federal Government should lead the way in planning communities in which retired people might gather, if they so desire, to live their remaining years with others who share their interests. I hope the 85th Congress will give sympathetic attention to the problems confronting the retired and soon-to-be-retired in this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is the duty of Congress to step in where private industry and local communities have been unable to cope with the housing problem and extend a helping hand. We have the potential to take our free way of life and refine it to a point that staggers the imagination. No one needs to go hungry; no one needs be improperly clothed; no one should want for adequate housing. The challenge is clear—shall we meet it?

Achievements of the Fund for the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Fund for the Republic has made a contribution of major importance in the field of race relations in the United States. Its thoughtful approach to this problem and its valuable contribution of funds to important projects in the field of race relations are well stated in the May 1956 bulletin of the fund. Because this fine work deserves the widest public knowledge, I, under unanimous consent, insert at this point excerpts from the bulletin referred to:

CIVIL LIBERTIES AND RACE RELATIONS

THE REVOLT AGAINST INTEGRATION

The most acute of all current issues in the field of civil liberties and due process are clearly those generated by the southern revolt against the desegregation orders of the Federal courts. Racial discrimination, denials of equality of opportunity and the equal protection of the laws on racial grounds are not, of course, confined to the South. Grover C. Hall, Jr., editor of the Montgomery (Ala.) Advertiser, has attracted much attention with a campaign to search out racial tensions, discrimination and segregationist practices elsewhere in the country, and has found no lack of material. The Negro community is not the only racial minority in the country which frequently meets with less than justice. But it is the southern resistance to school integration—especially in South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, where the white community is most determined and more nearly unanimous—which is now raising the most serious problems for all those interested in the principles of the Bill of Rights.

The problems, it must be noted, are not one but many, on various levels of law and social action. The southern interposition movement has raised what purports to be a basic constitutional issue. It is difficult to believe that this can ever be posed in a practically meaningful way; but if it ever were, it would at least call in question the foundation of the Bill of Rights itself. Proposals, like those in Virginia and other States, to evade the Court orders by closing the public schools and substituting State support for pupils in private segregated institutions present the legal issue on a somewhat narrower plane.

Still another question of due process is precipitated by the contention of many Southerners that the NAACP (the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) has no right to organize, from outside the section, its systematic campaign of court actions to enforce compliance with the Supreme Court decision. This is said to be using the Federal courts as a club with which to compel a change in the social institutions and stabilized patterns of southern life. While many will find it difficult to understand what the courts should be used for if not to establish legally declared constitutional rights, the practical argument as to how they should be used, in the tense and human contexts of the segregation issue, is bound to be troubling.

When the white southern reaction against the NAACP descends to cruder levels, in attempts to ban the organization as subversive, to dismiss teachers and other public servants for holding membership in it, to exclude its lawyers from the courts, one meets a blunter challenge to the usual concepts of civil liberties and due process. And the challenge becomes even cruder still in the activities of the White Citizens Councils and related movements in bringing economic pressure, intimidation, if not occasionally more violent methods of coercion, upon the Negro communities in order to force the removal of signatures from integration petitions, to deny them their voting rights or exclude them from juries.

One of the most striking, as well as most baffling, of these problems in civil rights and justice is raised by the resort of both the white and the Negro communities to the weapons of economic boycott. The Montgomery bus strike has aroused not only national but international attention—a similar bus strike by Negroes was recently reported in Capetown, South Africa. Less widely publicized, but possibly no less disturbing, are local boycotts and counterboycotts against retailers, distributors, sometimes against national brands, springing out of the racial tension. Dealers have at times been boycotted simultaneously by the white community because of rumors that they were unduly friendly to the NAACP and by the colored community because they were supposed to have denied jobs or credit to Negroes in enforcing the campaign against desegregation. The marked rise over the past few years in the relative buying power of the Negro community in the South has given it weight in economic conflict of this kind. There is little information on which to estimate the real seriousness of the resort to economic weapons, but there is no doubt that the potentialities have seriously alarmed the more thoughtful leaders on both sides of the racial issue. The larger economic costs to the South of an embittered struggle over school integration—in discouraging industrial developments, in exacerbating labor relations, in hindering the sale of State and municipal bonds, as well as in possible violence and extremism—are proving an inducement to reasonable and careful attitudes.

THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

As an educational foundation established to preserve and advance civil liberties and due process, the Fund for the Republic has from its inception taken an active interest in interracial problems in all parts of the country. With the development of the acute situation in the South, it has increased its grants for educational and fact-finding work in that region; it has at the same time maintained programs in interracial relations either national in scope or dealing with specific situation in localities outside the South.

Both nationally and in facing the sectional problem, the fund has proceeded in the belief that there are no simple or programmatic solutions; that the interests of justice, civil rights, and equality of opportunity involved can ultimately be met only through better knowledge and understanding, and that the conflicts of interest, attitude, and public policy which have arisen will be resolved mainly by getting at the facts and debating the clash of principles in which the facts are entangled. The fund has aimed, not to develop doctrainaire policies or programs, but to reduce the tensions to a point at which sound policies and programs will have a chance to grow.

THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL COUNCIL

The fund's chief effort in the South has been in support of the Southern Regional

Council, to which it has given grants now totaling $445,000. The council is an organization of southerners, both white and Negro, established in 1944 to further equal opportunity for all people in the South. Managed and directed by southerners, it has sought to coordinate southern thought and leadership in meeting racial problems through the methods of conference, fact-finding, reason, and persuasion. It has established 12 State affiliates (usually called Councils on Human Relations) through the South; like the parent body, these are biracial in composition.

The Southern Regional Council's board of directors has from time to time included such well-known southerners as Hodding Carter, publisher of the Greenville (Miss.) Delta Democrat Times; Dr. Charles S. Johnson, president of Fisk University; Dr. Rufus E. Clement, president of Atlanta University; Rt. Rev. Charles C. Clingman, Protestant Episcopal bishop of Louisville; Rt. Rev. E. A. Penick, Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of North Carolina. Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, was one of its incorporators. Its president is Marion A Wright, a retired lawyer of South Carolina, and its executive director, with his central office in Atlanta, is George S. Mitchell. The council, together with its affiliates, brings leaders of the two racial groups together; it promotes local discussion and educational work; it is able to render advice on specific local desegregation problems. It is a center for information. With a recent grant of $50,000 from the fund, the council is now setting up a small organization throughout the South for the prompt assembly and analysis of the facts in various aspects of southern race relations.

THE COMMISSION ON RACE AND HOUSING

The fund has made numerous grants for work in race relations as a national and not merely a southern problem. In the fall of 1954 the fund established a commission on race and housing, under the chairmanship of Earl B. Schwulst, chairman of the board, president and trustee of the Bowery Savings Bank, New York, to make a nationwide study of minority housing problems. Up to the present the fund has appropriated $235,000 to the support of the commission. In addition to Mr. Schwulst, the members are: Gordon W. Allport, Elliot V. Bell, Laird Bell, Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., Henry Dreyfuss, Peter Grimm, Charles S. Johnson, Charles Keller, Jr., Clark Kerr, Philip M. Klutznick, Henry R. Luce, Ward Melville, Francis P. T. Plimpton, R. Stewart Rauch, Jr. and Robert R. Taylor.

Under Dr. Davis McEntire, of the University of California as research director, a center has been established at Berkeley for the study and statistical analysis of data drawn from all significant regions of the country, with particular concern for the housing problems of Negroes in all sections, of Puerto Ricans in urban centers, of Mexicans in the Southwest and of those of Asian antecedents on the Pacific Coast. The Commission has also made grants-in-aid in support of field studies in all these areas and is considering further cooperative arrangements with other research centers and public agencies. "We hope at the end of the study," Mr. Schwulst has said, "to present some concrete and workable suggestions as to how government, private builders, realtors, financial institutions and civic groups can cooperate in bringing about better living conditions for all people."

RACE RELATIONS LAW REPORTER

In another major grant in this field, the fund has supplied $200,000 to the Law School of Vanderbilt University to finance the publication of Race Relations Law Reporter, a periodical to be issued 6 times a year, under the direction of Paul H. Sanders. It is devoted to the dissemination of court cases, legislation, regulations and other primary materials in race relations law. The fund grant permits the service to be offered for $2 a year. The first issue appeared in February.

Other grants in the field of race relations

American Friends Service Committee: Grants for job-opportunity programs in Texas and North Carolina, integration in Washington, D. C., and work with American Indians	$176,000
NAACP legal defense and education fund: In support of its educational work in defense of the legal rights of the Negro minority	50,000
National Union League: For educational work in industrial race relations	50,000
National Council of Churches of Christ in the U. S. A.: For betterment of race relations through the churches	40,750
Board of social and economic relations of the Methodist Church: For educational and conference work in race relations	25,000
National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church: For work in race relations	25,000
Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago: To expand a program for reducing interracial tensions in the Chicago area	18,000
Catholic Committee of the South: For educational work in racial and cultural relations	15,000
Disciples of Christ: For educational work in racial and cultural relations	15,000
Presbyterian Church in the United States (South): For educational work in racial and cultural relations	15,000
Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. (North): For educational work in racial relations	15,000

Congresswoman Martha W. Griffiths Reports to the People of the 17th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am taking this opportunity to provide the residents of the 17th District of Michigan a brief résumé of major legislation and of my activities as their Representative in the 84th Congress.

This Congress, I am proud to report, has compiled a distinguished record of achievement in both foreign and domestic fields. Constructive legislation action has been taken to meet the needs and problems of our people.

BETTER HEALTH PROTECTION

My chief interests have included health and welfare legislation and I am happy to say that we in Congress have taken significant steps forward in these important fields. A 15-percent increase in funds to rebuild the Food and Drug Administration was voted this year. I entered testimony before the Appropriations Committee for this agency and urged the establishment of a testing laboratory in Detroit for better enforcement of food and drug laws.

On other fronts we approved establishment of a National Institute for Dental Research and created a National Medical Library. I worked for the enactment of a 3-year $90 million program to assist private institutions in the construction of medical and scientific research facilities. We in Congress boosted by $10 million the Federal program of research in such fields as cancer, heart disease, and mental illness; and provided the important Federal program for free distribution of Salk antipolio vaccine. More than $2 million has come into Michigan under the vaccine program.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The most important forward step since the program was started under a Democratic President and Democratic Congress 20 years ago was taken by this Congress in providing social-security benefits to women at age 62 and to individuals permanently disabled at age 50.

This legislation, guided to final passage under Democratic leadership and over the vigorous opposition of the Eisenhower administration, takes practical recognition of two important deficiencies in our program of care for citizens in their declining years. Women will now draw benefits 3 years earlier than in the past and disabled persons will no longer have to wait until they reach 65 to receive monthly checks under the program.

This is a great social advance, made urgent by our times, and I was proud to have supported this legislation.

VETERANS BENEFITS—RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

The House made a determined effort to expand and liberalize benefits for veterans and their dependents. The House approved measures providing a 10 percent increase in pensions for disabled veterans and a liberalized program of support for widows and orphans. This was needed legislation which I supported but the Senate failed to take affirmative action.

A 10-percent boost in retirement income for retired railroad workers was enacted into law as was a program to increase retirement benefits for civil-service workers. Both of these programs, however, gained only lukewarm support from the administration.

HOUSING

We in Congress moved forward in the field of housing legislation which was drafted by one of my committees, Banking and Currency. The new legislation extends the program of FHA mortgage insurance and liberalizes the terms of insured home improvement loans. A homeowner may now borrow up to $3,500—instead of $2,500—for up to 5 years—instead of 3 years—at moderate interest rates. This new Housing Act also contains provisions to encourage the construction of both private and public housing specially designed and financed for the elderly.

I took a special interest in these two provisions—liberalized terms for home improvement loans and housing aids for the elderly. Some of the provisions of one of my own bills on housing for the

elderly were included in the final legislation.

HIGHWAYS

One of the outstanding domestic achievements of the 84th Congress was enactment of a $33 billion highway construction program. This is a pay-as-we-build program which will save us, as taxpayers, at least $11 billion which would have been spent in interest charges had a bond financing program, as advanced by the administration, been approved.

The program, which began July 1, 1956, will mean an additional $70 million for road construction in Michigan this fiscal year with $232.7 million earmarked for our State through 1959. I voted for this legislation in 1955 when it failed of passage largely because the administration insisted on the costly bond financing arrangement.

EDUCATION

It is disappointing to me to report the House failed to pass the $1.6 billion school construction bill this session. This urgent legislation met defeat largely because the Powell antisegregation amendment was first made part of the measure.

I voted against the Powell amendment because the issue of segregation was extraneous to the legislation. Inclusion of the Powell amendment served to deprive the schools of our district of millions of dollars which could have been put to good use in building needed classrooms.

The Congress did, however, extend the program of school assistance to those districts affected by Federal activity. Since this program was started in 1950, Michigan schools have received more than $8 million for construction with Livonia, Northville, and Redfor Township schools among those sharing in this aid.

I worked closely with superintendents of several Michigan school districts and with members of the Education and Labor Committee to obtain workable amendments to this law and then for its final passage.

SMALL BUSINESS

In addition to extension and expansion of the Small Business Administration, I joined with other members in successfully obtaining passage by the House of the equality of opportunity bill for small business. I was among the early signers of the discharge petition which was necessary to obtain House action on the bill.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The highlight of legislation in this field was extension of the Mutual Security Act for another year. I supported the action of the House Foreign Affairs Committee which cut the President's money request by $1 billion. It was this reduced figure of $3.8 billion which was approved by Congress. In the debate I supported the amendment which terminates military aid to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia who has returned to the good graces of the Soviet Union.

GENERAL

At my urging funds for completion of a flood-control survey of the Rouge River were included in this year's appropriation for the Army Corps of Engineers.

My efforts, along with other Congressmen, to expand the distribution of surplus food to the needy of our country by a stamp plan met with strong opposition from the administration and was not approved. This program has the support of the Detroit Common Council, the Detroit Department of Welfare, and the Detroit Food Industry Committee.

Final action to bring the St. Lawrence seaway to Detroit was taken by the 84th Congress in providing funds needed to deepen the connecting lakes channels. The sum of $5 million was approved for this year's work.

It was through my efforts that the Chief of the Corps of Engineers speeded up the bid procedure so that the good summer months for construction would not be lost this year.

PERSONAL REPORT

In addition to my legislative duties I should make reference to my other work and responsibility as your spokesman in Washington. I have attempted from the outset of my congressional service to keep the residents of the 17th District as fully informed as possible on my work.

To accomplish this, I have written a newsletter each month; I have maintained both a weekly and monthly radio report series through the cooperation of radio stations WWJ and WKMH; and I have written a short column each week for weekly newspapers and club and organization publications.

Your letters have been appreciated and I have attempted to answer each one as promptly as possible. The opinion of residents of our district are important to me.

I have been pleased to assist many residents of our district in their dealings with various Federal agencies. Some results have included bringing a Detroit family and their adopted Korean orphan child together; reuniting a family with their elderly mother from Germany; and cutting Air Force redtape so that a young airman could be with his family at Eastertime.

MY LEGISLATION

Among the bills I have sponsored are measures to put the House and its committees on television; to give postal and civil service workers an adequate pay raise; to make it easier for older people to have homes of their own; to require humane methods in the slaughter of livestock; to provide the food stamp plan, to create a Federal agency for the physically handicapped; to assist libraries in rural and fringe urban areas; and to make inspection of poultry in interstate commerce compulsory.

In conclusion let me say that I have done my best to be responsive to the needs and opinions of the residents of our district and to discharge my responsibility as your Representative in Congress in a way which I hope meets with your approval.

Slovaks Helped Build Jamestown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two articles which were reprinted—one in the Bridgeport Post and the other in the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call—which call attention to the historical fact that Slovaks played a prominent role in the establishment of the colony at Jamestown by Capt. John Smith back in the 17th century:

SLOVAKS HELPED BUILD JAMESTOWN

(Republished from the Allentown (Pa.) Morning Call, July 11, 1956)

DEAR EDITOR: Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, made the following statement, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 5, 1956, on pages A5292–A5293: "Slovak ingenuity and craftsmanship were highly valued by the redoubtable Capt. John Smith, when on September 25, 1608, the sailing ship *God Speed* sailed into Jamestown harbor with 6 skilled craftsmen on board, 2 of whom, Juraj Meta and Jan Bogdan, were Slovaks. These men, with the four Poles, Lowicki, Stefanski, Zrenica, and Sadowski, came in answer to an urgen plea by Captain Smith to his London agents, to "send 30 carpenters, blacksmiths, and bricklayers rather than a thousand of the kind we have here."

Congressman FLOOD continued that "it was largely due to skilled efforts of these craftsmen that the Jamestown colony was able to secure a foothold on the American continent."

The names Mata and Gogdan are purely Slovak. These names are associated with the early life of Slovak-Americans. They are listed as founders of many Slovak parishes and societies.

Slovaks took it for granted, for many years, that the first Slovak to reach the American Colonies was Count Maurice De Benovsky, born in Vrbove, Nitra County, Slovakia, whom FLOOD also mentions, stating: "And in the War of the Revolution, Slovak love of liberty was exemplified in the military exploits of Count Maurice Benovsky who served with Pulaski at Savannah, and who was born in storied Nitra, that ancient See of St. Methodius."

Benovsky came to Baltimore, Md., in 1785, at the recommendation of Benjamin Franklin, our American Ambassador, who met him in Paris and gave him a letter of introduction to American businessmen. Benovsky came on his ship *Intrepid*. Later Benovsky became King of Madagascar, where he was mortally wounded. Now, it is remarkable indeed, that 100 years before the birth of Benjamin Franklin, 2 skilled Slovak craftsmen and 4 Poles, came to Jamestown in 1608 and through their efforts the first permanent settlement in the New World was built.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA,
Editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom.
PASSAIC, N. J.

(The above story appeared in the Passaic-Clifton Herald News, Passaic, N. J.; the Passaic Citizen; the Passaic Sunday Eagle; the Youngstown Sunday Vindicator; the Bridge-

port(Conn.) Post; the Slovak Amerike, Chicago, Illl.; and other publications.)

SLOVAK EDITOR REVEALS MORE DATA ON CAPTAIN SMITH

(Reprinted from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, July 26, 1956)

TO THE EDITOR: Since my letter was published in the Post about 2 Slovak and 4 Polish craftsmen who came to Jamestown in 1608 to aid Capt. John Smith, I have been asked how it came about that Slovaks knew and trusted Capt. John Smith and vice versa. After all, a trip to the New World was a great risk at the beginning of the 17th century.

Let us look back to the period when Smith was born, in January 1580, in England. In his youth he retired to a wooded place. There he studied Machiavelli's Art of Warre and Marcus Aurelius. His exercise consisted of riding a fast horse and he practiced with a lance and ring.

In this idyllic life Smith did not satisfy his restless temperament. He went to the Continent and opportunity presented itself for a new adventure when the Turks were ravaging eastern Europe.

In 1568, 2 years after the death of Sulliman the Magnificent, the greatest of Turkish conquerors, peace was made between the Emperor of Germany who ruled the Bohemians, Austrians, Hungarians, Slovaks, and other nations living under the Carpathian Mountains down to the Lower Danube, and the Sultan of Turkey. This peace freed Hungary and part of Slovakia, which had been ravaged and overrun by the Turkish armies from payment of a tribute.

In 1593 a daring raid by a Turkish army into Croatia, now part of Yugoslavia, sacked and burned villages, devastated lands, and sold inhabitants into slavery. This act roused Rudolf II of Hapsburg, Emperor of Germany and Austria, to attack. This war was destined to drag on up to 1606. Capt. John Smith was attracted to this war. According to John Gould Fletcher, a critic of Smith and Pocahontas, Smith was sent by a certain Englishman and an Irish Jesuit to Vienna, armed with introductions to many important officers in Emperor Rudolf's struggle with the Turks.

The Carpathians with few roads, mountain ranges, bridgeheads, and passes were suitable for movement of rapidly moving armies. According to observers, this terrain was "a fighter's paradise," for which Smith yearned.

Smith fought against the Turks as an artilleryman. The Turks took over the city of Kanisza. Smith and his companions were rushed to the defense of Oberlimach. Here he fought with the Slovaks and Poles against the Turks. General Kisell, commanding the artillery, came to the aid of Earl Meldritch with 10,000 men. And here was a chance for a young Englishman to distinguish himself. Smith took full advantage of it. He devised a method of signaling and was able to communicate from a distance of 7 miles to the besieged garrison of Oberlimach. General Kissel did not consider his army strong enough, so Smith's strategy was followed. Kisell made the charge and the Turks were defeated.

Later Sigmund Bathory, Duke of Transylvania, issued an official document, signed by himself and attested with his official seal on December 9, 1603, praising Smith's bravery and recommending him to his subjects and his noblemen. Thus Smith's name as a hero was known among the Poles, Slovaks, and Hungarians. The name Bathory is also well known among the Slovaks. They cannot forget especially the mad countess Alzbeta (Elizabeth) Bathory, who lived in Slovakia in the castle of Chactice, where she lured peasant girls into her palace as servants, murdered them to bathe in their blood to retain her beauty. Any old Slovak man or a woman will recite this story with great drama.

Smith on his sojourn visited Slovakia and no doubt, Juraj Mata and Jan Bogdan, as well as the four Polish craftsmen became his admirers and followed him on the ship *God Speed* on September 25, 1608, to Jamestown. They knew and trusted Smith, whose war experiences fighting the Turks in the Carpathian Mountains equipped him for his tough ordeal with the Indians in the woods of Virginia, where he established in Jamestown the first permanent English settlement.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA,
Editor, American Friends of Slovak Freedom.
PASSAIC, N. J.

Resolution of the Polish-American Congress for the State of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following resolution of the Polish-American Congress for the State of Nebraska, pertaining to the recent uprisings of the Poles in the city of Poznan. This resolution was prepared and adopted by the committee of that organization on July 22 and was later adopted by the assembly of that organization. It was forwarded to me by Anthony Zaleski, president of the organization, and a longtime leader in its affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS FOR THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Be it resolved—

That we admire the courageous Poles of the city of Poznan, who on June 28, 1956, awakened the conscience of the world, in the mass demonstrations of the Polish workers for bread and freedom, and to get rid of the Soviet troops from their native land.

That we condemn the terrible conditions of long hours, starvation wages, and high norms of output imposed on the Polish laborers by the Red regime, which drove the desperate Poles to protest against the exploitation and slavery of the Polish people.

That we denounce the puppet government of Poland, and its masters in Moscow, for turning out troops manned by Russians, with machineguns, tanks and planes against these defenseless people, killing many of them, wounding hundreds and causing mass arrests of thousands.

That we protest against the imprisonment, torture and mock trial of 323 of these unfortunate victims, including 7 priests, for their appeal for bread and freedom, and decent living standards and human rights.

That we thank the Government of the United States for its prompt and generous offer to send food into Poland to alleviate the suffering of the Poles, and denounce the Red Communist regime for refusing to receive the magnanimous proffer of help.

That we are grateful to the Members of Congress, both in the House and the Senate, for the resolutions adopted and speeches made condemning the Red regime in Warsaw and Soviet Russia, for the intolerable conditions that are imposed upon the Poles, and the brutal reprisals for putting down the uprising against the starving Poles in Poznan.

That we urge our Government and its agencies to intervene for and on behalf of the Poles arrested in Poznan and accused of sabotage to save them from further cruelty and vengeance.

That we beseech the President of the United States and the State Department to intercede for Poland, in the interest of justice and peace, before the United Nations and elsewhere, so that the Poles will have the right to choose their own free government, and that the Soviet troops be removed from Poland.

That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Honorable John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, and to the Members of Congress from the State of Nebraska.

Progress in American Samoa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of our colleagues to an editorial and a news story which appeared in a recent edition of a Western Samoa newspaper. Western Samoa is administered by New Zealand as a United Nations trusteeship.

These items concern the progress Gov. Richard Barrett Lowe, his competent staff, and members of the American Samoan Legislature are making in advancing the American Samoans toward eventual self-government.

It was my privilege to chair a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which held hearings on the general growth and development of American Samoa in Pago Pago during November 1954. Therefore, I have maintained an active and continuous interest in the progress and welfare of our 22,500 American nationals in the South Pacific.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial and a news story from the Samoa Bulletin, published in Apia, Western Samoa, on June 22, 1956:

REALISM VERSUS IDEALISM

The more publicized advance of Western Samoa toward self-government under the United Nations trusteeship system has encouraged people of this territory to believe that this section of Samoa is much more progressive than American Samoa, especially since the United States Navy ceased using Pago Pago as a base. Any who still hold those views would receive a rude shock if they were to visit the American Samoa of today. With the first fumbling years of civil administration, and the uncertainly bred by the procession of governors before Mr. Lowe took office, nightmares of the past, American Samoa now knows where it's going, and it's going there briskly, and determinedly.

Many of the things which Western Samoa is still trying to do, or should try to do, American Samoa has achieved or is achieving. Politically, they've had practical local government for a long time, as a basis for the higher organs of political authority.

Now they're drawing up a constitution which will be a documented compromise between Samoan custom and American law. American Samoa has tackled its economic problems realistically, and is already reaping the benefits of foreign capitalized industry, while Western Samoan leaders still quibble over the principle when asked to put it into practice.

It's not unlikely that in 10 years' time, America Samoa and Pago Pago will be names famous in a world which still thinks that Apia is a Fiji.

SELF-GOVERNMENT UNDER UNITED STATES FLAG SEEMS POLITICAL DESIRE IN TUTUILA

(By T. J. Dunleavy)

"We have self-government at the local level, and it works, and the people know its works," the Governor of American Samoa, Mr. Richard Barrett Lowe, told me in a special interview in Pago Pago last week, when we were discussing political progress in the American territory. A draft constitution is expected to be placed before a constitutional convention later this year, and Governor Lowe considers that American Samoa will have a high degree of self-government "certainly by 1960."

The Governor could not name any target date for absolute self-government, and indicated that the people of American Samoa seem to want only as much self-government as is possible under the American flag. These people, as loyal American nationals, don't want the United States flag hauled down—that's obvious," the Governor remarked.

American Samoa's progress to whatever degree of self-government it eventually desires will be based on a practicable and proven pattern of local government, in which authority rises through a pyramid of more than 50 village pulenu'u, 14 county chiefs, and 3 district governors, all nominated by their respective regional councils. At the top of the pyramid is a bicameral legislative arrangement which, curiously enough in an American territory, seems to be based more on the House of Lords-House of Commons relationship in the United Kingdom, rather than the Senate and House of Representatives in the United States.

The value of American Samoa's bicameral system is not in what it emulates, but in what it achieves. It is a system which caters effectively for the twin desires among Samoan people to achieve progress while retaining as much as possible of their own customs.

The senate, or house of chiefs, has a membership of 15 Samoan titleholders, each nominated according to Samoan custom by a district council of local chiefs. The house of representatives is open to persons of any rank, matai or taule'ale'a, man or woman, and election is by secret ballot in a universal adult suffrage. I was told in Pago Pago that, in practice, the senate is conservative while the house of representatives is progressive, and the two together combine in an effective and acceptable compromise in the territory's legislative program.

BASIC PROBLEM

In the economic field, American Samoa's leaders face a basic problem that is similar in one way but quite different in another from Western Samoa's difficulties. Both face the prospect of rapidly increasing populations, but, where in Western Samoa there is ample scope for agricultural expansion, only 20 percent of American Samoa's land is arable, and that is not much land in a territory of only 76 square miles. The people will have to use that little land largely for subsistence crops, and there is little likelihood that conventional agricultural products can ever become an exportable, revenue-producing factor to any considerable degree.

As an alternative, the people of American Samoa have been encouraged; under the successful administration and the realistic planning of Governor Lowe, to seek their prosperity elsewhere. Secondary industry is being encouraged to establish in American Samoa, and a territorial Industrial Incentives Act, giving attractive taxation exemptions and benefits to industrial enterprises, has been drawn up and is now under study by the Department of Interior in Washington. The act has been based on a similar measure enacted in Puerto Rico, where spectacular success was achieved.

INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

American Samoa's industrial revolution has so far produced the following results:

Hundreds of tons of canned fish are now being exported in an industrial enterprise which provides steady jobs for 350 local residents, and which benefits the rest of the population by placing on the market fresh fish at bargain prices, as well as cheaper canned fish.

Negotiations have led to the construction of a major international airport at Tafuna which is planned to take the biggest aircraft, and which could well make Tutuila what aviation pioneer Harold Gatty predicts, the air center of the South Pacific.

Tourism is expected to flourish as a result of the opening of the airport, and the regular visits by the big Matson liners. Governor Lowe sees tourism as a substantial revenue-producing activity, and he and his administration are giving it due regard. Already, Governor Lowe has had several offers from outside private capital seeking to establish a modern touriest hotel in or near Pago Pago; the Government is to encourage an expansion of local sales of Samoan handcrafts by the provision of more selling fales along the main road at Fagatogo; and tourism is expected to breathe new life into the local transportation industry. The Governor also hopes to attract the world's game fishermen. All he has to do is to mention his own experience. In 2½ years of regular fishing in the deep, he has only once returned empty-handed.

KNOW WHERE THEY'RE GOING

As I can see it in a brief visit to Pago Pago, the big news from American Samoa is that everyone knows exactly where their territory is going. They know what is ahead and they like it and they are prepared to work to make it a success. Political progress attracts local interest but it has not been allowed to become the dominant feature of government. Politics seems to be confined to the provision of safeguards for the Samoan people in the new and progressive drive toward territorial prosperity.

In their political activity, the leaders of American Samoa have set their course for the future with the same care which has marked their plotting of the economic course. When the constitutional convention is convened later this year, it will have a basic, well-considered document before it for discussion. This document has been drawn up by a committee of top administrative and legislative leaders and after ratification or alteration by the convention will be sent to Washington for the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

A former naval tank farm is likely to be leased by the Standard Oil Company of California, if present negotiations are successfully completed and shipping, aircraft, and local consumers will have the advantage of a plentiful supply of cheap fuel.

Local development is being pushed ahead. Electrification is now complete as far as Fagasa, Mapusaga and Lauli'i in all directions, and it is said that only one-sixth of the potential generating capacity is yet being used. Other pub-water supply renewed the main dock, and maintained existing services at a high level.

Preliminary discussions have begun in the setting up of a system of local taxation.

With the consent of the legislators, a study will be started of the possibility of proclaiming Pago Pago a municipality in which the component villages will retain their individual entities as wards within the overall municipality.

No one can foresee when American Samoa will become self-supporting. Governor Lowe admits that the United States Government will still need to make annual appropriations. The United States has shown itself a generous patron to its small Samoan territory, particularly since the inception of the civil administration. Through Governor Lowe, the people of American Samoa have been given a lead, and they have accepted it.

A Record of Some Achievements of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress draws to a close, I would like to review some of its major legislative action, under leave to extend my remarks. This Democratic-controlled Congress was a hard working, responsible Congress, as the record will show, and its accomplishments will prove that it was much concerned about the public welfare.

Being convinced that a well-informed public will be better able to evaluate the issues which will be raised during the coming Presidential campaign, I am listing some of the achievements of the 84th Congress. While over 22,000 bills were introduced, it is natural that many were not acted upon. However, 2,878 bills were approved by the Congress, and these represent many hours, days, and weeks of hearings, deliberations, and debates in committees and in both Houses of Congress. Many of the bills were of importance to certain areas of the country only, and many were private bills. I would mention, however, those bills only which are of national importance and special interest to the people of my district.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Over the administration's opposition, and in order to keep our country well prepared for any emergency, Congress voted $1.1 billion more than the administration requested for the Air Force; expanded research facilities in aeronautics; enlarged atomic energy projects, and increased funds for aircraft control and warning systems.

INTERNAL SECURITY

Because of the many injustices that had occurred and the extravagant statements that were made about security risks in the Government, Congress voted to create a Commission on Government Security to review the present program and to make recommendations thereon. It also voted to strengthen penalties for seditious conspiracy and for advocacy of overthrow of the Government; to prohibit Government employment of disloyal persons or those who believe in the

right to strike against the Government; to provide rewards for information on the illegal importation, manufacture or acquisition of nuclear material or atomic weapons; and to provide penalties for the willful damage or destruction of aircraft.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Laws were enacted to extend the reciprocal trade agreements and strengthen provisions for the protection of domestic industries; to provide for settlement of World War II claims against Hungary, Rumania, and other countries; to provide for the disposal of alien property seized during World War I; to continue the mutual security program of military, economic, and technical aid abroad; and funds were appropriated to complete the Inter-American Highway. A number of treaties were ratied by the Senate. These did not require House action.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

One of the major pieces of legislation approved was the increase of the minimum wage under the Federal Labor Standards Act from 75 cents to $1 per hour. Also approved were laws to continue the Small Business Administration to June 30, 1957, and increase its revolving funds for loans to a total of $175 million; to authorize a 4-year program of airport construction, providing $63 million a year grants-in-aid to States; to authorize a $33.4 billion highway construction program; to exempt from Federal admissions tax, tickets of 90 cents or less; to increase from $25 million to $125 million, the authorization of the Small Business Administration to make disaster loans and liberalize terms; to permit automobile dealers to sue under antitrust laws for unjust revocation of franchise; to establish a Federal policy to encourage the development of commercial fisheries industry, to create a $10 million loan fund, and to reorganize the Fish and Wildlife Service.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Many bills of interest to his group were approved, including ones to permit persons in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, to continue accrual of educational benefits; provide incentive pay increases of 6 to 25 percent and allowances, for members of Armed Forces; extend to July 1, 1959, provisions of the Dependents Assistance Act; provide social-security wage credits for military service before January 1, 1956; provide for educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II or Korea; put all military personnel under Social Security and increase benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans; extend home loan guarantees for home purchase or construction to July 25, 1958; provide for medical care of dependents of members of the Armed Forces; increase pay of 6-month trainees under the Reserve Act from $50 to $78 per month; and provide lump-sum readjustment payment for Reservists involuntarily released from active service.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

The discovery of the polio vaccine by Dr. Salk, resulted in enactment of legislation authorizing $30 million to assist States in providing this vaccine for needy children and expectant mothers. The program was later extended to July 1, 1957. Legislation was approved to authorize a 3-year $1.25 million program of Federal aid for nationwide research and reevaluation of problems of mental health; to authorize a training program to increase the number of public health specialists, aid to States for training nurses and practical nurses, and grants for improved mental health administrations; increase fund authorization and extend the school milk program, broaden distribution to include camps and nurseries for under-privileged children and to all nonprofit child-care centers and agencies; authorize survey by Public Health Service of extent and effects of chronic illnesses; and to provide $4 million for new equipment and facilities for National Institute of Dental Research.

In the field of housing, Congress authorized a 2-year program of public housing construction at the rate of 35,000 units per year; increased FHA insurance authorization by $3 billion; authorized additional military housing; permitted FHA loans for repair of homes damaged in floods and other major disasters. It also authorized $378 million Federal aid for school construction, maintenance, and operating costs, in districts affected by Government activities, and extended the program to June 30, 1958.

MARITIME LEGISLATION

As a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I am vitally interested in the maritime situation and all legislation which affects our shipyards, our port activities and matters related thereto.

When conditions in the shipyards became extremely critical, the administration finally gave approval to some measures to help remedy the situation and provide some work, to enable the yards to retain much of their skilled help and to keep the machinery in working order. One of the bills approved was a $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion for 1957, including a nuclear powered cruiser, and 50,000-ton aircraft carrier. Other legislation authorized the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship for operation in foreign commerce; granted authority to the Maritime Administration to conduct research and experiment in port and cargo handling of the atomic vessel; to require a periodic survey of national shipbuilding capability; to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, which I sponsored personally; to authorize the construction of prototype modern cargo vessel for mass production in the event of emergency; to facilitate private financing of passenger vessels in the interest of national defense by providing that in the case of special-defense vessels, the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to insure 100 percent of the principal and interest, on any mortgage eligible for insurance.

Another bill which I introduced which became law, eliminates the requirement that purchasers under the Merchant Ship Sales Act agree that the use factor in charter hire payable by the Government, shall not exceed 15 percent of the statutory sales price. Other legislation authorized the appropriation of necessary funds for the construction of 2 prototype ships, and the conversion of 1 Liberty ship, by the Maritime Commission; authorized the sale of 2 war-built tankers; and extended the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act.

Mr. Clarence G. Morse, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, stated that at the start of the new fiscal year, July 1, 1956, there were 57 oceangoing merchant ships, including 7 passenger vessels, being constructed, reconditioned, or converted in United States shipyards, or on order. In addition, over $14 million of work was placed with the repair yards, in bettering naval-auxiliary type ships in the reserve fleet. He mentioned also that congressional interest and activity in maritime matters has been at a high peak during the past session, and listed 24 principal items of new legislation bearing on the merchant marine.

In addition to the approval of the above-mentioned legislation, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee spent many days on hearings and consideration of labor-management problems in the American merchant marine. Realizing that a strong, healthy, and vigorous merchant marine is dependent, to a great extent, on satisfactory labor conditions, the committee tried to get at the facts thoroughly and objectively, and made its recommendations to the Congress.

An investigation into the activities of foreign freight forwarders and brokers was also held by the committee. The inquiry extended to the activities of forwarders on the export shipments of Government departments and agencies, and the export shipments of private commercial firms. These areas of activity have been the subject of many years of complaints and costly litigation, yielding only dissatisfaction and confusion.

As a result of the sinking of the schooner *Marvel* in the Chesapeake Bay last year, with the loss of 14 lives, the committee held hearings on legislation to require inspection and certification of certain vessels carrying passengers, and this has been enacted into law.

Another matter of concern to our Merchant Marine, were the efforts being made to repeal the Cargo Preference Act, better known as the 50–50 law. This law, passed in the last Congress, requires that 50 percent of all Government-financed commodities be transported by privately owned United States vessels, when they are available. This law is intended to provide additional work for American-flag ships. Since enactment, many charges were leveled against it, both by some of our own Government departments, and by foreign shipping associations. After a thorough investigation of the charges by the committee, which included weeks of hearings, the committee recommended to the House that it vigorously oppose all efforts to change or modify the present law.

The national wildlife system has developed slowly over a great many years, as the result of the efforts of many citizens, conservation organizations and official agencies. The tremendous growth of population, and the industrial and

agricultural expansion of the country in recent years, has compelled the realization that the preservation of wildlife values can be achieved only through large-scale steps to preserve and manage suitable habitat areas for such purposes. Extensive committee hearings revealed that there is extreme administrative confusion in the administration of the laws governing the wildlife system. After careful study of the matter, the committee decided to try, for an experimental period of time, an arrangement between the Secretary of the Interior and the committee, under which each proposed alienation or relinquishment of any interest the Fish and Wildlife Service has in lands under its jurisdiction, would be submitted to the committee for approval or disapproval. If this arrangement does not work satisfactorily, the committee will recommend appropriate legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS

I was especially pleased with the passage of these amendments, as I believe this act must be continually reviewed, to make sure the benefits are kept abreast of economic developments, so that it serves the purpose for which it was intended. This legislation will affect more people in my district, than any other legislation enacted in this Congress, and is the greatest importance to them. Some of the major changes with respect to benefits under the law are:

First. It reduces the age at which women can qualify for old-age insurance benefits, or for benefits as the wife, widow, or dependent mother of an insured worker, from 65 to 62.

Second. It provides disability insurance benefits for certain persons who become disabled between the ages of 50 and 65.

Third. It provides child's insurance benefits to disabled children age 18 or over, in case the disability began before attaining age 18.

Fourth. It extends social-security coverage to lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, nautropaths, osteopaths, chiropractors, and optometrists.

Fifth. It provides matching Federal funds for medical care furnished by the States to recipients of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled up to a maximum average of $6 per adult and $3 per child receiving assistance. This is a new provision.

Sixth. It amends the matching formulas for grants to States for various forms of public assistance. For old-age assistance, aid to the blind and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, the new formula calls for Federal grants equal to four-fifths of expenditures up to $30—formerly $25—for any individual, plus one-half of expenditures between $30 and $60—formerly one-half of expenditures between $25 and $55. For aid to dependent children, it provides for grants equal to fourteen-seventeenths—formerly four-fifths—of expenditures up to $17—formerly $15—for each person for whom benefits are paid, plus one-half of expenditures over $17 which do not exceed the maximum of $32—formerly $30—for the adult, $32—formerly $30—for the first child and $23—formerly $21—for each additional child in the same home.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACTS AMENDMENTS

A bill to raise the limitation on the amount of railroad-retirement annuity to spouses to maximum payable under the Social Security Act, was approved in the first session. The bill just approved, increases benefits under the act by approximately 10 percent. However, it does not increase an annuity which now equals an annuitant's average monthly wage. An annuity which has already been increased to the social-security minimum, will be further increased only where that minimum is less than the amount computed under the regular railroad-retirement formula, as amended by this bill. The present maximum of $54.30 for a spouse's annuity remains unchanged. These changes are effective as of July 1, 1956.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS

The merit system of Federal employment was improved and strengthened through the reorganization of the Civil Service Commission. The merit system was extended to 60,000 Federal employees by the granting of career-type appointments for indefinite Federal employees who were in positions in the competitive civil service on January 23, 1955, who had passed competitive qualifying examinations, or who would pass such examinations within 1 year, and who had 3 years of satisfactory service in the competitive civil service. A bill approved just recently, and which I sponsored, provided the same benefits for postal employees.

Classified Federal employees were given a salary increase of 7½ percent. An allowance was granted to all Government employees required to wear uniforms. Over one-half million Federal employees were bonded without charge. Where positions were placed in a lower grade due to reclassification, employees in those positions were protected from salary reductions.

The third of a series of increases in annuities for Federal employees already retired was approved. The Civil Service Retirement Act was completely rewritten, and some of its major provisions now are:

First. Annuities for Federal employees will be computed at (a) 2 percent of the average salary multiplied by all years of service in excess of 10, plus 1½ percent of such salary multiplied by the first 5 years of service plus 1¾ percent, multiplied by the years of service from 5 to 10 or (b) 1 percent of the average salary, plus $25 multiplied by the total years of service, whichever is greater. Under the prior law, annuities were computed on the basis of 1½ percent of the average salary, or 1 percent of such salary plus $25, multiplied by the total years of service, whichever is greater.

Second. The annuity of an employee retiring before reaching 60 will be reduced by 1 percent for each year the retiring employee is under age 60 and 2 percent for each year under 55. The prior law required a reduction of 3 percent for each year under 60.

Third. The annuity of an employee electing a survivor annuity will be reduced by 2½ percent of the first $2,400 and 10 percent of the balance.

Fourth. For disability benefits, the act establishes a minimum of 40 percent of the average salary, or the annuity which would have been earned at age 60, whichever is less.

Fifth. A reduced annuity is granted upon involuntary separation from service after attaining age 50 with 20 years of service. Heretofore an annuity was granted upon involuntary separation after 25 years of service, regardless of age. This provision is continued.

Sixth. Survivor annuities of an employee who dies after 5 years of service, or of a retired employee who dies, are increased by an average of 150 percent.

All of these measures and many others which were in the public interest and necessary for our economy or national defense had my support. This Democratic-controlled Congress has again proved that the interest and welfare of all the people, are its major concern and prime consideration, and as a result, was able, despite considerable opposition in many instances, to achieve a splendid record of a most constructive nature, which will have far-reaching effects.

The New Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress this summer made some significant improvements in the social-security system. The bill was signed into law by President Eisenhower on August 1, 1956.

Coverage has been extended to 200,000 more self-employed. These include lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, optometrists, and doctors of osteopathy. Substantially all the self-employed, except doctors of medicine, now will be included in the system. These newly admitted groups will be eligible for benefits as the result of their own contributions after they are in the system for 18 months.

Two hundred thousand widows of deceased workers who were contributors to the social security fund will receive benefits at age 62. This is particularly important, for a woman of that age who has spent her life taking care of her family would find it extremely difficult to get a job if her husband passed away.

Dependent mothers who are the sole survivors of social security contributors will also receive benefits at age 62.

Other working women also may retire at age 62, but benefits will be permanently lower than they would be if they postponed retirement until age 65. For example, a woman whose average earnings were $2,400 a year would receive $62.80 monthly if she retired at 62; while she would receive $78.50 monthly if she waited until 65 to retire.

Wives of men who have retired after reaching the permissible retirement age of 65 can also apply for benefits at age 62. As in the case of working women, wives who elect the earlier benefit age must accept lower permanent benefit payments. For instance, the average industrial male worker in New Jersey earns a little more than $300 a month. A couple, which means a working husband and a nonworking wife, who had that average wage when the wife was 62 would receive $135.50 a month; but, if the wife waited for her benefits until she reached 65, the monthly payment would be $147.80.

Individual circumstances will dictate the decision to be made in the case of each couple, but it is pertinent to point out that it would be better for a woman, where possible, to wait until she is 65 before claiming benefits because the life expectancy of women at 62 is 17 years.

The reason for the setting of these lower retirement benefits for working women and wives who retire at 62 is that if they were to receive full retirement at that age, the solvency of the trust fund which has been set up for the benefit of those who have retired and who will retire in the future would be jeopardized. If such a cost was to be incurred, it would necessitate a further increase in social security deductions from the wages of all workers.

The first payment to widows, and to working women and wives of retired men who will benefit under these provisions will be for the month of November 1956, payment being made in the first part of December.

Another important provision in the new law is that which provides benefits at age 50 to totally disabled persons who have been in the social-security system for a substantial period of time immediately previous to receiving their disability. The definition of disability is: a physical or mental infirmity that prevents the worker from engaging in a substantial gainful activity and which can be expected to continue for a long and indefinite period.

It is estimated that 25 years from now nearly 1 million persons will be benefiting by this provision.

Some opposed this disability-payment provision on the grounds it is impossible to accurately estimate the cost of such a program and because of the possibility it might dissipate the money in the social-security trust fund paid by workers towards their retirement.

It is estimated the disability payments will cost anywhere between $900 million and $2 billion a year. To prevent a possible dissipation of the social-security retirement fund, the new law provides that a special trust fund for disability payments be established through a tax of one-quarter of 1 percent each on employer and employee. This tax will start January 1, 1957. The first payments to the disabled will be made in July 1957.

The new law also provides that survivors benefits for a disabled child unable to earn a living which now stop at 18 shall continue indefinitely.

Another important provision which was recommended by President Eisenhower is that the Federal Government will match to a limited amount payments by the States for necessary medical expenses to those receiving public assistance.

The law also states as one of its objectives the rehabilitation of those unable to earn a living. This means that every effort will be made to restore the disabled and those receiving public assistance to the role of self-supporting wage earners.

Of course, it is essential that additional benefits should not impair the soundness of the trust fund. You will note that cost of the new disability coverage is provided for by a new tax and the cost of earlier retirement of workingwomen and wives through actuarially sound reduction of benefits if they take them at the earlier age.

There is no special provision for paying the additional cost, which is substantial, for the earlier date of paying benefits to widows. This is taken care of in two ways. First, owing to the passage of the bill giving social security to soldiers and the inclusion of more self-employed, the cost of the system is slightly lowered; on all group-insurance systems, the more who participate the lower the cost. And, in the second place, owing to the fact that money rates are higher now than in the past, the trust fund is able to invest its funds at a rate of a little above 2½ percent where in the past it was only 2¼ percent. This difference redounds to the benefit of the beneficiaries of the social-security system.

These improvements in our social-security system, which now is 21 years old, may provide increased benefits to almost every family in our great Nation—either presently or in the future.

TWUA Veteran Carl Holderman Proves Value of Unionman in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the July issue of Textile Labor contains an interesting article on the Honorable Carl Holderman, commissioner of labor and industry for the State of New Jersey. As was predicted by all his friends, Commissioner Holderman has made an excellent record in his high office and has fully justified their confidence and trust. His fine qualities of mind and heart have won the commissioner universal admiration and esteem, and the State is most fortunate to have the benefit of his services.

The article follows:

TWUA VETERAN CARL HOLDERMAN PROVES VALUE OF UNIONMAN IN GOVERNMENT

(By Irving Kahan)

New Jersey's commissioner of labor and industry these days is a man from the ranks of labor. That's a genuine novelty.

Before Carl Holderman stepped into the post, everybody but the butcher, the baker, and the candlestickmaker had a crack at the job. Among his predecessors were a civil servant, a physician, a newspaper publisher, an insurance executive, and even a former big-league baseball player.

Man from labor? That certainly is Carl Holderman's label. If you skim through his 38 years as a trade unionist, you'll find he's been a hosiery union official, a TWUA vice president and State director, and the New Jersey CIO's secretary-treasurer and president.

Gov. Robert B. Meyner tapped him for the State post early in 1954 after the Democratic Party had regained the governorship to end a 12-year drought.

What's so special about a labor man in a government labor post? Basically, it lies in his approach.

The other fellows who filled the job before him had this kind of an outlook: They considered the department an impartial agency set up to supervise labor-management relations in line with State laws.

To Holderman, it's nothing of the sort.

"As I see it, this department is for the protection of the physical and economic interests of industrial workers. That's fundamental," he says bluntly.

"I had this out at the start with government and political leaders, and I'm still here," he adds dryly.

Sure, the official title is Department of Labor and Industry, Holderman concedes; but "industry" was tacked on in 1948 after the State constitution was revised.

He calls it an artificial label, pointing out that there has been no change in jurisdiction since the agency was established simply as the Department of Labor in 1915.

His job? It's "interesting" but at the same time "it's the most taxing assignment I've ever had."

Holderman is in charge of a department staffed by 3,300 employees spread out over 15 buildings in Trenton alone, and 52 field offices.

It has three major branches: employment security, workmen's compensation, and a division of labor.

Among its assorted functions is the distribution of unemployment and temporary disability benefits, placement of jobless workers, processing of workmen's compensation claims, regulation of private employment agencies, and the enforcement of safety and health regulations, child labor laws, and minimum wage standards.

Also under its jurisdiction is an assortment of bureaus. Examples: a rehabilitation commission, a mediation board, and a service for migrant workers.

So how does a labor man, with a setup like this, make over an impartial agency into one dedicated to "the protection of the physical and economic interests of industrial workers"?

With Holderman, it's first things first, and No. 1 on his list was an end to the corruption and inefficiency he inherited from the Republicans.

Biggest mess was in the division of employment security, uncovered and cleaned up after the death of Harold G. Hoffman who headed it for the GOP.

Corruption aside, the department was steeped in inefficiency. The central office was using manual methods in a machine age. Employees were officious, treated the jobless as charity seekers.

The result: Only 72 percent of claims were being paid within the conventional 2 weeks after they were filed; there was a backlog of 88,000 unpaid claims; the jobless had to wait 6 to 12 weeks for their benefits; the division received 25 to 40 letters of complaint a week.

Holderman mechanized the division, reorganized personnel and procedures.

The result: 94 percent of all claims are now paid within the first 2 weeks of unemployment, one of the best records in the Nation, he says; claimants are treated with

courtesy; the flood of complaints has stopped.

In the workmen's compensation division Holderman found a backlog of 12,000 cases; he has cut it down to 9,000. That's not as bad as it sounds, he points out. Because of legally fixed automatic waiting periods, the backlog will never drop below 7,000.

Holderman also found that more than half of the State's medical examiners were on insurance company payrolls, too. He quickly laid the law down—cut private payroll ties or resign. Four doctors left; the rest severed their connections with the insurance companies.

Under the Republicans there was only token enforcement of safety and health codes. Holderman stepped up enforcement and in the course of this campaign 6 firms were indicted for violations. Another result: Compensable accidents have been cut by 3,000 with a saving of $2 million in insurance costs to employers.

Holderman has also taken steps to boost minimum wages and shorten work hours under regulations pertaining to women and minors. Most wage codes ranged between 26½ cents and 60 cents an hour when he took over. He has signed wage determinations lifting the restaurant industry's minimum to 53 cents to $1 an hour from previous standards of 26½ cents to 53 cents an hour.

In the mercantile field, he signed an order fixing a $1 minimum for retail and wholesale workers instead of the prevailing 55 cents to 60 cents floor; this before there was a $1 Federal minimum wage. He also has a program under way to reduce the workweek for women and minors, now as high as 48 hours, to 40 over a 1½- to 2-year period.

It hasn't been all cheers for Holderman, he admits. There have been jeers, too. Significantly, though, they come largely from employers' groups and the GOP. For one thing, there are 10 legal suits on file blocking his wage and hour determinations. Also, the Republican-dominated legislature, which opposed his appointment, keeps throwing up obstacles.

It refuses to enlarge his Department's budget. As a result, Holderman is unable to provide new services to workers.'

However, he's not frustrated. Even without new services, workers stand to gain a great deal from a sympathetic administration ,and that's what they're getting from Holderman. In a nutshell, New Jersey's labor laws had been about one-third effective; they're much nearer to par now, he says.

One important factor, Holderman points out, is that Governor Meyner has given him a free hand and has not allowed politics to interfere.

"I'm aware that other labor people who have entered government service have shifted their allegiance from their trade unions to the political party which appointed them," he says. "I have not and I will not."

"While I accept my responsibilities in respect to helping the Democratic Party progress and prosper, my primary responsibility will always be to the workers."

New England Flood-Control Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as the 2d session of the 84th Congress comes to an end, I would like to just take a moment of your time to express my personal thanks and the deep appreciation of my constituents in the Second Massachusetts District, and of all of the citizens of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the New England region, for your generosity during this session in appropriating large and urgently needed sums for New England flood-control projects.

My distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman PHILBIN, who was the chairman of the Massachusetts congressional delegation committee on flood prevention and relief, has already summarized for your information just what these flood-control appropriations will do for our region in preventing disasters that we experienced last August and October.

Those disasters underscored the need for adequate flood-control projects in New England, and this body responded to our urgent requests by appropriating the largest sum ever approved in any one calendar year for our region, $34,436,000 in President Eisenhower's urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and $22 million for flood-control and water resource development programs in the public works appropriation bill. Also, congressional authorization of the Littleville Dam in western Massachusetts will speed up the planning and construction of this vital project. We also appreciate your adoption of a flood-insurance program backed by the Federal Government.

The Correlation of Duties and Rights Under Our Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KEAN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins, a resident of Maplewood, in my congressional district, before the annual meeting of the New Jersey State Bar Association in Atlantic City on May 11, 1956:

THE CORRELATION OF DUTIES AND RIGHTS UNDER OUR CONSTITUTION

In asking me to talk to you about the correlation of rights and duties under the Constitution, your chairman has posed the problem which is before us every day in the enforcement of our internal security laws.

The problem has been posed acutely for us by the threat of international communism which for the first time in our history has raised a serious threat to the constitutional form of government under which we live. Responding to that threat, the Congress has enacted laws specifically designed to counter subversion. In so doing, it has necessarily raised fundamental issues of the rights and duties which we have under the Constitution.

Few of us who have made any study of the basic teachings of international communism and of the actions taken to put these teachings into practice have any doubts of the aims and purposes of communism. It would seem unnecessary to belabor these aims and purposes here today were it not for the tactics of the Communists in attempting to conceal their real purposes, and the success they have had in this attempt.

Communism in this country has undergone several distinct periods since the establishment of a Communist Party in this country in 1919. Its first few years were marked by internal dissensions and it was not until the 1930's and the adoption of the so-called "united front" tactic that the Communists began to make headway. Through the guise of front organizations and through infiltration into strategic areas of American life, the Communists attained such strength that it was possible to estimate that for every Communist Party member there were at least 10 others ready to do his bidding. The Communist tactic of infiltration reached its highest point in the years immediately after the end of the war.

From about the time of the outbreak of the Korean war and the Supreme Court affirmance of the first conviction of Communist leaders under the Smith Act, the Communists operated largely through the underground. In the past year, however, we have seen them emerging from the underground, cloaking themselves in the mantle of peace lovers and attempting to portray the Communist Party as a normal American political party.

The present tactics of the Communists in this regard were described to a congressional committee recently by a man who is in a position to know, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, in the following language:

"Significant is the fact that the party proposes during the coming year to tactically exploit the Geneva Four-Power Conference with a background effort to defeat the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Smith Act, and other anti-Communist legislation.

"The party has set aside a fund to conduct an intensive crusade which will last 4 to 6 months to achieve this objective. Their campaign is intended to involve legal maneuvers, acquiring eminent counsel to defend the party and its leaders, and the use of various petitions, forums, mass meetings, radio broadcasts, and any media that can assist the party in its propaganda efforts. Their tactics will be concealed and will emerge through Communist-front organizations and through so-called liberal groups which they are able to infiltrate and interest in their behalf."

Although the Communist Party today is small in numbers, this new tactic is being exploited in an effort to win adherents to the point of view that advocacy of force and violence to overthrow our Government was but a horrible nightmare inflicted upon unwilling Communists by the treacherous Stalin. To quote again from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"They contend that the Communist Party is a political party just like the Republican and Democratic Parties and not a conspiracy designed to overthrow the United States Government by force and violence."

Khrushchev and his so-called collective leadership are being credited with the abandonment of force and violence and the attendant evils of dictatorship. And we are asked to believe that Communists no longer constitute a threat to our security.

By this tactic I can assure you that they are becoming an even greater threat. Anyone who has studied Khrushchev's long harangue to the so-called World Congress of Communists in Moscow last February knows that he has reaffirmed the basic Communist principles of force and violence. Speaking here in Atlantic City the other day, the Attorney General quoted from Khrushchev's remarks to show that there has been no deviation from the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

Let us look for a moment at some of these quotes. Obviously referring to the United States, Khrushchev stated that:

"There is not a shadow of doubt that for a number of capitalist countries the overthrow of the bourgeois dictatorship by force and the connected sharp aggravation of the class struggle is inevitable."

Certainly, that does not sound like a new party line. In another part of his speech Khrushchev reiterates that in countries where capitalism is strong, the serious resistance of what he calls the reactionary forces is inevitable, and he adds:

"There the transition to socialism will proceed amid conditions of an acute revolutionary struggle."

Those of us charged with internal security responsibilities have no doubt what those words mean, and I can assure you that we will not for a moment relax in the discharge of our responsibilities to enforce the laws which the Congress has given to bring to justice those who are dedicated to destroy us and our constitutional system of government.

In the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, the right of a government to maintain its existence—self-preservation—is the most pervasive aspect of sovereignty. This responsibility—this duty—is one we have sworn to perform and it is one we shall continue to perform.

We are proud of our record of accomplishment in the Department of Justice, not just because we are aware that our program or prosecutions has riddled the leadership of the Communist Party and diverted its resources from the accomplishment of their objectives, but also because we have been able to do so without deviating from our constitutional precepts and from the freedoms which they guarantee.

Security would mean little if it did not serve to preserve our freedoms. That is the only reason for the existence of security measures. It is the Government's duty to see that each and every one of our citizens, regardless of his race, creed, color, or political belief, is accorded the rights preserved to us by the Constitution. Chief Justice Earl Warren, writing a few months ago on this problem, said:

"The struggle between communism and freedom, whether hot, cold, or lukewarm, extends not only along the physical frontiers of our civilization, but also into its mind and soul, inevitably straining the fabric of all our institutions, the law included. Our legal system is woven around the freedom and dignity of the individual. A Communist state ignores these values. Ours is the difficult task of defending and strengthening these values while also pursuing a goal that sometimes appears to be in conflict with them—namely, the physical security of our Nation."

The Chief Justice in those words has posed for us what Justice Cardozo has called one of the paradoxes of legal science as old as the law itself, that is, the struggle between freedom and security.

Freedom, in the words of President Eisenhower, is not only a precious but also a complex privilege. He has described it as the most generous way of life known to man. It permits and encourages differences of opinion and infinite varieties of sentiment and attitude, placing its faith in the ultimate ability of the people to think clearly, to choose wisely, to act firmly and compassionately. The defense of freedom, he said, requires, first of all, a respect for freedom, and respect for freedom demands that we not allow those who are dedicated to its ultimate destruction to use it as a privileged sanctuary from which to carry on subversion of the Government. All of us, the President has said—citizens, jurists, officials—must remember that the Bill of Rights contains no grant of privilege for a group of people to join together to destroy the Bill of Rights.

As members of the legal profession we are all acutely aware of the rights and privileges guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights. Most of us are in agreement, I feel sure, with the words of Chief Justice Vinson, relating to these rights and privileges when he says that nothing is more certain in modern society than there are no absolutes; that a name, a phrase, a standard, has meaning only when associated with the considerations which gave birth to the nomenclature. You are all familiar with the words of Justice Holmes that the most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic. One of our greatest Chief Justices, Charles Evans Hughes, summed this up when he said:

"Civil liberties as guaranteed by the Constitution imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses."

To all of us these would seem to be obvious truths to which we would all subscribe, yet lately there has been asserted the principle that rights of the individual are unlimited. Embraced in this idea and without any legal authority therefor is the thought that teaching and advocating the forcible overthrow of our constitutional form of government is protected by the first amendment. While paying lipservice to these quotations I have cited to you, the advocates of this principle refuse to recognize the superior right of a nation to be protected against conspirators who would overthrow the Government by force and violence. In short, they deny what Mr. Justice Frankfurter has called the sovereign right of every government to self-preservation. They further charge that we are prosecuting Communists for their ideas and their thoughts. Nothing is farther from the truth.

More than 100 Communist Party leaders have been convicted in this country in the past few years for violation of the Smith Act. The Smith Act makes it a crime to teach and advocate the necessity and duty of forcibly overthrowing our Government. It also makes it a crime to be a member of an organization which advocates and teaches the duty and necessity of forcibly overthrowing our Government with the knowledge of the aims and purposes of the organization. Most of these Communist leaders have been charged with and convicted of conspiracy.

In the past year we have also indicted and convicted some of the top members of the Communist Party under the membership clause. In connection with this membership clause, let me reiterate what I have just said: That it is not enough to be a member of an organization advocating the forcible overthrow of the Government; the Government must prove that the defendant had knowledge of these aims and purposes.

In each and every Smith Act conspiracy trial the judge has explicitly charged the jury that they must find more than ideas advocating the overthrow of the Government. The jury is charged in each case that in order to convict they must find that the defendants knowingly and willfully conspired to organize and helped to organize the Communist Party as a means or vehicle to advocate and teach the necessity and the duty of overthrowing and destroying the Government of the United States by force and violence; and that they must be satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that the means and methods by which the conspiracy was to be carried out were carried on in furtherance of an object or purpose of the conspiracy.

Judge Medina's charge to the jury in the first Smith Act case in 1949 is an eloquent example of a charge in this type of case. "Books are not on trial here" he said, "nor are you concerned with the philosophical validity of any mere theory."

Later in his charge the judge referred to freedom of speech and freedom of the press as being among the most vital and precious of our liberties which must be preserved unimpaired in all their vigor. He reminded the jury, as the judges in the subsequent Smith Act cases have done since, that the defendants had the right to advocate by peaceful and lawful means any or all changes in the laws and in the Constitution. They had the right to criticize any policy of the Government or any change in our social and economic system. Part of his charge is so significant that I would like to quote again. He said:

"I charge you that if the defendants did no more than pursue peaceful studies and discussions or teaching and advocacy in the realm of ideas, you must acquit them.

"For example, it is not unlawful to conduct in an American college or university a course explaining the philosophical theories set forth in the books which have been placed in evidence by the prosecution, such as the Communist Manifesto, Foundations of Leninism, and so on. Of course, these books are to be found in public libraries and in the libraries of American universities. * * * Do not be led astray by talk about thought control, or putting books on trial. No such issues are before you here."

And later he said:

"I charge you that it is not the abstract doctrine of overthrowing and destroying organized government by unlawful means which is denounced by this law, but the teaching and advocacy of action for the employment of that purpose, by language reasonably and ordinarily calculated to incite persons to such action. Accordingly, you cannot find the defendants or any of them guilty of the crime charged unless you are satisfied beyond a reasonable doubt that they conspired to organize a society, group, and assembly of persons to teach and advocate the overthrow and destruction of the Government of the United States by force and violence * * * by language reasonably and ordinarily calculated to incite persons to such action."

The judge then warned the jury that no requisite intent could be inferred from the open and aboveboard teaching of a course on the principles and implications of communism in an American college or university where everything is open to scrutiny. And that is why, he concluded, in charging the jury that "it is so important for you to weigh with scrupulous care the testimony concerning secret schools, false names, devious ways, general falsification, and so on, all alleged to be in the setting of a huge and disciplined organization, spreading to practically every State of the Union and all the principal cities and industries."

In affirming the conviction which resulted from the case that I have just quoted to you, the Supreme Court held that words can be the instruments by which crimes are committed. Where they are, action must be taken as the court suggests. In that decision the Supreme Court said that if a government is aware that a group aiming at its overthrow is attempting to indoctrinate its members and commit them to a course whereby they will strike when the leaders feel the circumstances permit, action by the Government is required. In dealing with the commission of crime in this field, scrupulous care must be exercised to insure that there is no conscious or unconscious abridgement of the first amendment right to freedom of speech but, in the words of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, "free speech is subject to prohibition of those abuses of expression which a civilized society may forbid."

Compare for a moment the trials which Communists are afforded in this country with the kind of trials afforded to defendants under a Communist state. Let us look at the rights and privileges of a defendant under the Communist system. One of the best known and most publicized of recent Communist trials is that of Beria, former head of the Soviet secret police. This trial must be presumed to represent what the

present collective leadership of the Soviet Union believes in rather than a trial that can be ascribed to Stalin because Beria, you will recall, was arrested and brought to trial by the present leaders of the Soviet Union who are attempting to ascribe to Stalin all of the evils which we associate with the Communist state.

Beria was indicted on December 17, 1953. His trial commenced December 18. He was found guilty and sentenced to death on December 23. His execution was announced that same day. Although we do not have a complete transcript of the record in his case, Pravda did publish the printed records of the indictment, the judgment and the sentence of the court. The case was heard in a closed session under a law which requires that the investigation be concluded in a period of not more than 10 days, that the indictment be presented to the accused 24 hours before the hearing of the case in court, that the accused be denied the benefit of counsel, and that the sentence of the court is final with no petition for mercy allowed.

It is hardly necessary to compare this proceeding with the trial of a Communist in the United States. Nor is it necessary to point out that in the United States they are granted every right that is afforded to a criminal, that they fight their cases from start to finish and fight them vigorously. They are thorough and painstaking in the investigating and evidence-gathering stage. During trial they employ every defense tactic; on appeal they exhaust every argument.

Our Nation today stands foremost among the countries of the world in the zeal and vigor with which it protects the freedom of the individual. It is the soul of our democracy. It is the hope that we hold out to the enslaved peoples throughout the Communist world. We know that everything our country stands for is in direct conflict with communism.

Let is consider for a moment another contrast between our two systems. The Constitution of the United States speaks the voice of the people. The Constitution of the Soviet Union is an edict of the ruling class, the Communist Party. We may change our Constitution lawfully only when the people desire it. The Constitution of Russia, on the other hand, can be changed as often as it suits the convience of the Communist Party to do so regardless of the will of the people.

The Communists use terminology of our system of government. They speak, for example, of representative government. By representative government we mean a system under which we can choose our own candidates, select our own policies and issues. The Communists use those words to speak of an institution of government under which people may vote only for the candidates who have been approved by the Communits Party. To us the ballot is the means by which the people can choose freely among the candidates. To the Communist the ballot is the slate for which the people must vote at the direction of the Communist Party.

Democracy has become on of the favorite words of the Communists. They speak, for example, of people's democracies. By democracy we mean a system where the reservoir of political power is in the hands of the voters. The leaders we select are our servants, not our masters. Under the Soviet system political power is concentrated in the hands of a few who constitute the ruling group of the Communist Party. The officials are the masters, not the servants.

It needs no argument to see that the Communist Party in the United States has been formed in the image of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, that it follows each and every dictate of the Soviet masters, and that it is the instrument of the Soviet Government in this country. The Communists today, as I have said, are attempting once again to play the role of a domestic political party. As J. Egdar Hoover pointed out in recent testimony, the Communist Party is currently streamlining its underground apparatus. Present plans call for a reduction in the size of underground operations with the expectation that Communists will be able to come out into more open activity by reason of the current atmosphere created by the new party line in Moscow and by what they characterize as a growing understanding of communism in this country.

I do not think the American people will be fooled by this kind of specious reasoning. They will recognize the Communist Party for what it is—an integral part of a world apparatus. It is just as much a part of international communism as is the Red army. The Communist Party of the United States, as someone has said, is American only in a geographical sense.

The framers of our Constitution did not envision the Communist conspiracy. Although there is nothing new about espionage or sabotage, warfare by a fifth column, be it a hot or cold war, is a manifestation of the 20th century. The key to our Constitution and our system of government is in the Bill of Rights and the protection or safeguards afforded to the individual, but the framers of the Constitution never intended it to serve as an instrument for the protection of persons operating as agents of a foreign-directed conspiracy. The right of an individual to be protected by his government does not bring with it a correlative right to undermine and destroy the government. This thought was later expressed by Judge Learned Hand when he said that "revolutions are often right" but a "right of revolution" is a contradiction in terms, for a society which acknowledged it could not stop at tolerating conspiracies to overthrow it, but must include their execution.

As lawyers we are part of the judicial system of this country, a system invested with powers to protect the individual from the unauthorized exercise of governmental authority. Our duty is to sustain and strengthen that system of government under law. To sustain that system we have the duty to understand the forces at work to destroy that system.

We have the obligation to study carefully all measures designed to preserve our freedom. We must likewise study the methods and measures used to protect our security. This imposes upon us an obligation to ascertain the facts. Our internal security program has been subjected, as it should be, by the bar and public alike to careful scrutiny. We ask only in examining these measures that you as lawyers seek the facts. You cannot be satisfied with the half-truths and the downright falsehoods which have been spread by some who have attacked our security system. Such is the stuff on which communism thrives.

The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has said that a fearless and independent legal profession, alert to the Machiavellian devices of the Communists, is one of our best lines of defense against this conspiracy. As members of the bar we have a duty to study our institutions of government so that we may speak intelligently of the ideals and methods by which we have undertaken in this country to preserve our rights: the right to speak, the right to go where we will, the right to worship. Ours is a system and a way of life worthy of such a study. We have a duty likewise to be alert to the dangers which threaten those rights.

In our examination of this problem we should always be mindful of these words of President Eisenhower when he said:

"The future of our country belongs to men who know that freedom's fight must be forever relentless, uncompromising, and fair. It belongs to men who—tomorrow—will be ready to press their counterattack into the enemy's darkest haunts—the dark areas of poverty, intolerance, prejudice, social injustice.

"The future belongs to men who know—in their hearts and minds, their souls and very bones—that freedom can be strong."

The Record on the Alaska Mental Health Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have from time to time during the past few months called to the attention of the Members of Congress different phases involved in the struggle to obtain legislation which would provide proper and humane treatment for the mentally ill of Alaska. In summation of this successful struggle I would like now to call to the attention of my colleagues a comprehensive, roundup of the history of the Alaska Mental Health Act as prepared by Dr. Marjorie Shearon, of the Shearon Legislative Service, on this measure. Dr. Shearon has devoted to H. R. 6376 attention and study to a degree which has resulted in her report being of such a caliber that it should receive the careful consideration of every Member of this Congress. I take pleasure in presenting Dr. Shearon's report:

HOPE FOR ALASKA'S MENTALLY ILL

(By Marjorie Shearon, Ph. D., editor, Challenge to Socialism, formerly consultant to the late Senator Robert A. Taft)

THIS IS ALASKA

Alaska is our last frontier and our first line of defense. One-fifth the size of the continental United States, it is a land rich in oil, minerals, and forests. Its coastal waters abound in seal and salmon, which have given the Territory two great industries. Development of these natural resource has barely started. A million new settlers are needed to take up homesteads, to raise cattle, to explore mineral resources, and to expand the oil, fishing, fur, and lumber industries.

Recognizing the strategic importance of Alaska, the United States has already spent $400 million on listening posts in the far North, up to and beyond the Arctic Circle. These constitute the DEW line—distant early warning line—which Air Force Secretary Quarles would now extend through the Aleutian Islands at an additional cost of $68 million. We in the States find further protection in the thousands of members of the armed services stationed in Alaska, for here the United States comes within 45 miles of Russia's Siberia.

Alaska, so dimly known, so long neglected, and so little appreciated, is now of greatest strategic importance. Our very lives—yours and mine—may one day depend on the early information flashed from isolated, advance outposts along the DEW line in Alaska and Canada should Communist planes attempt a surprise attack on the United States across the North Pole.

What sort of country is Alaska? What of its people? Are Alaskans citizens of the United States? Do they fight our wars, pay our taxes, share our joys and sorrows? What is this distant Territory that has come in for such abuse in recent months? Why have

some Americans stateside tried to thwart Alaskan hopes for control of the Territory's mentally ill?

This is Alaska. A wild, undeveloped country like our wonderful West of a century or more ago. But there are important differences. Alaskan cities, though small, are modern, with schools, general hospitals, airfields, railroad stations, electricity, post offices, taxis, bus lines, and chambers of commerce. It is a country where modern civilization abuts on a primeval wilderness.

The University of Alaska, a land-grant college on a 2,250-acre tract at Fairbanks, boasts a new geophysical institute. This million-dollar building provides some of the finest facilities in the world for the study of the Arctic, the stratosphere, and regions beyond.

The climate of Alaska is about like that of Norway, Sweden, Scotland, and Minnesota. Conditions in southern Alaska are comparable to those in our Northern States. Temperatures range from —78° to a maximum of 100° at Fort Yukon on the Arctic Circle. At Anchorage the range is from —36° to 92°.

Alaska's greatest handicap is not her climate, but her lack of statehood. She is a Territory clamoring for the right of self-determination, of self-government. She wishes to handle her own finances, to pass laws governing her own people. She seeks responsibility, not dependency. Alaska is neither a poor relation, nor a helpless child needing a guardian. She is a vast Territory of latent wealth which has already yielded gold, platinum, copper, coal, and silver. Timber, waterpower, fur animals of the sea and of the land, fish, agriculture, trapping, fur farming, oil—sources of wealth barely tapped, awaiting development. This is Alaska.

We stateside find it hard to picture Alaska. Accustomed as we are to cities of 100,000 to 7 or 8 million, we cannot easily imagine a country of over half a million square miles which does not have a single city with as many as 60,000 persons. Alaska's largest city, Anchorage, in 1955 had a population of 27,000 in the city, 32,000 in the metropolitan area. It compared favorably in size with Marion, Ind., Tucson, Ariz., as it was in 1940, and Hillsboro, Tex.

On July 1, 1955, the civilian population of Alaska was only 168,000. On July 1, 1954, the combined civilian and military population was 208,000—a little less than the population of Syracuse, N. Y. Indeed, the territorial population is so sparse that if it were uniformly spread over the entire surface of 375,290,000 acres, every family of 4 would have 7,217 acres, or more than 11 square miles in which to roam. Looking at it another way, we may compare the density of population in the Nation's Capital in 1950, which was 13,150.5 persons per square mile, with that in Alaska, where it was 1 person per 5 square miles.

Many Alaskans are aborigines—Eskimos, Aleuts, and Indians—numbering about 33,000 or about one-fifth the civilian population. Alaskans are citizens of the United States, enjoying some of the privileges of citizenship and sharing in all the responsibilities. They pay income taxes and serve in the Armed Forces. Their Governor, however, is not elected by the Alaskans, but appointed by the President. And their Delegate to Congress cannot vote.

Some of Alaska's problems stem from sparsity of population, inadequate road systems, lack of land transportation between towns and villages, the short growing season, and the low temperatures in winter. The presence of permafrost, permanently frozen ground, has accounted for much of the difficulty encountered in building roads, railroads, and houses. Permafrost was found to a depth of 1,000 feet near Barrow, Alaska, when the Navy was drilling for oil. However, Alaska is not alone in having to face this problem. One-fifth the land surface of the world is underlain by permafrost. It is present in one-half of Russia.

There are some 42 villages, cities, and districts in Alaska, but no counties. Of this number, 13 are villages with populations of less than 500, while 10 villages and towns have populations of 500 to 999. Of the 42 localities, 32 have populations of less than 2,500. In 1950, Fairbanks had 5,771; Juneau, the capital, 5,596; Ketchikan, 5,305; and Nome, 1,876.

The principal means of transportation between the larger cities is by plane. Daily flights go out from the principal communities to scores of smaller places, carrying to them passengers, mail, and freight. Once a week a plane flies from Anchorage to the Pribilof Islands, center of the fur seal area, via the Aleutians.

Alaska, presently, has only 560.1 miles of railroads. There is one main highway, the Alaska Highway, constructed as a military necessity by the United States and Canada at a cost of $113,824,220. Running from Dawson Creek, British Columbia, to Fairbanks, Alaska, through the very heart of the peninsula, it is 1,523 miles long.

Vast areas are still without roads or plane service. Many of the smaller villages are isolated and present health, sanitation, and other problems because of their inaccessibility. Native settlements of 50 to 100 persons are often without any medical facilities, physicians, nurses, welfare agencies, courts, or jails.

So extensive is this Territory that when a map of Alaska is placed on a map of the continental United States, the Aleutian Islands touch the coast of California, while the southern Alaskan Pacific Mountain region reaches to the eastern shores of South Carolina.

Once called Seward's Folly and American Siberia, Alaska is now an invaluable frontier for young pioneers and the guardian of the international boundary between the United States and the U. S. S. R.

Russian interest in the Arctic North America led to the discovery of Alaska. Early in the 18th century Peter the Great commissioned a Danish sea captain, Vitus Bering, to explore the northwest coast of the American continent. In 1728 he discovered the passage now know as Bering Strait. The Russians made their first settlement on Kodiak Island in 1784. Later they explored all the western coast of this arctic part of the North American Continent.

On the strength of the two voyages by Bering, Russia laid claim to this northwestern portion of the New World. She warred on the Indians and Aleuts; her fur traders depleted the country of furs. In 1799 they created a trading corporation, the Russian-American Company. Under a 20-year concession, renewed periodically, the Russians assumed absolute domination in Alaska. They established a capital at Kodiak which they later moved to Sitka on Baranof Island, south of Juneau.

A century ago, during the Crimean War, the Russians became worried about the possibility that England might try to seize this northwestern tip of the American Continent. In 1855 Russia made overtures to the United States for the sale of Alaska, but nothing came of the proposals for more than a decade. Finally, on October 18, 1867, after many delays, the sale was consummated by treaty and a congressional appropriation was made. Secretary of State William H. Seward signed the treaty for the United States. Thus we acquired a fabulously rich territory of 586,400 square miles (375,296,000 acres) for $7,200,000, or a little less than 2 cents an acre.

For several decades the United States paid little attention to Alaska. There was scant appreciation of the value of the natural resources nor was there any immediate attempt to develop them. Alaskan affairs were administered first by the Army of the United States, then by the Treasury, and later by the Navy.

It was not until May 17, 1884, that the Congress of the United States provided for appointment of a governor and the organization of a government in the District of Alaska. For the first time the Secretary of the Interior was empowered to enforce United States law relating to education and to mining claims.

Under an act of May 7, 1906, Alaska was empowered to elect a nonvoting delegate to Congress, and by the organic act of August 24, 1912, the incorporated Territory of Alaska was created with a bicameral legislature.

ALASKA'S MENTALLY ILL

It was in this early period, before Alaska was incorporated as a Territory, that Congress enacted a law (June 6, 1900) providing that the Governor of Alaska should contract for the care and custody of persons adjudged insane in the district of Alaska. Five years later the powers of the Governor were transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

At first there was only 1 insane person to be sent to the States. For several years there were only 4 or 5 and these were cared for in Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Then, in 1904, a private hospital, the Morningside Hospital, in Portland, Oreg., obtained the contract to care for Alaska's mentally ill. That arrangement has persisted for over 50 years. Recently there have been some 345 Alaskans at Morningside Hospital. The proprietor has taken a yearly fee of $30,000, his son $12,000. Over and above that the profit has been $69,000 a year. An audit demanded by Representative GREEN of Oregon this year revealed large-scale padding of the hospital's items of expense resulting in a much larger profit. The Federal Government has paid $184 a month per patient, the annual expense being about $800,000, not counting transportation charges to and from Oregon.

The care at Morningside Hospital has been primarily custodial. There is some therapy, but the hospital has had only one psychiatrist, a physician who had not passed his board examinations. Nursing personnel has been quite inadequate. Furthermore, 115 of the 345 patients, or one-third, are mentally retarded and should not be in a hospital for mental illness.

About 40 or 45 years ago Congress authorized the building of 2 hospitals for the insane in Alaska, 1 at Nome, the other at Fairbanks. The Nome hospital was never built, since funds were not appropriated. At Fairbanks a small, 2-story frame detention house was constructed in lieu of a hospital. The building deteriorated so badly that it was finally closed as unfit for human use. About 25 years ago it burned down and was never replaced. Thus, there is not now and never has been a hospital for mental illness in the Territory of Alaska.

The only other provisions which were ever made were the reservation of 18 beds in a general hospital in Anchorage. This hospital is under the Alaska Native Service which, unfortunately, does not have jurisdiction over the care of the mentally ill, not even the natives. Such jurisdiction has been vested exclusively in the Department of the Interior. Consequently, because of Federal prohibitions, those 18 beds, which might have been used for acute cases of mental illness, have remained vacant or have been used for other types of patients.

Under the law as it has stood, the commitment procedures are those which were enacted 50 years ago by our Congress (33 Stat. 619; 48 U. S. C. 47). They were not out of line with similar procedures in the States at that time. But in the light of ad-

vances in psychiatry during the past half century, the old law seems barbaric and cruel. Under it, a person accused of being insane is subjected to procedures similar to those of a criminal trial. It has been impossible for Alaskans to improve the old law because when the Territory was created under the Organic Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512; found in 48 U. S. C. 24), the territorial legislature was expressly forbidden from changing the then existing law respecting commitment of the insane of Alaska.

The law in the Territory, unchanged through the years, provided that a person who was charged with being insane should be thrown in jail to await a jury trial. The jury consisted of six residents, possibly trappers, miners, fishermen. A medical diagnosis might be made, but was not required. Persons were often adjudged insane without having a medical opinion. After the trial, if the person was adjudged guilty of insanity he was returned to jail to await the long trip to Portland, Oreg., up to as much as 2,000 miles away. He might be kept in jail for weeks or months uhtil enough prisoners were assembled to warrant the trip to the States by a United States marshal. Then the insane person might be forced to travel with murderers and other criminals.

Young children adjudged insane were given the same treatment. They might be mentally retarded or epileptic; they might have cerebral palsy. As the law stood, if a lay jury decided the child was insane, it was sent to Oregon. Idiots were classed as insane. An extreme case was that of a 17-day old baby which was adjudged insane and sent to Portland, Oreg.

CONGRESS HELD OUT HOPE

Since the Federal law forbade Alaskans to improve the statutes respecting insane persons in the Territory, the Congress sought to divest the Government of its authority by transferring it back to Alaska where it was originally. All States and Hawaii are empowered to pass mental-health laws for the insane within their boundaries. Alaska alone has been prohibited by law from legislating for its mentally ill. For 50 years this prohibition has stood. Efforts have been underway for 8 years to correct this unfair situation. To this end several professional studies were made in Alaska by competent authorities.

In 1948 the American Medical Association made the first field study of mental health in Alaska. The following year the Department of the Interior appointed a committee headed by the distinguished psychiatrist, Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of the largest and oldest Federal hospital for mental disease in the United States, St. Elizabeths in Washington, D. C.

This committee spent 3 weeks in Alaska, holding public hearings at Juneau, Sitka, Palmer, Anchorage, Nome, and Fairbanks. On February 10, 1950, they submitted a report recommending:

1. Development of a comprehensive mental-health program under the Territorial Department of Health;

2. Emergency treatment and observation centers in most of the general hospitals to be operated by the Territorial Department of Health;

3. Drafting of model legislation for Alaska; and

4. Amalgamation and unified direction of all public mental-health services under the Territorial Department of Health.

While these field surveys were being made in Alaska, the Council of State Governments was expressing interest in mental-health programs in all States. In June 1949, the governors' conference directed the council to make a comprehensive, factual study of the activities and facilities of the several States in the field of mental health and to submit a report at the 1950 governors' conference. Leaders in public welfare and psychiatry served as a technical advisory committee to the council. Representatives from State hospitals, the American Public Welfare Association, and the National Committee for Mental Hygiene served on the advisory committee along with such eminent psychiatrists as Dr. Winfred Overholser, Superintendent of St. Elizabeths, Dr. Karl Menninger, and Dr. George S. Stevenson.

The Council in 1950 produced a most helpful volume entitled: "The Mental Health Programs of the 48 States." This provides a wealth of comparative material on admission laws, financing of institutions, care and treatment of patients, and related matters.

While the State governments were working on this project, a legislative drafting project was being undertaken at the request of the Advisory Mental Health Council. After the President had approved the National Mental Health Act on July 3, 1946, and the National Institute of Mental Health had been established in the United States Public Health Service, many States had asked for assistance in revising their outmoded mental health laws.

As a result of this increased interest in State mental health laws, the Federal Security Agency early in 1949 undertook to write a model draft for a State law. The first draft act governing hospitalization of the mentally ill was completed in 1950 and revised in September 1952. It represented the work of attorneys inside and outside the Government aided by Dr. Winfred Overholser and Dr. R. H. Felix, Director of the National Institute of Mental Health. Referring to this draft act, Dr. George S. Stevenson, Medical Director of the National Association for Mental Health, stated:

"The provisions of this draft act can be sincerely recommended as a forward step in our handling of the mentally ill and in the maximum utilization of our mental hospital facilities."

In 1952 the Governor of Alaska requested a further study of mental health conditions in the Territory. Former Surgeon General Thomas Parran and some 18 experts (sanitary engineers, physicians, an anthropologist, a biometrician, etc.) made an exhaustive study of social and economic conditions and of health problems in Alaska. Their report was published in 1954.

On the basis of the several recommendations made by the professional groups which had studied the mental health problems of Alaska Delegate E. L. BARTLETT introduced H. R. 610 on January 5, 1955, and Representative EDITH GREEN, of Oregon, introduced an identical bill, H. R. 5092, on March 21, 1955, These bills dealt with commitment procedures and other provisions for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill with a view to establishing "an integrated, modern program for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of residents of and persons in Alaska who are mentally ill."

Mr. BARTLETT and Mrs. GREEN also introduced two additional bills, H. R. 3991 and H. R. 5093, respectively, on February 14, 1955, and March 21, 1955. These identical bills provided "for the location, equipment, and operation of a hospital for the mentally ill of Alaska." An open-end appropriation was authorized for the purpose of constructing a hospital and related buildings, "together with such other in- or out-patient mental health facilities as may be required for the establishment and operation of a comprehensive mental health program in Alaska." These 4 bills, 2 by Delegate BARTLETT and 2 identical ones by Mrs. GREEN, would have served to provide funds for the care of Alaska's mentally ill and the construction of hospital and other facilities in the Territory. Commitment procedures were set forth based on the provisions in the Draft Act of 1952.

These bills would have transferred authority from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. All expenses for construction and subsequent administration would have been the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Since the bills related only to the Territory of Alaska and not to the people of the United States in general, they were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the House. The Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, headed by Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, of New York, held hearings April 21, May 18, June 15, and July 7 and 8, 1955. There were no opposition witnesses.

After the first day of hearings representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated they would prepare rather extensive amendments to the two pairs of bills. This they did, producing a single bill, H. R. 6334, which Representative O'BRIEN, as subcommittee chairman, introduced on May 18, 1955.

In the light of subsequent violent accusations regarding plots of the HEW Department and of the Public Health Service to enter into some sort of world plot for the incarceration of United States citizens from the States in an Alaskan concentration camp, it is interesting to note that Mr. O'BRIEN'S bill, drafted by administration officials, specifically divested the Federal Government of all future control of Alaska's mentally ill.

The O'Brien bill was a great improvement over the prior bills inasmuch as it made more adequate and specific provision for funds for construction and for a land grant that would provide future sums for administration. Commitment procedures were carefully spelled out. Based on the Draft Act, they were modified in the light of conditions existing in Alaska. The draftsmen recognized that any realistic bill would have to take account of the sparsity of population in the Territory, the paucity of professional personnel while the program was being developed, and the difficulties of transportation. Critics of the mental health bill have given little or no thought to these practical problems which will beset the Alaskans for some years.

H. R. 6334 was introduced into the hearings on May 18, 1955, by Mr. O'Brien. Witnesses from the Department of the Interior and from the HEW Department made it abundantly clear that they were trying to turn over to Alaska the entire responsibility for care of the Territory's mentally ill. Their willingness to accept language changes in the bill and their obvious wish to be helpful to the Alaskans precluded any possibility of their being involved in a diabolical plot, as later charged.

Governor Heintzleman, of Alaska, stated on May 18, 1955: "I want to say that I heartily endorse the proposed bill by the Department of the Interior, drafted by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as a substitute for H. R. 610 and its associated bills."

On June 15, 1955, H. R. 6376 was introduced into the House hearings. This is the same as the O'Brien (administration) bill. There was general belief that an Alaskan mental health bill, which would ultimately void the contract of the Morningside Hospital in Portland, Oreg., would have to be sponsored by a Representative from Oregon if it were to be passed. This is the bill that was finally enacted by the House on January 18, 1956, with strong bipartisan support. Since the bill was not controversial in the House, it was passed by voice vote, as is customary in such cases. A rollcall vote in the House takes at least 20 minutes and is used only on demand in the case of hotly contested measures.

After conclusion of the hearings in July 1955, the House Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs went to Alaska where they spent 3 weeks, visiting 22 cities. They took testimony on many of Alaska's problems, including mental health. Alaskans were

unanimous in approving H. R. 6376 and in urging its enactment. There was also much testimony on public lands and on the great naval oil reserve (Pet. 4) in northern Alaska which had been set aside under Public Land Order 82 during World War II. Though no one thought about it at the time, this oil reserve was to figure in the final opposition to H. R. 6376 as it was reaching the end of its hectic history in the Senate.

As the bill passed the House it:

(1) Transferred from the Federal Government to the Territory of Alaska basic responsibility and authority for the hospitalization, care, and treatment of the mentally ill of Alaska;

(2) Modernized the procedures for such hospitalization (including commitment), care, and treatment and authorized the Territory to modify or supersede such procedures;

(3) Authorized an appropriation of $6,500,000 to enable the Surgeon General to make payments to the Territory of Alaska as the total contribution of the Federal Government to be used in the construction of hospital and other facilities in Alaska needed for the carrying out of a comprehensive program for the mentally ill of Alaska;

(4) Provided for a 10-year program of grants-in-aid to the Territory, in a total amount of $6 million, to enable the Territory gradually to assume the full operating costs of the program; and

(5) Provided for a land grant of 1 million acres to the Territory to assist in placing the program on a firm long-term basis.

In the House, debate was friendly, for there was no significant opposition. Representative MILLER, Republican physician from Nebraska, had already proposed in committee an amendment to increase the land grant from 500,000 acres to 1 million, for he feared the smaller amount would be inadequate to provide funds for the continuing costs of a long-term mental health program. The House approved the amendment and the bill was passed by a voice vote.

On the same day, January 18, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, a minority member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced S. 2973 which was the same as the House-passed H. R. 6376. It contained the same money grants and the million-acre land grant and omitted the criminal procedures. Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, Democrat, of Washington, had previously introduced S. 2518 on July 15, 1955. This was the draft which had been prepared by the Department of the Interior. The two Senate bills and H. R. 6376 were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, headed by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat, of Montana. There they were assigned to the Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs consisting of HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington, chairman; RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana; THOMAS H. KUCHEL, California; WILLIAM R. LAIRD III, West Virginia; BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona.

Hearings were held on the 3 bills on February 20 and 21 and on March 5, 1956.

A "NOISY SMALL MINORITY"

Since the whole plan to transfer authority for the care and treatment of Alaska's mentally ill from the Congress to the Territory had been under discussion for 7 or 8 years and since it was the Delegate from Alaska, E. L. BARTLETT, who had introduced the basic bills in the House, no one anticipated any last-minute opposition to these humane proposals.

Furthermore, the legislation had proceeded at a leisurely pace. House hearings had extended from late April to early July 1955. The House Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, headed by Representative LEO W. O'BRIEN, Democrat, New York, had held prolonged hearings in Alaska in September 1955, where there was universal support for the legislation. (Hearings, in 3 parts, comprised 871 pages.) From April 1955, until the bill passed the House on January 18, 1956, there had been no opposition from any quarter.

The Departments of Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare had been strongly in favor of divesting the Federal Government of its authority over Alaska's mentally ill and of transferring that authority to the Territory. All expert testimony had favored the proposals, including the commitment procedures. Support for H. R. 6376 had been bipartisan in the House.

Senator JACKSON had not even expected to hold subcommittee hearings on H. R. 6376 because of widespread approval of the bill and also because of the adequacy of the House hearings. However, suddenly a wild, irrational furor arose in California. As Representative O'BRIEN testified on March 5, 1956, before the Senate subcommittee:

"There has been, and I use the words advisedly, a 'noisy, small minority' which have conjured up things in this bill which just do not exist."

Mr. O'BRIEN, stating that he had not intended to testify, pointed out that testimony had been given before the Senate Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs which, in effect, "charged that a small group of men and women behind closed doors, concocted a sort of witches brew, a dark and fearsome thing which we suddenly set loose upon the American people.

"It was that it was all part of a plot close to treason under which we planned to send political prisoners to 'Siberia,' United States of America. * * *

"I say to you, Mr. Chairman, if this is a vicious bill, if this is a plot against the people of this country who might disagree with our political thinking, then many stand indicted in connection with that plot." Those so indicted are the House of Representatives, the administration, and the Departments of Interior and Health, Education, and Welfare which drafted the bill.

Senator JACKSON said to Mr. O'BRIEN:

"Frankly, we thought you had done such a good job over there that we would not need any further testimony over here."

Despite this general feeling in Congress, in both parties, that H. R. 6376 was an admirable bill, sudden opposition developed. Like an unheralded tornado, an outcry arose in California in January 1956, whirling across the country to strike the astonished Members of Congress and the White House staff. Nothing quite like it has ever happened before.

A handful of patently ill-informed housewives in California became greatly disturbed shortly before H. R. 6376 passed the House. They had previously been fighting mental health bills in California. Now they centered their attack on H. R. 6376. Drawing upon their weird imaginations, they conjured up visions of an Alaskan Siberia for political dissidents in the United States. One woman, Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland, of Van Nuys, Calif., wrote a lurid description of H. R. 6376 early in January 1956, entitled "Siberia, U. S. A." Although Mrs. Burkeland's analysis of the bill was farfetched and imaginative, it made a great appeal in limited quarters.

At about the same time, a group of some one hundred housewives, known as the American Public Relations Forum, Inc., headed by Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president, took up the hue and cry against H. R. 6376. This group had sounded a warning against the bill late in 1955. But it was the Burkeland release that caught popular fancy in a few noisy quarters. This fantastic and untrue statement was mimeographed by the California State Chapter of the Minute Women of the U. S. A., Inc., sometime in January 1956. They mailed it out far and wide through the Nation.

On January 24 the Santa Ana Register, California, one of the papers in the R. C. Hoiles Syndicate, published an editorial headed "Now Siberia, U. S. A." It was apparently a rewrite of the Burkeland release, although Mrs. Burkeland herself has refused to answer questions on the subject.

Then, in rapid-fire succession, several individuals and organizations took up the "Siberia" slogan, amplifying it as suited their fancies. On February 2, the Concordians, Box 16, Toluca Lake Station, North Hollywood, published a five-page bulletin on mental health legislation with special reference to H. R. 6376. It gave a false analysis of the bill and ended with: "Is this to be the Siberia of the United States?"

A few days later, Dr. George A. Snyder, of Hollywood, issued a vitriolic letter addressed to all Members of Congress asking for a "complete investigation of the Alaska Mental Health Act, H. R. 6376, for elements of treason against the American people behind the front of the mental health program."

In rapid succession across the country the Burkeland-Snyder charges were repeated. On February 15 Mervin K. Hart in New York City published an Economic Council Letter (No. 377) in which he spoke of the possibility of railroading dissenters to Alaskan mental institutions.

As these scare bulletins appeared in different parts of the country they betrayed a common origin, for all referred to the railroading of persons from the States to Alaska and made horrified mention of "Alaskan Siberia" or "Siberia, U. S. A." Next to pick up the slogans was Dan Smoot, of Dallas, Tex., who published a special issue on mental health on February 17. He spoke well of the well-organized drive for mental-health legislation most of which would permit seizure, incarceration, and treatment of mentally ill people without trial by jury and without the due process of law prescribed by our Constitution.

In a flippant, meaningless statement, Dan Smoot, referring to the definition of mental illness given in H. R. 6376, said: "* * * a mentally ill person is defined as a mentally ill person." Mrs. Burkeland had been even more flippant, for she had said the definition of mental illness was so broad "as to include anything from dandruff, headaches, toothaches, or fallen arches." The Burkeland phraseology was lifted by the Greater Nebraskan magazine, published in Omaha by George J. Thomas, executive director of the Congress of Freedom at the same Omaha address. A variant of the Burkeland remarks turned up later when Dr. L. D. Sprague, of Tucson, Ariz., stated that the definition could cover "anything from falling hair to ingrown toenails." The Sprague variant was then sent out nationwide by the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons in their March newsletter.

The Burkeland-Dan Smoot criticisms of H. R. 6376, made prior to the Senate hearings in late February, were mailed to papers and organizations from coast to coast. They were rehashed and embellished. Individuals and extreme rightist groups initiated secondary mailings of the original "Siberia, U. S. A.," or the Smoot mental health release, or of the rewrites.

These are the people referred to by Representative O'BRIEN as a noisy, small minority. It seems clear beyond any reasonable doubt that not one of these alarmists had studied the legislative history of the Alaska mental health bill. At that time—late January and early February—none of the House hearings was available in print. Five volumes (1,228 printed pages) appeared during March and April. Up to that time they had been available only in transcript form in Washington.

There is no evidence that Mrs. Stefanie Williams or Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland or Dan Smoot came to Washington to study the legislative history of the bill or to acquaint themselves with the published research material and reports on Alaska mental health

before writing their opposition releases. It is impossible to interpret any bill without attending the hearings or studying them in printed form. Federal attorneys and members of the Supreme Court rely heavily on the legislative history of any act, but Mrs. Burkeland, Mrs. Williams, and Dan Smoot presumably were able to form an opinion without this essential background information.

Thus, this entire furor over the bill can be traced back to the fanciful interpretations placed upon it by two California women who publicly admitted their professional incompetence to form an opinion about Federal legislation. On February 20, 1956, when Mrs. Williams was testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Territorial Affairs, she stated: "I am only a housewife." This was her explanation for not knowing that "State" is customarily defined in Federal and State laws as meaning "any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." (Sometimes Puerto Rico and one or more of the Territories is omitted in a particular definition.)

In the tortured mind of Mrs. Williams, inclusion of the customary definition of "State" in H. R. 6376 meant that the legislation was "an international bill * * * set up, I believe, I have been told that it comes under the United Nations World Health Organization." This flimsy, undocumented type of testimony was characteristic of Mrs. Williams' objections.

Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland, who wrote the Siberia, United States of America article, presumably early in January 1956, before passage of H. R. 6376, directed much of her Senate Interior testimony to the "hospital at Fairbanks, Alaska." She wanted to know why mentally ill patients were being placed in jails instead of in the Fairbanks hospital. When pressed to state the improvements she would like to have made in the bill, she said: "I would have to know the condition of the hospital [at Fairbanks], why it is not being used."

Later she said that the Congress "would have to make an appropriation for doing over the Fairbanks hospital that already exists."

When Senator MALONE, Republican, of Nevada, pressed Mrs. Burkeland to state which provisions in the bill should be deleted and what should be added, she replied: "I am no expert."

That was clear. Mrs. Burkeland, while in Washington to testify, might easily have inquired about the Fairbanks hospital. She had only to ask Delegate BARTLETT why the Alaskans had not used the hospital she thought was at Fairbanks. On the same day Mrs. Burkeland testified, Mr. BARTLETT told the subcommittee:

"Funds were appropriated and a so-called detention hospital was built at Fairbanks * * * I am sure it was built shortly after 1910. It was not a hospital, sir, at all. It was merely, in respect to this one community in all the communities in Alaska, a place where the patients were kept temporarily prior to their being sent to Morningside if they were found to be disturbed mentally. They were not treated there * * * It was a 2-story, ramshackle, frame building, but actually reference to that detention hospital has not pertinency to the debate now whatsoever because that was consumed by fire, Mr. Chairman, at least 25 years ago, to my knowledge, and probably somewhat longer."

Senator BIBLE asked: "Nothing was ever rebuilt on the site?"

Delegate BARTLETT replied: "No, nothing was ever built on the site.

"As a matter of fact, because the United States marshal who had custody declared it to be unsafe for human habitation in any form, it was not in use for any purpose, as I recall it, for 2 or 3 years before fire destroyed it."

Senator BIBLE queried further: "As of this date, you do not even have a so-called detention hospital at Fairbanks, because it has been burned?"

Delegate BARTLETT replied: "That is correct; we have nothing but jails."

This discussion about the "hospital at Fairbanks" has been given in detail because illustrates the type of misinformation about H. R. 6376 that was disseminated by Mrs. Burkeland. She chose to include in her original statement on "Siberia, U. S. A." false assertions, unverified charges, and fancied dangers. If she had been qualified to analyze the bill, she would have checked her statements carefully. She could easily have verified such a simple fact as whether or not there was a hospital at Fairbanks. She could easily have ascertained from the legislative history of the bill whether there was anything in the bill that would have enabled the Federal Government to railroad political dissidents to Alaska.

It was unfortunate enough that Mrs. Burkeland should have written her misguided release early in January 1956, and that she should have taken the trouble to appear on February 21 before the Senate Interior Subcommittee where she rambled through a maze of incorrect assertions, beliefs, hearsay statements, and groundless fears.

The real damage done by Mrs. Burkeland came through the circulation of her "Siberia, U. S. A." release to all parts of the United States by the California State Chapter of the Minutewomen, U. S. A., sometime during January. Although the release was palpably false, hysterical, and highly imaginative, it was picked up by a certain small segment of the population which developed into the opposition to H. R. 6376—the "small, noisy minority."

Practically without exception, this opposition to the Alaska mental health bill came from individuals and organizations lacking in professional competence to pass on Federal legislation. They did not understand the customary language of Federal laws. Definitions, interlocking provisions, and general language appearing in nearly all bills were wholly unfamiliar to many critics. Sinister meanings were ascribed to harmless words and phrases. Mass hysteria developed among extreme conservatives whose opinions were molded by a steady stream of inflammatory releases, bulletins, and newsletters mailed from a few centers in California to secondary mailing centers in Texas, Arizona, Nebraska, Indiana, New York, Illinois, and a few other places.

Although the Alaskans were uniformly in favor of the bills designed to give them control over their own mentally ill and while the Federal agencies directly involved were eager to divest themselves of authority over Alaska's mentally ill, a few excited, ill-informed, and, for the most part, nonprofessional alarmists sought to keep the Alaskans from gaining their goal. Competent psychiatric societies and psychiatrists, as well as attorneys favored H. R. 6376. The American Medical Association gave strong endorsement to the bill. But there was a noisy medical minority that joined the bewildered housewives of California.

A NOISY MEDICAL MINORITY

Dr. George A. Snyder, of Hollywood, Calif., from early in February 1956 until the enactment of H. R. 6376, put on a one-man campaign against the bill. He appeared before the Senate Interior Subcommittee to testify against the bill and to serve as sponsor of Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland and the Finn twins of California. These twins, George C. and Charles Finn, had had considerable newspaper notoriety in California in connection with their difficulties with the Federal Government. Dr. Snyder is reported to have hired them at $100 a week to stay in Washington to fight the bill.

The charge brought by Dr. Snyder against the Federal Government was made in a 4-page letter, dated February 6, 1956, which he mailed to Members of Congress and to individuals serving as secondary distributors of rightist material. He asked for a complete investigation of the Alaska Mental Health Act, H. R. 6376, for elements of treason against the American people behind the front of the mental-health program. He referred to medical fraud and medical atrocity.

In addition to Dr. Snyder there was a single medical group that opposed H. R. 6376. This was the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, a small extremely conservative organization formed some 13 years ago to study and act on the social, economic, and legislative aspects of medicine. It is not a scientific group like the American Medical Association, the American Academy of General Practice, and the many specialty societies. The AAPS has a small office in Chicago headed by an executive secretary, a high-school graduate with no professional training. He writes their legislative bulletins, subject to approval by AAPS officials in other cities, handles much of their correspondence, and has managerial responsibility for mailings, banquet arrangements, and the distribution of educational material. AAPS legislative bulletins are sent to all State medical societies and to a limited number of physicians in the several States.

On February 25, 1956, a week after Dan Smoot issued his mental-health release against H. R. 6376, AAPS mailed out an emergency bulletin headed "Mental Health Bill Is Incredible, Inane Legislation." Referring to H. R. 6376 as "another horrible and vicious bill" which is nearing enactment "unless you and thousands of others act at once." AAPS stated that the bill "applies to every United States citizen—you and me."

Quoting from the customary reciprocal reimbursement provisions (the famous section 119 (c)), AAPS warned: "This means the creation of a potential 'American Siberia' where an 'interested party,' in disagreement with your libertarian views because they do not conform to 'normal human behavior of liberals' could 'send you away'."

Commenting on the definition of a mentally ill person as given in the bill, AAPS said: "Thus, a mentally ill person is defined as a mentally ill person."

They continued: "The bill is backed by the United Nations and three of its agencies, UNESCO, World Health Organization, and the World Federation of Mental Health."

These quotations were taken directly from the Dan Smoot release without credit being given to him. All the statements were false and irresponsible, repeating the irrational fantasies which were being voiced at that time by the lunatic fringe and by Dan Smoot. For a national medical organization, however small, to adopt the slogans and misrepresentations of the bewildered California housewives must have given considerable comfort to the muddled opponents to H. R. 6376. Indeed, in response to the alarmist AAPS bulletin, many members of the organization sent telegrams of opposition to H. R. 6376. A staff member of the Senate Interior Committee said they were surprised and worried about this medical opposition. To be sure of their ground, they asked the American Medical Association to give its opinion of the bill.

In the meantime, the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons made its own position perfectly clear. It had adopted the Burkeland-Smoot-Siberia line, recklessly, without careful study.

On February 24, Dr. Arthur G. Blazey, of Washington, Ind., cochairman of AAPS legislative committee, had sent out a completely irrational letter headed "Alaskan Concentration Camp for Americans." Pre-

senting a false analysis of H. R. 6376, he wrote:

"Here are the salient features of an international Socialist plot foisted upon our sleepy Congressmen with the blessings of our new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, via the World Federation of Mental Health:

"1. A section of Alaska larger than the State of Rhode Island is designated for confinement of individuals having psychiatric or other diseases which impair their mental health." [Mrs. Burkeland in her early January Siberia U. S. A. had compared the size of the million-acre grant to the size of Rhode Island. Since when have reputable physicians taken their views from uninformed housewives?]

"2. Commitment is expedited by removing the time-tested laws that require examination by three physicians for certification of insanity." [Does Dr. Blazey think 3 psychiatrists could make a living in an Eskimo village of 50 persons, or 100, or 500?] "We have long heard about how the Red Gestapo whisk deviationalists out of their living quarters to oblivion. * * * Now we are hearing some of these same stories in our own country, and are now faced with a cunning scheme, under the guise of mental health, to establish a facsimile of a Red Siberia for our own citizens."

This wild, irrational statement came from the legislative cochairman of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.

Then, on February 25 the alarmist AAPS emergency bulletin, written, presumably by their office manager, who has only a high-school education and who lacks professional competence to analyze Federal legislation, was issued. On receipt of this bulletin on February 27, I protested vigorously to Dr. James L. Doenges, then president of AAPS. He telephoned the office manager, Mr. Harry Northam, to call me. Mr. Northam telephonedfive officers of AAPS and got them to agree to back his February 25 bulletin which, we may assume, they had previously hastily O. K.'d. On February 29 Mr. Northam called me, protesting my stand in favor of H. R. 6376. He stated, cockily that he had on another occasion told the AMA that AAPS did not agree with them. Now he was telling me. He said: "I don't care what happens to the Alaskans [as though they were citizens of Russia or China]. I'm worried about what will happen to the citizens of the United States." [As though the Alaskans were not.] He concluded his telephone conversation by stating: "I hope we defeat the bill."

On March 1, 1956, 5 days after AAPS had taken a position against H. R. 6376, their then president, Dr. James L. Doenges, wrote me:

"I am sorry to see that you feel the AAPS is in error on the matter of the mental health bill, and I am impatiently awaiting the arrival of the copy of the present bill, since I certainly would not want AAPS to make that kind of an error." (Obviously Dr. Doenges had OK'd the emergency bulletin of February 25, opposing H. R. 6376, without having seen the bill.)

On March 2, Dr. Arthur G. Blazey wrote to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY further denouncing H. R. 6376 and saying: "Regardless of the above changes, H. R. 6376 should be tabled by your committee because it is a further transgression on the proper limitations of Federal authority."

The same Dr. Blazey on March 3 wrote me: "The barbarism of Alaskan treatment of mental patients is Alaskan business until it affects these United States, as stipulated in H. R. 6376. The international activities of Overholser in connection with the U. N. [actually nonexistent], and his domestic activities in the instance of Lucille Miller [he released her from St. Elizabeths after her home State, Vermont, had sent her to the Federal hospital] and others does not render him an acceptable authority on mental health in my opinion—or others."

Dr. James L. Doenges wrote me on March 6: "If AAPS is wrong, we will certainly admit our error and publish a correction. * * * If we should be proven wrong by the facts, we will retract. * * * We certainly have no intention of attempting to take credit for anything such as the rewording of a bill, so you need not worry about that." (I had written Dr. Doenges that I thought they would try to claim credit if the committee made any changes in the bill for any reasons.)

By March 17, Dr. Doenges had shifted his ground. He wrote me: "* * * if we are proven wrong, we of AAPS will publish a bulletin and will retract. However, if the committee or the Senate makes changes in the provisions of the bill to which we have objected, then you and all others must regard that our objections and criticisms were valid and correct."

On March 20 the American Medical Association sent a letter of approval of H. R. 6376 to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. It became available to the public the following day. On March 22 the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons announced a shift of position. Moving away from their intransigent stand of opposition to the bill, which would also have placed them in opposition to the AMA, they wired a hastily drafted set of amendments to the committee, indicating that if these were adopted the bill would be satisfactory. Among other corrections, they asked for deletion of the costomary "and for other purposes" in the preamble.

Six days later AAPS asked the Senate Interior Committee to disregard most of its former amendments and to substitute others. They showed unseemly haste and great indecision. So insistent were they to have their amendments accepted that they induced Senator WATKINS, Republican, Utah, to have them printed. (Committee print, April 10, 1956.) Officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reviewed the AAPS amendment and condemned them as administratively incongruous and as inconsistent with other provisions in the bill. The definition of mental illness proposed by AAPS was described by the HEW Department as "in complete disagreement with all modern concepts for the care and treatment of the mentally ill," inasmuch as they would have refused hospital care to persons in the early stages of mental illness. (Committee print No. 3, April 19, 1956.)

Other amendments proposed by AAPS with respect to commitment procedures showed their lack of understanding of modern medical opinion regarding such procedures. All told, their proposals were so unworkable and so inconsistent with current medical and legal practice in the care and commitment of the mentally ill, that the committee rejected the suggestions and did not even discuss them. Thus, the efforts of the only medical organization that set out to defeat or mutilate the bill came to naught. AAPS was discredited for having published an irresponsible and untrue bulletin on Feb. 25, 1956, and for failing to retract as requested to by the Alaska Territorial Medical Association. The amendments which they proposed indicated clearly that the drafting of Federal legislation is not a task to be lightly undertaken by amateurs.

Viewed as a whole, opposition to H. R. 6376 was stirred up by a noisy, ill-informed minority comprising housewives, a few editors, and a scattering of physicians. A partial list includes: The American Public Relations Forum, Inc., Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president; Association American Physicians and Surgeons, especially Dr. James L. Doenges and Dr. Arthur G. Blazey; Mrs. Leigh F. Burkeland; the Concordians; the Finn twins; the Greater Nebraskan; Mervin K. Hart; the Hoiles Syndicate; Brig. Gen Herbert C. Holdridge, retired; Dan Smoot; Dr. George A. Snyder; and the Tablet.

IGNORANCE BRED FEAR OF H. R. 6376

In the main, opposition to H. R. 6376 stemmed from ignorance which bred fear and distrust. It centered on 3 or 4 provisions in the bill and on certain language which is standard in virtually all bills.

Among the trivial objections was one to section 101 (m): "The term 'State' or 'States' includes the States, the District of Columbia, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico." Mrs. Stephanie Williams, president of the American Public Relations Forum, Inc., objected to the definition, saying that similar language appeared in the Connecticut and Illinois laws. Senator BIBLE, Democrat, of Nevada, said he saw no cause for alarm in the definition, since it was "customary." To which Mrs. Williams replied: "You are so accustomed to this. I am only a housewife."

Of course, the term "State" must be defined, since some laws apply to all States and Territories while others exclude Alaska or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The definition is indeed customary in State and Federal laws and should not be considered alarming or sinister.

Similarly, several individuals and the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons were alarmed at the phrase "and for other purposes" in the preamble of the bill. The AAPS went so far as to wire the Senate Interior Committee to delete the phrase. Later they wired to leave it in.

Actually, anyone who is alarmed at this phrase betrays woeful ignorance of Federal and State legislation. The phrase is to be found in the preamble of thousands of bills for the simple reason it is impossible to list all the purposes of most bills. This covering phrase "and for other purposes" is found not only in bills and laws, but also in contracts, articles of incorporation, and other legal instruments. However, one opponent to the bill, Brig. Gen. Herbert C. Holdridge, retired, Vice Presidential candidate on the Prohibition ticket, wrote to President Eisenhower on March 12, 1956, stating his own peculiar ideas of what "and for other purposes" meant. He said that the bill was "a dastardly attempt to establish a concentration camp in the Alaskan wastes." In impassioned phrases he asserted: "The bill establishes a weapon of violence against our citizenry far more wicked than anything ever known in recorded history—far worse than the Siberian prison camps of the Czars or the Communists, or the violences of the Spanish Inquisition. * * * These are clearly the 'other purposes' stated in the title of the bill." He continued: "The plot of wickedness revealed in this bill fairly reeks of the evil odor of the black forces of the Jesuits who dominate the Vatican, and, through affiliates in our Government, dominate our policies."

Later, on March 24, the same brigadier general wrote to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Democrat of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee: "I shall retain your letter of March 21, 1956, as documentary evidence that you, yourself, are insane, subversive, or at minimum, incompetent. It may prove useful if your reciprocal provisions ever become effective."

Many persons expressed alarm over various provisions in the commitment procedures, although these have been incorporated in the laws of many States and are working satisfactorily. Numerous critics demanded that compulsory jury trial be included in the procedures. This demand unquestionably arose from ignorance of current practice in the States. Compulsory jury trials have been

abandoned by all States save Texas which is even now working on that reform. A majority of States have optional trial by jury. As a rule, patients and their families wish to avoid the publicity and stigma which accompany jury trials.

Furthermore, mental illness is no longer regarded as a crime in informed quarters. Enlightened thinkers in this field are endeavoring to do away with criminal procedures in handling such cases. One of the worst features about compulsory trials is that patients who desire voluntary commitment in the early stages of mental illness are deterred from applying and are likely to wait until they are in advanced stages of mental deterioration.

One of the most hotly debated provisions of H. R. 6376 was that providing 1 million acres to aid Alaska in defraying future operating costs of the program. The California opponents and their followers reached the conclusion that Congress and Alaska were engaged in a Marxist plot to sell the million acres to Russia for a concentration camp. Mrs. Stephanie Williams was of that opinion and during May 1956 her organization went so far as to suggest that an oil lease which the Department of the Interior was negotiating with a Colorado oil company was part of the same plot to transfer the public domain to Russia, a million acres at a time, with the connivance of the Congress of the United States, the controlling committees in Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Legislature of Alaska.

Other disturbed opponents thought Alaska might be planning to build a stockade around the million acres and to turn loose within the compound persons falsely adjudged insane in the States and railroaded to Alaska. The fact there was nothing in the bill to justify such conclusions has not bothered the noisy, bewildered critics. These weird interpretations have been made almost exclusively by persons without adequate professional background in analyzing Federal legislation and without a knowledge of American history and the place of land grants in State organization.

Unquestionably the section of the bill that was most generally misunderstood was the compact clause, section 119, which covered the customary reimbursement provisions between States. Such clauses antedate our Constitution and appear in one or another form throughout welfare legislation. Thus, States are in the habit of ascertaining the legal residence of all recipients of public charity. If the person in question does not have legal residence in the State where he becomes a public charge, he may be sent back to the State where he has such residence or that State may be charged for his care.

Similar provisions are customary in State laws dealing with the mentally ill or with prisoners. If a State lacks adequate facilities or treatment centers, it may arrange with another State to incarcerate a prisoner or to provide for a mental patient needing special treatment. These arrangements are made on a reimbursable basis under a compact clause of a type which has been sanctioned in American jurisprudence for over 170 years. They antedate Marx, communism, and the United Nations by many decades. Such a compact clause was included routinely in section 119 of H. R. 6376.

It is incomprehensible that a provision which has been in common use for over a century and a half in State and Federal laws should suddenly arouse such fears as did section 119. The compact clause was widely misunderstood as having something to do with commitment procedures. Yet it referred only to financial reimbursement. Failure to distinguish between a compact clause and commitment procedures led the noisy minority to claim that Congress was authorizing the States to railroad political dissidents to a Russian-owned corral in Alaska.

Probably no bill has ever been so garbled, distorted, and misunderstood as H. R. 6376. Yet it was perfectly clear from the hearings in the House and Senate and from conversations with Federal officials who aided in the drafting of the measure that no one in Washington had any plot in mind. At no time did any Government official in the Interior Department or in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare make a particular point about the wording of any single provision. Nor was any Senator or Representative wedded to particular language as would have been the case if some deep plot were afoot.

It was clear beyond any possibility of doubt that the only desire anyone connected with the drafting of the bill had in mind was to draft a good bill that would redress old wrongs and would transfer authority in the field of mental health from the Federal Government to the Territorial government. To these ends an original grant was proposed for the construction of facilities, while grants-in-aid on a decreasing scale were authorized for a 10-year period and a grant of 1 million acres was authorized to provide for long-term financing of the program. Old laws were repealed. Modern commitment procedures were set forth. The Federal Government was divested of power. These provisions attested the good faith of Congress.

To impugn the motives of those who wrote and sponsored this legislation is to see plots and evil designs where none exist. It was the Alaskans who sought long-overdue redress of cruel treatment accorded their mentally ill and retarded. It was the Alaskan Delegate, E. L. BARTLETT, who introduced the first bill in the present series and later introduced others. It was a respected Republican, Representative MILLER, a physician, who fought for the million-acre grant and won necessary House approval. It was the Republican Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Wesley A. D'Ewart, who disclaimed any scheme for Alaskan concentration camps. This is not to detract in any way from the fact that it was the Democrats who introduced and sponsored the bills. Representatatives LEO W. O'BRIEN of New York and EDITH GREEN of Oregon, as well as Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, fought rationally and judiciously to give the Alaskans a fine mental health program.

The entire history of this legislation attests the integrity of purpose and the high ideals motivating congressional action. For half a century the Alaskans had suffered a cruel form of inhumane punishment in seeing their loved ones railroaded to a hospital in some cases 2,000 miles or more from home. Then when Congress, after due and careful study and after obtaining the best available professional help in drafting this complex bill, was about to complete action, an avalanche of protests poured into Washington from persons who would in no way be affected by the bill.

Protests voiced indifference to, or hatred for, the Alaskans. None of the opponents in January, February, and March 1956, seemed to have any interest in the plight of the Alaskans. Ignorance, fear, malice, and strange aberrations characterized the opposition to H. R. 6376. When before has a small, noisy minority of housewives in California, editors in Santa Ana, Calif., Dallas, Tex., McClellan, Tex., New York City, and Omaha, Nebr., bestirred themselves over a small Alaskan bill? It is as bizarre a situation as has occurred in the memory of many an oldtimer in Washington.

HISTORICAL PRECEDENTS

Alaska is eagerly awaiting statehood. Bit by bit the United States is giving more authority to the Territory. Historically the Federal Government has made large grants of land to all Territories as they approached statehood. Precedents in history and in American jurisprudence shaped the important provisions of H. R. 6376.

Land grants for public purposes: Land grants for schools, colleges, and other public purposes go back more than 170 years in our history. They were established under the Ordinance of May 20, 1785, and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. Those early grants were in Ohio where lot 16 in each township was set aside by the Government for schools. Later, land-grant colleges were endowed by the Government.

Between 1880 and 1906 five Western States received land grants for the care of their insane. These Federal grants were made at the time of the enabling acts of Idaho (1890), Oklahoma (1906), South Dakota (1889), Utah (1894), and Wyoming (1890). The grants ranged from 30,000 acres in Wyoming to 200,000 acres in Oklahoma and constituted up to 0.3 percent of the State's area. The proposed Alaskan grant of 1 million acres is less than 0.3 percent of the land area of the Territory.

This modest grant to Alaska actually looks small compared to the United States grants of 10 million acres of the public domain to Arizona, nearly 9 million acres to California, 24 million acres to Florida, 16 million acres to Minnesota, 7 million acres to Oregon, and 4 million acres to Indiana. These 6 States have a total land area of 548,809 square miles which is only 22,000 square miles less than Alaska's 571,000 square miles. The land grants to the 6 States in question have amounted to 70 million acres as against the 1 million now being proposed by Congress for Alaska. These 6 States have enjoyed land grants amounting to over 70 times the amount now being proposed for Alaska. Presently the Federal Government owns more than 99 percent of the Territory, thus having a strangle-hold on one of the chief sources of revenue that might make Alaska more nearly self-sustaining. Since the United States paid only 2 cents an acre for Alaska, the proposed million-acre grant for a mental health program would represent only a $20,000 outlay.

Elective jury trial for the insane: Although the new version of H. R. 6376, which was reported by the Senate Interior Committee and voted by the Senate (the Goldwater amendment), omitted the commitment procedures of the House-passed bill, many persons are demanding inclusion of provisions for compulsory jury trial.

Such inclusion would go against modern judicial opinion and medical experience. The Council of State Governments, which has been devoting considerable attention to modernizing State mental health laws and procedures, published a valuable document in 1952 on the Mental Health Programs of the 48 States. They give a table entitled "Legal Provisions Governing Admissions and Commitments of the Mentally Ill, by States, 1949" (p. 52) which shows the following 26 States provide for trial by jury, but that only Texas makes this mandatory: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

There is clear medical evidence that mandatory jury trial should be avoided. Where it is optional, patients show their preference by avoiding a jury commitment. In St. Elizabeths hospital only 16 patients out of 1,700 asked for jury trial.

Legal opposition to jury trials in such cases is that mental illness is not a crime and consequently constitutional protection under the "due process" clause is not applicable. Court decisions support this view:

"Insanity is not a crime and therefore the constitutional guaranty of jury trial is not

applicable." (*Barry* v. *Hall*, 99 F 2d 222, 225 (1938, C. A., D. C.))

"It has been frequently announced by this and many other courts that due process of law, within the meaning of both the Federal and State Constitutions, does not necessarily imply a trial by jury." (*In re Brewer* (Iowa, 1937), 276 N. W. 766, 768.)

"Since an insanity case is a civil case (*State ex rel. Peper* v. *Holtcamp* (235 Mo. 232, 138 S. W. 521)), it would seem at least that due process of law does not require that there be a jury trial, whether demanded or not, and we so hold." (In re Moynihan (Mo. 1933) (62 S. W. 2d 411, 413).)

Involuntary detention for acutely ill mental patients: Members of Congress have been bombarded with protests over provisions in H. R. 6376 dealing with involuntary detention. Since the Senate had already voted to accept the Goldwater amendment which omits commitment procedures and since Senate and House conferees have accepted this version, none of the commitment procedures are at issue.

However, in order to answer some of the most common objections which have been raised, we would point out that the common-law rule has been that "a dangerous maniac may be restrained temporarily until he can be safely released, or can be arrested upon legal process, or committed to the asylum under legal authority." (*Kelcher* v. *Putnam* ((1880) (6. N. H. 30, et al.).)

Provisions authorizing temporary detention of dangerous insane persons are found in the statutes of most States. A compilation which appears in the Mental Health Programs of the 48 States indicates that in 1949 30 States provided for emergency commitment without court order.

The common-law rule, with certain limitations designed to protect the interests of both the patient and the arresting officer, is embodied in section 104 (a) of H. R. 6376. Simply stated, this section says that if a licensed physician issues a certificate that an individual is mentally ill and because of illness is likely to injure himself or others if allowed to remain at liberty, then any health, welfare, or police officer, or any person deputized by a United States commissioner shall have authority, upon medical certification, to take the individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto.

However, there will be times when it is impossible to obtain medical certification. If a person who gives evidence of being mentally ill and seems likely to injure himself or others cannot be medically certified at once, any health, welfare, or police officer may take such individual into custody, apply to a designated hospital for his admission, and transport him thereto (sec. 104 (b)).

One opponent to this bill wanted to have this section deleted. We wonder what he would suggest for handling the case of a person who went berserk in Alaska 500 miles from the nearest physician—let alone 3 psychiatrists as he suggests.

One opponent to H. R. 6376 wanted this section deleted. However, that would be impractical, considering the conditions of travel in Alaska. If a person in a remote village of 50 or 100 persons should go berserk 500 miles from the nearest physician and 1,000 miles from a psychiatrist, some person in authority would have to act to protect the public and the patient. The proposal made by an official of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons that an Alaskan who became mentally ill should have his family physician acocmpany him and that three psychiatrists be consulted is wholly unrealistic.

The following States have procedures substantially identical to those under section 104 (a): Idaho, South Carolina, Utah, and Florida. Provisions similar to section 104 (b) are to be found in the laws of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Idaho, Utah, and Missouri.

Criminal provisions of H. R. 6376: Several witnesses objected to the fact that when the bill was passed by the House, section 31, providing fines and imprisonment for persons conspiring to cause unwarranted hospitalization of anyone or denial of rights granted under the act, was omitted. This was not the result of a sinister plot to expedite hospitalization on false charges. Instead, there was a general feeling that criminal provisions belonged in the Criminal Code, not in a mental health bill.

Conclusions: As one analyzes the objections to the Alaska mental health bill, one sees that they were based on ignorance of American history, of State and Federal laws, and of conditions in Alaska. These objections, raised by a noisy minority, represented the obsessions conjured up by extremists, fanatics, and gullible dupes who lacked professional competence to form a judgment about the bill.

REASON PREVAILED

The small minorities opposing H. R. 6376 made so much noise at first that they sounded like a large army marching on Washington. Then, as Members of Congress and their staffs began to compare notes, there was observed a similarity of wording in opposition letters, telegrams, releases, and bulletins. Over and over the same scare phrases appeared: "American Siberia," "Alaskan concentration camps for Americans," "U. N. plot," "UNESCO plot," "Marxist plot," etc. Exception was taken to the million-acre grant, to the commitment procedures, to the absence of compulsory jury trial. The Siberia theme showed up in certain newspapers—never many.

Congress began to realize that the opposition was not really nationwide. It had originated with 1 woman and 1 group of housewives in California. Across the country there had rolled an extreme rightist chant—"Siberia, U. S. A. Housewives, retired Army officers, a few editors, and a scattering of physicians picked up the slogans, opposition arguments, and scareheads. In January, February, and early March 1956, the scaremongers seemed to have taken over.

Then, in March, the tide began to turn. On March 1, Challenge to Socialism, a conservative weekly paper published by Marjorie Shearon, legislative analyst and former consultant to Senator Robert A. Taft, published a calm analysis of H. R. 6376, with an explanation of some of the more controversial sections. Dr. Shearon published four issues on Alaska mental health during March, explaining the reasons for the commitment procedures and pointing to the historical precedents for land grants and provisions for reimbursement for the care of public charges on a reciprocal basis by the several States. All told, Dr. Shearon published over a dozen issues, devoted in whole or in part to the historical background, legislative history, and legal precedents for this much-needed, humane, and entirely innocuous bill.

On March 16, 1956, Leo H. Bartemeier, M. D., chairman of the council of mental health of the American Medical Association, wrote to Delegate BARTLETT:

"During the past fortnight I studied this bill, and I personally believe that it is in complete agreement with our procedures and our methods of caring for the mentally ill. It will be of great benefit to the people of Alaska.'

Four days later, on March 20, the American Medical Association, which had made a careful study of the bill and of its legislative background, wrote to Senator MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"With the reservations hereinafter discussed, the American Medical Association supports and recommends the enactment of H. R. 6376, 84th Congress.

"Three studies of the situation of the mentally ill in Alaska have been made in recent years. The earliest of these, in 1948, was conducted by the American Medical Association. The report of the group of physicians which visited Alaska in the course of this investigation was critical of the existing commitment procedures and the lack of facilities in Alaska for the care and treatment of mental patients. It recommended the establishment of a centrally located hospital for the needs of the Territory. * * *

"* * * in our opinion, the procedures set forth in H. R. 6376 are on a par with the better procedures adopted by the several States, and are superior to those presently followed in Alaska."

The reservations of which the American Medical Association spoke were one dealing with possible inclusion in the bill of criminal procedures in the case of unwarranted hospitalization and one clarifying the language of section 119 (c), the compact clause for reciprocal reimbursement.

On March 15, the Alaska Hospital Association had urged Senator MURRAY to support the bill. On April 3, the Medical Society of the District of Columbia expressed its approval of the bill and stated:

"In the opinion of our board this bill should receive high priority in health legislation because of the urgent need for improving the care of the mentally ill in Alaska."

One of the first health and medical groups to go on record as favoring H. R. 6376 was the Alaska Board of Health which passed a series of resolutions on October 12, 1955, uring that "this legislation, so badly needed, be passed and approved without further delay."

Similar approval was given by the Juneau Parent-Teacher Association on February 23, 1956, by the Church of the Holy Trinity in the capital city of Alaska on February 10, and by the Juneau Chamber of Commerce on February 20.

Dr. George S. Stevenson, national and international consultant for the National Association of Mental Health, supported the bill wholeheartedly, going into the major provisions in considerable detail. He said:

"This bill will do much to advance the care of the mentally ill of Alaska from the present primitive provisions to that which is enjoyed by mentally ill persons in our most advanced States. * * *

"This bill will modernize the processes of admission of Alaska's mentally ill to a mental hospital. It will replace the mandatory jury adjudication by providing for a professional evaluation and still maintain the judicial safeguards. Many patients have been irreparably injured by the formal court process through which they have to pass. This bill guards against such damage. * * *

"The provisions made by this bill for the commitment of patients are those that are found in many of our States, and the anxieties which have been voiced by some as to what hight happen because of the liberality of the provisions actually do not happen in those States where these same provisions obtain. * * *

"It also makes it possible for Alaska to care for residents of other States who happen to fall ill while in Alaska. This provision can be either by resources within Alaska or by transfer to another State. Again this makes it possible to do what is best for the patient. There have been criticisms of this aspect of the bill, but these criticisms reflect a lack of understanding of the provision and of the fact that this is already an approved procedure in some States and has shown none of the dire results that are attributed to it."

Since the Alaskans were strongly in favor of H. R. 6376 and since the American Medical Association supported the bill, favorable action by the Senate Territorial Subcommittee and later by the full Committee

on Interior and Insular Affairs was assured. There had been no informed, responsible medical opposition. The Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, which set out on February 25 to defeat the bill and which in its March Newsletter repeated its false analysis of the bill, later attempted to introduce crippling and unworkable amendments. The committee paid no attention to the proposals and after the AMA had supported the bill, AAPS retreated from its untenable position although it failed to retract its early false bulletin.

There had been two schools of thought about the best way to handle the legislation. One advocated repeal of the old laws dealing with mental illness in Alaska, transfer of authority from the Federal Government to Alaska, the grant of transitional funds, and a land grant. The other school of thought advocated all this and a spelling out of the commitment procedures. In the end, the Senate Territorial Subcommittee decided on the first line of action. Senator GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona, introduced an amendment to H. R. 6376 which was virtually the same as the House-passed bill except that it omitted the commitment procedures.

The feeling was that Alaska had progressed to such a point that it was capable of writing its own procedures. Furthermore, there was little point in Congress writing the procedures and then simultaneously giving Alaska authority to rewrite the procedures in any way it saw fit. As a practical reality, Alaska will undoubtedly enact the procedures as they were written into H. R. 6376, since much professional thought had gone into the drafting and since medical authorities in Alaska had already approved the language in the bill.

On April 23 the Territorial Subcommittee voted to accept the GOLDWATER amendment in principle. On May 14 the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs approved the GOLDWATER amendment to H. R. 6376. The Senate unanimously approved the bill on June 7. House and Senate conferees were appointed. They accepted the Senate version with minor changes on July 16. The bill, as amended, was then unanimously approved by the Senate. The House on July 20, by a vote of 130 to 16, passed H. R. 6376 and it is now Public Law 830 of the 84th Congress.

Thus, at long last, Congress, unmoved by the lunatic fringe, has passed a forward-looking piece of legislation, soundly conceived and wisely drafted. The Democrats sponsored and fought for the bill, but throughout it received bipartisan support. Hope, finally, has been vouchsafed to Alaska's mentally ill.

Hydroelectric Potential of the Hells Canyon Reach of the Snake River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the hydroelectric potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The defeat by the Senate of the Federal Hells Canyon bill has not ended, unfortunately, the political misrepresentations which have so long beclouded this vital issue.

It is to be hoped, nevertheless, that even the ardent proponents of the Federal high dam will pause for a moment to give earnest consideration to the facts regarding the comparative benefits of the 3-dam plan and the high dam proposal.

As the Oregon Journal, an independent newspaper in the Pacific Northwest, has declared, Hells Canyon has been the subject of exaggeration, mistatement and planned confusion. Typical, the Journal points out, was the comment of Senator MORSE that the defeat was a "tragic blow to the welfare of the Nation." The Journal describes this statement simply as "unadulterated balderdash."

In order that we may attempt to place the Hells Canyon controversy in some perspective, I have attempted to examine objectively the facts on the development of the hydroelectric potential of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River.

THE FACTS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HYDROELECTRIC POTENTIAL OF HELLS CANYON REACH OF SNAKE RIVER ON THE IDAHO-OREGON BOUNDARY

To compare the 3-dam plan licensed by the Federal Power Commission to a privately financed electric power entity with a high-dam plan to be federally financed is possible, but this requires a careful analysis of the facts and the rules controlling each proposal.

The licensee, in this instance, is the Idaho Power Co., and the Federal Construction Agency would be the Bureau of Reclamation. The company may not be paid for downstream benefits to Federal powerplants that result from regulation of the waters of the stream. The Federal project may credit its operations with the net value of downstream benefits to both Federal and privately owned plants, and from the latter class it may collect that value in dollars.

A Federal development does not pay taxes, but a privately financed development must. In both cases American citizens would be served by the production of electric power and service. It is estimated for the year 1955 that the private electric industry in the country, as a whole, received in operating revenues $6,930,000,000; that of this amount $625 million was paid in State and local taxes, being 9 percent of the operating revenues; $1,014,000,000 was paid in Federal taxes, being 14.6 percent of the operating revenues. The sum of these taxes is 23.6 percent of the operating revenues.

The records of the Federal Power Commission show that the Idaho Power Co. paid $3,870,000 annually in Federal income taxes, and $3,300,000 in State and local taxes for the year 1954. These amounts happen to be 3 percent on the investment of the company for Federal taxes and 2.42 percent on the investment for State and local taxes.

There are, admittedly, downstream benefits for power, flood control, and navigation from the operation of the 3-dam plan in Hells Canyon reach of Snake River. These benefits are paid for by the users of the power which is generated at the three dams and sold to consumers, and thus will not be paid for by the beneficiaries downstream, under present rules and regulations.

In the voluminous hearings before the Federal Power Commission on the application of Idaho Power Co., and in the hearings before the Senate Interior Committee on S. 1333, factual information of unquestioned validity was presented which unfortunately has been obscured by political exaggerations.

The Federal Power Commission had the duty to determine the best plan for development of this portion of Snake River. To do so they reduced the various plans to the common denominator of Federal financing and construction. Thus, this record must be searched and analyzed carefully to find what data, together with the testimony before the Senate Interior Committee, were presented which could be correlated to show plainly and directly the comparable facts which bear on the economics of the two plans. I have had these data reduced to four tables in order that physical and fiscal comparisons may be reduced to understandable terms.

These data clearly indicate that the job of supplying electric power to our people would be more equitably accomplished if there were no Federal taxes on privately owned systems, and if federally owned projects were required to pay the same State and local taxes as others.

It is common knowledge, I think, that Federal income taxes on the electric-power industry are paid by the users of electricity. To tax these industries is to tax the people.

I now refer to the technical data available to analyze and compare these two plans about which so much ill-advised controversy has been raised.

In the Hells Canyon reach there is a total fall of 602 feet. When dams are built, this fall is converted to a head, and the use of this head is the means of converting falling waters into electric energy. Both plans develop this head of 602 feet. In the 3-dam plan, the variation in the head is only 101 feet, because that is the maximum drawdown on the storage unit at Brownlee Dam. For the high dam, the maximum drawdown is 289 feet and thus, the head will vary from 602 to 313 feet. The high dam will produce a little more power because it captures flood-waters which are not usable except with a larger storage volume.

I have assumed, as did the Federal Power Commission, that power data supplied by three engineers were the best in the large volume of evidence taken. These three engineers were from the Bonneville Power Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Federal Power Commission. These experts did not represent the licensee. In making allowances for upstream increases in irrigation use and the determination of critical periods of water supply to be firmed by storage, these engineers varied only about 5 percent in their estimates of nominal prime power.

I have taken the average of the values submitted by these engineers as the best figures available. For the 3-dam plan, the prime power at site is 565 megawatts with downstream benefits of 110 megawatts. For the high dam at site the prime power is 646 megawatts, and downstream benefits of 278 megawatts. At the site, then, there is a difference of only 81 megawatts. These data appear in my table A.

I stated that the foregoing values were the averages of data submitted by three witnesses. I note that the data of the Federal Power Commission witness is practically identical with the average. I find in the testimony that he made a special study of actual energy output for the 20-year period of streamflow records, 1929–48, allowing for about 8 percent more irrigation depletion than the average of the three witnesses who computed estimates for normal prime power. The average energy output of the period is as follows:

At site: 3-dam plan, 546 megawatts; high dam, 634 megawatts.

Downstream benefits: 3-dam plan, 59 megawatts; high dam, 113 megawatts.

The difference at the site is 88 megawatts, whereas in prime power calculations the difference at site was 81 megawatts. I hold that this study of energy output is the test of the projects. It is what would have been produced by them over a 20-year critical period containing years of high variation in stream flows and also containing the critical months for which storage uses must be relied upon.

When I have mentioned downstream benefits, I have done so on the basis of these engineers, and they included the following downstream powerplants, as if they were in full operation: Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, all on the Columbia River. I

also have assumed the existence of Ice Harbor, Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite, which are on the Lower Snake River, none of which may be constructed for many years. The average megawatts of output are shown on my table B.

Table C included general data and comparisons between the two plans for the proposed developments. The data shown are comparable one with the other for each plan, excepting that item 2 for the 3-dam plan shows the cost per kilowatt hour at 3.8 mills, which is not based upon item 11, but which is the accepted cost of construction by the licensee. The 3.8 mill figure is based upon Federal construction costs, which is nearly $50 million greater than the bid for constructing the 3-dam plan.

There was an estimate in the Federal Power Commission hearings of $21 million for transmission lines to market the power of the licensee, the Idaho Power Co. It is understood that this would bring the power to Boise, or to a similarly situated market. To connect the high dam with the Northwest power network is estimated to cost $77 million. The two latter items appear in item 13a of the table.

For the high dam plan, in order to supply the downstream benefits, the transmission cost was estimated to be $146 million. I have used the costs for the high dam and the transmission lines as given before the Senate Interior Committee. The combined cost of these items comes to about $55 million less than that testified to before the Federal Power Commission. A footnote on table C indicates the place where these values may be found.

Since contracts have been let for the 2 plant units of the licensee, there now remains little question of the sufficiency of the estimate of $133 million to cover the cost of the 3-dam plan exclusive of transmission.

At the beginning, I said that it was possible from the evidence available to compare the two plans. The data are arranged in my table D. The at-site costs have been substantiated. The annual costs for operating the projects are:

For the 3-dam plan, $8,400,000 for operation, maintenance, replacements, and depreciation, and fish facilities, together with fixed costs including interest on the investment. When there is added the Federal income tax on the basis now being paid by Idaho Power Co., and similarly local and State taxes, the total annual cost is $15,400,000. This results in 3.21 mills per kilowatt-hour of average generation over the 20-year period previously mentioned. If Federal taxes were deducted, the cost is 2.38 mills per kilowatt-hour. If all taxes were eliminated, the cost would be 1.75 mills per kilowatt-hour.

For the high dam, there are no taxes, and I have assumed the annual cost to be that testified to by the Federal Power Commission engineer, who computed the average energy output over the 20-year period. The cost is 2.71 mills per kilowatt-hour. If there is added to the annual cost of the high dam, local and State taxes at 2.25 percent of the allocation of power, at site—$278 million—the total annual cost would be $21,300,000, and the cost per kilowatt-hour would be 3.83 mills. But, I have compared these kilowatt-hour costs at site for the reason that the licensee can receive no compensation for downstream benefits for power, or flood control, or navigation. The high dam, federally owned, can and does take credits for these downstream benefits. These credits are reflected in the annual cost as reduced to $15,045,000. If this were not done, the costs of power development for both plans would be approximately 3.2 mills per kilowatt-hour, in spite of the fact that the 3-dam plan carries $7 million annually in taxes, and the proposed Federal project carries none.

These startling data reveal the inequity of our treatment of our citizens. I have suggested a formula for equalizing the item of taxes. It is this: Relieve the privately financed generation industry from Federal income tax, and require that Federal projects pay local and State taxes. Consumers are entitled to such fair and equitable treatment.

The difference in power costs to the consumers in these plans is insignificant. To develop an additional 88 megawatts at site would require an additional expenditure of $328 million minus $133 million or $195 million. This is $2,220 per average kilowatt of incremental output. No one could justify such a cost to the Nation's taxpayers, who would have to advance the money for so little gain in power. If we use the 142,000 additional kilowatts in downstream benefits, the cost would be $1,375 per average kilowatt of incremental output. That is still four times too high for fiscal justification.

The additional 142,000 kilowatts is less than 1 percent of the power requirements of the Northwest by 1980, which according to the Federal Power Commission studies will be 17 million kilowatts. We certainly can find, without any difficulty, places to develop 1 million kilowatts with just the saving of $195 million.

In the Hells Canyon matter we have heard a lot of talk about much of little consequence. Yet, the defeat of the Hells Canyon bill saved the Nation's taxpayers nearly a half billion dollars that is needed for a multitude of better projects in the West. More important is the fact that the plan under construction is a better contribution to the Nation's economy. That the Federal Power Commission made a good decision under pressure of bitter opposition is a sign we should recognize for what it is, namely, the wisdom incorporated in the Federal Power Act which removed one phase of the development of natural resources from purely partisan politics.

Development of Hydroelectric Power in Hells Canyon Reach, Snake River

Table A.—*Estimated nominal prime power in average megawatts*

[Basis: Minimum release of 2,000 cubic feet per second; additional irrigation of 520,000 average acres; downstream powerplants, Bonneville, The Dalles, John Day, McNary, Ice Harbor, lower Monumental, Little Goose, and lower Granite; critical period, average 29 months]

	3-dam plan	High dam
Physical data:	*Feet*	*Feet*
Maximum head	602	602
Minimum head	501	313
Maximum variation	101	289

Estimated nominal prime power[a]

Witness	3-dam plan		High dam	
	At site	Downstream	At site	Downstream
McIntyre (Bonneville Power Administration)	585	117	647	314
Riter (Bureau of Reclamation)	550	105	654	257
Meadowcroft (Federal Power Commission)	559	109	637	264
Average	565	110	646	278
Average total	675		924	
Difference	249			

NOTE.—Relatively little variations between witnesses.

Table B.—*Estimate of average annual energy in average megawatts of output*

Basis: Additional irrigation, 563,000 acres, average of the 20-year period, 1929–48.

NOTE.—The estimates are from the testimony of Witness Meadowcroft. Table A indicates this witness' calculations are nearly the average of the three used.

Three-dam plan:	
At site	546
Downstream	59
Total	605
High dam:	
At site	634
Downstream	113
Total	747
Difference	142
Difference at site	88
Difference downstream	54

NOTE.—This table shows estimated actual generation of power; eight downstream plants in operation.

Table C.—*General data*

	3-dam plan	High dam
1. Power output (prime) (kilowatt) total	675,000	924,000.
1a. Power output (prime) (kilowatt) at site	565,000	646,000.
2. Power costs (per kilowatt-hour)	3.8 mills [1]	2.7 mills.
3. Active storage (acre-feet)	1,000,000	3,880,000.
4. Flood-control benefits (annual)	$1,000,000	$2,300,000.
5. Navigation benefits (annual)	$108,000	$189,000.
6. Recreation benefits (number annual visitors)	250,000 to 325,000	500,000 to 650,000.
7. Power revenues for aid to future reclamation	Yes, if Congress directs	Yes, if Congress directs.
8. Availability of power to entire region	Yes, required by FPC	Yes.
9. Development of phosphate fertilizer	No appreciable differences	No appreciable differences.
10. Development of electro-process industries	do	Do.
11. Cost of project (less transmission lines)	$133,000,000	$328,000,000.[3]
12. Best plan	Unanimously approved by FPC.	
13. Cost of transmission lines, total, including downstream plants.		$146,000,000.[3]
13a. Cost of transmission lines at site—generation to market.	$21,000,000 [4]	$77,000,000.[5]
14. Benefit-to-cost ratio	2.13 to 1 [2]	1.83 to 1.

[1] Based on Federal construction costs.
[2] P. 485, Senate hearings.
[3] P. 489, Senate hearings.
[4] FPC hearings.
[5] FPC brief, April 1956.

TABLE D.—*Cost estimates*

[Basis: Testimony before Federal Power Commission, and before Senate Interior Committee. Transmission costs not included.[1]]

	At site	
	3-dam plan (private development)	High dam (Federal development)
Cost of structures	[2] $133,000,000	[2] $328,000,000
Annual cost (operation and maintenance, and depreciation or amortization)	[2] $8,300,000	[2] $15,045,000
Estimated Federal tax [4]	[4] $4,000,000	None
Estimated local and State tax	[4] $3,000,000	None
Total annual cost	[4] $15,400,000	$15,045,000
Average annual million kilowatt-hours at site	[4] 4,793	[4] 5,554
Cost per kilowatt-hour (mills)	3.21	2.71
Cost, less Federal tax (mills)	2.38	----------
Cost, less all taxes (mills)	1.75	----------

[1] Transmission costs to market average, generally, 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour for Federal construction.
[2] Table 3, appendix A of FPC brief of staff counsel, and 5.48 percent for interest and depreciation. See p. B-94, staff brief, FPC. Includes fish facilities.
[3] Testimony before Senate Interior Committee, p. 485 of hearings, and appendix C of respondents brief of April 1956. Table 1, average of lines 11 and 14, col. 6.
[4] Income taxes passed on to consumers.
[5] FPC brief (p. 22) gives a higher annual cost, but this is based on Federal construction estimates of cost. Basis for taxes from records of Federal Power Commission. See footnote 1 of table C.
[6] Values of table B multiplied by 8,760.

The 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress draws to a close I would like to make an informal report to the more than 325,000 people I represent from the 19th Illinois Congressional District.

To my mind the most important thing to all of us is the fact that America is at peace. Since President Eisenhower concluded the tragic war in Korea, no Americans have been in combat duty any place in the world. Our leadership has been firm. The President has not jumped from one crisis to another, but has consistently demonstrated to the world our sincere desire for peace by positive and constructive acts. While there are many trouble spots, we are now in the fourth year of a world at peace, and tense though it might be, these years have given us a prayerfully welcome respite from the slaughter and destruction of major wars.

Along with peace has come the greatest prosperity in our Nation's history and the transition from war to peace has not brought about the depression predicted by advocates of "gloom and doom." On the contrary, the Nation, industry, and labor enjoy the highest and best level of prosperity in our history.

The American people have more houses, more automobiles, and more of the better things of life than ever before. This has been accomplished without the stimulation of a war economy.

FARM PROGRAM

The welfare of the American farmer was one of the most seriously considered problems of this Congress. After much deliberation notable changes were made in the law and governmental policies relating to agriculture. Farmers caught in the squeeze between falling farm prices and rising costs in production have not shared in the general booming prosperity of other industry and labor. A number of factors contributed to this situation. Tremendous stores of supported commodities continued over production of surplus crops which was a factor in reducing the farmers' gross income. At the same time his net income was reduced because of high operating costs.

Congress adopted legislation to strike directly at these problems. The principal part of the new program is the soil bank law. I sponsored such a bill. Other legislation and administrative actions deal with disposal and marketing problems. The administration is selling more and more agricultural commodities to foreign countries and I introduced legislation that has resulted in millions of dollars of farm products being disposed of through world markets. Still more farm products are being consumed through our expanded school lunch program and relief programs.

In an effort to bring farm prices back in line with operating costs the President increased the support levels on most of the basic crops and Congress raised the parity price on feed grains and dairy products. In recent months hog prices have shown a strong recovery from last year's slump and this means much to Henry County, Ill., which is the undisputed hog capital of the world. The cattle market too has been firm even though it has never recovered from the rollback ordered in 1952 by former President Truman. I believe the agriculture program enacted by the 84th Congress is constructive and forward looking.

To further relieve the economic plight of the farmer, Congress enacted legislation to exempt them from paying Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used in the operation of their farm. This should mean an over-all annual tax relief to the farmers of about $60 million.

SOCIAL PROGRESS

At the same time we continue to make giant steps in social progress. Our social-security system has been improved and strengthened. The new law lowers the retirement age for women to 62 years, and provides benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers at age 50, continues benefits for physically disabled and mentally retarded children over 18 years, increases grants for public assistance to the needy aged, blind and disabled, and extends social-security coverage to many professional groups. This is certainly a significant step forward in meeting the needs of our older citizens.

The 84th Congress made a significant record in enacting programs to provide long-range health and research work to conquer disease and alleviate suffering. Funds were appropriated for intensive work in medical research in the fields of mental health, heart, cancer, arthritis, neurology, and blindness as well as dental research.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

One of the major accomplishments of this session of Congress was passage of a record $32.9 billion highway-construction program—which, of course, is the biggest such undertaking in our Nation's history. This legislation authorizes construction of 41,000 miles of super interstate highways which by 1969 will link most State capitals and other major cities from coast to coast. This road program will not only facilitate traffic and commerce but in case of a national emergency will also speed military communication. Federal funds, under the terms of this bill, will be allocated to the States. This giant bill should take care of the great overall need for the improvement of roads of our country and particularly improve rural, farm-to-market routes, city streets as well as interstate highways. There has been little argument over the need for sound highway legislation because of our year-to-year expanding population, and construction of adequate highways has not kept pace.

This giant road bill is another of the major accomplishments of the 84th Congress.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Recently I was appointed vice chairman of the investigating committee authorized by a resolution adopted by my Foreign Affairs Committee, to reexamine, reevaluate, and reappraise the entire foreign-aid program. It is my firm belief that the entire program should be overhauled and I believe this investigation is timely. In many instances requests are too large and cannot be justified. When the mutual-security bill came up in the House I voted to cut the funds requested by over $1.1 billion.

I want to assure all those I represent that I will do everything I can to bring about a thorough review of this program so we will know in what direction we are going and if the continuation of the program is for the best interests of the United States.

I might add that 82 percent of all the money appropriated is spent right here in the United States and the remaining American dollars must eventually be spent in this country.

I have the distinct honor of representing what is often referred to as the farm-equipment capital of the world. A close examination of purchases made under foreign-aid programs discloses that the farm-equipment industry and allied manufacturers in this area benefited to a large extent under these programs. In the period May 1949 through December 1955, the International Cooperation Administration and its predecessor agencies have financed orders from the following companies in the amounts shown:

J. I. Case	$11,330,000
John Deere	15,248,000
International Harvester	75,454,000
Minneapolis-Moline	1,448,000
Caterpillar	62,714,000
R. G. LeTourneau	7,547,000
Butler Manufacturing Co	2,200,000
Clearing Machine Corp	6,648,000
Rockford Machine Tool	638,000

REPRESENTING MY CONSTITUENTS

During my 18 years in the House of Representatives I have conscientiously endeavored to serve the needs of all the people I represent. So far as legislation is concerned, I have diligently tried to support measures which would truly benefit the greater number of our people and which would serve the public interest. I feel, as an elected Representative, it is my duty to carefully consider all viewpoints. This I have tried to do to the very best of my ability before making my final decision on how my votes would be cast. I have consistently voted for what I thought was for the best interests of my constituents.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

It has been my privilege to personally serve the people of my district who have contacted me about particular problems involving some phase of Government. I have tried to give this service promptly, courteously, efficiently, and fairly to all who have sought my help. Such services range from routine request for Government publications to complicated problems involving veterans' benefits, tax problems, social security and railroad retirement cases, immigration problems, Government contracts, and many other types of services to citizens in their relationships with their Government.

HOME FRONT

Much activity should develop in the 19th Congressional District in the ensuing months. Ground has been broken for the new Federal building in Rock Island where the post office will be quartered as well as the United States court. This project will have an overall cost estimated at $2 million and is the first project to be constructed under the lease-purchase program of the Government. It involves no outlay of Federal funds. The building will be financed entirely by private capital and the Government will acquire title upon completion of the purchase installments.

A bill which I introduced was recently signed by the President authorizing Rock Island to proceed with the building of new approaches to the Centennial Bridge. This will ultimately mean much toward alleviating bad traffic conditions that now exist there.

In these closing days of the session legislation was also adopted to turn the Hennepin Canal over to the State of Illinois for recreational purposes. It is estimated the Federal Government will have to spend $2 million to put it in proper shape so the State might assume future maintenance.

Clearing and snagging work is also to be done on Mill Creek and South Slough. Forty thousand dollars has been allocated to cover engineering planning work for flood control at Campbell's Island; and $28,000 for dredging a channel in Lake Potter for a boat harbor for recreational boating.

There is no question but what there will be much activity as a result of all this construction work and employment should be good in this area.

Three Army Reserve training centers have been allocated for the 19th District and will be located in Rock Island, Galesburg, and Canton.

We also have had the distinct honor of a Federal judge appointed from Fulton County—Hon. Fred Mercer. He will be the first to hold court in the new quarters when they are completed in Rock Island.

A DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

We are all fully aware of the high degree of confidence placed in President Eisenhower. The American people sense his high purpose and his desire to be helpful to our people in all walks of life. They like what he has done in the 4 years he has served as our Chief Executive. They are in favor of what he seeks to do. But too often the people overlook the fact that it is difficult for the President to have enacted into law the legislation he proposes unless he has a Congress with the majority of his own party.

Anyone who believes in President Eisenhower and intends to support him should give him a Congress that will help him. It is not fair nor reasonable to elect him and then withhold a friendly Congress. To do so is only to handicap him from doing the very things for which he was elected.

Furthermore in these uncertain times when questions of great international importance are continually arising there should be assured unity of action between the President and Congress. With such unity our position is strengthened in world affairs. Therefore, it is to our own national interest and welfare, both from a domestic as well as foreign standpoint to have a Congress in full accord with our President. Our national welfare can best be promoted at this time by reelecting President Eisenhower and giving him a Republican Congress.

The Russians Attempt To Capitalize on the Failure of Congress To Approve President Eisenhower's Request for OTC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, one item of unfinished business left by the 84th Congress was approval of President Eisenhower's request for United States participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

When President Eisenhower first proposed our becoming a member of the Organization for Trade Cooperation, I said that I could only approve of this action if an amendment to insure that the Organization for Trade Cooperation could not be converted into the International Trade Organization were added to the bill, H. R. 5550, which had been introduced in the other body. The Congress refused to accept the International Trade Organization, provided for in the Habana Charter, in 1950.

On June 20, 1955, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Department of State which compared the International Trade Organization with the Organization for Trade Cooperation. I then told the Senate that—

"I have no doubt whatsoever that the present administration means exactly what it said in the statement explaining the difference between the Organization for Trade Cooperation and the defunct International Trade Organization. However, the OTC agreement provides in part 4, article 16, that:

" 'Amendments to this agreement shall become effective, in respect of those members which accept them, upon acceptance by two-thirds of the members of the organization and thereafter in respect of each other member upon acceptance by it.'

"I have no fear that this administration would ever accept an amendment to the OTC agreement that would compromise its stated position. Unfortunately some future administration may not be so dedicated to these principles. Therefore, I shall support United States participation in OTC provided the resolution, which I know we shall adopt, contains a reservation that any new obligation to be imposed upon the United States as an amendment to this agreement can only be accepted by the United States with the concurrence of the Congress. Mr. President, with this one reservation I feel that we should wholeheartedly support the President in his effort to secure the maximum expansion of world trade which the Congress approved in its adoption of H. R. 1.

"President Eisenhower and the able team he has assembled in the Department of State merit the confidence of all those who believe in the ultimate triumph of free-enterprise economics."

The Russians, during the summer of 1955 at Geneva, once again proposed at the United Nations Economic and Social Council that the International Trade Organization be reestablished. I brought this matter to the attention of the Senate on July 29, 1955. I said:

"Mr. President, on several previous occasions I have addressed the Senate on the efforts being made by certain countries within the United Nations to implement portions of the Habana Charter for an International Trade Organization. You will recall the Congress was asked to approve the Habana Charter by President Truman in 1949. The House Committee on Foreign Affairs conducted hearings in the spring of 1950, but made no report. Late in 1950, President Truman announced that he would not ask the 82d Congress to again consider the Habana Charter. Mr. President, it is significant that the Soviet Union was not a signatory to the Habana Charter. Yet on Thursday, July 14, the Russian delegate to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, Mr. Pavel Nikolayevitch Kumykin, announced that the U. S. S. R. was ready to join the nonexistent International Trade Organization. He introduced Resolution No. E/L. 677 which reads as follows:

" 'The Economic and Social Council—

" 'Observing, that the charter of the International Trade Organization drawn up in Habana has not so far been brought into operation;

" 'Considering the increasing need for setting up within the framework of the United Nations an international organization which would facilitate the development of international trade relations and thereby raise the level of living of the peoples and mitigate the tension in international relations;

" 'Invites the governments of states members of the United Nations to ratify the charter of the International Trade Organization as soon as possible and requests the Secretary General to take appropriate steps for calling the first regular session of that organization.'

"Mr. President, this action by the Soviet Government once again emphasizes the importance of the stand which this administration has adopted in rejecting membership on the Commission on International Commodity Trade designed to implement chapter VI of the Habana Charter, and in rejecting the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices which was designed to implement chapter V of the Habana Charter. The Congress and the administration have both made it clear that this country is dedicated to furthering economic advancement through the development of free, competitive, private enterprise. Congressional approval of the Organization for Trade Cooperation will make it impossible for the Russians to appear to be cooperating with the West by advancing the formation of an organization which would never be acceptable to the United States. They can then show their good faith by joining the Organization for Trade Cooperation and assume, of course, the obligations which such membership entails.

* * * * *

"The introduction of this resolution by the Russians makes my reservation absolutely necessary if we are to protect the economy of the United States. We are making progress, Mr. President, and I again commend the Secretary of State for the fine work by our delegation to the 20th session of the Council."

When H. R. 5550 was finally reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means, it contained the following language:

"Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall on behalf of the United States accept any amendment to the agreement on the Organization for Trade Cooperation."

This provision completely met my original concern.

I am, indeed, sorry that, in spite of the perfecting amendments adopted by the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Democratic leadership refused to bring this bill before the Congress.

My fears of a year ago have been completely confirmed. Our failure to act has caused a serious problem for the United States delegation to the United Nations Economic and Social Council. A dispatch to the New York Times, dated July 26, by its European correspondent, Michael L. Hoffman, shows how the Russians again attempted to sell the discredited International Trade Organization to the Economic and Social Council at its 1956 summer session. Michael Hoffman concludes his dispatch with this statement:

"Some western delegates, notably the French, are trying to persuade the smaller countries to avoid taking any position on the Soviet plan until after the United States elections. They say the western trade cooperation plan still has a chance of congressional approval. Privately even delegates who are passing this word around concede that they do not have much faith in their own arguments."

I sincerely hope that the 85th Congress will give President Eisenhower what he has asked for.

I am inserting Mr. Hoffman's entire article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that all of my colleagues may understand the importance of this issue to our overall foreign policy:

[From the New York Times, of July 27, 1956]

U. N. TRADE AGENCY PUSHED BY SOVIET—MOVE SAID TO BE DIRECTED AT EASING UNITED STATES RESTRICTIONS ON STRATEGIC GOODS

(By Michael L. Hoffman)

GENEVA, July 26.—While the United States stands more or less helplessly by, the Soviet Union is plugging steadily ahead with its campaign to get the United Nations to set up an international trade organization.

All the Soviet leaders are asking for this year is an Economic and Social Council resolution to set up a committee to "work out the proposals."

Debate on the resolution in the Economic Committee of the Council was postponed today, since most delegations said they lacked instructions.

According to the text of the resolution, the ultimate aim of Moscow is to get a new specialized agency established to promote trade cooperation.

From the wording of their various statements on the matter it is clear that by trade cooperation the Soviet leaders have mainly in mind steps to remove discriminatory restrictions and obstacles impeding international trade.

PRESSURE ON UNITED STATES IS AIM

In short, they want a new forum for putting pressure on the United States to take off restrictions on exports of so-called strategic products of Communist countries.

There is an organization for international trade cooperation on the books, called the Organization for Trade Cooperation. It is not at all what the Soviet leaders have in mind. It was planned and constructed with the object of establishing and interpreting commonly agreed rules of commercial policy for what Moscow would call the capitalist world. It was modeled on ideas that originated primarily in the United States.

However, this organization exists only on paper. It is thoroughly approved by President Eisenhower but the administration has never been able to get it past the committee stage in Congress. In Western Europe it is generally assumed now that the organization is defunct.

ADVANTAGE GAINED BY SOVIET

The failure of Congress to approve United States participation in the organization means that the western states have very little to offer in opposition to the very different, but superficially similar, Soviet proposal.

Soviet delegates have helped confuse the issue by borrowing the name of the Organization for Trade Cooperation for their own proposed creation.

The general recognition is that there is a glaring gap in provisions for consultation in the family of international organizations in the trade field. Such consultation not only is possible but also is essential because of the very nature of the problem. As a result more and more countries are receptive to the Soviet alternative.

Some Latin-American and Middle East countries are beginning to think they would get something out of the Soviet proposal if Moscow improved and enlarged its trade relations with non-Communist countries.

Some western delegates, notably the French, are trying to persuade the smaller countries to avoid taking any position on the Soviet plan until after the United States elections. They say the western trade cooperation plan still has a chance of congressional approval. Privately even delegates who are passing this word around concede that they do not have much faith in their own arguments.

What Should We Do About Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include another trenchant and penetrating article by one of the first eminent American officials to realize and proclaim the true nature of the Communist movement and its program dedicated to the isolation and destruction of the United States. William C. Bullitt was the first United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union from 1933 to 1936. He turned in a remarkably distinguished performance as Ambassador to France, warning our people of the terrible truth in the dizzy days of attempted appeasement of that tyranny.

Mr. Bullitt is a patriot as courageous as he is intelligent. Why do we not pay more attention to the men who have been consistently right in the past, and less to those who have been consistently wrong?

The article is from U. S. News & World Report of June 29, 1956, and is in reply to an article by George Kennan who believes the power of the tyrant's sword is greater than that of the patriot's love of freedom and that, therefore, we must and should accept the tyrants, rather than resist them. Mr. Bullitt vigorously disagrees. One can only hope our people and our leaders follow Mr. Bullitt and the courses he advocates which in the long run represent not greater but less risk—and greater hope. The article follows:

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT RUSSIA?

(By William C. Bullitt, United States Ambassador to Russia, 1933–36)

Since the Second World War our foreign policy has led us from a pinnacle of power and security into the valley of the shadow of death. Mr. George F. Kennan played a part in our descent from safety to danger, and it is not unreasonable to hope that he may be able to suggest a path of escape from the pit into which he helped to lead us. Even a discredited guide is apt to know some landmarks.

It is a pleasure to find in the latter part of Mr. Kennan's address a bit of good advice. He rightly attacks those American politicians who grovel before unfriendly governments and try to buy friendship by offerings of the American taxpayers' money. Our gifts to Nehru [Prime Minister Nehru of India] and his neutralist disciples, who act as advance agents for our enemies, have brought us nothing but contempt. Mr. Kennan is wise to urge our politicians to try to earn respect for the United States and to abandon efforts to purchase popularity.

Strangely enough, he suggests that we should channel such aid as we may give in future "through some international agency." He seems to have forgotten the manner in which UNRRA [United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration] spent a considerable amount of our money in accordance with the advice of Communist sympathizers and dupes. Fortunately, no American Congress is likely to be bitten twice by that dog. In any event, Mr. Kennan's international agency aberration does not diminish the merit of his contempt for American grovelers.

To praise this comment of Mr. Kennan's is to exhaust all the approval that can be accorded to his address. The rest of it is softness, self-satisfaction and defeatism.

What does Mr. Kennan advise us to do to survive as an independent nation?

1. He believes that the changes which have recently occurred in Russia represent "the beginning of that mellowing process which overtakes sooner or later all militant movements," and that they point the way "to the restoration of a more normal and hopeful relationship of the Russian people to their world environment and to us in particular."

He goes on to say: "I can see no reason why a satisfactory and hopeful relationship

should not be established between the United States and Russia, even though the respective social systems and political philosophies remain theoretically in conflict."

How agreeable it would be if that were true. But there is no evidence that it is true. Khrushchev has attacked Stalin but he has never attacked a single article of the Communist faith. The political philosophy and the social system of the Soviet Union are still based, as always, on the godless Communist creed which teaches that the duty of every Communist is to destroy every capitalist country like the United States.

There is nothing theoretical about the conflict. In the past 11 years the Soivet Union and its agents have forcibly seized control of countries containing more than 700 million persons. The Communists will not stop their attacks—they can only be stopped. Stalin and Beria are dead but the rest of the old gang of criminals, which is guilty of more murders and tortures of men, women, and children than any other gang that has ever existed in any country, including the Hitler gang, is still running the Soviet Union and the countries it has enslaved.

These Kremlin gangsters, by denouncing Stalin, are merely trying to kill 2 birds with 1 stone: to shift the blame for the unhappiness of life in the Soviet Union from their own shoulders to those of the dead Stalin, and to slow down the rearmament of the free countries of the world by convincing them that it is useless to go on spending money on armaments since the Soviet Union will never attack.

Meanwhile, the Soviet Government is pushing its production of intercontinental bombers and nuclear bombs and ballistic missiles so intensely that our chief expert on this problem, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, has testified that by 1959 the Soviet Union may be strong enough to destroy the United States by sneak attack.

"MELLOWING PROCESS" IN KREMLIN?

Mr. Kennan's desire to trust the Russians is so powerful, however, that he finds a "mellowing process" in this crude Kremlin maneuver. This is the same sort of wishful thinking that led Harry Hopkins to convince the ailing Roosevelt that he could and should trust Stalin.

2. Mr. Kennan then turns to Communist China and says: "I must say that up to this time I have been able to observe in the conduct and outlook of the Chinese Communist leaders nothing that could give justification for any immediate hope of better relations between ourselves and them—nothing, in fact, but the most profound arrogance, inhumanity, and obstinate error in the understanding of the Western World."

Four paragraphs later he writes: "I feel that the present Chinese leaders have given to this country the deepest and most unjustified sort of offense, which they should not be permitted to forget at any early date. I see nothing to be gained by entry into any direct diplomatic relations with them. Let us rather keep our distance, defend our own interests with whatever ruthlessness the situation requires."

These paragraphs are sensible and logical but between them Mr. Kennan has inserted a paragraph in which he advocates that we should now permit these same Chinese Communists to have a seat in the United Nations. He knows that this would mean the presence of large numbers of Chinese Communist agents in New York, and, indeed, throughout our country. He knows that the admirable, loyal, law-abiding Chinese communities which are scattered throughout the United States would then be under enormous pressure to swing to the Communist side.

He knows that the Nationalist Chinese, our friends in Formosa and throughout the world, would rightly feel betrayed. He knows that gradually almost all the 11 million overseas Chinese—whether in Singapore, Indonesia, Vietnam, the Philippines, or elsewhere—would go over to the Communists. He knows that every Communist state in the United Nations is another enemy in a seat of power. He knows that admission to a seat in the U. N. would be a steppingstone for the Chinese Communists to an Embassy in Washington, and for desertion by our Government of the Chinese Nationalists in Formosa.

He inserts the knife with diplomatic delicacy. In Washington, "No, no," he says; in New York, "Yes." He advocates that against the Chinese Communists we should "defend our own interests with whatever ruthlessness the situation requires," but his ruthless action with regard to their admission to the U. N. turns out to be to "abstain from voting on this particular question."

At times, Mr. Kennan seems to understand that to grovel is not the way for a nation to win respect and friends, but he seems not to understand that, throughout the world, disrespect for the United States would be multiplied manyfold if we should permit the Chinese Communists to have a seat in the United Nations. That would be the ultimate grovel. The truth seems to be that, in Mr. Kennan's emotional constellation, to grovel is not to grovel if you grovel to the Soviet Government or its satellites.

3. Mr. Kennan's other suggestions are equally queer. He thinks we should abandon all effort to free the peoples of the satellite states from Soviet slavery. He writes: "What we must recognize today, in the case of the satellites, is that evil, like good, produces its own vested interests. Where regimes of this nature have been in power for more than a decade, there can be no question of putting Humpty Dumpty together again and restoring the status quo ante * * * there is a finality, for better or for worse, about what has now occurred in Eastern Europe."

These are as peculiar words as have ever been written by an American who pretends to know something about history; for they are flatly untrue. The vested interests of evil do not become permanent or respectable or sacrosanct at the end of 10-year period or any other period. Most of the history of the past 180 years consists of the successful struggles of oppressed peoples to destroy the vested interests of their oppressors.

If Mr. Kennan's statement were true, there would never have been a United States. The vested interests of England in its American colonies had existed for more than 150 years when our forefathers destroyed them and won our independence. The vested interests of the Hapsburg monarchy in Bohemia had been so absolute from 1620 to 1848 that the Czechs scarcely remembered that they had been a nation; but, in 1918, the Czechs won complete independence and ended every vestige of Austrian vested interest in their country.

For centuries, Italy was nothing more than a geographical expression divided between the vested interests of Germans, Austrians, Spaniards, Normans, French, and a gaggle of local tyrants. Yet the Italians, in the 19th century, destroyed those vested interests and became a united nation.

HOW OTHERS WON FREEDOM

Poland, transformed by the third partition in 1795, into a mere conglomerate of vested interests of Russia, Prussia, and Austria, won her absolute independence in 1918. In my childhood the Cubans, with our help, ended the old vested interest of Spain in their country. In my youth the antique vested interests of Turkey in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia were destroyed.

Examples from the past could be multiplied, but let us look merely at what has happened since the close of the Second World War.

Great Britain has been pushed out of its vested interests in India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Burma, Jordan, Israel, and the Sudan.

France has been driven out of its vested interests in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Morocco, and Tunisia. The Netherlands has given up its vested interest in Indonesia.

The Soviet Union, to be sure, since the Second World War, has established vested interests in 11 satellite states containing more than 700 million souls. But to assert that these Kremlin conquests are permanent is to drop to the level of an adolescent schoolboy, ignorant of history, attempting to pose as a worldly wise cynic while he smokes his first cigarette.

The fact is that every vested interest of evil succumbs in the end to man's will to be free. Since Mr. Kennan aspires to be taken seriously, his perversion of historic fact is as shocking as his readiness permanently to abandon the enslaved peoples of Eastern Europe to the Kremlin criminals.

4. Mr. Kennan then advocates that large neutral zones should be set up between the United States and the Soviet Union—not by neutralization of the Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe and the Balkans, not by the neutralization of Communist China, North Korea, and North Vietnam, but by the neutralization of our allies. Germany and Japan, and the surrounding areas as well.

PLAYING INTO SOVIETS' HANDS

Nothing could be better suit the Soviet Government's purpose to weaken the Western World. The physical strength of our side in the struggle for survival would be vastly reduced if Germany and Japan should be neutralized. Respect for the United States would be diminished to the vanishing point. Nearly everyone in the world would be convinced that the Soviet Union had us on the run, and most human beings—who are not heroes—would feel inclined to mount the Soviet band wagon.

With regard to Germany, Mr. Kennan writes: "I have always doubted the wisdom of the decision to rearm Western Germany and to bring her into the Atlantic Pact. It seems to me that American policy should be aimed at the reunification of Germany and the earliest possible establishment of that country as a neutral factor that can blunt the sharp edge of military bipolarity in Europe and help, eventually, to mitigate the intensity of conflict between East and West.

"I am aware of the memories and inhibitions that cause the French and many other Europeans to contemplate such a prospect with unmitigated horror. * * * If our European allies insist that we must try to solve the European problem of today on the basis of the conditions that prevailed 20 years ago, then I am bound to say I see no solution of that problem at all, and no very good reason, therefore, why the United States should continue to commit resources to the vain hope of its solution. This, as I do not need to stress, is a very serious conclusion."

Thus Mr. Kennan advises us to cut off aid to our European allies unless they will accept the reunification of Germany at the price of her disarmament and neutralization. That would, indeed, be a very serious conclusion if it had been reached by the Government of the United States instead of by Mr. Kennan. Fortunately, the two are not the same.

With regard to Japan, Mr. Kennan makes even more grotesque remarks. He regrets our conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan which settled nothing with respect to the adjacent areas and provided for an indefinite stationing of American Forces on Japanese territory. Then he states: "I suspect that this may have had more to do than we suppose with the outbreak of the Korean war." The Korean war started on June 24, 1950, more than 15 months before the peace treaty with Japan was signed on September 8, 1951. This is possibly the first time in history that

a later event has been suspected to be a cause of an earlier event. Perhaps Mr. Kennan will now prove to us how the election of President Eisenhower in 1952 helped to produce the election of President Truman in 1948.

"I think," writes Mr. Kennan, "American policy ought to be pointed toward a solution in which the Japanese archipelago, like Central Europe, could eventually come to constitute a bridge, and an area of reconciliation, rather than a bone of contention, between the two great world systems."

Here is wishful thinking of the type that is based on ignorance. The fact is that Japan's respect for the United States received a dagger thrust when Harry Truman dismissed General MacArthur, whom the Japanese revered. The death blow to Japan's respect for the United States was delivered when Truman's policy of acceptance of defeat by the Chinese Communists and the conclusion of an armistice at the 38th parallel, instead of at the Yalu River, was carried to the bitter end by President Eisenhower. Since then the Japanese have regarded us as a new-rich Nation which has no idea how to use its money or its strength to insure its own survival or the survival of its friends.

Mr. Kennan says that he has "confidence in the maturity and enlightened self-interest of the Japanese people." That is more confidence than any Japanese has today in the political system of his country. A neutralized Japan would drift rapidly into the Communist orbit. In defense of Mr. Kennan it should be said that he propably does not understand the consequence of the measures he advocates since he knows almost nothing about the Far East.

Mr. Kennan knows the Soviet Union well. He was named after his great uncle who had written a best seller on the sufferings of the exiles in the prison camps of the Tsar. All his life Russia has been his romance.

He learned to speak Russian fluently and acquired an extensive acquaintance with Russian history and literature. In 1933, when I chose the secretaries for the first American Embassy in Moscow, I selected Mr. Kennan as a junior member of my staff. An admirable subordinate, passionately interested in his work, he carried out my orders efficiently. He was, to be sure, inclined to give the Russians the benefit of every doubt—not because they were Communists, but because they were Russians—and he was apt to flee from harsh reality.

He had a book which he reread every year, and he imitated its balanced sentences in his writing. It was the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," by Edward Gibbon. Mr. Kennan's devotion to that book gave him a pessimistic bent of mind for one so young. He was more captivated by declines and falls than by rises and achievements.

His views were stimulating but he found it almost unbearable to have a beautiful theory slain by a refractory fact. It was, therefore, entertaining to listen to him but unwise to take his notions seriously and, in spite of my liking for him, I acquired gradually a distrust of his judgment.

"EMOTIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN RUSSIA"

Mr. Kennan's appointment as Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the Department of State in 1947 aroused in me, therefore, lively apprehensions—which, unfortunately, turned out to be justified. His emotional involvement in Russia was so great that he could not bear the idea of standing up to the Communists with force, even in China.

In 1952, Mr. Kennan achieved one of his great ambitions: He was appointed Ambassador to Moscow. A few months later the Russians demanded his recall because of his indiscreet statements. He was astounded. He was so fond of the Russians that he had talked to them, and about them, as if he were a reproving elder brother, and he had not realized that they did not love him nearly so much as he loved them.

Since then he has spent most of his time at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N. J. That Institute has nothing to do with Princeton University; and its inmates, from Dr. Robert Oppenheimer to Mr. Kennan, live in the higher atmosphere of nuclear physics and international morals.

The American foreign policy there evolved by Mr. Kennan is based on four main proposals:

1. Trust the Kremlin criminals.

2. Admit the Chinese Communists to the U. N.

3. Abandon permanently the enslaved peoples of the Soviet satellite states.

4. Encourage Germany and Japan to cease to be our allies and to become neutrals.

This is defeatism.

Mr. Kennan seems to have transferred his interest from the "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" to the "Decline and Fall of the United States." His advice, if accepted, would hasten the day when he would have the material to write that book.

But we are not defeated. If we were to have war with the Soviet Union tomorrow, we would probably win. We are not yet in as great peril as Great Britain after Dunkirk. To be sure, we have no United States standing behind us. We have no one standing behind us. In this fight we ourselves are the last reserve. And we know that within a few years the Soviet Union may feel that it has such destructive nuclear weapons that it can reduce our power of retaliation to negligible proportions by a sneak attack.

We are only now entering the period of supreme peril. Some Americans believe that we can cringe our way to safety; but most Americans have enough common sense and physical and moral courage to face the fact that to try to appease the unappeasable is folly. We cannot turn a tiger into a cat by stroking it. We can shoot it. We can keep it ringed with fire until it loses its nerve and runs.

The essential, indispensable factor for our survival is the maintenance of our power to deliver, at any moment, on the Soviet Union, a weight of nuclear explosive far heavier than the Soviet Union can deliver on us. That is the ring of fire.

If we maintain that ring long enough, the Soviet Union will, I hope, lose its nerve and turn and run. Khrushchev's admission that Stalin was a low and brutal criminal may gain for the living criminals of the Kremlin a slightly improved standing with their own people, and it may cause soft dupes and easy marks outside the Soviet Union to relax their vigilance and their defense against the tiger.

Yet, at the same time, the official revelation that Stalin was loathsome must have dealt an almost fatal blow to the Communist faith. Since 1918 the deepest source of strength of the world Communist movement has been the quasi-religious fanaticism of the believers in the gospel according to Marx, Lenin and Stalin. Without sacrilege, it is possible to ask what would have been the disillusionment of the early Christians if a church council, 38 years after the crucifixion, had proved that St. Peter was a brutal criminal and that St. John was a torturer.

I have known something about Russians since 1914 when I was in Moscow at the outbreak of the first World War. I cannot imagine that the spirit of the Communist movement will survive unshaken the impact of the official admission of the truth about Stalin. I hope that the spirit of the tiger has received such a blow that he will slink away if we maintain our ring of fire.

I believe that, if we face the Soviet Union with an absolute determination not to cringe or appease or submit, and a happy will to face whatever the Lord God may bestow, be it honor or death, we shall win.

Highway Bonanza

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by the Honorable Andrew J. Sordoni, of Wilkes-Barre, president, American Automobile Association, the article having appeared in the August issue of the American Motorist:

HIGHWAY BONANZA

(By Andrew J. Sordoni, president, American Automobile Association)

We have entered the golden era of highway building. We began officially when the President of the United States signed the Federal-Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956, opening the way to build in this country the best and greatest system of highways the world has ever known. To those on AAA committees and in AAA clubs and headquarters who have labored long toward such a goal, enactment of legislation so representative of basic AAA policies is a monumental achievement.

It is difficult to comprehend that we now can solve problems that once appeared insurmountable: traffic congestion and dangers, economic loss, national security, traffic safety, and many more. In the lifetime of the great majority of today's motorists, safe and convenient highways will link most of the major cities and bring rural areas together.

Now, what does this mean to you, a motorist-member of an AAA motor club?

First, wherever you live you will be served by better and safer roads between your home and entrances to the national system of interstate and defense highways. When your car enters this system, you will have before you 41,000 miles of the best and safest highways ever built, a system of super highways connecting 90 percent of the cities of over 50,000 population and extending from coast to coast and border to border, through every State.

In the next 13 years, all of the roads on which you will drive, whether a part of the interstate, primary, secondary, or urban Federal-aid systems, or roads and trails in national parks, will be vastly improved. Driving time will be reduced. Greater safety and comfort, more economical operation of your car are other dividends.

You are practical, and you ask: "What will this cost me?"

It will cost the average passenger car owner from $8 to $10 per year more than he now pays in Federal taxes—1 cent more per gallon on gasoline and 3 cents more per pound on tires and recaps. Your home State must match the Federal funds, dollar-for-dollar on primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid roads, and 10 cents to the dollar for the interstate system. There appears to be no reason to expect the State to increase levies more than has the Federal Government; so in the final analysis, the motorist may pay from $16 to $20 more per year to Federal and State governments for the road program. On the other hand, by virtue of a modernized highway system, he may expect to save 1 cent a mile, or $100 a year, in car operating costs, so his yearly net profit on the new highways could be about $80.

Now, when will this program start?

It began on July 1, when the new Federal taxes went into effect. Already, many States have planned for building new highways.

Standards for the Interstate System have been drawn up by Federal and State highway agencies. A speedup in roadbuilding on the primary, secondary, and urban Federal-aid systems should be noticeable shortly. It has been predicted that some new sections of the Interstate System will be in use by 1958.

TOTAL COST $38 BILLION

The entire program will cost approximately $38 billion in Federal funds, plus $12 billion or $13 billion in State funds, for a total of over $50 billion. The mechanics of getting such a program underway are great. On the Interstate System, of which about 15 percent is now completed, estimates on relocation of the 41,000-mile system range upward to 85 percent. Routes must be surveyed, rights-of-way purchased, contracts awarded. State highway departments must expand their forces, roadbuilders must obtain more machinery, roadbuilding suppliers — notably concrete, aggregates, steel—must increase their production. An indication of the extent of this expansion is seen in 1954, when 810 million tons of stone, sand, gravel, and other aggregates were used in all construction, of which 375 million tons were used for highway building. In addition to increasing production of present plants by 40 percent, the industry anticipates the need for a minimum of 560 additional portable plants.

The program will require 7 times the amount of steel used on road construction in 1954, about 5,200,000 tons. Moreover, the steel industry must meet increased demands from builders of highway-construction equipment. In 1954, road construction required 45 million barrels of the cement industry's 265-million barrel production; by 1959 the demand for cement for highway building is expected to reach 112 million barrels.

Employment? By 1958, some 130,000 additional workers will be needed, bringing the total to 350,000 employed directly on highway construction sites. By 1961, the figure should be about one-half million. It is impossible to estimate the number of jobs that will be created elsewhere because of the impacts of this program.

These figures will perhaps give you a better idea of the immensity of the task ahead; I hope that they will give you a greater understanding of the action your AAA clubs and representatives have taken to help your interests and welfare.

Long before the highway bill started to take shape, the AAA and its affiliated clubs were developing policies to encourage such legislation and to guard the welfare of passenger car owners. By last fall the AAA's motorists' program for better highways was ready. The AAA executive committee, the highway committee and AAA clubs were hard at work. At home and in Washington they presented the AAA views. They testified in House and Senate committee hearings. AAA club members deluged Congress with postcards, letters, telegrams and phone calls in support of AAA policies. Hundreds of AAA club officials paid personal visits to their Congressmen.

The AAA fought for a provision to recognize the principle of a tax rate differential requiring heavy trucks to pay more nearly their fair share of highway costs. The legislation provides for a registration fee of $1.50 per 1,000 pounds on trucks weighing over 26,000 pounds.

For years we have urged that priority be given to the completion of the vital Interstate System. The new bill provides $25 billion for this purpose. The AAA opposed bond financing of highway construction and advocated the pay-as-you-build principle, which is embodied in the highway bill. We, not our children and grandchildren, will pay for our roads.

The AAA felt that efforts should be concentrated on building the new roads we need; not in paying for roads already constructed. We opposed a provision that would have reimbursed States for toll roads accepted as a part of the Interstate System. The new law provides for a study of this—an earlier declaration of policy favoring reimbursement was not adopted by the Congress.

This year, and the years ahead, will see the start, the progress and the completion of the greatest and most ambitious highway building program in world history. We will enjoy a great advance in travel by private automobile; a greater flexibility in the use of autos; advances in safety on our streets and highways. In the early years of the AAA's first half-century of service, our organization was the first and greatest advocate of good roads. With the support of AAA clubs, the Nation's motorists got out of the mud. Now I would say that our clubs and our AAA members have played a large part in the enactment of legislation that will get America's millions of motorists out of the muddle, and onto a safe and adequate road system.

Republicans Responsible for Success of President Eisenhower's Program in the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me as chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As chairman of the Senate Campaign Committee I want to show which party supported President Eisenhower in the Senate during the past 4 years. This can only be done by examining all rollcall votes in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. I have prepared a complete analysis which I am inserting in the RECORD so that the American people may have the facts.

The 83d Congress was under the control of the Republican Party; the 84th Congress was under the control of the Democratic Party. The votes in these two Congresses covering a period of 4 years are a measure of the support that the two parties have given President Eisenhower.

There were 271 rollcalls in the 83d Congress and 230 rollcalls in the 84th Congress, or a total of 501 rollcalls. Every rollcall has been reviewed and accounted for so that the record will be complete and all-inclusive.

After eliminating procedural votes, as well as issues which were clearly not a part of the President's program, I find that there were 220 rollcalls in the 83d Congress and 203 rollcalls in the 84th Congress which represented a clear test of support for President Eisenhower. In the 83d Congress on this entire group of issues, the Republican Members cast 7,525 votes in support of President Eisenhower's program or 64.7 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 4,114 votes, or 35.3 percent of the total.

In the 84th Congress when the Democrats were in control of the Congress, the Republicans cast 6,682 votes or 59.4 percent of the votes cast for President Eisenhower, and the Democrats cast 4,575 votes or 40.6 percent of the votes for his program. Over the 4-year period on these 423 issues, Republicans cast 14,207 votes for President Eisenhower's program or 62.1 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 8,689 votes or 37.9 percent of the total.

An examination of the votes cast in opposition to President Eisenhower's program shows a sharp party division. During the 83d Congress, Republicans cast only 1,630 votes in opposition to the President's program or 25.7 percent of the total. Democrats cast 4,701 votes or 74.3 percent of the total. During the 84th Congress once again we find Republicans casting only 1,715 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower's program or 29.7 percent of the total opposition votes with the Democrats casting 4,053 or 70.3 percent of the opposition votes. Over the 4-year period, the Republicans cast only 3,345 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower's program or 27.6 percent of the total opposition votes. The Democrats cast 8,754 or 72.4 percent of the opposition votes.

The 423 rollcalls included issues which were passed unanimously such as the ratification of treaties and issues which had bipartisan support where a majority of both parties voted in support of the President.

An examination of all issues which were not passed with bipartisan support is even more revealing. During the 83d Congress there were 126 votes in this category. Republicans cast 4,203 votes in support of President Eisenhower or 75.6 percent of all supporting votes. The Democrats cast 1,356 votes or only 24.4 percent of the total. When we examine the opposition votes, the Democrats cast 3,749 votes in opposition to the program or 77.2 percent of the total. The Republicans cast only 1,109 such votes or 22.8 percent of the total.

There is a remarkable consistency in the statistics between the 83d and 84th Congresses. During the 84th Congress 102 issues fell into this group. On these issues Republicans cast 3,106 votes in support of President Eisenhower or 76 percent of the total support votes. The Democrats cast 979 votes or only 24 percent of the total support votes. An examination of the opposition votes shows that the Democrats cast 3,405 votes or 73.7 percent of the total. The Republicans cast only 1,214 votes or 26.3 percent of the total. Over the 4-year period there were 228 rollcalls which were not adopted with full bipartisan support. Of all the votes cast in support of the President's program on these rollcalls, 75.8 percent were cast by Republicans and only 24.2 percent by Democrats. Of all opposition votes, 75.5 percent were cast by Democrats and only 24.5 percent by Republicans.

At this point I shall include a table which shows the position of the two parties in the two Congresses in their support of President Eisenhower:

All Eisenhower rollcalls

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	220	7,525	64.7	4,114	35.3	4,701	74.3	1,630	25.7
84th	203	6,682	59.4	4,575	40.6	4,053	70.3	1,715	29.7
Total	423	14,207	62.1	8,689	37.9	8,754	72.4	3,345	27.6

Immediately following is a tabulation showing the support accorded President Eisenhower on all rollcalls where a majority of the two parties was not in accord with the President's program. The 228 votes include 188 votes where a majority of the Republicans supported the President and a majority of the Democrats voted in opposition to him. It also includes the 40 votes where a majority of the Republicans voted in opposition to President Eisenhower.

Eisenhower rollcalls on issues without bipartisan Senate support

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	126	4,203	75.6	1,356	24.4	3,749	77.2	1,109	22.8
84th	102	3,106	76.0	979	24.0	3,405	73.7	1,214	26.3
Total	228	7,309	75.8	2,335	24.2	7,154	75.5	2,323	24.5

I have further subdivided the rollcalls in each Congress into 6 groups. Group 1 includes issues not included in the President's program which were adopted on a bipartisan basis. This group includes votes on Senate procedure.

Group 2 includes votes on issues which were not included in the President's program where the two parties were divided. The vote on the Niagara power development is an example of an issue in this category.

Group 3 includes issues which were included in the President's program and were adopted with no recorded opposition. The ratification of numerous treaties is included in group 3.

Group 4 includes issues where a majority of both parties voted in support of President Eisenhower's program. It is interesting in this connection that during the 84th Congress 69 rollcalls are included in this group and they account for 30 percent of all 84th Congress Senate rollcalls. While the majority of both parties supported the President's position on each rollcall, I find that 50.5 percent of the votes cast in favor of the President's program were cast by Republicans and 49.5 percent by Democrats. On this group of issues, the Democrats contributed 56.4 percent of all the votes cast in opposition to the President and the Republicans only 43.6 percent.

Group 5 includes those issues on which a majority of the Republicans voting were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program. There were 20 such rollcalls in both the 83d and 84th Congresses. The vote to restrict mutual security aid for Yugoslavia is an example of the type of issue included in this category. It is important to note that there were only 40 rollcalls included in this group during the 2 Congresses. They represented less than 8 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

Group 6 includes all issues where a majority of the Republican Senators voted to support President Eisenhower's program and were opposed by a majority of the Democratic Senators. On this group of issues, the Republicans supplied 81.7 percent of all the votes cast in support of President Eisenhower and the Democrats only 18.3 percent during the 84th Congress. Conversely, the Democrats supplied 82.2 percent of the votes recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower and the Republicans only 17.8 percent.

In reviewing this record it must be remembered that many items were never reported to the Senate during the last 2 years as the Democratic Party was in control of all the committees and decided which issues would receive consideration as well as the form in which they were reported.

I believe that this complete analysis of the votes cast over the past 4 years conclusively shows why President Eisenhower needs a Republican 85th Congress. I am inserting the entire tabulation in the RECORD at this point.

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF SENATE ROLLCALLS, 83D CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the Senate rollcalls during the 83d Congress. Two hundred seventy-one rollcalls were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below:

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 51 rollcalls, or 19 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
Yeas 794
Nays 559
Democrats:
Yeas 755
Nays 546

The number of issues included in group 1 is 33, accounting for 12 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Republicans 625
Democrats 133

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Democrats 556
Republicans 111

The number of issues included in group 2 is 18, accounting for 7 percent of 271 rollcalls.

Groups 3 through 6 include rollcalls on issues included in the President's program. They total 220 rollcalls or 81 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

VOTES CAST

Republicans:
Yeas 355
Nays ..... ---
Democrats:
Yeas 352
Nays ..... ---

The number of issues included in group 3 is 9, accounting for 3 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 2,967
Percent 55.2
Democrats:
Votes cast 2,406
Percent 44.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 952
Percent 64.6
Republicans:
Votes cast 521
Percent 35.4

The number of issues included in group 4 is 85, accounting for 32 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 224
Percent 43.0
Democrats:
Votes cast 297
Percent 57.0

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 518
Percent 46.8
Republicans:
Votes cast 590
Percent 53.2

The number of issues included in group 5 is 20, accounting for 7 percent of 271 rollcalls.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 3,979
Percent 79.0
Democrats:
Votes cast 1,059
Percent 21.0

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 3,231
Percent 86.2
Republicans:
Votes cast 519
Percent 13.8

The number of issues included in Group 6 is 106, accounting for 39 percent of 271 rollcalls.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all rollcalls not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 126 issues or 46 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	224		297		518		590	
6	3,979		1,059		3,231		519	
Total	4,203	75.6	1,356	24.4	3,749	77.2	1,109	22.8

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all rollcalls representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 220 of the 271 rollcalls or 81 percent of all Senate rollcalls. These rollcalls are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 64.7 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 35.3 percent. The Democrats supplied 74.3 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 25.7 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	355		352					
4	2,967		2,406		952		521	
5	224		297		518		590	
6	3,979		1,059		3,231		519	
Total	7,525	64.7	4,114	35.3	4,701	74.3	1,630	25.7

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.

Record vote No.	Group	Description
1	1	Consideration of rules adoption for 83d Cong.
2	1	Membership on Armed Services Committee—Vote by ballot under rule XXIV.
3	4	Charles E. Wilson—Confirmation as Secretary of Defense.
4	1	Internal Security Investigation—Vote on resolution (S. Res. 46).
5	4	Harold E. Talbott—Confirmation as Secretary of the Air Force.
6	4	Reorganization Act of 1949—McClellan amendment.
7	1	Condemning persecution of minority groups by Russia (S. Res. 84).
8	4	Albert M. Cole—Confirmation as Housing Administrator.
9	4	Charles E. Bohlen—Confirmation as Ambassador to Russia.
10	4	Tidelands—Anderson motion to lay aside.
11	6	Tidelands—Taft motion to table Anderson amendment.
12	6	Tidelands—Douglas-Anderson Continental Shelf amendment.
13	6	Tidelands—Monroney 3-mile-mark amendment.
14	6	Tidelands—Douglas coastline amendment.
15	6	Tidelands—Lehman educational-use substitute.
16	6	Tidelands—Kefauver Commission substitute.
17	6	Tidelands—Neely revenue-use substitute.
18	6	Tidelands—Langer national-debt amendment.
19	6	Tidelands—Passage (H. R. 4198).
20	6	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Langer consumer-dollar amendment.
21	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—McCarthy housing amendment.
22	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Byrd congressional control-limitation amendment.
23	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Bricker standby-authority amendment.
24	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Bricker ceiling-exemption amendment.
25	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Dirksen 5-percent reduction amendment.
26	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Public buildings-service amendment.
27	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Douglas buildings-maintenance amendment.
28	5	First independent offices appropriations, 1954—Dworshak public-housing amendment.
29	1	The Morse resolution (S. Res. 32)—To add Senator Morse and an additional Republican member to committees.
30	6	Reorganization Plan No. 2 (Agriculture Department)—Russell resolution to disapprove.
31	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—State Department buildings amendment.
32	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Business-census amendment.
33	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ferguson motion to lay on table Knowland motion to reconsider rollcall vote No. 32.
34	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ellender airport-aid substitute.
35	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ship-construction amendment.
36	1	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Bridges Communist China amendment.
37	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Bridges motion to suspend rules to permit United States marshal amendment.
38	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Mundt motion to reconsider vote by which Senate rejected amendment by rollcall vote No. 31.
39	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ferguson motion to suspend rules to permit employee-dismissal amendment.
40	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations, 1954—Ellender motion to table Douglas motion to reconsider rollcall vote No. 38.
41	6	Treasury-Post Office appropriations, 1954—Douglas amendment to reduce amount for postal operations.
42	6	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Russell et al. substitute amendment to Williams soil conservation payments amendment.
43	6	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Williams amendment as amended by Russell substitute amendment.
44	5	Department of Agriculture appropriations, 1954—Williams soil conservation payment reduction amendment.
45	2	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Knowland motion to consider conference report.
46	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Knowland motion to table Long motion to reconsider consideration of conference report.
47	6	Defense Production and Temporary Controls Act of 1953—Vote on adoption of conference report.
48	6	Outer Continental Shelf—Hill education substitute.
49	5	Outer Continental Shelf—Hendrickson-Case education-formula amendment.
50	4	Outer Continental Shelf—Long State-reimbursement amendment.
51	2	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Dirksen $25 million surplus-commodity amendment.
52	1	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Humphrey $50 million surplus-commodity amendment.
53	6	Mutual Security Act of 1953—McClellan currency conversion surplus commodity amendment.
54	4	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Goldwater French Indochina amendment.
55	6	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Case motion to table Long motion to recommit with $1.5 billion cut.
56	4	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Long motion to recommit with $1 billion cut.
57	5	Mutual Security Act of 1953—Long motion to recommit with cut to House figure.
58	6	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, 1954—Hill et al. hospital-construction amendment.
59	6	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations, 1954—Langer tuberculosis amendment.
60	4	Agreement on German external debts—Douglas motion to recommit.
61	4	Agreement on German external debts—ratified.
62	4	NATO Status of Forces Agreement—Bricker criminal jurisdiction reservation.
63	4	NATO Status of Forces Agreement—Ratification.
64	6	Excess-profits tax extension, Williams amendment to increase minimum exemption.
65	1	Equal rights constitutional amendment (S. J. Res. 49)—Hayden saving-clause amendment.
66	1	Equal rights constitutional amendment (S. J. Res. 49)—Passed.
67	1	Legislative employees retirement (S. 2175)—Carlson motion to refer bill to committee.
68	1	Legislative employees retirement—Williams amendment to increase retirement deductions for Members of Congress and legislative employees.
69	2	Knowland motion that Senate recess until 10 a. m., Saturday, July 18.
70	4	Commercial treaties with Ethiopia, Finland, Israel, Denmark, Greece, Germany, Japan, Italy—Ratified.
71	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Douglas single-purchaser amendment.
72	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Douglas large producers limitation amendment.
73	6	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Long amendment to permit either House or Senate to reject one or more proposed sales.
74	4	Sale of Government-owned synthetic-rubber plants (S. 2047)—Passed.
75	5	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Saltonstall motion to eliminate committee amendment.
76	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Maybank amendment to increase Air Force funds.
77	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1954—Hayden amendments to increase pilot training.
78	4	International Sugar Agreement—Ratified.
79	3	Fishery Convention Between the United States and Canada—Ratified.
80	4	Immigration visas to certain refugees (S. 1917)—Jenner amendment authorizing President to suspend visas.
81	4	Immigration visas to certain refugees (S. 1917)—Ives-Ferguson-Hendrickson amendment to include nationals of Italy.
82	4	Special-quota immigration visas (H. R. 6481)—Passed.
83	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Long amendment to limit amount available for expenditure.
84	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—McCarthy motion to suspend rules to permit consideration of amendment to bar funds from countries trading with Red China.
85	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Ellender amendment to cut mutual aid military funds for Europe.
86	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Ellender amendment to cut economic aid funds to Great Britain.
87	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Jenner amendment to limit expenditures to $5.5 billion.
88	6	Mutual Security Appropriation Act—Gore amendment to delete $50 million item for mutual special weapons planning.
89	4	Mutual Security Appropriation Act (H. R. 6391)—Passed.
90	6	Outer Continental Shelf—Adoption of conference report.
91	1	Standing committees—Anderson et al.
92	1	Standing committees adjustment—Adopted.
93	4	St. Lawrence seaway development—Long annual appropriations amendments.
94	4	St. Lawrence seaway development—Flanders motion to recommit.
95	4	St. Lawrence seaway development—Passage.
96	6	Robert E. Lee—Confirmation as FCC member.
97	4	Korean Mutual Defense Treaty—Ratification.
98	1	Subcommittee on Investigations personnel—Adopted.
99	4	Commodity Credit Corporation indebtedness—Conference report adopted.
100	4	Bricker amendment—Ferguson international-agreement amendment.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
101	4	Bricker amendment—Knowland treaty-ratification amendment.
102	6	Bricker amendment—Ferguson supreme-law amendment.
103	6	Albert C. Beeson—Confirmation as member of the NLRB.
104	2	Johnson (Texas)—Motion to adjourn.
105	5	Bricker amendment—Bricker internal-law amendment.
106	1	Bricker amendment—Morse motion to recommit.
107	1	Legislative retirement—Conference report adopted.
108	5	Bricker amendment—George modified amendment.
109	5	Bricker amendment—George substitute.
110	6	Mexican farm labor—Passage.
111	6	Hawaiian Statehood—Anderson amendment.
112	2	Natural Gas Act—Morse motion to recommit.
113	2	New Mexico election—Cordon amendment.
114	2	New Mexico election—Passage.
115	1	Capehart motion to recess.
116	5	Excise taxes—Douglas home-appliances amendment.
117	4	Excise taxes—Douglas automobile amendment.
118	4	Excise taxes—Douglas radio-and-TV-sets amendment.
119	4	Excise taxes—McClellan highway amendment.
120	4	Excise taxes—Williams-Byrd substitute.
121	4	Excise taxes—Passage.
122	4	Excise taxes—Conference report adopted.
123	4	Hawaiian statehood—Monroney et al Commonwealth substitute.
124	6	Hawaiian statehood—Smathers et al. referendum.
125	4	Hawaiian-Alaskan statehood—Passage.
126	6	Federal Aid Road Act—Chavez State-apportionment amendment.
127	4	Lease-Purchase Act—Dirksen $20,000 limitation.
128	6	Lease-Purchase Act—Passage.
129	6	Wool bill—Ellender 90 percent of parity amendment.
130	4	Wool bill—Malone tariff amendment.
131	6	Wool bill—Humphrey dairy substitute.
132	6	Wool bill—Thye dairy amendment.
133	6	Wool bill—Ellender price-support limitation.
134	4	Wool bill—Passage.
135	4	International Sugar Agreement—Dirksen reservation.
136	4	International Sugar Agreement—Ratification.
137	1	District of Columbia public works construction—Morse substitute.
138	1	District of Columbia public works construction—Payne tax-plan amendments.
139	6	Taft-Hartley amendments.
140	2	Constitutional amendment—Supreme Court composition.
141	2	Time-lag bill—Motion to recommit.
142	6	Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriations—Postal inspectors' amendment.
143	2	Transportation of fireworks—Johnston private transportation exemption.
144	1	Transportation of fireworks—Passage.
145	4	Independent Offices appropriations—FCC funds amendment.
146	5	Independent Offices appropriations—Cooper TVA-funds amendment.
147	2	Oregon public lands—Morse administration amendment.
148	1	HOLC amendments—Douglas nationwide-savings-and-loan amendment.
149	2	HOLC amendments—Douglas 39-States-savings-and-loan amendment.
150	6	Constitutional amendment—18-year-old voting.
151	5	Civil functions appropriations bill—Douglas $2-million-reduction amendment.
152	5	Civil functions appropriations bill—Douglas $3.6-million-reduction amendment.
153	4	Santa Margarita project—Douglas United States-rights amendment.
154	4	Agriculture Department appropriations—Schoeppel-Cooper experiment-station amendment.
155	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Douglas REA amendment.
156	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Morse motion tabling reconsideration of REA amendment.
157	6	Agriculture Department appropriations—Long school-lunch amendment.
158	4	Agriculture Department appropriations—Morse REA amendment.
159	4	Housing Act of 1954—Knowland public-housing amendment.
160	4	Constitutional amendment—Congressional emergency operation.
161	4	Col. Leland Hazelton Hewitt—Chavez motion to recommit appointment.
162	6	Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations—Monroney amendment with respect to McLeod.
163	6	Defense Department appropriations—Kennedy additional funds amendment.
164	6	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Gore 3-year amendment.
165	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Mundt farm-parity amendment.
166	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act—Passage.
167	4	Caracas Declaration reaffirmed—Resolution adopted.
168	4	Universal Copyright Convention—Ratified.
169	6	Universal Copyright Convention—Reconsideration tabled.
170	6	Indian hospitals transfer—Passage.
171	6	Tax revision bill—Millikin personal-exemption substitute.
172	6	Tax revision bill—George personal-exemption amendment.
173	5	Tax revision bill—Johnson (Colorado) dividend-study amendment.
174	6	Tax revision bill—Long individual-tax-credit amendment.
175	4	Tax revision bill—Morse depreciation-schedules amendment.
176	2	Tax revision bill—Gore life-insurance amendment.
177	4	Tax revision bill—Douglas farm-machinery amendment.
178	4	Tax revision bill—Douglas motion to recommit.
179	4	Tax revision bill—Monroney corporate-tax amendment.
180	4	Tax revision bill—Passage.
181	6	Vocational rehabilitation services—Morse Washington pilot center amendment.
182	3	Vocational rehabilitation services—Passage.
183	4	Military and naval installation construction—Long reduction amendments.
184	4	Military and naval installation construction—Long Director-of-Installations amendment.
185	6	Priest Rapids development—Magnuson power-preference amendment.
186	6	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Kennedy nationwide standards amendment.
187	6	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Kennedy State-use amendments.
188	4	Employment Security Administrative Financing Act—Passage.
189	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Anderson contractual-power amendment.
190	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Ferguson amendment.
191	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Johnson (Colorado) power-disposition amendment.
192	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Johnson (Texas) motion tabling reconsideration of Johnson (Colorado) amendment.
193	2	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Humphrey Civilian Application Division amendment.
194	1	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion to recess.
195	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Pastore's atomic-pool amendment.
196	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Kerr licensing amendment.
197	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Sparkman patent-licensing amendment.
198	2	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland cloture motion.
199	4	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Lehman international agreement-section amendment.
200	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Murray power-liaison amendment.
201	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Stennis domestic-section amendment.
202	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Daniel national-debt amendment.
203	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Fulbright education amendment.
204	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Humphrey license-regulation amendment.
205	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Knowland motion tabling Morse fair-price amendment.
206	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Passage.
207	4	Housing Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
208	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Capehart Export-Import Bank amendment.
209	1	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Red China U. N. seating amendment.
210	6	Tax revision bill—Conference report adopted.
211	5	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Malone strategic-materials amendment.
212	3	Expression favoring German sovereignty—Resolution adopted.
213	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Malone aircraft-construction amendment.
214	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Smathers Latin-American amendment.
215	6	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Johnston farm-surpluses amendment.
216	1	Flanders-McCarthy censure resolution—Knowland motion to refer to a select committee.
217	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Long $1-plus billion reduction amendment.
218	6	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Long one-half billion amendment.
219	4	Mutual Security Act of 1954—Passage.
220	4	Supplemental appropriation bill—Morse Hoover Commission amendment.
221	6	Supplemental appropriation bill—Ferguson civil defense headquarters amendment.
222	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—McCarthy 90 to 100 percent of parity amendment.
223	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Schoeppel 82½ to 90 percent of parity amendment.
224	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken flexible-supports amendment.
225	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Thye dairy-products amendment.
226	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken dairy-support-elimination amendment.
227	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Young 75 and 90 percent of parity for grain substitute.
228	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Aiken grain-support-elimination amendment.
229	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—Williams disaster-relief amendment.
230	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Anderson forest-administration amendment.
231	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Kerr beef-parity amendment.
232	4	Agricultural Act of 1954—Thye utilization amendment.
233	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Ellender wool amendment.
234	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Humphrey county-committeemen amendment.
235	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Johnston motion tabling reconsideration committeemen amendment.
236	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Passage.
237	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Commission on Security amendment.
238	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Ives labor-organization amendment.
239	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Daniel separability amendment.
240	3	Subversive Activities Control Act—Humphrey Communist Party amendment.
241	3	Subversive Activities Control Act—Passage.
242	6	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Conference report rejected.
243	6	Mutual Security Appropriations—Maybank reduction amendment.
244	1	Corliss Lamont cited for contempt.
245	4	Atomic Energy Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
246	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Butler Communist Party amendment to House amendments.
247	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Humphrey Communist Party amendment to House amendments.
248	6	Subversive Activities Control Act—Gore motion tabling reconsideration of Humphrey amendment.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 83d Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
249	4	Subversive Activities Control Act—Senate concurrence in House amendments.
250	6	Rivers and harbors bill—Kennedy Delaware River amendment.
251	4	Rivers and harbors bill—Passage.
252	6	Agricultural Act of 1954—Conference report adopted.
253	6	Santa Maria project—Pay raise rider.
254	6	Santa Maria project—Morse acreage amendment.
255	3	Subversive Activities Act—Conference report adopted.
256	1	Railroad Retirement Act—Goldwater amendment.
257	5	Pay raise bill—Knowland amendment.
258	5	Pay raise bill—Passage.
259	3	Tax Treaty With Great Britain—Ratified.
260	3	Opium Treaty—Ratified.
261	3	Tax Treaty With Germany—Ratified.
262	1	Adjournment until Nov. 29, 1954 (S. Res. 331)—Lehman amendment to change date in resolution to Nov. 22, 1954.
263	1	Adjournment until Nov. 29, 1954 (S. Res. 331)—Passed.
264	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Dirksen amendment.
265	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Mundt amendment.
266	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bridges amendment.
267	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Adoption of committee amendment to sec. 1.
268	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bridges motion to table sec. 2, as modified.
269	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Bennett amendment to second committee amendment (in the nature of a substitute therefor).
270	2	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Passage of second committee amendment, as amended.
271	1	McCarthy censure (S. Res. 301)—Passed.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
1	41	5	29	16
2	46	1	35	6
4	39	-------	34	-------
7	39	-------	40	-------
29	2	33	17	23
36	38	-------	38	-------
52	3	27	9	27
65	24	19	34	6
66	42	1	31	10
67	12	27	9	29
68	12	27	7	31
91	3	36	23	23
92	39	-------	45	1
98	44	-------	41	1
106	1	45	17	29
107	33	13	28	17
115	-------	41	1	43
137	5	31	10	20
138	13	23	10	22
144	38	2	35	1
148	1	36	13	22
194	44	-------	12	-------
209	47	-------	44	-------
216	40	3	35	9
244	38	1	33	2
256	7	30	-------	38
262	-------	42	2	34
263	42	-------	34	2
264	21	22	-------	44
265	15	29	-------	45
266	20	23	-------	45
267	23	20	44	-------
271	22	22	45	-------
Total	794	559	755	546

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
45	Yea	39	-------	39	-------
51	Yea	22	6	32	10
69	Yea	34	6	27	4
104	Nay	45	-------	47	1
112	Nay	35	17	19	6
113	Yea	36	-------	48	5
114	Yea	36	-------	48	5
140	Yea	43	15	19	-------
141	Nay	35	2	34	5
143	Nay	36	29	6	6
147	Nay	37	15	17	1
149	Nay	25	14	20	11
176	Nay	41	19	22	1
193	Yea	45	2	8	1
198	Yea	40	4	39	3
268	Yea	29	4	41	14
269	Nay	23	-------	45	19
270	Nay	24	-------	45	19
	Total	625	133	556	111

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
79	36	-------	41	-------
182	44	-------	38	-------
212	45	-------	43	-------
240	43	-------	41	-------
241	43	-------	42	-------
255	39	-------	40	-------
259	35	-------	36	-------
260	35	-------	36	-------
261	35	-------	35	-------
Total	355	-------	352	-------

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
3	Yea	47	30	6	-------
5	Yea	40	36	6	-------
6	Nay	36	28	14	2
8	Yea	40	24	16	2
9	Yea	34	40	2	11
10	Nay	42	19	18	3
34	Nay	38	20	17	2
35	Nay	22	32	6	18
38	Yea	29	19	17	6
40	Yea	38	26	12	4
50	Nay	38	23	17	1
54	Nay	30	34	6	11
56	Nay	21	27	13	21
60	Nay	35	16	13	3
61	Yea	29	17	11	5
62	Nay	27	26	12	15
63	Yea	37	35	6	9
70	Yea	43	43	1	-------
74	Yea	40	25	14	2
78	Yea	34	40	1	-------
80	Nay	26	23	23	17
81	Nay	32	30	16	13
82	Yea	38	25	22	8
83	Nay	27	26	18	17
84	Nay	23	27	15	19
85	Nay	24	28	14	18
86	Nay	21	24	17	20
87	Nay	26	23	18	15
89	Yea	31	38	1	9
93	Nay	31	24	23	11
94	Nay	27	24	18	14
95	Yea	25	26	18	15
97	Yea	44	37	5	1
99	Yea	23	26	9	1
100	Yea	36	26	18	2
101	Yea	40	32	15	1
117	Nay	39	24	20	5
118	Nay	39	25	19	4
119	Nay	36	25	20	7
120	Nay	26	28	16	18
121	Yea	38	38	3	5
122	Yea	34	38	4	4
123	Nay	37	23	20	4
125	Yea	33	24	19	9

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
127	Nay	26	34	-------	8
130	Nay	37	39	-------	7
134	Yea	40	29	13	4
135	Yea	42	32	2	-------
136	Yea	38	22	11	5
145	Yea	37	32	5	1
153	Nay	29	19	12	-------
154	Yea	27	24	8	12
158	Nay	38	23	19	3
159	Yea	38	28	14	2
160	Yea	34	36	1	-------
161	Nay	40	19	18	-------
165	Nay	27	25	11	12
166	Yea	37	34	1	2
167	Yea	36	33	-------	1
168	Yea	35	30	2	1
175	Nay	40	20	19	1
177	Nay	39	26	12	3
178	Nay	41	21	15	-------
179	Nay	40	18	14	1
180	Yea	41	22	9	-------
183	Nay	38	25	11	1
184	Nay	35	19	13	-------
188	Yea	43	35	3	-------
199	Nay	41	23	17	1
207	Yea	38	21	17	4
208	Nay	26	31	13	20
213	Nay	39	42	-------	7
214	Yea	44	42	1	1
217	Nay	24	24	18	20
219	Yea	29	38	4	15
220	Nay	37	18	18	1
222	Nay	43	38	8	4
229	Nay	28	37	6	19
232	Nay	34	22	18	12
238	Yea	46	41	1	-------
239	Yea	44	41	1	-------
245	Yea	39	20	17	-------
246	Yea	41	21	18	1
249	Yea	40	41	1	-------
251	Yea	40	37	2	-------
	Total	2,967	2,406	952	521

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
21	Yea	3	16	24	38
25	Nay	16	27	12	23
26	Yea	10	9	31	25
27	Nay	12	24	15	24
28	Nay	11	23	13	25
44	Yea	16	6	32	19
49	Nay	3	39	-------	37
57	Nay	17	25	16	22
75	Yea	15	10	33	29
105	Nay	17	33	13	29
108	Nay	16	14	31	30

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*—Con.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
109	Nay	14	17	28	32
116	Nay	15	8	36	28
146	Yea	8	15	23	33
151	Yea	1	4	38	44
152	Yea	2	2	38	43
173	Nay	10	3	38	33
211	Nay	18	22	21	28
257	Yea	16	-------	38	17
258	Nay	4	-------	38	31
	Total	224	297	518	590

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
11	Yea	38	18	26	7
12	Nay	39	19	21	5
13	Nay	41	18	20	2
14	Nay	34	16	18	8
15	Nay	38	22	25	5
16	Nay	38	21	26	6
17	Nay	42	22	25	2
18	Nay	36	20	26	8
19	Yea	35	21	26	9
20	Nay	36	9	26	4
22	Yea	33	12	28	13
23	Yea	24	2	38	23
24	Yea	40	8	33	7
30	Nay	35	11	28	1
31	Yea	21	13	23	15
32	Yea	25	16	22	16
33	Yea	27	12	22	13
37	Yea	35	-------	36	-------
39	Yea	35	-------	36	-------
41	Nay	32	12	25	6
42	Nay	32	5	32	6
43	Nay	32	6	32	6
46	Yea	41	-------	41	-------
47	Yea	42	-------	44	3
48	Nay	30	7	34	11
53	Nay	29	6	35	14
55	Yea	30	18	22	12
58	Nay	35	6	35	8
59	Nay	35	3	33	6
64	Nay	36	16	25	9
71	Nay	38	11	28	3
72	Nay	37	8	31	3
73	Nay	35	-------	40	7
76	Nay	46	9	38	-------
77	Nay	42	6	40	1
88	Nay	37	18	21	2
90	Yea	37	8	37	6
96	Yea	40	18	23	2
102	Yea	38	6	39	4
103	Yea	42	3	41	1
110	Yea	42	17	21	1
111	Nay	41	2	43	3
124	Nay	39	20	23	3
126	Nay	29	15	24	13
128	Yea	36	11	26	4
129	Nay	37	11	33	7
131	Nay	40	20	25	7
132	Nay	37	16	29	9
133	Nay	45	21	22	1
139	Nay	42	-------	47	3
142	Nay	40	4	26	-------
150	Yea	27	7	24	-------
155	Nay	37	3	36	6
156	Nay	37	2	38	5
157	Nay	37	6	36	3
162	Nay	41	-------	35	-------
163	Nay	40	10	37	1
164	Nay	39	6	32	-------
169	Yea	41	11	23	-------
170	Yea	44	13	27	-------
171	Yea	46	-------	48	1
172	Nay	45	4	44	2
174	Nay	41	9	31	2
181	Nay	41	-------	43	1
185	Nay	40	5	28	1
186	Nay	42	14	27	3
187	Nay	41	7	29	2

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
189	Nay	44	11	34	2
190	Yea	44	12	33	2
191	Nay	35	6	39	6
192	Nay	38	4	41	5
195	Yea	44	2	40	1
196	Yea	40	1	37	-------
197	Yea	42	1	24	-------
200	Nay	41	15	28	2
201	Nay	40	11	30	1
202	Nay	22	18	19	18
203	Nay	40	15	24	1
204	Nay	39	15	22	1
205	Yea	37	5	31	3
206	Yea	44	13	26	2
210	Yea	42	19	23	3
215	Nay	42	16	26	6
218	Nay	25	16	26	19
221	Yea	24	5	31	13
223	Yea	37	12	34	10
224	Yea	39	10	36	8
225	Nay	37	11	34	10
226	Yea	37	12	33	10
227	Nay	38	16	26	7
228	Yea	38	14	24	5
230	Yea	40	5	35	6
231	Nay	44	18	21	2
233	Nay	46	20	21	-------
234	Nay	43	1	41	4
235	Nay	43	-------	42	4
236	Yea	44	18	25	3
237	Nay	44	13	29	2
242	Yea	39	2	43	5
243	Nay	26	8	29	12
247	Nay	38	1	38	3
248	Nay	38	1	40	3
250	Nay	39	17	20	1
252	Yea	31	13	23	5
253	Yea	36	11	28	2
254	Nay	34	11	17	-------
	Total	3,979	1,059	3,231	519

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF SENATE ROLLCALLS, 84TH CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the Senate roll calls during the 84th Congress. Two hundred thirty rollcalls were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The two groups together include 27 rollcalls or 12 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
Yeas ---------- 455
Nays ---------- 381
Democrats:
Yeas ---------- 492
Nays ---------- 366

The number of issues included in group 1 is 20, accounting for 9 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Republicans ---------- 204
Democrats ---------- 77

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Democrats ---------- 221
Republicans ---------- 85

The number of issues included in group 2 is 7, accounting for 3 percent of 230 rollcalls.

Groups 3 through 6 include rollcalls on issues included in the President's program. They total 203 rollcalls or 88 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

VOTE CAST

Republicans:
Yeas ---------- 1,292
Nays ---------- -----
Democrats:
Yeas ---------- 1,361
Nays ---------- -----

The number of issues included in group 3 is 32, accounting for 14 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 2,284
Percent ---------- 50.5
Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 2,235
Percent ---------- 49.5

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 648
Percent ---------- 56.4
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 501
Percent ---------- 43.6

The number of issues included in group 4 is 69, accounting for 30 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 258
Percent ---------- 43.1
Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 341
Percent ---------- 56.9

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 526
Percent ---------- 47.2
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 589
Percent ---------- 52.8

The number of issues included in group 5 is 20, accounting for 8 percent of 230 rollcalls.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 2,848
Percent ---------- 81.7
Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 638
Percent ---------- 18.3

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast ---------- 2,879
Percent ---------- 82.2
Republicans:
Votes cast ---------- 625
Percent ---------- 17.8

The number of issues included in group 6 is 82, accounting for 36 percent of 230 rollcalls.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all rollcalls not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 102 issues or 44 percent of all Senate rollcalls.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	258		341		526		589	
6	2,848		638		2,879		625	
Total	3,106	76.0	979	24.0	3,405	73.7	1,214	26.3

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all rollcalls representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 203 of the 230 rollcalls or 88 percent of all Senate rollcalls. These rollcalls are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 59.4 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 40.6 percent. The Democrats supplied 70.3 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 29.7 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	1,292		1,361					
4	2,284		2,235		648		501	
5	258		341		526		589	
6	2,848		638		2,879		625	
Total	6,682	59.4	4,575	40.6	4,053	70.3	1,715	29.7

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.

Record vote No.	Group	Description
1	1	Communist conspiracy and investigation—Daniel et al. sense of Senate resolution opposing communism.
2	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Langer amendment barring use of troops.
3	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Kefauver substitute.
4	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Lehman-Morse amendment to strike certain language re protecting related positions.
5	4	Presidential use of Armed Forces re Formosa, Pescadores, and related islands—Passage.
6	4	Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty (Ex. K)—Ratification.
7	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Morse amendment re legal status of territories applicable.
8	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Morse amendment to strike language making provisions applicable to other territories.
9	4	Mutual Defense Treaty With Republic of China (Ex. A)—Ratification.
10	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Bush amendments to strike language re increases for Members of Congress.
11	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Williams amendment to defer increase until budget is balanced.
12	4	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Passage.
13	3	Convention with Japan relating to taxes on income (Ex. D)—Ratification.
14	3	Convention with Japan relating to taxes on estates, inheritances, and gifts (Ex. E)—Ratification.
15	3	Convention with Belgium relating to taxes on estates and successions (Ex. G)—Ratification.
16	1	Congressional-judicial salary adjustment—Williams motion after rejection of conference report that conferees be instructed.
17	6	Corporate and excise tax rate extension—Johnson (Texas) et al. substitute for the reported bill.
18	6	Corporate and excise tax rate extension—Committee amendment re $20 tax credit.
19	4	Nomination of John Marshall Harlan to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court—Confirmation.
20	6	Sale of 3 synthetic-rubber-producing plants in California—Thye and Humphrey resolutions re disapproval of sale of plants.
21	6	Sale of 24 synthetic-rubber plants as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission—Resolution re disapproval of sale of plants.
22	5	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Stennis amendment to increase acreage allotments by 1½ percent.
23	6	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Case (South Dakota) amendment increasing 1955 wheat allotments by 1½ percent.
24	6	To amend the cotton-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended—Passage.
25	6	Postal employees' pay increase—Johnson (Texas) motion to table Carlson substitute amendment providing average 7.6-percent increase.
26	5	Postal employees' pay increase—Passage.
27	4	Protocol on the termination of the occupation regime in Federal Republic of Germany (Ex. L)—Ratification.
28	4	Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the Federal Republic of Germany (Ex. M)—Ratification.
29	4	International Telecommunication Convention (Ex. R)—Ratification.
30	4	Colorado River storage project—Neuberger amendments en bloc to delete Echo Park Dam.
31	4	Colorado River storage project—Passage.
32	1	Department of Agriculture appropriation bill—Williams amendment to reduce funds for soil-building and soil-and-water-conserving practices.
33	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Douglas amendment to eliminate peril-point provision.
34	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Morse amendment re 90-day delay period before future agreement shall take effect.
35	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Douglas amendment eliminating 2 Tariff Commission sections of bill.
36	4	Extension of Trade Agreements Act—Passage.
37	5	Postal employees' pay increase—Conference report—Passage.
38	2	Repeal of sec. 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—Holland amendment to retain section 348 with certain exceptions.
39	4	Constitutional amendment re vacancies in the House of Representatives—Passage.
40	6	Postal employees' pay increase—Failure of passage over veto.
41	6	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955—Martin (Pennsylvania) substitute amendment representing administration viewpoint.
42	6	Federal-aid Highway Act of 1955—Bush motion to recommit.
43	3	Postal employees' pay increase (8-percent bill)—Passage.
44	3	Great Lakes Fisheries Convention Between the United States and Canada (Executive B)—Ratification.
45	5	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Knowland amendment to Potter amendment re availability of 50 percent of economic development funds on loan basis only.
46	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Potter amendment re availability of 75 percent of economic development funds on loan basis only.
47	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Ellender amendment to cut defense fund for Europe, the Near East and Africa, and to Asia by one-half.
48	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Jenner motion to recommit with instructions to report back 2 bills.
49	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Long amendment reducing authorization by $318 million.
50	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—McCarthy amendment withholding aid to countries trading with Communist China.
51	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Ellender amendment striking President's $200 million Asian regional development fund.
52	6	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Capehart amendment re waiver of civil service termination laws re certain FOA employees.
53	4	Mutual Security Act of 1955—Passage.
54	6	Housing amendments of 1955—Capehart amendment reducing authorization to 35,000 units annually for 2 years.
55	4	Housing amendments of 1955—Passage.
56	4	Department of Commerce appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment increasing CAB payments to air carriers.
57	4	Department of Commerce appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment increasing ship construction and maritime activites.
58	4	Austrian Treaty (Ex. G)—Ratification.
59	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Symington en bloc amendments to increase certain Marine Corps funds.
60	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Mundt amendment to eliminate all of section 638 re Government in business.
61	3	Defense Department appropriations, 1956—Passage.
62	4	McCarthy sense of Senate resolution re Geneva Conference—Rejected.
63	6	Compulsory cumulative voting of stock re election of directors of national banking associations—Passage.
64	6	Construction projects by Atomic Energy Commission—Hickenlooper amendment re atomic-powered merchant vessel.
65	4	Home rule bill for the District of Columbia—Passage.
[1] 66–69	3	(66) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. D)—Ratification. (67) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. E)—Ratification. (68) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. F)—Ratification. (69) Geneva Convention of Aug. 12, 1949 (Ex. G)—Ratification.
70	3	Self-determination of peoples—Passage.
71	1	Colonialism and Communist imperialism—Passage.
72	4	Reserve Forces Act of 1955—Jenner amendment re assignment of personnel to a foreign country exercising criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel.
73	4	Reserve Forces Act of 1955—Passage.

[1] En bloc.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
74	6	Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950—Capehart amendment re employment of w. o. c.'s (persons without compensation).
75	6	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment restoring House cut of $420 million for military-assistance phase.
76	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Ellender amendment to reduce European defense funds from $85 million to $64 million.
77	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Ellender amendment to reduce Asian defense funds by $206.8 million.
78	5	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment reducing Asian (India) development assistance $10 million.
79	6	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Committee amendment to increase President's Asian economic-development fund by $50 million.
80	4	Mutual security appropriations, 1956—Passage.
81	3	German Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation—Ratification.
82	6	Railroad retirement increases—Smith (New Jersey) amendment striking sections 5 and 6.
83	3	Railroad retirement increases—Passage.
84	5	Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act, 1953—Passage.
85	4	Treaty of Mutual Understandings and Cooperation With the Republic of Panama (Ex. F)—Ratification.
[1] 86–89	3	(86) Netherlands Convention of Apr. 29, 1948, (Ex. I)—Ratification. (87) Protocol Supplementing Netherlands Convention of Apr. 29, 1948, (Ex. I)—Ratification. (88) Italian Tax Convention (Ex. C)—Ratification. (89) Italian Tax Convention (Ex. D)—Ratification.
90	6	Nomination of John A. Hall to be director of Locomotive Inspection, Interstate Commerce Commission—Confirmation.
91	4	Retirement of Government capital in certain institutions under supervision of the Farm Credit Administration—Vote on Williams amendment re application of assets on liquidation or dissolution of any bank for cooperatives.
92	4	Assistance to Federal personnel in exercising their voting franchise (conference report)—Rejection of vote on Morse motion to recommit conference report with instructions.
93	6	Extension of Defense Production Act of 1950 (conference report)—Capehart motion to recommit.
94	6	Nomination of Harold C. Patterson to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission—Confirmation.
[1] 95–96	3	(95) Protocol Amending the Slavery Convention (Ex. F)—Ratification. (96) Protocol Modifying the Convention re the International Union for the Publication of Customs Tariffs and the International Bureau for the Publication of Customs Tariffs (Ex. P)—Ratification.
97	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Potter amendment to recommit.
98	2	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Pastore amendment requiring Federal Power Commission to determine the reasonable market price.
99	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Potter amendment re "fair and equitable formula versus reasonable market price."
100	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Humphrey amendment re escalation clauses.
101	1	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Douglas amendment re small producers.
102	2	Natural Gas Act of 1938, to amend—Passage.
103	1	Select Committee To Investigate Alleged Improper Attempt To Influence Vote of Senator Case (South Dakota)—Passage.
104	6	Sugar Act of 1948, to amend and extend—Capehart amendment re foreign-sugar quotas.
105	3	International Convention To Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material (Ex. Q)—Ratification.
106	1	Special Committee To Investigate Illegal or Improper Political Influence—Passage.
107	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Anderson amendment re 90 percent of parity.
108	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey substitute amendment to amendment of Hickenlooper re farm base acreage.
109	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote rejecting the Humphrey substitute amendment.
110	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment to Kerr amendment re incentive payments for cattle and hogs.
111	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr amendment re price supports for hogs and beef cattle.
112	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Aiken amendment to eliminate language re millable quality wheat.
113	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table motion to reconsider the vote agreeing to Aiken amendment.
114	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment to Williams amendment re 90 percent price supports to limited loans.
115	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Jenner amendment to Williams amendment re $25,000 limitation for participation in soil bank.
116	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Williams amendment, as amended, re limits on price-support loans and participation in soil bank.
117	3	Nomination of William E. Dowling and James Weldon Jones to be members of the U. S. Tariff Commission—Confirmation.
118	6	Agricultural Act of 1956.—Carlson amendment re 100 percent parity for wheat.
119	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Russell amendment re 100 percent parity for cotton.
120	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—George amendment to strike language which made the average grade of cotton the standard.
121	3	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment re brucellosis-control program and milk for school children.
122	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Payne amendment re other commodities eligible for acreage-reserve program of the soil bank.
123	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Aiken amendment to strike from the bill the dual parity formula.
124	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Aiken amendment was rejected.
125	6	School milk and brucellosis (conference report)—Hickenlooper motion to recommit with instructions.
126	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr amendment re inclusion of grazing lands in the conservation reserve.
127	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—First vote on Morse amendment to strike language in bill re contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief.
128	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Anderson amendment to strike language re reallocation of acreage among cotton States.
129	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Young amendment to limit imports of surplus crops to annual average of preceding 3 years.
130	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Welker amendment re surplus crops grown on reclaimed lands ineligible for soil-bank benefits and price-support legislation.
131	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Magnuson amendment to eliminate a section of the bill repealing the so-called 50–50 cargo preference law.
132	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Kerr et al. amendment re certification from beef processors as to price paid.
133	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to table motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Kerr et al. amendment was agreed to.
134	5	Agricultural Act of 1956—Holland amendment re producer allocating a percentage of his acreage to the soil bank.
135	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Morse amendment was rejected.
136	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Second vote on Morse amendment to strike language in bill re contribution to cost of feed and seed furnished as disaster relief.
137	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Humphrey amendment making mandatory the authority for set-aside of corn, upland cotton, and wheat.
138	4	Agricultural Act of 1956—Passage.
139	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Langer amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Selection of candidate by direct vote in both primary and general election.
140	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Lehman substitute amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Abolition of electoral college and direct popular election.
141	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Case (New Jersey) substitute amendment to Daniel et al. substitute: Reduction of State's electoral vote in proportion to total vote cast.
142	1	Constitutional amendment re election of President and Vice President—Daniel et al. substitute providing for a more direct popular vote.
143	4	Joint Committee on Central Intelligence—Passage.
144	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (conference report)—Agreeing to.
[1] 145–147	3	(145) Convention re international civil aviation (Ex. F)—Ratification. (146) Convention re customs facilities for touring (Ex. A)—Ratification. (147) Convention re importation of private road vehicles (Ex. B)—Ratification.
148	5	Increased appropriation for the Food and Agriculture Organization and International Labor Organization—Bricker amendment to limit contribution.
149	5	Bank holding companies—Douglas amendment re companies acquiring additional assets.
150	4	Bank holding companies—Capehart amendment re nonbanking assets.
151	4	Bank holding companies—Morse amendment to revise definition.
152	2	District of Columbia Transit System—Allott amendment to make authority an agency of the United States.
153	2	District of Columbia Transit System—Passage.
154	6	Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Knowland amendments re State participation after June 30, 1959.
155	4	Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—Passage.
156	2	Niagara River power project—Bush motion to recommit.
157	2	Niagara River power project—Passage.
158	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Young amendment re sale of surplus wheat for feed.
159	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Williams amendment to strike mandatory support prices for feed grains.
160	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Holland modified amendment re price support program for feed grains.
161	1	Agricultural Act of 1956—Smith (New Jersey) amendment to strike language re upland cotton.
162	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—First vote on Williams amendment re limit of payments.
163	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Saltonstall motion to reconsider vote agreeing to Williams amendment.
164	6	Agricultural Act of 1956—Second vote on Williams amendment re limit of payments.
165	6	Civil Service Retirement Act revision—Carlson amendment re retirement age.
166	5	Civil Service Retirement Act revision—Knowland amendment re survivor annuity.
167	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Payne amendment raising the interest rate on loans under college housing program.
168	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Fulbright motion to table motion to reconsider vote by which Payne amendment was rejected.
169	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Bricker amendment to limit public housing units to 35,000 a year.
170	6	Housing Act amendments of 1956—Bush amendment restricting new public housing to localities with a "workable program."
171	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland amendment as substitute re prevailing wages under the Davis-Bacon Act.
172	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Bridges motion to table a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Knowland amendment was agreed to.

[1] En bloc.

Classification of all Senate rollcalls, 84th Cong.—Continued

Record vote No.	Group	Description
173	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland motion to table Chavez amendment providing for application of the Davis-Bacon Act to wages on the Interstate System.
174	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Chavez amendment re prevailing rate of wages on Interstate System as determined under the Davis-Bacon Act.
175	5	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Capehart amendment setting up formula for apportioning authorized appropriations among the several States.
176	6	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Knowland motion to table motion to reconsider the voice vote by which the Fulbright amendment re review and appeal was agreed to.
177	6	Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956—Dworshak amendment limiting purchases to 5,000 short tons per calendar month.
178	1	Automobile dealers' right to sue manufacturers who fail to act in good faith—Passage.
179	4	Defense Production Act of 1950, to extend—Bush motion to table committee amendment declaring congressional policy re dispersal of industrial facilities.
180	4	Defense Production Act of 1950, to extend—Committee amendment declaring congressional policy re dispersal of industrial facilities.
181	4	Federal Aid Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956—Motion to adopt conference report.
182	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Bridges amendment to committee amendment re Air Force increased funds.
183	6	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Committee amendment re Air Force increased funds.
184	3	Defense Department appropriations, 1957—Passage.
185	6	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Young amendment re agricultural commodities in surplus from increased imports.
186	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Johnston (South Carolina) amendment re limitation on imports of cotton and cotton textiles.
187	5	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—O'Mahoney amendment to committee amendment re aid to Yugoslavia.
188	5	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Bridges amendment to committee amendment re aid to Yugoslavia.
189	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Long amendment limiting appropriations to $2,765,875,000.
190	6	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Modified Knowland amendment re establishment of Commission To Study Foreign Aid Program.
191	4	Mutual-security program, 1957 authorization—McCarthy amendment re shipment of strategic materials to Russia.
192	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—O'Mahoney amendment re the furnishing of information relating to the program to congressional committees.
193	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Bridges amendment to cut funds for India.
194	4	Mutual-security program, 1957, authorization—Passage.
195	5	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Williams motion to recommit.
196	6	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Williams amendment re "windfall" benefits.
197	6	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Humphrey amendment.
198	5	Air carriers reinvestment of proceeds of sale—Passage.
199	4	Ex. I, 84th Cong., 2d sess., International Wheat Agreement—Ratification.
[1] 200–202	3	(200) Ex. E, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification. (201) Ex. G, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification. (202) Ex. H, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Ratification.
203	6	S. 4146, to provide for a civilian atomic power acceleration program—Passage.
204	4	Confirmation of nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be United States circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—Motion to recommit.
205	4	Nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff to be United States circuit judge for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals—Confirmation.
206	5	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Modified Long amendment to liberalize matching formula for old-age assistance, aid to blind and totally disabled persons; and to provide temporary extension of 1952 matching formula for dependent children.
207	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—George amendment to pay cash disability benefits at age 50.
208	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Pastore motion to table Johnson (Texas) motion to reconsider vote on George amendment.
209	5	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Kerr amendment to lowr from age 65 to 62, for all women, the age at which they can claim old-age and survivors' insurance benefits.
210	6	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Douglas amendment to allow recipients of old-age assistance to earn up to $50 a month without deduction.
211	3	H. R. 7225, social-security amendments of 1956—Passage.
212	6	S. 1333, to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon—Passage.
213	3	Ex. J. 84th Cong., 2d sess., a convention between the United States of America and the French Republic to eliminate double taxation—Resolution of ratification.
214	3	Ex. K, 84th Cong., 2d sess., a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Honduras for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of income-tax evasion—Resolution of ratification.
215	4	Nomination of Paul G. Hoffman to be a United States representative to the 11th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations—Confirmation.
216	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2,300,000,000 to $1,735,000,000.
217	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2.3 billion to $2 billion.
218	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendment to reduce military aid from $2.3 billion to $2.1 billion.
219	6	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—First committee amendment increasing amount for military assistance from $1.735 billion to $2.3 billion.
220	1	H. Con. Res. 265, expressing sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations—Passage.
221	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Ellender amendments to reduce defense support and development assistance appropriations $126 million.
222	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Senate Appropriations Committee amendments to provide $1,175,200,000 for defense support and $293,000,000 for development assistance.
223	5	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Knowland motion to suspend rules to permit vote on amendment barring use of funds under provisions of H. R. 12130 and any prior act, for military assistance to Yugoslavia.
224	5	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Modified Knowland amendment barring any use of funds in the bill for military assistance or military equipment to Yugoslavia.
225	4	H. R. 12130, mutual-security appropriations for fiscal 1957—Passage.
226	1	Douglas motion that Senate stand adjourned for 5 minutes.
227	5	H. R. 12350, second supplemental appropriation bill, 1957—Monroney amendment to provide $15,000,000 for constructing a second air facility for Washington, D. C., at Burke, Va.
228	6	S. 2663, unemployment in certain economically depressed areas—Smith amendment creating an Assistant Secretary of Commerce to be in charge of redevelopment in the United States.
229	6	S. 2663, as amended by committee, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas—Passage.
230	6	H. R. 3210, to authorize the State of Illinois and the Sanitary District of Chicago, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, to test, on a 3-year basis, the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and for other purposes—Passage.

[1] En bloc.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
1	46		38	
14	30	3	32	4
32	4	32	1	44
71	44		44	
97	11	34	19	30
99	13	30	20	29
100	14	30	19	29
101	14	30	21	28
103	45		45	
106	37	1	42	
131	27	16	30	7
139	2	41	11	28
140	1	41	16	25
141	10	32	10	34
142	22	19	26	18
160	40	4	33	10
161	12	30	1	41
178	37	1	38	
220	43		43	
226	3	37	3	39
Total	455	381	492	366

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
38	Yea	25	10	34	15
98	Nay	30	23	25	15
102	Yea	31	22	24	14
152	Yea	25	7	28	14
153	Nay	25	6	27	14
156	Yea	35	3	43	5
157	Nay	33	6	40	8
	Total	204	77	221	85

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
13	34		38	
14	34		37	
15	36		38	
43	35		43	
44	36		43	
61	40		40	
66	37		40	
67	37		40	
68	37		40	
69	37		40	
70	44		45	
81	41		42	
83	44		47	
86	41		45	
87	41		45	
88	41		45	
89	41		45	
95	43		41	
96	43		41	
105	35		41	
117	46		46	
121	44		45	
145	42		39	
146	42		39	
147	42		39	
184	40		48	
200	42		46	
201	42		46	
202	42		46	
211	45		45	
213	44		43	
214	44		43	
Total	1,292		1,361	

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
2	Nay	42	41	2	1
3	Nay	43	32	11	
4	Nay	42	32	12	1
5	Yea	43	42	2	1
6	Yea	40	42		1
7	Nay	27	30	10	1
8	Nay	27	33	9	1
9	Yea	27	38	5	1
10	Nay	42	38	2	1
11	Nay	34	37	6	9
12	Yea	32	30	13	11
19	Yea	39	32	9	2
27	Yea	33	43		2
28	Yea	33	43		2
29	Yea	33	41		1
30	Nay	29	23	22	8
31	Yea	27	31	15	8
33	Nay	47	35	9	
34	Nay	40	33	9	4
35	Nay	46	21	21	
36	Yea	38	37	6	7
39	Yea	40	36	3	
46	Nay	21	31	9	20
47	Nay	27	29	12	15
48	Nay	26	36	4	12
49	Nay	26	27	14	13
50	Nay	26	34	5	13
51	Nay	31	32	8	9
53	Yea	28	31	7	11
55	Yea	27	33	9	16
56	Yea	32	19	19	5
57	Yea	21	32	6	14
58	Yea	28	35		3
62	Nay	35	42		4
65	Yea	31	28	12	3
72	Nay	39	40		14
73	Yea	41	39		1
76	Nay	33	30	13	9
77	Nay	30	30	13	11
80	Yea	30	32	11	11
85	Yea	39	33	13	1
91	Nay	37	43	2	7
92	Nay	32	24	15	7
115	Yea	46	38	9	
116	Yea	43	35	10	1
122	Nay	25	33	10	19
129	Nay	25	22	22	21
130	Yea	41	22	22	6
138	Yea	44	49		2
143	Nay	38	21	19	8
150	Nay	31	37	3	10
151	Nay	30	21	20	8
155	Yea	35	26	5	2
179	Nay	24	26	7	13
180	Yea	22	26	2	11
181	Yea	42	47	1	
186	Nay	30	22	22	14
189	Nay	30	28	15	12
191	Nay	27	33	9	14
192	Nay	36	22	18	5
193	Nay	24	32	8	15
194	Yea	27	27	13	12
199	Yea	41	44	1	1
204	Nay	34	29	15	5
205	Yea	35	29	15	4
215	Yea	27	37	6	16
221	Nay	30	24	23	13
222	Yea	32	25	20	13
225	Yea	30	30	15	15
	Total	2,284	2,235	648	501

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
22	Nay	13	26	18	33
26	Nay	19	2	44	28
37	Nay	11		37	29
45	Nay	21	29	11	22
78	Nay	2	14	29	39
84	Nay	15	19	27	27
134	Nay	9	37	12	36
148	Nay	8	32	8	35
149	Nay	13	5	36	22

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*—Con.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
166	Yea	15	1	40	25
175	Yea	16	11	30	25
187	Yea	11	41	3	33
188	Nay	21	29	15	23
195	Yea	17	5	38	24
198	Nay	8	14	24	29
206	Nay	18	3	41	21
209	Nay	5	2	46	40
223	Nay	14	19	28	31
224	Nay	19	23	24	26
227	Yea	3	29	15	41
	Total	258	341	526	589

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
17	Nay	45	5	43	1
18	Yea	45	16	31	1
20	Nay	40	8	36	3
21	Nay	43	13	30	1
23	Nay	26	17	26	21
24	Nay	38	13	30	9
25	Nay	38	3	43	9
40	Nay	37	2	46	8
41	Yea	30	1	47	13
42	Yea	39		46	4
52	Yea	40		40	
54	Yea	32	6	35	9
59	Nay	37	2	37	3
60	Yea	32	1	39	9
63	Yea	35	18	20	1
64	Yea	40	1	42	
74	Yea	44	2	44	1
75	Yea	29	21	23	15
79	Yea	30	16	27	11
82	Yea	24		46	20
90	Yea	35	8	35	6
93	Yea	36		33	1
94	Yea	37	12	28	1
104	Yea	25	5	39	17
107	Yea	41	13	35	6
108	Nay	43	3	42	2
109	Yea	44	3	42	2
110	Nay	41	12	35	6
111	Nay	46	15	31	1
112	Yea	34	11	34	11
113	Yea	40	6	35	6
114	Nay	41	15	32	4
118	Nay	29	10	37	17
119	Nay	38	19	27	6
120	Nay	37	10	36	6
123	Yea	35	9	35	10
124	Nay	38	4	42	7
125	Yea	46		47	1
126	Nay	45	18	23	1
127	Nay	43		39	3
128	Yea	34	12	32	11
132	Nay	36	8	41	8
133	Nay	39	3	46	6
135	Nay	42	3	45	2
136	Nay	42	3	45	2
137	Nay	39	5	44	6
144	Nay	31	4	35	15
154	Yea	35	4	28	3
158	Yea	33	16	21	10
159	Yea	31	8	31	13
162	Yea	34	10	24	5
163	Nay	19	3	30	19
164	Yea	21	7	26	17
165	Yea	30	6	35	11
167	Yea	38	2	40	1
168	Nay	38	1	40	1
169	Yea	31	7	34	7
170	Yea	30	2	40	4
171	Yea	25	14	26	13
172	Yea	27	14	26	13
173	Yea	25	12	27	14
174	Nay	25	12	27	15
176	Yea	21	15	23	10
177	Yea	19	3	27	5
182	Yea	39	3	44	3

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*—Continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
183	Nay	37	3	43	5
185	Nay	25	20	25	18
190	Yea	41		44	1
196	Yea	25	12	30	16
197	Nay	29	14	24	8
203	Nay	40		46	3
207	Nay	38	7	41	6
208	Nay	41	2	46	3
210	Nay	26	8	38	18
212	Nay	43	8	39	2
216	Nay	31	15	29	13
217	Nay	29	15	24	13
218	Nay	29	15	26	16
219	Yea	32	18	26	13
228	Yea	43		42	1
229	Nay	27	3	44	16
230	Nay	30	3	37	6
	Total	2,848	638	2,879	625

A Partial Review of Republican Misrule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better prelude to my annual report to my constituents than to remind them of what I said at the close of each of the first 3 years of this Republican administration. For purposes of better comparison, I point out that during the 83d Congress which coincided with the first 2 years of the Eisenhower administration, the Republicans were in the majority in both Houses.

On August 3, 1953, I said:

SO THE TIME FOR A CHANGE ARRIVED, AND CREEPING SOCIALISM BECAME THE BIG GIVEAWAY WHILE THE LITTLE FELLOW LOST HIS SHIRT

Mr. Speaker, this is the true story—I wish it were a fairy tale—of an America grown up—but not wiser.

If what follows sounds political, believe me it is intentionally so. After all, politics, according to all lexicographers, is the science of government and this saga deals only with government—your Government.

If it sounds partisan it is so only because the members of the opposite political faith have slanted the record that way by their actions.

If what I say hurts, it is only because the sponsors of inimical policies have failed to provide any armor against the cruelties inherent therein.

With such brief apologia, let me proceed to tell this tale of woe.

For 20 years almost every attempt by Democratic leaders and legislators to improve the conditions of our country and to establish world peace and to expand man's divine right of equal opportunity to earn a livelihood with a decent standard of living, has been ridiculed, derided and opposed by members of the Republican Party. In all those years there was little or no constructive criticism. There was much carping and bitterness as phony labels were sought to be attached to every progressive step that was taken to benefit the citizenry of our country.

Home loans, farm loans, small-business assistance, housing and power, rural electrification and telephones, soil conservation and flood control, farm subsidies and fuel regulation, savings programs and bank deposit insurance, development of natural resources for the benefit of all, social security and unemployment insurance, protection of the right to work, improvement of the lot of the civil servant, protection of the veteran, particularly the maimed and disabled, assistance to the orphan, the widow and the helpless, aids to health, education, and the public welfare were all labeled "creeping socialism" and worse.

Only in the field of foreign policy was there any semblance of bipartisan cooperation for the best interests of the country. Even there it was only agreement on principle. Despite the fact that a Democratic administration sought and obtained only the best available men, regardless of political affiliation, thus putting as many Republicans as Democrats in charge of administration, the sniping never abated.

We were told:

Time for a change—stop the monster from creeping further into the Nation's vitals—drive it out—return the country to free enterprise—stop inflation—bring prices down—produce more—pay less—get more—balance the budget—cut expenditures—reduce taxes.

Repetition had its effect. Even those who knew better, began to succumb to the never-ending stream of propaganda.

At the psychologically correct moment, the knight in shining armor appeared on the scene, a truly great soldier, deservedly honored as a world hero. When he, unacquainted with the ways of politics, but in the best of faith and intentions, began to sing the same song, the melody was indeed sweet and the words most beguiling.

Logic and reason took flight. Fantasy and wishful thinking wafted many into the land of make-believe. What could we lose? Is a Republican mink coat—or is it sable—different from the Democratic one? Is it not time for a change? Few asked: A change to what or why or for whom? After all—we can always change back. Nor did they stop long enough to inquire: If the change should be for the worse, can we regain our losses?

Election day, 1952, came and with it the first change as the people willed it. A Republican President and a Republican Congress.

Eureka, but not yet Utopia.

Democrats, who for 20 years winced under the tongue lashing of the Republicans, remembered the Biblical injunction to do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Like good American citizens, they bowed to the will of the majority.

They promised cooperation. They announced there would be only constructive criticism, no sniping, no back-biting, no invectives.

Came January 3, 1953, and the new Congress was sworn in and organized. They listened politely but impatiently and indifferently to the outgoing President. They waited for Inauguration Day.

Came Inauguration Day, January 20, 1953, and they listened, fearfully but enthusiastically, to the incoming President. And again they waited.

Be not impatient. Give them time. Give them a chance.

Time passed. And they acted—both the new President and the new Congress. Things happened. Not too much and, certainly, not too good.

Now as the 1st session of the 83d Congress comes to a close this fine summer day, August 3, 1953, would it be unfair if I stated the account, totaled the "do's" and the "don'ts," the "gives" and the "takes" and tried to get a balance—knowing full well that there will be little balance left for our fellow citizens.

Here goes:

Promise: A balanced budget.

Performance: More unbalanced than when the Republicans took over.

Promise: Spend less.

Performance: Spent more with an increase in future fixed charges of government.

Promise: Reduce taxes.

Performance: Increased by extending taxes due to expire.

Promise: A stabilized economy by reduction of prices and cost of living.

Performance: Higher prices to the consumer, higher costs to the home buyer, higher rents to the tenant, and lower prices to the farmer.

Promise: Reduce the national debt.

Performance: An attempt to increase it, prevented by an almost solid Democratic opposition in the Senate. It passed the House with 84 percent of the Republicans voting for it and 61 percent of the Democrats opposed.

Promise: A new foreign policy. Precisely what changes we were to expect were never told.

Performance: Absolutely no change in policy. The change in administration, however, is driving our friends and allies further and further away from us.

Promise: A new farm policy.

Performance: No change in policy. A change in administration that has antagonized the farmer who has voted 10 to 1 to continue the old policy.

Promise: A new tax program.

Performance: None presented. The only change is the reduction in individual income taxes effective January 1954, pursuant to a law enacted by the last Democratic Congress and signed by the last Democratic President. However, Mr. Taxpayer, do not spend that saving. The next session of this Republican Congress may take it away from you. They are even now threatening us with a Federal sales tax.

Promise: The Republican Party promised to keep the Taft-Hartley labor law intact. The Republican candidate for President said he recognized its inequities and promised amendments.

Performance: No change in that law.

Promise: Statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

Performance: Nothing.

Promise: A change in our permanent immigration laws to liberalize them and remove the inequities and unfairness thereof.

Performance: No change. The temporary Refugee Immigration Act to admit 217,000 immigrants over a 3-year period was part of the Democratic program and was enacted only because of Democratic support.

Promise: To conserve the natural resources of the Nation.

Performance: Submerged oil lands given away. This was promised by the Republican candidate and he was supported by southern Democrats who campaigned for reelection on that pledge. Public power, TVA, AEC, and soil conservation programs gutted. Rubber plants ordered sold, RFC assets, including defense plants, ordered disposed of.

Promise: Encouragement and improvement of health and education programs.

Performance: Cutting the budgets for these programs.

Promise: A comprehensive civil-rights program.

Performance: Nothing.

Changes that we got even though not promised:

First. Hard money, that is, money that is harder to get.

Second. Higher interest rates on Government bonds, thus increasing the cost of Government and the burden of the taxpayer; higher rates on mortgages; higher rates on consumer's financing; higher rates on vet-

eran's loans; higher rates on business loans; higher rates on State and municipal loans; higher rates on farmer's loans; higher rates on auto loans.

Third. Depreciation of Government bonds, some are selling as low as 92 cents on the dollar.

Fourth. Destruction of the public-housing program.

Fifth. Impairment of the morale of civil-service employees by executive orders emasculating the merit system.

Sixth. Decrease in veterans' benefits.

In sharp contrast to all of the foregoing is the conduct of the responsible Democratic Members of the Congress.

They offered bills to implement their party platform. They could get no hearings from committees controlled by the majority party.

They offered bills and amendments to bills to effectuate the President's program to the extent that it coincided with the Democratic program.

The press, time after time, referred to the passage of such bills as Eisenhower victories. Actually they were part and parcel of the Democratic platform. They could never have been enacted without Democratic votes. In most instances there were more Democrats than Republicans voting for those measures.

Notable among these measures were, first, extension of the President's power to reorganize the executive departments—if he does not economize in that field, the responsibility is solely his; second, establishment of the Cabinet post of Health, Education, and Welfare; third, rejection of the cut in funds for REA; fourth, prevention of the weakening of civil service; fifth, rejection of cut in funds for soil conservation; sixth, restoration of funds for aid to schools; seventh, continuance of a nonpolitical tariff commission; eighth, extension of reciprocal trade-agreements authority; ninth, prohibiting arbitrary denial of medical care to veterans; tenth, authorization and appropriation of moneys for foreign aid; eleventh, extension of the mutual-security program; twelfth, gift of wheat to starving Pakistanians; thirteenth, admission of 217,000 immigrants over 3-year period.

That is the record to date.

Even if President Eisenhower should not acknowledge that his program could never have been enacted without Democratic votes, we in the Democratic Party will continue to vote for what we believe is in the best interests of our country.

In the not too distant future, the electorate will have an opportunity to voice its approval or disapproval of the changes it got and of the changes it did not get.

Until then, we will do our duty as we see it—let the chips fall where they may.

On August 19, 1954, I said:

To Secure These Rights the Fight Must Go On

Mr. Speaker, at the close of the first session of this Congress, on August 3, 1953, I reviewed for my constituents the accomplishments, and lack thereof, of our distinguished body. I pointed out the great divergence between the pledges and promises by the Republican Party and its presidential candidate in 1952 and their performance or lack thereof as the majority party in power in 1953.

Another legislative year has now gone by. It is time again to take a look. Perhaps not a New Look, but certainly a good look, even though we know it will not look good. I intend today to reverse the usual form of stating first the facts and then the conclusion.

CONCLUSION

When the 80th Congress was dubbed the worst Congress of history, our contemporaries overlooked that worse than a "do-nothing Congress" is a Congress that does nothing but give away the birthright of a nation.

The 83d Congress and this Republican administration have earned the right to be charged with doing nothing but giving away the people's rights and property.

The balance of this report will be devoted to documentation of the foregoing conclusion.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This is an excellent time to refresh our memories with a quotation from our Declaration of Independence of these immortal words:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their health and happiness."

Those principles have been written into our Constitution as rights accorded to our citizens, and with restrictions against any impairment by executive, judicial, or legislative action.

If they are to be changed, that change can be accomplished only by constitutional amendment.

Nevertheless, we have seen during these last 2 years, a complete disregard of those basic concepts.

Fear runs wild, and hysteria has taken over.

Laws have been enacted in violation of article I of the Constitution, prohibiting ex post facto laws and bills of attainder. An ex post facto law imposes punishment for past conduct which was not previously criminal. A bill of attainder imposes punishment upon a person or group without indictment and trial.

Laws and executive orders violative of the Bill of Rights, as contained in our Constitution, have been enacted and promulgated.

I have done my best to resist such utterly un-American conduct, first because it is fundamentally wrong and secondly, because it strengthens our enemies and weakens our will to withstand their totalitarian philosophy.

I favor the right, under safeguard of court order or search warrant, to obtain evidence, even by wiretapping, to convict criminals. I opposed the bill to give the right to use such evidence previously obtained without court order or search warrant.

I favor empowering the courts to require witnesses to testify in criminal proceedings by granting them immunity where otherwise some other criminal might escape trial. I oppose giving that right to Congress, because Congress is a legislative body and not a court. Congress is supposed to investigate solely for the purpose of legislating; it is not the FBI; it is not a grand jury; it is not a petit jury; it is not a judge; it is not a prosecutor; it is not a President with power to pardon. No legislative body in our entire American history has ever been blocked from legislating because a witness or group of witnesses refused to testify.

The best evidence that I am correct in that statement is that despite witnesses who have refused to testify about communism, the Congress has, nevertheless, enacted a law finding that the Communist Party is not a political party but a criminal conspiracy.

I agree with the finding, but urged that the law was a very bad one because it usurps the function of the judiciary.

The bill to outlaw the Communist Party violates every principle of good government. Aside from being a bill of attainder and an ex post facto law, it denies not only free speech but free thought; it denies the right of assembly and the right of petition for redress of wrongs. It is a completely totalitarian technique.

The manner in which these bills were foisted upon the Congress was even worse. Not only was gag rule imposed by limitation of debate, but they were brought before the House without having had adequate hearings, without reports for guidance of the Members, without copies of the bills, and under rules permitting no amendments.

That is the horribly terrifying manner in which a heretofore deliberative body struck down our liberties and impaired our freedom by pushing through in the closing days of this session bills which do violence to the things for which men and women have fought and died since before Magna Carta.

I attribute these bad bills to what has come to be known as McCarthyism. Those who contend that McCarthyism has alerted the country to the danger of communism must now concede that the direct result has been the creation of an unhealthy atmosphere of fear and suspicion which may easily destroy the very vitals of good government.

LIBERALISM VERSUS CONSERVATISM

Our President has repeatedly told us that as to human values and human rights, he is liberal, but as to property and property rights, he is conservative. It sounds good. I wish it were true. I will not repeat here the many failures of President Eisenhower to perform the pledges of Candidate Eisenhower. They have been previously documented. Let us today analyze what has happened under our President's leadership and thereby make apparent his and the Republican Party's fulfillment of the converse of his declared policy.

OPERATION GIVEAWAY, OR BUNDLES FOR BILLIONAIRES

The gift of the submerged-oil lands was camouflaged as a return to certain States of their property. You cannot return to a State what it never had. The United States Supreme Court three times ruled that these lands and rights never belonged to any State. As a matter of fact, most of them were bought with funds from the United States Treasury.

If Congress and the President had not given them away for the benefit of the big oil companies and not the few States involved as is claimed, the revenues from those lands would have been used to educate the children of every State of the Union.

OUR NATIONAL RESOURCES: CREEPING FAVORITISM

The Nation's resources have been the subject of a whole series of gigantic giveaways, beginning with the offshore oil bill endorsed by President Eisenhower.

Perhaps the most incredible giveaway of all deals with atomic energy. The people of the country have spent $12 billion of their tax money in developing an atomic-energy program. The Eisenhower administration and the Republican-controlled Congress, however, chose to set the wheels in motion for giving away the rights to atomic energy to the few private power monopolies. The most fantastic Republican proposition was the Dixon-Yates contract whereby a certain private group was granted contract rights to provide power without competitive bidding; it was arbitrarily selected for the benefit, although other firms offered to do the job more cheaply. The Eisenhower administration even offered to pay all their taxes for them and guarantee them against any loss. I am proud of my vote against the atomic energy giveaway.

The efforts to dispose of our synthetic-rubber and tin-smelting plants and the attempt to wreck TVA and our entire public power program, are more of the giveaway philosophy in action.

MONEY: HARDER TO GET

I spent considerable time and effort in opposing the Republican giveaway to bankers through higher interest rates. The so-called hard-money policy actually made money harder to get. Republican bankers took over the Treasury Department and promptly proceeded to raise the interest rate to the highest level since 1933. They sold Government bonds below par value to bankers who profited immensely from unnecessarily higher interest rates. I joined with other Members of Congress in protesting this giveaway to bankers, and my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are quite numerous on this subject.

Not only did this hard-money policy constitute excessive profit for bankers, but it was perhaps the principal cause of the recession we have had. With interest rates excessively high, consumers and small-business men could not borrow money. As a result, mass unemployment occurred, causing a serious recession because of a lack of consumer purchasing power to buy the products of American industry.

The Eisenhower administration was disastrously slow in taking action against this recession; indeed, we still have close to 4 million Americans unemployed, with many more in jobs at only part time. Because of our constant pounding, the administration finally reversed itself and repudiated the hard-money policy, although its evil effects are regrettably still with us.

Call me a prophet of gloom, Mr. President. But it is your Secretary of Commerce who says that the gross national production is down $9 billion from 1953 to 1954, and it is your Federal Reserve Board that says that industrial production is down $12 billion from 1953 to 1954.

VETERANS' RIGHTS

Part of the liberal Republican policies was the increase of interest rates on veterans' mortgages. This was among the very first accomplishments of this administration.

As soon as we achieved a reversal of the hard-money policy, I started a campaign to decrease the veterans' loan interest rates to what they had been.

The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, on the floor of the House, promised me such legislation would be enacted.

It has not even been reported to the Congress.

We did succeed in enacting a bill to increase veterans' pensions by 5 percent. Liberal, indeed. A monthly pension of $50 is now $52.50.

But all veterans' services—medical care, hospitalization, and the like—have been cut and cut more than 5 percent.

That was not being illiberal as to humans; it was being conservative as to money.

I have consistently supported measures to adequately compensate our Armed Forces and veterans for the sacrifices they make in the Nation's behalf. I have introduced bills providing free postage on letters to and from members of our Armed Forces, extra compensation for prisoners of the Korean war, income-tax exemption for members of the Armed Forces, and various adjustments to secure equitable pensions, compensation, and retirement pay.

THE CONSUMERS' POCKETBOOK AND THE FARMERS' PLIGHT

During these 2 years of Republicanism, the cost of living has reached an alltime high, as any shopper can testify and as Government statistics prove in black and white. Coupled with this record high cost of living have been the hardships caused by the recession, so that many millions of Americans have suffered reductions in their standard of living.

Particularly pernicious has been the price of food. Consumers are forced to pay twice for their food, first in their tax bill to the Government and then in the market place. There is something radically wrong with the present agricultural program, as I have often said in Congress. Official reports show that food prices to the consumer have actually risen, while prices to farmers have declined.

Yet the Republican leadership has done nothing to remedy this situation. The only solution the Secretary of Agriculture offers is to reduce farmers' incomes below their present level, despite his claim that no appreciable reduction in consumer food prices will result. The proposal I have made is to try the Brannan plan for all agriculture, which Candidate Eisenhower termed "moral bankruptcy," but which President Eisenhower has instituted for the wool industry.

The President and his agriculture experts pretend that a flexible price support program will reduce prices to the consumer and increase income to the farmer.

They continue in that fallacious claim even after they have proved themselves wrong.

We have never had rigid but only flexible price supports for the dairy industry.

One of the first things done by our Secretary of Agriculture, with the hearty approval of our President, was to drop price supports for this industry from 90 percent of parity to 75 percent.

Result: The farmer is getting less and the consumer is paying more.

That is not caused by any failure of the cut in prices to seep through.

I am talking about milk produced one day and sold the next day for which the farmer receives less and the consumer pays more.

How can they urge that any different result can come from products that will be stored for long periods of time.

Do not be fooled by any pretense that we will store less of the staples or basic commodities.

On the basis of the representations of the President and his Secretary of Agriculture that we will store more, this very session of Congress increased the buying, lending, and storing authority of the President and his Department of Agriculture from $6½ billion to $10 billion. That is in addition to all the billions to be taken out of storage and not charged to the authorization.

LABOR AND UNEMPLOYMENT

One of the most important Republican pledges was amendment of the Taft-Hartley law. I favored the elimination of the Taft-Hartley Act's repressive measures against organized labor. I have always sought to promote legislation fair to labor and management.

But, as you may remember, President Eisenhower reversed himself when he refused to go along with Secretary of Labor Durkin's program for labor legislation, which followed Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Mr. Durkin resigned. The Republican leadership did not allow Congress to pass on the bills seeking to right the wrongs of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I sponsored a number of bills in the labor field, but as usual the Republican leadership did nothing. One called for equal pay for equal work and an end to discriminatory wage practices against women. Still another case where the Republicans did nothing was the minimum wage. My bill called for an increase in the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour. Secretary of Labor Mitchell agreed there should be an increase, but President Eisenhower's economic report flatly opposed one.

The most serious problem in this field is that apparently the Republican Party is not concerned over the tremendous loss of earnings of the wage earners of our country. I have called attention to the millions of Americans without jobs, largely due to the administration's hard-money policy, and to the millions more earning smaller wages and working only part time.

In the present Congress, I have been a cosponsor of H. R. 9430, the Forand bill, dealing with unemployment-compensation standards. I introduced H. R. 1270 to permit an increase in earnings without loss of social-security benefits. My bill, H. R. 1277, called for income-tax exemption on annuities and pensions, a principle adopted in part in the new tax law.

This administration takes credit for enactment of a broader social-security law, but soft-pedals the fact that this was a New Deal-Fair Deal measure that was supported and fought for by Democrats during all the years Republicans were resisting it as creeping socialism.

PUBLIC HEALTH AND HOUSING

I have always insisted that effective government action must be taken to improve the national health. Proper medical care must be put within the reach of every American. It is a duty of the Government to assure that and to do it without socializing medicine.

Yet the Eisenhower budget cut cancer research 28 percent, heart disease research 33 percent, and the National Institutes of Health allotment 34 percent.

The so-called health reinsurance bill, the administration proposed, merely came to the aid of certain insurance companies, and did nothing for the health of the individual American man, woman, and child. The only public health in the bill was in its title. It made neither health nor insurance available to any citizen.

A similar situation was the Republican housing bill, which I called "a sham and a fraud upon the American people." I have long maintained a particular interest in public housing, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with my attempts to try to provide decent housing for all Americans. I proposed amendments to legislation to deal with FHA abuses, but Republicans joined as a unit to vote them down, as they did my efforts to prevent discrimination against minority groups and to provide low interest rates on housing loans and veterans' home loans.

However, the Republican leadership insisted on guaranteeing excessive profits for builders and lenders and blocked my efforts and those of my colleagues to write into law even the minimum number of public-housing units requested by the President.

Here too, the only public housing in the bill was in the title. I think it is outrageous that the people of this country should be denied an opportunity to live in decent shelter.

The so-called housing bill passed this year prevents any new public housing and effectively kills the program. The same bill, however, makes it easier for the bankers, mortgage lenders, and builders to get richer. It contains no real safeguards against a repetition of the FHA scandals now filling the newspapers. It does contain a provision subsidizing the mortgage lenders, guaranteeing them not only against loss, but also a profit, all at Government risk.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: BEWITCHED, BOTHERED, AND BEWILDERED

The present world situation is one of crisis, and I have wholeheartedly supported the administration's continuation of the bipartisan policies initiated by prior Democratic administrations, including the point 4 program and foreign aid. I have urged the strengthening of our greatest potential instrument for peace, the United Nations.

Our position in world affairs, however, has worsened markedly under Republican leadership. World communism has increased, and we have lost much of the good will painstakingly built up by Democratic administrations with the non-Communist nations of the world. The present administration has cut our military strength and has foolishly

tried to compensate for it by a series of transparently hypocritical slogans.

No one knows where we stand on anything. If you add up all the pronouncements made by the President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, and assorted Republican leaders, the sum total is bluff and backtalk, threat, and retreat.

If the matter were not so very serious, we could sing Bewitched, Bothered, and Bewildered. We have learned a bitter lesson that Indochina could not be saved by the threats of Mr. Dulles and his colleagues. The situation in the Far East is bad.

The same muddled thinking is causing the situation in the Near East to worsen from day to day. This administration refuses to recognize that an enemy of a friend cannot be a friend and that you do not arm one who may use the arms against your friend.

I opposed the Bricker amendment, which would paralyze the President's right to conduct our foreign affairs.

I have supported the extension of reciprocal trade agreements and lower tariffs to aid our allies, even though the President backed down from the request he has termed "essential."

I have tried to build up friendly relations with the Latin American Republics, and with Italy, whose late Premier Alcide de Gasperi I had the pleasure of greeting on his visit here in 1951.

I have striven for peace in the Near East and the proper development of that new addition to the family of free nations, Israel.

OPERATION TAKEAWAY: GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

I have long felt that the Government should act as a model employer, and I have been deeply distressed by the methods of the present Republican administration as regards civil service. Aside from the reprehensible "numbers game" reflecting on many loyal civil servants, the Eisenhower administration has conducted the crudest sort of spoils system in taking away the jobs of Government employees for political reasons.

I have opposed the transfer of Government agencies from the New York and Brooklyn areas for political reasons, such as the Quartermaster Purchasing Agency and the diversion of contracts from the Brooklyn Navy Yard. I have sponsored bills to extend Federal compensation coverage to civil-defense workers, for longevity step increases in the civil-service scale, to exempt compensation and pensions from income tax, to excuse Government employees from work to permit them time to vote in elections, and similar measures aimed at making the Government an employer of which every citizen can be proud.

I realize full well the inadequate salaries paid civil servants, and I have supported proposed increases. Having worked as a railway mail clerk, I know the hardships of postal employees, and on their behalf have testified before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It is nothing less than reprehensible to deny postal and Federal employees a 5-percent increase in their pay. From the President down, every Republican concedes that these loyal men and woman are underpaid.

To deny them a pay increase unless we simultaneously provide additional revenue is a fraud and a sham. The subsidy given to business, by the Post Office Department alone, exceeds the entire amount of such increase. The dividend tax exemption alone exceeds the cost of such a pitifully inadequate increase. The additional depreciation tax cut to big business is about double that cost.

Conservative policy indeed, as to wages for the underpaid and liberal, as to tax cuts for the greedy.

IMMIGRATION

The inequities of our present immigration laws make a mockery of the splendid inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. I was happy to serve as a cosponsor with Senator LEHMAN and many other Members of Congress of a bill designed to rewrite completely our immigration laws and to remove every trace of bigotry therefrom.

In addition, I introduced a bill calling for 240,000 special visas during the fiscal year 1953–54, and have sponsored many private bills for the relief of my constituents and their families.

In this field, as in so many others, the fight must go on, and I am confident that someday the faults of our present immigration system will be corrected. They still remain under President Eisenhower's administration, although candidate Eisenhower pledged prompt reform.

TAXES: THE TRICKLE-DOWN BILL

Surely no part of the activities of government is more important than taxation—and it is in this field that we find the most glaring and inequitable giveaway.

Ninety-two percent of American families have good reason to be unhappy about the Republican tax bill that is now the law of the land, for they do not own any corporation stock. This Republican Congress and administration, however, have given tax benefits to the 8 percent of American families who do. In fact, the Republican program of "bundles for billionaires" especially benefits only six-tenths of 1 percent of American families, who own 80 percent of all publicly held stock.

The new Republican tax law provides benefits for stockholders, to the detriment of those Americans who earn their income through the sweat of their brow. Let us take as an example two families, each with husband, wife, and 1 child, and an income of $5,000. One of these 2 families has an income consisting entirely of wages or salary; its income tax will be $420. The other family, with income entirely from stock dividends, will pay an income tax of only $328. Thus unearned income is to be taxed less than earned income of the same size.

Of course, the tax difference increases greatly as income increases. Seventy-three and seven-tenths percent of taxpayers with incomes over $25,000 reported dividend receipts, while only 4.5 percent of taxpayers with incomes under $5,000 did so. It is primarily those with incomes of $10,000 or more per year who report dividend receipts. I might point out further that the Eisenhower administration asked for much greater benefits for stockholders, but Democrats in Congress managed to cut them down.

This Republican tax bill gives corporations, and the 20 percent of American taxpayers with incomes over $5,000, 77 percent of the total tax benefits. The 80 percent of American taxpayers with incomes less than $5,000 get only 23 percent of tax relief, thanks to republicanism. It seems that the basis for Republican taxation is the old "trickle-down" idea, which we thought had disappeared forever; it gives the wealthy the benefit of tax relief although they need it least, in the hope that some of the benefit will trickle down to the great mass of the people. I am proud of my vote against the trickle-down tax bill.

I believe in giving tax relief to those who need it most. Ever since 1948 I have introduced resolutions calling for an increase in personal exemptions to $3,500 for heads of families as the first step in reducing taxes. But of course this was in conflict with the policy of the Republicans in control who insist on giving tax preference to those wealthy enough not to need it. One of my proposals, however, was partially carried into effect: An exemption will be provided for the first $1,200 of retirement income. Another of my proposals gained some ground, too; child-care allowances were provided, but much less than adequate and much less than I called for in my bill.

One further fact should be mentioned here about taxes, because Republicans are very unlikely to mention it themselves; the general 10-percent decrease in individual taxes that became effective the first of this year was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Democratic President. The Republican tax bill is the one benefiting the well-to-do, and that is the giveaway I opposed.

Please understand, I am not opposed to eliminating double taxation. But I insist that inequities be remedied equally. The taxpayer earning interest on a savings account is entitled to the same relief as a taxpayer receiving dividends on stock. Furthermore, if we cannot remove all inequities because we will lose too much revenue, do not select one class as against another.

Do not increase and continue depreciation and depletion allowances at the expense of the wage earner. If we cannot save taxes for all, save taxes for him first. He spends all of his earnings almost as fast as he gets them. That is what makes for prosperity.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND BROTHERHOOD

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership defeated my efforts to prohibit discrimination in regard to public housing projects, and did nothing about my measures to prevent Federal aid to National Guard units practicing discrimination and to secure similar acts to guarantee civil rights for all.

I have always recognized the role of religion in life, and I have been privileged to participate in many religious and interfaith activities.

Although I recognize the separation of church and state guaranteed by our Constitution, I appreciate that the fundamental principles of civil rights are based on the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

We can legislate on these principles intelligently only if we understand them. We understand them only if we know religion.

That is why I constantly direct my colleagues' attention to the activities of all religious groups and do my utmost to stir them into action against all antireligious groups and activities.

In opposing McCarthyism and in deploring the current wave of hysteria in this country largely inspired thereby, I do not lessen my hatred of communism and all its works. My constituents may well remember the campaign of 1948 when my opponent was Lee Pressman, once described as the No. 1 Communist of the country. In that year the Communists spent a quarter of a million dollars trying to defeat me, and I was viciously attacked because of my vigorous anticommunism. I am happy to associate myself with the remarks of the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, auxiliary bishop of Chicago and a leading Roman Catholic churchman and genuine anti-Communist. He said, among other things:

"I take it that a genuine anti-Communist is one who despises the court methods of the Communists. I take it he hates the Communist idea that one is guilty until proved innocent. I take it that the genuine anti-Communist is one who above all believes in the democratic procedures and is willing to stand by them, even in the face of great temptations to lose one's temper and to lose one's faith in the methods of freemen."

I am proud to stand alongside him in this vital fight for our civil liberties.

I am the only Member of any Congress who had an opponent who dared to avail himself of the privilege of running for office under the name and emblem of the Communist Party.

I am also proud of the autographed photograph given me by one of the great statesmen of the free anti-Communist world, the late Premier Alcide de Gasperi of Italy, for my efforts in behalf of Italy's fight against communism. Indeed, when I think that a

certain Senator first discovered communism in 1950, 2 years after I had opposed and defeated communism in a congressional election; when I think of my votes for foreign aid to bolster the anti-Communist allies of this country and the contrast with his votes against all foreign aid; when I think of his apparent objective, the catching of headlines rather than Communists, and the demoralizing effect of his wave of fear, then I am certain that even my humble efforts have done more against communism than his ever will.

I have called attention to the McCarthyite actions of the staff of the Reece investigating committee, branding as communistic the encyclicals of two Popes of the Catholic Church. I have opposed—even when almost alone—the serious threats to our civil liberties posed by actions taken during a wave of hysteria, when some legislators abdicated their responsibilities because of fear. In my position, I have been happy to coincide with the views of J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI, and Judge Harold Medina, who presided over the trial which resulted in the conviction of the top Communists of the country.

THE FOLKS BACK HOME

It is with mixed humility and pride that I present this report. It is with humility, because I recognize my responsibility as a servant of my constituents and of the public interest. It is with pride, because I have never failed to carry out a campaign pledge, and because I have consistently striven to serve the public interest as I saw it to be.

My services have always been at the disposal of my constituents. I have never failed to try to help with their individual problems so far as I was able to do so. I joined with my colleagues in trying to keep local Federal services operating efficiently and at a maximum.

Some criticism has been leveled at me for eulogizing a departed former Member. It is traditional for the dean of a State delegation to lead in such a eulogy and for other Members to join him, regardless of political beliefs. One Protestant and four Catholic Members joined two Jewish Members on that occasion.

While I do not expect the electorate to agree with me at all times on all matters, at least we will make every effort to understand one another so that our respect for each other will survive our disagreement.

That is the American way.

On August 2, 1955, I said:

HOBGOBLINS AND REALITIES

Mr. Speaker, before the start of our legislative session, the President had great misgivings about the coming months. He reprimanded the voters of the Nation because they chose to send Democrats to Congress, while the administration was of the opposing political faith. He forecast that a Republican administration would not have the support of a Democratic Congress. During the 1954 congressional campaign, he even foresaw the possibility of a cold war within Government which could destroy the Nation's unity at this crucial time.

The same kind of talk from a Democratic President would have been labeled in the one-party press either as intended to scare our people or as an insult to our intelligence. Coming from the leader of the Republican Party, that same part of our American press repeated the reckless charge as though it were unimpeachable gospel.

How disappointing it must be to them to find that the hobgoblins and the gremlins disappeared into thin air even before the 84th Congress opened.

Now that the first session of this Congress has closed, the American people are entitled to the full story.

Even though an ardent Democrat, I will not pretend that none of my Democratic colleagues made any mistakes, nor that there was no occasion when some of my Republican colleagues did vote right. I do proclaim, however, as loudly as I can, that my Democratic colleagues voted right more frequently than my Republican colleagues and conversely, that the Republicans voted wrong more frequently than the Democrats—too frequently for the good of our country.

Let us now proceed to analyze the record.

The President greatly underestimated the caliber and character of the Democratic majority. He now admits that the political responsibility of the Democratic-controlled Congress made the successes of this session possible. The proof of Democratic leadership and support—the willingness to lay aside political antagonism, and jealousies—is a part of the record.

It is with great pleasure that I review these accomplishments. In doing so, we must have in mind that what is right or wrong is not determined by who sponsors a proposal, nor by which party supports it. The determination must be based on the sole test of what is best for the greatest number of our people.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS: UNITY AND STRENGTH

Nowhere is the story of cooperation and responsibility better illustrated than in the areas of foreign policy and national defense. The world situation threatens to remain a precarious one for many years to come. Although the great ideological conflicts between East and West show some indication of being eased, few are shortsighted enough to believe that the aims of international communism have changed so completely in so short a time. If these differences between East and West cannot be settled or at least compromised, the alternative is a global atomic war from which no side could emerge victorious. While urging thorough exploration of every path that might lead to world peace, the Democratic Party stood as one man in favor of keeping our guard up and our defenses strong enough to withstand a sneak attack. In our system of government the President and his State Department must assume the leadership in the realm of international affairs. Congress responded by supporting them completely on every major issue. The President was authorized to use United States military forces in defending Formosa and the nearby Pescadores Islands. Executive agreements were ratified establishing a mutual-defense treaty with Nationalist China and a NATO-type defense alliance for southeast Asia.

Despite overwhelming sentiment in the Congress for it, the executive branch of our Government took no firm or realistic step toward establishing permanent peace in the Near East.

The occupation of Germany was ended so that she could be armed and brought into the European defense system. Austria was reestablished as an independent and democratic state.

To carry out our foreign policy aims, Congress authorized $3.2 billion for economic and military aid to foreign countries.

To encourage the benefits of international trade, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was extended for 3 years so that the President has the full authority to continue his efforts to promote our foreign affairs. A bill simplifying our complicated and outmoded system of customs definition, classification, and rate structure was passed by the House of Representatives and awaits Senate approval in the next session of Congress.

A manpower reserve program was put into effect which provides for a trained military reserve of 3,900,000 men by 1959. Such a program, the President told us, will avoid the cost and inconvenience of a large standing army, while at the same time providing for the national defense. It was necessary, nevertheless, to extend the selective-service law for 4 more years, including the draft of doctors and dentists for 2 more years. I am far from satisfied with either of these laws, but believe they are the best compromise we could get at this time.

Atomic-energy projects were authorized to the extent of $237 million for research facilities and actual production of atomic peacetime projects, as well as atomic weapons. Funds were also authorized for the expansion of existing aeronautical research, for construction of foreign military bases and housing, and for a billion-dollar Navy shipbuilding program.

The only issue on which Congress and the administration clashed was the relatively minor one involving Marine Corps manpower. Congress refused to bow to the Republican demand for a 22,000-man cut in this important military unit.

All in all, the Democratic Congress was happy to follow a foreign-policy program whose principles were enunciated by President Truman and Secretary of State Acheson, several years ago. The result has been a satisfying one. American prestige has grown abroad; the cold war tensions have lessened, if only temporarily, and a period of diplomatic negotiation has been vigorously begun. Democratic support, far from being absent, has been consistently greater than the support of the President's own party. Because of this support, the United States has been able to demonstrate its strength and unity.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION: FOR THE MANY AND NOT THE FEW

In domestic matters, of course, there was no comparable need for unanimity of thinking. The Democratic majority acted according to its political and economic principles and clashed with the administration where there was substantial difference. Once again, however, Mr. Eisenhower's forecast of a cold war was completely unfounded. The Democratic opposition to administration policies was as intelligent and high-minded as it was determined. There was no opposition merely for opposition's sake.

In the area of social legislation, several of the administration's proposals were extensions of earlier New Deal and Fair Deal ideas. These found enthusiastic Democratic support as far as they went—but often they did not go nearly far enough. Increased railroad retirement benefits, better FHA mortgage insurance coverage, and improved surplus property disposal to schools and hospitals were implementations of the Democratic program. Other parts of the administration program, however, proved quite inadequate.

A minimum wage proposal of $0.90 per hour, unreal at a time of high prices and general prosperity, was changed to a $1 minimum. This increase over the old $0.75 minimum will help keep industries from "running away" to the South and West where labor is so much cheaper, as well as preserve a decent wage for all American workers. More important, it raises the standard of living of all our citizens, nationally and not sectionally.

The administration's housing bill asked for only 35,000 public-housing units and made them well-nigh impossible of construction by improper restrictions. Congress increased the low-rent provisions by 10,000 additional units and eased the requirements to enable more extensive and better-balanced housing projects. Such liberalization of the law is necessitated by the acute housing shortage and the slum clearance needs of our urban centers.

To cure the unfortunate polio vaccine mixup, Congress authorized $2 million more than was asked by the President. In addition, all necessary funds are to be made available to the States to purchase enough vaccine for one-third of all the unvaccinated children, plus all expectant mothers. A more extensive and a better program was opposed by the administration as unnecessary and a step toward socialized medicine. The threat

of a veto of the entire program effectually prevented the enactment of control legislation. Obviously, this administration is willing to risk black markets which may destroy the health of our people.

In appropriations for general matters of health, education, and social welfare, the Congress added more than $17 million to the Eisenhower program. The Congress felt that these were matters in which false economy was extremely dangerous. We were not willing to hear the responsibility of holding back research programs on cancer, heart disease, arthritis, and mental health so that the Federal budget might be a fraction of 1 percent lower. This, too, points up a basic difference of philosophy. The Democrats believe in being liberal with money to conserve the health of our people.

So too, an attempt to liberalize the social security laws and made the program more adequate to meet today's problems was stoutly opposed by the Republican administration. The Democartic majority in the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a bill to lower retirement age for women from 65 to 62, to allow disability benefits to 250,000 workers aged 50 or more, to continue disability benefits for children after age 18, and to extend coverage to the professions. Administration opposition in the Senate defeated this program there, although the need for such legislation has become more and more apparent in recent years.

Throughout the consideration of these matters, the Republicans consistently showed themselves for what they are—a party dedicated to the few rather than the many; a party which is more interested in budgetary figures than hunman needs; a party seeking to carry out a minimal social program at a minimal expense. Plenty of lip service, but no votes.

BUSINESS AND TAXATION: THE LITTLE FISH IN A BIG POND

The Eisenhower administration has time and again denied that it is an administration of, by, and for big business. And yet the record clearly shows that almost all of the major economic policies which seek to help the small-business man have orginated among the Democratic Members of Congress and have been opposed by the Republican administration.

The Small Business Administration, an agency dedicated to the plight of small business, was extended for 2 years. The administration opposed any increases in its authorized funds. The amount of any individual loan was increased to $250,000. These loans are intended for those deserving small-business men who cannot get help from regular bank sources. The disaster loan program and the small business participation in Government proceurement were strengthened. The lending function together with the help given to small business in geting a fair share of Government procurement contracts makes SBA one of the most important agencies to have been started in recent years.

This is one of the few domestic policies, which in principle, has been consistently supported by both parties.

Bills were passed to halt the growing monopolistic practices in business. The antitrust penalty for violation of the Sherman Act was raised from $5,000 to $50,000. It was evident that $5,000 to a large corporation is merely a petty-cash transaction which was no deterrent to such a potential violator. In addition, the House passed a bill to curb the influence of bank holding companies by requiring Federal approval of new bank acquisitions by holding companies and requiring those companies to divest themselves of their nonbanking interests. This bill is designed to preserve the small independent bank as the banking unit best able to serve the interest of the small-business men. In the area of taxes, most of the existing income, corporate and excess-profits taxes were extended for another year. The only important proposal for tax relief came from the Democratic side of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Although this concerned a mere $20 cut in personal income taxes for each taxpayer and each dependent—relief aimed at the lowest-income bracket, yet equally fair to all income brackets—the Republican administration forcefully rejected the idea and caused its defeat in the Senate after the House had given its approval.

ARMED SERVICES AND VETERANS: SOMETHING FOR SOMETHING

Thanks to Democratic support, the serviceman and veteran were not forgotten during the past few months. Those who were in the service as of Janury 31, 1955, were allowed to go on building up GI schooling benefits until discharged from the service. The Veterans' Administration direct-loan program was extended for another 2 years and was broadened to include home improvements as well as home purchases. Disabled veterans, including those who fought in Korea, were given the privilege of starting purchase of a special automobile before October 1956.

To help the buildup of a strong backbone of career servicemen—an essential supplement to the new military Reserve program—Congress raised the pay and created greater benefits for servicemen as an incentive to a military career. Finally, Congress decided to continue regular pay to the dependents and relatives of missing or captured men who had fought in Korea.

The feeling was strong in the Congress that our Government should do as much as it could for the men who defend our country and are called upon to make great sacrifices. This program was both an expression of gratitude of the American citizen and a means of compensation for their sacrifices.

TRANSPORTATION: BUT NOT AT ANY COST

The pressing need to bring the Nation's transportation system up to date was apparent to the leaders of both parties. Airport construction was encouraged to the extent of $252 million in grants-in-aid to the States for 4 years.

In advocating a nationwide highway-construction program, the Eisenhower administration asked that the 10-year program be financed with special high-rate bonds. This would have involved at least $2.7 billion in unnecessary interest payments to bankers and other bondholders. The administration proposal was another unfortunate example of special-interest legislation which the Democratic majority has refused to stomach. The Democratic majority almost unanimously rejected this. They proposed in its place a system of user taxes on gasoline and tires, a plan by which those who benefited by the construction of the highways would pay their cost. Opposition to this proposal arose from many sources and the House defeated the bill even though the Senate had given its approval. The Republican opposition was almost unanimous.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES: MORE OF THE SAME

With regard to the pay of Federal employees, the administration insisted it would approve only a straight 5 percent increase, while conceding the employees were entitled to more. The Democrats once again felt this to be bad business and false economy, having in mind how much Government workers' pay had lagged behind the cost-of-living increases and comparable wage increases among other workers throughout the country. We prevailed, though not to the full extent. Increased pay bills for more than the administration recommended were passed and approved.

THE GIVEAWAYS: BIGGER AND MORE

The minks are now sables. The 5-percenters are 10-percenters. Teapot Dome was a drop in a bucket compared to Dixon-Yates. First they gave away our oil lands. Now they are trying to give away all the rest of our natural resources.

The projects in which big business would not risk its stockholders' money are now beginning to pay back the taxpayer his investment. So the administration will now get the Government out of business by giving to big business the taxpayers' property.

To help do this our Government now uses WOC's. That is the old dollar-a-year man. He now works for us "without compensation." Big business pays him and lends him to the Government for nothing. For nothing to the taxpayer, but not for nothing to his private employer. He merely steers the Government business to his employer. He sits in on all the highlevel policymaking conferences, either as the head of the department or as his consultant. Maybe he does not give his private employer any advance information. Maybe he does not write the specifications that only his private employer can bid on. Maybe I am speculating. Then why did Secretary of Commerce Weeks refuse to tell a congressional committee what his big business advisers do? Why was it necessary to employ as a top executive in the Container Division of that Department, the Washington "special representative," on the payroll as such, of the country's largest container corporation? The testimony showed this man knew nothing about the business.

The full story is being developed now and promises to be the biggest scandal of our history.

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER: THEY NEED EACH OTHER

I have supported the Democratic farm program because I am convinced that neither farmer nor consumer can prosper alone. They live and prosper together, or not at all.

The Eisenhower farm program will destroy our country.

Our warehouses are bursting at the seams. Some because they are overloaded. Others because this administration bought and paid for defective storage facilities.

In various parts of the country there is unemployment so serious that our people are starving while surplus commodities in Government warehouses are rotting away.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the farm program sustained losses of $1 billion. In less than 2½ years of Republican administration the farm program lost $2½ billion.

In 20 years under the Democrats, the maximum authorization for the program was $6¾ billion. In 2½ years under the Republicans, the Eisenhower administration increased it to $12 billion.

If you do not think cheese smells ask Secretary Benson to explain about the millions of dollars he just handed to—no not the farmers—to the big cheese processors.

FISCAL POLICY: I HOPE YOU CAN ADD

Candidate Eisenhower promised to balance the budget. Of course, you know he was fooling. President Eisenhower, thinking you took Candidate Eisenhower seriously, has hastened to explain that he did not say when.

But he did promise as President, that if we increased the national debt limit in 1954 to $281 billion, he would cut back the increase in 1955. In the last days of this session, he sent word to your Congress that he could not keep his promise and that we must give him another year in which to do what he said needed only 1 year to do.

Let us not be too hard on him. I think that you, too, would have trouble with that much money. I know that I would.

MY OWN PROJECTS: SOMETHING FOR THE FUTURE

Every Congressman has his own particular interests that he hopes to see enacted. Throughout the years I have been able to gain the approval of many proposals while others still await congressional approval.

Without attempting to set them forth in the order of their importance, some of the proposals I hope to see enacted in the near future are: low-income housing for the aged; a complete civil-rights program; revision of the refugee relief and immigration laws; no discrimination or segregation in National Guard units; measures to keep racist and defamatory literature out of the mail; power to the President to act in health matters in case of a national emergency; strengthening of our antitrust laws to help keep the small-business man as the backbone of our free-enterprise system; income-tax deductions for all educational expenses of dependents and exemptions for servicemen serving overseas; prevention of the giveaway programs of Government rights and property; free postage to and from members of the Armed Forces; a review of all disapproved veterans' claims by the United States Court of Claims; a sound and just security program that will weed out the disloyal, without destroying the loyal; a system of standby economic controls for the prevention of inflation; a system of allocations and priorities of fuel for emergencies; a Department of Civil Defense within the Department of Defense, with strengthened authority; greater consideration of consumer problems by establishing a congressional committee therefor, as well as an executive department to protect the consumer; better pay for Federal employees; equal pay for equal work by women; and a code of ethics in Government for Government officials which, among other things, will prevent big business from acquiring our birthright.

CONCLUSION: RESPONSIBILITY AND INTELLIGENCE

The record of the Congress this year has been a mixed one. And this is far from a complete record. It is merely a brief summary. Some of the more important legislation that might have been enacted this year has been left until next year.

The accomplishments, nevertheless, have been solid ones—the very opposite of what the Republican leaders told the American people to expect.

The moral of this story may be simply stated; the opposition to the administration by the Democratic majority has been intelligent and responsible. Where differences have existed between administration and Congress, there has been a give-and-take and compromise worthy of democratic institutions. The people of this country were not neglected by their Government in favor of partisan politics and petty jealousies. The Democrats of this country have a right to be proud of that record.

RECESS BUT NOT RESPITE

Although Congress is about to recess until January 1956, your Congressman will continue to serve you. His office—your office—is room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C. It will remain open and fully staffed throughout the year. If visiting Washington, feel free to come in. If you have a problem that you think your Congressman can help you solve, write him a note to that address. He may not be able to help you, but you may be sure he will try.

A Report to the People of the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the folks of the Sixth Congressional District of Ohio on my voting record for the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Congress. This report includes only those questions and issues upon which there was a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives. This information is not generally available to the people of my district and I believe it should be made available to every citizen. It has been my policy by means of public opinion questionnaires to give the people I represent an opportunity to express their views on questions and issues of national interest, and I have endeavored to carry out what appeared to be their wishes in voting on bills, resolutions, and motions that were considered in the House of Representatives.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, the following are some of the more important bills and resolutions which I supported and for which I voted "yea."

January 25, 1955: House Joint Resolution 159, a joint resolution authorizing the President to employ the Armed Forces of the United States for protecting the security of Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions and territories of that area. On passage. Passed 410 to 3.

January 27, 1955: H. R. 587, a bill to provide that persons serving in the Armed Forces on January 31, 1955, may continue to accrue educational benefits under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. On passage. Passed 366 to 0.

February 8, 1955: H. R. 3005, to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. On passage. Passed 394 to 4.

February 18, 1955: H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. On passage. Passed 295 to 110.

February 25, 1955: H. R. 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. On passage. Passed 242 to 175.

March 10, 1955: H. R. 4720, to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pay and allowances. On passage. Passed 399 to 1.

March 18, 1955: H. R. 4903, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. On Preston amendment providing $4 million for technical-assistance programs under the United Nations. Passed 175 to 107.

March 21, 1955: H. R. 4951, a bill directing a redetermination of the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955–56 marketing year. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Failed. Two-thirds required. Yeas 260, nays 152.

March 22, 1955: House Resolution 170, a resolution to declare that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to the Congress on January 24, 1955. Failed. Yeas 132, nays 283.

March 23, 1955: House Resolution 171, a resolution to disapprove proposed sale to Shell Oil Co. of certain synthetic rubber facilities as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission report. On agreeing to resolution. Failed. Yeas 137, nays 276.

March 30, 1955: H. R. 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption. Conference report on adoption, 387 to 8.

April 20, 1955: H. R. 4644, to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities. On Moss amendment to provide 8.2 percent increase, yeas 224 to 189 nays. On passage. Passed 324 to 85.

April 21, 1955: H. R. 4393, to provide for the construction and conversion of certain modern naval vessels. On passage. Passed 373 to 3.

May 5, 1955: H. R. 12, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, by restoring 90 percent mandatory price supports for basic commodities. On passage. Passed 206 to 201.

May 9, 1955: S. 1, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. Conference report on adoption, 328 to 66.

May 12, 1955: H. R. 6042, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. On passage. Passed 384 to 0.

May 23, 1955: S. 727, an act to adjust the salaries of the judges of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia Tax Court. On passage. Passed 283 to 33.

May 25, 1955: H. R. 2851, to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress. On passage. Passed 344 to 1.

June 7, 1955: S. 2061, an act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Two-thirds required. Yeas 410, nays 1.

June 8, 1955: H. R. 5923, to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. On passage. Passed 353 to 13.

July 13, 1955: H. R. 6766, a bill making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 316 to 92.

July 13, 1955: House Resolution 295, a rule providing for the consideration of

H. R. 7089, a bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans. On agreeing to rule, yeas 376, nays 24.

July 18, 1955: H. R. 7225, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for certain disabled individuals who have attained age 50, to reduce to age 62 the age on the basis of which benefits are payable to certain women, to provide for continuation of child's insurance benefits for children who are disabled before attaining age 18, to extend coverage, and for other purposes. On motion to suspend rules and pass. Two-thirds required. Yeas 372, nays 31.

July 20, 1955: H. R. 7214, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act to make the minimum wage $1 an hour effective March 1, 1956. On passage. Passed 362 to 54.

July 26, 1955: House Resolution 314, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7474, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. On agreeing to resolution. Passed, yeas 274, nays 129.

July 27, 1955. H. R. 7474, a bill to amend the Federal Aid Road Act and to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways. On passage. Failed, yeas 123, nays 292.

July 28, 1955. H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. On motion to recommit. Failed, yeas 203, nays 210.

July 29, 1955: S. 2126, an act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works. On passage. Passed 396 to 3.

August 1, 1955. House Resolution 299, a resolution providing further expenses for the Select Committee on Small Business. On passage. Passed 231 to 134.

I was paired for the following bills:

June 15, 1955: House Resolution 210, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to the Federal Open Market Committee. On agreeing to resolution. Failed, yeas 178, nays 215.

June 30, 1955: S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. On passage. Passed 273 to 128.

July 7, 1955: S. 2090, an act to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 262 to 120.

August 2, 1955: S. 2126, an act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 187 to 168.

The following are some of the more important bills and resolutions which I opposed and on which I voted "nay."

February 16, 1955: H. R. 3826, to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress. On passage. Passed 283 to 118.

March 1, 1955: H. R. 3828, to adjust the salaries of judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, Members of Congress. Conference report, on adoption. Adopted 223 to 113.

April 20, 1955: H. R. 4644, to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities. On motion to recommit. Failed, 125 to 287.

July 28, 1955: House Resolution 315, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act. On agreeing to rule. Passed 273 to 135.

July 28, 1955: H. R. 6645, to amend the Natural Gas Act. On passage. Passed 209 to 203.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 3	Call of the House	Present.
2	Jan. 26	Call of the House	Absent.
3	Jan. 31	H. R. 8780, relieving farmers from excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes: On passage. (Passed 387 to 0.)	Yea.
4	Jan. 31	H. Res. 352, authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities: On adoption. (Adopted 385 to 1.)	Yea.
5	Feb. 1	H. R. 7993, authorizing the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels: On passage. (Passed 358 to 3.)	Yea.
6	Feb. 2	Call of the House	Present.
7	Feb. 8	H. Res. 396, disapproving sale of the Institute, W. Va., synthetic rubber plant, as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission: On adoption. (Rejected 61 to 310.)	Yea.
8	Feb. 20	H. R. 8710, amending the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947: On passage. (Passed 372 to 2.)	Yea.
9	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
10	Feb. 28	H. Res. 311, providing for the consideration of H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On adoption. (Adopted 354 to 26.)	Yea.
11	Feb. 28	Call of the House	Present.
12	Feb. 29	Call of the House	Present.
13	Mar. 1	Call of the House	Present.
14	Mar. 1	H. R. 3383, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project: On passage. (Passed 256 to 136.)	Nay.
15	Mar. 7	H. R. 9739, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act: On amendment deleting language authorizing 11 supergrade positions in the General Services Administration. (Rejected 150 to 231.)	Yea.
16	Mar. 13	H. R. 9166, extending to April 11, 1957, the existing corporate normal tax rate and certain excise tax rates: On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Adopted 366 to 4.)	Yea.
17	Mar. 20	Call of the House	Present.
18	Mar. 21	Call of the House	Present.
19	Mar. 21	H. R. 8320, extending and providing additional authority for the special school-milk program and the brucellosis eradication program for fiscal year 1956: On motion to agree to the conference report. (Rejected 195 to 215.)	Yea.
20	Mar. 21	On motion to concur in Senate amendments extending above programs for 2 years. (Agreed to 406 to 0.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 21	S. 1271, authorizing the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, U. S. Army, retired: On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 80 to 311.)	Yea.
22	Apr. 11	Call of the House	Present.
23	Apr. 11	H. R. 12, The Agricultural Act of 1956, providing 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to recommit conference report to conference with instructions to provide 82½ percent support for basic crops and 80 percent support for milk under a more liberal parity-equivalent formula and to delete dual parity provisions, mandatory support for feed grains and multiple price plans for wheat and rice. (Rejected 181 to 238.)	Nay.
24	Apr. 11	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 237 to 181.)	Yea.
25	Apr. 12	H. R. 9893, authorizing certain construction at military establishments: On passage. (Passed 377 to 3.)	Yea.
26	Apr. 18	Call of the House	Present.
27	Apr. 18	H. R. 12, the Agricultural Act of 1956, providing 90 percent support for basic crops: On motion to pass bill notwithstanding the veto of the President. (Rejected 202 to 211.)	Yea.
28	Apr. 23	H. R. 7728, transferring responsibility for constructing and operating Jones Point, Va., bridge from Department of Interior to Department of Commerce: On passage. (Passed 284 to 9)	Yea.
29	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
30	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
31	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
32	Apr. 24	Call of the House	Present.
33	Apr. 25	Call of the House	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 10721, the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations bill:	
34	Apr. 25	On amendment fixing at grade GS-16 the compensation of certain employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. (Rejected 179 to 184.)	Nay.
35	Apr. 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10660, the Federal Highway and Highway Revenue Acts of 1956:	
36	Apr. 27	On passage. (Passed 388 to 19.)	Yea.
37	May 2	Call of the House	Present.
38	May 3	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 10875, the Agriculture Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
39	May 3	On amendment to provide for an acreage reserve program for grazing lands. (Adopted 199 to 195.)	Yea.
40	May 3	On amendment to fix at 84 percent of partly the support price for upland cotton. (Rejected 186 to 208.)	Yea.
41	May 3	On motion to recommit to committee with instructions to incorporate provision authorizing prepayments up to 50 percent of 1957 program to producers. (Rejected 184 to 211.)	Nay.
42	May 3	On passage. (Passed 314 to 78.)	Yea.
43	May 9	Call of the House	Absent.
44	May 9	Call of the House	Absent.
45	May 10	Call of the House	Absent.
		H. R. 10986, the Defense Department appropriation bill:	
46	May 10	On amendment to delete sec. 633, containing language requiring Appropriations Committee approval before Department of Defense could eliminate governmental activities in competition with private business. (Adopted 222 to 156.)	Paired against.
47	May 10	On passage. (Passed 377 to 0.)	Not voting.
48	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
49	May 16	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 8901, providing for restoration of franchise to Capital Transit Co.:	
50	May 17	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 161 to 172.)	Yea.
51	May 21	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11124, providing for the payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Federal judges:	
52	May 21	On passage. (Passed 238 to 52.)	Yea.
		H. R. 11319, appropriating funds for the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1957:	
53	May 22	On amendment to provide $160,000 for a resurvey of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. (Adopted 179 to 170.)	Yea.
		H. R. 10875, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (soil bank):	
54	May 23	On motion to agree to the conference report. (Agreed to 305 to 59.)	Yea.
		S. J. Res. 135, providing payment to the Crow Indian Tribe for consent to transfer of right-of-way for Yellowtail Dam and Reservoir, Hardin unit, Missouri River Basin project, Montana-Wyoming:	
55	May 24	On motion to agree to conference report. (Agreed to 176 to 126.)	Yea.
		H. R. 10285, the Farm Credit Act of 1956:	
56	May 31	On passage. (Passed 247 to 4.)	Yea.
57	June 6	Call of the House	Absent.
58	June 6	Call of the House	Absent.
59	June 7	Call of the House	Absent.
60	June 8	Call of the House	Absent.
61	June 8	Call of the House	Absent.
62	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
63		H. R. 11356, the Mutual Security Act:	
	June 11	On passage. (Passed 275 to 122.)	Nay.
64	June 11	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 1840, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act and amend the antitrust law prohibiting price discrimination:	
65	June 11	On passage. (Passed 394 to 3.)	Yea.
66	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
67	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
68	June 12	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 5881, providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects:	
69	June 13	On motion to recommit conference report to committee. (Rejected 179 to 209.)	Yea.
		H. R. 4090, amending the Communications Act of 1934, to require the installation of an automatic radiotelegraph call selector on United States cargo ships carrying less than 2 radio operators:	
70	June 13	On motion to recommit to committee for evaluation of reliability of device and other study. (Rejected 151 to 228.)	Nay.
		H. R. 9540, to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Act:	
71	June 13	On motion to recommit with instruction to delete section providing Federal grants for construction of sewage plants. (Rejected 165 to 213.)	Nay.
72	June 13	On passage. (Passed, 338 to 31.)	Yea.
73	June 20	Call of the House	Present.
74	June 25	Call of the House	Present.
		S. 3295, empowering the District of Columbia Commissioners to extend daylight saving time in the District of Columbia to the last Sunday in October:	
75	June 25	On passage. (Passed 199 to 120.)	Yea.
76	June 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7886, providing for presumptive disability at age 65, and increasing the monthly rates of non-service-connected veterans pension awards:	
77	June 27	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected, 110 to 305.)	Nay.
78	June 27	On passage. (Passed, 364 to 51.)	Yea.
79	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
80	June 28	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9852, extending until June 30, 1958, provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950:	
81	June 28	On motion to agree to the conference report expressing approval of Defense Department dispersal order. (Agreed to, 200 to 197.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 554, providing for the consideration of H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to the States for school construction:	
82	June 28	On adoption. (Adopted, 327 to 67.)	Yea.
83	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
84	June 29	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 9801, authorizing and directing the Panama Canal Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Panama Canal Zone at Balboa, C. Z.:	
85	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to, 325 to 59.)	Nay.
		S. 2379, providing grants of $925,000 to train professional personnel in the field of commercial fishing:	
86	July 2	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 254 to 133.)	Nay.
87	July 3	Call of the House	Present.
88	July 5	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7535, providing Federal assistance to States for school construction:	
89	July 5	On amendment providing for payment of 1 percent of Federal income taxes to the State where collected for school construction purposes. (Rejected 168 to 250.)	Nay.
90	July 5	On amendment requiring States to comply with the Supreme Court antisegregation decisions. (Adopted 225 to 192.)	Nay.
91	July 5	On motion to recommit with instructions to incorporate provisions allocating aid on basis of need and effort. (Rejected 158 to 262.)	Nay.
92	July 5	On passage. (Defeated 194 to 224.)	Yea.
93	July 6	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11380, raising postal rates and establishing a congressional policy for the determination of postal rates:	
94	July 6	On passage. (Passed 217 to 165.)	Nay.
		H. R. 9893, the Military Construction Act of 1956:	
95	July 9	On motion to recommit conference report with instructions to House managers to substitute Kalkaska, Mich., as a site for an air defense base, as recommended by the Air Force, instead of Manistee, Mich. (Rejected 29 to 343.)	Nay.
		H. R. 11967, reactivating National Stadium Commission and setting aside site:	
96	July 9	On passage. (Passed 287 to 80.)	Yea.
97	July 11	Call of the House	Present.

Voting and attendance record, Representative JAMES G. POLK, 6th District, Ohio (84th Cong., 2d sess.)—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H. R. 12130, making appropriations for mutual security for fiscal year 1957:	
98	July 11	On passage. (Passed 284 to 120.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 584, waiving points of order against provisions of H. R. 12138, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957:	
99	July 12	On adoption. (Adopted 362 to 30.)	Not voting.
		H. R. 12139, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1957:	
100	July 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete authorization for Jones Point Bridge across the Potomac River. Rejected 24 to 370.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12038, providing increases in veterans' service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances:	
101	July 12	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Agreed to 391 to 0.)	Yea.
102	July 17	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Con. Res. 265, expressing the sense of Congress against admission of the Communist regime in China as the representative of China in the United Nations:	
103	July 18	On adoption. (Adopted 391 to 0.) (On this vote I was unavoidably detained by a long-distance telephone call. I favored the above resolution and if present, would have voted "yea.")	Not voting.
		H. R. 11708, amending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 so as to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for purposes of title I of the act:	
104	July 18	On passage. (Passed 389 to 6.)	Yea.
105	July 19	Call of the House	Present.
106	July 19	On motion to lay on table a motion that further proceedings under a call of the House be dispensed with. (Rejected 104 to 290.)	Nay.
107	July 20	Call of the House	Present.
108	July 21	Call of the House	Present.
109	July 23	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 627, providing means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the United States jurisdiction:	
110	July 23	On motion to recommit to committee. (Rejected 131 to 275.)	Nay.
111	July 23	On passage. (Passed 279 to 126.)	Yea.
		S. 1644, prescribing policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies:	
112	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 246 to 145.)	Yea.
		H. R. 12227, providing a 3-year suspension of import duties on certain coarse wool hair:	
113	July 23	On motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. (Rejected, ⅔ not having voted in favor, 216 to 123.)	Yea.
114	July 24	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 7992, enacting into permanent law certain provisions now included in the Department of Defense and Civil Functions Act:	
115	July 24	On the committee amendment giving Congress veto power over the elimination by the Defense Department of Government enterprises competing with private business. (Adopted 201 to 185.)	Nay.
		H. R. 12061, directing Atomic Energy Commission to construct and operate plants to produce electric energy with atomic reactors.	
116	July 24	On motion to strike the enacting clause. (Rejected 195 to 199.)	Nay.
117	July 24	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 203 to 191.)	Nay.
118	July 25	Call of the House	Present.
		H. R. 11742, the Housing bill of 1956:	
119	July 25	On amendment to the rule making in order an amendment to strike out title V, authorizing public housing. (Rejected 92 to 299.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 638, citing Arthur Miller for contempt of the House of Representatives by refusal to answer questions before the Committee on Un-American Activities:	
120	July 25	On adoption. (Adopted 373 to 9.)	Yea.
121	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
122	July 26	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 641, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 412, authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado:	
123	July 26	On adoption. (Rejected 179 to 194.)	Nay.
		H. Res. 602, the rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
124	July 26	On adoption. (Adopted 184 to 178.)	Nay.
		H. R. 8902, excluding from income net gains from the sales or disposition of property in determining subsidy payments due certain airlines:	
125	July 26	On motion to recommit to committee. (Agreed to 196 to 153.)	Nay.
126	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 625, the rule providing for the consideration of S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
127	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 219 to 126.)	Yea.
		S. 3338, freezing the rates charged for electric power and energy marketed by the Southwestern Power Administration:	
128	July 27	On passage. (Passed 201 to 140.)	Yea.
129	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
130	July 27	Call of the House	Present.
		H. Res. 604, a rule providing for the consideration of H. R. 7850, authorizing construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project, Idaho:	
131	July 27	On adoption. (Agreed to 173 to 168.)	Nay.
132	July 27	Call of the House	Present.

Congressman Leroy Johnson Friend of Reserves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighbor in the New House Office Building, Congressman LEROY JOHNSON, of California, is a true friend of the Reserves of all of the armed services. In addition to this, he has been responsible for some of the most far-reaching legislation, affecting the military services, enacted by Congress in recent years.

LEROY JOHNSON came to Congress in 1943, and at that time was assigned to the Military Affairs Committee. In 1947 the old Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee were combined into the present Armed Services Committee. The first chairman of this committee was the distinguished gentleman from New York, the late Walter Gresham Andrews, a noted soldier of the First World War. At that time he told me that he was anxious to have LEROY JOHNSON assigned to the Armed Services Committee, as he was desirous of having this highly decorated and combat-tested aviator on the committee because of his background and wide experience in military affairs and legislation affecting all of the armed services.

Very shortly after the Armed Services Committee was formed and my colleague, LEROY JOHNSON, of California, became a member, I recall that Chairman Andrews assigned him to some of the most important subcommittees and related tasks in the committee. Since Walter Andrews has passed on, we cannot give the exact reason why LEROY JOHNSON was chosen for this important work, but suffice it to say that his conduct in working on these problems, and solving them, became well known, not only in the committee but by virtually every Member of the House.

Bear with me for a moment while I briefly outline some of these assignments. During the 80th Congress when the Republicans controlled the House, LEROY JOHNSON was assigned to five separate subcommittees of the Armed Services Committee and was made chairman of one.

First he was assigned to the important Subcommittee on Organization and Mobilization. This subcommittee was charged with the overall organization and plans for national security; military and industrial mobilization plans, including plans for the mobilization of our national resources for war as well as mobilization of the armed services and their civilian components, including the National Guard and Reserves; plans for coordination of foreign and military policies and coordination of civilian and war economies; occupation armies, military government, and all other military operations of the armed services overseas. In addition to this the subcommit-

tee was charged with keeping closely informed of all plans and operations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to insure that all legislation affecting the military policy of the United States was consonant with foreign policy and overall security plans. Furthermore, while a member of this subcommittee, Congressman LEROY JOHNSON was designated to hold extended secret hearings in order to develop legislation for the establishment of a top Government security agency. This legislation resulted in the birth of the Central Intelligence Agency, and a large share of the credit for the establishment of this well-known and vital agency of our Government must go to LEROY JOHNSON, of California.

From what I have said you would think that the subcommittee assignment I have just described would have been sufficient to take all of the time of the average Congressman. But LEROY JOHNSON is far above the average and he plunged into the work of other subcommittees to which he had been assigned. For instance, I refer to the subcommittee on Heavy Munitions which was charged with the procurement and production of all heavy industrial munitions of war for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, requiring extraordinary tooling-up of industry and large quantities of strategic materials, including ship construction and heavy Army and Navy ordnance, and transportation equipment.

Another important subcommittee on which my colleague served was that dealing with legal matters and which had charge of all investigatory activities of the committee. On this subcommittee LEROY JOHNSON'S legal background served him well, for before this group came all of the legal business of the committee, including questions of subpena, committee jurisdiction and legal procedure, and considerations and proposals for the reform of existing systems of military and naval justice.

Probably the work closest to the heart of LEROY JOHNSON came as a result of his assignment to still another subcommittee, for although the Subcommittee on Scientific Research and Development was charged with matters concerning the maintenance of the supremacy of the United States in research and development, it so happened that much legislation affecting the Reserves was handled by this subcommittee. Thus it was that as chairman of this subcommittee Congressman LEROY JOHNSON conducted the hearings which resulted in the enactment of legislation authorizing for the first time the establishment of a retirement system for members of the Reserve components. Probably no other statute is so well known to our Reserves as the Reserves Retirement Act, and certainly every member of the Reserve components, whether retired under the provisions of this statute or authorized to do so in the future, can reflect with gratitude upon the work that Congressman JOHNSON did in connection with this law.

In the 83d Congress when the Republicans again controlled the House, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, became the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and, as was to be expected, appointed LEROY JOHNSON as chairman of the subcommittee to handle all Reserve and National Guard legislation. Shortly after this assignment LEROY JOHNSON introduced legislation and conducted hearings on one of the most far-reaching legislative items affecting the Reserve components ever enacted by Congress. He spent eight continuous weeks in study and in public hearings on the bill which became the Reserve Officer Personnel Act, establishing for the first time a statutory system of promotion for all Reserve officers of the armed services. In testimony of the type of work that LEROY JOHNSON did on this legislation, it should be remembered that this legislation passed both the House and the Senate without a dissenting vote.

In the 83d Congress alone, Congressman JOHNSON introduced 18 separate legislative items in behalf of the Reserves, National Guard, and Civil Air Patrol. He sponsored legislation to equalize benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces, legislation to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act to authorize full and fair hearings of claims, a bill to increase the enlisted strength of organized units of the Reserve components, a bill to establish the Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the Air Force and to extend aid to the CAP in the fulfillment of its objectives, and so many others that I cannot take the time to describe them all fully.

When the Armed Services Committee was first organized in 1947, LEROY JOHNSON was the 13th ranking Republican on that committee. Today he is the fourth ranking Republican, and as such is constantly concerned with the overall policy of the committee and, in addition, serves as ranking minority member of one of the three important legislative subcommittees.

Since he came to Congress in 1943, the name of LEROY JOHNSON has become known throughout the armed services and the Nation as a Member of the House of Representatives dedicated to the furtherance of the national security and defense and to the welfare and well being of all members of the Armed Forces.

Christopher News Notes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two articles which appeared in the May issue of Christopher News Notes, one entitled "On Every Dollar Bill," and the other entitled "One Philadelphia Proofreader Speaks Up":

ON EVERY DOLLAR BILL

There's a powerful lesson on every dollar bill. Take a look at the back of one—the green side—i. e., the greenback. The two circles represent both sides of the great seal of the United States.

Do you know what the circular symbol on the left means? Ask a few friends if they understand the significance of the pyramid shown there, and the eye above it?

We made many tests and found that not 1 person in 100 could explain the meaning behind these symbols, even though they are on every one of the 1½ billion $1 bills now in circulation.

RAY BOLGER HELPS

So we decided to dig up the facts for one of our weekly Christopher television films. Hollywood star Ray Bolger appeared in the program and explained in a fascinating way both the spiritual and historical lesson symbolized on the back of every dollar bill. * * * We have already received so many requests from all over the country for a detailed explanation that we thought it well to summarize it here in the News Notes.

ORIGIN OF SYMBOLS

The founders of our country thought it so important to express the basic truths of our Nation in the great seal that the matter was brought before Congress on the very afternoon of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

Three great leaders, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and John Adams were appointed as a committee of three to prepare the seal. Six years later, on June 20, 1782, after exhaustive study and largely through the efforts of William Barton and Charles Thomson, Congress passed a resolution approving the final design of the great seal.

DETAILS WITH A MEANING

Here are some of the significant details we found through our research:

1. Pyramid: First of all, note the pyramid in the left hand circle. It represents the material strength of our country. In the words of William Barton, who played such an important part in designing it, it stands for "strength and duration."

2. Eye: Directly above the pyramid is the Eye of God which, though separate, completes the pyramid. It emphasizes the importance of putting the spiritual welfare of our country above its material prosperity. Our Founding Fathers [1] firmly believed that our strength was rooted in God and that our progress must always be under the watchful eye of Providence.

3. Under God: The words "Annuit Coeptis" circling the top of the seal are once again a significant proof of the faith of the Founding Fathers and this Nation's dependence on God. These words mean: "He (God) has favored our undertakings."

4. New order: Now look at the three Latin words directly under the pyramid—Novus Ordo Seclorum, which mean "A new order of ages." They signify that this new republic, which had just been founded, introduced a new age in the life and freedom of the people of the world, that it ushered in a new era in which the people themselves would be able to exercise their God-given rights to self-government.

5. Started in 1776: The Roman numerals, MDCCLXXVI, at the base of the pyramid add

---

[1] In the book, The History of the Seal of the United States, by Gaillard Hunt, published by the State Department in 1909, it states on page 12 that Jefferson, Franklin, and Adams explicitly approved the inclusion of the Eye of Providence in the seal. Then on page 42, Mr. Hunt quotes: "The pyramid signifies strength and duration. The eye over it and the motto allude to the many signal interpositions of Providence in favor of the American cause."

In the Encyclopedia Britannica under the topic, "Seal of the United States," it states that Benjamin Franklin first suggested the "Eye of Providence in a radiant triangle."

up to 1776, the beginning of the United States as an independent Nation.

THE CIRCLE AT THE RIGHT

Now take a look at the right-hand circle on the back of the dollar bill.

1. Eagle: It first became our national emblem in 1782 when it was chosen for the great seal as a symbol of strength and victory.

2. States' rights: The shield on the eagle's breast signifies self-reliance. It contains 13 stripes as a reminder that each individual State, with its basic rights and responsibilities, was expected to help protect the freedom of all the States.

3. The role of Congress: The bar across the top of the shield stands for Congress—as the unifying and binding force between the States. The colors of the bar and stripes are red, white, and blue in the seal itself. Red, signifies hardiness and valor; white, purity and innocence; and blue, vigilance, perseverance and justice.

4. Peace comes first: In the right talon or claw of the eagle, you will note an olive branch and if you examine it closely, you will see that it has 13 olive leaves. * * * In the eagle's left talon is a bundle of 13 arrows. Symbolizing the power of peace and war, the olive branch and the arrows are a reminder to the 13 States of their obligation first to work for peace and against war.

5. Ring of light: Finally, above the eagle's head is a ring of light in gold, surrounding 13 stars of silver on a blue field. The stars denote "a new State taking its place and rank among other sovereign powers."

So you can see how important the great seal of the United States really is. In its design our Founding Fathers drew a lesson that was meant to be handed down for generations to come.

It may interest you to know that the great seal is used on official documents, medals, currency, official stationery and publications, and in several other ways under the supervision of the Secretary of State, who is custodian of the seal.

WHAT YOU CAN DO

If you take a few minutes to familiarize yourself with these facts about the great seal, you'll be in a position to do a little missionary work in passing them on to others. Here are a few suggestions:

1. Take a dollar bill and explain the meaningful details to members of your own family, your friends, and fellow workers.

2. Tell teachers to explain these symbols in every classroom.

3. Remind your local newspapers, radio, and television stations that they can perform a public service by bringing these facts to the attention of the public as part of the great American heritage that each and all have a right to know.

IF YOU WON'T, WHO WILL?

In these days when there is widespread criticism of how little is know about the high ideals on which our Nation is founded, it is up to those who believe in God to use every opportunity to keep all Americans ever conscious of the fact that our whole concept of liberty is rooted in divine truth.

If you won't, who will?

By doing nothing, you may be aiding those who slowly but surely are striving to despiritualize every phase of public and private life. Their chief strength is the failure of the average good citizen to make his voice heard.

Here is an opportunity for you to spread far and wide a few simple facts. Doing something positive and constructive like this is far more effective than merely complaining about what's wrong with your country—and your world.

Don't forget for one moment what you, personally and individually, can do. If you are tempted to do nothing, recall the solemn warning of Jesus Christ: "He that is not with me, is against me." (Matt. 12: 30)

ONE PHILADELPHIA PROOFREADER SPEAKS UP

A proofreader in a Philadelphia commercial printing house showed recently what one person can do by taking a stand for decency. The courage of this one individual has already inspired countless people who read about the incident in the Philadelphia Bulletin.

The company for which this proofreader works has been printing a magazine which is an undergraduate publication of a local university. A recent issue received in manuscript form was sent as usual to the typesetter. Then it went to the head proofreader for checking. He was so surprised and disgusted by the sordidness and brutality of the article that he brought it to one of the officials of the printing firm.

He protested to him against printing an article which told in blunt language about the depravity of a man whose wife was about to become a mother.

SHOCK UPON SHOCK

The printing manager agreed completely with the proofreader and got in touch with the student editorial staff as well as the faculty. He explained that in good conscience they couldn't print the article.

The printers thought that someone in high authority would immediately stop publication. But such was not the case. In fact, they were taken to task for making any comment at all and, as a result, the printing of the magazine was taken away from them.

The reaction of the head of the printing establishment was that of any normal, decent person. He said:

"It is their privilege to find a new printer—if they can. In fact, we would rather they took the business away. But we never expected to be jumped on with both feet when we went to the faculty. Instead of being thanked for stopping this obscenity from going into circulation, we lose a customer and create ill will at the university. But regardless of all that, we still would have taken the same course."

LIVING UP TO THEIR PRINCIPLES

Rather than back down from their courageous position of living up to principle, the spokesman for the printing firm frankly declared that they had a moral obligation not to use their equipment to turn out such lurid trash.

Then he went on to say: "I don't see how we could have taken any other course. When we saw the nature of it, we wouldn't let it go through this plant. It would have never been put in type if we had read it first."

A PATTERN FOR OTHERS TO FOLLOW

If only more printers, bookstores, newsstands, newsdealers, and others who feel a responsibility to their customers would take a similar stand, there would be a refreshing change for the better almost overnight in the whole field of literature.

Both printer and distributor have similar rights to those of a publisher. If the latter takes advantage of his position to try to impose foul ideas under the pretext of good literature, the distributor has the same obligation in conscience to stop it as a butcher would have in refusing to sell meat that was deliberately poisoned.

BE NOT DECEIVED

Protests on the part of a few about tainted meat "looking fine" or being "well cut" only underline the deception perpetrated on the average innocent customer who has a right to expect pure food.

If a few prefer rotten meat, they can prostitute their "freedom of choice" to poison themselves. But by no stretch of the imagination does "academic freedom" allow anyone of foul mind the license to defile the minds of others.

IN MOVIES, TELEVISION, AND RADIO

You can certainly do something to encourage others to imitate the courage of the Philadelphia proofreader. Stir up as many as possible to take a similar stand in regard to movies, television, and radio. Thank God, the majority who run these fields are normal, decent people who are anxious to have presentations and programs which are suitable for the entire family.

INCREASE THEIR NUMBER

Then, too, write those who are acting in films and on the air and remind them of the important role each can play in taking an individual stand for what is right and decent and, therefore, against what is debauching and degrading. We know of several New York and Hollywood stars who have turned down scripts because they had the same courage of conviction as the printers in Philadelphia.

To be sure, they pay a price—and often a heavy one—of losing business. But that is the price of imitating Christ. One wins eventually by losing temporarily. Our Saviour lost in many ways in order to win for everybody.

WHAT YOU PERSONALLY CAN DO

As we have mentioned before, you too, are in a strong position to shape public opinion toward what is normal and decent. All articles, books, programs and movies are bidding for your attention. They depend on you for survival.

You are the judge. The more selective and discriminating you are, the better product you are likely to get. You are always free to approve or to disapprove. You hold the purse strings. You have the power of the pocketbook (no matter how slender it may be) to back up your freedom of choice. In short, the tone of most literature and entertainment will be just about what you—and others like you—demand.

God has implanted in every person a sense of what is right and wrong. He has done this through the natural law and the Ten Commandments. Relying on that sense of decency, an individual can make sound judgments on his own and apply them without delay. Very often, unless the individual acts immediately on his own, it is too late to prevent public harm.

Here are a few tips that you may find helpful:

1. Avoid two extremes of being too prudish on one hand—or of being so "broad-minded" that you stand for no principles.

2. Give credit where credit is due in seeing abuses, take care not to overlook the good that is being done.

3. Be not deceived by those who defend an immoral production by saying: "But it was so well done." The more artistically or cleverly presented, the more harmful any such work can be. Remember what Will Rogers once said: "What we need today are cleaner minds and dirtier fingernails."

4. Pray daily that the great and powerful channels of communication will be used for good to all and harm to none.

5. Encourage young people with Christ-like ideals, ability and determination to consider taking up careers in the writing end of newspapers, magazines, books, movies, television and radio.

Right-To-Work Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I inserted in the RECORD for July 24 the argument of the attorney general of Texas, Hon. John Ben Sheppard, before the State supreme court in support of the validity of a right-to-work law. Since that time the court rendered its opinion. In order that the fullest information can be available on the subject involved I believe it would be in the public interest for the dissenting opinion of Justice Clyde E. Smith in that case to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The matter follows:

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF TEXAS, No. A-5061—M. E. SANDSBERRY, JR., ET AL. AND GULF, COLORADO & SANTA FE RAILWAY COMPANY, ET AL., PETITIONERS, *v.* INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

DISSENTING OPINION

I most respectfully dissent. In this case the respondents, labor unions, in attempting to deny the petitioners-individuals the right not to join a union are, in effect, destroying the principle of constitutional liberty upon which their very existence is founded. The union's effort to compel the Santa Fe to enter into the proposed contract which would ultimately bring about compulsory union membership cannot be sustained by the courts and such a contract between private parties (the unions and the Santa Fe) is not insulated from review for conformity with the Bill of Rights when governmental action is otherwise present. In the case of *Steele* v. *Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co.* (323 U. S. 192, 198, 199 (1944)), the United States Supreme Court said that the conduct of a labor union which is authorized by act of Congress to function as an exclusive bargaining representative sufficiently involves the hand of Government to raise questions for review under the Bill of Rights. The Court specifically said: "But we think that Congress, in enacting the Railway Labor Act and authorizing a labor union, chosen by a majority of a craft, to represent the craft, did not intend to confer plenary power upon the union to sacrifice, for the benefit of its members, rights of the minority of the craft, without imposing on it any duty to protect the minority. Since petitioner and the other Negro members of the craft are not members of the Brotherhood or eligible for membership, the authority to act for them is derived not from their action or consent but wholly from the command of the act."

This same principle was announced in the case of *American Communications Association* v. *Douds* (339 U. S. 382, 401–402 (1950)):

"Under the statutory scheme, unions which become collective bargaining representatives for groups of employees often represent not only members of the union but nonunion workers or members of other unions as well. Because of the necessity to have strong unions to bargain on equal terms with strong employers, individual employees are required by law to sacrifice rights which, in some cases, are valuable to them. See *J. I. Case Co.* v. *Labor Board* (321 U. S. 332 (1944)). The loss of individual rights for the greater benefit of the group results in a tremendous increase in the power of the representative of the group—the union. But power is never without responsibility. And when authority derives in part from Government's thumb on the scales, the exercise of that power by private persons becomes closely akin, in some respects, to its exercise by Government itself. See *Graham* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen* (338 U. S. 232 (1949)); *Steele* v. *Louisville & N. R. Co.* (323 U. S. 192 (1944)); *Tunstall* v. *Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen* (323 U. S. 210 (1944)); *Wallace Corp.* v. *Labor Board* (323 U. S. 248, 255 (1944)); *Railway Mail Association* v. *Corsi* (326 U. S. 88, 94 (1945)).

"We do not suggest that labor unions which utilize the facilities of the National Labor Relations Board become Government agencies or may be regulated as such. But it is plain that when Congress clothes the bargaining representative 'with powers comparable to those possessed by a legislative body both to create and restrict the rights of those whom it represents,' the public interest in the good faith exercise of that power is very great."

It is by force of the command of the act, or authority of the act, and that alone that the respondent unions seek to compel the employer, Santa Fe, to enter into a contract and agreement requiring, as a condition of continued employment, that within 60 days following the beginning of such employment, or the effective date of such agreements, whichever is the later, all employees shall become members of the labor organization representing their craft or class. The respondent unions' pleadings in their motion for judgment wherein it was said, "Plaintiffs and cross-plaintiff railroads could be entitled to injunctive relief only if the objective for which labor union defendants were bargaining was unlawful. Congress, however, by passage of the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act unequivocally settled the law applicable to this case. By removing the ban on union-shop contracts which the 1934 Congress had enacted, it restored the traditional right of management and labor to enter into union-security agreements." After the passage of the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act, the respondent unions began their efforts to bring about compulsory unionism. The following excerpt from one of the letters written by a vice general chairman of one of the unions to a nonmember is typical of the attitude of the unions after they had been clothed with powers comparable to those possessed by a legislative body by the amendment of 1951, "you have probably heard through the newspapers or radio or from some other cource that our organization, together with 16 cooperating organizations, have filed notice upon the Santa Fe as of February 5 for negotiations to amend our agreement to provide for the union shop and checkoff system. We are quite confident that our agreement on the Santa Fe will be amended within a reasonable length of time to include provisions for a union shop. The union shop will provide that every employee in service as of the date of the signing of this agreement would be required to tender their application to our organization within 60 days after the revision is signed, or forfeit his right to work. I am sure that you are not one of the few employees who will insist that they must be forced into the organization against their will, but rather one of the employees who, through some misunderstanding or lack of knowledge to what the organization represents, or what it has done for you in the past, has failed to become a member prior to this time."

It is obvious that the respondent unions are using the positive legislative action of Congress as a weapon to force nonmembers to join the union. It is true the act does not say that the railroads must enter into union security agreements, but the act, as a whole, even though it says that carriers and unions "shall be permitted to make agreements," has the legal effect and accomplishes the same purpose as though it had provided that carriers shall enter into such agreements. The act contemplates that upon the signing of a union-shop agreement all employees not then members must become members and subject themselves to the disciplinary measures of the union. The statute provides that all agreements shall contain a provision that "all employees shall become members of the labor organization representing their craft or class." Certainly the statute contemplates membership in a union. The purpose is not limited to just the payment of dues. To refuse to accede to the demands of the union could mean but one result. The nonunion member of the craft or class represented by the union bargaining agent under the principle of majority rule would be fired or, to use the words of the respondent unions, "forfeit his right to work." This governmental action amounts to the Government's "thumb" on the scales in favor of the unions and the act of 1951 is instrumental in depriving the nonunion member of fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution and protected by right-to-work laws in Texas. In order to protect the workingman as contemplated by the Constitution of the United States we must recognize that it is just as essential that the right of a man not to join a union be preserved and safeguarded as the right to join a union. By the use of the term "right to work," I do not mean it in the sense of a right to demand of an employer a particular job, or in the sense that an employee, having acquired the job, can say to the employer that he, the employee, cannot be discharged for cause. State right-to-work laws were not enacted for such purposes. The justification for such laws rests primarily on the proposition that Texas recognized the necessity of giving statutory protection to the workingman in the enjoyment of his constitutional right to work. This principle has been recognized and upheld by the courts in many suits involving the question of the constitutional right of a worker to join a union. The same principle should be applied in a case such as we have here where men desire to exercise their right of freedom of choice. To deny them this right is to destroy freedom itself. I agree with the petitioners in their statement, "If men are to be free to join unions they must also be free not to join; otherwise they have no freedom of association but a duty or obligation to join an organization selected not by themselves but by others—which is the coercion of the slave state and the very antithesis of the freedom of choice which is the core of American constitutional liberty." See *Texas & New Orleans R. Co.* v. *Brotherhood of Clerks* (281 U. S. 548 (1930)); *Virginian R. Co.* v. *System Federation, No. 40* (300 U. S. 515 (1937)); *National Labor Relations Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1 (1937)).

Returning to the demands made by the respondent unions upon the individual petitioners in this case, and particularly emphasize the fact that respondents, in writing the nonunion members, as above pointed out, used the very provisions of the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act. It is clear that this lawsuit springs from the wording of the statute itself. The effort to justify their acts by claiming that the statute is merely permissive and that all of their efforts are to reach a voluntary agreement between employer and union leaders and that when such contract is entered into it should be respected is merely a subterfuge to avoid the application of constitutional principles. A union shop is not, in a true sense, a voluntary arrangement. Respondents' actions in this case reveal coercive methods not only against the employees who do not desire to submit to the disciplinary power of the union and thereby sacrifice their freedom guaranteed under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, but also are acts of coercion

against the petitioners, railroads, as well. The evidence shows that the objective of respondent unions is to ultimately force all employees to join a union, and the freedom of contract they seek is the freedom of the employer to contract with the unions that all employees must join a union. Although the respondent unions have been designated as the bargaining representatives of their respective crafts, they completely ignore the rights of the minority, in this case the nonunion members, and demand a contract in accordance with the terms of the statute, the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act. In other words, they are advocating the converse of the right of the employer to be free to contract with employees that they would not be required to join a union. Respondent unions are proceeding not only under the general authority of the act, but, in addition, under the express permission given the respondents by the statute, to demand a compulsory union-shop agreement.

In the case of *Betts* v. *Easley* (161 Kan. 159, 169 P. 2d 831) the Court said:

"In the light of the history and purpose of the [Railway Labor] Act, as construed in many decisions, the trial court's view that the acts complained of are solely those of 'a private association of individuals' is wholly untenable. The acts complained of are those of an organization acting as an agency created and functioning under provisions of Federal law. This being true, it is unnecessary to consider appellee's contention that the fifth amendment is not here applicable because it relates only to action by the Federal Government and not to acts of private persons. Nor do we need to inquire whether appellees' statement as to the operation of the fifth amendment is too broadly stated. In any event the constitutional guaranties of due process, whether under the Federal or State constitutions, are to be liberally construed to effectuate their purposes, and are a restraint not only upon persons holding positions specifically classed as executive, legislative, or judicial, but upon all administrative and ministerial officials who act under governmental authority. * * * While claiming and exercising rights incident to its designation as bargaining agent, the defendant union cannot at the same time avoid the responsibilities that attach to such statutory status."

The action of the respondent unions is most assuredly subject to review by the courts because the demands are unreasonable and capricious in that the statute here involved aids the respondent unions, who are not only bargaining representatives of union members but also of nonunion workers as well, to compel nonunion employees and employers to sacrifice rights which are valuable to them. The unions under the very terms of the act have been given certain power and authority. This power and authority has been derived at least in part from the Government—in this case the 1951 act of Congress, the amendment to the Railway Labor Act. In fact, the 1951 amendment is the only defense or justification the respondent unions can offer for their present contentions in this case. The respondents contend that the Supreme Court of the United States did not hold that there was governmental action in the case of *Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia* v. *Pollak* (343 U. S. 451 (1952)). In my opinion, the question of governmental action was considered. The Court said in part: "It was held by the Court below that the action of Capital Transit in installing and operating the radio receivers, coupled with the action of the Public Utilities Commission in dismissing its own investigation of the practice, sufficiently involved the Federal Government in responsibility for the radio programs to make the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution of the United States applicable to this radio service. * * * We find in the reasoning of the court below a sufficiently close relation between the Federal Government and the radio service to make it necessary for us to consider those amendments." The Court actually passed upon the constitutional question raised in that case. It was necessary, just as it is here, for the Court to do so in order to finally dispose of the case; otherwise, the Court would not have passed upon the constitutional questions. See *Arkansas Fuel Oil Co.* v. *Louisiana* (304 U. S. 197, 202 (1938)); *Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co.* v. *Department of Public Utilities* (304 U. S. 61, 64 (1938)); *Light* v. *United States* (220 U. S. 523, 538 (1911)).

As heretofore pointed out, the act invested the union with powers it did not otherwise have, and further that no common-law rule renders compulsory unionism lawful, whether brought about by closed or union shop contracts. The respondents contend that the validity of the type of union-shop agreement does not involve a constitutional question that the validity of the contract desired is not tested by the provisions of the first, fifth, and ninth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, but that its validity rests on the common law. In support of this position respondent unions rely on such cases as *Harper* v. *Local Union No. 520* (I. B. E. W., Tex. Civ. App. 48 S. W. 2d 1033, writ dismissed) and *Underwood* v. *Texas & P. Ry. Co.* (Tex. Civ. App., 178 S. W. 38, 1915, no writ history). Those cases have no application here because of the vast difference in the facts and, further, the cases involved purely private action between private parties with no governmental action statute involved such as we have in the case at bar. Therefore, no constitutional issues were presented for decision. The case at bar comes within the rule that wherever government assists private parties, there is sufficient governmental action to require review under the Bill of Rights. A review of the record in this case leads to the inevitable conclusion that the respondent unions with the aid of the 1951 amendment are attempting to accomplish that which is unlawful and violative of the rights of the petitioners. This does not contemplate a new rule or the extension of the present rule, but it does contemplate an application of the present rule as announced by the United States Supreme Court that freedom rests on choice, and where choice is denied by governmental action freedom is denied as well. If this rule is applicable in racial restrictive covenant cases, then I see no reason why it should not apply in the present case where an agreement is sought which would require compulsory union membership. The ultimate result would be that the unions under the guise of security would obtain a complete monopoly and no nonunion member would ever be able to secure employment in the particular field for which he has been trained. He would be caused by such monopoly to lose not only his seniority rights gained as a result of long and faithful service, but also his right to work as well. As was said in the case of *Phelps Dodge Corp.* v. *Labor Board* (313 U. S. 177 (1941)): "Reinstatement is the conventional correction for discriminatory discharges. Experience having demonstrated that discrimination in hiring is twin to discrimination in firing, it would indeed be surprising if Congress gave a remedy for the one which is denied for the other." That court also said: "To differentiate between discrimination in denying employment and in terminating it, would be a differentiation not only without substance but in defiance of that against which the prohibition of discrimination is directed."

In the case of *Lincoln Federal Labor Union* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Co.* (336 U. S. 525 (1949)) the unions asserted "that the right to work as a nonunionist is in no way equivalent to or parallel of the right to work as a union member; that there exists no constitutional right to work as a nonunionist on the one hand while the right to maintain employment free from discrimination because of union membership is constitutionally protected." The court, in rejecting this theory said in part: "* * * There cannot be wrung from a constitutional right of workers to assemble to discuss improvement of their own working standards, a further constitutional right to drive from remunerative employment all persons who will not or cannot participate in union assemblies. The constitutional right of workers to assemble, to discuss and formulate plans for furthering their own self interest in jobs cannot be construed as a constitutional guaranty that none shall get and hold jobs except those who will join in the assembly or will agree to abide by the assembly's plans. For where conduct affects the interests of other individuals and the general public, the legality of that conduct must be measured by whether the conduct conforms to valid law, even though the conduct is engaged in pursuant to plans of an assembly."

With governmental action present, as was unequivocally held in the Hanson case by the United States Supreme Court on May 21, 1956, the record in the present case authorizes the court to issue its most gracious writ of injunction to restrain the respondent unions from unlawfully demanding a contract which, if executed and carried out, would destroy the rights given to the petitioners under the first and fifth amendments. A brief review of the facts of this case demonstrates the correctness of this conclusion. The testimony of Mr. Daniel P. Loomis, chairman of the Association of Western Railway, shows that immediately after the passage of section 2, eleventh, the Santa Fe, among other railroads, received a formal notice from respondents reading in so far as material as follows:

"Please accept this as formal notice served in accordance with the procedures of the Railway Labor Act on behalf of all employees we represent of our desire to make an agreement between your company and the employees represented by this organization effective 30 days after date of this letter providing as follows: 'Notwithstanding any provision in any prior agreement between the parties hereto, it is hereby agreed that (a) all employees now or hereafter employed in any work covered by the rules and working conditions agreement between the parties hereto shall, as a condition of continued employment in such work, within 60 days following the beginning of such employment or the effective date of this agreement, whichever is later, become members of, and thereafter maintain membership in good standing, in the organization party to this agreement representing their craft or class, provided that this condition shall not apply with respect to any employee to whom such membership is not available upon the same terms and conditions as are generally applicable to any other member, or with respect to any employee to whom membership was denied or terminated for any reason other than the failure of the employee to tender the periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments not including fines and penalties uniformly required as a condition of acquiring or retaining membership.'"

This demand was rejected. Subsequently, on July 9, July 10, and July 31, 1952, in conferences between Mr. Loomis, representing the Santa Fe and other carriers, and respondent unions, the unions refused to discuss any agreement under which only money payments would be made to them by nonunion employees. Mr. Loomis' testimony in this respect reads as follows:

"Question. The question has been raised here in connection with the testimony of a number of witnesses as to whether the union is entitled to payment from all members of craft or class employed by the rail-

road for its services in acting as a collective bargaining agent.

"Was the demand of the nonoperating unions for an agreement on this subject at the conference you attended or conferences that you attended, confined to one providing for the payment of fee or charge, for such services?

"Answer. No. It was not. As a matter of fact, the union committee stated that they would not be interested even in discussing such an arrangement.

"Question. Was the question asked of them?

"Answer. Yes. On July 9, 10, and 31, during the conferences in Washington, I inquired whether there was anything to be gained by discussing the proposition whereby those covered by collective-bargaining agreements would contribute to the cost of collective bargaining but would not have to join a union.

"I was answered by the chairman of the nonoperating committee, Mr. Leighty, by Mr. Harrison of the clerks' union, and by Mr. Duffy of the electrical workers, that particularly they would not be interested in such an arrangement but they wanted a full union shop agreement whereby all employees would be required to join the union."

Mr. Loomis further testified:

"Question. Now in these conferences that took place, did the carriers make any alternative proposal to the proposals for the union shop with the checkoff?

"Answer. We made a direct proposal for maintenance of membership. We explored various other areas. We particularly explored, as I stated yesterday, whether there was any use in discussing any arrangement whereby employees would support the cost of collective bargaining without having to join a union.

"We discussed the United States Steel settlement; the Western Union agreement which is what is called an agency contract where the employees do not have to join the union.

"We discussed the proposition of exempting employees now in service. The direct offer that we made, however, was a maintenance of membership arrangement.

"Question. Would you explain what is involved in that maintenance of membership arrangement?

"Answer. Maintenance of membership arrangement, in ordinary usage, has an escape period of possibly 2 or 3 weeks or a month during which employees have the opportunity to decide whether they want to remain members of the union or get out of the union.

"At the end of the escape period all of those who are still members of the union are required to maintain their membership in the union.

"Question. Was that substantially the proposal that the carriers made to the labor leaders?

"Answer. That is correct.

"Question. What response did they make?

"Answer. It was rejected.

"Question. You said that the carriers' conferees made a number of other proposals over this period of time. I believe you had described some of them?

"Answer. I put it that we explored areas of negotiation, whether there was anything to be gained by pursuing a certain line of discussion.

"Question. You mean that you put out feelers to find out what might be acceptable?

"Answer. Well, we asked the direct question: Now suppose that we were to discuss making a union-shop agreement but the employees now in service would be exempt; is there any use in our considering such a proposition as that? Would you be willing to talk about it? Or after the settlement was made in the steel industry, we studied that contract and explored whether there was any use to follow that up, in discussing there whether we could reach any possibility of a settlement.

"Question. Did you explain yesterday what were the essential provisions of the steel arrangement?

"Answer. Yes.

"Question. That was my recollection; now, what response did the union conferees make to these feelers?

"Answer. Just one. That wanted a full union-shop agreement."

The proposed contract contains section 1 which is an absolute requirement that nonunion employees should become full union members. That section reads as follows:

"In accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, all employees of the carriers now or hereafter subject to the rules and working conditions agreements between the parties hereto, except as hereinafter provided, shall, as a condition of their continued employment subject to such agreements, become members of the organization party to this agreement representing their craft or class within 60 calendar days of the date they first perform compensated service as such employees after the effective date of this agreement, and thereafter shall maintain membership in such organization; except that such membership shall not be required of any individual until he has performed compensated service on 30 days within a period of 12 consecutive calendar months. Nothing in this agreement shall alter, enlarge or otherwise change the coverage of the present or future rules and working conditions agreements."

Various other provisions contained in sections 3–A and 3–C of this same exhibit make it clear that the contract demanded required full union membership.

The testimony of Mr. John Landreth, one of the railroad negotiators at the conference held the day before plaintiffs filed their suit, testified that respondent unions stated that the contract in the record here as exhibit No. 1 would be the minimum offer, that it had been pared to the bone, and that there would be no deviation from it. The union representatives further stated that they had no authority to deviate in any way.

The petitioners, through their petition and prayer supported by evidence, are entitled to an injunction prohibiting the execution of a union shop agreement requiring full union membership. The unions demanded such a contract and threatened to strike to force its execution. The petitioners prayed for an injunction prohibiting respondent-unions from striking, and the injunction granted was warranted by the evidence in this case. The petitioners are entitled to an injunction restraining the respondent unions from threatening or requiring compulsory union membership to the extent of the payment of dues or assessments for political purposes, or for insurance premiums, or for any purpose other than such sums as are necessary to defray each worker's share of bargaining expense. The record in this case shows that the unions in this case are political organizations as well as bargaining agencies, and that the Clerks' Union levied a political assessment against at least one worker. The recent holding of the United States Supreme Court in the Hanson case is authority for the issuance of an injunction to restrain the unlawful assessment above enumerated.

The verdict of the jury establishes that the respondent unions demanded the full union shop contract. The petitioners are entitled to an injunction in any event under the record in this case to prohibit the unions from requiring the nonunion members to take the following oath:

"I, ———, of my own free will in the presence of Almighty God and this assembly do solemnly promise and declare that I will keep sacred and inviolate this obligation and the secrets of this brotherhood, and will not repeat outside of the lodge room any transaction whatsoever which may have taken place therein, to anyone other than those whom I know to be members in good standing."

They are entitled under the record in this case to an injunction restraining the execution of a contract which would require full membership in the union; and that an employee make application; take the necessary oath of allegiance to the union; become bound by its laws, rules, regulations and policies and subject to its discipline. The United States Supreme Court, in the course of its opinion in the Hanson case, delivered on May 31, 1956, said:

"If other conditions are in fact imposed [other than periodic dues, initiation fees and assessments], or if the exaction of dues, initiation fees, or assessments is used as a cover for forcing ideological conformity or other action in contravention of the first amendment, this judgment will not prejudice the decision in that case. For we pass narrowly on section 2 eleventh of the Railway Labor Act. We only hold that the requirement for financial support of the collective-bargaining agency by all who receive the benefits of its work is within the power of Congress under the commerce clause and does not violate either the first or fifth amendments. We express no opinion on the use of other conditions to secure or maintain membership in a labor organization operating under a union or closed shop agreement."

The employees, being forced to make application for membership and to take the necessary oath of allegiance to the union, as above set out, become bound by its laws, rules and regulations and policies and subject to its discipline; upon an attempt on his part to resist discharge from his job, for other causes than nonpayment of dues he will be met with the well established rule of law that "a labor union has the right to make and adopt reasonable rules and bylaws governing the conduct of its members. So long as the bylaws of a union relate to matters in which no one except the association and its members is interested, and violate no right of a third person and no rule of public policy, they are valid. The articles of agreement of a labor union, whether called a constitution, charter, bylaws, or any other name, constitute a contract between the members which the courts will enforce, if not immoral or contrary to public policy or the law of the land" (31 Am. Jur. 856 and authorities there cited). *Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers* v. *Marshall* (1938, 119 S. W. 2d 908, wr. ref.); *United Brotherhood* v. *Carpenters Local Union No. 14* (1943, 178 S. W. 2d 558, wr. ref., w. o. m.).

State right-to-work laws have time and again been upheld as constitutional by the United States Supreme Court and such laws cannot be superseded or set aside except by valid constitutional enactments of the Congress. Respondent-unions assume the position that whether a man must join a union as a condition of railroad employment is a matter of policy to be settled by Congress, and, therefore, is beyond the province of the court. The petitioners take the position that compulsory unionism is a matter of Congressional policy if, and only if, the union shop statute is judicial determined to be within the power of Congress. Petitioners contend that whether a statutory step is within the power of Congress is purely a judicial question and that this case questions the power of Congress to enact the union shop statute. I agree with the contention of petitioners. I cannot conceive of the United States Supreme Court holding that compulsory union membership brought into being by virtue of the 1951 amendment is possible after reading such cases as *Labor Board* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.*, supra, and *Thomas* v. *Collins* (323 U. S. 516), and many others upholding the right of a worker

to join a union. The labor unions, through the courts, have successfully maintained their position that the employer did not have the right to deprive the worker of the right to join a union. Now, it would be a sad spectacle, indeed, for the Congress to be permitted to enact a statute which would have the effect of enabling the union to drive the nonunion employees into the union or out of work.

The record in the present case is the authority for holding that the other conditions referred to in the Hanson opinion exist, and applying the holding in that case to the facts in the present case, and in view of its holding that governmental action was present in the Hanson case, this court should hold that governmental action was taken on behalf of the unions by Congressional action in the enactment of section 2, Eleventh, and that such action was unlawful and unconstitutional, and in strict violation of petitioners' rights under the first and fifth amendments. The record in this case shows a design or pattern of procedure on the part of the respondent-unions to require a contract which would better enable the requirement of compulsory union membership, the taking of an oath that would indicate the subject was acting and speaking of his own free will, when, in fact, he is acting and speaking against his will and only on compulsion, and would ultimately lead to a destruction of his freedom of choice and freedom of conscience.

The judgment of the court of civil appeals and the trial court should be modified, and, as modified, the injunction granted by the trial court should be affirmed.

CLYDE E. SMITH,
Associate Justice.

Opinion delivered July 25, 1956.

Associate Justices Griffin and McCall join in this dissent.

Hon. Clifford R. Hope

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by Hon. CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, that he will not seek reelection to Congress and that he is retiring at the end of this session to enter the private practice of law prompts me to make a brief statement concerning his service in Congress.

Mr. HOPE has served with honor and distinction for a period of 30 years. During all of this time he has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture. Since 1932 he has been the ranking Republican on that committee, and in 1947–48 and 1953–54 he served as chairman.

For 18 of the 30 years that Mr. HOPE has been a member of the Committee on Agriculture it has been my privilege to be associated with him in the work of that committee. In all of the history of the Committee on Agriculture I doubt if anyone has ever equaled CLIFF HOPE'S contributions to the welfare of American agriculture.

His decision to retire is a great loss to farmers in every State in the Union. He represented a great wheat producing district and always fought for the interests of the people who elected him, but his interests in agriculture were not limited to his district and he worked unceasingly to improve the farmer's economic position in all areas of agricultural production. His wise counsel and sound reasoning on agricultural questions will be sorely missed in the Committee on Agriculture.

As he returns to the active practice of law in Garden City, Kans., I wish for him abounding success and complete happiness.

Government Is Your Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the News Notes published by the Christopher movement which enumerates the actions which an individual should take in order to engender interest in political campaigns on the part of others:

GOVERNMENT IS YOUR BUSINESS—EITHER YOU RUN YOUR GOVERNMENT OR GOVERNMENT RUNS YOU

At the last presidential election, approximately 40 million qualified persons failed to vote. This neglect is even more widespread and serious in primary elections. In one precinct on Long Island, N. Y., an average of only 14 out of 869 registered voters bother to go to the polls at primaries. This dangerous trend is taking place all over the country.

Are we gradually endangering one of our most precious rights—that of self-government, through lack of self-participation? The let George do it attitude in times like these has been fatal for many a country. Those who believe in the slave state are ever on the job to pick up every right we drop.

HOW TO BE A PRECINCT WORKER

The following hints have been helpful to many who have taken to heart the Christopher reminder that one person can do much, with God's help, to raise the standards of government. We have adapted them for use by anyone, regardless of party affiliation.

I. The ABC's

Every precinct organizer works under the direction of the precinct captain and in cooperation with the other workers.

1. Accept the responsibility to act as your party's representative to 20 families in the neighborhood.

2. Call on your neighbors. There is no substitute for a personal visit.

3. Serve your neighbors. Assist in times of adversity.

4. Know their interests and special activities.

5. Win their confidence through friendliness, integrity, and service.

6. Stimulate community spirit by organizing get-togethers on patriotic holidays, such as, Washington's Birthday, Memorial Day, Fourth of July, and Armistice Day.

7. Be well informed on major issues. Be able to give your party's viewpoint when the opportunity presents itself.

8. Be honest and discreet in all your dealings.

9. Become acquainted with your local authorities and enlist their aid when your neighbors need help with legitimate "around home" problems of a public nature.

II. The precinct organizer's tools

A. Calling cards: The local committee will find that investment in calling cards for precinct organizers will pay dividends in votes. The cards should be in colors, and should bear the information that the caller is his party's precinct organizer. It should have space for his name, address, and telephone number, and a notation that he is available for service. A card should be left at each house on each visit.

B. Voting list: The voting list is the most important tool of the precinct organizer. From it he will learn the political trend of the precinct. He will know who is not registered. It provides a mailing list for campaign literature. It supplies a possible audience for precinct, ward, or county meetings, as well as for radio parties and house meetings during the campaign.

The following information should be obtained:

1. First name, middle initial, last name and address of each voter who is part of your 20-family group.

2. Party affiliation. If the elector votes at the primary this information is available at the local board of elections, at the court house, or at county headquarters. Never antagonize a voter by pressing the point. Respect his convictions. Tact and diplomacy are important.

3. Does the voter usually go to the polls at the primary?

4. Have provisions been made for an absentee voter's ballot?

5. Are there young voters or those coming of age? (Valuable information for new registrations.)

6. Are voters newly naturalized or should they be? (Your help in getting them naturalized may interest them in voting).

7. Does the voter require transportation on election day?

8. Are there small children to watch while their parents vote?

C. Card index: When the poll is completed, the data assembled should be transferred to a card index, arranged alphabetically by streets and also alphabetically by voters' names. Lists should then be compiled of the following:

1. All voters likely to vote for your party.

2. All prospective party voters not registered.

3. All those who will cast an absentee ballot.

4. All voters to be transported to the polls.

(Give a copy of this list to your precinct captain.)

D. Vital voting information: Each precinct organizer should be equipped with the following vital information:

1. Location of the voting booth for the precinct.

2. A map of the precinct showing boundary lines.

3. The registration requirements.

4. Must persons changing their names reregister?

5. When may persons register? (Check board of elections.)

6. Date of primary election; general election; special election.

7. What is the procedure for an absentee ballot?

8. Who are the city, town, county, and State party officeholders? Term of office?

9. Who are the party candidates for office for whom the electors in your precinct will vote at the next election? What offices are to be filled? What are qualifications of the candidates?

NOTE.—If any questions regarding registration, election laws, or party stands arise which you cannot answer, consult your precinct captain or your town chairman.

III. Duties of the precinct organizer

1. The primary duty of the organizer is to call on the voters in his precinct. He should be honest and just in all dealings.

2. One call is not sufficient to build friendship or develop party interest and support. A precinct call should be a pleasant habit—not too frequent, but often enough to reflect an interest in the voter. Leave before you have worn out your welcome—and with a thought-provoking message.

3. The alert precinct organizer will notice voters with qualities of leadership who will make good campaign assistants.

4. A constant lookout should be kept for conscientious persons qualified for election booth duty.

5. Copies of a carefully kept poll and the information regarding qualified persons for both precinct work and election booth duties will be most valuable to the precinct captain.

6. Be a good listener. Let the other fellow talk. A digest of the reaction of voters to major issues would be very helpful to your Congressman or congressional candidate.

7. Do not argue. Express your opinion honestly and convincingly.

IV. Organizing the precinct for the campaign

Before calling an organization meeting consult your precinct captain. Discuss fully the plans for the campaign. Coordinate your ideas with his. Cooperation is the keynote to success.

A. The Mechanical Needs

1. Calling cards for your assistants (similar to yours).

2. A large map of the precinct.

3. List of registered or prospective voters, marked with party affiliation or as "independent" or "doubtful." This list can be prepared from your poll of the precincts.

4. Election statistics for the precinct for the last three elections, showing the vote for major candidates.

5. List of party nominees (chosen at primary or nominating convention).

B. Auxiliary Workers

Depending on the size of the precinct, the density of the population, the area it covers, secure the following helpers:

1. A precinct assistant for 20 additional families.

2. Volunteers from the ranks of your party's women's clubs (precinct, ward, city, or county).

3. Your party's young people clubs and teenagers or adult volunteers to distribute campaign literature.

4. Young members of the armed services and veterans.

5. Workers from nonpartisan groups—service and social.

6. Interested independent voters.

7. Men and women of foreign descent for work with newly naturalized and displaced persons.

8. Hospital, rest home, and institutional workers.

C. Booth Officials

Women should be recommended to the chairman of the ward or town committee for the following election-day jobs in the election booths: clerks, judges, checkers, witnesses, challengers.

A training period for the booth officials should be urged.

D. Meeting of Workers

As soon as practicable after the primary or nominating convention, a meeting of all workers should be called.

(If the primary comes late—organize now.)

Urge all precinct party organizers to attend. Include, if possible, the town chairman and the State committee members.

Ask each worker to bring a notebook. Use a blackboard.

1. Divide the precinct into sections which will allow not more than 20 families to each worker.

2. Give each worker a specific district to canvass. Care must be taken in assigning the right person to the right place, and special people to special groups. Post the precinct map. Have each worker make an outline of his district. Supply calling cards. Distribute lists of candidates and such literature that is available.

3. Instruct in taking the poll.

4. Instruct on the card index.

5. Give vital voting information.

6. Hold open discussion of methods of approaching a voter when making a call—all workers participating.

7. Ask workers to gather information on issues in which the voters are specifically interested, and note on poll card.

8. Catalog such information and obtain literature from your State committee to distribute to the workers for use when making return calls.

9. Hold monthly meetings during the year, then every week during the month before election.

10. Use your car to convey aged or infirm voters to the polls on election day.

11. Learn your election laws from your precinct captain. It is essential for you to be familiar with them.

12. Inspire your workers with enthusiasm and the part each one can play in protecting freedom. Emphasize high motivation—love of God and country. Stress friendliness and service.

TO SUMMARIZE

The precinct worker is the basis of political organization. Why? Because he must—

1. Personally contact at least 20 families.

2. Be sure that every member who is eligible to vote is both convinced and properly registered.

3. Know the facts and present them to as many as he can reach.

4. Be sure that on election day every registered voter votes.

5. Provide for those who need transportation or babysitters.

6. Remember that you, by the grace of God, can be an instrument in helping many others to exercise their God-given right to vote.

WHY YOU SHOULD GET BUSY

You, personally and individually, can do much to renew and strengthen the processes of self-government. These few reminders may help:

1. God delegates you: God has entrusted to you a bit of that power that comes from Him alone. As St. Paul said to the Romans (13:1): "There is no power but from God." He has given you a mission to fulfill that He has assigned to no one else. He has delegated you to play at least a small part, by prayer and work, in applying His truth and justice to the governing of mankind. Jesus Christ wants you to do something to bring down to earth the law and order of heaven—in short, to help put into practice, as best you can, the prayer: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

2. They always vote: Those bent on corruption, graft or subversion make it their business to vote at all elections. They go to the polls even when the choice is only between Tweedledee and Tweedledum. They know from experience the value in voting for those who favor their way even slightly.

3. They want you to stay away: Those who use politics for questionable ends do practically nothing toward informing the average citizen on the importance of voting. They know that if good people stay away from the polls, they have a greater chance of keeping control.

4. The penalty of neglect: Failure of one person to vote at any election weakens democracy just that much. Repeat the failure of one individual enough and freedom goes out the window. Edmund Burge said: "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

5. Light candles, don't blow them out: Avoid the danger of oversimplifying the problem of good government by branding everything as "dirty politics." First of all, it is not true. There are many conscientious people working hard to raise the standards of public affairs. Then, too, you may do double harm (a) by playing into the hands of those who would undermine good government, and (b) by discouraging many more participants of integrity and ability to take an interest in public affairs. Few realize the harm they do when they slip into the lazy habit of exaggerating the faults of their own government and minimizing its virtues. "Better to light one candle than to curse the darkness."

6. Everybody can do this: Spread far and wide a healthy appreciation of the God-given power of each voter to exercise his freedom of choice. Point out the mighty howl that would go up all over the country if only 1 out of every 10 or 20 eligible voters were allowed to vote at primary elections. But that, in effect, is the actual result.

7. Keep first things first: In voting or encouraging others to vote, always put the best interests of both people and country before those of any political party.

8. The price you pay: Keep in mind that bad politicians are elected by good people who don't bother to vote.

9. Government is your business: You have a direct and personal duty toward its betterment that you cannot delegate or rightly dodge. Either you run government or government runs you. Government will be just as good or as bad as you make it.

WHAT CAN YOU DO

In the next 12 months many important minor and major elections will take place over the United States of America. Voters can do much to shape the future of each of them. May we recommend that you interest yourself in your local unit. As a Christopher, or Christ-bearer, play a personal missionary role by reapplying the changeless truths of Christ to our changing times.

BEGIN IN YOUR OWN DISTRICT

No matter who or where you are, you are in one of the 145,723 election districts or precincts in the United States of America. Yes, one of them is yours. It belongs to you and you belong to it. It might interest you to know that, theoretically speaking, 22 votes one way or the other in each of these precincts, could have won or lost the election for either of the candidates. Each precinct contains from several hundred to many thousands of voters. Stir up more people with high ideals and talent to take a real interest in this basic unit of government and you will cleanse and strengthen the American political system.

Hundreds of workers are needed in each election unit—on the precinct level—to ring doorbells, to remind prospective voters how and where they may register, to distribute literature, to be good listeners, to give talks, etc. * * * If you are unable to play an active role, encourage at least one other person who is free to do so.

In keeping with Christopher policy, we take no sides on political issues nor do we recommend any candidates. Make your own decisions. Join or support any legitimate political party or effort that you see fit. Take whatever stand you consider best. In short, it is between you and God.

ONE PERSON TAKING A STAND

It refreshes and encourages us to see examples of how one person, by taking a firm stand, can turn the tide. Only 55 individuals took on the task of drafting the Constitution of the United States. They assembled at Philadelphia in May 1787. When a few delegates showed a desire to favor their own sections of the country in preference to the national welfare, George Washington, president of the convention and delegate from Virginia, made a short, forceful speech. In it he took a challenging stand that should make all of us pause and reflect upon his words:

"If to please the people," he said, "we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this 2d session of the 84th Congress, I sent a questionnaire to the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to serve. The response to the questionnaire was most pleasing and in order that they may know the results I list the questions and answers:

First. Do you feel that, on the whole, President Eisenhower's recommendations to the Congress should be supported? Seventy-six percent yes. Eleven percent no. Thirteen percent no opinion.

Second. Do you favor: (a) Continuing foreign military aid? Fifty percent yes. Thirty-six percent no. Fourteen percent no opinion.

(b) Continuing foreign economic aid? Fifty percent yes. Thirty-seven percent no. Thirteen percent no opinion.

Third. Do you approve additional Federal expenditures to develop and apply atomic and hydrogen energy to peaceful purposes? Three percent yes. Eighty-seven percent no. Ten percent no opinion.

Fourth. Do you approve amending the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act? Forty percent yes. Thirty-nine percent no. Twenty-one percent no opinion.

Fifth. Do you favor reduction of taxes before balancing the budget? Twenty-six percent yes. Sixty-six percent no. Eight percent no opinion.

Sixth. Do you approve direct Federal grants to States for education? Forty-eight percent yes. Forty-four percent no. Eight percent no opinion.

Seventh. Do you favor requiring registration of union pension and welfare funds and disclosure of financial transactions involving them? Eighty-eight percent yes. Nine percent no. Three percent no opinion.

Eighth. Do you favor an increase in postal rates to meet the postal deficits? Sixty-six percent yes. Thirty percent no. Four percent no opinion.

Ninth. Do you approve making all women eligible for old-age insurance benefits at 60 years of age instead of 65? Sixty-six percent yes. Thirty-two percent no. Two percent no opinion.

Tenth. Do you favor Federal plans for reinsuring privately run voluntary hospitalization and surgical insurance? Thirty-eight percent yes. Fifty-three percent no. Nine percent no opinion.

Eleventh. Do you favor continuation of the Federal low-rent public housing program? Fifty-one percent yes. Forty-seven percent no. Two percent no opinion.

Twelfth. Should the United States sell surplus farm commodities to Iron Curtain countries? Thirty-six percent yes. Fifty-nine percent no. Five percent no opinion.

Thirteenth. Do you favor free Federal medical treatment of veterans for non-service-connected disability? Twenty-six percent yes. Seventy-one percent no. Three percent no opinion.

On the 14th question, "If the 1956 presidential election were to be held today, whom do you favor?" 65 percent favored President Eisenhower, 12½ percent favored Mr. Stevenson, with the remaining 22½ percent distributed among 30 other candidates, no one of whom polled more than a partial percent. Thirty-six percent favored continuing Vice President NIXON in his present role, with 8 percent for Senator KEFAUVER for Vice President. The remaining percentage was given to 60 suggestions ranging from purely local names to national figures.

A study of the answers reveals a growing interest in good government. I am deeply appreciative that so large a number replied, and that so many took time to write additional comments.

The answers and comments were of great value to me in considering legislation upon which I had to vote. I intend to continue this procedure, if reelected, in order to know the views of the people whom I represent.

Despite television, radio, and all the advances that have been made in the field of communications in recent years, there is no substitute for personal visits by which a Member of Congress may learn the views of the people of his district and render to them the best possible service. As I have done on Saturdays this year and in previous years, I shall continue to travel throughout the district in my trailer office, meeting my constituents. It has been a pleasure to discuss with them legislation in which they were interested, national defense, veteran and social-security benefits, Academy appointments, immigration procedures, and business and personal problems.

The achievements of the present Republican administration under the leadership of President Eisenhower can be expressed in words understood by all—peace, prosperity, and progress.

PEACE

At the time President Eisenhower took over our boys were being killed in Korea. Today we have peace. Notwithstanding the troubled state of the world, arising from numerous and varied questions, creating problems that are new each day and causing deep concern, yet the fact remains we are at peace and our boys are not being called upon to die on foreign battlefields.

PROSPERITY

Today, as a people, we enjoy a degree of prosperity that exceeds that of the people of any other country in all the world. Our employment exceeds the fabulous figure of 65 million workers. Our national production in value reaches toward $400 billion. All of this has enabled us to enjoy a standard of living that exceeds any other period in our Nation's history.

PROGRESS

Innovations in the social-security program which would give additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers of this Nation.

The 2 major changes in the Social Security Act would, first, allow physically or mentally disabled workers to obtain cash benefits at age 50; and, second, reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The disability plan will take effect on January 1, 1957, and make about 250,000 more persons eligible for benefits.

The lowering of the age limit for women workers will provide benefits for about 325,000 workingwomen and 275,000 wives of workingmen. The bill also will provide benefits to about 175,000 widows at age 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

In an effort to improve the various veterans' programs of this grateful Nation, the Congress this year appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans' benefits. This Nation has the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents.

Raised the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour; approved a 4-year program to stimulate airport construction; extended the life of the Small Business Administration and increased the revolving fund for loans to small business; strengthened our antimonopoly law and passed a law to curb the influence of large bank-holding companies.

Enacted improved housing laws, providing special aid in this respect to our elderly citizens; approved dynamic, far-sighted programs for medical and dental research, for the training of public health personnel, and for hospital construction; and passed several laws which are specifically designed to benefit our youth.

Railroad retirement: Railroad retirement pensions were increased by 10 percent.

Civil service retirement: The Civil Service Retirement Act was liberalized and improved, thus benefiting the millions of postal and Federal employees.

On the international scene, we have authorized and appropriated $3.8 billion to continue and implement our mutual security agreements. The Congress has taken note of the increasing dissatisfaction of the people at home with the use of so much of our funds abroad. We have exercised our right over the purse strings of the Nation and decreased, so far as was commensurate with our security abroad, the funds authorized for this purpose. At the same time, we voted a ban on practically all future military aid to Yugoslavia. Our administration has taken note of this feeling also, as was evidenced by the re-

cent withdrawal by the State Department of its offer of financial aid to Egypt for construction of the Aswan High Dam.

For our national defense, we have appropriated over $34½ billion for the armed services for the fiscal year. We have increased by $72 million the 1956 fiscal year authority for appropriations for construction of aircraft control and warning system; we have authorized a $1.4 billion program of naval construction and conversion for 1957, including a nuclear powered cruiser and a 60,000-ton aircraft carrier.

At this point, and with pleasure, I point out that construction of the new aircraft carrier, the *CVA 64* has been assigned to our own New York Naval Shipyard—the "Know-How Yard." Delegations representing the top skilled workers from the yard came to Washington, and with them I presented to the Secretary of the Navy the compelling reasons why our yard should build the new carrier. I was proud to be the spokesman for these fine men and am humbly grateful for the many expressions of appreciation I have received from the locals represented. This new construction means continued employment for over 16,000 men—6,000 more than before the Korean war.

In addition to my work in studying and voting on legislation which has been brought to the floor, I personally have sponsored measures which I thought were deserving of House consideration. One among these was a bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent the payment of any pensions thereunder to individuals who have been convicted of espionage, sabotage, or subversive activities. I do not believe such persons should receive benefits from the very Government they seek to destroy.

Spurred by the inability of the FBI to act immediately in kidnaping cases, I introduced a bill designed to permit this fine agency to take immediate action.

One of the most important measures I introduced was designed to establish a commission to study the shortage of doctors of medicine in the United States. The New York Times, in commenting on the situation which so sorely needs study, said:

> Even with scheduled expansion American medical colleges cannot meet the demand for doctors needed or for admission of above-average students who want to study; 2,000 American students are studying medicine abroad and this source of training will become increasingly important.

The bill has met with enthusiastic response.

In the preceding paragraphs I have tried to show you, the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, how I have personally tried to serve you. You are the people who elected me to represent you in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to you in my congressional capacity, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff, and my services and and theirs are yours. I want you to know that even when the Congress is not in session, I am on the job.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, entitled "The Amazing Kilgore," by Albert H. Jenkins, written for the news service for railway labor magazines in August 1946 and widely published in that year.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMAZING KILGORE

(By Albert H. Jenkins, August 1946 news service for railway labor magazines)

A boy was born in the oil fields of West Virginia, son of a pioneer oil and gas driller. That boy grew up to be the amazing Harley M. Kilgore, whose encyclopedic knowledge, uncanny foresight, and driving energy have made him one of the most useful and conspicuous members of the United States Senate.

Kilgore is up for reelection this year, and the workers and common people of West Virginia should do their best to see that their great friend gets another 6 years to fight their battles in Washington. It is extremely unlikely that they could find another Senator who could half fill Kilgore's shoes.

How did Kilgore become that rare combination—a student who is also a fighter? How did he acquire his deep and sympathetic understanding of the people's needs? What made him the kind of man who could so quickly win the respect of the hard-boiled Senate—who could get action on the far-reaching and trail-blazing measures he proposed?

Why is it that Kilgore—instead of frequenting the cocktail bars of Washington and rubbing elbows with the rich and selfish—lives quietly in a modest suburb, and works 18 hours a day, 7 days a week, as his good wife complains?

Some answers to those questions can be found in his past life, and in the things he works for.

He was born at Brown, W. Va. When he was a baby, his family moved to Manningtón. There, he graduated from high school and went on to win a law degree at the University of West Virginia.

During vacations, he worked in the oil and gas fields with his father, laid firm foundations for his knowledge of and interest in human beings and technical problems.

Both the oil-field workers and his fellow students at the university instinctively liked friendly Kilgore and recognized his ability. He was elected manager of athletic teams, and played with bands, and was otherwise a leader in college.

Significantly, Kilgore did something that probably has never been done at any other university before or since.

The university students and the workers in the glass and tinplate factories at Morgantown were living their separate lives, more than a little suspicious of each other. To encourage mutual understanding and friendship, Kilgore organized soccer football games between teams of the workers and students.

At the early age of 21, he ran for circuit clerk of Monongalia County, lost out in a close race, but acquired a taste for politics.

After graduating from the university, he became a high-school teacher and principal, and went into the private practice of law. He served in the First World War, coming out as a captain.

As an officer in the West Virginia Guard, and as a student of military history and supply problems, Kilgore continued to pile up a fund of knowledge which enabled him, in the Senate, to make unique contributions to the winning of the Second World War.

Some of the most revealing sidelights are thrown on Kilgore's mind and heart by his 8 years as an elected judge of the Raleigh County Criminal Court. He won a reputation, particularly among the coal miners of the surrounding area, as a judge who tempered justice with wisdom and mercy.

Meting out punishment was to Kilgore less important than rehabilitating the man, woman, or child who had violated the law. He was for leniency when that seemed the best way to restore the violator to the path of virtue and usefulness to society.

Many of those who were brought before Kilgore were young people, as he handled juvenile cases. In these, his methods were unorthodox, phenomenally successful, and made him known all over the State.

He was one of the leaders in establishing the famous Boys State in West Virginia, promoted industrial trade schools for boys, and proved that juvenile delinquency can be almost wiped out if it is tackled with wisdom and goodwill.

Thus Kilgore had a broad background of experience when he went on to still wider fields in Washington, after being elected Senator in 1940.

Since then, in less than 6 years, he has piled up more first-rate achievements than most Senators could boast of if they stayed in office a lifetime.

Always looking ahead, Kilgore proposed and worked out proposals for defense preparations, for more effective prosecution of the war, for profiting in the future from lessons learned in the war, for reconversion to peace, for scientific research, for housing, full employment, the welfare of the workers and common people.

Often his recommendations were promptly adopted by Congress and the President. Whenever the Senate and House were slow to act on his measures, they lived to regret it, because time proved Kilgore had been right.

An unusual honor and opportunity was given to Kilgore when he was a new "freshman" Senator. He was appointed to the Senate Committee Investigating the Defense Program, then called the Truman committee, because its chairman was the man who is now President.

The committee saved the American people countless millions of dollars by exposing waste, inefficiency and graft in the vast defense construction and armament program which, belatedly, was getting under way before this country was in the war.

Kilgore played a large part in the committee's work, but he saw that something more was needed.

The committee was doing a useful and necessary job by exposing faults and misdeeds after they had happened, but it could not do enough to prevent their happening again. It could criticize government defense agencies and private corporations for what they had or had not done, but it could not help them plan to do better in the future.

As a first step toward remedying this lack, Kilgore introduced a bill to set up an office of Technical and Scientific Mobilization. Congress was slow to act on that bill, but it had two important results.

One was the creation of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, which brought government and private agencies together in scientific studies which revolutionized our weapons and greatly helped to

win the war. This office was patterned after Kilgore's ideas.

The other far-reaching result was the appointment of Kilgore as chairman of the Senate Committee on War Mobilization, which became known as the "Kilgore committee." It was formed as a result of a resolution which he introduced.

This committee held hearings which proved the need for the kind of overall war planning and management agency which Kilgore had in mind, and he introduced a bill to set up such an agency—the Office of War Mobilization.

That office, Kilgore proposed, would set up boards composed of representatives of labor, management and government, to make studies of war production problems, and to take steps to correct mistakes before they were made.

Before Congress could act on this bill, President Roosevelt adopted its main proposals, and by "executive order" set up the Office of War Mobilization.

That office greatly helped to win the war and to make the reputations of two men who went on to other key jobs in the Government.

One is James F. Byrnes, who was the first director of the "Office," left it to become Roosevelt's "assistant President," and now is Secretary of State.

The second director of the "Office" was Fred M. Vinson, who left to become the Government's chief "trouble shooter," then Secretary of the Treasury, and now has been appointed by Truman as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

Well-informed and impartial observers consider the creation of the Office of War Mobilization and achievement which, even alone, would give Kilgore a high place in the history of the Second World War.

While investigating war mobilization problems, Kilgore's committee found that this country was greatly weakened, both before and during the war, by monopolies and "international cartels."

The latter are like the "Oil Trust," "Steel Trust," and the many other monopoly and price-fixing combines against which the American people have been fighting for more than 50 years, but the cartels are combines of big corporations and trusts in several countries.

Particularly harmful, Kilgore found, were the cartel "agreements" between the Standard Oil Company, Aluminum Company of America, and other huge American corporations, with the I. G. Farbenindustrie and other German industrial giants which were closely tied up with the Nazi government.

These agreements limited production of synthetic rubber, magnesium, and other "key" war products in the United States, while they were produced in vast quantities in Germany.

Kilgore's exposure of these cartels blasted away many barriers and untied Uncle Sam's hands for "all-out" war production.

Kilgore's next step was a good example of his rare faculty for looking deep into both the past and future.

His committee had discovered and disclosed how Germany rearmed after the First World War, with the secret help of the Government at home, and a still more secret network of cartels, spies, business and financial agents and dummy companies abroad, even in the United States.

"Can and will Germany use the same methods to rearm again and start a third world war?" Kilgore asked. He found the answer was "Yes," unless the world learns from experience and takes steps to ward off the danger.

So the Kilgore committee published sensational reports, showing how Germany rearmed last time, and explained why and how it could be done again.

These reports greatly influenced the postwar decisions at the Big Three conference at Potsdam, the industrial disarmament methods of our military government in Germany, and the prosecution of Germany war criminals by Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson.

Meanwhile, Kilgore found time to follow up an idea which is dear to his heart—encouragement of scientic research. He had seen that idea adopted "for the duration of the war," but he was looking ahead to peace.

He introduced a bill to creat a national research foundation, through which Uncle Sam would encourage and subsidize scientific discoveries and inventions, not only for war but also for human welfare. He put into the bill a provision that the Government would own the patents on the discoveries the people paid for, so that monopolies could not seize the benefits.

Naturally, the monopolists have bitterly fought that bill, and it is not yet through Congress.

Kilgore's committee still has a lot to do, both in pushing this science bill and in further disclosing secret tie-ups between German and American big business. The latter's spokesmen in Congress are trying to kill the committee by denying it further funds. Kilgore is needed in the Senate to finish this job.

Books could be written about these subjects and Kilgore's other fights for labor, for housing, full employment, for veterans and all the common people, but no more space is available here.

He has battled for a better America, a land of real opportunity, without fear or hunger, secure from enemies within or without, a land where free men can live and work in a society governed for the many instead of the selfish few.

Kilgore's heart is in these fights and he will continue them as long as the plain people keep him in public office.

Douglas McKay, a Fabulous Soldier in Two Wars and an Excellent Secretary of the Interior

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include some comments concerning Douglas McKay, I am including some information concerning the fabulous war record of this great man.

In World War I he was a first lieutenant in the famous 91st Division whose slogan was "Powder River let her buck." He served in the Meuse-Argonne offensive as a combat officer. In that same division were several interesting men in public life today. One of them is Harold Burton, now a member of the Supreme Court as an Associate Justice, and the other one is Earl Warren, recently appointed Chief Justice of that Court. On the opening day of the great drive—September 26, 1918—the 91st Division had a very tough assignment. The resistance was terrific. The Germans knew that they had to muster all of their strength or be defeated. I may perhaps modestly say that I knew a good deal about that drive because on September 26 I was assigned the mission to fly over the area in which the 91st Division operated, and ascertain what progress its attack was making and I was assigned the mission to attack enemy troops and machinegun nests who might be slowing up the advance of our troops. I had seen thousands of the 91st Division troops as they moved north on the highway bordering on our airfield. I successfully carried out my mission by attacking and liquidating four German machinegun nests that were holding up the advance of our troops. Unfortunately Doug McKay was wounded by shrapnel from an 88-millimeter shell and the wound was so terrible that he did not fully recover until 12 years after the day that he was struck. The curious thing is that when the Japs made their sneak attack on Hawaii in 1941, Doug McKay was with the Willamette University football team in Hawaii. Instead of helping the team win its game, Doug McKay assisted in the organization of the defense of Hawaii.

When the Second World War was declared, he enlisted in the 44th Division under Gen. John Dahlquist, who later became the chief of the ground forces of the United States Army. General Dahlquist was very proud of the fact that this ex-wounded soldier was willing to offer his services in a division which was preparing for overseas duty.

Naturally, a soldier such as Doug McKay, when he was discharged, joined the American Legion as well as the Disabled War Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Because of his wounds he was awarded the Purple Heart medal which was a medal originated by Washington, our first Commander in Chief. He is also authorized to wear the World War I Victory Medal with battle clasps for Meuse-Argonne and Defensive Sector, American Campaign Medal and World War II Victory Medal.

Like many of the men in public life, Doug McKay was a self-made man. He was educated in the Oregon public schools, and later attended Oregon State College, and graduated in agriculture. He was a leader as is evidenced by his being elected president of the student body and later as president of the Alumni Association of OSC.

He worked his way upward until finally he became a successful businessman and he organized the Chevrolet Co. of Salem, which was one of the outstanding dealerships on the Pacific Coast. His leadership in his chosen field of business is evidenced by the fact that he was the State president of the Automobile Dealers Association.

When Doug McKay was selected as Secretary of the Interior, he carried on that office and administered its affairs in his usual capable manner. It is fantastic and sickening to read the perturbation, for political purposes, to which he was subjected, while in that office, by some Members of Congress. His administration was labeled a give-away program when it had no earmarks of any such situation. He got along well with the people in the Department, who were

career men, like the National Park Director and others. He jealously guarded the resources under the control of the Department of the Interior and faithfully carried out the trust which was imposed on him when he took the oath as Secretary of Interior.

Report to the People of the 21st Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I feel it is my duty to the electorate of the 21st Congressional District, New York, which I have the honor to represent, to make part of the official RECORD some of my more important activities in the 84th Congress.

On more important issues, I voted in favor of increased minimum wage; Federal aid for housing; Federal aid for road construction; increased payments for retired Government workers; wage increases for postal and other Government workers; mutual security; expanded social security to permit, among other things, women to retire at 62, and the disabled at 50; Federal aid for local antipollution facilities; broadened health research plans; increased Federal aid to farmers, including the soil bank; Federal for education, including the Powell amendment; the civil rights bill; the appropriation of money for small-business loans; strengthening of the Anti-Monopoly Act against big business; payments for disaster loans on people's homes; continued and increased defense appropriations; continued increased and expanded veterans' benefits; Federal assistance in flood control; the continuation and expansion of the school-milk program, and the resolution opposing the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

Important measures which I voted against were the Natural Gas Act and the attempt to increase postal rates.

Legislation was introduced by me to repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code—billion-dollar giveaway—to combat juvenile delinquency, to increase the minimum wage to $1.25, to amend and revise the Immigration Act, to provide increased safety regulations for railroad workers and passengers, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, to provide increased benefits in the Civil Service Retirement Act, to provide increased annuities for former FBI and other Government enforcement officials, to expand the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide increased coverage for retail employees, to amend the War Risk Insurance Act, to provide relief for victims of disasters resulting from floods, to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas, to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department of civil defense, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide a tax credit for payments made on account of education in public or private institutions, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act to require financial responsibility for damages to persons injured from the operation of any aircraft, to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes for all disabled individuals for their expenses for transportation to and from work, and to provide an additional exemption for any taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself. I have also introduced over 40 private bills providing relief under the present harsh immigration laws for residents of my district.

In my 1955 report, mention was made of my successful effort to save the Government several billion dollars by detection of a loophole in the internal-revenue laws. These efforts received nationwide approval by newspapers and distinguished Americans, in the following exact excerpts and quotations:

The Washington Evening Star, March 1, 1955:

BIG BUSINESS TAX WINDFALL CHARGES RATTLE REPUBLICANS

Charges that businesses have been given a five billion windfall through a widening loophole in the 1954 Tax Revenue Act were before the Congress today.

The windfall case was laid before Congress by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Labor, New York, in his maiden speech to the House.

Mr. ZELENKO first made the charge when speaking during the last week's debate for the proposed $20 deduction from individual's tax bills.

The charges apparently caught the Republican leadership unaware. GOP spokesmen have not yet refuted Mr. ZELENKO's declaration that the revenue loophole, in effect, provided corporations multi-billion-dollar tax forgiveness.

Labor, March 5, 1955:

HUGE NEW TAX LOOPHOLE—FRESHMAN SOLON CITES GIMMICK WHICH MAY COST UNCLE SAM BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

Another huge windfall loophole in last year's rich man's tax bill was pointed out this week by Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York. In his first speech as a freshman Member of the House, he caused a sensation by making serious charges which made Republican leaders and top administration officials run for cover.

The Milwaukee Journal, March 16, 1955:

A horrible blooper in last year's mammoth revision of the Federal tax cut has been turned up by the freshman Congressman from President Eisenhower's home district, HERBERT ZELENKO, of New York, Democrat-Labor. The size of it can be guessed as high as $5 billion of revenue loss this year, if the provisions are not retroactively repealed at once.

The Providence Journal, March 20, 1955:

A freshman Member, Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York, a Manhattan tax lawyer, surprised his leaders by popping up with a charge that under the 1954 tax law, sponsored by Humphrey's Department, business was being allowed to take a double deduction for expenses. That would cost the Treasury not $2⅓ billion but $5 billion.

On March 24, 1955, the loophole section of the law was repealed. The remarks of the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable JERE COOPER, taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date, were as follows:

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state that our distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. ZELENKO, was the first member to introduce the bill dealing with the subject now under consideration. He introduced a bill to repeal section 462 of the Internal Revenue Code. He has done a great deal of work on this subject and deserves a great deal of credit for the splendid contributions he has made. He spoke on this subject during a consideration of the tax bill in the House. I want to give him full credit for the splendid contribution he has made and to acknowledge the debt of gratitude to him for the assistance he has given in meeting and dealing with this problem.

Further comment on this subject appeared in Labor, April 2, 1955:

The House unanimously, and the Senate, are expected to pass soon a bill repealing tax Secretary George M. Humphrey's blooper, that is, the rich man's tax bill provision which would enable corporations to count 2 years' expenses in 1, thus reducing their tax by at least $1 billion. The blooper was first exposed by Congressman ZELENKO (Democrat, New York).

On June 16, 1955, the New York Daily Mirror reported as follows:

President Eisenhower signed a bill Wednesday, closing a loophole in the tax law under which business firms might have saved an estimated $1 billion in taxes.

On May 6, 1955, the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, United States Senator from Illinois, in writing to Mr. Sidney Barnett, a prominent citizen of the district, stated as follows:

DEAR MR. BARNETT: Congressman ZELENKO has done a marvelous job in exposing the tremendous abuses in section 462 of last year's tax bill. Seldom, if ever, has a freshman Congressman hit the bull's eye with such a bang.

With best wishes,

Faithfully yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senator.

The American Forum, a national television discussion program, on May 27, 1956, had for one of its guests the Honorable Paul M. Butler, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, who, in the course of debate, stated as follows:

If you do come up with a balanced budget and you have not yet arrived at that point, $1 billion of that, of any surplus that may arise, should be credited to Congressman ZELENKO, a Democrat, of New York, who found that loophole in the 83d Congress tax bill, as you will remember.

ON OTHER SUBJECTS

The New York Daily News, January 18, 1955:

Representative ZELENKO, Democrat, of New York, has introduced a bill to set up a $50 million appropriation for combating juvenile delinquency.

The New York Post, January 18, 1955:

Freshman Representative ZELENKO, Washington Heights, Democrat-Labor, today reported strong support for his measure pro-

posing a $50 million Federal grant to help States combat juvenile delinquency.

ZELENKO said governors of some States have promised to ask their Congressmen to back the proposal.

The New York World-Telegram, May 12, 1955:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO said yesterday he found a way for Congress to give away 30 millions a year without costing the taxpayer 1 penny. He introduced a bill to provide an across-the-board 10 percent boost in pension benefits to retired Government workers and their survivors. He said the money would come from the growing surplus of the Civil Service Retirement Fund, which now exceeds $6 billion.

The New York Daily News, November 9, 1955:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Labor, New York, proposes that at least 5,000 screened volunteers from the Armed Forces be put through a short training period to help combat narcotic smuggling.

The New York Herald Tribune, November 9, 1955:

A proposal that at least 5,000 members of the Armed Forces be screened on a voluntary basis and assigned, after a short training period, to a Federal agency to help stamp out the flow of illicit narcotics into this country, was made yesterday by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Manhattan Democrat.

The West Side News, December 8, 1955:

Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat-Labor, New York, this week presented to the Congressional Committee on Education and Labor in San Juan, P. R., which investigated increased minimum wages for the island, a letter from Gov. Averell Harriman of New York asking minimum wage increases in Puerto Rico.

Congressman ZELENKO has stated, in releasing the Governor's letter, that thousands of his constituents of Puerto Rican origin have asked him to do his utmost to help raise minimum wage standards in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The New York World Telegram and Sun, March 1, 1956:

A bill giving a better income tax break to parents of college students as well as to teachers who will take advanced courses was presented to Congress today.

Introduced by Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, New York Democrat, it would allow Federal tax income credit of 30 percent, but not exceeding $450 a year, of money paid for tuition charges.

The tax credit idea intended to lighten the financial load borne by students and their families is essentially that proposed by the American Council of Education.

The West Side News, March 29, 1956:

Congressman ZELENKO introduced a bill to amend title 3 of the Social Security Act to provide, where a husband and wife are both entitled to benefits under the act, and one of them dies, the benefit of the survivor shall be equal to the total of the combined benefits to which they were entitled when living.

In introducing the bill he said:

"Many of our elderly married citizens who in the twilight of their lives are subsisting on the bare minimum of social security benefits are entitled to this additional protection from an appreciative government."

The West Side News, May 17, 1956:

AID CRIPPLED ON TAX PAYMENTS

Congressman ZELENKO introduced before Congress a bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes in the case of a disabled individual for expenses of transportation to and from work. He said this legislation was vitally necessary to help the gainfully employed handicapped person to continue to be self-sufficient. The bill also provides for an additional exemption for income-tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself.

The New York World Telegram and Sun, July 19, 1956:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, New York, freshman legislator, who first called Congress' attention to a loophole in the 1954 tax law paving the way for its repeal, in time to save the Government billions of dollars in tax forgiveness to corporations, says that he is now out to save a few more million.

This time he is seeking to prevent adoption of legislation which he claims would cost the Government some twenty to twenty-five million more than is necessary in connection with a tanker-chartering program.

The Washington Daily News, July 20, 1956:

READ ABOUT THIS ONE, TAXPAYER—THE SHIPPING BILL THAT SMELLS LIKE $25 MILLION

It would cost the taxpayer some $20 to $25 million, according to Representative HERBERT ZELENKO, Democrat, New York. Up to now he has been fighting the battle against the tanker bill almost singlehandedly. Representative ZELENKO is a freshman legislator who first called Congress' attention to a loophole in the 1954 tax law, paving the way for this repeal in time to save the Government billions of dollars in tax forgiveness to corporations.

Drew Pearson, writing in his column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 25, 1956, and commenting on my efforts to block the tanker giveaway, said:

It takes alert Congressmen to make the wheels of democracy run efficiently. ZELENKO, New York Democrat * * * was alert, blocked this giveaway from sneaking through on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. Pearson again wrote in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 5, 1956:

One of the best watch-dogs in our recent Congress was HERBERT ZELENKO, former champion wrestler at Columbia University and Congressman from Ike's former voting district in Manhattan. * * * He blocked two bills which would have cost the taxpayers money. One was to give a ship to friends of Dictator Trujillo of the Dominican Republic, and another to permit the sale of ships to Uncle Sam at an inflated value by McLean Industries.

Cognizant of the cosmopolitan nature of my district, I have supported those measures and ideals which are closest to the hearts of my constituents. Some written verbatim comments with respect to these activities I believe will be of interest to my constituents:

Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division 3, New York County:

APRIL 2, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT ZELENKO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The officers and members wish to express to you their appreciation for the fine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your remarks on "The Great Contribution of the Irish people to America" * * *.

With every good wish for your success and my own kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JAMES M. GRUNDY.

On the same subject, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 17, 1955, had the following to say:

Representative HERBERT ZELENKO of New York, in a speech before the House of Representatives, spoke on Irish Builders of America * * * Among other things, Congressman ZELENKO said: "Irish blood, brain and brawn have played a valiant part in the fabric of America. People of Irish descent may take a pardonable pride in the Irish contribution to the development and preservation of the American Government."

Royal Greek Embassy, Washington, D. C.:

APRIL 19, 1955.

The Honorable HERBERT ZELENKO,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I would like you to know how much I appreciate your appropriate remarks in the House of Representatives on the 24th ult. on the occasion of the 134th anniversary of the independence of Greece.

With my reiterated thanks for this public expression of your philhellenic sentiments which are fully appreciated, not only by the Greek people and the Greek government; but also, I am sure, by the Americans of Greek ancestry, I remain

Very sincerely,

GEORGE V. MELAS,
Ambassador of Greece.

Jewish Community News, June 1956:

CONGRESSMAN ZELENKO RECEIVES SCROLL FROM 10TH ZOA DISTRICT

At the 35th annual meeting of district 10, Zionist Organization of America, held on Monday evening, June 25, Congressman HERBERT ZELENKO was presented with a scroll citing his leadership in the community.

Embassy of Israel, Washington, D. C.:

MAY 16, 1955.

DEAR MR. ZELENKO: I have noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that on April 27, 1955, you saluted the State of Israel on the floor of the House of Representatives on the occasion of Israel's Independence Day. Please accept the expression of my deep appreciation.

Sincerely,

ABBA EBAN.

In 1954 I received from Manhattanville Post No. 1057 the American Legion citation for merit in recognition of outstanding service and accomplishment.

This, then, is a general outline of my congressional activities. I trust it has met the approval of my constituency and in some way has proved of benefit and value to all in our beloved United States of America.

Hon. Oliver P. Bolton

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the announcement by OLLIE BOLTON that he will not seek reelection and that he plans to

retire at the end of this term removes from the Ohio delegation a very able and conscientious Member of Congress.

It was my privilege to know his distinguished father, Hon. Chester Bolton, who served in Congress for 5 terms more than 20 years ago. OLLIE is a worthy son of a great father and has brought additional fame and luster to an outstanding Ohio Republican family. His mother, Mrs. FRANCES BOLTON, has been a Member of Congress since 1940.

As OLLIE BOLTON returns to his business interest in Ohio, I wish him abounding good health and much happiness.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the prayer offered by the Reverend Edgar C. Reckard, Jr., chaplain, Brown University, Providence, R. I., at the funeral of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore at Beckley, W. Va.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER FOR THE FUNERAL OF SENATOR HARLEY MARTIN KILGORE AT BECKLEY, W. VA., OFFERED BY THE REVEREND EDGAR C. RECKARD, JR., CHAPLAIN, BROWN UNIVERSITY, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

(Adapted from the Book of Common Worship)

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth.

Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, will not we fear.

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, who lovest us with an everlasting love, and canst turn the shadow of death into the morning: Help us now to wait upon Thee with reverent and believing hearts. In the silence of this hour speak to us of eternal things, that through patience and comfort of our faith we may have hope and be lifted above our darkness and distress into the light and peace of Thy presence.

It is from Thee, O God, we come; unto Thee we return; and in Thee we live and move and have our being. We praise Thee for Thy good gift of life, for its wonder and mystery, its friendships and fellowships. We thank Thee for the ties that bind us one to another. We bless Thee for Thy loving and patient dealings with us, whereby Thou dost ever teach us Thy way; for the meaning that lies hidden in the heart of sorrow, disappointment, and grief; and for Thy guilding hand along the way of our pilgrimage.

We give thanks unto Thee for this, Thy servant, recalling in him all that made others love him. We bless Thee for the good and gracious influences of his home and training, and for all that ministered to his best life. We thank Thee for the goodness and truth that have passed from his life into the lives of others, and have made the world richer for his presence.

We beseech Thee, who art the Father of mercies, to look in Thy tender love and compassion on his sorrowing family and friends. Enable us to find in Thee our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. Grant unto us faith and hope in Him who by death hath conquered death and by rising again hath opened the gates of everlasting life, Jesus Christ our Lord.

We bless Thy name for the revelation of Thyself and of Thy love in our Lord Jesus Christ, and for the hope set before us in the gospel. We thank Thee that deep in the human heart is an unquenchable trust that life does not end with death; that the Father, who made us, will care for us beyond the bounds of vision, even as He has cared for us in this earthly world. We praise Thy name that our hope has been so wondrously confirmed in the life and words and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Grant us, we beseech Thee, the comfort of Thy presence and the ministry of Thy holy spirit. Renew within us the gifts of faith, patience, and enduring love. Help us to walk amid the things of this world with eyes open to the beauty and glory of the eternal; and grant to us a renewed dedication to those good purposes Thy servant loved, in this community and Nation, that our lives may be an honor to His memory and to Thy graciousness. Give us grace that, among the sundry and manifold changes of this life, our hearts may be surely fixed where true joy and hope is to be found, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Mystery and Misery of the Backache

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR WICKERSHAM
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that the American people, each year are becoming increasingly concerned about the over-all status of our national health. For, as modern technology works its wonders in the field of science and industry, we as a people now are able to concentrate our public time and energy on improvement of our own human welfare.

One of the latest manifestations of this particular national trend has been the study recently undertaken by the Public Affairs Institute of Washington, D. C., a non-profit, objective research organization which published the results of this study in a booklet entitled "The Present Day Doctor of Chiropractic."

The Public Affairs Institute in its definitive study says:

The present-day doctor of chiropractic is equipped both by training and experience to treat successfully many of the ills besetting mankind.

It also points out that the profession of chiropractic has specialized in the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses having their origin in the region of the back.

Considering the institute's new study, it is interesting to note that a recent issue of Life magazine concerns itself with a corollary subject entitled "Mystery and Misery of the Backache."

The national need for further information on this subject is apparent in Life's statement that—

Something like 250,000 workmen a year hurt their backs while on the job and have to be sent home • • • most of them incapacitated longer than workers who have suffered such far more spectacular damage as broken legs or arms.

All Americans should realize, too, that the agonizing discomfort and pain of a backache is not, by any means, necessarily confined to those persons doing hard physical labor. The stresses and strains of modern living force every citizen to give consideration to what is now realized as one of our national health problems.

This situation is pointed up by the eminent psychiatrist, Dr. Thomas H. Holmes, of the University of Washington School of Medicine, who testifies from clinical experience that "almost invariably any anxiety, resentment, or hostility in a patient is reflected by muscle tension in the lower back. If the tension lasts long enough, it will produce pain."

LIFE RESEARCH GOES TO WORK

Considering the widespread prevalence of backache throughout all segments of our modern society, it is evident that Life magazine has done us all a real service in putting a team of researchers to work getting the facts which describe a backache, briefly and pointedly, in the following words:

Mankind • • • insists on defying gravity by standing erect. His back muscles have to work 16 hours a day just to hold him up. He bounces up and down on his spine as on a pogo stick, putting a heavy load of weight and shock on the disks. And when he bends over from the waist to pick up a shoe or golf ball, as he is always doing, he exerts an almost intolerable strain on his lower back. The bend comes between the fused vertebrae of the sacrum and the lumbar vertebrae just above them.

This point, called the lumbo-sacral joint, is like the fulcrum of a lever. It and the 1 or 2 joints above it must support the entire weight of the torso and do the hard work of lifting it. When a man straightens up from a bent-over position, the strain on the muscles, vertebrae, ligaments, and disks can amount to more than a quarter of a ton. If something is lifted at the same time, the weight of the object is multiplied by a leverage factor of 15 or more, depending on the length of the torso and the position of the arms. Thus the frailest stenographer who bends over to lift a portable typewriter or the housewife who picks up a sack of flour from the pantry floor subjects her lower back to tensions of as much as half a ton or more.

While the spine is a most ingenious structure, it is also highly vulnerable under mankind's abuse. Anybody who has ever suffered a sprained ankle knows how much pain can come from a ligament stretched too far—and there are more ligaments in the back than in all the rest of the body put together. Anybody who has suffered a Charley horse knows the pain of a muscle spasm—and the back has layer after complicated layer of muscle. Anybody who has cracked his so-called funny bone knows how pain can radiate along a squeezed nerve—and the spinal cord has big trunk nerves branching off between each pair of vertebra and radiating out to all the extremities of the body. The human back, in short, is abundantly endowed with all sorts of potentially painful parts just waiting to be abused.

Certainly the problem has been very clearly presented by these statements from the Life magazine article.

With regard to the treatment for this widespread ailment, I think it pertinent to point out that the second largest branch of the healing arts—the profession of chiropractic—has specialized in the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses having their origin in the region of the back.

The fact that this profession has grown so rapidly in recent years is, in no small measure, due to the success this profession has had in relieving people's backaches and all the ills that appear to be dependent on bad back conditions.

Indeed, Life's article takes on new and hopeful meaning when brought into context with the modern doctor of chiropractic and his successful efforts in treating backache—now recognized as one of the Nation's far-flung illnesses.

The Public Affairs Institute study gives us the following facts:

Today's doctor of chiropractic is a graduate of a 4-year college that accepts only high-school graduates or those with at least 2 years of general college work beyond the high school. In the 8 colleges accredited by the National Chiropractic Association a minimum of 4,000 hours of classroom lectures, clinical and laboratory work are required for graduation.

Of this, 1,960 hours are devoted to the diagnosis and treatment of illnesses according to chiropractic principles, and this is premised on 740 hours of instruction and laboratory work in anatomy, 240 hours of physiology, 180 hours of biochemistry, 520 hours of pathology and bacteriology and 200 hours of public health and hygiene.

With such a background of scientific training and clinical practice, today's doctor of chiropractic is licensed to practice his particular form of the healing art by boards in the several States of the Nation, all but four States having special laws to cover this body of practioners.

The broadest definition of licensure, that of California reads: "The basic principle of chiropractic is the maintenance of the structural and functional integrity of the nervous system. The practice of chiropractic consists of all necessary means to carry out this basic principle."

TWO MILLION NEW PATIENTS

Public recognition has grown as doctors of chiropractic have become better trained and as the beneficial results of their treatments have become known to more people. Each year now, some 2 million new patients seek the aid of over 25,000 practicing doctors of chiropractic. Over 500 insurance companies now accept chiropractors' certification for claims.

Business and industry, and the great labor unions such as the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen have either contracts with doctors of chiropractic or arrangements for the treatment of their people, or have endorsed chiropractic as beneficial. The big motion picture companies, such as Columbia Pictures, use the services of doctors of chiropractic so that "the show can go on."

Sordoni Enterprises of Pennsylvania, headed by Andrew Sordoni, president of the American Automobile Association, employs five full-time doctors of chiropractic available to its corps of workers, which is typical of many industrial concerns. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans, among other veterans' organizations, have consistently and actively supported chiropractic as an important means of treating illnesses.

Chief among the virtues of the chiropractic treatment is the fact that, as Dr. Philip Lewin, associate professor of bone and joint surgery of Northwestern University's Medical School, so well points out—"Backache is one of the human crossroads where body and mind meet and where minor errors and variations may cause major discomforts and disabilities." On that one truism of medical science alone, the chiropractic treatment could well rest its case. For it is with the treatment of ills which have either their origin in the back area or are benefited by attention to that area that the chiropractic treatment has come to be recognized as most helpful.

This has been pointed out succinctly by Dr. C. W. Weiant, chiropractor and doctor of philosophy, research director of the Chiropractic Research Foundation, in this brief statement: "Today the medical profession is beginning to recognize what the chiropractor has been contending for the past half century: (1) that the spinal column is the source of many physical ills and pains which appear in other parts of the body; and (2) that the human backbone is an intricate mechanism."

With the National Safety Council reporting that 1 out of every 14 people suffers some accidental injury during the year, and over 10 million accidents occur within 12 months, the Council said that back strain accounted for nearly 10 percent of all lost-time injuries. A survey of the State Workmen's Compensation cases in Colorado indicate that under chiropractic care the loss of time from work averaged about 2½ days, or about one-half the time averaged by other methods of treatment.

Now it is particularly interesting to note, in the Life magazine article, that research on cases of backache at the Institute of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at New York University has led to the conclusion that "practically all back trouble is functional."

ACCOMPLISHING GREAT GOOD

Thus we can realize, as the Public Affairs Institute has indicated, that a body of present-day trained doctors of chiropractic, using modern methods of diagnosis and treatment and prescribing proper hygienic care to restore the normal functioning of the back region and its related parts, can accomplish great good for the millions of Americans suffering from our Nation's widespread troublesome illness.

The Life article corroborates this with the statement that—

Because chiropractors specialize in manipulation of the spine, they attract a lot of patients who suffer from backache. They press against some suspect vertebra and often there is a sudden snap and the patient gets up feeling much better.

That statement, of course, is an oversimplification of the methods used by the modern-day doctor of chiropractic who, according to the scientific study of the Public Affairs Institute, "is a force for good in promoting the health of his community."

Lodi Scouts Well Trained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article printed in the Lodi News-Sentinel, a paper published in the city of Lodi, Calif.

This story tells about the fine work that a Scout leader and some Boy Scouts and Cub Scouts did to help a group of persons who were injured in a head-on collision on Highway 40.

I have had the pleasure of introducing and getting passed bills in two instances to carry Scouts to Europe and also to California for international and national jamborees. For many years before I entered Congress, I was interested in Scouting in the Calaveras-San Joaquin district and learned of the fine training which the Scout movement gives to boys.

I include the article which was printed in the Lodi paper as I know the national Scout executive will be interested in reading about the rescue work that was accomplished in this case:

[From the Lodi (Calif.) News-Sentinel of July 10, 1956]

LODI SCOUTS, LEADER WIN PRAISE IN CRASH TRAGEDY

Eight Lodians, a Scoutmaster, five Boy Scouts, a Cub Scout, and a 15-year-old girl, turned out to be angels of mercy and heroes in disguise Sunday night, but the story wasn't revealed until an Auburn highway patrolman telephoned Lodi Police Chief Fred Hunt yesterday.

Troop 26 Scoutmaster Larry Marino, Scouts Jerry, 12, and Charles, 11, Schuh, Valiant Kenney, 11, Oscar Hess, 12, and Stanley Spitzer, 12, Cub Scout Michael Weaver, 9, and the girl, Mary Ellen Hunter, were returning from a Lake Tahoe weekend in Marino's car. The group had been the guests of Mary's parents, Mr. and Mrs. William Hunter of Lodi.

At about 7 p. m., 6 miles east of Colfax, Placer County, on Highway 40, they noticed a head-on collision 100 yards behind them. Marino could see that the accident was pretty bad so he turned around and went to the scene.

Once there, Marino dispatched 1 Scout to the east and 1 to the west to halt oncoming vehicles and inform them of the serious mishap. The rest of the Lodi group put the Boy Scouts' first aid kits to work. After placing the injured persons, seven in all, on blankets the Lodians began applying first aid to the best of their ability. By the time the highway patrol arrived the situation was well under control, thanks to the efforts of these people. Marino's group had controlled the traffic well and had lessened the severity of some injuries.

Their story ended sadly, however. A 10-year-old boy, Joe Garcia, who was involved in the crash, died in the hospital later.

Sergeant Haines, California highway patrol, Auburn office, phoned Chief Hunt yesterday to see that the Lodians were given the credit they deserve.

Appendix

America Faces the World Challenge—Will Meet the Oil-Suez Crisis Successfully

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as the 84th Congress concludes its session, we may well look forward to a most challenging period up ahead—challenging in both domestic and foreign affairs.

Events are moving so fast at home and abroad as to almost awe the imagination of man.

I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD there be printed a statement by myself on the subject of America Faces the World Challenge.

I shall make particular reference to one phase of that challenge—the world petroleum problem, as tied up with the Suez crisis and the whole unfortunate problem of possible foreign nationalization of private resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"Will the Middle East countries some day make the tragic mistake of nationalizing oil? Will the Arab lands eventually commit the blunder of taking over foreign petroleum resources—the oilfields, the refineries, the pipelines?"

Those are the big questions in the minds of thinking people throughout the free world. Those questions loom behind the serious controversy over Egyptian nationalization of the Suez Canal.

The free wrold certainly hopes the tragic mistake of nationalization will not occur.

WE HAVE FAITH REASON WILL PREVAIL

Actually, it is our hope that reason and judgment and fair play will instead prevail. We trust that a sense of enlightened self-interest, a sense of playing by the rules of the game, the rules of contracts—will prevail in the Middle East.

We hope tempers will cool. Bitterness should subside. Commonsense should take over, as world diplomacy brings the full power of moral persuasion to bear.

The free world knows—even if all the leaders of the Arab lands may not know—that nationalization of the oil in the ground, of the pipelines which carry it or the refineries which process it—would be a calamity to the Middle East and a tragedy for the free world. Such a ruinous step—if it occured—would work to the disadvantage most of all—of the Arab governments and peoples themselves.

MUCH MISUNDERSTANDING OF NATIONALIZATION PROBLEM

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of misunderstanding of precisely what is involved in this nationalization controversy.

Some few fuzzy-minded people in the West may tend to go along with the nationalization concept. They may do so on the ground, they say, that it is "within the legal right of a country to take over foreign property within its borders, provided fair and prompt compensation is assured."

What such people entirely forget is the net affect—direct and indirect—of nationalization. They forget that the legal issue, while obviously fundamental, is accompanied by other issues—political, economic, military, moral. And the legal problem itself is by no means as simple as the fuzzy-minds assert.

INVESTORS AVOID NATIONALIZING COUNTRY LIKE A PLAGUE

The fuzzy-minds forget that as early as when a nationalization decree is possibly in the offing, an evil chain reaction begins to occur. And the end result is the inevitable tendency for investors forever after to avoid that country like a plague.

There are many reasons for such well-merited avoidance. Let me cite three such reasons:

1. In the first place, the very fact of nationalization indicates a breach of faith, a unilateral and illegal violation of contract.

The very essence of free enterprise is to abide by one's contractual commitments.

By contrast it should be noted, for example, that the Eyptian Government had concluded legal agreement after agreement with the Suez Canal Company, the most recent within the period of the last 2 months. But now, Egypt, by itself, is ripping up its own contract.

How can private investors in the future have faith in the word of the Egyptian Government?

POLITICAL DEMAGOGERY AND FINANCIAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

2. In the second place, the very fact of nationalization usually indicates a country's fiscal irresponsibility.

When a country recklessly nationalizes, it is very often caused by some demagogic politician who wants to fasten his greedy hands on an alluring asset, which doesn't belong to him. He wants to convert it into a source of patronage and plunder.

The same type of politician who will arbitrarily nationalize a company will usually tend to wreck a country's financial position. If he thinks so little of private property that he will confiscate it, he probably has a poor concept of running his own country's treasury and its entire fiscal system.

History indicates that political demagogery is tied hand and glove with financial demagogery.

SO-CALLED COMPENSATION PAYMENTS MAY BE WORTHLESS

What does that mean, in turn? It means that the so-called compensation which a country may glibly promise in return for this confiscated property may not prove to be worth the paper it is written upon.

So-called bonds which are issued as compensation, may prove utterly worthless. The interest promised on them may not be paid at all, or may be paid in a currency which in the end is worthlessly depreciated. Money after all is only as good as the credit standing of the government which issues it and which backs it up.

FOREIGN CAPITAL WILL STAY AT HOME

So, nationalization, or even the threat of it, makes investors stay at home. It should be remembered that the great United States itself remains the foremost single attraction for United States investors' funds. Why should any American investor who can earn 4 or 5 percent or more with almost complete safety here in our own country, risk sending capital abroad, when he may get there only the same return or perhaps slightly more, but will be risking having his entire principal confiscated overseas?

Obviously, if a foreign land expects to attract capital, it must provide some measure of special financial attraction to make up for the risk which an investor may foresee even under the best of conditions.

If the chances are even one in a hundred that foreign capital may be nationalized, that in itself is serious. But if the chances of nationalization increase, then, there is no sensible investor who would think of going into such a land.

UNITED STATES CORPORATION HEADS ARE TRUSTEES

Foreign governments must realize that the executives of the United States corporations are trustees of corporate funds. A chairman of a board and his fellow members of a board of directors are charged with faithfully administering resources of the corporation. They dare not squander those resources. They dare not invest stockholders' or bondholders' capital in propositions of grave risk.

Some foreign governments complain that United States capital will not come in for relatively long-range projects. They say our corporations prefer instead to invest in projects which will pay for themselves relatively quickly.

What the foreign governments don't realize (or only pretend not to realize) is that it is their governments' own threatening policies which are the very cause of any private preference for short term, quick turnover investments.

Moreover, it is not simply the threat of nationalization which discourages United States corporations; it is often local governments' policies of harassment. Such harassment includes the unreasonable imposing of retroactive taxes or duties or the arbitrary, unilateral raising of pipeline fees or the like. Such arbitrary governmental policies can utterly discourage foreign companies. We Americans don't like to be squeezed. We don't like to be pushed around.

FAIRNESS FOR ARAB PEOPLES AND FOR FOREIGN COMPANIES

What I am saying in effect is that it is the total climate of a country—favorable or unfavorable climate—which will determine how much foreign capital will come into it and how much will remain.

Of course, the Arab peoples have pride. The Arab peoples are entitled to their due. Within the vast 3.6 million square miles—of the Middle East—with their 54 million inhabitants—are fortunately vast petroleum riches. And a fair return on their own wealth for the inhabitants is obviously essential.

But so, too, is a fair return for private foreign companies which have poured more than $2 billion of indispensable investment into the area.

Such companies are also entitled to their due. They are also entitled to be treated fairly and squarely.

SENATOR WILEY'S PREVIOUS COMMENTS ON THIS ISSUE

On previous occasions in the Senate, for example, on March 21 and July 25, I have referred to this same general issue of fair treatment. I have pointed out that how a country, like our friend Venezuela, which cooperates with foreign capital, which welcomes capital and treats it fairly, has prospered beyond almost the brightest dreams and hopes of its Government and its people.

I have pointed out by contrast how a foreign government which freezes out capital does itself no good and does the cause of the free world no good. My observations and analyses are based on personal review of this type of problem over a period of many years. I have directed supplementary studies, made at my request by a member of our committee staff.

MY RESPONSIBILITY AS A UNITED STATES SENATOR

I feel that it is incumbent upon me as a United States Senator and as senior Republican on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to follow this problem extremely closely.

After all, the American and other foreign oil companies working in the Middle East are hardly in the easiest position where they themselves can speak their own minds frankly and openly against local demagogic influences which may harass them.

But someone must certainly speak frankly to these Middle East lands. And that is why I feel that the executive branch deserves the fullest support, and why we in the legislative branch must likewise speak our piece firmly, but in a friendly way, as I am doing now.

MY BASIC PURPOSE TODAY: PROTECT UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY

I am speaking for the principle of morality.

I am speaking for the principle that any American, working or investing abroad, is entitled to reasonable protection from his own Government.

But I am speaking as well for a crucial strategic interest of my country. For it is mid-East oil which fuels Western Europe's economy, which helps maintain Western Europe financially solvent, and which helps power NATO's defensive mechanism.

Moreover, we must never forget that an expanded foothold in the Middle East is what the Soviet Union covets for her own revolutionary purposes—a foothold which must certainly be prevented by the West.

OUR VAST OIL RESOURCES COMPARED WITH RUSSIA'S

A comparison between free world and Soviet world resources is of interest. For the total free world, the authoritative Oil and Gas Journal estimates for 1955: proven reserves of 177,984,314,000 barrels, 569,661 total wells in production, 13,690,000 barrels average daily production, 574 operating refineries with capacity for crude distillation of 15,887,000 barrels daily.

By contrast, the comparative figures for Red Russia and controlled areas are: 10,833,300,000 barrels reserve, an undetemined number of wells, 1,450,000 barrels average daily production, 50 operating refineries with capacity of 1,481,000 barrels daily.

NATIONALIZATION OFTEN ACCOMPANIED BY SOCIALIST POISON

I have referred so far to two reason why investors will avoid like a plague certain lands which toy with nationalization.

3. A third basic reason to bear in mind is that a trend toward nationalization is very often accompanied by socialistic concepts.

The same demagog who may breathe fire and brimstone against foreign capital, may also falsely denounce the whole capitalist system as allegedly constituting "exploitation of the sweat on labor's brow."

Few criticisms are more unjustified.

It is capitalism—America's private enterprise system—which has enriched the average man in this country to a greater degree than the common man has experienced anywhere else in the world.

The common man is king in America. Ours is a country of "people's capitalism."

And it is "people's capitalism which we believe in abroad, as well.

THE ROAD TO EGYPTIAN PROSPERITY NOT PAVED WITH RED TANKS

No people want to see the living standof the Middle East uplifted more than we.

Few peoples will get greater satisfaction than we will from seeing the life span of the average Egyptian extended, disease in Egypt eradicated, sanitation systems built, schools, houses, and the like.

But we know that the road to a higher standard in Egypt cannot be built by Czech or Soviet tanks. On the contrary, every bale of Egyptian cotton which is mortgaged to the Reds for Soviet arms is one bale of cotton which is not being used to uplift the standards of Egypt's own people.

The Soviet technicians pouring into Egypt are the ruthless disciples of the atheist Karl Marx; they have no sympathy for the prophet Mohammed, nor for Islam and its faithful.

ARAMCO AND OTHER COMPANIES' FINE RECORD

I say that, contrary to misrepresentations, the record of American companies operating abroad in dealing with foreign governments and peoples makes for one of the finest of all chapters.

Far from constituting exploitation, the record shows that enlightened American companies have brought higher wages, better living conditions, modern schools, hospitals, and every conceivable modern service to foreign areas.

For example, I understand that the pay scale of the Arabian-American Oil Co. for the average Arab worker is $1,000 a year, whereas the pay for the non-oil-company workers in these lands is $50 per year.

So United States oil companies operating in the Middle East, individually and/or in conjunction with British, French, Dutch, or other foreign capital, have good reason to feel that they have operated more than fairly.

In any event, why should an American investor remove his capital from a country where free enterprise has flowered and is safe and place it in a country where Socialist confiscation thinking is rampant?

EARLY UNITED STATES NATIONALISM UNLIKE PRESENT MID-EAST NATIONALISM

Earlier, I referred to "fuzzy minds" which confuse the real issues.

Such fuzzy minded people think that the nationalism of the Middle East may be compared to the nationalism of America in our early days or as of today.

To be sure, there are some superficial resemblances. To be sure, each people—our own or any other—is entitled to its own sovereignty, its own nationhood—to love of its own flag, its own national anthem, its own national heroes, and culture.

But there, all resemblance ceases between our type of enlightened nationalism and the type of fanatic, blind, and self-defeating nationalism which is unfortunately arising in much of the Middle East and in other parts of the world as well.

UNITED STATES IN 1800'S WELCOMED FOREIGN CAPITAL

We of America welcomed foreign capital. It was foreign capital which built our railroads and many of our other great milestones of progress. Such foreign capital helped to generate local United States capital. We always treated foreign capital fairly. We welcomed, too, the contributions of emigrants to America.

We recognized from the very start that we could not adopt a two-faced policy—being capitalistic toward our own domestic capital, while being socialistic against foreign capital.

We recognized that if the free-enterprise system is to work, it must work uniformly for all groups in our land.

We welcomed friendly relations with all the peoples of the world. We recognized that prejudice against any people abroad would inevitably be harmful in our own land as well.

Fortunately, other lands, like Canada, the United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, West Germany, and Venezuela have displayed similar enlightened attitudes.

The more enlightenment, the better a country serves its own interests.

ARTICLE, NEW HORIZONS IN FOREIGN OIL

In the summer 1956 issue of the magazine the Lamp, published by the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, there was a most interesting article entitled "New Horizons in Foreign Oil." It pointed out how favorable petroleum legislation in various countries provides heightened incentive to foreign capital.

Oil exploration is, of course, an exceedingly costly process. Today, the world's soaring fuel needs require more and more fuel reserves.

From Guatemala, from Haiti, to Zanzibar, Turkey, and beyond, intensive oil drilling is now taking place. But exploration cannot go on, and on the scale which is necessary, unless there is a continuing favorable climate in the foreign lands—a favorable economic, legal, political, and moral climate.

THE $63 BILLION WORLD OIL INDUSTRY

As I have already indicated, the oil industry is one of the free world's greatest resources. A study by the Chase Manhattan Bank estimates that the gross fixed assets of the free world's oil industry total $63 billion. Sixty-four percent of that huge sum is invested in the United States. It is, of course, here in our own land that the petroleum industry has made the greatest of all contributions toward the highest, most modern standard of living for an entire people.

What we have done constructively, other people can begin to do, if they will allow the rule of law and not of demagogs or mobs; the rule of free enterprise and not the rule of socialism, the rule of unbreakable contracts which cannot be changed except by mutual consent, as against the rule of one side tearing up contracts like scraps of paper.

WE HOPE FOREIGN LANDS WILL SEE THE LIGHT

In conclusion it is my earnest hope that those foreign lands which are, unfortunately, playing with dynamite by toying with oil-nationalization ideas, will see the light.

No object lesson is more illustrative of the utter folly of oil nationalization, than the pitiful record of Iran's mismanagement of the resources of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. during the period of nationalization. Iran's bankruptcy—economic and otherwise—during that period should certainly not be forgotten.

It is my hope that present fears of oil nationalization will prove groundless. I trust that moderate leaders in the Middle East—men of real understanding, men of vision and of courage, will put a brake on the extremists, the hotheads, the demagogs, who are trying to whip up supernationalist frenzy.

A WORD OF WARNING TO DEMAGOGS

But let not the demagogs think that the free world can be blackmailed into submission. Let not the demagogs think that the free world will not use its resources to devise alternative methods to cope with demagogery.

Admittedly the free world is heavily dependent upon the Suez Canal. Admittedly it is dependent upon Mid-East petroleum resources. But the free world is not without ample peaceful alternatives to utilize, so as to curb blackmailers and to show them that they cannot get away with extortion.

TANKER PRODUCTION MUST BE EXPANDED

Fortunately, world tanker production is constantly increasing. United States and foreign shipyards will have to lay still more supersized bottoms so as to help meet current and future oil transportation problems. Thus, we will be in a stronger position to cope with efforts to blackmail us over the canal.

These are not simply my own frank views. They are views, I feel, which are shown by men of good will, by leaders of the free world generally. We want peace in the Middle East. We want security and justice. We want neither the Red flag of communism to fly there, nor the black flag of piracy.

REACTIONS TO SENATOR WILEY'S COMMENTS INVITED

I cordially invite now the reactions of readers of my comments to the frank remarks which I have presented above. I appreciate the very fine reactions which I have received in response to previous statements on the general theme of a green light for foreign free enterprise.

Analysis of All House Rollcall Votes During President Eisenhower's Administration, Both 83d and 84th Congresses

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, now that Congress has adjourned it is possible to examine the support which President Eisenhower received from the 83d and 84th Congresses in connection with his legislative program. The 83d Congress was a Republican Congress. The Republicans had a a majority of 50.8 percent. The 84th was a Democrat Congress. The Democrats had a majority of 53.3 percent. In order to appraise the record of the Congress in dealing with President Eisenhower's program, I have had prepared a tabulation of every vote taken during the entire 4-year period covered by the 83d and 84th Congresses.

After eliminating procedural votes and votes on items which were not a part of President Eisenhower's program, there were 123 votes involving his program in the 83d and 129 votes in the 84th Congress—a total of 252 such votes. On the 252 votes, Republicans cast 37,954 of the votes for President Eisenhower's program, or 58.2 percent of the total. The Democrats cast 27,223 such votes, or 41.8 percent of the total. On these 252 issues, the Democrats cast 21,435 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower, or 69.9 percent of all the opposition votes. The Republicans cast 9,227 such votes, or 30.1 percent of all opposition votes. The tabulation which follows shows a breakdown of the rollcalls for the 83d and 84th Congresses:

All Eisenhower rollcalls

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	123	19,985	61.5	12,498	38.5	9,717	71.7	3,833	28.3
84th	129	17,969	55.0	14,725	45.0	11,718	68.5	5,394	31.5
Total	252	37,954	58.2	27,223	41.8	21,435	69.9	9,227	30.1

The above tabulation included many votes which were adopted with full bipartisan support, including some on which there was no recorded opposition.

Mr. Speaker, all votes which were adopted with a majority of both parties supporting President Eisenhower's program have been eliminated to see what the picture looked like when the chips were down. This left 117 votes in the 2 Congresses which were not passed with bipartisan support. On votes falling into this category, Republicans cast 16,344 votes for President Eisenhower, or 74.3 percent of the total. The Democrats cast only 5,664 such votes, or 25.7 percent of the total. On this same group of 117 issues, the Democrats cast 17,306 votes in opposition to President Eisenhower, or 74.4 percent of all opposition votes, and the Republicans cast only 5,944 such votes, or 25.6 percent of the total. A breakdown of votes in this category for the two Congresses follows:

Eisenhower rollcalls on issues without bipartisan House support

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	54	8,296	77.0	2,479	23.0	7,421	75.9	2,352	24.1
84th	63	8,048	71.6	3,185	28.4	9,885	73.3	3,592	26.7
Total	117	16,344	74.3	5,664	25.7	17,306	74.4	5,944	25.6

Mr. Speaker, every vote we have taken during the past 4 years has been examined. This includes 296 rollcalls. They have been grouped into categories for each Congress.

The first group includes issues which were not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties. This group includes House organization and procedural matters.

The second group includes votes on items which were not included in the President's program but where a majority of the Republican Members took a position in opposition to the majority of the Democrat Members. The election of the Speaker would be included in this group.

The third group includes all issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition.

The fourth group includes those issues in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties. Passage of the Mutual Security Act and the Formosa resolution, as well as numerous appropriations measures, fell into this category.

The fifth group includes those comparatively few issues where a majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program. The vote on the Powell amendment to the school construction bill is an example of a vote which would fall into this category. During the 83d and 84th Congresses only 26 out of the 296 rollcalls—just 9 percent of the total—represented issues in this category. This clearly shows that the Republicans in the House have supported President Eisenhower's legislative programs.

The sixth group includes all those issues where a majority of the Republicans voted to support President Eisenhower's program and were opposed by a majority of the Democrats. There were 47 such votes in the 83d Congress and 44 in the 84th. Votes on issues in this group are a true measure of party support and opposition to President Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, included at this point is a summary of the tabulations for votes in category 6 for the 83d and 84th Congresses:

Congress	Number of votes	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
		Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
		Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
83d	47	7,926	80.1	1,965	19.9	6,664	83.2	1,347	16.8
84th	44	6,736	82.2	1,460	17.8	7,596	83.8	1,466	16.2
Total	91	14,662	81.1	3,425	18.9	14,260	83.5	2,813	16.5

It will be noted that more than 80 percent of the votes cast in support of President Eisenhower's program in both the 83d and 84th Congresses on issues in this category were cast by Republicans, and that more than 80 percent of the opposition votes in each case were cast by Democrats.

House roll calls tell only a part of the story. Congressional committees determine the form in which legislation is presented to the Congress and in many cases, under our established rules, we have little opportunity to modify legislation on the floor. During the 84th Congress, the Democrat Party had control of all committees and they determined which issues would receive consideration.

The complete review of the voting patterns over the past 4 years should convince the voters of this country that they must support President Eisenhower by giving him a Republican Congress when we convene next January. As chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, I shall leave no stone unturned in furthering President Eisenhower's program by the election of a Congress which will give his program the sympathetic consideration it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, so that the record may be complete and that every vote may be accounted for, included as a part of my remarks is a complete tabulation covering all votes taken during the 83d and 84th Congresses:

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF HOUSE VOTES, 83D CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the House votes during the 83d Congress. One hundred forty-seven votes were taken. They have been placed into six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 24 votes, or 16 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
- Yeas 1,648
- Nays 38

Democrats:
- Yeas 1,394
- Nays 157

The number of issues included in group 1 is 9, accounting for 6 percent of 147 votes.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Republicans 2,325
- Democrats 584

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Democrats 1,981
- Republicans 493

The number of issues included in group 2 is 15, accounting for 10 percent of 147 votes.

Groups 3 through 6 include votes on issues included in the President's program. They total 123 votes or 84 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

Vote cast:
- Republicans:
  - Yeas 2,123
  - Nays -----
- Democrats:
  - Yeas 1,949
  - Nays -----

The number of issues included in group 3 is 11, accounting for 7 percent of 147 votes.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 9,566
- Percent 54.2

Democrats:
- Votes cast 8,070
- Percent 45.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 2,296
- Percent 60.8

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,481
- Percent 39.2

The number of issues included in group 4 is 58, accounting for 40 percent of 147 votes.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 370
- Percent 41.9

Democrats:
- Votes cast 514
- Percent 58.1

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program—Con.

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 757
- Percent 43.0

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,005
- Percent 57.0

The number of issues included in group 5 is 7, accounting for 5 percent of 147 votes.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
- Votes cast 7,926
- Percent 80.1

Democrats:
- Votes cast 1,965
- Percent 19.9

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
- Votes cast 6,664
- Percent 83.2

Republicans:
- Votes cast 1,347
- Percent 16.8

The number of issues included in group 6 is 47, accounting for 32 percent of 147 votes.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all votes not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 54 issues or 37 percent of all House votes.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	370		514		757		1,005	
6	7,926		1,965		6,664		1,347	
Total	8,296	77.0	2,479	23.0	7,421	75.9	2,352	24.1

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all votes representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 123 of the 147 rollcalls or 84 percent of all House votes. These votes are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 61.5 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 38.5 percent. The Democrats supplied 71.7 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 28.3 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	2,123		1,949					
4	9,566		8,070		2,296		1,481	
5	370		514		757		1,005	
6	7,926		1,965		6,664		1,347	
Total	19,985	61.5	12,498	38.5	9,717	71.7	3,833	28.3

Classification of all House votes, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
A		2	Election of Speaker.
1	3	4	Extend Reorganization Act of 1949 (H. R. 1979)—Passage of bill, Feb. 3, 1953.
2	4	4	Provide for second Under Secretary of State for Administration (S. 243)—Passage of bill, Feb. 3, 1953.
3	5	6	Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Motion to recommit to increase appropriations for Veterans' Administration by $10 million, Feb. 19, 1953.
4	6	4	Second supplemental appropriation bill for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Passage of bill, Feb. 19, 1953.
5	7	1	House Un-American Activities Committee appropriation (H. J. Res. 119)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 24, 1953.
6	8	3	Repeal of military personnel limitation (H. R. 2332)—Passage of bill, Feb. 25, 1953.
7	9	4	Housing loan insurance (H. J. Res. 160)—Motion to recommit to limit interest rate to not more than 6 percent per year on unpaid balance, Feb. 25, 1953.
8	11	6	Hawaiian statehood (H. R. 3575)—Motion to recommit, Mar. 10, 1953.
9	12	6	Hawaiian statehood (H. R. 3575)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1953.
10	17	4	Establishment of new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. J. Res. 223)—Passage of bill, Mar. 18, 1953.
11	18	2	Second supplemental appropriation for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Motion that House recede from disagreement with Senate on conference report, Mar. 19, 1953.
12	19	2	Second supplemental appropriation for 1953 (H. R. 3053)—Amendment to conference report increasing rural telephone authorization funds by $10,000,000, Mar. 19, 1953.
13	21	4	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Motion to recommit, Apr. 1, 1953.
14	22	4	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Passage of bill, Apr. 1, 1953.
15	23	4	3-year extension on procedures for Mexican agricultural workers (H. R. 3480)—Passage of bill, Apr. 15, 1953.
16	24	6	National bank stockholders (H. R. 4004) to provide that national banks furnish list of stockholders upon request of the Comptroller of the Currency—Motion to recommit, Apr. 15, 1953.
17	27	5	First independent offices appropriation for 1954 (H. R. 4663)—Motion to recommit to insert authorization for public housing, Apr. 22, 1953.
18	29	2	Price supports for Maryland tobacco (H. R. 1432)—Passage of bill, Apr. 24, 1953.
19	30	1	Daylight saving time for District of Columbia (H. R 4363)—Passage of bill, Apr. 27, 1953.
20	32	6	Interior Department appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4828)—Motion to recommit to increase funds for Southwestern and Bonneville Power Administrations, Apr. 28, 1953.
21	33	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Motion to recommit striking out provisions permitting discharge of personnel whenever such discharge is deemed necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States, May 5, 1953.
22	34	4	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Passage of bill, May 5, 1953.
23	36	4	Submerged lands seaward from historic State boundaries (H. R. 5134)—Passage of bill, May 13, 1953.
24	37	6	Submerged lands within State boundaries (H. R. 4198)—Adoption of resolution (H. Res. 232) to concur in Senate passage, May 13, 1953.
25	41	6	Agriculture appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5227)—Amendment to reduce amount for soil conservation to $140 million, as recommended by Secretary of Agriculture, May 20, 1953.
26	42	4	Agriculture appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5227)—Passage of bill, May 20, 1953.
27	44	6	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Amendment to increase by $6 million funds allocated for school districts affected by Federal activities, May 26, 1953.
28	45	6	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Motion to recommit to increase funds for hospital construction by $25 million, May 26, 1953.
29	46	4	Labor-Health, Education and Welfare appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 5246)—Passage of bill, May 26, 1953.
30	49	6	Resolution to disapprove President Eisenhower's reorganization plan for the Department of Agriculture (H. Res. 236)—Motion to discharge Committee on Government Operations from further consideration, June 3, 1953.
31	52	2	Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953 (H. R. 5495)—Motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title increasing membership of Tariff Commission from 6 to 7, June 15, 1953.
32	53	4	Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1953 (H. R. 5495)—Passage of bill, June 15, 1953.
33	55	6	Second independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 5090)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete provision granting the Veterans' Administration power to determine the right of certain veterans to free hospitalization, June 18, 1953.
34	56	4	Second independent offices appropriation for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 5690)—Passage of bill, June 18, 1953.
35	57	4	Mutual Security Act extension (H. R. 5710)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 291) to consider bill, June 18, 1953.
36	60	4	Mutual Security Act extension (H. R. 5710)—Passage of bill, June 19, 1953.
37	63	4	Wheat for Pakistan (H. R. 5659)—Passage of bill, June 23, 1953.
38	66	4	Authorize sale of Government-owned rubber producing facilities (H. R. 5728)—Motion to recommit, June 25, 1953.
39	69	6	Resolution to disapprove President Eisenhower's reorganization of Defense Department (H. Res. 295)—Adoption of resolution, June 27, 1953.
40	70	4	Exempt Cabinet officers and Presidential appointees from annual and sick leave provisions (H. R. 4654)—Adoption of conference report, June 27, 1953.
41	75	6	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 5659)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for Air Force by $1.2 billion, July 2, 1953.
42	76	3	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 5659)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1953.
43	80	4	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 5173)—Motion to recommit with instructions to limit use of such excess taxes to payment of unemployment compensation and to delay State repayment of advances, July 8, 1953.
44	82	4	Financial aid for drought-stricken farmers and stockmen (H. R. 6054)—Passage of bill, July 9, 1953.
45	83	2	Develop Niagara River power through private enterprise (H. R. 4351)—Motion to recommit, July 9, 1953.
46	84	2	Develop Niagara River power through private enterprise (H. R. 4351)—Passage of bill, July 9, 1953.
47	86	6	Excess-profits tax extension (H. R. 5898)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase base period for calculating excess profits, July 10, 1953.
48	87	4	Excess-profits tax extension (H. R. 5898)—Passage of bill, July 10, 1953.
49	89	4	Mutual security (H. R. 5710)—Adoption of conference report, July 13, 1953.
50	91	6	Supplemental appropriations (H. R. 6200)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase funds for Voice of America and eliminate personnel reduction provisions, July 15, 1953.
51	93	4	Resolution to disapprove reorganization plan covering foreign information functions (H. Res. 262)—Adoption of resolution, July 17, 1953.
52	95	1	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 4974)—Amendment expressing sense of Congress that Communist Chinese Government not be admitted to the United Nations, July 21, 1953.
53	96	6	State, Justice, Commerce appropriations (H. R. 4974)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment providing appropriations of $12.5 million in funds for Federal aid to airports, July 21, 1953.
54	97	6	First independent offices appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 4663)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment to authorize construction of 20,000 public housing units, July 21, 1953.
55	98	4	Army civil functions (H. R. 5376)—Motion to recommit with instructions to add $2.2 million for the Missouri River bank stabilization project, July 21, 1953.
56	100	4	Mutual Security Act appropriations (H. R. 6391)—Passage of bill, July 22, 1953.
57	102	5	Import quotas on petroleum products and sliding scale tariff on lead and zinc (H. R. 5894)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 347), July 23, 1953.
58	103	5	Import quotas on petroleum products and sliding scale tariff on lead and zinc (H. R. 5894)—Motion to recommit, July 23, 1953.
59	105	6	Small Business Administration (H. R. 5141)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete terminating the RFC, July 27, 1953.
60	106	2	Investigations of foundations (H. Res. 217)—Adoption of resolution, July 27, 1953.
61	109	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Adoption of rule for consideration (H. Res. 353), July 28, 1953.
62	111	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Motion to recommit, July 28, 1953.
63	112	6	Refugee Act of 1953 (H. R. 6481)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1953.
64	114	4	Emergency Famine Relief Authority (H. R. 6016)—Motion to recommit, July 29, 1953.
65	116	4	Mutual-security appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 6391)—Motion to recommit to cut reappropriations for European military assistance, July 31, 1953.
66	117	4	Mutual-security appropriations for 1954 (H. R. 6391)—Adoption of conference report, July 31, 1953.
67	119	6	National debt limit (H. R. 6672)—Motion to recommit, July 31, 1953.
68	120	6	National debt limit (H. R. 6672)—Passage of bill, July 31, 1953.
69	122	2	Withholding of local income taxes (H. R. 6413)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 361) for consideration, Aug. 1, 1953.
70	123	6	First supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1954 (H. R. 6200)—Motion that House concur in amendment authorizing Director of U. S. Information Agency to terminate employment of certain personnel not having veterans' preference, Aug. 3, 1953.

Classification of all House votes, 83d Cong., 2d sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
1	3	4	Establishment of Air Force Academy (H. R. 5337)—Passage of bill, Jan. 21, 1954.
2	4	4	Increase available funds for Commodity Credit Corporation (H. J. Res. 358)—Passage of resolution, Jan. 27, 1954.
3	10	6	Lake Michigan water level (H. R. 3300)—Amendment to provide that no withdrawals above present limit be permitted until survey by Army Corps of Engineers. Feb. 4, 1954.
4	11	6	Lake Michigan water level (H. R. 3300)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 4, 1954.
5	15	6	Exchange of timberlands (H. R. 4646)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 17, 1954.
6	17	1	Authorize funds for Un-American Activities Committee (H. Res. 400)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 25, 1954.
7	21	6	Authorize recruitment of Mexican farm labor (H. J. Res. 355)—Motion to recommit, Mar. 2, 1954.
8	25	4	State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations for 1955 (H. R. 8067)—Passage of bill, Mar. 5, 1954.
9	28	6	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Motion to recommit with instructions that no tax shall be imposed on theater admissions of 50 cents or less, Mar. 10, 1954.
10	29	4	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1954.
11	34	6	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Motion to recommit eliminating dividend credit and increasing personal income tax exemptions, Mar. 18, 1954.
12	35	4	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Passage of bill, Mar. 18, 1954.
13	41	4	Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (H. R. 8224)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 30, 1954.
14	43	6	Independent offices appropriations for 1955 (H. R. 8583)—Motion to recommit providing no funds may be used for administrative expenses in connection with sale of any FNMA mortages at less than par value, Mar. 31, 1954.
15	46	5	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Motion to recommit to authorize 35,000 new public-housing starts, Apr. 2, 1954.
16	47	4	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Passage of bill, Apr. 2, 1954.
17	51	6	Wiretapping (H. R. 8649)—Amendment in the nature of a substitute to provide that evidence must be authorized by Federal court order as well as by Attorney General, Apr. 8, 1954.
18	52	4	Wiretapping (H. R. 8649)—Passage of bill, Apr. 8, 1954.
19	58	3	Defense Department appropriations for fiscal 1955 (H. R. 8873)—Passage of bill, Apr. 29, 1954.
20	62	4	St. Lawrence seaway (S. 2150)—Motion to recommit, May 6, 1954.
21	63	4	St. Lawrence seaway (S. 2150)—Passage of bill, May 6, 1954.
22	66	5	Fugitive extradition (H. R. 2556)—Motion to strike enacting clause, May 10, 1954.
23	68	1	Citation for contempt for Bernherd Deutch (H. Res. 533), May 11, 1954.
24	69	4	Cooperative research in education (H. R. 9040)—Passage of bill, May 12, 1954.
25	70	6	Establishment of National Advisory Committee on Education (H. R. 7434)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 532) to consider bill, May 12, 1954.
26	72	6	Establishment of National Advisory Committee on Education (H. R. 7434)—Passage of bill, May 13, 1954.
27	74	4	White House Education Conference (H. R. 7001)—Passage of bill, May 19, 1954.
28	76	3	Authorize expenditures for military and naval construction (H. R. 9242)—Passage of bill, May 26, 1954.
29	77	1	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 568) to consider social security amendments (H. R. 9366), June 1, 1954.
30	78	4	Social security amendments for 1954 (H. R. 9366)—Passage of bill, June 1, 1954.
31	80	4	Reciprocal trade extension (H. R. 9474)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 580), June 11, 1954.
32	81	4	Reciprocal trade extension (H. R. 9474)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1954.
33	83	2	Appropriations, District of Columbia (H. R. 9517)—Amendment to increase Federal contribution to general fund, while increasing funds for capital improvements, June 15, 1954.
34	85	4	Authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury (H. R. 8729)—Motion to recommit, June 16, 1954.
35	87	1	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 583) to provide that House disagree to Senate amendment to Housing bill (H. R. 7839), June 17, 1954.
36	89	3	Western Hemisphere protection (S. Con. Res. 91)—Adoption of resolution, June 29, 1954.
37	91	3	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Amendment to provide no funds authorized may be used on behalf of governments committed by treaty to maintain Communist rule over any defined area in Asia, June 30, 1954.
38	92	4	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Passage of bill, June 30, 1954.
39	96	6	Farm bill (H. R. 9680)—Amendment to provide flexible price supports, July 2, 1954.
40	97	3	Vocational rehabilitation (H. R. 9640)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
41	98	6	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 9709)—Motion to recommit with instructions to increase amount and duration of benefits, July 8, 1954.
42	99	4	Unemployment compensation (H. R. 9709)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
43	100	3	Espionage (H. R. 9580)—Passage of bill, July 8, 1954.
44	102	4	Adoption of rule (H. Res. 623) to consider health insurance bill (H. R. 8356), July 13, 1954.
45	103	6	Health insurance (H. R. 8356)—Motion to recommit, July 13, 1954.
46	105	1	Opposition to admission of Red China to the United Nations (H. Res. 627)—Adoption of resolution, July 15, 1954.
47	107	6	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Motion to recommit with instructions for 4-year public housing program, July 20, 1954.
48	108	4	Housing redevelopment (H. R. 7839)—Adoption of conference report, July 20, 1954.
49	109	3	Extension of veterans' education and training (H. R. 9888)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
50	110	3	Veterans' compensation and pensions (H. R. 9020)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
51	111	6	Increase in both postal pay and postal rates (H. R. 9245)—Passage of bill, July 21, 1954.
52	113	1	Contempt citation, Bolza Baxter (H. Res. 664)—Adoption of resolution, July 23, 1954.
53	115	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Amendment to grant normal patent rights for nonmilitary development, July 23, 1954.
54	117	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Motion to recommit, July 26, 1954.
55	118	6	Atomic Energy Act (H. R. 9757)—Passage of bill, July 26, 1954.
56	120	4	Mutual security appropriations for fiscal 1955 (H. R. 10051)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1954.
57	121	6	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Motion to recommit conference report, July 28, 1954.
58	122	4	Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (H. R. 8300)—Agreement to conference report, July 28, 1954.
59	124	6	Fryingpan-Arkansas project (H. R. 236)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 626) for consideration, July 28, 1954.
60	125	4	Increase borrowing authority of Commodity Credit Corporation (H. R. 9756)—Passage of bill, July 29, 1954.
61	126	2	Adjournment of Congress (H. Con. Res. 256)—Adoption of resolution, July 29, 1954.
62	129	3	Modifications in Railroad Retirement Act (H. R. 7840)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
63	130	2	Reclassification of hardboard for tariff purposes (H. R. 9666)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
64	131	2	Adjournment of Congress (H. Con. Res. 266)—Adoption of resolution, July 30, 1954.
65	132	6	Rogue River Reclamation (H. R. 8384)—Passage of bill, July 30, 1954.
66	135	4	Grant immunity to witnesses before congressional investigating committees (S. 16)—Passage of bill, Aug. 4, 1954.
67	137	5	Increase postal pay (H. R. 9245)—Motion to discharge Rules Committee from further consideration, Aug. 9, 1954.
68	138	5	Increase postal pay (H. R. 9245)—Passage of bill, Aug. 9, 1954.
69	139	2	Trout labeling (H. R. 2033)—Adoption of rule (H. Res. 687) for consideration, Aug. 9, 1954.
70	140	4	Mutual security authorization for 1955 (H. R. 9678)—Motion to recommit with instructions to disagree to provision permitting President to waive certain contracting and procurement regulations, Aug. 9, 1954.
71	142	4	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Passage of bill under suspension of the rules, Aug. 16, 1954.
72	144	6	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Motion to direct House conferees to agree with Senate amendments making membership in Communist Party, per se, a felony, Aug. 17, 1954.
73	145	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 10051)—Agreement to conference report, Aug. 19, 1954.
74	146	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 10051)—Motion that House concur in Senate amendment, Aug. 19, 1954.
75	147	4	Subversive activities control (S. 3706)—Agreement to conference report, Aug. 19, 1954.
76	148	2	Establish Commission on District of Columbia Transportation Problems (H. R. 2236)—Motion to recommit conference report, Aug. 20, 1954.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
5	168		147	2
19	152	34	98	65
52	194		185	
2D SESS.				
6	185		178	1
23	185		161	
29	171	3	99	71
35	192	1	169	18
46	199		182	
52	202		175	
Total	1,648	38	1,394	157

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
A	Martin	220		201	
11	Yea	155	10	153	38
12	Nay	162	12	140	31
18	Yea	84	26	130	82
31	Nay	200	15	179	6
45	Nay	184	70	112	18
46	Yea	182	80	102	18
60	Yea	140	69	114	49
69	Nay	117	44	120	72
2D SESS.					
33	Nay	119	49	116	70
61	Yea	161	22	159	34
63	Yea	160	75	87	22
64	Yea	159	21	141	26
69	Yea	161	48	134	25
76	Nay	121	43	93	2
	Total	2,325	584	1,981	493

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

1ST SESS.

Vote number	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
6	196		174	
42	199		187	
2D SESS.				
19	197		181	
28	175		171	
36	193		179	
37	199		190	
40	183		164	
43	175		149	
49	208		192	
50	209		190	
62	189		172	
Total	2,123		1,949	

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
1	Yea	205	184	2	3
2	Yea	192	150	15	3
4	Yea	188	181	1	1
7	Nay	198	92	77	2
10	Yea	194	97	73	13
13	Nay	191	92	91	15
14	Yea	188	97	90	18
15	Yea	155	104	61	26
22	Yea	185	159	1	4
23	Yea	193	116	79	12
26	Yea	195	189	2	10
29	Yea	199	197		2
32	Yea	179	184	9	25
34	Yea	202	195		2
35	Yea	172	169	15	20
36	Yea	119	161	27	81
37	Yea	119	161	27	81
38	Nay	190	126	56	2
40	Yea	132	138	21	44
43	Nay	189	103	86	7
44	Yea	194	194		4
48	Yea	169	156	39	38
49	Yea	95	127	29	80
51	Nay	166	144	8	3
55	Nay	141	111	79	58
56	Yea	129	160	33	82
64	Nay	194	128	72	10
65	Nay	101	99	95	97
66	Yea	115	122	72	84
2D SESS.					
1	Yea	160	171	14	22
2	Yea	178	145	15	12
8	Yea	168	97	83	22
10	Yea	211	200	3	
12	Yea	208	132	74	5
13	Yea	201	194	1	
16	Yea	189	164	27	9
18	Yea	197	181	9	1
20	Nay	14	98	95	62
21	Yea	144	97	94	64
24	Yea	181	115	47	8
27	Yea	179	90	65	4
30	Yea	181	175	6	2
31	Yea	146	128	36	27
32	Yea	126	155	14	39
34	Nay	169	81	78	2
38	Yea	118	142	47	79
42	Yea	178	131	29	7
44	Yea	175	99	70	18
48	Yea	196	162	23	7
56	Yea	121	145	43	85
58	Yea	201	114	74	3
60	Yea	170	147	30	27
66	Yea	177	117	52	3
70	Nay	127	140	40	56
71	Yea	156	149	1	1
73	Yea	81	107	36	41
74	Yea	74	114	29	47
75	Yea	121	144	1	1
	Total	9,566	8,070	2,296	1,481

No. 5.—*Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
17	Yea	34	123	69	176
57	Nay	72	111	81	138
58	Yea	104	138	56	105
2D SESS.					
15	Yea	48	128	61	150
22	Nay	66	2	128	100
67	Nay	23	6	180	166
68	Nay	23	6	182	170
	Total	370	514	757	1,005

No. 6.—*Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
3	Nay	176	23	163	19
8	Nay	199	28	167	15
9	Yea	177	97	101	37
16	Nay	169	71	78	1
20	Nay	187	25	156	11
21	Nay	160	8	154	27
24	Yea	184	94	99	17
25	Yea	152	44	147	54
27	Nay	140	16	176	61
28	Nay	173	30	166	31
30	Nay	204	57	127	1
33	Nay	165	15	178	39
39	Nay	169	66	97	11
41	Nay	196	34	156	5
47	Nay	185	90	106	21
50	Nay	177	67	130	24
53	Nay	180	50	138	22
54	Yea	173	66	125	36
59	Nay	197	30	159	2
61	Yea	152	98	100	52
62	Nay	133	89	113	73
63	Yea	132	89	111	74
67	Nay	203	22	173	
68	Yea	169	70	125	33
70	Yea	147		134	5
2D SESS.					
3	Yea	144	33	153	49
4	Yea	123	27	161	73
5	Nay	126	35	160	66
7	Nay	164	86	114	42
9	Nay	210	3	200	
11	Nay	201	9	194	10
14	Nay	196	18	176	4
17	Nay	166		189	32
25	Yea	178	16	134	6
26	Yea	161	18	134	23
39	Yea	182	46	147	23
41	Nay	173	68	93	17
45	Nay	120	14	163	75
47	Nay	155	79	106	50
51	Yea	207	21	169	2
23	Yea	190	13	155	6
54	Nay	196	26	158	7
55	Yea	195	36	147	7
57	Nay	204	23	166	3
59	Yea	137	51	133	62
65	Yea	100	63	81	63
72	Nay	99	1	152	56
	Total	7,926	1,965	6,664	1,347

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF HOUSE VOTES, 84TH CONGRESS

This study reviews all of the House votes during the 84th Congress. One hundred and forty-nine votes were taken. They have been placed in six groups as summarized below.

Groups 1 and 2 include items which were not included in the President's program. The 2 groups together include 20 votes or 13 percent of the total.

No. 1. Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties

Republicans:
- Yeas 1,778
- Nays 520

Democrats:
- Yeas 2,031
- Nays 504

The number of issues included in group 1 is 13, accounting for 9 percent of 149 votes.

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members

REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
- Republicans 864
- Democrats 249

No. 2. Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members—Con.

OPPOSED TO REPUBLICAN PARTY POSITION

Vote cast:
Democrats 1,106
Republicans 315

The number of issues included in group 2 is 7, accounting for 4 percent of 149 votes.

Groups 3 through 6 includes votes on issues included in the President's program. They total 129 votes or 87 percent of the total.

No. 3. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition

Vote cast:
Republicans:
Yeas 1,078
Nays .....
Democrats:
Yeas 1,233
Nays .....

The number of issues included in group 3 is 6, accounting for 4 percent of 149 votes.

No. 4. Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 8,843
Percent 46.2
Democrats:
Votes cast 10,307
Percent 53.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 1,833
Percent 50.4
Republicans:
Votes cast 1,802
Percent 49.6

The number of issues included in group 4 is 60, accounting for 40 percent of 149 votes.

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 1,312
Percent 43.2
Democrats:
Votes cast 1,725
Percent 56.8

No. 5. Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program—Con.

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 2,289
Percent 51.8
Republicans:
Votes cast 2,126
Percent 48.2

The number of issues included in group 5 is 19, accounting for 13 percent of 149 votes.

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

EISENHOWER POSITION

Republicans:
Votes cast 6,736
Percent 82.2

No. 6. Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program—Continued

EISENHOWER POSITION—continued

Democrats:
Votes cast 1,460
Percent 17.8

OPPOSED TO EISENHOWER POSITION

Democrats:
Votes cast 7,596
Percent 83.8
Republicans:
Votes cast 1,466
Percent 16.2

The number of issues included in group 6 is 44, accounting for 30 percent of 149 votes.

Groups 5 and 6 consist of all votes not adopted with bipartisan support which represent tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups combined include 63 issues or 42 percent of all House votes.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
5	1,312		1,725		2,289		2,126	
6	6,736		1,460		7,596		1,466	
Total	8,048	71.6	3,185	28.4	9,885	73.3	3,592	26.7

Groups 3, 4, 5, and 6 combined consist of all votes representing tests of President Eisenhower's program. These groups include 129 of the 149 votes or 87 percent of all House votes. These votes are a complete test of the support given President Eisenhower.

The Republicans supplied 55 percent of all the votes for President Eisenhower's program, and the Democrats 45 percent. The Democrats supplied 68.5 percent of all the votes opposed to President Eisenhower's program and the Republicans only 31.5 percent.

No.	Eisenhower position				Opposed to Eisenhower position			
	Republicans		Democrats		Democrats		Republicans	
	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent	Votes cast	Percent
3	1,078		1,233					
4	8,843		10,307		1,833		1,802	
5	1,312		1,725		2,289		2,126	
6	6,736		1,460		7,596		1,466	
Total	17,969	55.0	14,725	45.0	11,718	68.5	5,394	31.5

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
A	----------	2	Election of Speaker.
1	3	4	Formosa policy (H. J. Res. 159)—Adoption of resolution, Jan. 25, 1955.
2	4	3	Veterans' educational benefits (H. R. 587)—Passage of bill, Jan. 27, 1955.
3	5	4	Selective service extension (H. R. 3005)—Passage of bill, Feb. 8, 1955.
4	6	4	Congressional-judicial salaries (H. R. 3828)—Passage of bill, Feb. 16, 1955.
5	8	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—First vote on closed rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
6	9	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—Amendment to permit open rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
7	10	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. Res. 142)—Adoption of closed rule, Feb. 17, 1955.
8	11	5	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Motion to recommit, Feb. 18, 1955.
9	12	4	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Passage of bill, Feb. 18, 1955.
10	15	6	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Motion to recommit deleting $20 individual tax credit, Feb. 25, 1955.
11	16	6	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Passage of bill, Feb. 25, 1955.
12	17	4	Congressional-judicial salaries (H. R. 3828)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 1, 1955.
13	19	4	Military career incentives (H. R. 4720)—Passage of bill, Mar. 10, 1955.
14	21	5	Second supplemental appropriation (H. R. 4903)—Amendment to provide funds for United Nations technical assistance program, Mar. 18, 1955.
15	23	5	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Suspension of rules, Mar. 21, 1955.
16	25	4	Burley tobacco allotment redetermination (H. R. 4951)—Motion to suspend rules, Mar. 21, 1955.
17	27	6	Sale of Government rubber plants (H. Res. 170)—Adoption of resolution, Mar. 22, 1955.
18	29	6	Sale of Government rubber plants (H. Res. 171)—Adoption of resolution, Mar. 23, 1955.
19	33	4	Taxes (H. R. 4259)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 30, 1955.
20	34	6	Independent offices appropriation (H. R. 5240)—Phillips amendment limiting amounts paid for reports to Budget Bureau figure, Mar. 30, 1955.
21	37	6	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Moss amendment to raise average pay increase 8.2 percent, Apr. 20, 1955.
22	38	6	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Motion to recommit, Apr. 20, 1955.
23	39	5	Postal employees pay (H. R. 4644)—Passage of bill, Apr. 20, 1955.
24	41	4	Navy shipbuilding and conversion (H. R. 4393)—Passage of bill, Apr. 21, 1955.
25	46	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Amendment to eliminate peanuts from list of basic commodities, May 5 1955.
26	47	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Motion to recommit, May 5, 1955.
27	48	6	Farm-price supports (H. R. 12)—Passage of bill, May 5, 1955.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 1st sess.—Continued

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
28	50	6	Postal employees pay (S. 1, substitute for H. R. 4644)—Motion to recommit, May 9, 1955.
29	51	5	Postal employees pay (S. 1, substitute for H. R. 4644)—Adoption of conference report, May 9, 1955.
30	52	4	Alaska-Hawaii statehood (H. Res. 223)—Adoption of rule, May 9, 1955.
31	57	6	Alaska-Hawaii statehood (H. R. 2535)—Motion to recommit, May 10, 1955.
32	62	6	Defense appropriation (H. R. 6042)—Amendment to permit transfer of activities performed by civilian employees to private enterprise, May 12, 1955.
33	63	3	Defense appropriation (H. R. 6042)—Passage of bill, May 12, 1955.
34	69	4	District of Columbia judges' salaries (S. 727)—Passage of bill, May 23, 1955.
35	71	2	Indiana toll charges (H. Res. 244)—Passage of bill, May 25, 1955.
36	72	4	Donable commodities (H. R. 2851)—Passage of bill, May 25, 1955.
37	74	2	District of Columbia judges salaries (S. 727)—Motion to recommit conference report, May 26, 1955.
38	76	4	Reclamation (H. R. 5881)—Motion to recommit, May 26, 1955.
39	78	4	Alaska water resources (H. R. 3990)—Motion to recommit, June 1, 1955.
40	79	4	Postal employees pay (S. 2061)—Passage of bill, June 7, 1955.
41	80	4	Inter-American Highway (H. R. 5923)—Passage of bill, June 8, 1955.
42	83	4	Reciprocal trade agreements (H. R. 1)—Adoption of conference report, June 14, 1955.
43	84	4	Bank holding companies (H. R. 6227)—Passage of bill, June 14, 1955.
44	86	6	Federal securities investigation (H. Res. 210)—Adoption of resolution, June 15, 1955.
45	88	4	Federal employees pay raise (S. 67)—Passage of bill, June 20, 1955.
46	89	1	NATO Parliamentary Conference (H. Con. Res. 109)—Adoption of resolution, June 20, 1955.
47	90	4	Travel expenses (H. R. 6295)—Passage of bill, June 20, 1955.
48	91	5	Central Valley, Calif., reclamation project (H. R. 4663)—Passage of bill, June 21, 1955.
49	93	5	Customs simplification (H. R. 6040)—Motion to recommit, June 22, 1955.
50	94	1	Colonialism and Communist imperialism (H. Con. Res. 149)—Adoption of resolution, June 23, 1955.
51	95	4	Debt-limit extension (H. R. 6992)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1955.
52	97	4	Military public works (H. R. 6829)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1955.
53	99	4	Selective-service extension (H. R. 3005)—Motion to recommit conference report, June 28, 1955.
54	100	4	Selective-service extension (H. R. 3005)—Adoption of conference report, June 28, 1955.
55	103	1	District of Columbia judges salaries (S. 727)—Motion to recommit second conference report, June 29, 1955.
56	105	4	Mutual Security Act (S. 2090)—Passage of bill, June 30, 1955.
57	109	5	Lake Michigan water diversion (H. R. 3210)—Motion to recommit, July 6, 1955.
58	110	4	Mutual Security Act (S. 2090)—Adoption of conference report, July 7, 1955.
59	112	4	Mutual security appropriation (H. R. 7224)—Passage of bill, July 11, 1955.
60	114	5	Public works appropriation (H. R. 6766)—Adoption of conference report which included items not approved by the Bureau of the Budget, July 13, 1955.
61	115	4	Survivors' benefits (H. Res. 265)—Adoption of closed rule, July 13, 1955.
62	119	4	Social security (H. R. 7225)—Passage of bill, July 18, 1955.
63	125	4	Minimum-wage increase (H. R. 7214)—Passage of bill, July 20, 1955.
64	129	4	Reserve forces (H. R. 7000)—Adoption of conference report, July 25, 1955.
65	130	4	Highway construction program (H. Res. 314)—Adoption of rule, July 26, 1955.
66	132	6	Highway construction program (H. R. 7474)—Motion to recommit, July 27, 1955.
67	133	4	Highway construction program (H. R. 7474)—Passage of bill, July 27, 1955.
68	135	4	Natural Gas Act (H. Res. 317)—Adoption of rule, July 28, 1955.
69	137	6	Natural Gas Act (H. R. 6645)—Motion to recommit, July 28, 1955.
70	138	6	Natural Gas Act (H. R. 6645)—Passage of bill, July 28, 1955.
71	140	6	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Wolcott amendment, July 29, 1955.
72	141	4	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Passage of bill, July 29, 1955.
73	143	2	Increase in Small Business Committee funds (H. Res. 299)—Adoption of resolution, Aug. 1, 1955.
74	144	2	Repeal franchise of Capital Transit Co. (S. 2576)—Motion to suspend the rules, Aug. 1, 1955.
75	147	6	Housing Act of 1955 (S. 2126)—Adoption of conference report, Aug. 2, 1955.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 2d sess.

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
1	3	3	Gasoline tax refund for farmers (H. R. 8780)—Passage of bill, Jan. 31, 1956.
2	4	1	Appropriation for Un-American Activities Committee (H. Res. 352)—Adoption of resolution, Jan. 31, 1956.
3	5	4	Navy shipbuilding and conversion (H. R. 7993)—Passage of bill, Feb. 1, 1956.
4	7	4	Sale of Government rubber plant (H. Res. 396)—Adoption of resolution, Feb. 8, 1956.
5	8	4	Military procurement (H. R. 8710)—Passage of bill, Feb. 20, 1956.
6	10	4	Colorado River storage (H. Res. 311)—Adoption of rule, Feb. 28, 1956.
7	14	4	Colorado River storage (H. R. 3383)—Passage of bill, Mar. 1, 1956.
8	15	4	Independent offices appropriation (H. R. 9739)—Amendment on supergrade positions, Mar. 7, 1956.
9	16	4	Extension of corporate and excise taxes (H. R. 9166)—Passage of bill, Mar. 13, 1956.
10	19	6	Agricultural Act of 1954, amendment (H. R. 8320)—Adoption of conference report, Mar. 21, 1956.
11	20	3	Agricultural Act of 1954, amendment (H. R. 8320)—Adoption of Senate amendment, Mar. 21, 1956.
12	21	4	Permission for President to appoint retired Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard to a civilian position in the Department of Justice (S. 1271)—Motion to recommit.
13	23	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Motion to recommit conference report, Apr. 11, 1956.
14	24	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Adoption of conference report, Apr. 11, 1956.
15	25	4	Military construction (H. R. 9803)—Passage of bill, Apr. 12, 1956.
16	27	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 12)—Motion to override President's veto, Apr. 18, 1956.
17	28	1	Potomac River Bridge (H. R. 7728)—Passage of bill, Apr. 23, 1956.
18	34	6	Justice appropriation (H. R. 10721)—Amendment to eliminate supergrade positions, Apr. 25, 1956.
19	36	4	Highway construction bill (H. R. 10660)—Passage of bill, Apr. 27, 1956.
20	39	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Amendment on grazing lands, May 3, 1956.
21	40	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Amendment re 84 percent parity support on cotton, May 3, 1956.
22	41	6	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Motion to recommit providing advance payments for soil bank, May 3, 1956.
23	42	4	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Passage of bill, May 3, 1956.
24	46	6	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 10986)—Amendment to permit transfer of facilities operating in competition with private enterprise, May 10, 1956.
25	47	3	Defense Department appropriations (H. R. 10986)—Passage of bill, May 10, 1956.
26	50	2	Franchise of Capital Transit Co. (H. R. 8901)—Motion to recommit, May 17, 1956.
27	52	4	Annuities to widows and children of Federal judges (H. R. 11124)—Passage of bill, May 21, 1956.
28	53	6	Public works appropriations (H. R. 11319)—Amendment to provide funds for resurvey of Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, May 22, 1956.
29	54	4	Agricultural Act of 1956 (H. R. 10875)—Adoption of conference report, May 23, 1956.
30	55	6	Payment to Crow Indian Tribe (S. J. Res. 135)—Passed May 24, 1956, vetoed June 7, 1956.
31	56	4	Farm Credit Act, 1956 (H. R. 10285)—Passage of bill, May 31, 1956.
32	63	4	Mutual Security Act (H. R. 11356)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1956.
33	65	1	Strengthen Robinson-Patman Act (H. R. 1840)—Passage of bill, June 11, 1956.
34	69	6	Reclamation (H. R. 5881)—Conference report, motion to recommit, June 13, 1956.
35	70	6	Require use of automatic radio-call selector on United States cargo ships (H. R. 4090)—Motion to recommit, June 13, 1956.
36	71	6	Water-pollution control (H. R. 9540)—Motion to recommit with instructions to delete Federal construction grants, June 13, 1956.
37	72	4	Water Pollution Control Act (H. R. 9540)—Passage of bill, June 13, 1956.
38	75	1	District of Columbia daylight-saving time (S. 3295)—Passage of bill, June 25, 1956.
39	77	5	Veterans' disability pension (H. R. 7886)—Motion to recommit, June 27, 1956.
40	78	5	Veterans' disability pension (H. R. 7886)—Passage of bill, June 27, 1956.
41	81	5	Defense Production Act (H. R. 9852)—Adoption of conference report, June 28, 1956.
42	82	4	School construction (H. Res. 554)—Adoption of rule June 28, 1956.
43	85	4	Panama Canal bridge (H. R. 9801)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1956.
44	86	6	Fishing industry (S. 2379)—Passage of bill, July 2, 1956.
45	89	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Gwinn amendment, July 5, 1956.

Classification of all House votes, 84th Cong., 2d sess.—Continued

Serial No.	Rollcall vote No.	Group	Description
46	90	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Powell amendment, July 5, 1956.
47	91	6	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—McConnell motion to recommit, July 5, 1956.
48	92	5	Federal assistance for schools (H. R. 7535)—Passage of bill, July 5, 1956.
49	94	6	Postal rates increase (H. R. 11380)—Passage of bill, July 6, 1956.
50	95	4	Military construction (H. R. 9893)—Motion to recommit, July 9, 1956.
51	96	1	National Memorial Stadium (H. R. 11967)—Passage of bill, July 9 1956.
52	98	4	Foreign aid appropriations (H. R. 12130)—Passage of bill, July 11, 1956.
53	99	1	Resolution to consider supplemental appropriations bill (H. Res. 584)—Passage of resolution, July 12, 1956.
54	100	1	Supplemental appropriations (H. R. 12138)—Motion to recommit with instructions, July 12, 1956.
55	101	3	Increase in service-connected disability pensions (H. R. 12038)—Passage of bill, July 12, 1956.
56	103	1	Resolution opposing admission of Communist China to the United Nations (H. Con. Res. 265)—Adoption of resolution, July 18, 1956.
57	104	4	Increase funds, agricultural trade bill (H. R. 11708)—Passage of bill, July 18, 1956.
58	106	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Smith (Va.) motion, July 19, 1956.
59	110	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Motion to recommit, July 23, 1956.
60	111	4	Civil-rights bill (H. R. 627)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
61	112	1	Construction Contract Act (S. 1644)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
62	113	2	Suspension of wool tariffs (H. R. 12227)—Passage, July 23, 1956.
63	115	6	Defense appropriations (H. R. 7992)—Amendment concerning the transfer of work to private industry, July 24, 1956.
64	116	6	Atomic power (H. R. 12061)—Amendment to strike enacting clause, July 24, 1956.
65	117	6	Atomic power (H. R. 12061)—Motion to recommit, July 24, 1956.
66	119	4	Housing (H. R. 11742)—Amendment to rule, July 25, 1956.
67	120	1	Contempt citation, Arthur Miller (H. Res. 638)—Adoption of resolution, July 25, 1956.
68	123	6	Fryingpan-Arkansas rule to consider (H. Res. 641)—Adoption of resolution, July 26, 1956.
69	124	6	Air carriers rule to consider (H. Res. 602)—Adoption of resolution, July 26, 1956.
70	125	5	Air carriers (H. R. 8002)—Motion to recommit, July 27, 1956.
71	127	6	Southwestern Power Administration rates rule to consider (H. Res. 625)—Adoption of resolution, July 27, 1956.
72	128	6	Southwestern Power Administration (S. 3338)—Passage of bill, July 27, 1956.
73	131	6	Adoption of H. Res. 604 to permit action on Senate bill 3227 to authorize Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho, July 27, 1956.

No. 1.—*Issues not included in the President's program which were supported by a majority of both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
46	142	23	195	8
50	167	----	200	----
55	82	98	76	128

2D SESS.

2	181	----	204	3
17	136	8	148	1
33	179	3	215	----
38	104	55	95	65
51	126	48	162	32
53	161	27	201	3
54	20	170	5	200
56	189	----	202	----
61	105	87	141	58
67	186	1	187	8
Total	1,776	520	2,031	504

No. 2.—*Issues which were not included in the President's program where majority of Republican Members voted in opposition to majority of Democratic Members*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Republican Party position	Republican Party position, vote cast		Opposed to Republican Party position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
A	Martin	198	----	228	----
35	Nay	161	5	197	8
37	Yea	103	67	118	47
73	Nay	130	4	198	33
74	Nay	90	60	138	77

2D SESS.

26	Nay	96	76	95	66
62	Nay	86	37	132	84
	Total	864	249	1,106	315

No. 3.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties with no recorded opposition*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Vote cast			
	Republicans		Democrats	
	Yeas	Nays	Yeas	Nays
2	160	----	206	----
33	179	----	205	----

2D SESS.

1	180	----	207	----
11	193	----	213	----
25	178	----	199	----
55	188	----	203	----
Total	1,078	----	1,233	----

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by both parties*

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
1	Yea	185	225	1	2
3	Yea	171	223	----	4
4	Yea	117	166	59	59
9	Yea	109	186	35	75
12	Yea	104	119	53	60
13	Yea	191	208	----	1
16	Yea	109	151	68	84
19	Yea	187	200	8	----
24	Yea	176	197	1	2
30	Yea	121	202	8	58
34	Yea	134	149	16	17
36	Yea	156	188	1	----
38	Nay	78	157	8	54
39	Nay	91	187	10	69
40	Yea	187	223	----	1
41	Yea	161	192	1	12
42	Yea	150	197	18	36
43	Yea	158	213	----	24
45	Yea	165	205	----	3

No. 4.—*Issues included in the President's program which were supported by majority of both parties*—Continued

1ST SESS.—continued

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
47	Yea	131	189	11	30
51	Yea	133	134	43	13
52	Yea	143	173	1	1
53	Nay	94	127	88	83
54	Yea	176	213	1	4
56	Yea	113	160	51	77
58	Yea	109	153	48	72
59	Yea	105	146	53	70
61	Yea	179	197	12	12
62	Yea	169	203	8	23
63	Yea	170	192	29	25
64	Yea	146	169	38	40
65	Yea	153	121	94	35
67	Nay	164	128	94	29
68	Yea	143	130	88	47
72	Yea	185	211	3	----

2D SESS.

3	Yea	170	190	2	1
4	Nay	167	143	59	2
5	Yea	171	201	2	----
6	Yea	166	188	12	14
7	Yea	120	136	63	73
8	Nay	122	109	87	63
9	Yea	168	198	1	3
12	Nay	172	139	67	13
15	Yea	174	203	1	2
19	Yea	188	200	15	4
23	Yea	123	191	16	62
27	Yea	102	136	19	33
29	Yea	132	173	12	47
31	Yea	118	129	2	2
32	Yea	112	163	52	70
37	Yea	148	190	5	26
42	Yea	168	159	51	16
43	Yea	142	183	16	43
50	Nay	155	188	5	24
52	Yea	124	160	50	70
57	Yea	187	202	5	1
58	Nay	178	112	94	10
59	Nay	164	111	102	29
60	Yea	168	111	102	24
66	Nay	141	158	44	48
	Total	8,843	10,307	1,833	1,802

No. 5.—Issues where the majority of the Republicans were recorded in opposition to President Eisenhower's program

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
5	Yea	62	116	101	106
6	Nay	59	134	82	109
7	Yea	65	128	88	104
8	Nay	66	140	80	119
14	Yea	47	128	22	85
15	Yea	85	35	190	112
23	Nay	84	1	217	107
29	Nay	66		212	116
48	Yea	76	154	54	99
49	Nay	83	149	58	85
57	Yea	71	3	201	115
60	Nay	78	14	203	113

2D SESS.

39	Yea	71	39	182	123
40	Nay	41	10	213	152
41	Yea	65	135	76	121
45	Nay	88	162	61	107
46	Nay	46	146	77	148
48	Yea	75	119	105	119
70	Yea	84	112	67	86
	Total	1,312	1,725	2,289	2,126

No. 6.—Issues where majority of Republican Members voted to support President Eisenhower's program and majority of Democratic Members voted in opposition to his program

1ST SESS.

Vote No.	Eisenhower position	Eisenhower position, vote cast		Opposed to Eisenhower position, vote cast	
		Republicans	Democrats	Democrats	Republicans
10	Yea	189	16	205	5
11	Nay	173	2	221	21
17	Nay	191	92	131	1
18	Nay	189	87	132	5
20	Yea	137	17	187	40
21	Nay	172	17	202	22
22	Yea	122	3	215	72
25	Yea	178	15	201	14
26	Yea	175	24	193	19
27	Nay	172	29	185	21
28	Yea	117	1	211	64
31	Yea	113	105	107	63
32	Yea	147	37	168	34
44	Nay	185	29	177	1
66	Yea	186	7	214	7
69	Nay	123	87	136	67
70	Yea	123	86	136	67
71	Yea	151	66	152	36
75	Nay	131	37	153	34

2D SESS.

10	Nay	193	22	195	
13	Yea	167	14	211	27
14	Nay	146	35	189	48
16	Nay	173	38	182	20
18	Nay	92	92	99	80
20	Nay	178	17	191	8
21	Nay	184	24	183	3
22	Yea	183	1	207	4
24	Yea	158	64	133	123
28	Nay	166	4	178	1
30	Nay	125	1	159	17
34	Yea	119	60	147	62
35	Yea	133	18	185	43
36	Yea	140	25	176	37
44	Nay	100	33	170	86
47	Yea	149	9	215	47
49	Yea	178	39	162	4
63	Nay	169	16	179	22
64	Yea	174	21	179	20
65	Yea	176	27	174	17
68	Yea	126	53	140	54
69	Yea	107	77	109	69
71	Nay	122	4	172	47
72	Nay	134	6	167	34
73	Yea	170	3	168	
	Total	6,736	1,460	7,596	1,466

A Sound Conservation Policy—False Charges Exposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, probably more misinformation, half-truths, and distortions of fact have been circulated in recent months concerning oil and gas leasing on certain wildlife refuges, than about any other Interior Department activity.

Numerous statements have been issued which accuse the Department of acting to "reverse policies to preserve the integrity of the wildlife refuges" through the "opening" of wildlife refuges to oil and gas leasing.

These statements have appeared without in any way defining the real purpose of the wildlife refuge system. The availability of refuge lands for oil and gas leases for more than 20 years, as well as for other economic purposes, has been ignored.

MULTIPLE USES

Implicit in the attacks on the Department has been the charge that this was a brandnew activity initiated by the present administration.

This allegation completely disregards the multiple uses which historically have been made of wildlife lands.

The uses include sharecropping, grazing, timber removal and, in one case at least, a factory site. Oil drilling has been included, too, where it does not interfere with the use of the area for its primary purpose—wildlife conservation.

Former Secretary McKay's approval of new regulations last December to govern oil and gas leasing in these areas was immediately seized upon by administration foes as a pretext for charges of reprehensible conduct.

When the regulations—before they were signed—were submitted to the Secretary's Advisory Committee on Conservation, no one raised a serious objection. Not until afterward did the critics open their barrage of acrimonious press releases, public statements, and canned speeches by certain Members of Congress.

Some of those who were loudest in their objections on later occasions were members of the advisory committee and had remained silent when the proposed regulations were considered prior to Secretarial approval.

THREE CATEGORIES

Before the facts of this controversy can be properly weighed and evaluated, it is necessary to understand that there are approximately 17½ million acres in the Nation's wildlife management system. They are divided into three categories as follows:

First. Wildlife refuges, areas over which the Fish and Wildlife Service has primary jurisdiction and which are managed primarily for wildlife purposes.

Second. Game ranges, areas over which the Fish and Wildlife Service shares jurisdiction with another agency and on which wildlife conservation may be one of several equally important uses rather than the primary purpose.

Third. Cooperative lands, areas owned by the Federal Government but administered by the State for wildlife purposes.

There are, all told, 272 wildlife areas in all categories of these lands throughout the United States.

Leasing has been allowed in a total of 20 areas, or approximately 7 percent of all the areas in the system.

The number of acres in the 20 areas opened to leasing is roughly 250,000. This is about 1½ percent of the acreage in the entire system.

The practice of oil and gas leasing in these areas is not new.

Issuance of such leases dates back to, and is authorized by, the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. The intent of this act was later reaffirmed by amendment.

The Mineral Leasing Act for acquired lands, and the act of June 15, 1935, relating to administration of wildlife refuges, also authorize oil and gas leasing in wildlife areas.

The first regulations under which leases were issued in wildlife areas were signed in 1947 by Secretary Krug in the administration of President Truman. These were found lacking by the present administration and were superseded by the newer ones approved by McKay last December.

NUMBERS OF LEASES

The total number of leases which have been allowed up to now by the Federal Government is 612. Of these, 277 were allowed by previous administrations—270 between 1947 and January 20, 1953—while the present administration has allowed 335.

McKay's accusers have held him to be in a conspiracy with oil firms to enable them to fatten their purses at the expense of the Nation's wildlife population. After he signed the new regulations he was portrayed by some as indulging in a veritable orgy of leasing in areas which had been sacrosanct before this administration took office.

The figures show an opposite picture.

Under the administrations in the White House before January 20, 1953, a total of 13 areas were opened up to oil and gas exploration and development. As has been stated, there were 277 leases in these areas.

Under McKay seven new areas were opened to leasing. A total of 85 leases were allowed therein.

In other words, previous administrations opened nearly twice as many new areas as did McKay and allowed two-thirds more leases in the areas thus opened.

In six of the areas which had already been opened by the previous administration, the Department allowed 250 additional leases compared with the 277 issued prior to January 20, 1953.

NARROW MARGIN

Hence, the figures show McKay opened fewer areas to leasing than did his predecessors; he allowed fewer leases in the

areas opened, and he allowed fewer leases in those areas already opened when he took office than had officials of past administrations.

Only when the leases granted in newly opened areas are combined with those allowed in areas already opened does the present administration come out with a total greater than that of past administrations. And the margin is only 58 more leases.

Considering each of the three categories separately, the figures are as follows:

Wildlife refuges: Previous administrations opened 7; allowed 20 leases. Present administration opened 4; allowed 11 leases. In 3 of those already opened by previous administrations, present administration allowed 6 leases.

Game ranges: The previous administration opened 1; allowed 241 leases. Present administration opened 1; allowed 21 leases. In the game range already opened by the previous administration, the present administration allowed 230 leases.

Cooperative lands: The previous administration opened 5; allowed 16 leases. The present administration opened 2; allowed 53 leases. In 2 of these areas already opened by the previous administration, the present administration allowed 14 additional leases.

OTHER FACTS

Figures on royalties paid over the years by oil drillers operating in wildlife areas further refute the implication that this activity is new with the present administration.

Total income to the Government from this source was $5,650,000 from 1947 through 1955. The amount collected under the previous administration was $3,650,000, or $1,650,000 more than has been collected by the present administration.

Leasing in refuge areas has also been attacked as an impropriety and injurious per se to the waterfowl and other wildlife. Opponents of the administration have consistently tried to paint a picture of derricks scattered across the landscape, spouting oil over the ducks while streams are polluted and the ground is torn up by workmen and their machines.

In flat refutation of this line of attack is the fact that the Audubon Society, one of the Nation's leading conservationist organizations, permits oil and gas leasing and development on its own private refuge holdings.

NEW REGULATIONS

Administration opponents have also claimed that the new regulations issued by former Secretary McKay were capricious and revolutionary. This is not borne out by the facts.

Soon after he took office, McKay noted that the 1947 regulations were not adequate to protect wildlife values. Under those mildly protective rules, an oil or gas lease had to be approved and issued automatically if certain minimum conditions were met by the operator-applicant.

The drawing of new regulations was ordered. When they were approved, they represented more than 2 years of preparation by the Department's career specialists in wildlife management and land use.

They were designed to strengthen the control of the Fish and Wildlife Service over this activity in wildlife areas, and to provide the Service with a veto over the issuance of leases. They took certain areas out of leasing altogether.

Far from being the first Secretary to open refuge lands to oil and gas leasing, McKay actually was the first one in the history of the Wildlife Service to close some areas to exploration in deference to irreplaceable wildlife values.

The importance of the new regulations also lies in the future as well as in the present.

There are now approximately 3½ million acres in the wildlife refuges, as distinguished from game ranges and cooperative lands.

FUTURE NEEDS

Specialists in this field foresee a need within the next 25 years for 12½ million acres to provide food and living space for the desired population of 50 million birds, in the face of growing urban development and reclamation of wet lands for agricultural development.

The program of the Federal Government calls for the acquisition of an additional 4 million acres to serve as waterfowl habitat. The States are expected to provide an additional 5 million acres.

The land which the Federal Government adds to its refuge system will in almost all cases be acquired through purchase from private ownership.

It is significant that the Fish and Wildlife Service is finding more and more difficult the securing of mineral rights to land purchased for wildlife use. Owners of large tracts are unwilling to part with the subsurface mineral rights when they sell.

In the past, only about 20 percent of all land acquired by purchase had the mineral rights withheld by the sellers. Now the situation is reversed.

Only about 15 percent of the land being purchased currently has the mineral rights attached. This means that on over 85 percent of the land being bought today the previous owners retain the right, perhaps, to enter that portion of a wildlife area sometime in the future to drill for oil.

VAST DRILLING POSSIBLE

Thus, if the Fish and Wildlife Service is to fulfill its goal of adding 4 million more acres to the waterfowl refuge system, it faces the possibility that oil drilling may one day take place on about 3,500,000 acres of this land, regardless of conservationists, Congress, or ducks.

Under the new regulations, the Department is better prepared to cope with leasing and drilling activity on this unprecedented scale than it ever has been before. It cannot forbid private owners of mineral rights from exercising their rights. It can require them to exercise the most stringent precautions to avert destruction of the wildlife values.

DRILLING HERE TO STAY

A number of the critics of the new regulations have admitted privately that, if oil and gas drilling must take place, it would not be possible to draft a better or more protective set of procedures.

These individuals say they are against drilling in principle.

It appears they have not faced up to the fact that oil development on wildlife land is here to stay and must inevitably expand.

STOP ORDER

Much of the sound and fury generated by this controversy resolves about the so-called stop order issued August 31, 1953, for the announced purpose of allowing the Department time to study and rewrite the 1947 regulations inherited from the previous administration.

The order, in the form of a memorandum, was addressed to all field offices of the Bureau of Land Management and was signed by William Zimmerman, Jr., the Acting Director of the Bureau. This document enjoined Bureau field offices from processing oil and gas leases on refuge lands until further notice.

The pending applications were suspended, rather than canceled, to avoid inflicting an undeserved penalty on the applicants by depriving them of their filing priority, because of the shortcomings of the Government's regulations.

But the memorandum did not specify that action on leases on game ranges or cooperative lands should be suspended. Therein lies the crux of this matter.

The leasing activity which did occur during the period between the issuance of the suspension memorandum and the approval of the new regulations reflects a basic and unresolved conflict of policy between the Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

The BLM has held traditionally that game ranges are not refuge lands within the meaning of the 1947 regulations. It based its position upon a literal interpretation of the minerals clauses in the Executive orders which created the ranges. This interpretation extends back into the last administration. Accordingly, the Bureau held that leasing on the ranges was not covered by its own suspension order of August 31, 1953.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, on the other hand, viewed game ranges as refuge lands and contended that they should be so regarded under the regulations and under the suspension order.

LEASES ACCOUNTED FOR

This policy difference was not impressed upon the congressional committee leading to the assumption, fostered by administration foes, that hundreds of leases were brashly issued during a period in which the Department was proclaiming a self-imposed restriction.

Similarly, BLM did not feel that the 1947 regulations or the suspension order related specifically to cooperative lands; that is, lands withdrawn for conservation management by the States. The view of the Fish and Wildlife Service again was wholly divergent.

These conflicts account for virtually all of the leasing activity following issuance of the BLM memorandum.

Of 293 leases allowed during the period, records show only 6 were on wildlife refuges. The rest were on game ranges, 222, and on cooperative lands, 65.

Four of the refuge leases were issued in error by BLM field offices which were not aware that the leases involved refuge land. The other two were approved by

former Assistant Secretary Orme Lewis on the ground that they were in full compliance with the 1947 regulations and had been nearing approval at the time the memorandum suspending further processing went out to BLM field offices.

By far the greatest number of leases issued during the period were in the Fort Peck, Mont., game range where a total of 201 was allowed. Twenty-one other leases were issued in the Kenai, Alaska, moose range.

Fort Peck, it should be noted, was originally opened to leasing by the previous administration which had allowed 241 leases in the area before this administration took office, out of a total of 612 leases in all wildlife areas, leaving a balance of 170 scattered elsewhere in the system. It is further interesting to note that no oil has been discovered at Fort Peck and no drilling is in progress there.

OTHER LEASES

Of the 65 leases allowed during the same period on cooperative lands, a total of 52 were on the Railroad Valley, Nev., refuge, owned by the Federal Government but managed in the State of Nevada. Issuance of the leases was desired by Nevada. They led to the discovery of oil and development of the first producing field in the State.

Only about 5 percent of this 140,000-acre area is used for wildlife purposes. Its value for conservation has been enhanced during the oil exploration work through the drilling of water wells by the company, the construction of dikes and the impoundment of water.

The 13 other leases allowed on State-managed cooperative lands were divided between the East Fork, Wyo., elk pasture, 7; the Sun River, Mont., elk range, 5; and the Fox Lake, Mont., waterfowl project, 1.

In no case has any of the leases issued during the period been shown to be detrimental to existing or potential wildlife values on game ranges or cooperative lands.

SUMMARY

Although oil and gas exploration and development in wildlife areas has been permissible since 1920, little interest was shown in reserves beneath these lands until after World War II which was marked by an enormous drain on the Nation's petroleum resources.

There has been a continuing program of such activity since 1947, the year the first regulations governing these leases were drawn.

There have been no flurries of leasing or accelerated activity at any particular time since then.

These facts notwithstanding, a loud claque of administration accusers has charged that former Secretary McKay threw open refuge lands to oil and gas leasing. They have attempted to give substance to their allegations by constant repetition.

Through their horrified tones and the volume of their clamor, they have sought to convey the impression that there was no such activity before this administration took office.

The record shows otherwise. Since 1920, a total of 612 leases has been granted. Previous administrations allowed 277. The present administration allowed 335.

The inference has also been that oil and gas leasing in wildlife areas is indecent, inhuman, or corrupt.

This view is evidently not shared by the Audubon Society, a renowned conservationist organization, which permits such activity on its refuges.

New regulations approved by Secretary McKay last December have been lauded by career technicians in the Department as providing the greatest measure of protection the refuge areas have enjoyed in their history.

As Secretary of the Interior, McKay obviously could not forsake one resource while catering to another. It would have been as remiss for him to ignore publicly owned oil reserves while safeguarding wildlife, as it would for him to disregard wildlife while protecting the public's rights in oil reserves under public lands.

Much has been said regarding the leasing that took place during the "stop order period."

It must be understood that the purpose of the suspension or "stop order" was to afford this administration an opportunity to study and strengthen regulations existing when it took office.

The memorandum to suspend the processing of applications was an alert to the Bureau of Land Management field offices that such a study was being undertaken.

It was intended primarily to prevent final action on any applications for leases where wildlife values would need the added protection of strengthened regulations. The memorandum did not specify to field personnel that game ranges and cooperative lands were to be excluded from consideration for leasing.

Virtually all the leases issued during this period were issued on lands located within one game range—Fort Peck—and one cooperative unit—Railroad Valley. In neither case has it been shown that any damage to wildlife values resulted or is likely to result.

Finally, it is significant to note that this entire dispute involves only 20 wildlife areas throughout the United States, or approximately 7 percent of all the areas in the system. The acreage affected comprises only about 1½ percent of all of that which has been set aside by the Nation for wildlife purposes.

Small Business, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I am impelled to express my disappointment because of the fact that the 84th Congress will pass into history without a single major legislation enactment in the interest of small business. There has been no lack of discussion on the subject of small business. It seems to me, in retrospect, that each legislative day has produced at least one speech or one statement on small business. Much of the discussion has been constructive and fair but for the most part, unfortunately, these discussions have not been concerned with legislation. However, I hasten to add that a number of statements purportedly on the subject of small business have, in fact, been attacks on President Eisenhower and the President's small-business program. Nobody has been fooled by these attacks, and particularly the small-business men themselves have not been fooled, because they know that business of every type is enjoying the greatest peacetime prosperity in the history of our country.

Many bills have been introduced to aid small business but very few have received any consideration whatsoever. A great many of these bills, had they been enacted into law, would have assured small business of further gains and the opportunity to advance to greater prosperity while maintaining a sound competitive position. I need hardly remind my colleagues that the Democrats have had complete charge of all legislative and investigative committees in both the Senate and the House. The legislative program, therefore, has been subject to the will and the control of the majority party in both Houses of Congress.

The few bills which have been reported out of committee and scheduled for further action have received the support of practically every Republican Member of the House and Senate.

THE GOOD-FAITH ISSUE

Thanks to Republican leadership in the House, one bill in which hundreds of thousands of small-business men were interested passed the House almost unanimously. This bill was strongly supported by our independent retail grocers, wholesalers, and other groups in the food industry. It was also supported by our independent druggists, tire dealers, filling-station operators, independent bakers, independent candy wholesalers, and, in fact, by practically every independent merchant in the country. This bill, as we know, proposed to amend the Robinson-Patman Act to strengthen the position of small business. It failed of passage in the Senate.

Why did not this bill, which had so much small-business support, become law? I think it is fair to say that if the acknowledged leaders of the Democratic Party had wanted this small-business bill enacted into law there would have been no question about it.

In addition to the bill designed to strengthen small business under the Robinson-Patman Act, many other bills looking toward the improvement and strengthening of our antitrust laws were introduced. However, the most important antitrust bill which affected corporate mergers failed of enactment.

CONGRESS AND SMALL BUSINESS

As I stated, I am disappointed with the legislative results for small business in the 84th Congress. This disappointment stems from the fact that constructive and remedial legislation is constantly needed to strengthen our free-enterprise system. As we all realize, most of our business institutions had

small beginnings. It is through the initiative, imagination, rugged individualism and the hard work of American businessmen that our small businesses grow and prosper. For the most part, however, this growth is possible only when the scales of opportunity are in balance, and here the Congress has a grave responsibility. This responsibility is discharged either through the passage of laws or constructive investigations which will, in fact, keep the scales of opportunity in balance.

As the elected representatives of our respective districts we in the House of Representatives are in the best position to seek out and respond to the needs of our people as these needs develop. There are certain legislative areas in which it is the sole responsibility of the House of Representatives, under the Constitution, to initiate legislation. The Constitution requires that the House originate our tax laws. Therefore, we who are Members of the House of Representatives should be especially concerned with the present unequal and inequitable Federal tax structure which bears so heavily on small business. The majority in the 84th Congress has failed to listen to the pleas of small business for equitable tax treatment under the law.

FREE ENTERPRISE AND SMALL BUSINESS—INCOME TAXES

The Federal income tax burden on small business became more apparent in the 84th Congress than ever before. Many bills were introduced which would have lessened this burden and would have had the further effect of allowing small concerns to keep pace with the urgency and necessity for growth, expansion, and modernization. The Republican Members of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House introduced tax measures as well as bills to correct many of the inequities which exist in the law applying to Government contract renegotiation. These bills, which were designed to equalize the burden of Federal taxes, were never given even passing consideration.

It can be safely assumed that our free-enterprise society, as we know it here in America, will exist only as long as small business remains. Once small business disappears from our midst then our economic system will lose its health and dynamic character.

Where would the Fords, the Chryslers, and the rest of them be if they had not been able to grow and expand under the tax structure that was in effect in the early days of their existence? Under the present tax structure there are very limited possibilities for growing businesses to make their full contribution to a prosperous economy and to the economic well-being of our Nation.

It is very generally recognized that the present tax structure makes it difficult, if not impossible, for small business to accumulate sufficient working capital to purchase up-to-date fixtures and machinery, to improve its plants and equipment, and to expand to its full potential usefulness. We must face the issue as we see it today because small business now, as well as in the past, must depend on back earnings for equity and working capital. It is practically impossible for small, closely-held businesses to have access to the capital markets. The issuance of stocks and bonds, except to a limited extent, is not a realiable source for small business financing. In order to survive the ups and downs of the economic cycle it is absolutely necessary for small business to be able to retain a fair share of earnings so that when a bad period comes it can weather the storm. Big corporations, with their vast borrowing power and with their ability to put away money because of the large capital structure, can weather the economic crises. The small business cannot. Therefore, it is our duty to make sure that small business does survive and that the tax structure is such that small business is always in a position to contribute in a full measure to our Nation's welfare.

THE SMALL-BUSINESS ISSUE?

As I mentioned earlier, measured by volume, the speeches on the subject of small business in the 84th Congress reached a new high, but certainly if legislative accomplishment for small business did not reach a new low it came pretty close to it. This was because most of the small business speeches of my Democratic friends were tirades against President Eisenhower's small-business program and were not, as they should have been, informative debates on legislation. The almost continual barrage of misstatement of fact regarding the well-being of small business under this Republican administration was only for the purpose of blowing up a false issue. False issues usually meet the fate of the Biblical house which was built upon the sands; they are destined to perish in the quicksand of untruths.

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND SMALL BUSINESS

It may have been a source of great satisfaction to some Democrats to belittle the efforts of the present administration to provide every possible aid for small business. Unfortunately, however, this belittling criticism carried with it the unhappy conclusion that business as a whole was not important to our total economy. This Democratic Party line is ridiculous from any viewpoint.. Our gross national product has now reached a record high, and to supply the things which permit us to enjoy this high standard of living there are more businesses in operation than ever before. There are more persons gainfully employed and our wages and salaries have reached unprecedented high levels in 1956. Personal income and the average weekly earnings in our factories are at the highest rate on record. All of these beacons on the road to prosperity have required the goods and services of our total business population. The most important point to remember is that small business has contributed its part and has shared in this unprecedented era of prosperity which has brought with it the highest standard of living in our history.

The vast majority of the people of this country are interested in results. The important thing, of course, is to have a program—that you must have before you can achieve results. President Eisenhower and his administration have had a program for small business which has been earnestly and forcefully put forward. This administration, under the laws previously enacted by the Congress and to the extent of its executive powers, has made it possible for small business to more nearly fulfill its vital role in our business life.

The President himself has stated that small business must remain the bulwark of our economy. President Eisenhower, in furtherance of his conviction, has established a Cabinet Committee on Small Business to study its problems and to make recommendations for both legislative proposals and administrative action. The Eisenhower administration realizes that even during our most prosperous times some smaller business concerns will have their problems, many arising from unfair competition.

The Eisenhower administration is keenly aware that our economy and our way of life will continue to be strong and to flourish as long as our businessmen possess their skills, their inventiveness, their initiative, and their desire to compete one against the other. This administration has and will supplement these sterling qualities of our businessmen by making certain that everyone plays the game fairly and by rendering particular assistance to small firms. We Republicans know beyond any doubt that a vigorous and healthy small-business community is one of the best assurances we have for the continued success and prosperity of our Nation.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Small Business Administration, an independent agency of the Government and responsible in the executive department only to the President himself, has been the keystone of the President's program. As chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business in the 83d Republican Congress, it was my privilege to introduce the bill which became the Small Business Act of 1953. It was a source of great gratification to have had this legislation so strongly supported by President Eisenhower. It is equally gratifying that the Small Business Administration has had the unqualified support of our great President throughout the 3 years of its existence.

Under the direction of President Eisenhower the Small Business Administration has continually improved its services to small business and has constantly sought ways and means to broaden the scope of its operations.

The essential requirement for the success of any program is leadership. The personal interest of the President has enabled the Small Business Administration to make progress never before achieved in any other program of assistance to small business. President Eisenhower's leadership has secured for SBA a brand of cooperation from all other departments and agencies of the Government which small-business programs have sorely lacked under previous administrations. The Small Business Administration has been successful because the requisite cooperation has been forthcoming.

As we know from information which has been supplied for the record on numerous occasions, the financial program entrusted to the Small Business Administration has been increasingly effective. The small-business loan program has been constantly expanded to serve small business everywhere and in practically every line of endeavor. The operation of the disaster loan program has been outstanding. The efficiency with which the Small Business Administration has moved into disaster areas has brought much favorable comment. Such comment from those who had suffered through the tragic hours of disaster and who had witnessed the terrible loss of life and destruction of property is the best evidence of SBA's efforts to carry out its mission with no other thought but to serve—and to serve well.

The Small Business Administration's program to secure civilian and military contracts for small-business concerns has been continually improved and enlarged. The Department of Defense and the General Services Administration, the two major agencies of the Government charged with the responsibility of procurement, have, in cooperation with the Small Business Administration, broadened the opportunity for small business participation in both prime and subcontract awards. Every civilian agency including the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the Post Office Department now have small-business programs. The Department of Defense has used every proper means to encourage subcontracting with small business by the larger prime contractors. The subcontracting program has been particularly effective in the aircraft manufacturing industry. The joint agreements of the Department of Defense with SBA which permits setasides of military purchases to be reserved for the exclusive competition of small-business concerns continues to grow in dollar value as well as in small-business participants.

The management and production assistance programs have been constantly improved. These programs have enabled thousands of small businessmen to learn of new management techniques and production skills, an opportunity they would not have had except for the sound provisions in the Small Business Act of 1953, which has enabled the Small Business Administration to carry on this important work.

The Small Business Administration has been accepted as the spokesman and proponent of small business in the executive department of our Government. SBA does not have to peer through a knothole in the fence to learn the score as did its predecessor agencies. The Small Business Administration is a full-fledged member of President Eisenhower's team. It shares full membership in the President's Cabinet Committee on Small Business.

It is well, I believe, to enumerate a few of SBA's other important functions as a member of the Eisenhower team.

The SBA is a key member of the Office of Defense Mobilization's Committee for the Maintaining of the Mobilization Base.

It has a leading role in the Production Equipment program which is designed to secure maximum utilization of Government-owned and Government-procured defense tools and facilities, especially machine tools.

The SBA shares the responsibility, in an advisory capacity, for direct loans under section 302 of the Defense Production Act which are granted to expedite the performance of defense contracts.

It takes part in the programs designed to encourage and stimulate the expansion of mining and the recovery of strategic metals and minerals for the national defense.

The SBA attends, as an observer, all meetings of the Business and Defense Services Administration's Industry Advisory Committees in order to advise ODM and BDSA on any matter which may affect small business.

It provides special assistance to small business in securing priorities for scarce materials which are needed for the execution of defense contracts.

The Small Business Administration represents small-business concerns before the ODM in securing fast tax write-offs for national-defense expansion and in the replacement of facilities destroyed or damaged by disasters.

Even the most casual, but fair, observer will recognize the growing usefulness of the Small Business Administration to the small-business community. As this usefulness increases the conviction grows that the SBA should not only be an independent agency but it should be a permanent agency. I repeat, the Small Business Administration should be made a permanent, independent agency of our Government. It should not be made a political football each time the act comes up for extension. It is my purpose to introduce legislation designed to give the Small Business Administration a permanent status on the 1st day of the 85th Congress.

We must remember that the Small Business Administration is a peacetime agency, and I emphasize—the first peacetime agency exclusively devoted to the interests of small business in the history of our country. It was not born as a stopgap agency in the midst of war; it came into being in a Republican Congress with the assistance of a Republican President in recognition of the basic fact that the scales must always be kept in balance, otherwise the free-enterprise society to which we owe our allegiance might not survive.

The Bradley Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. POLK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. POLK. Mr. Speaker, the Bradley report, a report to the President by the President's Commission on Veterans Pensions, which was released on April 23, 1956, has caused grave concern to war veterans and to veterans' organizations. Veterans believe this report to the President to be a direct attack on the Federal war veterans' pension system which has been in effect in one form or another since 1818. Not since the Economy Act of 1933 have veterans been so concerned about the future of veterans pensions, disability compensation, widows and orphans allowances and other benefits granted by Congress.

I share in this concern and believe that all Members of Congress interested in veterans legislation should be alerted to the implications of the Bradley recommendations. The members of the Commission were Clarence G. Ademy, director, National Citizens Committee for Educational Television; William J. Donovan, attorney; Paul R. Hawley, director, American College of Surgeons; Martin D. Jenkins, president, Morgan State College; Theodore S. Petersen, president, Standard Oil Company of California; and John S. Thompson, vice chairman of the board, Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co. Gen. Omar N. Bradley was Chairman. The Commission made 70 specific recommendations and the report covers 410 printed pages.

I wish to call attention to certain specific statements in the report to which I cannot agree:

First. Survey data show that the overwhelming proportion of veterans believe that non-service-connected benefits should not be generally provided—page 9.

Second. Military service in time of war or peace is an obligation of citizenship and should not be considered inherently a basis for future Government benefits—page 10.

Third. It cannot justifiably be contended that all sacrifices, however small and transient, by those in the Nation's military service should establish entitlement to monetary claim and specific privileges—page 10.

Fourth. Under present-day conditions, military service in itself cannot continue to serve as a basis for special privilege—page 16.

Fifth. The Commission recommends that veterans' pension benefits be coordinated with those payable under old-age and survivors insurance. It is proposed that this be done by maintaining a separate veterans' pension program, but changing the present eligibility standards to take account of all income, including OASI but not public assistance payments, as resources in determining need for a pension—page 18.

Sixth. As measures of need, present income limits are too high and result in payment of tax-free pensions to persons who are not in genuine need—page 18.

Seventh. A disability of at least 30 percent should be required at ages below 70. Only those found incapable of rehabilitation and unemployable should be eligible for a pension—page 19.

Eighth. Military service in time of war or peace should be treated as discharging an obligation of citizenship and not of itself as a basis for future Government benefits—page 136.

Ninth. Special veterans benefits should be provided only for the significant requirements of veterans that arise

directly out of their military service—page 136.

Tenth. The ordinary or nonservice connected needs which veterans have in common with all citizens should be met wherever possible through the general welfare programs under which veterans are covered along with other people. Veterans' non-service-connected benefits should be minimized and gradually eliminated—page 137.

Eleventh. The Commission's survey of medical specialists indicated that the statutory awards for arrested tuberculosis were unwarranted and unrealistic in the light of recent advances in medical knowledge. In this survey it was also observed that other statutory awards generally were obsolete and should be abolished—pages 166–167.

Twelfth. The presumption of service connection for chronic diseases, tropical diseases, psychoses, tuberculosis, and multiple sclerosis as now listed should be withdrawn—page 178.

Thirteenth. That Government life insurance be issued to servicemen upon termination of active service only if they have a service-connected disability that will prevent them from obtaining commercial life insurance at standard rates—page 224.

Fourteenth. Under the more normal conditions now prevailing in the economy, there appears to be no need for special muster-out payments to ex-servicemen—page 339.

Fifteenth. Under present conditions of military service the degree of interruption of the educational process incurred by peacetime ex-servicemen does not warrant special programs of educational benefits—page 345.

Sixteenth. It is recommended that no special loan benefits be made available for peacetime ex-servicemen—page 346.

Seventeenth. Within the not too distant future a separate veterans' pension program should no longer be necessary—page 372.

Eighteenth. The test of impairment at ages 65 to 70 should be made more realistic by requiring at least a 30-percent disability. Pension applicants should be required to register with the State employment service. The fulfillment of this requirement should be attested by a statement from the veteran's employment representative that efforts made to place the applicant have not been successful. Applicants for pensions at ages below 55 and those aged 55 or over who claim to be unemployable due to a disability which is of a lesser degree than that required for a pension at their age should be referred to the Federal State Vocational Rehabilitation Service—pages 388–389.

The 18 statements and recommendations I have mentioned are not all of the statements and recommendations in the Bradley report to which I object, but they are typical of the many bad features of this report.

I strongly object to the philosophy which runs throughout the report, that military service in time of war or peace is similar to any other type of employment and not of itself causing any obligation on the Federal Government for special benefits or pensions. It is difficult for me to understand how a commission made up of reasonable men could come to this conclusion. It is contrary to American principles and traditions and must be repudiated by action in the next Congress.

I want to assure all veterans, their widows and dependents, and all veterans' organizations that I shall strongly oppose all Bradley report recommendations which would deprive any veteran, widow, or dependent of any benefits now in effect. Many veterans' benefits should be increased and substantially liberalized.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for inclusion among the memorial tributes to the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, an evaluation of his public service made near the end of his first term in the Senate in 1946.

There being no objection, the evaluation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE: A 1946 ESTIMATE

Six short years ago a tall, studious county judge stepped down from the bench of the criminal court in Raleigh County, W. Va., waved goodby to his many friends and departed for Washington, D. C., to take a seat in the Nation's highest legislative body.

Official as well as unofficial Washington greeted the new United States Senator, Harley Martin Kilgore, with a feeling marked more by relief than by enthusiasm. They were tired of Rush D. Holt, the boy Senator from West Virginia.

Few in the Nation's Capitol personally knew the new Senator and none of them expected him to gain the limelight, but the folks back in the hills of West Virginia knew Harley Kilgore as a level-headed judge, and they felt confident that he would occupy his new position with dignity sans publicity schemes that cast reflection on the entire Mountain State.

It is impossible to crowd the whole story of the past 6 years in a few paragraphs; so much has been accomplished by the energetic, straight-shooting ex-judge that it seems as if it would have been impossible for one man to do so much in such a short period of time.

Last spring Life magazine, in a candid review of all Senators up for reelection this fall, pointed to Senator Kilgore's rapid rise from a county judgeship to an outstanding position in the United States Senate. It cited his connection with vital legislation and closed with "Opinion: one of the able Senators on the Democratic side."

Life's survey was not so kind to the majority of the other Senators up for reelection, but this praise, and other which has been voiced by countless newspapers, came as no surprise to official Washington which has watched the West Virginian step into national prominence with solid constructive legislative work, not to overlook an abundance of courage to move ahead despite the objections of the well-financed, powerful pressure groups.

When the history of the past 6 years is written few names will appear more prominent than that of the forwardlooking, visionary 53-year-old legislator from the hills of West Virginia who has taken the initiative with amazing foresight in many cases on almost every major issue effecting the destiny of this Nation and the welfare of its people. A Hollywood writer could use a book of adjectives describing this friendly, down-to-earth legislator who believes in legislating for the good of mankind rather than special groups, but the real test is to pick out the important pieces of constructive legislation of the past 6 years. In virtually every case you'll find Kilgore's name in the foreground.

He has fought for a better America, a land of real opportunity with full employment for all who want to work, a land of adequate housing for all, a land without fear and hunger, a land where freemen can work and live in a society governed for the many rather than for the selfish few.

When he came to Washington early in 1941, the tall, bespectacled man who had presided over the Raleigh County criminal court for 8 years with a feeling of understanding and fairness for all, was forcibly struck by the slowness and confusion of our defense program. A veteran of World War I, he knew the horrible price we paid for confusion in that earlier day and he was determined to do everything possible to assure his folks back home that they did not have to pay again for the same mistakes.

Although a freshman Senator, he was appointed to the Truman committee, the famous special committee investigating the national defense program, where he earned the reputation of being a fearless investigator and leader. Brushing aside the one-sided reports of the brass-hats, who had been trying to conceal errors, Kilgore and other members of the special committee went to the scene to get the true facts.

Long a student of military supply problems, Kilgore was able to make quick, accurate decisions, adding measurably to the committee studies which, according to conservative estimates, saved the Government millions of dollars in war costs by exposing inefficiencies and irregularities. But he was not satisfied. On October 13, 1942, the Senate gave him the go-ahead signal on his resolution calling for an investigation of the mobilization of technological resources for war, and the now famous Kilgore committee was born. Immediately it plunged into its huge task, and in the spring of 1943 the first report was issued. It was a hard hitting, tough report, citing the urgent need for basic policy integration, to replace the tragic muddled confusion of that day.

Kilgore wanted an overall agency to plan and supervise the gigantic production job. He held lengthy conferences with President Roosevelt who later issued an Executive order establishing the Office of War Mobilization. The West Virginia Senator was on his way to national prominence.

But, instead of resting on his past laurels, he fought on to establish the rights of the veterans who were caught up in a hodgepodge created by brass hats, and to speed war production.

The heads of major war agencies were called in and quizzed closely at length, then he sat down with his coworkers and drafted clear-cut plans to speed up the war program. At the same time he showed great courage by denouncing big businesses which in the early war days were reluctant to convert to the production of war material because they were reaping rich rewards by manufacturing civilian products.

While unsnarling redtape and speeding the flow of materials so vital to the prosecution of the war effort, Kilgore and his colleagues ran into monopolies and cartels

which had tied up and, in many cases, virtually stifled production through devious world agreements that benefited a few men but kept other areas virtually in bondage.

Vitally interested in technological studies since his boyhood days in the oilfields of north central West Virginia, the freshman Senator launched a widely acclaimed probe of monopolies and world cartels which, as Kilgore's exposure clearly showed, had placed artificial restrictions on the use of the resources of the world and produced waste and want and war.

This work on cartels saved America millions of dollars. The huge cartels in drugs, synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and others, could not escape his scrutiny. He shocked the Nation when he exposed the gasoline cartel which enable Japan, an enemy, to get technological secrets unavailable even to our own Government. He saved the folks at home untold sums of money when he brought out the facts about the Argentine-Britain leather cartels which kept shoe prices at artificially high prices.

Before V-E Day his committee unearthed conclusive evidence that the "German aggressors have begun to pursue a strategy which they found successful a quarter of a century ago; they are already deploying their economic reserves throughout the world in preparation for a third attempt at world domination." Calling for world cooperation based on good faith, the West Virginian reminded his colleagues that it could not be accomplished until we established a clear-cut policy of denazification, political and economic. The fight has not been won, but major steps have been taken in the right direction because Kilgore had the ability and courage to speak up.

Senator Claude Pepper summed up this work in a speech on the floor of the Senate in which he declared:

"The able Senator from West Virginia has rendered an immeasurable service to his country and to democracy and free enterprise in the world by the splendid work which he has done in respect to international cartels."

While carrying on his battle for international peace, he was not unmindful of the problems of the working people at home. He fully realized that they would suffer most in the postwar period unless we had a clear, workable plan for reconversion, and after weeks of study he drafted the reconversion bill, the only overall measure to "fully utilize our manpower and materials in the war effort" and direct their return to our civilian economy in a sane, well-planned manner.

Advocates of speedy termination of all war controls, as well as production contracts, virtually sabotaged his measure. Unable to kill its lofty purposes, because of strong public support, they eliminated the means of attaining these goals, and today we are reaping the seeds of destruction and unrest planted by those more interested in "fat profits" than the welfare of the average worker.

Recently, during a lull in a heated Senate debate, a Senator remarked that if "Congress had listened to Harley Kilgore back in 1944 we might not be facing the controversial problems of controls, housing, wages, working conditions, and social security in this unrestful reconversion era."

The housing industry is following outdated procedures, Kilgore told leaders in that field, and "it should modernize, utilizing production techniques developed during the war, to speed the construction of the homes so badly needed in America today." Slowly his suggestions are becoming realities, but in too many cases the progress is painfully slow.

In this field of technological study, the West Virginian pointed out that railroads should adopt radio devices for speed and safety. When the railroad owners replied that they did not have radio frequencies, Kilgore, a man of action, induced the FCC to grant the channels and within 3 months from that date more applications for radio channels had been filed with the FCC by the railroads than during the past 17 years. This is a small but typical example of the constructive work performed by this capable West Virginian.

The former high-school principal, who received his law degree from West Virginia University 32 years ago, sold the scientists of the Nation on the idea of working together and planning for full utilization of the sciences for the national benefit, and he is the father of the National Science Foundation measure to promote scientific research so badly needed in this atomic age.

How could one man accomplish so many things? Mrs. Lois Kilgore, the Senator's charming wife, supplies the answer: "By working 16 and 18 hours a day, 7 days a week." Those who have worked with Kilgore concur with her, but they still can't understand how he keeps up his grueling pace which has worn out many younger men.

A son of a pioneer oil and gas driller in West Virginia, Kilgore grew up in the rugged pioneer oil and gas fields. After receiving his law degree from West Virginia University he taught school, then moved to Raleigh County to practice law. Later his friends induced him to seek the Democratic nomination for judge of the Raleigh County criminal court.

He won the nomination and was elected in 1932 and reelected in 1938.

Deeply interested in youth problems, Kilgore was one of the leaders in establishing Boys State in West Virginia, and time and time again he advocated the establishment of industrial trade school for boys. Hobbies include his great love for the history of the Civil War, on which he is considered an expert, and military supply problems. He is an omnivorous reader.

Today he lives with his wife in a quiet suburban section of Washington. Their daughter, Elinor, is married, and their son, Robert, is just home from duty with the Army in the Philippines. Mrs. Kilgore personally manages the household and tries without success to make her husband slow down.

The folks back home in West Virginia are deeply proud of their great Senator. Last fall Gov. Clarence W. Meadows voiced their sentiments in these well-chosen words:

"When the people of West Virginia sent Harley Kilgore to the United States Senate we who knew him best and most intimately felt deep down in our hearts that he possessed innate ability and a wealth of human understanding; but his outstanding accomplishments as United States Senator have far transcended even our fondest hopes."

Biennial Report to Pennsylvania's 19th District Constituents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has closed. When we look back over the months since January 1955, it looms as a constructive, progressive Congress, with its accomplishments far outweighing the disappointments.

Perhaps the greatest accomplishment of the 84th Congress has been to disprove, forever, the belief, widely publicized in the fall of 1954, that when the legislative branch is controlled by one political party and the executive another, a cold war must inevitably follow.

This has been true in past years; certainly a cold war existed during the 80th Congress. It may be true again in future years. But I am proud that the leadership of my party, the Democratic Party, in the House and in the other body, recognizes the responsibilities of service in a free society and upon that basis worked cooperatively with a Republican President in order to meet the problems of the day.

There have been many instances during the past 19 months when the majority in the Congress has not seen eye to eye with the President. In some instances our differences were fundamental and could not be resolved. In most instances we sought the common meeting ground so that a constructive, progressive effort resulted.

Instances where we failed include the matter of tax reduction. We Democrats were and remain firmly convinced that the national economy is best served by granting relief to the individual taxpayer. The administration was and remains just as firmly convinced that the right way to go about granting tax relief is to do it in such a manner that 90 cents of every reduction dollar benefits those with the highest incomes. We declined to give in because a matter of fundamental principle was involved. The result was no decrease in taxation. This was a disappointment.

Another "no compromise" area involves conservation of natural resources. We Democrats believe in a forthright, forward-looking program of development and conservation of resources for the benefit of all the people. The Eisenhower administration, by its actions, demonstrates that it believes in giving these resources for exploitation to special interest groups. In the absence of a forward-looking program from the administration, we have only accomplished negative results; we have halted the give-aways except those which may be accomplished by administrative procedures. We were able to force the administration to back up on its proposal to destroy the Dinosaur National Monument through its insistence upon including the Echo Canyon Dam in the upper Colorado project. This Congress saved this great educational and recreational area for the benefit of all the people, and thus has earned the gratitude of naturalists, sportsmen, and others devoted to preservation of great national parks, forests, and monuments. We have refused to compromise on this issue and the people are the benefactors. They will not, however, reap fullest benefits from these policies until the administration either changes its policies or is replaced.

There are several outstanding areas where common ground was sought, discovered, and where positive action was taken. One such instance was the highway program. Mr. Eisenhower recommended a moderate highway construction program. This was a program which we accepted and expanded. He also recommended a complicated system of

budgetary legerdemain for financing the program which, at first glance, would have left the sacred cow budget with a paper balance, but would have saddled the taxpayers with terrific interest payments for years to come. For every dollar spent on highways, taxpayers would have been paying more than a dollar in interest. In the name of roads for the American people the administration was actually putting the New York investment bankers on easy street.

In contrast, the Democratic leadership in the Congress came up with a pay-as-you-go highway program under which every dollar collected for road construction will be spent on road construction. From this program which the administration finally went along with the people will benefit.

Another area where a common ground was sought involved minimum wages. We Democrats suggested an increase to $1.25 per hour. President Eisenhower recommended 90 cents. Throughout lengthy committee consideration, and throughout the debate in the House, the President remained obdurate. A veto was hinted. However, we compromised and the President did not go through with his veto. The result is that we now have a minimum of $1 per hour. This makes it possible for industries such as we have in the 19th Congressional District of Pennsylvania to compete on a more equitable basis with rivals from low-wage areas.

President Eisenhower has painted a picture of himself as being most concerned with matters of foreign policy—a field in which he felt his training as a career Army officer eminently qualified him. He considers the conduct of foreign policy, the creation of new policies where needed, and all aspects of our relations with the other nations of the world, to be the most important task he faces.

In this vital field, instead of being faced with a cold war in the Congress, Mr. Eisenhower has enjoyed far, far more cooperation and support from the 84th Congress, controlled by the Democratic Party, than he ever enjoyed from the 83d Congress, controlled by the Republican Party.

In fact, if we may believe the recently published authorized story of the Eisenhower administration by Richard Donovan—and it is pertinent to note that there have been no disavowals—the opposition of his own leadership in the Congress was so great that, at one time, the President toyed with the idea of forming a new party.

Contrariwise, on the key votes in the 84th Congress, we Democrats have given General Eisenhower a greater share of our votes than he has received from his own party.

Early in the 84th Congress we spoke to the President, through the record of our proceedings, informing him of our constructive, positive approach to foreign policy. We assured him that we would earnestly follow the belief that partisanship ceases when we reach the Nation's borders. We pledged that we would not seek out the petty as the basis for carping criticism and demagoguery, the warp and the woof of Republican Party attitudes when Mr. Truman and Mr. Roosevelt were in the White House.

This is not to say that we abrogated our responsibility as the loyal opposition. We have criticized tactics; we have criticized the smugness, the wishing-will-make-it-so-isms of Mr. Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles; we have criticized such contradictions as the recent series of Eisenhower-Dulles-Nixon-Dulles statements when the independent nations were praised, castigated, praised, castigated, and then praised in virtually that sequence; we have criticized the lack of forceful leadership here in the United States by Mr. Eisenhower in behalf of the things that must be done—the hard decisions that inevitably must be made.

We have urged the President to chart bold, new courses in the pursuit of peace, and promised our backing and support in these. When he has gently swayed in this direction, that backing and support have been forthcoming. We, in the Congress, cannot be blamed for the inertia of the White House.

Mr. Speaker, it is pertinent to point out that the record of the 84th Congress has earned such complimentary descriptions as a "do something Congress," a "constructive Congress," a "hard working Congress," and similar phrases from leading newspapers and such outstanding reporters as Roscoe Drummond, of the pro-Eisenhower New York Herald Tribune, Drew Pearson, and many others.

In addition to legislation already mentioned, the record shows that we legislated for the people in many other instances.

We have expanded coverage of the Social Security Act to include many self-employed professionals, and liberalized its benefits to women, dependent children and the disabled. We have extended and expanded the hospital construction program, and pioneered new health protection and research programs. We have provided for the training of an increased number of nurses. We initiated the Salk polio-vaccine program under which needy children and expectant mothers may be inoculated against the long dreaded disease. The Congress tightened up laws to control narcotics, and provided for discretionary death penalty for sales of illicit drugs to minors.

Of particular value to the people of the 19th District of Pennsylvania, where prosperity is based, in part, upon the well-being of many small industries, has been our efforts in behalf of small business. Faced with the tremendous number of mergers during the past several years, accompanied by a sharp increase in outright business failures, we have stiffened penalties for violation of antitrust laws, gave the Government right to sue for recovery of damages, and curbed activities of bank-holding companies.

In the House we adopted a measure to plug a loophole permitting discriminatory price practices; another to require advance notice to the Government of a merger; and both Houses adopted legislation to free the local automobile dealer from the shackles of the manufacturer under existing stifling trade practices.

In the field of agriculture we enacted a soil-bank plan, giving the Government an additional weapon to use to combat a farm depression; we expanded and extended the school-milk program over early opposition by the Department of Agriculture; we provided an expansion of the Agricultural and Trade Development Act; we liberalized the farm-loan program; and expanded the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

We passed, but the President vetoed, a bill which would permit farmers who raise their own feed grains to plant unlimited acreage.

We passed a bill, of which I was a cosponsor, granting the farmer relief from special taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels when they are used in vehicles operated on the farm.

We adopted many measures in the field of national security and foreign affairs—two functions of the Government which are very closely related—which have strengthened both. By stepping up the procurement of intercontinental A-bombers we have attempted to retrieve some of the ground lost by the early budget philosophy of the administration. We have, and this is most important, strengthened the President's hand in carrying out his constitutional function in foreign affairs.

There follows a compilation of my record on key matters:

VOTED FOR

Reorganization and strengthening military reserves.

Stepped up procurement international A-bombers and jet fighters.

Special funds to prevent drastic cut in Marine Corps.

Increased funds for aircraft control and warning system.

$1.4 billion naval-construction program, including A-powered ships.

Measures to strengthen internal security.

Mutual-security program.

Study and revision of United States foreign-policy programs.

Resolution opposing admission of Red China to United Nations.

Resolution to strengthen hand of President in Far East.

Added protection to workers and industries harmed by foreign competition.

Government Reorganization Act of 1955—implementing Hoover Commission.

Improved budgeting and accounting practices in Government—Hoover Commission.

Code of fair practices for congressional committees.

Salary increases for postal and other Federal employees.

Improvements to Civil Service Retirement Act.

Improvements under Railroad Retirement Act.

Reorganization and improvement of Foreign Service.

More effective civil-rights program.

Income-tax reduction for average taxpayer.

Plugging $5 billion loophole in 1954 tax law.

Increase in minimum wage.

Long-range highway program.

More protection for small business against unfair price practices.

Good-faith bill favoring local automobile dealers.
Anti-bid-shopping contracting bill.
Incentive pay increases and allowances for military personnel.
Continued accumulation of GI school benefits by servicemen.
Fair compensation for veterans and dependents.
Agricultural Act of 1956.
Freeing cattle and poultry farmers from restrictions on growing own feed—sponsored.
Relief for farmers from excise taxes on gasoline and other motor fuels used on farm—sponsored.
Repeal of acreage allotment ACP tie-in provisions of 1953 Agriculture Act—sponsored.
Relief of apple growers from Federal price practices.
Increased sales of agricultural surpluses for foreign currencies.
Extension and expansion of school milk program.
Liberalization of farm loan programs.
Improved conservation research.
Extended and expanded brucellosis eradication program.
Retirement at age 50, under social security, for disabled.
Retirement at age 62, under social security, for women.
Increased benefits to aged and infirm under social security act.
Federal aid to school construction—general.
Federal aid to school construction and maintenance—impact areas.
Federal aid to Carlisle Joint School District for new high school.
Federal aid to make Salk miracle anti-polio vaccine available to needy children and expectant mothers.
Expanded programs for medical-dental research, hospital construction.
Four year airport construction program.
Strengthened prohibition against mailing indecent literature.
Increased penalties for peddling dope to children.
Improved housing program.
Prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight.

VOTED AGAINST

Higher gas bills for consumers.
Higher costs for mailing letters.
Higher feed grain prices for 19th District cattle and poultry men.
Higher subsidies for big airlines.
Socialized transportation in Nation's Capital.

Backward in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned with the tense situation on Cyprus and with the problem which will face the United States at the next United Nations General Assembly. I have been a long time supporter of self-determination for Cyprus in accordance with traditional principles of American foreign policy. I would like to draw the attention of the Congress to the following letter, which appeared in the Baltimore Sun, July 22, 1956, which sheds light on the latest developments. It is to be noticed that its author, Lord Winster, a member of the British House of Lords, is a former colonial Governor of Cyprus—1947–50:

BACKWARD IN CYPRUS
(By Lord Winster)

We have had to wait a very long time for the Government's final (for the time being) decision on Cyprus. Now that we have got it we find that far from taking us nearer to a settlement it is a step backward.

I happened to be speaking in Bristol the day following the announcement when I described it as a "bankruptcy of statesmanship discreditable to the Prime Minister, Foreign Secretary and, above all, to the Colonial Secretary." I added, "The Colonial Secretary, Mr. Lennox-Boyd, has been to me a great disappointment. When he was appointed I thought we should make some progress in colonial policy, but he seems to have reverted to the ideas of Joseph Chamberlain and Rudyard Kipling."

Chamberlain's contribution to thought on colonial matters was to say "the day of small nations has passed away; the day of empires has come." Could a man have been more fatally wrong? Hardly. But we always have our Bourbons with us who neither forget nor learn anything and in the direct line of descent from Chamberlain the present Governor of Cyprus announced in May this year: "Narrow nationalism is out of date."

On the contrary, the small nations and their nationalism are the worldwide problem of today. Perhaps in the course of his soldiering the Governor has not had time to notice that by her signature to the Atlantic Charter, Britain has undertaken to "respect the rights of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live."

What the Government statement boils down to is just this—they are allowing Turkey to rule the roost and decide the issue. This is running true to form, for the English like Johnny Turk and are, at best, lukewarm about the Greek. Which is odd because the Turk fought against us in World War I, when he inflicted unspeakable barbarities upon the men who surrendered at Kut, and was neutral in World War II.

Look at what has happened. Two of the most important and influential members of the Cabinet are the Foreign Secretary and the Lord Chancellor. And there is a doctrine known as collective Cabinet responsibility, which means that if there are disagreements inside the Cabinet room all agree, nevertheless, to present a united front in public in upholding the majority decision. It was enunciated with great brevity and clarity by Lord Melbourne, who, after a protracted wrangle, declared, "It doesn't matter what we say provided we all say the same thing."

Last December the Foreign Secretary, then Mr. Macmillan, in the House of Commons officially conceded the right of self-determination to the Cypriots, a 180-degree turn in policy. In June of this year the Lord Chancellor said of Cyprus in a public speech, "Turkey has a stronger claim to it. And yet they say we should give way to a campaign (in Cyprus) fostered by a few militant clerics."

The Lord Chancellor is the keeper of the Queen's conscience, but I think it is his own conscience which most needs a keeper. He contradicts in public a statement made with Cabinet authority by the Foreign Secretary and deliberately falsifies the situation in Cyprus by representing it as an affair of "a few militant clerics," whereas it is now a genuinely national movement.

On this count alone how can one expect Cypriots, seeing these contradictions, to have any belief in the good faith of Eden's government? Turkey having scented these differences has become progressively more intransigent. A member of the Government incurred severe criticism for being credited, somewhat inaccurately, with having in the past said never in regard to the Cyprus claim for self-determination. In fact, he was made a scapegoat of, dismissed from office and kicked upstairs to the Lords. But the same Government has now endorsed Turkey's right to say never to the Greek Cypriots' claim to self-determination and to a majority in a Cypriot-elected legislative assembly.

In that connection we have another instance of the Government's bad faith. At the tripartite conference last autumn the Foreign Secretary, speaking of the proposed legislative assembly, envisaged "an assembly with an elected majority, a proportionate quota of seats being reserved for the Turkish community." The words "proportionate quota" are meaningless unless they imply that Mr. Macmillan quite properly assumed that an elected majority must be Greek.

Our representative at the United Nations last September took matters a little further by saying of a future Cypriot Government that "a proportion of the ministerial portfolios would be reserved for that (Turkish) community." Yet when Archbishop Makarios, during the abortive negotiations with Field Marshal Harding, claimed that "representation in the Assembly will be proportional to the constitution of the population," the negotiations broke down on that point; it was discovered after 5 months of negotiation that the archbishop was a bad character unfit to be negotiated with and he was deported.

Lord Radcliffe, now in Cyprus to discuss a constitution for the island, has been sent by the government on a sleeveless errand. I described it in my speech at Bristol as "a waste of time. He could not talk to the Governor and other officials. Who will be the Cypriots he will talk to?"

Already the news shows that Lord Radcliffe is finding that out. In any case, he could only hear and find out what is already known ad nauseam. The only good result of his visit would be if he comes home and tells the Prime Minister that what they have been saying who know Cyprus far better than Eden, the Foreign Secretary and the Colonial Secretary, is true—that any hope of a political settlement rests upon reopening negotiations with the archbishop and ceasing to dishonor our commitments about self-determination and a Greek majority in the Assembly.

Hon. Charles B. Deane

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, July 23, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, we will miss our colleague, CHARLIE DEANE, who will not be with us in the next session of Congress. He has ably, diligently, and zealously served the people of the Eighth District of North Carolina and the people of the United States during the past 10 years as a Member of Congress.

He was an industrious legislator, and took a keen interest in all legislation having to do with the public welfare and the advancement of our free way of life. He has an unusually keen and perceptive mind and always displayed aggressive energy in tackling troublesome issues. CHARLIE DEANE is a statesman, a man of integrity, and he is held in high esteem by his colleagues.

I join with all my colleagues in wishing CHARLIE DEANE success and the very best of good fortune in the years that lie ahead.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion of the work of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, entitled "Names in the News: Senator Harley M. Kilgore," by Helen Thomas, of the United Press Radio's Washington bureau, April 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NAMES IN THE NEWS: SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE

(By Helen Thomas)

It's been tough sledding for the President's Fair Deal program in the Senate this session.

But administration Democrats can point to at least one major victory this year. That's the passage of liberalized displaced persons bill. And a lot of the credit can go to Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, who sponsored the measure. Kilgore calls it a good, workable bill. A down-the-line fighter for the administration, he predicts Senate and House conferees will have little trouble resolving minor differences on the bill.

The 57-year-old Democrat is roly-poly in appearance, round faced and friendly by nature and a down-the-line fighter for the administration.

Kilgore has a popular following among the West Virginia coal miners and is ardently prolabor. He voted against the Taft-Hartley law and believes it has proved to be a handicap in the field of collective bargaining.

The genial Senator also supports the President's civil-rights program, although he fears it will be stymied by a filibuster in the Senate.

And he's all for a foreign policy which calls for spending whatever's necessary.

"It's better to spend money now to help our neighbors," he says, "than to spend lives later."

Kilgore was one of the first from his home to join up in World War I, and was honorably discharged with the rank of captain in 1920.

For 10 years afterward, he commanded a National Guard battalion. During those years, Kilgore recalls how difficult it was to get Government support to keep military equipment from going to ruin. He's all for a big defense program and believes in keeping Western Europe strong.

Kilgore was born at Brown, W. Va., and graduated from West Virginia University Law School at the age of 21. He was defeated for the first political job he went after—that of county clerk.

The lawmaker's easygoing manner and his ability to tell a story have helped his political campaigns. He's warmhearted and West Virginians don't mind calling him at any hour of the night on various matters.

The balding Kilgore has a slight fringe of gray hair ringing the back of his head. He has small blue eyes and a ruddy complexion. He smokes chain fashion and is quite a gum chewer.

Kilgore was elected to the Senate in 1940 and lost no time in making a name for himself. A few months after arriving in Washington he introduced a bill which would have created the Office of War Mobilization. The late President Roosevelt didn't wait for congressional action on the measure, however. He thought the idea was so good he created it by Executive order.

The Senator is best known for his work on the War Investigating Committee which President Truman once headed. Kilgore was elected chairman of that group in 1946. His committee traveled more than 100,000 miles holding hearings, inspections, and conferences in all parts of the United States, in Alaska and Germany. Kilgore and Mr. Truman are cronies from way back. The President knows he can count on the West Virginian to fight for his program.

Kilgore took the lead in sponsoring a broad program for the reconversion of the United States from war to peace. As a member of the Investigating Committee during the war, he helped conduct numerous hearings on oil and steel monopolies and cartel agreements.

"We never made public charges until they were thoroughly substantiated by the evidence," he explains. "And most of our work was carried on in executive session."

He believes the current investigation of communism in the State Department has been harmful to the conduct of foreign relations because of what he calls unproven headline charges.

Pictures of his political colleagues and Cabinet officers line the walls of his office. One wall, however, is reserved for the family. On it are pictures of his daughter and son, both married, and his three grandchildren.

Kilgore is a student of Civil War history and he loves to fish, although he never seems to find time for it any more.

The administration is happy to have Senator Kilgore around. He's one of its right-hand men.

Congressman Wolverton's Seniority in Congress Helps First Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, my decision to be a candidate for reelection to Congress is based upon a desire to serve and with the thought that my long experience in Congress can be helpful in solving problems arising in these exceptional times.

I think all will agree that experience in any line of endeavor can prove beneficial in the fulfillment of the duties of that particular activity. This is particularly true in matters of legislation. Furthermore, in legislative bodies seniority is highly important. It naturally increases usefulness and influence.

As a result of the seniority I have gained by continuity of service I have become the ranking member of one of the most important committees of the House of Representatives, namely, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. And, in the opinion of many, it is the most important of all the committees from the standpoint of legislative duties.

The importance of this committee arises from the numerous and varied subjects of great importance to our Nation and its people which come within its legislative jurisdiction. There is no committee of the House that has such an extensive jurisdiction as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was one of the first committees of Congress, having been established in 1795, and it has had a continuous existence from that time to the present.

The committee has jurisdiction over all types of transportation, including railroads, buses, and trucks; all forms of communication, including radio, television, telephone, telegraph, and cables; civil aviation, both domestic and foreign; public health in all its many and varied activities to promote the health of our people, including research activities relating to heart, cancer, mental and circulatory diseases, cerebral palsy, muscular distrophy, arthritis, nervous diseases, and many others; advanced scientific endeavor by means of the National Science Foundation, the Bureau of Standards, and kindred organizations; the Fair Trade Commission, to guarantee fairness and truth in business; the Federal Power Commission, to control and regulate the interchange of electric power across State lines; food and drug legislation to guarantee and make certain of the quality of all such for public consumption; laws governing administration and disposition of alien property taken over from enemy countries during the last war; welfare legislation; railroad retirement and Mediation Service, and all activities pertaining to the welfare of railroad labor. These and many other activities indicate the wide scope of the work of this committee and its importance to the people, not only of the First Congressional District of New Jersey but throughout the Nation.

It has been a privilege and an honor to represent the First Congressional District for 15 terms in the Congress of the United States. During this period of time we have experienced high prosperity, so-called, in the late twenties, followed by a depression period that brought us to the very depths of distress. Then, before we had fully recovered from the depression came World War II and the Korean conflict. These brought postwar problems affecting our veterans and every other segment of our people.

All of these conditions have presented their particular problems for solution. The experience gained by participating in their solution and in others that have arisen cannot be otherwise than helpful in dealing with new problems in the future. In addition, there have been the problems incident to communism and

our endeavor to maintain peace in the world.

In all of my service as a Member of Congress I have striven to render the best possible service to all of our people regardless of political affiliation or partisanship. By word and by deed I have sought to do that which I thought was right and for the best interest of the First Congressional District and its people. In recent months I have worked diligently to bring work to the New York shipyard. I led the fight against increased bridge tolls and against the Philadelphia wage tax. I shall continue to do so. I backed pay raises for postal and other Government workers, and assisted in obtaining funds for the deepening of the Delaware River channel to the end that the district may take on increased importance. These are only a few of what I consider worthwhile things done for the welfare of our people.

I will consider it a great honor to continue to serve the First Congressional District. I pledge my best endeavors at all times to do in the future, as I have done in the past, that which is in the best interest of our people and which will tend most surely to promote their welfare.

James L. E. Jappe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. BENDER
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Alvin Silverman, the political editor of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, about my good friend, Mr. James L. E. Jappe, which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on July 26, 1956.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECALLS 1924 CONVENTION IN PUBLIC HALL

(By Alvin Silverman)

James L. E. Jappe, the eminent lobbyist, fisherman and aid to GOP national committee, is about to leave for his 10th Republican national convention.

This is a span that carries him within a soft wedge shot of the party's first convention 100 years ago, when a fellow named A. Lincoln was defeated for the vice presidential nomination.

So the reporter, no green hand at avoiding work, said to Mr. Jappe: "Mr. Jappe, which convention had the most impact on the American people?"

And Mr. Jappe, a man of a few thousand well-chosen words, replied, to wit as follows:

JAPPE NOW PITCHING

In my opinion, the Republican national convention here in Cleveland in 1924 had greater impact on the Nation than any of the eight others I have attended.

It was the first national convention after the adoption of the 19th amendment, giving women nationwide suffrage. It was the first convened by a Republican national committee that had as many women members as men. It was the first to have several hundred women delegates.

Among the 585 accredited representatives of the press on hand was William Jennings Bryan, who boasted that he was the first Democratic presidential candidate to cover a Republican National Convention. Another was Will Rogers, who wrote that "this is the first vice presidential convention in the history of politics," a quip based on the certainty that the convention would make President Coolidge the head of its ticket.

Incidentally, it became the first to nominate a man for the Vice Presidency, only to have him reject the nomination. The man was Frank O. Lowden.

SOUND AND FURY

Far and away the most important first was the application of new developments in electronics to convention facilities and functions. After thorough investigation and discussion, the national committee decided to install in Cleveland's Public Hall a public-address system and radio broadcasting equipment.

Before the opening session, Senator Theodore E. Burton visited the auditorium to try out "that new voice machine." He was to be the temporary chairman and he brought his keynote address with him.

The Senator had a national reputation as an orator. When he blasted into the microphone, the hall boomed and reverberated. He pressed his hands to his ears. It took fast talk to convince him that the engineers had set the volume too high for the empty house. After Burton addressed the convention, however, he received an ovation. Every word carried clear to all 12,000 people in the hall.

At one end of the speakers' platform was a desk holding a thing that looked like an oversize telephone. The desk, having a low glass enclosure on three sides, was occupied by a slight, intense young man with hearing gear on his head.

He seemed to listen much more than he talked and he spoke in a low quick, vibrant voice. H· was doing a first-time feat, giving a play-by-play story of the convention to millions of radio listeners. He was picking up speeches and applause, music and demonstrations for the largest audience that one person had had up to that time. This man was Graham McNamee, who quickly became America's best known reporter.

ONE MAN'S OPINION

For the first time, the people back home experienced a sense of participation in a national political convention. Among the radio listeners were many who used the long distance telephone or the telegraph to express themselves to their delegates.

Senator Burton was delighted. He said to me: "We Republicans have taken politics out of the smoke-filled room and into the light of the living room. That will be good for the country and for every citizen."

The true measure of the impact of the 1924 convention on the Nation is this: The vote at the presidential election exceeded that for 1920 by more than 3,700,000. This tremendous increase in public interest in national affairs was due largely to the radio broadcasting.

In 1940, the Republican National Committee initiated telecasting of national conventions at Philadelphia, thus creating more interest on the part of more citizens in their Government. From 1920 to 1952, our population increased 46 percent but the number of voters at the presidential election increased 142 percent.

That's true progress for democracy (Jappe concluded) and here's hoping it will continue until every eligible citizen votes at every election.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sketch of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, which appeared in the volume Current Biography: 1943, published by the H. W. Wilson Co., New York, N. Y., and which provides, for the Senator's early career in the Senate, a valuable contemporary account.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE

To Senator Harley M. Kilgore, New Dealer from West Virginia, the mobilization of America's resources for war seems to have proceeded more or less along the lines of an experimental symphonic performance he once heard about. The musicians decided to prepare for a new symphony without the aid of a conductor and without group rehearsals, and each member of the orchestra conscientiously practiced his part by himself. Although all of them were competent performers, the results might have been predicted: "what was supposed to be a well-organized and integrated symphony turned out to be a jumble of discordant noises—without form, without pattern, without meaning." Overall planning is Senator Kilgore's recommended remedy for the analogous discord within and between war agencies over how the war is to be conducted on the domestic front.

Although Senator Kilgore has not yet been able to convince a Senatorial majority of his thesis, he is a persuasive attorney for his cause; many years of legal experience before his election to the Senate in November 1940 have served him well. Harley Martin Kilgore was born in Brown, W. Va., the son of Quimby H. and Laura Jo (Martin) Kilgore, on January 11, 1893, and he took his LL. B. from West Virginia University 21 years later. That same year, 1914, he was admitted to the West Virginia bar, and the next year he began practice at the town of Beckley in his home State.

His career as an attorney at law was interrupted shortly afterward by the First World War. In 1917, after attending the first officers' training camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind., he was commissioned a second lieutenant in the United States Army, and he served until his resignation on March 15, 1920, as a captain of Infantry. In 1922 he became a major in the West Virginia National Guard, commanding the 2d Battalion of the 150th Infantry; he was later advanced to the rank of lieutenant colonel. By this time he had returned to his law practice, and in May 1921 he had also acquired a wife; the former Lois Elaine Lilly. In January 1933 he became a judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, and he served as such until his election to the Senate.

In the Senate Kilgore quickly took his place among the liberals and supporters of the administration. He is a member of the Military Affairs and Judiciary Committees of the Senate, but is best known as chairman of the Truman committee's special subcommittee on technological mobilization and as sponsor of more than one bill designed to help mobilize America's resources, material and otherwise, for an all-out WE-.

As head of the Truman subcommittee Kilgore saw how slow were the OPM and the War Department to realize the necessity for expanding the production of certain essential items, and he came to the conclusion that over-all planning was needed on the production front. He saw instances in which scientific developments of likely value to the war program had been deliberately smothered by industry and ignored by the Government, and thus conceived the idea of an Office of Technological Mobilization that would force the licensing of patents and secret processes, promote research on new production methods, and in general, mobilize our scientific capacity in the war program. His subcommittee studied the need for more centralized manpower control as a means of alleviating the labor shortage which confronted the farms and war industries, and once more the conclusion was similar: "a definite, clear-cut manpower policy which makes sense was essential.

Other special Senate and House groups were also investigating the conduct of the war on the domestic front and were also reaching conclusions, and in November 1942 their chairmen—Senators Truman, Murray, and Pepper, and Representative Tolan—joined with Kilgore in introducing bill S. 607. This bill, generally known as the Pepper-Kilgore bill, aimed to create an overall Office of War Mobilization which would put production, manpower, and supply under one single roof and in command of a single director. Its purpose was to establish a unified command on the production front which will treat manpower, materials, tools, warehouses, boxcars, and everything else as parts of a whole production pattern, all subject to central planning and direction and use, each fitting into its place in a way which will supply the full requirements of our Armed Forces as quickly as possible. If we needed a unified military command, Senator Kilgore pointed out, we were no less in need of a unified control and direction of our nonmilitary economy.

Early in Janauary 1943 S. 607 was reported favorably by the Senate Education and Labor Subcommittee, and in February 10 Senators from all 3 parties in the Senate joined in reintroducing it. Shortly afterward the Military Affairs Committee succeeded in capturing jurisdiction over it, taking it away from the Education and Labor Committee. Informed Senate circles predicted that its chances of emerging intact from that committee were very slight indeed, particularly since the War Department opposed it as a move to strengthen civilian control of the war effort. Kilgore nevertheless announced that he, Pepper, and their supporters would have a conference to draw up a plan of strategy for keeping it alive.

While this bill remained in subcommittee Kilgore urged passage of his bill to create an Office of Technological Mobilization. On March 30 this proposal enlisted the support of Thurmond Arnold, who testified: "Had this bill been in effect before the war the Army and the Navy would have been as far advanced in the techniques of rubber as Standard Oil. That knowledge would have been spread to the independent industries that were trying in vain to get licenses under Standard Oil domination." In answer to charges that the bill would "regiment industry," Arnold replied that private research regiments industry. He also pointed out, in reply to the charge that the bill would "put science in a straitjacket," that Government research in agriculture actually has stimulated private initiative in agriculture and has stimulated more research, the benefits of which are shared with the public because farming is not cartelized. Kilgore himself interjected that his bill would provide the same sort of scientific service for businessmen that the Department of Agriculture provides for farmers. In November 1943 hearings were still being held on the bill, while Kilgore was fearlessly exposing industrial cartels and monopolies.

In March 1943 Senator Kilgore, as an expert on the manpower problem, attempted to defeat the Bankhead bill to defer farm workers from the draft. On March 16 he gave the Senate evidence that blanket draft deferments would actually impede the conversion of farms to war production; with a 2-year supply of short staple cotton and a 1- to 2-year supply of tobacco already on hand, the Nation was about to use almost one-third of its farm labor on the production of more of these unneeded crops, both of which use a tremendous quantity of fertilizer. Both Kilgore and Pepper supported a substitute for the Bankhead bill which would have provided a $300 million fund for recruiting, training, and transporting a mobile army of farmworkers to the areas where they were needed, but their bill was defeated by a vote of 65 to 9. Kilgore, of course, then voted against the Bankhead bill itself. On both domestic and foreign issues Kilgore has a voting record which is, almost without exception, proadministration.

An May 12, 1943, the Kilgore subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee released an interim report recommending immediate consideration of the proposed legislation to create a War Mobilization Board. It was stated that mobilization for war production was confronted by a crisis, with aircraft, tank, ordnance, and other quotas undergoing cutbacks, but that alleged material and customary Government and production praclack of proper mobilization policies and the necessary war organization to support them. In Washington attention was concentrated "on how to avoid the inevitable changes in customary government and production practices and relationships which alone will release the mighty productive and manpower resources of the American Nation for an all-out war effort."

In the last week of May, President Roosevelt set up the War Mobilization Board and the Office of War Mobilization under Justice James F. Byrnes, a step that the sponsors of the so-called Pepper-Kilgore bill felt "incorporated the most urgent provisions" of their proposed measure.

The Senator from West Virginia is just an inch short of 6 feet in height, and weighs 200 pounds. He has two children, Robert Martin and Elinor Stuart Kilgore. His favorite spare-time occupation is reading local and military history, and he could probably pass any New York Times' history test in a walk. He is a member of the West Virginia and Raleigh County Bar Associations, a member of Delta Tau Delta Fraternity, a member of the Christian Church, a Mason, and an Elk.

According to Delos Lovelace, in the New York Sun, Kilgore "looks like a judge. The features of his round face fall easily into the somnolent detachment of the bench, and when he purses his lips and teeters his spectacles in his left hand imaginative onlookers are more than half sure the next sound will be a bailiff crying 'Order in the court.'"

Hon. George A. Dondero

SPEECH
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our good friend and colleague, GEORGE A. DONDERO, has decided to retire from Congress after a distinguished career of 24 years of devoted, unselfish, and constructive public service. He will be missed by all of his many friends in Congress.

It was my pleasure to serve as one of an investigating group of which Mr. DONDERO was cochairman. He proved himself to be a most congenial and considerate traveling companion, who was always most solicitous of his colleagues' comfort and well-being. It was this same spirit which endeared him to all the Members of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO is a man of vision and foresight, who took seriously the trust his constituents placed in him. He served them ably and worked diligently for their best interests. He has high political principles, and it is to his everlasting credit that he stood by them. His record in Congress is a consistent one, and he can look back over the past 24 years of public service with great satisfaction.

I join with other Members in wishing GEORGE DONDERO many years of health, happiness, and contentment as he retires from the active political arena to enjoy a richly deserved retirement.

Hon. James Prioleau Richards

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 25, 1956

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to join with our distinguished colleagues from South Carolina in conducting this well-deserved tribute to a great American. It has been my good fortune to have had the benefit of the advice and the inspiration of service with Representative RICHARDS for 20 years in the difficult days preceding World War II, during that war and after it.

It is typical of the conscientious and wise chairman of the great Committee on Foreign Affairs of this House that he worked at full speed and effectiveness throughout this session, although he already had determined it would be his last in Congress. It was not in his nature to relax merely because he had decided not to stand for reelection.

With acute consciousness of the delicacy of balance between peace and war in the troubled world of today, Mr. RICHARDS has continued to study with intensity, to formulate his views with great care and, then, to expound them with vigor, sincerity, and courage.

We cannot tell our friend that he must not return to his beloved South Carolina and the opportunity to mix a bit of leisure with his work. Knowing in our hearts, though, that his keen mind will never retire, we can wish that there were some magical inducement, or mechanism, in our political scheme which would make it more difficult for a public servant such as he to remove his invalu-

able and effective counsel from a position of influence in the arena of government.

In whatever occupies our colleague's attention in the years ahead, let us hope there will be time and inclination to send forth to those who could profit from it the benefit of his long experience in perceptive appraisal of international developments.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Summary of Legislation Considered by the House Committee on Banking and Currency, 84th Congress, 2d Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRENT SPENCE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, there follows herewith a summary of the legislation considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. For the benefit of the membership of the House each legislative act is preceded by a caption reference, together with the public law number, the House reports relating to the legislation, and the bill number of the legislation as considered in the House.

BANKING, CREDIT, AND FINANCE

Bank Holding Company Act

Public Law 511—House Report No. 609

H. R. 6227

This act authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to control the future expansion of bank holding companies, and requires that bank holding companies divest themselves of investments in nonbanking businesses. At the close of the 1st session of the 84th Congress, this legislation had passed the House but had not been acted upon by the Senate. During the second session, the Senate passed the House bill with amendments, and the House agreed to the Senate amendments. The measure became law on May 9, 1956.

The act defines a bank holding company as a company which controls 25 percent or more of the voting shares of 2 or more banks or of a bank holding company, or controls the election of a majority of the directors of 2 or more banks. Certain exemptions, however, are provided.

Bank holding companies are required under the act to obtain approval of the Federal Reserve Board before acquiring additional bank stocks or assets. Before acting on any application for such approval, the Board notifies the agency which chartered the bank or banks involved (Comptroller of the Currency for national banks and the State supervisory authority for State banks) and allows 30 days for submission of the views of the chartering agency. In determining whether to grant approval, the Board considers, among other factors, whether the proposed acquisition would be consistent with adequate and sound banking, the public interest, and the preservation of competition in the field of banking. The Federal Reserve Board cannot approve the acquisition by a bank holding company of the shares or assets of a bank outside the company's home State unless the law of the State in which the bank is located expressly authorizes such acquisitions.

The act prohibits bank holding companies from acquiring interests in nonbanking businesses, and requires them to divest themselves of any such interests which they now hold. Appropriate provisions are included with respect to tax treatment of forced divestments under the act. In addition, the act contains certain prohibitions against self-dealing between bank holding companies and their subsidiary banks.

This country has established a system of independent competing banks, in preference to the centrally controlled bank systems established by other countries. The holding company device has been used to bring many formerly independent local banks under the control of a few large corporations. The Bank Holding Company Act will provide a means of preserving the American system of independent competing banks and guard against monopolistic control of credit.

Purchase of Treasury obligations by Federal Reserve

Public Law 622—House Report No. 1843

H. R. 9285

This act extends until June 30, 1958, the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury in amounts totaling not more than $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

Prior to 1935 Federal Reserve banks could purchase Government obligations either in the market or directly from the Treasury. The Banking Act of 1935, however, required that all purchases of Government securities by Federal Reserve banks be made in the open market. In 1942 the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase securities directly from the Treasury was restored, but a limit of $5 billion was placed on the amount outstanding at any one time. The $5 billion authority was granted initially only through 1944, but the Congress has extended it from time to time so as to provide continuous limited direct borrowing authority ever since.

The primary purpose of this direct borrowing authority is to help the Treasury and the Federal Reserve System work together in minimizing the disturbing effects on the economy of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, particularly around the time of quarterly income-tax payments. This act was approved June 25, 1956.

Residence of national bank directors

Public Law 496—House Report No. 1815

S. 1736

This act, approved April 27, 1956, amended the law governing residence requirements for directors of national banks, in order to allow a somewhat wider range in the selection of such directors. Before this act was enacted, the law provided that at least three-fourths of the directors of a national bank must have resided in the State where the bank is located, or within 50 miles of the bank's office, for at least 1 year preceding their election, and must maintain such residence during their term of office. This act reduced the number of directors subject to this requirement from three-fourths to two-thirds, and increased the 50-mile limitation to a 100-mile limitation. Consequently, under the new law at least two-thirds of the directors must maintain a residence within the State or within 100 miles of the bank's office.

Examination of national banks

Public Law 502—House Report No. 1816

S. 1188

This act, approved April 30, 1956, makes three changes in the law governing examinations of national banks, in order that the Comptroller of the Currency may more effectively discharge his responsibilities with respect to such examinations.

The first change permits the Comptroller to waive 1 of the 2 examinations provided for each year, but this waiver cannot be exercised more than once in every 2 years. Such a waiver will result in 3 examinations in a 2-year period, instead of the previously required 4 examinations. The second change permits the Comptroller to assess all national banks on a yearly basis for examination services, regardless of whether 1 or 2 examinations are made. The third change relates to the charges made for examining the trust departments of national and District of Columbia banks. Under the new law these charges are based on the cost of making the examination, rather than on the amount of the trust assets, as was previously provided.

Revolving fund for purchases of coinage metals

Public Law 677—House Report No. 2121

H. R. 10230

Under this act, approved July 9, 1956, the minor coinage metal fund, which is a revolving fund used to purchase metals for coining pennies and nickels, was increased from $2 million to $3 million. The act also permits the silver profit fund, which is a revolving fund established from the gain arising from silver coinage, to be used to purchase alloy metal for dimes, quarters, and 50-cent pieces. The act established uniformity of practice in the purchase of all coinage metals in that all types are now purchased through established revolving funds.

Extension of Export-Import Bank Act

House Report No. 2620

H. R. 11261

The committee reported this bill on July 5, 1956, but the House did not act on it before adjournment. The bill would have extended the operating authority of the Export-Import Bank from its present expiration date of June 30, 1958, to June 30, 1963. The bank, which began operations in 1934, assists in financing and facilitating trade between the United States and foreign countries.

Cumulative voting in electing national bank directors

House Report No. 2855

S. 256

The committee reported this bill on July 21, 1956, but the House did not act on it before adjournment. The law now provides that in the election of directors of national banks each shareholder may vote the number of shares owned by him for as many persons as there are directors to be elected, or he may cumulate such shares and give one candidate as many votes as the number of directors multiplied by the number of his shares shall equal, or distribute them on the same principle among as many candidates as he wishes. The bill would have eliminated this statutory requirement as to cumulative voting, but would have permitted the shareholders of each bank to establish cumulative voting if they wished to do so by providing for it in the articles of association.

HOUSING

Housing Act of 1956

Public Law 1020—House Reports Nos. 2363 and 2958

H. R. 11742

H. R. 11742, referred to as the Housing Act of 1956, contains six titles modifying existing law and providing for several new programs which are noted in more detail in the summary which follows.

Title I of the new act deals with FHA insurance programs.

Title II relates to an expanded secondary mortgage market program.

Title III expands and broadens the slum clearance and urban renewal program.

Title IV revises and extends the low-rent public housing program, including a new program for the elderly and provisions for the disposition of federally owned housing.

Title V amends the military housing program and provides that the military must in certain instances acquire Wherry Act housing.

Title VI continues the authority of certain programs including college housing, hospital construction, and farm housing, as well as providing a new research program, and revises provisions relating to public facility loans and loans made by Federal savings and loan associations.

FHA title I home repair loans

FHA's title I loan insurance program has long been a basic part of our economy. In very recent years, however, the volume of title I loans has declined sharply from the peak of 2,200,000 insured loans during 1953 to currently about 1 million loans a year. No 1 factor can be singled out as a cause for this sharp decline, but 2 important influences have been (1) the effect of the change of the 1954 act which denied eligibility for title I financing for newly constructed homes until they had been occupied for 6 months, and (2) a discernible trend in recent years on the part of some lenders to make home-improvement loans on an "own plan basis."

Under the provisions of the new act the maximum loan amounts for this title are increased from $2,500 to $3,500 for the improvement of existing single-family structures, from $3,000 to $3,500 for new structures, and from $10,000 to $15,000 ($2,500 average per family unit) for multifamily structures. The FHA Commissioner is given discretionary authority to increase the maximum loan term from 3 years and 32 days to 5 years and 32 days on loans for improvement of single-family structures "if he determines such increase to be in the public interest * * *." A sliding interest rate scale is provided, with an annual $5 discount on loans below $2,500 and a $4 discount on that portion of the loan which exceeds $2,500 The program is continued to September 30, 1959.

FHA title II insurance programs

FHA title II provides mortage insurance programs for sales and rental housing, cooperative housing, and relocation housing in connection with urban renewal programs.

Under the new act provisions added to section 203 removed the former statutory disadvantage of mortgage terms for existing homes by making the ratios of loan to value the same for both existing and new construction (95 percent of first $9,000 of value and 75 percent of the excess), except that existing homes not built under FHA inspection must be at least 1 year old to qualify for the more liberal terms. Under former law existing homes were limited to 90 percent of the first $9,000 of valuation.

The maximum insured loans under section 203 (h) available to persons whose homes are damaged or destroyed by disaster is increased from $7,000 to $12,000.

The insuring authority under section 207, which is designed to assist the construction of rental housing, is modified by increasing the permissible loan-to-value ratio from 80 percent to 90 percent. Loan ceilings are increased from $2,000 to $2,250 per room and from $2,400 to $2,700 per room for elevator-type structures. The act also authorizes the Commissioner to increase the dollar ceilings per room by not to exceed $1,000 per room in high-cost areas.

The act authorizes modifications of two FHA programs to furnish housing assistance to elderly families and elderly single persons. A provision was added which permits the downpayment on the purchase of a home financed by an FHA section 203 mortgage to be made by a corporation or person other than the mortgagor where the mortgagor is 60 years of age or older. Provisions were also added which liberalize section 207 FHA mortgage insurance for rental housing projects sponsored by nonprofit corporations and designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons. Such mortgages cannot exceed $8,100 per family unit and 90 percent of estimated replacement cost of the project.

Under the new act the Housing Administrator is directed to establish an advisory committee on matters relating to housing for elderly persons.

Cooperative housing insurance

The cooperative housing insurance authority under section 213, which is designed to assist middle- and low-income families in acquiring adequate housing at moderate monthly costs, was modified in the new act by reducing from 65 to 50 percent the proportion of veterans required to qualify a cooperative for a 95-percent FHA section 213 mortgage loan and for higher room and unit mortgage amounts. World War I veterans can be counted in determining the percentage of veteran cooperators. The FHA Commissioner is also authorized to increase the mortgage amount on cooperative housing by $1,000 per room in high-cost areas.

The act provides for a new class of eligible mortgagors for management-type cooperatives. Any such mortgagor who has certified to the Commissioner he intends to sell the project upon its completion to a cooperative may receive a commitment of a loan up to 85 percent of replacement cost and proceed with construction before the prospective cooperative has been formed. Until he sells the project the sponsor-mortgagor will be regulated by FHA as to rents, capital structure, and rate of return. If the sponsor fails to sell to a cooperative, he may not use the special commitment insurance feature again.

The general mortgage insurance authorization of FHA is increased by $3 billion over the amount of insurance in force and commitments outstanding on July 1, 1956.

The insuring authority under section 220, which is designed to provide housing for slum clearance and urban renewal areas, is modified under the new act to give additional incentive to the production of multifamily rental housing in such areas. A profit and risk allowance of 10 percent of project cost (excluding land) for sponsors of housing projects is permitted, although the FHA Commissioner is authorized to prescribe a lesser percentage if he certifies that a 10 percent allowance is unreasonable. The Commissioner is authorized to increase dollar mortgage limitations by not to exceed $1,000 per room or per unit in any geographic area where he finds the cost levels so require. This increase applies to both garden-type and elevator-type appartments.

The insuring authority under section 221, designed to assist in relocating families displaced by slum clearance or redevelopment operations, is liberalized under the new act. The maximum dollar amount of mortgages is increased from $7,600 to $9,000 per dwelling unit or family unit and from $8,600 to $10,000 per dwelling or family unit in high-cost areas. The ratio of loan to value for single-family homes is increased from 95 percent to 100 percent of appraised value, but the mortgagor is required to make a payment of at least $200 in cash or its equivalent. The maximum maturity of section 221 mortgages is increased from 30 to 40 years.

The cost certification requirements of FHA (sec. 227) with respect to multifamily housing are modified (1) to provide that a cost certification, when approved by the FHA Commissioner, shall be final and incontestable except for fraud or material misrepresentation on the part of the mortgagor; (2) to permit an allocation of general overhead cost acceptable to the Commissioner to be included in total certified costs; and (3) to provide that if the insured mortgage is to assist the financing of repair or rehabilitation of housing already owned by the mortgaor, full credit will be given for actual renovation costs in determining the maximum amount of the loan where the owner has a sizable equity in the property.

Federal National Mortgage Association

Several of the operating provisions of the Federal National Mortgage Association are modified and a new program is added to the Association's operations by the new act. FHA's section 803 military housing mortgages and FHA or VA mortgages covering houses in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii are exempted from the $15,000 per dwelling unit limit on the amount of the mortgage which can be purchased by FNMA under any of its operations. The former requirement that a person who sells a mortgage to FNMA must purchase stock in FNMA equal to 3 percent of the unpaid mortgage principle is modified so that he must now purchase stock amounting to only 2 percent of the mortgage. FNMA may vary such requirement upward or downward, but in no event may such requirement be less than 1 percent. The new act changes the price criterion for FNMA purchases from "at the market price" or "within the range of market prices." It also authorizes FNMA to make advance commitments to purchase mortgages under secondary market operations "at prices which are sufficient to facilitate advance planning of home construction, but which are sufficiently below the price than offered by the Association for immediate purchase to prevent excessive sales to the Association pursuant to such commitments." The new act requires FNMA, in purchasing special assistance mortgages, to pay not less than 99 percent of the unpaid principal amount for a period of 1 year. The $50 million revolving fund available for advance commitments for cooperative housing mortgages was modified to make the limit apply to both mortgages held and commitments outstanding. Provision is also made for the FNMA $5 million advance commitment limit per State for cooperative housing mortgages to operate on a revolving fund basis.

Slum clearance and urban renewal

Under the new act amendments are made to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 which provide authority to the Housing Administrator to (1) make urban renewal planning advances to a single local public body acting on behalf of the local public bodies having authority for making surveys and plans for an urban renewal project; (2) make loans or capital grants on the basis of a local plan covering an urban renewal area without requiring the local public agency to submit a separate plan for each redevelopment project within the area; (3) make advances for the preparation of long-term "general neighborhood renewal plans" for urban renewal areas of such scope that the urban renewal therein may have to be carried out in stages rather than as a single project, provided the local agency proposes to undertake promptly an urban renewal project embracing at least 10 percent of the area; and (4) make advances to local public agencies for surveys of urban areas to determine where the undertaking of urban renewal projects may be feasible.

The act would also amend the definition of an urban renewal project and permit the cost of public facilities financed through special assessment against real property in an urban renewal area to be counted as a local grant-in-aid contribution where the property against which the assessment is levied is within the project area but is not acquired by the local public body. The act would also authorize local public agencies that do not pay taxes on land held for urban renewal purposes to include an amount equal to such taxes in computing the gross project cost, and to consider such amount as a local grant-in-aid.

The act would increase from $70 million to $100 million the aggregate amount of capital grant contracts which may be entered into, without regard to the 10 percent limitation on the expenditure of funds in any one State, in States where more than two-thirds of the maximum capital grants permitted has been obligated.

New provisions were added by the act which authorize the Administrator to reimburse local public agencies for relocation payments made to individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project respecting which a contract for Federal grant has been executed. These payments may be made by the local public agency involved to cover reasonable and necessary moving expenses and other losses of property (except good will or profit), for which compensation has not otherwise been made and which were incurred on or after the date of enactment. Such payments may not exceed $100 in the case of any individual or family, and $2,000 in the case of any business concern.

The new act provides that local grants-in-aid shall be required for each project but that such local grants-in-aid, together with local grants-in-aid of all other projects of the local public agency, shall not be required in excess of one-third of the aggregate net project costs of all projects of the local public agency.

The Housing Administrator is also authorized to extend urban renewal assistance to major disaster areas, under certain conditions, without regard to requirements that the community have a workable program for the prevention and elimination of slums, and that the urban renewal plan must conform to a general plan of the locality, and without regard to requirements of public hearings and certain requirements with respect to the predominantly residential character or blighted character of urban renewal areas. The FHA sections 220 and 221 urban renewal mortgage insurance programs are amended to permit temporary waiver of the present workable program requirement. Urban renewal planning grants would be permitted for a community affected by a major disaster without regard to the fact that the community's population is 25,000 or greater.

The new act also increases the urban planning grant authorization from $5 million to $10 million.

Low-rent public housing

The new act authorizes contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 31, 1956, for not more than 35,000 additional low-rent public housing units each year for 2 years. Any balance of the authorization of 45,000 units provided by the Housing Amendments of 1955 which is not utilized by July 31, 1956, is carried over to 1957; any balance remaining in the authorization for 1957 and 1958 may be carried over for 2 years. The act reinstates the workable program requirement which requires that the locality have a workable program approved by the Housing Administrator before new contracts for annual contributions for additional units can be entered into. The proviso in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953 which prohibits the Public Housing Administration from committting itself to authorize the commencement of construction in any one year of more than 35,000 units of low-rent public housing is repealed. The act also increases from 10 percent to 15 percent the maximum portion of annual contributions and grant funds for public housing which may be made in any one State.

Public housing for the elderly

In order to meet the pressing needs of elderly families and persons in the lowest income group, the act makes low-income elderly single persons 65 years of age or over eligible for admission to low-rent public housing. The Public Housing Administration is also authorized to assist in the construction of new housing or the remodeling of existing housing in order to provide accommodations designed specifically for elderly families. Local public housing authorities are authorized to give a first preference in admission to elderly families in respect to any low-rent public housing units suitable to their needs. The local authorities are also authorized in the case of the elderly to waive the requirement that tenants admitted to public housing must come from substandard dwellings. The act also increases the maximum cost per room for dwellings designed specifically for elderly families from $1,750 to $2,250.

Farm labor camps

The new act directs the Public Housing Administration to transfer farm labor camps without monetary consideration to local public housing agencies whose areas of operation include such projects. Requests for such transfers must be made within 18 months after enactment of the act. The local public housing agency must give first occupancy preference to low-income farm families and second occupancy preference to other low-income families. In the case of farm labor camps in the State of Florida and public housing agency acquiring such farm labor camps is required in the event of sale of such project to use the proceeds to construct new facilities for low-income farm families.

Disposition of defense housing

The new act provides for the transfer of 41 temporary defense housing projects and 2 Lanham Act war housing projects from the Housing Agency to the Department of Defense on September 1, 1956. The Department of Defense is authorized to use revenues from such property for its maintenance, operation, improvement, and liquidation, and for related administrative expenses.

The act also provides that any housing constructed or acquired under the provisions of title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Services Act of 1951 which is not transferred to the Department of Defense shall be disposed of as expeditiously as possible, but not later than June 30, 1957.

The Housing Administrator is also directed to convey a Lanham Act project at Newport, R. I., to the Housing Authority of the City of Newport, and two Lanham Act projects at Philadelphia, Pa., to the Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pa. Exception is made, however, so that it is possible to house military personnel in such projects without regard to their income, and for a period of 3 years a first preference is given to military personnel in respect to a specified number of dwelling units in each of these projects. The Lanham Act is amended by adding a new section 614, which provides for the accelerated disposition of those projects which must be sold for off-site use or as an entire project.

Provision is also made for the sale of the Chinquapin Village housing project to the city of Alexandria, or to the Alexandria Redevelopment and Housing Authority; for the sale of the Lakeshore Village housing project of the city of Euclid, Ohio; and for the sale of Techwood Dormitory, situated in Atlanta, Ga., to the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Payments in lieu of taxes

The Public Housing Commissioner is directed to approve payments in lieu of taxes in the amounts specified in the act for project fiscal years ending prior to April 1, 1956, by 11 local public housing agencies named in the act.

Military housing

The provisions of RHA title VIII military housing program are modified and liberalized in the act in the following respects:

First, FHA is permitted to insure mortgages covering military housing on Midway Island and the Canal Zone, in addition to the areas formerly covered.

Second, the program is continued to June 30, 1958.

Third, the insurance authorization is increased from $1,363,500,000 to $2,300,000,000. This will provide for a total program of military housing of approximately 150,000 units.

Fourth, the determinations of the Secretary of Defense as to the need for additional housing and the effect of such housing upon occupancy of existing housing are made subject to the approval of the FHA Commissioner. The act also requires the FHA Commissioner to report to the Committees on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the House of Representatives each instance in which he requires the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss.

Fifth, an average cost of $16,500 per family unit per project is permitted, including the cost of ranges, refrigerators, shades, screens, and other fixtures.

Sixth, the total monthly payments that can be made by the Secretary of Defense to amortize military housing mortgages is increased from $9 million to $21 million.

Seventh, military housing plans developed after the date of the enactment of the Housing Act of 1956 must follow the principle of modular measure.

Eighth, the same net floor area limitations are applied to title VIII military housing as now apply to appropriated funds military housing.

The act also clarifies the intent of Congress with respect to local taxation of the lessee's interest in Wherry Act projects. This provision provides that such interest shall be subject to local taxes and assessments. However, such taxes or assessments (unless they were paid or encumbered the property prior to June 15, 1956) may not exceed the amount of taxes or assessments on other similar property of similar value, reduced by the amount the Secretary of Defense determines to be equal to (1) any payments made by the Federal Government to the local taxing or other public agencies involved with respect to such property, plus (2) appropriate amounts for expenditures made by the Federal Government or the lessee for the provision or maintenance of streets, sidewalks, etc., which are customarily provided by the State, city, or other local taxing authority with respect to such other similar property.

Acquisition of Wherry Act housing

Wherry Act housing, most of which is presently held by private sponsors, is located at or near military installations, and was built by mortgages insured by FHA under the provisions of title VIII of the National Housing Act as in effect prior to the Housing Amendments of 1955. Because of the probable impact of the construction of housing under the new FHA title VIII upon existing Wherry housing, the new act requires the Secretary of Defense to acquire any Wherry Act project which is located at or near an installation where a new title VIII project is programed. If the Wherry Act project is acquired through negotiation, the purchase price cannot exceed the FHA's estimate of the replacement cost of the housing and related property (excluding the value of improvements made with appropriated funds) as of the date of final endorsement for mortgage insurance, reduced by an allowance for physical depreciation determined by the Department of Defense with the advice of FHA. If the property is not acquired by negotiation, it must be acquired by condemnation.

The act provides further that housing acquired under this provision may be either assigned as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents or leased to military and civilian personnel. Amounts equal to such quarters allowance and allotments where housing is assigned as public quarters,

and receipts realized from the rental of the housing, will be deposited in a revolving fund.

This revolving fund will be used to pay the purchase price of such housing, mortgage payments, and related expenses, and alteration and improvement costs. An appropriation to the revolving fund of $50 million is authorized. The Secretary of Defense is also authorized, with the approval of the President, to transfer, from unexpended balances of any appropriations of the military departments not carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury, such sums as may be necessary to provide adequate capital for the revolving fund.

College housing

The act increases the loan fund for college housing and other educational facilities from $500 million to $750 million outstanding at any one time.

Research

The Housing Administrator is directed to conduct a research program which will develop information on the Nation's housing inventory, mortgage market problems, availability of low-income and middle-income housing, housing for elderly persons, and other related subjects. The Administrator is authorized to enter into contracts with State agencies or local governments, and educational institutions and other nonprofit organizations, and into working agreements on a reimbursable basis with other Federal agencies. These contracts and working agreements may not exceed $500,000 during the fiscal year 1957. This limit will be increased by $1 million on July 1, 1957, and July 1, 1958.

Public facility loans

Title III of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by the act to permit public facility loans to be made by the Housing Administrator in the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Federal savings and loan associations

The act raises the limit from $2,500 to $3,500 on property alteration, repair, or improvement loans made by Federal savings and loan associations. The act also increases from 15 to 20 percent the proportion of their assets that may be loaned without regard to the loan limitation of $35,000 for any one property and without regard to a requirement that the property must be located within 50 miles of the association's home office.

Hospital construction

The act revives upon a limited basis and extends until June 30, 1958, the authority of the Housing Administrator to make loans and grants for hospital construction to public and nonprofit agencies. Only those agencies which applied for such assistance prior to June 30, 1953, and were denied solely because of the lack of funds would be eligible. Appropriations are authorized for this purpose in the amount of $5 million for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, and June 30, 1958.

Farm housing

The act amends title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize, for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, (1) $450 million for farm housing loans, (2) $10 million for contributions by the Secretary of Agriculture to prevent defaults in payments of loans for potentially adequate farms, and (3) $50 million for grants and loans for improvement and repair of certain farm structures.

VA direct home loans

The act provides for an extension of the Veterans' Administration direct home-loan program for 1 additional year.

FHA title I insured loans for repair of new homes damaged by major disasters

Public Law 405—House Report No. 1657

House Joint Resolution 471

Following the disastrous hurricanes and floods of last fall, one of the first actions taken by the committee in the 2d session of the 84th Congress was to report out this resolution permitting the FHA Commissioner to insure home repair loans on new homes damaged in major disasters without regard to the requirement that the home be completed and occupied for a period of at least 6 months. In some of the floods of last fall, subdivisions of new homes suffered severe damage and enactment of this legislation permitted the Commissioner to make the FHA title I program immediately available for use in financing the repair of damages incurred. The resolution became law on February 10, 1956.

Transfer of two war housing projects to the city of Euclid, Ohio

House Report No. 2876

H. R. 12020

This bill directs the Housing Administrator to sell to the city of Euclid, Ohio, for a total price of $6,125,000. Lanham Act war housing projects, containing 1,300 dwelling units, located in the city of Euclid. The purchase price, secured by a mortgage, will be payable in 20 equal annual installments with interest of 4½ percent on the unpaid balance. The purchase price, which is based on two independent fee appraisals, represents the full market value of the property. The city desires to use the property to facilitate the carrying out of redevelopment plans for the area.

The House did not take separate action on this bill as its provisions were incorporated in section 407 (c) of the Housing Act of 1956, which, as previously noted, became Public Law 1020, enacted August 7, 1956.

Sale of Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.

Public Law 367—House Report No. 1554

H. R. 7340

Although this bill providing for the sale of a 248-unit Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex., was reported by the committee on July 28, 1955, action was not taken by the House until the second session when it was passed by the House on February 1, 1956. As passed the bill was amended to provide that the transfer would be made by the Administrator of the General Services Administration rather than by "the appropriate Government agency" as provided in the bill as it was reported by the committee. The act was approved June 4, 1956.

Transfer of war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash.

Public Law 407—House Report No. 1340

H. R. 6298

As noted in the committee's summary of legislation for the 1st session of the 84th Congress, this bill was reported by the committee and passed by the House in the 1st session of the 84th Congress but action was not completed in the Senate. The bill provides for the transfer of two war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash. These projects contain a total of 172 temporary family dwelling units. Action on the bill was completed by the Senate during the 2d session of the 84th Congress and the bill became law on February 15, 1956.

Extension of the time limit under Public Law 235 for the conveyance of certain property to the State of Louisiana

Public Law 437—House Report No. 1656

H. R. 7927

Public Law 235 of the 84th Congress, approved August 4, 1955, authorized the conveyance of dwelling projects containing 255 units to the State of Louisiana. These projects, which housed military personnel assigned to Alexandria Air Force Base during World War II, were designed in such a manner that they could be converted to eventual hospital use. The act provided for transfer of the projects to the State of Louisiana in consideration of the payment of $300,000 in 3 equal annual installments. The State was required to pay the first installment within the first 6 months after approval of the original act. Public Law 437, which was approved March 24, 1956, granted an additional 6 months to the period within which the State of Louisiana is required to make the first payment.

Housing for essential civilian employees of the Armed Forces

Public Law 574—House Report No. 2215

S. 3515

Before enactment of this legislation the FHA mortgage insurance program was limited in its application at armed services research or development installations because the research or development activities of the military provided a disproportionate part of the economic base of the community. Under the regular FHA mortgage insurance program the agency must find that the property meets a test of economic soundness geared to long-term normal development of the community. This act under appropriate safeguards waives the economic soundness test in order that adequate housing may be provided for essential civilian employees.

This act adds a new section 809 to title VIII of the National Housing Act, as amended, to provide mortgage insurance on homes to be owned by private individuals who are essential civilian employees of the armed services, or employees of contractors of the armed services, at research or development installations. Mortgage terms available under the bill are the same as those available under section 203 of the National Housing Act, the FHA's regular program of mortgage insurance for sales housing.

In order to qualify for insurance under the proposed new section, an individual is required to hold a certificate issued by the Secretary of Defense which certifies that (1) he requires housing; (2) he is, on the date of the certificate, a civilian employed at a research or development installation of one of the armed services of the United States, or an employee of a contractor of the armed services; and (3) he is considered by the armed services to be an essential, nontemporary employee at such date.

In addition to issuing the certificate attesting to the employment status of each essential civilian and his need for housing, the Secretary of Defense is required to certify to the Commissioner of FHA that housing is necessary for these civilian employees and that there is no present intention to substantially curtail the number of such civilian personnel assigned or to be assigned to such installations. The latter certificate will be conclusive evidence to the FHA Commissioner of the need for housing, but if the Commissioner should determine that mortgage insurance on such housing is not an acceptable risk he may require the Secretary of Defense to guarantee the armed services housing mortgage insurance fund from loss with respect to the mortgages in question.

ECONOMIC

Extension of Defense Production Act

Public Law 632—House Reports Nos. 1983 and 2486

H. R. 9852

This act, approved June 29, 1956, extends the Defense Production Act of 1950 for a period of 2 years to June 30, 1958. A corresponding 2-year extension is made in the contract authority to purchase strategic materials under section 303 of that act. In

addition, two provisions were added to that act. Under one of these, the Secretary of Commerce is directed to make a special study of the production, allocation, distribution, use of nickel, of its resale as scrap, and the supply and marketing of nickel, with particular attention directed to the adequacy of the existing system of nickel allocation between defense and civilian users. An interim report of such study is to be made by August 15 and a final report made by December 31, 1956, containing such recommendations as the Secretary of Commerce deems advisable. The other provision added amends the Declaration of Policy of the Defense Production Act through providing it is a policy of the Congress to encourage geographical dispersal of the industrial facilities of the United States in the interest of the national defense.

The maintenance of a strong and flexible defense program requires that current military and atomic-energy programs proceed without interruption and that a broad and diversified mobilization base be established which will reflect new requirements resulting from changes in technology and strategy. The authorities provided in the Defense Production Act are essential to meet those objectives.

Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956

Public Law 1016—House Reports Nos. 2746 and 2959

S. 3722

The act provides for an experimental program to provide insurance and related forms of financial protection against flood losses.

The act authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (1) to issue Government insurance policies against property losses due to flood, (2) to reinsure flood loss policies isued by other insurers, and (3) to make contracts with private individuals and business concerns assuring them, in the event of any subsequent flood loss, of a line of credit to assist in restoring or replacing damaged or destroyed property.

The act authorized coverage of real and personal property against loss due to flood as defined in the act. The term "flood" is broadly defined to include the water component of any severe storm as well as rising waters and abnormally high tidal water, and the Administrator is authorized to assign such other specific meaning to the generic term "flood" as he may prescribe by regulation. Specifically, the act defines "flood" to include "any flood, tidal wave, wave wash or other abnormally high tidal water, deluge, or the water component of any hurricane or other severe storm, surface landside due to excess moisture" and such other meaning as the Administrator may prescribe by regulation. The act authorizes insurance and loan contract coverage against flood damage for property located in the United States, its Territories, possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The Administrator will establish a schedule of estimated rates for insurance offered under the act. This schedule will be computed on the basis of the risks involved; the estimated rates will be uniform for similar risks within a given class of property; and estimated rates will be fixed at levels that would, in the Administrator's judgment, be adequate, if collected, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses. The schedule of estimated rates is not to include any factor for payment of Federal administrative expenses; these are to be paid out of directly appropriated funds.

Once established, this schedule of estimated rates will be used by the Administrator as a ceiling from which to compute a schedule of fees the purchasers of flood-insurance policies will be required to pay. The testimony received by the committee indicates that a schedule of estimated rates based entirely on actuarial considerations will prove to be too high to serve as an adequate basis for providing flood-insurance protection to prospective purchasers. Therefore, the act provides that the Administrator shall establish a schedule of fees to be paid by purchasers of the insurance designed to provide insurance protection at reasonable costs and to achieve marketability of the insurance policies. No insurance policy, however, can be issued for a fee lower than 60 percent of the corresponding estimated rate for insurance provided by that policy. In effect, this difference between the estimated rate and the fee may be referred to as a subsidy.

The fees for reinsurance are to be established from time to time by the Administrator through a process of negotiation with insurance companies seeking reinsurance. These fees will contain no subsidy in the sense in which that term has been used above. The reinsurance fees are to be based on the consideration of the risks involved and are to be adequate, in the Administrator's judgment, to produce sufficient proceeds over a reasonable period of years to pay all claims for losses covered by the reinsurance agreements. The fees are not to include any loading for administrative expenses for the Federal Government under this act.

Perhaps the most perplexing problem in devising a workable flood insurance program is the difficulty of providing insurance in high-risk areas at rates which are not prohibitive. In view of this problem, a supplemental program of protection is provided which should operate at much lower rates than those which will be charged for direct insurance.

Basically, this supplemental program will give potential flood victims, for a resonable fee, the contractual right to borrow money in the event of loss due to flood. A person who purchases this protection and subsequently loses his home or business in a flood will have an assured line of credit to restore his property, and will be given an extended period of time in which to absorb the shock of his initial loss.

This protection will be afforded to private individuals and business concerns through loan contracts with the Administrator. If a person who has purchased such a contract suffers a flood loss, he will be assisted in either of two ways. First, if he is able to obtain a loan elsewhere to repair his loss, the Government will guarantee the lender against loss on the loan. Second, if he is unable to obtain such a loan, the Government will make the loan directly. As noted above this program should operate at a lower schedule of fees than those charged under the insurance program inasmuch as the Government's ultimate exposure to loss is limited to credit losses on flood loans rather than to the actual flood losses themselves.

The face amount of insurance policies issued under the act cannot exceed $250,000 per person, and cannot exceed $10,000 for any dwelling unit, including any structures and personal property connected with it. The same limits are provided for loan contracts.

In an effort to reduce "nuisance" claims, keep the cost of administering the program low, and provide the insured an incentive to protect the insured property against flood damage, the act requires a minimum loss deductible clause in each insurance policy issued by the Administrator that will relieve the Government from any liability for paying the first $100 of a proved and approved claim of loss, plus 5 percent of the remainder of such claim. The act further authorizes the Administrator to increase either the amount or the percent, or both, upon the issuance of an insurance policy, taking into consideration the class of risk involved. A loss deductible clause in the amount of $500 is provided in the loan contract program.

The act provides that insurance and reinsurance policies outstanding under this program cannot exceed $3 billion (or $5 billion with the approval of the President), plus an amount equal to the fees collected for insurance or reinsurance under the act, less claims paid. In addition, a limit of $2 billion is placed on the face amount of loan contracts outstanding at any time; this limit may be increased, with the approval of the President, by $500 million in any fiscal year.

The face amount of insurance policies issued and reinsurance agreements entered into under this act should be many times greater than the amount of losses expected to be incurred, just as in other forms of property insurance written by private companies actual losses incurred are only a small fractional amount of the face amount of policies written and in force. Likewise with respect to the loan contract program, the loans made or guaranteed to cover flood losses actually incurred will be only a small fraction of the dollar amount of loan contracts issued and on such loans the only loss the Government will suffer will be that resulting from failure to repay such loans.

The act expressly provides that insurance, reinsurance, and loan contracts cannot be issued under the act covering risks against which insurance is available on reasonable terms from other public or private sources.

The act provides that after June 30, 1959, each State will be required to pay into the disaster insurance fund one-half the difference between the fees charged for policies issued after that date on property in that State and the estimated rates needed to cover losses on such properties.

Although the act contains no fixed termination date, it requires that the annual report of the Administrator for the year ending December 31, 1961, must contain his opinion, supported by pertinent findings, concerning the advisability of withdrawing, in whole or in part, Federal assistance in the flood-insurance field, keeping in mind the desirability of offering flood-insurance protection. In the event the Administrator's opinion recommends withdrawal of entire or partial Federal financial support for the flood-insurance program, it is to be accompanied by appropriate legislative recommendations. In the light of conditions then existing, the Congress can consider in the public interest the procedures to be adopted for terminating the Federal flood-insurance program. These provisions will assure that at the end of 1961 the Administrator must come to grips with the problem of determining whether it is necessary for the Federal Government to remain in the flood-insurance field either as a direct insurer or as a source of reinsurance. This act was approved August 7, 1956.

Amendment of the Small Business Act of 1953

Public Law 402—House Reports Nos. 1633 and 1685

H. R. 7871

Although the Small Business Act from inception has contained authority for the Administrator to make disaster loans it became evident as a result of last year's severe storms that early action would be needed in this session of the Congress to increase the authorization provided for the making of disaster loans. This act, which became law on February 2, 1956, increased the disaster loan authorization from $25 million to $125 million outstanding at any one time. The act further modified the disaster loan authority by providing such loans could be made with maturities up to 20 years (previous limit 10 years) and made clear that in cases where the Small Business Administration participates with a lending institution in making a disaster loan the interest rate on the Small Business Administration's portion of the loan cannot exceed 3 percent per annum, which is the same rate applicable to

direct disaster loans made by the Administration.

Redevelopment of depressed industrial and rural areas

House Report No. 2543

H. R. 11811

This bill was reported by the Banking and Currency Committee on June 29, 1956, but was not acted on by the House before it adjourned on July 27, 1956.

H. R. 11811 contains seven major provisions.

First, the bill would create an Area Redevelopment Administration within the executive branch of the Government. It would be headed by an Administrator whose appointment would be subject to Senate confirmation.

Second, the bill would authorize the Administrator to designate two types of redevelopment areas—industrial and rural—in the United States. An area could be designated as an "industrial redevelopment area" if the Administrator determines that excessive unemployment has existed in the area for an extended period of time. Areas must be so designated where unemployment (a) is currently 8 percent or more and has been 8 percent for the major portion of each of the preceding 2 years, or (b) is currently 12 percent or more with no reasonable prospect for improvement in the immediate future, and has been at least 12 percent throughout the preceding 6 months. Those rural areas in the United States in which the Administrator determines that there exist an excessive number and percentage of low-income farm families, and a condition of substantial and prolonged underemployment, would be designated as "rural redevelopment areas."

Third, the bill would authorize the Administrator to make loans from a revolving fund of $150 million for constructing or rehabilitating industrial plants and similar facilities, and for purchasing or developing land for industrial usage, in redevelopment areas. Such loans could be made only if recommended by a local redevelopment committee.

Fourth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to make loans and grants for constructing or improving public facilities, or for purchasing or developing land for public-facility usage, in redevelopment areas. Such a loan or grant could be made only upon application from a redevelopment area. A revolving fund of $100 million would be established for loans, and appropriations of not more than $50 million a year would be authorized for grants.

Fifth, the bill would authorize the Administrator to provide technical assistance to redevelopment areas. It might be provided by use of the staff of the Administrator or by contract with individuals or institutions.

Sixth, the bill contains two sections which would enable the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to assist industrial redevelopment areas. Grants and loans for slum clearance could be made in these areas under title I of the Housing Act of 1949 without regard to certain existing requirements of that act. Planning advances authorized by the Housing Act of 1954 would be made available to all communities in industrial redevelopment areas without regard to the population limitation otherwise applicable.

Seventh, the bill would require the Secretary of Labor to provide suitable training for unemployed persons in redevelopment areas in need of training, retraining, or reemployment, or vocational education. The training would be provided through the existing facilities of Federal and State Governments by contracts on a reimbursable basis, or by contracts with private institutions. The bill provides that the Secretary of Labor shall enter into agreements with the States whereby the States as agents of the Federal Government would make weekly retraining payments to unemployed individuals not entitled to unemployment compensation who are certified by the Secretary to be undergoing training for a new job. Retraining payments could not be made for more than 13 weeks in amounts equal to the average weekly unemployment compensation payment in the State.

COMMODITIES

Commodity Credit Corporation

Public Law 864—House Reports Nos. 2211 and 2772

S. 3820

The committee reported a companion bill, H. R. 11132, the provisions of which were substituted for S. 3820 on the House floor. The conference substitute retained the Senate bill number.

This act increases the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation from $12 billion to $14.5 billion to enable the Corporation to carry out its farm crop price-support operations, and to provide initial financing for the new soil-bank program provided by the Agricultural Act of 1956. The act also amends the penal provisions of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act to make it a Federal offense to willfully steal or convert property mortgaged or pledged to a private lending agency under a program of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to reduce from a felony to a misdemeanor certain offenses involving property of a value of $500 or less.

The Commodity Credit Corporation is a federally chartered corporation through which price support is extended on farm commodities through loans, purchase agreements, and purchases, in accordance with legislation passed by the Congress. While price-support operations constitute the major activity of the Corporation, it also conducts a storage facilities program, a supply and foreign purchase program, a commodity export program, and other activities as authorized or directed by Congress.

The Corporation, as required by its charter, utilizes private trade facilities, including banks, cooperatives, commercial warehouses, handlers, and others to the maximum extent practicable. This act was approved August 1, 1956.

Extension of Export Control Act of 1949

Public Law 631—House Reports Nos. 1998 and 2485

H. R. 9052

This act extends the Export Control Act of 1949 for a further period of 2 years to June 30, 1958. That act, which is administered by the Secretary of Commerce, authorizes the regulation of exports to the extent necessary (1) to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce commodities, (2) to safeguard the national security insofar as it might be adversely affected by exports of strategic commodities, and (3) to further our foreign policy. The need to control exports in the interest of national security will probably continue for the foreseeable future. It is clear that this country must continue to take special precautions to see that United States goods of strategic significance do not go unchecked to the troubled spots of the world.

One of the items in our export trade about which there has been considerable controversy recently as to the volume of permitted exports is iron and steel scrap. The extending legislation directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a survey of the iron and steel scrap available and potentially available and to file with the Congress an interim report within 3 months and a final report not later than January 31, 1957. This act was approved June 29, 1956.

Texas City tin smelter

Public Law 608—House Report No. 2159

House Joint Resolution 607

This act permits continued operation of the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., up to January 31, 1957. It also authorizes the Federal Facilities Corporation (successor to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in operation of the smelter) to dispose of the smelter and related assets by sale or lease before that date. In the event disposition is not made of part or all of the plant and related assets by January 31, 1957, then the property will be reported as excess property for transfer and disposal under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

The Texas City tin smelter was constructed by a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1942. While the Government continued to purchase tin metal thereafter, the operation of the smelter was nevertheless an important part of the program through which the Government was able to supply essential needs for tin during the war period. The smelter was also helpful in meeting demands for tin in the reconversion period after World War II and more recently in meeting stockpile needs. Tin smelting capacity in other parts of the world has been restored and since stockpile objectives have been achieved, it is no longer necessary for the Government to continue operations of the smelter. From the beginning of operations up to June of last year the smelter had produced a total of 420,000 tons of tin metal. This act was approved June 22, 1956.

International Wheat Agreement

Public Law 945

S. 4221

This act amends the implementing legislation (the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949) under which the United States, acting through the Commodity Credit Corporation, exercises its rights, obtains the benefits, and fulfills its obligations under the International Wheat Agreement, which has been extended to July 31, 1959. Under the agreement as now in force, 6 exporting countries (including the United States) have agreed to supply approximately 300 million bushels of wheat to some 40 importing countries, who in turn agreed to purchase this amount. Maximum and minimum prices are set at $2 and $1.50, respectively, for the basic grade of wheat at the basing point Fort William/Port Arthur, Canada. The Commodity Credit Corporation program, which is conducted pursuant to this legislation, enables commercial wheat exporters and millers to purchase wheat at domestic market prices and to sell the wheat or wheat-flour product to purchasers in International Wheat Agreement importing countries, at prices consistent with the price range contained in the agreement, in competition with other exporters in the world market. During the 7 years the wheat agreement has been in effect the United States wheat exports under it have approximated 1.3 billion bushels. This act was approved August 3, 1956.

MISCELLANEOUS

Justice Brandeis medal

Public Law 727—House Report No. 2678

H. R. 11000

This act, approved July 18, 1956, directs the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a medal in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the late United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Dembitz Brandeis. Three thousand of such medals will be furnished to the Brandeis University at Waltham, Mass., at the estimated cost of manufacture. The year 1956 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Justice Brandeis. He served with distinction on the United States Supreme Court for 23 years before retiring in 1939.

Use of surplus grains to prevent waterfowl depredations

Public Law 654—House Report No. 2210

H. R. 7641

This act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to requisition from the Commodity Credit Corporation such wheat, corn, and

other grains as the Corporation certifies to be available from its price-support inventories for the purpose of feeding migratory waterfowl such as ducks and geese. The Secretary of the Interior may make the grain available for the feeding of migratory waterfowl directly or through Federal, State, or local governmental bodies or officials or private persons or organizations. Feeding must be so accomplished as to lure waterfowl away from farmers' fields where they are causing crop damage, yet not expose the waterfowl to shooting.

The legislation offers a procedure that should be of material assistance in solving the problem of protecting agricultural crops in those areas where the impact of a large migratory waterfowl population creates a special problem. This act was approved July 3, 1956.

Report to the People of the 11th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, Congress has acted upon many bills during this second session that is approaching adjournment. All of them merit comment; but, as has been my practice since being a Member of Congress, I would like to report on those that are most beneficial to my constituents.

At the outset I wish to state that, because of the differences in opinions existing between Members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, not all of the measures I favored were enacted into law in the form that I would like them to be in. Then, too, not all legislation I favored was considered. This is natural under the procedures in our representative form of government, and more so when the President and his administration are of one political party and the control of the Congress rests in the majority of another political party.

Another factor that has retarded the development of certain projects that we in the 11th District consider desirable has been the urgent need for restoring order to our Federal fiscal affairs. Now that the Eisenhower administration has ended deficit financing and achieved fiscal solvency, it is my expectation that American citizens can look forward to accelerated progress in the development of our economy, the conservation of our resources, and the preservation of our American heritage.

President Eisenhower again at the beginning of this session of this Congress submitted an extensive and worthy legislative program asking for soundly progressive action that would benefit all Americans equally.

Since all of my constituents live by or within close proximity to the Great Lakes I know they are all interested in the progress of the St. Lawrence seaway, which will do so much to strengthen our Nation economically and militarily. The Corps of Engineers has recommended modification of existing projects on the Great Lakes to provide for further improvements to the channels in the St. Marys River, the Straits of Mackinac, the St. Clair River and Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River. So that an adequate draft for safe navigation would be possible, Congress passed legislation authorizing the controlling depth of the connecting channels to be not less than 27 feet. The estimated Federal cost for this channel improvement is $115,818,000 for new work and $200,000 annually for maintenance.

Living in a district that has approximately 1,000 miles of shoreline, we are aware that much work is needed to improve our harbors. During 1956 alone Congress appropriated $53,000 for the St. James Harbor at Beaver Island, with local interests providing an additional $7,500. One hundred and ten thousand dollars was appropriated for plans and specifications to initiate dredging work at the Cheboygan Harbor and River. Funds have been made available to permit the completion of the preliminary examination report at AuTrain-Shelter Bay Harbor. Harbor improvements, which are quite urgent will be accomplished at Whitefish Point for which $100,000 was made available this year. It is estimated that to complete this project $394,000 will be needed.

Just within the last few weeks the Bureau of the Budget has released $241,000 to commence work on the Inland Waterway Route in the Lower Eleventh.

A resolution which I introduced was adopted providing for a review of the Waiska River Harbor.

Hearings have been arranged in Escanaba on September 12 by the Corps of Engineers on proposals to survey the needs of the harbor with a view to obtaining Federal assistance.

In September of 1955 I reported that there was included in the President's budget message $3,312,000 for the removal of the bridge island at the upper end of the Soo Locks and for the construction of a new railroad bridge. This expenditure will cover the 3-year period of 1956 to 1958. In July of this year the Congress authorized the Secretary of the Army to accomplish the alteration of the International Bridge across the St. Marys River under an agreement with the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co. The estimated cost of the alteration of the bridge is $2,620,000 of which the bridge company will pay $262,000.

The Escanaba Airport has received an appropriation of $87,500 to acquire land, grading, draining, and paving the east-west runways.

Seventy-three Capehart-type housing units will be provided at Camp Lucas. Two million one hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars has been allocated to Kinross Air Base for operation and training facilities, maintenance facilities, housing, and community facilities and land acquisition.

New post office facilities have been made available at St. Ignace, Atlanta, and Charlevoix. Indian River will have a new post office within the next few months, and bids are being requested for a new facility at Stephenson. The Post Office Department also has under consideration plans for other new post offices in the 11th Congressional District.

I am sure many of you will recall that a treaty has been adopted relative to the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention between the United States and Canada. The purpose of the treaty is to control, and if possible eradicate the lamprey eel which has seriously injured our fishing industry in the Great Lakes area. To carry out the provisions of the treaty $620,000 has been appropriated for this fiscal year.

We must have a proper resource development of fish, and still we must maintain the inherent right of every citizen and resident of the United States to engage in fishing for his own pleasure, enjoyment, and betterment; and still further we must stimulate the development of a strong prosperous, and thriving fishery and fish processing industry. In order to establish a sound and comprehensive national policy with this respect and to strengthen the fisheries segment of the national economy, legislation was enacted creating a United States Fish and Wildlife Service within the Department of the Interior consisting of two separate agencies, both of which shall have the status of a Federal bureau. One of the agencies shall be known as the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the other as the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

At the urging of the Eisenhower administration newly passed farm legislation has brought into being the soil bank. Under this program an acreage reserve program is set up which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to compensate the farmers for reducing their 1956 to 1959 acreage of basic commodities, feed grains, and so forth, at the discretion of the Secretary. Land put into the soil bank and retired from production may not be put to any other use. It is expected that with this legislation overproduction may be cut down in order to assist in the reduction of the multi-billion-dollar surplus agriculture stocks which are depressing farm prices and the income of the farmers. In addition we may expect that our precious farmland will be revitalized and replenished.

The school-milk program was extended to 1958. For each of the 2 fiscal years in the period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending July 30, 1956, $75 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by schoolchildren. This program will promote the health of our children and foster the economic well-being of our dairy farmers.

As a means of stabilizing the dairy industry and suppressing and eradicating brucellosis in cattle $20 million of the funds of the Commodity Credit are to be appropriated for the fiscal years 1957 and 1958.

Early in this 2d session of the 84th Congress action was taken on a bill which relieves the farmers of the burden of the excise taxes they pay on the gasoline and special fuels used on their farms for farming purposes. The refund under this new section of the Internal Revenue Code will be 3 cents a gallon.

On June 26 of this year Congress completed action on the biggest roadbuilding program in United States history. This highway measure will result in the expenditure of some $33 billion for highway construction during the next 13 years. It will be financed through increased taxes upon highway users. I would like to point out to my fellow citizens that despite the increased taxes necessary to finance this highway development progress, motoring in the future will be less expensive because of reduced congestion and fewer stops. Highway experts tell us that the increased taxes will be more than offset by motoring economies and of course the increased highway safety that will result from our improved road system more than justifies the added cost.

Amendments have been made to our Social Security Act which will make it possible for the totally disabled workers to begin to draw benefits at age 50; widows and workingwomen will be eligible for benefits at 62 instead of 65. Coverage has been extended to include all professional groups excepting physicians and osteopaths. In addition, increased Federal funds were voted for public assistance benefits and governmental medical help. I personally regret that more improvements were not enacted in our social-security law so that it would more adequate serve its intended purpose of providing for people in retirement and in adversity.

Effective January 1, 1957, under the Servicemen's and Veterans' Survivor Benefits Act the widows of servicemen and veterans dying from service-connected disabilities will receive $112 plus 12 percent of the deceased servicemen's base pay. There will be contributory social-security coverage after December 31, 1956, for all Armed Forces personnel. The lump-sum 6 months' death gratuity for in-service deaths occurring after December 31, 1956, will be continued with a minimum payment of $800 and a maximum of $3,000.

Many new retirement benefits for Federal employees are contained in legislation which was enacted in the closing days of this session. Annuities are increased for Federal employees and their widows and dependent widowers on the average of approximately 25 percent and those for surviving children by approximately 150 percent. The value of the benefits provided by this law is estimated at $340 million a year, of which the employees will contribute approximately $45 million, resulting from an increase in their payroll deduction from 6 percent to 6½ percent.

Every child, regardless of where he or she may live should have an equal opportunity to receive an education. We have large holdings of State and Federal lands in the State of Michigan upon which taxes cannot be levied and money received for educational purposes. Michigan itself has been negligent in assisting the poorer school districts to acquire the necessary facilities for the education of our youth. These are reasons for my feeling so strongly in favor of Federal aid for school construction and why I supported the school construction bill when it was before the Congress. I am sorry that it did not pass, but trust that in the future favorable consideration will be given to this much-needed legislation.

However, Congress did see fit to extend two laws which will assist those school districts where the federally caused impact of children anticipated from new or enlarged Federal installations create serious shortages of school facilities. Assistance will be granted to those school districts for school construction and also for the maintenance and operation of schools already in existence in areas affected by Federal activities. This assistance will be available until June 30, 1958.

The foregoing account is a dissertation on the mere highlights of the legislative accomplishments achieved in the past year. There were many other meritorious bills enacted that will benefit us all as American citizens. It is my hope and intention that the coming first session of the 85th Congress will bring about the passage of legislation beneficial to our farmers, aged, veterans, and Federal employees, and grant to the American people a substantial reduction in the tax burden they have shouldered so long. With the Congress and the President working together I am confident we can look forward to an America that is at peace, an America that is prosperous, and an America with a future that is limitless under God.

Better Roads for a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, coming as I do from Detroit, the motor city of the world, it gives me great pleasure to have voted for the Federal highway-construction bill—a multi-billion-dollar roadbuilding project that will take more than a decade to complete. At long last, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, have placed the automotive problem in its proper perspective. You might say that the average citizen has come to realize what we in Detroit have known for a long time, namely, the family car is now a vital link in our everyday routine. Slowly but surely America also has been awakening to the fact that this wonderful invention, the automobile, is of no use if the roads are too congested to drive in comfort and parking is not available at our destination. In recent years State and local governments have been hard put even to repair roads enough to keep traffic moving. Some new roads have been constructed, but all too many of these are toll.

America is on the move. Today we are capable of traveling in hours a distance that would have taken our forefathers months. Mr. and Mrs. America on a modern-day vacation trip may journey 2,000 or 3,000 miles. The degree of enjoyment derived from a trip of this nature will depend in a large measure upon the ability of various regions to maintain their through-traffic roads. Quite often indebtedness limitations and other factors will prevent proper maintenance of the right-of-way. What then are we to do? The problem, unfortunately, cannot be attacked on a local basis. It is too big. The answer is to face the question squarely, admit that the interstate system is inadequate, and then make an effort to supply a solution.

Much is at stake in our highway system. The very complexion of our country is dependent upon the free movement of motor vehicles, both pleasure and commercial. In recent years, there has been a virtual exodus from the crowded cities to the clean air of the suburbs. Needless to say, this would have been impossible without the family car. With the suburban growth, however, the road congestion problem moved from the city to the county. Many suburban residents now find themselves quite inconvenienced since they must travel considerable distance to jobs, stores, and social events over choked, unsafe roads. It has been estimated that as high as 85 percent of workers living 10 miles from their place of employment must depend on their car for transportation. If suburban growth is to continue, we must link new communities and metropolitan areas with adequate roads. It is wonderful that so many parents are afforded the opportunity to raise their children in pleasant suburban communities; let us do nothing to inhibit further utilization of noncity areas.

A principal factor in the road problem demanding immediate attention is the rising toll of dead and injured on our Nation's thoroughfares. Every major holiday brings another sickening tabulation, each more terrible than the last. The plain fact is that the majority of our highways built 20 years ago were designed for light traffic and light vehicles but not to carry our present high-speed traffic. The neglect of the war years, coupled with expanded postwar production of fast, heavy motor vehicles, makes our present interstate system grossly inadequate.

It is quite safe to assume that in addition to personal annoyance, congestion, and loss of life and limb, many segments of our economy are being hampered and restricted in growth by the strangulation effect of poor roads. The farmer quite often cannot get his products to the consumer quickly enough to prevent spoilage; truckers cannot haul rapidly enough to assure inexpensive delivery of manufactured goods to the wholesale dealer. This in turn raises prices as expanded delivery charges are passed on to the ultimate consumer and, as prices go up, the customer restricts his purchasing. This is but one small instance of the indirect effect of poor roads on America's welfare. There are many other examples of industries adversely affected by the road situation. The most striking of these, of course, is the automobile industry.

It should be obvious to everyone that when the automobile industry suffers, the entire American economy will, in a

very short time, feel the ill effects of a slump in Detroit.

It is difficult to visualize the many important ties that the city of Detroit has with every crossroad in America. The automobile figures prominently in all phases of commerce and has contributed mightly to the fabulous progress of American business. In addition to providing the work horse of business, the automotive industry encourages and sustains a myriad of allied and subordinate industries. The 45,000 automobile dealers are but one small element of Detroit's contribution to the Nation's economic health. The thousands of gas stations—employing thousands of people—that dot the highways provide dissemination of the products of still other concerns which therein display and sell their wares to the auto owner.

Tires, glass, and mechanical repair shops, car washes, upholstery and convertible-top manufacturers, drive-in theaters, and restaurants—all are indebted to the automobile and all must have good roads to survive.

There are many reasons why an adequate road system is vital to the continued and expanded well-being of the American people. One out of every seven persons employed in the United States—or almost 10 million persons—is engaged in highway transport industries. This country owns 73 percent of the world's passenger cars, and almost $5 billion a year is paid in automobile insurance premiums. The Federal Government and the States have greatly benefited from auto vehicle taxes—some of which are too high. The automobile is a necessity, not a luxury.

The steel industry, the economic yardstick of the whole free-enterprise system, is also most dependent upon good roads to keep the sale of automobiles at a healthy level. As you probably know, the automobile industry consumes almost 40 percent of all sheet metal produced in the United States. Any economist will tell you that it is absolutely vital that the production of steel be kept as high as possible if the Nation is to remain financially stable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that our vast road system has made us think big. We have astounded the world with our transportation feats in both peace and war. In World War II, our ability to move large numbers of troops both here and abroad utterly fascinated logistical experts from other nations. We did not learn these transportation secrets by accident. We developed them through a steady production of the best automotive products in the world, which in turn encouraged the best road system in the world. However, advancements in production methods in recent years have brought about an imbalance that must be corrected if we are to prosper and grow. I am certain the Federal highway construction bill of 1956, in addition to creating 150,000 new jobs, will alleviate the majority of highway problems facing us today.

Department of Defense Investigations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, during the 10 years I have had the honor of representing the people of the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina, I have been increasingly impressed by the steady growth in the number and scope of congressional investigations.

There is no question but that the investigative function of the Congress is a most necessary adjunct to the legislative process. But it seems to me that greater care must be taken if these investigations are to fully serve the purposes for which they are intended. Where the matters being examined affect the executive branch of the Government, the investigation should be designed not only to help the Congress in its work but also the departments and agencies as well.

Since the Members of the Congress are themselves heavily burdened with their day-to-day legislative tasks, much of the actual investigatory work is, of necessity, placed in the hands of committee staffs. By and large, the staff personnel selected have been very good. However, I do not believe that the committees are making the best use of their potential. Individual members of committees are not always given an opportunity to participate directly with the staff and to guide their work. The staff, therefore, does not get the full benefit of the knowledge and experience of the entire committee.

The House Appropriations Committee, on which I have the honor and pleasure to serve, some months ago engaged a staff to investigate the procurement policies and practices of the Department of Defense. Although I was a member of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations, I was not informed of the purpose and scope of this particular investigation. Other members of the subcommittee found themselves in the same situation. It was not until the investigating staff submitted its report that we were aware of the full nature of the investigation and the methods employed. We were thus deprived of an opportunity to make available to the staff the knowledge and experience which we had accumulated from our many contacts with officials at all levels in the Defense Establishment and from our personal inspections of defense installations throughout the world. I feel sure that the results of this investigation would have been of much greater value to both the committee and the Defense Department had the knowledge and experience of all the members of the subcommittee been brought to bear on this particular problem area.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish these remarks to be construed as criticism of the committee and subcommittee chairmen. They are extremely able, conscientious, and courteous gentlemen, and grossly overburdened with work. I offer these remarks purely as a suggestion for improving the work of committee staff investigators and to better assure that their reports contribute to the objective of better government.

Leopold D. Silberstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Americans are becoming better acquainted with the name of Leopold D. Silberstein, president of Pennsylvania's Penn-Texas Corp.

However, there is considerable significance in the fact that his name is being used, to the exclusion of 30 or 40 others, in reports on the works of a committee of Congress looking into the ownership of certain American industries.

This committee is doing a fine job, I am sure, and certainly a most important one.

It has been reported in the newspapers that 30 or 40 large business enterprises and businessmen are involved in the inquiry, but the stories always seem to mention only Mr Silberstein by name, and refer to the others as "30 or 40 others."

This may or may not be a form of persecution for this man, but the evidence would sem to indicate that it is. It appears to me, in the interest of fair play, that if one of those being investigated is to be named than the others should be named.

When one man is singled out of 30 or 40, the question of individual persecution must arise, under our American way of thinking and the accepted rules of fair play.

While I do not know who is responsible for the situation, nor the reasons behind it, I do want to express the thought before my colleagues that if one name is to be used they should all be used.

This is an appropriate time further to bring Mr. Silberstein to the attention of Members of Congress because of his many accomplishments in the field of business enterprise, humanitarian causes, and membership in groups and organizations dedicated to the help of mankind.

He is an example of the energetic businessman who is never too busy to devote his talents to worthwhile causes and bring to them the same measure of success that has characterized his business enterprises.

We need more of these men in America today. Mr. Silberstein is president of the Pratt-Whitney Foundation, Inc., dedicated to philanthropic work; cochairman of the New York Daily Mirror youth program to combat juvenile delinquency; a member of the fund-raising committee of the National

Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., and a member of the 1956 campaign committee of the cerebral palsy drive.

Recently, the Advertising Club of Washington awarded a citation, entitled "Award for Achievement," to Mr. Silberstein.

In 6 years, starting with a Pennsylvania coal company in financial difficulty, Mr. Silberstein has erected an enormously successful and job-providing corporation with 16 subsidiaries throughout the United States.

The important point is that Mr. Silberstein came to this country only 8 years ago as a refugee—one who had been forced to flee for his life from Nazi persecution.

The citation stressed the fact that he has set new standards in business public relations based on the belief that the investing, working, and consuming public have the right to know how America's leading corporations operate.

Nowhere in all the world could this happen but in a great free society under our inspired system of government.

Mr. President, when William Penn founded the colony of Pennsylvania he did so in the concept of what he himself described as the "holy experiment."

This experiment, to be a beacon light to the founders of our Nation, made of Pennsylvania a sanctuary for the persecuted of all Europe.

Under the benevolence of William Penn, true principles of freedom, liberty of conscience, and love of one's fellowmen were founded in Pennsylvania. There were no barriers—there was no discrimination. There was neither creed, nor color, nor race.

Leopold Silberstein has given us new proof that our country is still the land of liberty and freedom and that our boundaries are limitless and our frontiers still unexplored.

My distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Oregon has previously mentioned Mr. Silberstein on this floor, as did former Senator Hunt, of Wyoming, who commented on Mr. Silberstein's speech over the Voice of America to foreign countries

His success, starting with the rehabilitation of the Pennsylvania coal company and providing many, many jobs for our people, led to the creation of numerous other companies.

Mr. Silberstein founded the Penn-Texas Corp., which he heads, and met with even greater success. A builder of companies, I note that Time magazine once described him also as a "professor of sick companies." None of his companies is sick oday. He makes them strong by modern, sound business enterprise.

We in Pennsylvania believe in free enterprise and we welcome those with the know-how to provide jobs and add to our Nation's economic growth and well-being.

Address of Col. Hugh Sawyer, Air Force Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD a splendid address by Col. Hugh Sawyer, of the Air Force Reserve, which was delivered at the Memorial Day exercises in Appomattox, Va., some time ago.

I feel that this address is particularly significant because of Colonel Sawyer's departure from the usual Memorial Day format. This, in my opinion, strikes at the very heart of the spirit behind the commemoration of that day.

The setting for his address is at historic Appomattox, around which so much of our history was centered.

I commend reading of his address by Members of this body.

ADDRESS BY COL. HUGH SAWYER, AIR FORCE RESERVE, MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, APPOMATTOX, VA., SUNDAY, MAY 27, 1956

Distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a distinct pleasure to be with you today as we gather at this historic spot to honor those of our Armed Forces who have given their lives in order that our Nation might be preserved to assume the world leadership that it enjoys today. Twenty-three hundred years ago, Pericles, one of the great Greek philosophers, said: "Remember your country as you have it before you, day by day, and when you find her great, remember, that greatness was won by men with honor and courage in action." It is those men and women that we honor today.

The thought I would leave with you during these few minutes is that the honor and homage which we pay to these men and women today should be felt and expressed every day of the year, not just by our words on this day, or by the act of placing flowers on the graves of our fallen heros, but should be expressed by our daily actions. Those men and women of our Armed Forces who lie beneath these hallowed grounds, and elsewhere throughout our land, made their sacrifices that you and I might enjoy the greatness of our Nation today. We should be ever mindful that it was those men and women and their honor and courage that made this country great. We should be mindful of this not just this one day of the year, but every day of our lives.

Now we can very well ask ourselves how we can do this, day by day—how we can pay the respect, the homage, and devotion that we feel for those who have laid down their lives for us. We cannot do it with words alone; we must do it by the way we live. The way we conduct our businesses and our professions, the way we maintain our homes and rear our children.

First, we can take the time, and make the effort, to become better informed of what our country stands for today, and to better know the position of leadership which we are so fortunate to occupy. A well-informed public is the stoutest pillar of our democracy. Just last week I was fortunate to attend the National Resources Conference which was conducted by the Industrial War College of the Armed Forces. During this conference the real greatness of our country was graphically depicted. I wish that each of you could share that experience, for as we learn more about our Nation and our objectives, we are then in a better position to fully appreciate the real greatness of our country, and to always remember that it was brought about by the courage, devotion, and sacrifices of those we are here to honor today.

Another effort that we can make in our daily lives to prove to those who have made the supreme sacrifice that we still honor them, and are grateful for that great sacrifice, is to get to know one another better. The tragedy of our Nation which ended 91 years ago on this spot perhaps could have been avoided if we had known one another better. However, at that time our forefathers were less fortunate than we are today, because they did not have the means of visiting one another, or communicating with one another, or sharing ideas among themselves. Such facilities are available to us today and it is our obligation to take advantage of them, and know each other throughout our land, in order to solidify the unity of our Nation. For, after all, a nation is only as strong as its peoples.

Another, and the most important means of guaranteeing to the fallen heroes whom we honor today that their sacrifices have not been in vain, is to offer our lives to God and to live as He would have us do so. Unless we can live in a godlike way and be governed by God, then our country will be ruled by tyrants. Since the beginning of time our history substantiates this philosophy, and as we see what is happening today in the country which is generally considered as our greatest potential enemy, there can be no doubt that without God governing us we will be ruled by tyrants.

These are then the things that we can do as we stretch out our hand to the dead, and reaffirm our faith in their great sacrifices.

Let us live daily with their memory constantly before us.

Let us seek to understand and know each other better, in order that we all will love one another.

Let us become better informed, and hence better able to understand fully the aims and ideals of our country, and to share the responsibility of the leadership which we enjoy today.

Most important of all, we must dedicate our lives to God, because in doing so we then are assuring those men and women who gave their lives for us that this Nation will be preserved and will never be ruled by tyrants.

In closing, I would like to again quote Pericles' statement of 2,300 years ago, which I am sure you will agree is as true today as it was then: "Remember your country as you have it before you, day by day; and, when you find her great, remember, that greatness was won by men with honor and courage in action."

Thank you.

The Well-Being of the People of the United United States and the People of the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in this season of campaign politics there is inevitably a considerable amount of partisan charges back and forth.

Both political parties will point with pride to their respective records, and both will tend to view with alarm the records of their opposite numbers.

As a Republican, I am naturally personally proud of the achievements of the Republican administration and of Republican Members of Congress. I believe in the reelection of Dwight D. Eisenhower and believe that the Republican Party should win control of the Congress as well.

NO PARTY HAS A MONOPOLY ON PATRIOTISM

But I have never maintained that the Republican Party has a monopoly on goodness or a monopoly on patriotism.

And I am delighted at the wise and statesmanlike comments on that fact which have been made by Republican leaders, led by the President himself.

Yes; despite partisan differences, we Americans can and should respect one another. Republicans should be willing to confirm the constructive contributions by Democrats and our Democratic

friends should be willing to concede that we Republicans do have our good moments as well.

Seriously speaking, it is a fact that we 167 million Americans face so many issues at home and abroad requiring that we work shoulder to shoulder together in a nonpartisan way that it is absolutely imperative that we have an atmosphere of friendliness and of open dealing between parties.

OUR COMMON NONPARTISAN GOALS

Our basic goals are, after all, the same.

Prosperity here at home is a goal to which Republicans and Democrats are naturally 100 percent committed.

And world peace is an overriding objective to which we are naturally wholeheartedly committed.

Of course, there are party differences as to how we may best achieve both of these objectives. But, nevertheless, we are united in our goals.

TWO STATEMENTS AT JWV CONVENTION

I have before me now two important statements, each on a separate phase, each with its individual and unique interpretation of America and world problems. Both were in connection with the national convention of the Jewish War Veterans, that great and honored organization of patriots. I was pleased months ago to be invited to address the 1956 annual convention of the JWV in Milwaukee.

The items which I have before me now represent presentations by others at the convention.

The first is an excerpt from an address made by a noted leader of the motion picture industry, the head of MGM Studios in Hollywood, Mr. Dore Schary. He is a famous writer, an outstanding producer and executive. Mr. Schary happens to be of an opposite political persuasion than my own. But that political fact is beside the point when we read this warm, human document by Mr. Schary. It is a statement of which any Democrat, any Republican, any American might well be proud, and I only regret that limitations of space prevent its reproduction in full.

The second is a newspaper report—also commendable—but of a different nature, on a different theme, and by not 1, but 2 leading men. It relates to the crisis in the Middle East. It was designed to help soothe the troubled waters of that area, to help bring the light of statesmanship and understanding there.

COMMENTS BY GENS. JULIUS KLEIN AND JOHN HILDRING

The statement was presented by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, former national commander of the JWV. He was joined in it by Maj. Gen. John W. Hildring. General Klein is a distinguished Republican. General Hildring was a career military officer. What they have to say will, I know, be welcomed by both parties, by all men of good will and of all faiths, who are concerned with peace and security and justice in the explosive Middle East.

Thus, on the one hand I present by Mr. Schary, a vivid, eloquent human statement of the challenge to human beings in general terms, in this atomic age.

And secondly, I present the summary of a statement by Generals Klein and Hildring, on another challenge—a very specific international problem.

Between these two items there runs a common thread, a search for what is right, and a deep sense of personal and national responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that in the final edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these two items be published.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DORE SCHARY

What must be done is to clarify to all mankind that we share a common interest. This is basic. It is a platitude, but nevertheless a truth, that you carry my name and I carry yours. All of us—white, red, black, yellow—Christian, Jew, Mohammedan—all of us who live and breathe in God's world carry the same name—human being. We talk a lot about this in smoke-filled, noisy political convention halls, where a variety of politicians, anxious to get our vote, speak in sometimes lofty and sometimes down-to-earth phrases designed to get us to mark the "X" in the right spot.

We talk about it in frantic sales conferences, where executives calculate and cogitate about our demands and needs as human beings and plan to supply us with correct iceboxes, radios, television sets, movies, and suitable clothing.

We talk about it in medical conferences where diseases are studied and our vital organs are analyzed in the aim that more years will be added to the life span of us, the human beings.

We talk about it in churches and synagogues and temples, where men of the cloth speak to us about our relationship with other human beings and with our relationship to God.

Yes, there is much interest in the human being—in his body, in his manners, in his mind and in his soul. With all this effort over so many centuries, the human being has come a long way. Some populated areas of the world have done a better job than others. Here in this magnificent country it is undoubtedly true that man is enjoying a better standard of living than any other generation of people at any other time has ever known. But there are other places where things that we, as Americans, take for granted would be known as miracles. We are inclined, whether we are young or old, to become forgetful and to stop counting our blessings.

Despite the fact that I am neither halt nor deaf with age, I can remember the time when electricity in the home was a delight and a luxury. I can remember horses being held in at the sound and sight of strange vehicles called automobiles. I can remember scratching the crystal of a radio set in an effort to hear the Dempsey-Firpo fight. I can remember the first herky-jerky movies and the incredible wonder when sound and color came into the medium. I can remember so very well when a man of fifty was considered old and far beyond his prime. I can remember friends who died from illnesses that are now easily controlled by the wonders of modern medicine. I can remember the old-fashioned clothes that bound us and choked us—and I can remember the thrill when my family finally had a private telephone of its own. I can remember, too—and remember too well, as I have mentioned before—the tensions of early childhood—the tensions attendant to the divergence in religious and racial matters—and all through these years I have been well aware of the constant talk and effort on behalf of the human being.

Today we take for granted electricity, the automobile, television, movies, medicine, telephones, and the like. Today's world is different. Where we once dreamed of an airplane ride, today we contemplate travel in space. But there is one area which has remained more or less static. It has to do with matters affecting religion and race. Science has made enormous strides, but in the field of human relations we have not kept pace. The hare of man's scientific achievement has far outdistanced the tortoise of human relations, which has plodded along gaining just a little bit.

One of our accomplishments is that we have finally created a method of warfare that can in no time at all decimate half the world's population and leaving the remaining half in danger of slow and painful extinction. This dubious accomplishment may, however, seem less dubious and more beneficial if, as a result, we are frightened enough to create finally on earth a true peace and, once and irrevocably, abolish the sin and the slaughter and the waste of war. But the cloud hangs heavy—and we human beings have done too little in one area—and that is the area of our relationship to each other. It is in this area of human endeavor where, in my opinion, we have failed each other the most. It is in this area that too few have done too little for too many.

We permit too much. We allow too much to go unnoticed or unspoken or unchallenged. We make too little of too many things. Good, decent people still go to hotels and join clubs that deny entrance to some of their friends. We elect to public office people who are still committed to the point of view that the color of a man's skin denies him the inalienable rights to which he is entitled. Too many of us still hate in the plural. I urge you veterans who have fought in one kind of war to enlist more of your time in the future to winning the war against bigotry of all kinds and in helping to solve this problem of human relations.

Certainly it is a problem that is highly complicated because it concerns two and a half billion humans living on the face of the earth. I wonder if you realize that this is a staggering number of people. Have you any idea what this living number of people represents in percentage of all the people who have ever lived in the recorded history of man? May I repeat that: Have you any idea what these two and a half billion people represent in terms of the percentage of all people who have ever lived in the recorded history of man? Would it be 1 percent, 2 percent, 5, 10? Actually the number of people alive today represent 20 percent—20 percent—of all mankind who have ever breathed in our recorded history. Two out of every ten people who have ever lived are alive today. And by the end of this century—living people will likely represent 50 percent of all recorded mankind.

Therefore, this problem of getting along with each other concerns 20 percent of all humankind in our entire world history. That's an overwhelming figure. It becomes more overwhelming when we realize that if we do not get along with each other, we have the means of wiping out practically all of us.

But it must be possible for man, who has done so much, to do even more and create a society where different people can learn to live with each other without hatred or violence. The mind of man, which can, by its inventiveness, regularly carry us from Los Angeles to New York in 6½ hours—which has given us penicillin, insulin, atomic energy, refrigeration, the electric eye, television, X-ray, rayon, synthetics of all kinds—the mind of man which has probed the deepest part of the ocean and nudged a hundred miles into space, must be able to come up with some ethical approach to life which will bring enduring compassion and peace. And where better for such a movement to begin than here in these United States—a new nation created by men of ideas and courage,

who fashioned the electric dream of freedom that flashed around a dark world? And you men are well qualified to help frame and communicate this ethical approach—you men who are members of the large fraternity of those Americans who have fought in two great world wars—you men who are members of a minority group that has in its very sinews a devotion to ethics and to man's responsibility to man.

Perhaps it is necessary for all of us, as Americans, and as Jews, to jog our memories about our heritage. The Old Testament is replete with poetic and firm statements concerning freedom and responsibility—and the ethical and moral inspiration which forms the bedrock of our religion is the bedrock of our national heritage. From our very first national statement, America declared for freedom in terms so forceful, so sublime and so inexorably appealing to men's consciences, that the whole world was shaken to its foundations. Tyrannies dissolved—hope sprang up like a fresh breeze—movements of liberation fairly mushroomed.

The greatest foreign-aid program in American history was not wheat or cotton or tanks—it was freedom, and the inspiration to freedom. No nation has ever improved on that kind of export. We did not begin with a frenzied blood bath, shooting down children of the British royal family and liquidating Tories. We did not spring into being with cries of doom to this class or that class. We began with God in our hearts.

"The laws of nature and of nature's God" says the Declaration of Independence, and goes on immediately to declare for the human being the finest billing he has ever enjoyed—"all men are created equal * * * endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights." It was the Creator, and not Marx or Engels or Augustus Caesar, who was cited. Unlike the way "He" is used in many political speeches, God was more than an epilog, a postscript, in our thinking. He was more than an afterthought in the writing of our history. He was the prologue.

There has always been in our national literature a steady, sober, exalted regard for the qualities of dignity and divinity, which we believe exist in the two-legged, rather contentious creature who was made in God's image. And again, in our tradition as Jews there is this same regard, this same passion for these qualities.

Can we not draw on this history and on this concept and go further to help fashion for all of us here and throughout the world a society where we can live in absolute freedom from fear—where ideas can be spoken without reservation—where color does not keep us out of a bus—where no one tries to humiliate us as we sign a hotel register?

So very often you will hear people say that "you can't change human nature"—that people are what they are—and so often they say, "I would be willing, but my next door neighbor wouldn't." They are always so sure of themselves, but so unsure of their neighbors—in the same way, perhaps, that their neighbors might be unsure about them.

Perhaps we need a revival of more faith in each other. Certainly we will be fooled—but is that a disaster? Only a cynic is never betrayed. Only a man who believes that all men are base is never fooled. But he also never enjoys the pleasure of abiding friendships. He never enjoys the glow that comes with giving or the warmth that comes with getting.

Let us make resolutions, not on New Year's Eve or Yom Kippur, but now—on this August day—resolutions that we will try, and in trying perhaps our neighbors will try, to really get along. I'm a realist—I know that there will be moments of temper—words of slander—hoarse shouts of anger—vagrant thoughts of malice—sins of flesh and pride and mind—but if we just try to cut down the number of backslidings, we'll be making progress.

There is a big enormous guaranty bank in our lives—the bank of faith and understanding. If we all make ample deposits, our assets will grow and we will take from the bank in our lifetime, and our children will draw from it in the future, the happy compound interest of peace and security.

In my lifetime I have seen pictures of or have met many people of goodness who have given to the world full measures of devotion. There is something in their faces that is very special. It is the look you see in the face of a Mrs. Roosevelt or an Einstein or a Gandhi—in the face of a Louis Brandeis or an Albert Schweitzer—in the faces of many clergymen and teachers and artists. It's a good look—that is ever blooming and is there for all to see. Sometimes we see it in the face of a man who comes to help us after an accident—in the face of a doctor as he looks at a sick and worried patient—in the face of a gardener as he tends a rose—in the face of a parent as he looks at his firstborn—in the face of a child as he looks at his mother—in the face of a bride as she looks at her groom.

I believe the capacity for that look is in each one of us—and sometimes in our lives, it's there. It only needs more exercise to keep it there.

I congratulate you men of this convention today for your contributions to American and to Jewish life, and I urge upon you the need to finish the unfinished work in the family society of nations and of humans. May we all live our lives so that when we are asked, as we all will one day be asked, "How did you treat your fellow man?" we will be able to answer, "I treated him well, as God directed me."

Thank you very much.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel]

KLEIN URGES CUT IN UNEQUAL ARMS

The most urgent need in the Middle East today is "to reduce the possibility of wide discrepancies in armed strengths."

This observation was made here Wednesday by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein (retired) former national commander of the Jewish War Veterans (JWV), who is attending the national JWV convention at the Schroeder hotel.

General Klein was joined in his statement by Maj. Gen. John H. Hilldring (retired), who was unable to attend the convention.

Klein and Hilldring, who commend the Eisenhower administration and the United Nations for their Middle East policies, are noted military and civic leaders.

Klein served as commander of troops in the Pacific under General MacArthur and later was appointed special assistant to War Secretary Patterson.

Hilldring is a career soldier. He was Chief of the Military Government Division of the War Department before President Truman appointed him as United States delegate to the United Nations. He also served as Assistant Secretary of State during the Truman administration.

Klein said that statement was prepared before the current Suez Canal crisis and after frequent trips to foreign countries and discussions with leading foreign figures.

Stressing that "the overall interests of the United States comes first," the generals came to these conclusions:

Israel is here to stay as an independent nation.

The United States Government's policy has helped prevent further allout war in the area.

The United States is right in working for peace and seeking to prevent present quarrels from becoming conflicts which could endanger world peace.

State Secretary Dulles has advanced the common effort to thwart aggression and work toward Middle East peace.

Reliance should be placed upon the processes of the United Nations.

Possible discrepancies in armed strengths in the Middle East should be reduced.

"We are satisfied that Secretary Dulles has set himself against letting the balance of military strength get one sided," the generals said.

They concluded with a plea for nonpartisan support for "the cause of freedom" in the Middle East.

Voting Record of the Honorable Richard E. Lankford, of Maryland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting record during the 84th Congress. The purpose of this report is to provide my interested constituents with a simple compilation of the votes I cast on important legislation which came before the Congress.

For the purpose of identification I include a brief description of each bill. For further simplification I have divided the list into categories according to general subjects.

FARM LEGISLATION

Voted for H. R. 10875 with soil-bank provisions and other programs designated to bolster farm income.

Voted for H. R. 8780 to eliminate gasoline taxes on fuel used in operation of farm machinery.

Voted for H. R. 12 to amend the Agriculture Act of 1949 with respect to price supports for basic crops.

Voted for H. R. 2851 to make Commodity Credit Corporation—farm surplus—commodities available for distribution to distressed areas.

Voted for H. R. 11708 to increase appropriations for disposal of agricultural products.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Voted for S. 67 to increase pay of civil-service employees and provide fringe benefits.

Voted for H. R. 4644 to increase postal workers' pay, eliminate inequities in service.

Voted for H. R. 7619 which liberalizes civil-service retirement benefits.

LABOR

Voted for H. R. 7214 to increase the minimum wage of $1 per hour.

Voted against H. R. 9852 which would require dispersal of defense industries.

Voted for Bacon-Davis amendment to highway bill that requires prevailing rates of pay for all labor on highway-construction projects.

VETERANS

Voted for H. R. 7886 to provide increased pensions for World War I veterans.

Voted for H. R. 587 to extend the GI education bill.

Voted for H. R. 12038 for increased payments for service-connected disabilities.

Voted for H. R. 7089 to provide increased survivor benefits for servicemen.

Voted for H. R. 9824 which provides for for educational assistance to children of certain veterans who died in World War II or Korea.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Voted for H. R. 6042 in 1955 and H. R. 10986 in 1956. Both bills provided for appropriations to operate the armed services.

Voted for H. R. 4393 in 1955 and H. R. 7993 in 1956. These bills provided $1.3 and $1.4 billion for Navy shipbuilding and modernization of fleet programs.

Voted for H. R. 3005 to increase benefits under dependents' assistance program and provide for a continuing Armed Forces personnel program.

Voted for H. R. 7000 to strengthen the Armed Forces Reserve program which offers youths choice of several ways to fulfill their military obligations.

Voted for H. R. 6829 in 1955 and H. R. 9893 in 1956 which provided nearly $4 billion for military construction projects.

Voted for H. R. 4720 to increase pay and allowances for members of the Armed Forces.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Voted for House Joint Resolution 159 which authorized the President to use the Armed Forces of the United States for the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores.

Voted for H. R. 1 which authorized the President to enter into beneficial trade negotiations with various nations of the world.

Voted for H. R. 7224 and H. R. 12130 which provided foreign aid funds.

Voted for House Concurrent Resolution 265 which expressed Congress' opposition to admittance of Red China into the United Nations.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Voted for H. R. 7535 to authorize a Federal aid program for school construction.

Voted for H. R. 7225 to lower the retirement age for women to 62 and start disability payments at age 50 under the social-security program.

Voted for S. 3272 which protects threatened communities by providing $15 million for Army engineers to construct without further authoriaztion small flood-control projects.

Voted for H. R. 2840 which authorizes 5-year $7.5 million a year program of Federal aid for State library services in isolated rural areas.

Voted for S. 849 which authorizes Federal aid of $30 million annually for 3 years for construction of non-Federal facilities for research into various crippling and killing diseases.

Voted for S. 3616 to increase benefit payments under railroad retirement system.

Voted for H. R. 11861 which provides for Federal participation in the cost of protection of the shores of the United States from erosion and permits Federal assistance to shores other than those publicly owned where a benefit will accrue to or is incidental to the benefit to public property.

Voted for H. R. 10660 which sets up a 13-year $33 billion program to develop interstate primary and secondary highways in the Nation.

Voted for H. R. 8320 which extended school milk program and set up $75 million fund for program.

BUSINESS

Voted for H. R. 8710 which removed authority of Defense Department to negotiate big contracts. Bids must now be called on contracts over $2,500.

Voted for H. R. 7992 which would require Defense Department to submit proposal to Congress before contracting out work to private industry.

Voted for H. R. 6227 which provides regulation by the Government of bank holding companies.

Voted for H. R. 4259 and H. R. 9166 for extension of corporation taxes.

Voted for S. 3732—Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956—provides liberal program for issuance of direct flood-insurance policies.

Voted for S. 3879 which permits automobile dealers to sue under antitrust laws for unjust revocation of franchise.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Voted against H. R. 6645, a bill which would have exempted independent gas producers from regulation under Natural Gas Act of 1938.

Voted for H. R. 12080 to authorize $1.3 billion for river and harbor improvements, flood and beach erosion control projects.

Voted for S. 890 which increases to $1 million a year Federal research grants to States and expands program for water-pollution control to $50 million a year for 5 years.

Voted for H. R. 8750 which broadens watershed and flood-prevention program—allocates shared costs among Federal and local interests.

Pay as You Go in Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MARTIN of Pennslyvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my speech to my comrades of the Spanish-American War at the 57th reunion of the old 10th Pennsylvania Infantry, which fought with the greatest distinction in the Philippines.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Spanish-American War was our last armed conflict in which every man was a volunteer. It was the first war in which our troops fought beyond the seas. It started the course of the United States toward leadership as a world power.

The pay of the Spanish War serviceman was $13 a month, paid in gold. He didn't get a $10,000 insurance policy, a bonus, separation pay, adjusted compensation, or a college education at Government expense.

No service pensions were provided for Spanish War veterans until 20 years after the war ended and no hospitalization was available until 24 years after the war.

The food of a soldier consisted of meat, beans, potatoes, and hardtack. It took a troop train 8 days and 8 nights to cross the continent, and soldiers were carried in second-rate day coaches. It required 30 days to go from San Francisco to the Philippine Islands.

In view of present day conditions it is interesting to look back to those days and consider the situation in the United States in 1898.

At that time there were 45 States in the Union. The population of the United States was a little under 76 million. It is now more than 166 million.

In the year, 1898, the national income was a little more than $15 billion a year and the money in circulation was less than $2 billion or about $24 a person. Now we have a national income in excess of $324 billion a year and the money in circulation amounts to $31 billion or $183 per person.

All taxes collected by the Federal Government preceding the Spanish-American War totaled less than $3 billion. Since that time the American people have paid more than $800 billion in Federal taxes.

In 1898 there were 200,000 Federal employees. Now we have 2¼ million.

At that time there were less than 1,000 automobiles in the world. There were dreamers who thought that someday we might travel in the air. There was no thought of radio or television.

There was not a single mile of paved road in the United States. Less than one-fourth of the homes of the country were equipped with plumbing. Practically every house had its own source of water supply.

There was practically no preventive medicine. Each year there was a heavy toll from fevers, pneumonia, measles, and diphtheria. Very little progress had been made toward modern sanitation.

Many people still lived in log and sod houses and miner's cabins. The greater number of our people still maintained themselves by work on the farm. There were few labor-saving devices.

Less than half of our young people had the opportunity to complete a high-school education, and only a few were able to go to college.

We are now the greatest power of all history. Our Capital City is the center of the world. While we possess only 7 percent of the world's population and area, yet we produce more than half of the world's goods.

What has brought this about? What great resources did we possess that made us, in less than 200 years, the strongest, the richest, and most productive Nation in the world?

We had freedom of the individual and an economy firmly established on the American system of free enterprise.

These precious assets will be the foundation of greater security, greater progress, and more expanding prosperity provided we keep our Government on a sound and strong financial footing.

To assure the safety and security of the United States and to perpetuate freedom of the individual the pay-as-you-go principle should be applied to Government financing at all levels.

Otherwise we face the dangers of high taxes and excessive debt which have destroyed more great nations than invading armies.

It is most important for Americans to consider that our national debt of $273 billion is more than the combined debt of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

The debt of State and local government is the highest in all history and they are continually reaching out for more taxes.

Individual indebtedness has climbed to the highest level in the history of the United States.

It should be a matter of deep concern to all of us that our public and private debt has reached the fantastic total of $658 billion.

The direct and hidden taxes paid by the American people for the support of Government are greater than the combined taxes of 75 other nations of the world, including Soviet Russia.

High taxes and burdensome debt are responsible for inflation and the severe hardships that result when the dollar is depreciated to half its value.

America must be awakened to these dangers. What can we do?

We must all take part in government. It is unfortunate that so many of our people fail to take an active interest in civic affairs.

We must all work for economy and sound fiscal policies at all levels of government, Federal, State, and local.

We must have a stable dollar, supported by a free economy, producing plenty of goods to buy with our earnings.

Every real American must be on guard against communism and all other subversive influences. We must all preach and practice patriotic Americanism.

Every man and woman must be ready and prepared to defend our freedom. It cannot be done with push button warfare.

We pray that we may never be forced into another war but in time of peril our Nation will again be defended by heroes in the mud, in the air, on the water, and in the jungles.

Our forefathers, in the development of this great country, carried with them into the wilderness the axe, the rifle, and the Holy Bible.

The axe is the symbol of work and self-reliance.

The rifle symbolizes the individual responsibility of every American to defend the way of life we are privileged to enjoy.

The Bible calls for faith in the greater power that rules the world and will protect those of courage, understanding, and righteousness.

The characteristics that have made America great are courage, freedom, justice, temperance, tolerance, faith, hope, and love of God. These characteristics, practiced by the individual, are the strength of our Nation.

Let us fill our knapsacks with those noble ideals and march forth, as you did and as have brave men of every generation, in the defense of our country.

Israel Should Have the Help of All Free Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Israel is one that should have the sympathetic and favorable consideration of all who are in a position to be helpful.

The long and sacrificial period of years that preceded the establishment of the state of Israel is one of the most outstanding and praiseworthy efforts of any people to have freedom and a nation with its own flag. The courage that was displayed, the fearless determination, and the indomitable will to succeed merits whatever help is necessary from America and the other free nations of the world to establish and make certain its sovereignty and security.

Israel is surrounded by Arab nations with unfriendly feelings and designs calculated to destroy it and its people. This attitude on the part of the Arabs cannot be explained or justified upon any reasonable basis. Certainly the little nation of Israel is not in any sense strong enough to menace or be harmful to the Arab nations that surround it. Nor is there any intention or desire to do so. The people of Israel are peaceful. They have no desire for war nor conflict of any kind. They want to live peaceably with all men. They have opened their gates to all people, the Arabs included. They have shown no resentment or discrimination against any race, creed, or people of any national origin, including the Arabs themselves. The people of Israel have no desire to be other than helpful and friendly and enjoy their homeland.

There is a need in my opinion, for the United Nations Organization to stand up and boldly admonish the Arab nations that the sovereignty of Israel as a nation is to be respected and its people are not to be molested but are permitted to enjoy to the fullest extent all the rights and privileges of a free people. It should be made equally plain that it is the purpose and intent to stand by and support Israel in these and all other attributes of a full and free sovereignty.

And what is the duty of our own Nation under existing conditions? Let us answer this question by asking ourselves what would we desire under similar circumstances. The answer is not difficult to make. We would want and expect the support of all free nations. Is not Israel entitled to the same? Our Nation is the most outstanding exponent of liberty and freedom in all the world. Our boys have fought and died in World War I, World War II, and in the Korean conflict to establish the principles of liberty and freedom throughout the world. We cannot afford to be lukewarm in support of any nation that holds aloft the flag of freedom. Israel is in a strategic position in the Near East. It is likewise in a position of danger because of the enemies that surround it. As these enemy nations are supplied weapons of war by Soviet Russia and its satellites, why should Israel be denied weapons of defense by the free nations of the world?

The important question to be considered in determining whether a nation should be armed or not is, What is its intention? If it be to make war, then it would be dangerous to put weapons of war within its grasp. If, however, the intention is to prevent war or for defensive purposes, then to put such in the hands of a peacefully inclined nation cannot be otherwise than to promote peace. The advice of President Theodore Roosevelt given many years ago, "Speak softly and carry a big stick," still holds good. Israel, with peaceful intentions, is entitled to have the help of other nations with like desire.

The peaceful activities carried on by Israel in industry, agriculture, and education have already made a marvelous improvement in Israel. Likewise, that which has been done to improve the living conditions of its people indicate that in years ahead, as given the opportunity, the progress that can and will be made is indescribable. I have had the opportunity of seeing whereof I speak, as a result of my visit a few years ago, and, consequently, I am most optimistic as to the future of Israel and its people.

With a full understanding of the aims and purposes that actuate the leaders of Israel and the high ideals that motivate them in all their activities, I deem it a privilege and an obligation to be helpful in the future as in the past whenever and in whatever way may be within my power.

Pledge and Performance—A Record of Magnificent Republican Accomplishment for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, no political organization has ever done more to keep its pledges to the people of this country than the Republican Party under the leadership of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The result is a record of magnificent accomplishment for America.

Less than 4 years ago the citizens of this Nation turned to President Eisenhower and the Republican Party because they wanted some changes made in the way the Federal Government was being run.

Small wonder.

Here are some of the things they were reading about in the newspapers:

New casualty lists from the stalemated war in Korea.

Prospects of a bigger Federal deficit with billions more added to the public debt in the year ahead.

Falling farm prices and mounting farm surpluses.

Scandal and corruption in government.

Communist subversion; new disclosures of Red sympathizers holding jobs on the Federal payrolls.

Inflation sending the price of consumer goods higher and higher.

Threats of new Government controls over an economy already in a straitjacket of regimentation.

Schemes to centralize more power in Washington at the prce of State and local authority as well as individual freedom.

This was the sorry state of the Union after two decades of Democrat mismanagement, and the people of America were at long last wised up, fed up, and burned up with the record of a party that was long on promise and short on performance.

What a welcome contrast the stewardship of the Republican-Eisenhower administration has been.

The story of that stewardship—of achievement in the field of national security, domestic economy, and social progress—is on the books.

We have come far—farther than anyone believed we could come in such a short time—toward restoring sound, decent, far-sighted government.

In broadest outline, we have moved from war to peace and from a stagnating economy to a prosperity unsurpassed in the history of man.

Only the bitter partisan would insist the Nation's well-being today has all come about by accident.

Wars just do not end by themselves.

Our domestic economy is not run by perpetual motion.

Government plays a major role in the life of every citizen, and it is the individual himself who knows whether the government serving him is good or is bad.

Our people have had good government for the past 4 years and they know it.

They have never had better government.

The war in Korea—that frustrating, deliberately stalemated war—was ended by the new Republican-Eisenhower administration as the first order of business.

What is more important, there have been no new wars.

Under the experienced leadership of President Eisenhower, the Nation's defenses have been strengthened.

Americans are more secure today than ever before—safer from attack and from subversion.

A firm, consistent foreign policy has earned us world respect.

Our proposals for an enduring peace have bolstered the hopes of freedom-loving men and women everywhere and have confounded our potential enemies.

Thanks to competent administration of our defense buildup, we have made the taxpayer's dollar work harder, giving us greater armed might for less money.

We lead the world in the development of atomic weapons and we lead the world in a program for the peaceful use of nuclear power.

In 1950, Republicans adopted a Statement of Principles and Objectives, one of which held that "A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security."

The American economy has never been stronger than it is today.

Our economy is strong because of Republican policies which were put into practice by President Eisenhower and his administration, and supported by Republicans in the Congress of the United States.

What did we do to stimulate this record-breaking national prosperity? Many things.

Let me list a few:

We abolished artificial wage and price controls that were stifling economic growth.

We cut Government spending, eliminating waste and extravagance in the Federal household.

This operation involved reductions in the Federal payroll amounting to tens of thousands.

It involved more than a dozen reorganization plans adopted by the Republican 83d Congress on the recommendation of the administration.

It involved chopping out waste and luxuries in the Truman administration's budget by more than $10 billion in the first year of the Eisenhower administration.

With such savings it was possible for a Republican administration to make good on its pledge to cut taxes.

As a result, American taxpayers got the biggest break from the Republican 83d Congress in the Nation's history—a $7.4 billion annual tax reduction program, with $2 out of every $3 staying in the pockets of individuals.

Beyond that, a monumental tax revision bill corrected scores of inequities which had grown up in our tax structure through the years, inequities that caused unreasonable hardship for many in lower income brackets who could least afford the burden.

A Republican administration and a Republican Congress moved rapidly and in harmony to get the Government out of competition with private industry where such competition was unjust and unnecessary.

A Small Business Administration was established, for the first time, to help the little operator solve his postwar problems and prosper as a vital part of our complex economic machine.

Recognizing agriculture's prime importance to the health of the Nation's economy, a Republican administration moved early to attack deep-rooted farm troubles with a sound and sensible program.

The new program, finally enacted after repeated Democrat attempts at sabotage, is now in operation and agriculture is moving ahead. The long downward trend of farm prices has been reversed and farm income is rising. Since 1954, nearly $3 billion worth of Government-owned surplus agricultural products have been disposed of, mostly by export.

Our goal is a fair share of the national income for the farmer without unwarranted regimentation by Government bureaucracy.

Republicans consider fiscal integrity a priceless ingredient of good government.

Careful handling of the people's money has been a hallmark of this Republican administration.

One of the major pledges of the Republican Party was to balance the Federal budget at the earliest possible time.

The budget has been balanced.

Moreover, the Federal Treasury has been able to announce a surplus of $1.7 billion to apply on the national debt.

These actions supplied the foundation for our present prosperity—a prosperity unprecedented in scope.

Here are the record-breaking aspects of our domestic economy today, an economy that is booming because our people have confidence in the policies and principles of this Republican-Eisenhower administration:

National income is at its highest level in history, surpassing by $33.5 billion the war-stimulated peak under a Democrat regime.

We have broken through the $400 billion mark on our gross national product.

Employment is beyond all previous expectations, with nearly 67 million Americans holding jobs.

What is more, hourly and weekly wages are running at an all-time high. Pay increases mean something today, in sharp contrast to cost-of-living wage hikes of past years which were always a step below a price level that kept going up and up.

Strike losses are at the lowest level since the long years of war and Government intervention in work stoppages.

Per capita disposable personal income is at a record high and so is production and consumer purchasing.

Far-reaching plans for the expansion of business and industry give assurance of even more and better job opportunities for young men and women now coming into the labor market.

Through the years, the Republican Party has always woven into the fabric of our social and economic orders the good that has developed generation by generation.

The surging progress of the last 4 years in the area of human well-being is without parallel in the past 20 years.

This short period has seen establishment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It has seen the country's social security system broadened and improved, with more than 10 million additional Americans brought into the program and benefits increased to the millions already participating.

Unemployment insurance coverage has been extended to millions of additional workers and railroad retirement benefits increased.

A program of hospital construction for the chronically ill is now in operation.

The dream of most American families—to own their own homes—has been realized by more households than during any other similar period in the Nation's history.

The record number of new homes—built by private industry under Government policies that have encouraged but not subsidized such activity—demonstrates that America can become a nation of homeowners without a vast public housing program.

The social progress we have made under Republican leadership has not been at the cost of individual self-reliance. It has not been accomplished through socialization of vast segments of our economy, but through well-ordered programs that have stimulated private initive and free enterprise.

The Nation's long-neglected highway system, the network of roads so necessary to the orderly growth of America socially and economically, and to our very security, has come in for a full share of attention.

Never before has any nation embarked on a roadbuilding program so ambitious in its concept than the one put on the record books this year.

Blocked by a Democratic Congress for a year, the $33 billion program was finally enacted into law, thanks to the persistance of a Republican President and Republicans in the Congress, who put the national good above all other considerations.

It is this determination of a Republican President to serve all the people that has contributed so much to the success of the Republican program for a better America.

President Eisenhower has kept the faith.

He has restored the great prestige of the office of the Presidency by the example he has set.

The people of America believe in him because he has proved that he believes in them.

There is no favoritism in the White House today.

There is no petty bickering with the Congress, no ultimatums, no displays of spleen.

Citizens in all walks of life know that under Republican leadership they have been treated as Americans should be treated—fairly and with respect.

Small wonder President Eisenhower stands today as the most widely admired leader in the world.

Much remains to be done.

Under continued Republican leadership, it can and will be done.

We have come far along the road to an enduring peace, but problems and misunderstandings still beset mankind.

The prosperous times we presently enjoy can be but the prelude of an even better life for future generations of Americans if we hold to principles that have already made our Nation the envy of the world.

The Republican Party has demonstrated what sound leadership can do for America and for the world.

It is pledged to continue that kind of service in the years ahead.

Additional Hospital and Medical Attention for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, during the time that it has been my privilege to serve in Congress problems affecting the welfare of our veterans have been before us for consideration every year.

It has always been a pleasure, as well as a privilege, to support the efforts that have been made to improve the welfare of ex-service men, their widows, survivors, and dependents. No nation can long succeed that does not recognize and hold sacred the sacrifices of the men and women who answer the call of their country in the hour of emergency.

It is gratifying to realize there has been a general recognition of this duty and an obligation by Congress throughout the years. I hope the time will never come when there will be any lack of desire to be helpful.

Although the benefits provided for veterans and their dependents have been numerous and varied, yet there are many ways that remain for further improvement. Without attempting to enumerate them in detail, I do wish to express the opinion that steps should be taken, by legislation or by administrative means, to improve and expand the right of veterans to have greater hospital facilities and the benefit of additional medical attention. Too often I have found that because of restrictions, limitations, or administrative interpretations it is difficult, and sometimes impossible, for a veteran to gain admission to a veteran's hospital. This should not be so.

I trust that the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, which has already done an excellent job for our veterans, shall give this subject careful and favorable consideration.

The Right to Counsel: A Basic American Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a recent speech on this floor tracing the historic development of the right to counsel, I had occasion to take notice of the position which Assistant Attorney General William F. Tompkins had taken relative to the right of all persons to be defended by counsel in all trial actions. Mr. Tompkins had challenged the Cleveland Bar Association, according to United Press Correspondent Robert F. Coll. The Cleveland Bar Association's president, Eugene H. Freedheim, strongly denounced Mr. Tompkins' statement. Mr. Freedheim said:

> The defense of an unpopular cause is not an easy task. Those who perform such tasks are acting in the highest and best American tradition, and they should be thanked and not blamed for keeping alive in the United States the constitutional tradition that every man should have a fair trial * * *. The Justice Department is the last branch of our Government which should attack the bar for doing its patriotic duty.

Now, as it happens, Mr. Tompkins is one of the leading Republicans in my own State of New Jersey. It has been reported from time to time that he will be a candidate for high public office in that State in the near future. With this in mind I felt it to be my duty to make his views known to our people and to take exception to them. Not too long after I made the speech regarding the strange position taken by Mr. Tompkins, the Republicans in the New Jersey Senate indirectly supported his stand by refusing to confirm the nomination of Judge John O. Bigelow as a member of the board of governors of Rutgers University, the State university of New Jersey.

When this Republican position was made public the reaction was immediate and, I am happy to say, unanimously in favor of defending our traditional civil liberties.

Although some Republican members of the New Jersey State Senate took issue with their colleagues and are to be congratulated for so doing, the Republican leadership appears to have been blind to the historic right to counsel. Governor Meyner and the Democrats in the State senate roundly criticized the Republican senate majority for their stand and supported the appointment of former Superior Court Judge John O. Bigelow, Jr., as a member of the board of trustees.

As a result of the broadest kind of condemnation of the Republican position by the people of New Jersey and the country as a whole and the affirmation of our traditional liberties by the Democratic Party of New Jersey and by the distinguished Democratic Senators in the New Jersey State Senate the whole matter was taken up once more and Judge Bigelow was approved. I am proud of the people of the State of New Jersey for their prompt and effective defense of our basic liberties. The action of New Jersey's Republican leaders in reversing themselves comes too late for them to escape the stigma which their original vote and their politicking in the matter has cast upon them. I am grateful for the confirmation of Judge Bigelow but little credit for this can accrue to the Republican Party in New Jersey, or to its leaders who have shown such a complete lack of knowledge of our American traditions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include here as part of my remarks editorials from the Trenton Evening Times, the Trentonian, the Newark News, the New York Times, and the New York Herald Tribune. Also included is an article from the Washington Daily News.

The matters follow:

[From the Trentonian]

A SORRY SPECTACLE

The New Jersey State Senate judiciary committee, by a vote of 4 to 3, has blocked Governor Meyner's appointment of former Superior Court Judge John O. Bigelow, Jr., as a member of the board of trustees of Rutgers University. The dissenting action was taken because Judge Bigelow represents a client who once invoked the fifth amendment in testifying before a congressional committee.

Governor Meyner countered by charging that the senate group displayed a lack of comprehension of the basic philosophy of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

The Governor also characterized the action as a "sorry spectacle," and added that "If you're going to censure a lawyer for representing clients you don't like, you're going to break down the system of trial by jury, fundamental to democracy."

The Canons of Professional Ethics of the American Bar Association read as follows:

"It is the right of the lawyer to undertake the defense of a person accused of crime, regardless of his personal opinion as to the guilt of the accused; otherwise innocent persons, victims only of suspicious circumstances, might be denied proper defense. Having undertaken such defense, the lawyer

is bound by all fair and honorable means, to present every defense that the law of the land permits, to the end that no person may be deprived of life or liberty, but by due process of law."

This canon, incidentally, is applicable to the members of the bar of New Jersey under rules laid down by the State supreme court.

If, as is probably true, those senate members who blocked Judge Bigelow's appointment were motivated by a desire to clip Governor Meyner's political wings, they fell far short of their miserable objective. Rather, it would seem, they added to the Governor's stature and lessened their own.

One need not be a lawyer to recognize the wrong this little senate group has done. Judge Bigelow, on the other hand, committed no wrong. He merely exercised an unquestionable right that was his to exercise, and performed a duty that he could not honorably evade.

Governor Meyner's enemies must be hard put when they resort to measures such as this to embarrass him. Indeed it was a sorry spectacle.

[From the Trenton Evening Times]

WORST MISTAKE

Refusal to confirm Judge John O. Bigelow as a member of the Rutgers board of governors stands as the worst mistake made by the Republican majority in the State senate.

That is how it was accurately described by Senate Majority Leader McCay, and that is what most people interested in the welfare of New Jersey must also feel.

The senate did not even consider that Judge Bigelow is a man of great intellectual attainment who would aid in making Rutgers a greater State university. The only consideration was given to the fact that, as a lawyer, Judge Bigelow represented a teacher who had used the fifth amendment to avoid testifying in a Communist investigation.

The fifth amendment is a part of the United States Constitution. It prevents any citizen from being forced to testify against himself. It has been used occasionally by Communists, but it is available to everybody in the United States as a defense against unfair prosecution. It is the duty of every citizen, as well as every lawyer, to defend this as one of the basic civil rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

It is a sorry day for New Jersey when a handful of State senators can blacken the name of a fine citizen and hamper a long-planned improvement in higher education because they disagree with one of our basic constitutional freedoms.

[From the Trentonian]

UNDO THE WRONG

It will be next Thursday, if then, before the State senate condescends to act on the nomination of former Judge John O. Bigelow for the board of governors of Rutgers University.

The strange case has taken a strange twist. Pursuant to long-established legislative custom, the nomination was originally blocked in secret committee session behind closed doors. But when the matter came up for reconsideration last Thursday, both Governor Meyner and Judge Bigelow demanded a public hearing.

The committee yielded. But that was about as far as it would go. Unaccustomed to doing things out in the open, the spotlight apparently cramped their style. Hence the sudden decision to think things over till next Thursday.

Four senators—Farley of Atlantic, Mathis of Ocean, Hannold of Gloucester, and Hillery of Morris—are directly responsible for the impasse. Under New Jersey's cockeyed and unrepresentative rules of legislative procedure, they have the power to keep the nomination bottled up in committee and to hinder the senate as a whole from acting on it.

Meantime a cloud has been cast over the career of one of New Jersey's most honored citizens. Ironically this pall of gloom falls over him in the declining years of a life that has been devoted to public service and exemplary living. In this connection, it might be noted in passing that he lost a son in action in World War II.

That Judge Bigelow was within his moral, professional, and legal rights in defending a client who refused to testify before a congressional committee is undeniable. Certainly no doctor would ever be penalized for rendering medical aid to a person with a questionable background, nor would the finger of scorn and ridicule ever be pointed at a prison chaplain for administering spiritual comfort to a condemned criminal on the gallows.

The Trentonian submits unhesitatingly and without any reservations whatever that Judge Bigelow has been wronged. And, to make matters still more untenable, he has been wronged by duly accredited representatives of the people of the sovereign State of New Jersey.

It is well that the senate has decided to reconsider this action and think things over. It is also well that the final decision is to be made out in the open.

And when the hour comes to make this final decision, confirmation of Judge Bigelow's appointment is the only way the senate can, in good grace, redeem itself. Otherwise another black Thursday will surely blot our calendar.

[From the Trentonian]

THE MAJORITY RULES

After some inexplicible detours down the blind alley of minority misrule, the strange case of Judge Bigelow has taken the only course that it could justifiably have taken. The noted lawyer and jurist has been confirmed by a majority of New Jersey's State senators as a member of the newly created board of governors of Rutgers University.

It will be some time, however, before the storm created by the senate judiciary committee's stubborn recalcitrance to accept him as fit to serve will abate. Too many questions have been raised; too many people have hastily dipped into the puddle to help stir up the mud. Indeed, one of the questions is this: Is the theory of a nonpolitical board of governors for the State university founded on a false premise?

We fear that it is. If a man of Bigelow's stature is to be denied confirmation simply because a few members of a governing body feel he does not conform to concepts of their own making, then the worth of the board is for all time placed in jeopardy. And the specter of a politically controlled board conjures up the dread picture of a politically controlled educational institution.

With that in mind, it might be well for the citizens of New Jersey to take a long, hard look at the reorganization plan for Rutgers which has gotten off to such an unseemly start.

At the same time, citizens of New Jersey would be well advised to give serious thought to other questions arising from the deplorable Bigelow incident.

Have we reached a point where any person who embraces the shelter of the fifth amendment is to be deemed guilty? Have we reached a point where a lawyer who represents such a defendant is to suffer unwarranted reflection upon his personal and professional integrity?

In an even larger sense, have de departed so far from the concepts of personal liberty laid down by our Founding Fathers that a man is now to be adjudged guilty until he proves himself innocent?

All we can say in answer thereto is that if we have departed so far from our forebears' concepts of freedom, then it's time to turn back. It's time to turn back to the Constitution, which gives every individual the right to representation by counsel and the right to refuse to testify against himself.

And in New Jersey, it's also time to turn back to the rules of ethical conduct, specifically that of the New Jersey supreme court which holds:

"It is the right of the lawyer to undertake the defense of the person accused of crime, regardless of his personal opinion as to the guilt of the accused; otherwise innocent persons, victims only of suspicious circumstances, might be denied proper defense. Having undertaken such defense, the lawyer is bound by all fair and honorable means, to present every defense the law of the land permits, to the end that no person may be deprived of life or liberty, but by due process of law."

In the Bigelow case, the New Jersey State senate came dangerously close to treading upon concepts of constitutional liberties and obligations that are and must be a vital and indispensable part of the American way of life.

[From the Trenton Evening Times]

INDEFENSIBLE

The judiciary committee of the New Jersey senate has adopted an indefensible attitude with respect to Governor Meyner's nomination of former Superior Court Judge John O. Bigelow as a member of the newly created board of governors of Rutgers University.

Mr. Bigelow is a distinguished member of the New Jersey bar. His service on the bench has been creditable. No phase of his long career has been subject to criticism. In the course of his private practice he accepted the defense of a client who invoked the fifth amendment in testifying before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

For this reason the Senate Judiciary Committee by a majority vote har refused to report favorably the nomination of Mr. Bigelow although certain of its members concede that if the nomination reached the floor it would receive confirmation.

In his own behalf, Mr. Bigelow has stated an indisputable principle. "Everybody is entitled to counsel," he said. "I think that the bar as a whole is under duty to see that everyone who needs counsel has it. I will continue to represent my client regardless of any action by the senate."

A position contrary to this view is as foolish as it is unfair and unjust, as every member of the committee, and particularly every lawyer member, should realize. Every defendant, regardless of the nature of the charge, is entitled to counsel. Did not John Adams, to his credit as a sincere lover of justice, defend the British soldiers charged with the Boston Massacre? Is not the cause of even the most despicable criminals and traitors carried to the highest courts of the land by able and respected lawyers?

The committee's action in the nomination cannot be justified. It is to the credit of Majority Leader Albert McKay and Senators Ridolfi of Mercer and Sharp of Cumberland that they dissented from the majority action.

[From the Trenton Evening Times]

AT LAST

At last the State senate confirmed Judge John O. Bigelow as a member of the new board of governors of Rutgers University. By its action last night it cleared the way for the reorganization of Rutgers into a university which can meet the expanding needs of a growing State.

The delay in confirming Judge Bigelow showed once more the way in which a handful of determined senators have for years harassed every effort to improve government by bottling improvements in committee. This is not new and will continue as

long as the State senate permits the inane custom of senatorial courtesy to block good legislation. But it is good to have the public reminded how damaging are the efforts of Senators Farley, Mathis, Hannold, Dumont, and their friends.

To some the delay in Judge Bigelow's confirmation was shocking because he is such a distinguished jurist, scholar and churchman. To infer that he would coddle Communists is nonsense.

To others, including a number of newspapers, it was more shocking that a lawyer of the highest reputation could be withheld from appointment to the university governing board because he had recommended to a client the use of the fifth amendment.

The real base, however, of the public shock should be that there are members of the State senate, sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States, who would deny the rights in that Constitution to the citizens of New Jersey. The heart of the matter lies in the effort to deny to teachers the right to one of the Bill of Rights, to assume that a man using the fifth amendment is convicted of crime. This is the very protection which Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry demanded for every citizen. It is deep shock to find some State senators who want to set aside the Constitution of the United States.

[From the Newark Evening News]

SENATORIAL ABSURDITY

Public reaction against the State senate's failure to confirm John O. Bigelow for the new board of governors of Rutgers University is compounded of surprise, shock, and indignation. Protests mount, and with reason. For the more one examines this piece of senatorial foolishness, the more incredible it appears.

The fuzzy implication that Mr. Bigelow somehow comes under the head of a "security risk" is ludicrous. But, then, reason and equity didn't abide in the State senate on Monday. The list of senators voting against his confirmation—and as it now turns out, against Rutgers' reorganization—contains the names of men who ought to know better.

Obviously too much cannot be expected of Messrs. Mathis, of Ocean, and Farley, of Atlantic, who more or less run the Republican majority.

But what of such Republicans as Senate President Dumont, of Warren County, and Senator Hillery, of Morris? Or of Gloucester's Mr. Hannold? They were certainly in curious company in voting against confirmation. And, of course, there were the senatorial absentees whose votes, intelligently cast, would have averted this dismal farce.

For one, Senator Forbes, of Somerset, did not know the situation—or the judiciary committee—was loaded; he went home early. Senator Jones, of Bergen, had the legitimate excuse of family illness to account for his absence; so did Senator Harper, of Sussex.

Senator Murray, of Hudson, was absent, too; but present or unaccounted for, he would have been no help since he was against Mr. Bigelow, anyway. And by the usual coincidence, Passaic's Senator Shershin had one of those familiar business appointments which seem to arrive just ahead of critical rollcalls.

It is significant that Mr. Fox of Essex, the senator who knows him best, was in the thick of the fight to confirm Mr. Bigelow. He was supported by the Republican floor leader Senator McCay of Burlington, and also by six other senators, including Mr. Lance, Republican, Hunterdon; Mr. Stout, Republican, Monmouth; Mr. Ridolfi, Democrat, Mercer; Mr. Cowgill, Democrat, Camden; Mr. Sharp, Democrat, Cumberland; and Mr. Waddington, Democrat, Salem. That left 3 votes fewer than the 11 necessary to confirm.

Of course, it is never safe to predict what the senate will do. Nevertheless there are signs that it is coming out of its political fog. President Dumont at least has acceded to Senator McCay's request for a special session today.

The senate is now on notice from Waldron Ward, the man who wrote the enabling legislation, that it is no longer solely a matter of redressing an indignity to an individual, but also of saving State control of the university.

Mr. Ward holds that unless a full board of governors (which means Mr. Bigelow's confirmation) is approved September 1, "the reorganization plan will not be effectual" and the law will be void. With that interpretation Senator Jones, who is the legislature's unofficial counsel, is largely in accord.

So the Republican senate, as also the Republican Party, is now confronted with the fruits of its absurdity. Senators can continue their blind opposition to Mr. Bigelow and reorganization, or they can make honorable amends by reversing Monday's vote. As of now, the decision rests mainly with Senators Dumont, Hillery, and Hannold.

[From the Newark Evening News]

THE BIGELOW CASE

The senate has blocked Governor Meyner's nomination of John O. Bigelow to the new board of governors that will take over control of Rutgers University.

The senators' objection is based on the fact that, as a practicing attorney, Mr. Bigelow agreed to represent Robert Lowenstein, 1 of 3 Newark public-school teachers whose dismissal, because they invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about Communist affiliations by a house subcommittee, is now before the courts.

Apparently the senators don't know much about Mr. Bigelow. He recently retired as a judge of the appellate division of the superior court. Under the old constitution he was a vice chancellor. Before that he was counsel to the public utilities commission and prosecutor of Essex County. He was an Army officer in World War I. Just 40 years ago he was the Democratic candidate for State senator.

Born into one of Newark's oldest families, he is a descendant of one of the founders of Massachusetts Bay Colony and is the grandson of Newark's Civil War mayor, Moses Bigelow. He is a Princeton graduate and served in the general council of the Presbyterian Church. He is a member of the Essex Club, perhaps the most conservative in New Jersey, and is associated with one of the State's best known law firms, Pitney, Hardin & Ward, of Newark, the same firm where he began to read law 51 years ago.

Even the most nervous and subversion-conscious senator must have a hard time finding anything in his background and these associations that suggest the radical or the unbalanced liberal. Questioned by the senate judiciary committee, which has in mind some loyalty cases pending at Rutgers, Mr. Bigelow gave the answer that was to be expected from a man who had been a judge for 25 years.

He said he would have no hesitancy in firing a professor who was a known Communist, but that he would not, without an opinion from legal counsel, fire a person merely because he invoked the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination. He added that he would be guided by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

That wasn't good enough for the committee, so Mr. Bigelow was not confirmed.

It wasn't the first mistake the senate has made, but it is hard to recall one more frivolous and irresponsible.

Aside from the injustice done Mr. Bigelow, the senate's recalcitrance poses a serious question for the State and Rutgers. The new law setting up the State university requires approval of the new governors before the present trustees can adopt the reorganization plan. The deadline is September 1. Accordingly, the senate's failure to confirm leaves in doubt the status of the new board and thus places the issue of reorganization in a legal twilight zone.

The damage should be repaired quickly. The senate is not due to reconvene until September 17. Therefore a special session is called for, and unless the senate's Republican leadership is completely bankrupt, it will be called and Mr. Bigelow confirmed.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

ACT OF INJUSTICE

The behavior of the New Jersey State Senate in the Bigelow case is a shocking violation of just about every tenet of American justice. The facts are simple enough. Governor Meyner made six appointments to the board of governors of Rutgers University. Among them was former Judge John O. Bigelow, of the Superior Court, who in his 72 years has served with distinction as a lawyer, prosecutor, jurist, and public servant. But the senate, after many hours of secret conference on Monday, refused to give confirmation. There was only one reason. Judge Bigelow, as a lawyer, represents a Newark teacher who pleaded the fifth amendment before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and whose dismissal is still being contested through the New Jersey courts.

Now it is an established constitutional principle that every person, no matter how unpopular his cause may be or what degree of suspicion attaches to him, has the right to counsel. The duty of bench and bar is to see to it that an accused defendant is competently represented so that no one may be deprived of life or liberty except by due process of law. This is a fundamental guaranty of fair trial, based on Supreme Court opinions, bar association canons of ethics, and inherent commonsense.

What the New Jersey Senate, or at least a momentarily controlling faction, has done is to condemn Judge Bigelow as unfit for public service because he saw his duty of advocacy. The senators dislike Judge Bigelow's client; hence they lump the counsel into a package of association. But the fact that a lawyer accepts an unpopular case, as on occasion he is bound to do, has nothing to do with his qualifications to serve on the Rutgers board or in any other post. Even worse, the Senators have set up a system of intimidation under which the faint-hearted will hesitate to follow the dictates of duty and fair play for fear of such political condemnation.

Governor Meyner, leaders of the bar, and many other responsible citizens have heartily denounced this wrong-headed action. This criticism has persuaded the New Jersey Senate to reconvene today and take another vote. Let us hope it will undo the damage. Certainly this stupid deed must not be allowed to stand.

[Editorial from the New York Times]

THE BIGELOW CASE

The New Jersey State Senate can only bring itself into disrepute if it persists in its incredible rejection of a gubernatorial appointee solely because as a lawyer he represents a client who has pleaded the fifth amendment.

Governor Meyner had submitted to the senate the name of former Judge John O. Bigelow, a prominent and respected Newark attorney, for appointment to the newly created board of governors of Rutgers University. By a 4-to-3 vote the Republican-controlled senate judiciary committee refused to confirm Judge Bigelow's nomination after subjecting him to entirely improper questioning; and the senate acquiesced in its decision.

In angrily rejecting the demand of the senate Republican leaders to withdraw the

appointment, Governor Meyner is showing far more respect for the Constitution of the United States and the spirit of American justice than are the petty politicians who are thwarting Judge Bigelow's confirmation. One of the worst legacies of McCarthyism has been the tendency in recent years for lawyers to shy away from unpopular or allegedly subversive clients for fear that the public might impute to the lawyer some of the suspicion or guilt attached to the client. It is a cardinal principle of the American legal system that every accused person is entitled to a lawyer and few things could be more subversive of that system than to suggest that a lawyer must be suspect because he defends an unpopular client or because he advises him to fall back on constitutional guarantees. For a legislative body such as the New Jersey State Senate to penalize a citizen such as Judge Bigelow for doing just this is to hit a new low. It is, as one distinguished lawyer has said, "a species of terrorism against the bar itself."

The country's great bar associations have repeatedly recorded their feelings about the respective duties of both lawyers and the public in these cases. The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York State Bar Association, and the American Bar Association have all adopted virtually identical resolutions reaffirming "the duty of the bar to provide * * * aid even to the most unpopular defendants" and demanding "public acceptance of the correlative right of a lawyer to represent * * * any client without * * * having imputed to him his client's reputation, views, or character." The freedom of all lawyers is specifically at stake in this battle between Governor Meyner and the Republicans of the New Jersey Senate.

[From the Washington Daily News]

CIVIL RIGHTS: DIRTY WORDS

(By Inez Robb)

Are the civil liberties handed us on a silver platter by our embattled ancestors to be lost by default in this generation to creeping fascism? Is the Bill of Rights to be gutted?

Is the proud tradition of individual liberty and freedom of conscience to be lost?

Since World War II and the advent of McCarthyism, the very phrase "civil liberties" has become in many quarters two of the dirtiest words in our language.

Crackpots and lunatic fringe of the extreme right have transmuted that golden phrase into the base metal of subversion. Their addled heads equate it with communism.

For instance in New Jersey, the State senate's Republican majority has refused to confirm the appointment of Judge Ogden Bigelow, a distinguished jurist, lawyer, and citizen of the State, to the board of governors of Rutgers University solely because he represented a client who took recourse in the fifth amendment.

(It is completely beside the point that the 70-year-old jurist assumed the defense of this controversial client at the request of the Essex County Bar Association.)

Does this incredible action on the part of the Republican majority foreshadow the time—

When a lawyer is to be assumed guilty of the crimes with which his client is charged?

When that great bulwark of Anglo-Saxon justice, the assumption of innocence until proved guilty, is denied the accused and both he and his attorney are held guilty until proved innocent?

When a man and his attorney in an unpopular cause can be hounded from society, even before a case is settled?

Does this predict a time in the near future when a man accused in a cause repugnant to popular opinion will be unable to obtain counsel, and thus be denied justice, because the legal profession will shy from the presumption of guilt by association?

You say this is nonsense? Yet these are the implications plainly and boldly written in the action of the New Jersey Senate majority.

How else can you interpret the idotic, soap-opera statement of Wayne Dumont, Jr., president of the senate: "I would never have represented the type of client Judge Bigelow chose to represent. This is an issue bigger than either the senate or Judge Bigelow."

This from the man who presides over the senate of the first State in the Nation to ratify the Bill of Rights.

Social Security and Benefits for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. WOLVERTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I have been from the very beginning a strong believer in the aims and purposes of social security, and consequently I gave my support to the first social-security bill that was passed and to every amendment that has been adopted since that time.

The first bill was not much more than an adoption of the principle that underlies social security, namely, assistance to workers in their old age and to others handicapped and in need of help. The amount of benefits fixed by the bill was not large. But it was, at least, something. As time went on deficiencies in the legislation became more and more apparent. This brought demands for correction. Congress was sympathetic. It recognized the need. It sought to remedy the deficiencies. Thus, throughout the years and even up to and including this session of Congress changes have been made that have greatly improved the status of retired workers, elderly people, and the handicapped. Benefits have been increased, but there is more that should be done in this respect.

In addition to the many improvements made in the past, an admendment adopted during this session of Congress has reduced the age of eligibility of women from 65 years to 62 years. The amendment also has provided that persons totally disabled shall be eligible for benefits at age 50 instead of 65. Furthermore, the act has been expanded so that it now includes an additional 10 million persons to come under its coverage in different activities.

More than seven and one-half million are receiving monthly payments under old-age and survivors insurance. Over 1,300,000 are receiving unemployment insurance payments. Five million are receiving public-assistance payments through the Federal-State programs of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the totally disabled, and aid to the blind. Additional millions are receiving services pursuant to the maternal and child health and welfare provisions of the Social Security Act. In all, 14,000,000 persons are receiving money payments today under our Social Security Act programs.

As I have already said, I am of the opinion there are many changes yet to be made to make the act all that it should be. These relate to increased benefits and further reduction of age limitations for eligibility for benefits. Furthermore, the act should be expanded until all persons are brought within its provisions. There should be no business or other activity excluded. It is a national law and should give coverage to all who desire to participate in its benefits.

It seems to me there is a distinct duty and obligation upon a nation such as ours to make provision for its elderly citizens. This applies not only to social-security benefits, but also with respect to housing, hospital and medical care, nursing homes, and in other fields of welfare activities. There is nothing more disturbing nor the cause of greater worry than to approach old age with no assurance as to how it will be possible to meet the conditions of that time of life with only meager savings or maybe none at all.

If there should be any disposition upon the part of those who do not feel or face the condition I have just described and doubt the existence of such, then I can assure them that a day's experience in any congressional office will be sufficient to convince them of the fact that such a condition does exist. The letters that come into a Congressman's office and the personal appeals that are made to him, either by the aged themselves or by those who, with incomes insufficient to care for their own families, must assume the obligation to care for aged relatives, show this condition of need to be all too general. It is a pathetic problem, and we must find a remedy for it.

Investigations of every kind and character are authorized by Congress, and millions of dollars are spent in carrying them forward. I know of no investigation that is more necessary or more justifiable than an inquiry that will show the dire need of many thousands of aged persons who are faced with distress as they reach old age, and to this I pledge my support.

The Farm Price Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, last April I was one of those who fought for the 90-percent-of-parity price support program which the Congress enacted and the President vetoed. This veto doomed the American farmers to the Republican sliding-down scale price support program which has tobogganed many small farmers into bankruptcy.

The speech I made to the Congress on April 11, when the Democratic farm bill

was under consideration, and my other work in behalf of the farmers during my 4 years in Washington all tie in with the dramatic battle waged by the Democratic Party to maintain the high level farm prosperity of the Democratic years.

School Segregation Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have pointed to the tremendous problems created in Virginia and throughout the South by the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in connection with public school education.

Throughout our Southern States, and in fact of many other areas in the country, attention has been focused upon the scope of these problems, and I feel that our people are becoming more aware of the great dangers which confront us.

One of the great contributions being made in our fight is the stand taken by many courageous editors, who have forthrightly presented the facts, characterized the problem, and set about in a determined way to oppose that which we feel destroys our education system.

One of those who has been particularly aware of this problem and who has focused attention upon the situation is Edward A. Wyatt, district editor of the Progress-Index, of Petersburg, Va.

I wish to insert herewith an editorial from this newspaper referring to the problems confronting our people and calling attention to the stand now being taken in Virginia. I commend this to the reading of Members of this body.

The editorial follows:

QUIET DETERMINATION MAKES A GOOD MOOD

Now we have a date for the special session of the general assembly—August 27—to deal with the school segregation problem, and Governor Stanley is on record that he does not propose to see any mixing of the races in the public schools anywhere in Virginia.

The governor will recommend the proposals of the Gray legislative commission, minus the student assignment plan. The latter is something which has been losing friends steadily for a long time, because a student assignment plan based on other considerations than race would not be a preventive of integration. Further, he will recommend legislation authorizing and directing the governor to withhold certain State school funds from localities which might desegregate their schools.

Thus the governor points the direction of State policy, which will be to resist desegregation on a statewide scale rather than further decentralize authority so that the localities can deal with the situation as they see fit. It is likely that the general assembly will have to enact still stronger measures to vest power in the State and also to make the State rather than the localities the defendant in antisegregation suits.

The governor himself leaves an impression that more is to be added to fill out the program.

Less important, at this stage, than the details is the tone of quiet determination which marks the governor's statement. He takes account of the public's growing awareness of the implication of the Supreme Court decision, of interracial incidents occurring in other sections, and of the mounting concern over Federal judicial usurpation.

If the United States Supreme Court and Judge Paul have frightened Governor Stanley into believing that school desegregation must be accepted, he gives no evidence of it. It is a good omen for the approaching special session that he takes the stand he does and also that he manages to do it without the sputtering which some seem to feel is appropriate to the occasion.

He proposes to resist desegregation and also to carry on the orderly operating of public schools in Virginia as before. It is a foregone conclusion that the legislature will enact the appropriate measures.

Who Is Russia Trying To Fool?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Who Is Russia Trying To Fool?" by Richard S. Kaplan, first district commander, Department of Indiana, American Legion.

This is a vigorous anti-Communist statement, with which I am in general agreement.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS RUSSIA TRYING TO FOOL?

(By Richard S. Kaplan, first district commander, Department of Indiana, American Legion, 1955–56)

Premier Nikolai Bulganin and Communist Party Chief Nikita Khrushchev have destroyed the image of Stalin and have confessed that the great Stalin was a ruthless liar and murdered. They have apologized for the deliberate and senseless slaughter of millions of Ukrainians, Poles, Jews, and others in Soviet Russia since Stalin became head of the Communist state.

Those two honest (?) souls wept bitter tears as they made this confession, but forgot to tell the Russian people that they were part and parcel of the Stalin conspiracy; that they stood idly by participating in the sadistic joy that was Stalin's as innocent people were shot from behind at his behest.

Now they ask that we forget all that has happened and believe these two who want peace—nothing but peace—at their price. I have no doubt in my mind that many thousands of Americans believe in the sincerity of Bulganin and Khrushchev. But they forget some very important facts and they do not realize that what is happening is that these two master-minds have switched signals. No more obvious threats of war. They intend to win a new way. This time, as the NATO ministers agreed, a few weeks ago, the world is facing a new and dangerous agile Soviet foreign policy based on economic and cultural penetration.

Let us analyze some indisputable facts.

Many years ago Nicolai Lenin, who has not as yet been denied by Bulganin and Khrushchev, and who was smuggled out of Switzerland in a boxcar and brought to Russia to sparkplug the underhanded overthrow of the Kerenski government, the only democratic government Russia ever knew, wrote these words: "It is inconceivable that communism and democracy can exist side by side in this world. Inevitably one must perish." Read those words over and over again until they sink indelibly into your mind. Those words constitute the fixed purpose of Russian communism, namely, to take over the rest of the world.

The writings of Marx and Lenin constitute the basic law of communism. If we are to listen to the two present leaders of Russia on the matter of coexistence peacefully, then we must be made to believe that a positive, inflexible, basic, and fundamental purpose of communism is about to be destroyed, and that is pure, unadulterated hogwash. Eliminate this purpose, and you destroy the purpose of existence for the Communists, and the Russian leaders know it. They have never for one moment forgotten the basic teachings of Marx or their revered saint, Lenin, and don't let anyone fool you on that score.

Let us again go back to Lenin's words. He also wrote: "We must in no case, not even in a single strategic maneuver, tie our own hands. If I pursue an enemy who does not move in a straight line, but zigzags, then I, too, must zigzag in order to reach him. * * * When the turns of history are very sharp, the turns of the party's policy may also have to be sharp." This plan of action has not been repudiated by the present leaders of Russia.

Lenin also laid down this inflexible rule: "Until the final issue between capitalism and communism is finally decided, the state of partial war will continue. We say, 'A la guerre comme a la guerre.' Do they believe that the revolution * * * can proceed calmly, smoothly * * * without torments, without infliction of pain, without terror, without horror?" And this fundamental belief has not been repudiated by Bulganin or Khrushchev.

The laws of communism are clearly laid down and defined. It's a struggle to the death between capitalism and communism. Lie, cheat, steal, make agreements, but keep your fingers crossed and forget the agreements if it will serve your purpose. That's the Communist law and creed.

Doesn't Eisenhower know this fact? Doesn't Dulles know it? Don't the great leaders of the world know these facts? Certainly they do. They must know it. Then what in the name of all that is sane and holy keeps our leaders going around in circles and being whipped at every turn by the now sweet and gentle approach of the Russian killers?

Let's take a leaf out of the Russian book. It was Khrushchev who threatened, while visiting England, "Don't ever shake your fist at a Russian." It's about time we stop our diplomatic blunderings. Let's stop the efforts to use us as propaganda bait. Let's tell Russia in no uncertain terms, "Don't even dare to threaten us or shake your hydrogen bomb in our face or you may find it exploding in your own kitchen." Let us get on with the strengthening of our Nation and the nations truly friendly to us. Give not an inch. Show communism that although we are a peace-loving people, we too, can put iron in our fists when we are threatened.

The Communists understand only force and strength. They respect it. Then give them what they understand and respect.

There can be no peaceful coexistence between capitalism and communism. Marx said so. Lenin said so. Engels said so. And in this case, we believe those otherwise great liars.

But we will believe Bulganin and Khrushchev believe everything they say, when:

They see to it that every slave laborer in Russia is freed.

They demand the immediate return of every Allied serviceman who was captured in Korea and whose disappearance has not been explained.

They return every ship this country loaned them under lendlease during World War II.

They publicly acknowledge the debt they owe us for the gifts we gave to the Russian people during World War II.

They lift the Iron Curtain in Rumania, Albania, Lithuania, Poland, Esthonia, Hungary, and Russia, remove their stooges and allow the peoples of those nations the right to their own form of government.

Remove their stooges from East Germany and let Germany become reunited, without interference.

They denounce Lenin and Marx as imbeciles and would-be murderers.

Having acknowledged the thievery of Stalin, when they return the billions of dollars of machinery, factories, electrical supplies and tools they stole and removed from the conquered nations.

When they punish the murderous Chinese Communists who tied the hands of our captured fighting men and then shot them in the back.

When, by their acts, they have shown their desire to become a part of the decent world, we shall, indeed, believe them. Until then the Russians are fooling no one, that is, no one who knows what communism is and how it lives.

As of now the Russian Communists have only changed their pace. They're zigging where they formerly zagged. They're smiling where they formerly scowled. Why risk war when you can win by furnishing arms to the Arabs, encourage the Arabs to attack Israel, the only democratic bastion in the Mediterranean area, and force the western nations into another war, with Russia standing by, furnishing nothing but the means of war, preserving her power and strength and always hoping that capitalism will let down its guard.

The rest of the Nation may be fooled by the charming words and smiles of Messrs. Bulganin and Khrushchev but the American Legion will never permit these accessories before and after the fact to get away with their act. Let our diplomats shake hands and sit at diplomatic tables giving everything and getting nothing from the Russians in return. We, in the American Legion, will listen, watch and be prepared for the worst.

Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GRACIE PFOST

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, once again at the close of a congressional session I offer a report to the people of the First Congressional District on my activities in their behalf.

During the 4 years I have been in Congress there have been 550 quorum and roll calls in the House. I have been there to answer 97 percent of them. On the few rollcall votes where I could not be present, I arranged when I could to be paired with a Member of Congress whose views on a bill were opposed to mine, so the people would know where I stood.

For the past 2 years we have had a Democratic Congress and a Republican in the White House. The cold war of partisan politics as predicted by President Eisenhower did not materialize. On most vital issues, the Democrats cooperated more fully with the President than did members of his own party.

This was a Congress with a heart, which placed the security and welfare of the American people first. It was a hard-working Congress—it passed more bills than any other Congress in history. And, according to the conservative Washington Star, it was a Congress which wrote a "good, moderate, and productive" record.

NATIONAL SECURITY

In foreign affairs, we Democrats were nonpartisan. The President has been free to talk and act without harassment. Deterioration of American prestige abroad demands a reappraisal of foreign policies when the Congress reconvenes next year. The people of the United States did not know we were on the brink of war three times until Secretary Dulles revealed this shocking fact in a magazine article.

In the field of national defense, we Democrats took the initiative for a strengthened military posture. We gave the President $900 million more than he asked for airpower because of Russia's apparent superiority in the field of guided missiles and jet planes. Most of our best qualified military leaders agreed this increase in funds was prudent.

THE PEOPLE'S WELFARE

One of our most dramtic accomplishments was reducing from 65 to 62 the retirement age at which women can draw social-security benefits, and providing for the payment of benefits to the totally disabled at 50. These amendments were passed over the stiff opposition of the Republican administration. We were also successful in including many self-employed professional men and women under the social-security program.

We enacted a vast program of health and medical research which means hope for those who are ill—and those who may be stricken in the future.

We provided for an increase in old-age assistance payments of at least $5 a month for people in States which take advantage of the available increase in Federal funds.

We made home buying easier, and provided special housing aids for those over 65.

FARMERS

It was not our fault that the farmer had to take a second-best farm bill. The President vetoed the Democratic farm bill which would have quickly and substantially raised farm income. The watered-down bill which was finally enacted will give the farmer some help—but by no means enough. It does include long-range, though inadequate benefits from the soil-bank program.

Through legislation initiated by the Democrats, we also relieved the farmer from paying excise taxes on gasoline and oil used in farm machinery. We increased farm-loan funds and made credit easier to get.

THE WORKER AND THE SMALL-BUSINESS MAN

For the worker, we adopted a minimum-wage law. The President advocated 90 cents. We gave the laboring man a dollar an hour.

For the small-business man, we strengthened and improved the Small Business Administration, and increased the revolving fund from which he can borrow. The House passed legislation to stop price discrimination between chains and hometown merchants, but the Senate failed to act. Had the administration been more sympathetic, much stronger and more effective programs would have been enacted.

HIGHWAYS

We set in motion the greatest road-building program in the Nation's history. On the sound pay-as-you-go basis, sponsored by the Democrats, it will provide 41,000 miles of interstate highways to crisscross the Nation, and increase Federal contributions for all forms of roads—primary, secondary, and urban.

BENEFITS AND ANNUITIES

We increased benefits for veterans, qualified additional veterans' widows for pensions, and provided educational assistance for children of veterans who die of service-connected disabilities. Here again administration opposition blocked a more humane program.

We granted badly needed increases in retirement annuities for Federal and railroad workers.

TAXES

In the field of taxation, we repealed the so-called "Humphrey blooper"—named for the Secretary of the Treasury. This Republican tax law would have given corporations a billion dollars in windfall profits.

POSTAL RATES

We succeeded in blocking the bill sponsored by the Republicans to increase first-class and airmail postage rates. The 4-cent letter and 7-cent airmail bill passed the House, where I voted against it, but it was killed in the Senate.

SCHOOLS

A bill to provide desperately needed school buildings was killed in a shameful debacle because the Republicans refused to support the President. He opposed the Powell amendment, which barred funds to segregated schools, but 76 percent of House Republicans voted for it. This amendment made it impossible for many sincere southern supporters of Federal school construction aid to accept the bill. Sixty-one percent of House Republicans then joined the southerners and defeated the measure. The net effect of this cynical maneuver by the Republicans was to deny our children the new and suitable class rooms they need so badly.

IDAHO AND THE WEST

Idaho won a victory when the bill was passed giving domestic sugar producers a right to a greater share in our increased national sugar consumption. I was one of the sponsors of this bill which will pour millions of dollars into the Idaho sugar industry. The Sugar Act is one of the original New Deal aids which did so much for our farmers.

Idaho will also benefit by measures I sponsored to increase Government purchase programs for domestically mined, strategic ores; Federal assistance for a sewage disposal system for Sandpoint; new and improved contracts for the Riverside Irrigation District at Parma; and appropriation of $519,000 for the rehabilitation of the Hayden Lake Irrigation District.

Idaho and its people lost immeasurably when the Hells Canyon bill was defeated in the Senate. The pressure brought by the White House was clearly the decisive factor in the measure's defeat. Jobs, opportunities, and Idaho's expanding future went down with the bill. In my opinion, the Eisenhower administration put selfish interests ahead of the welfare of the people of Idaho and the Pacific Northwest.

The 84th Congress wrote a constructive record. It will make America a better place in which to live. President Eisenhower was the first President in a century to lose his own Congress in the first congressional election after taking office. He cannot honestly attack the record made by the Congress the people in their wisdom gave him.

Why Martin Dies Supports Program To Help Farms and Small Towns and Solve Our Critical Water Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTIN DIES
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, history teaches us that no nation can survive unless its farms and small towns are prosperous. They are the backbone of every democratic country. During the 7 years I investigated and exposed thousands of Communists, I found very few on the farms and in small towns. Almost all of them were in the big cities. As long as our farms and small towns prosper, communism can never enslave America.

Because I have realized this vital truth since I entered Congress in 1931, I have supported many programs to help our farms and small towns. Here is a partial list of these programs I helped to establish by my speeches and votes: The Agricultural Adjustment Acts of 1933 and 1938, which helped farmers obtain fair prices while establishing and improving a program to support prices and adjust supplies of major crops; the Soil Conservation Act of 1935, which established a Government program to promote soil conservation and farm productivity; Rural Electrification Act of 1936, which helped farmers obtain electrical power through rural cooperatives; Farm Credit Act of 1935, which established the Farm Credit Administration to provide low-cost loans to farmers; Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act, which established a program of Federal-State cooperation to meet hospital needs; School Lunch Act of 1936; Home Owners Loan Corporation Act of 1933 to help homeowners save their dwellings from foreclosure; the FHA, which has financed the construction of hundreds of thousands of homes in the United States; the Federal aid for library services in rural areas; the original Social Security Act and the 1954 amendment to it, which brought in self-employed farmers for the first time and which covered many additional farm employees; farm-to-market roads and highway construction, which have done so much to help the farms and small towns of America; the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, which has provided credit to farmers unable to secure credit from other sources at reasonable rates; the drought-relief programs to aid the victims of drought; the farm programs now in operation; the Dies Agricultural Exchange Act of 1935; and many other programs too numerous to list.

These various acts have helped the people in the small towns who depend upon the farm economy for their source of income. When the farmers are prosperous, the small towns are prosperous.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have had a part in these various programs, and I shall continue to do everything I can to insure prosperity for our farms and small towns.

Our most pressing problem is water shortage. We must adopt a comprehensive and workable plan to capture and store the water that now runs to the ocean. Our Government has some of the ablest engineers in the world. We must depend upon their expert knowledge to work out an adequate and practicable plan that will insure ample water for our farms, ranches, towns, cities, and industries. At the next session of Congress I shall make it my No. 1 job to get this program underway. Our prosperity and future growth in Texas depend upon the solution of this critical problem. Prolonged drought and water shortage have already cost our people and Government untold millions.

Temporary relief, while necessary, is no satisfactory answer. We can and we must find a permanent solution.

Report of Activities of the Committee on House Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OMAR BURLESON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith the report of activities of the Committee on House Administration, 84th Congress.

During the 84th Congress nearly 300 bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration. Hearings were held by the Subcommittees on Accounts, Elections, Library, and Printing on proposed items of legislation, after which recommendations were submitted to the full committee for final consideration and subsequent action by the House.

Funds in the amount of $3,500,132.89 were approved for the following standing and select committees to conduct studies and investigations authorized by the House of Representatives:

	Amount authorized
Standing committee:	
Agriculture	$50,000.00
Armed Services	150,000.00
Banking and Currency	150,000.00
District of Columbia	2,000.00
Education and Labor	125,000.00
Foreign Affairs	75,000.00
Government Operations	995,000.00
House Administration	85,000.00
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000.00
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	60,000.00
Judiciary	225,000.00
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	85,000.00
Post Office and Civil Service	75,000.00
Public Works	50,000.00
Un-American Activities	500,000.00
Veterans' Affairs	85,000.00
Ways and Means	330,000.00
	3,102,000.00
Special and select committees:	
Baltic States (for 83d Cong.)	1,632.89
Campaign Expenditures	30,000.00
Small Business	330,000.00
Survivors' Benefits (Armed Service)	36,500.00
White County Bridge Commission	10,000.00
	408,132.89
Total	3,510,132.89

During the first session the committee held extensive hearings over a period of over 2½ months on a bill introduced by the chairman authorizing an adjustment and equalization of salaries in the House of Representatives, the first overall study of personnel, positions, and salaries which had been undertaken in the House for many years. The head of each department of the House was invited to make recommendations to the committee concerning his department. The committee recommended that many obsolete titles should be changed and salary adjustments made. It was later decided that the Committee on Appropriations should handle the bill. Some of the provisions were adopted in conference on the general legislative appropriations bill, H. R. 7117, and other recommendations have been approved by the House in separate resolutions from time to time during the second session.

The committee recommended changes in the law regulating the use of electrical and mechanical office equipment for Members and offices of the House of Representatives—Public Law 420—and also recommended an increase in the telephone and telegraph allowance for Members including for the first time and authorization for cablegrams in the amount of $2,000 per annum for each Member—Public Law 422.

After due consideration the committee recommended and secured the approval of 15 additional privates, Capitol Police force, for duty on the House side of the Capitol—House Resolution 448.

Seven bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Ad-

ministration which would provide additional supervision for House pages. Hearings were held on the various bills, all of which indicated the sincere interest of the sponsors of the legislation in the welfare of the pages, but no decision was reached by the committee.

During the first session the Committee on House Administration, after a thorough study and investigation of existing facilities, recommended an expansion and improvement of the facilities of the House restaurant—House Resolution 218 and House Resolution 219. The committee's recommendations resulted in action of both the House and Senate in authorizing completion of the east front of the Capitol in accordance with the architectural plans which had been approved years ago. When completed, this addition to the Capitol will include ample restaurant facilities for Members and employees of both House and Senate.

Upon recommendation of the subcommittee on elections, which conducted hearings on the various subjects, the committee reported legislation which would amend the Hatch Act—H. R. 3084. Also, the committee recommended legislation—Public Law 296—providing certain framework which would permit members of the armed services, their families, and other personnel to exercise their voting franchise while absent from their legal residences. The committee also reported legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 94—which was agreed to by the Senate, recommending certain changes in State election laws by waiving State residence requirements in voting for President and Vice President of the United States.

Over 30 bills and resolutions have been referred to the committee which would provide for memorials to outstanding individuals. Many of these bills were not considered because of the long-established policy of the committee of not recommending the expenditure of Federal funds for such purposes.

The committee recommended the acceptance of a gift from the Republic of Venezuela of a statue of the great South American liberator, Simon Bolivar—Public Law 109.

The committee recommended legislation—Public Law 107—which designated the former Arlington House as the Custis-Lee Mansion, which has been dedicated as a permanent memorial to Robert E. Lee.

Other memorials approved by the committee include the placing of a statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglas White in the United States Capitol with appropriate ceremonies of unveiling—Senate Concurrent Resolution 24; the establishment of a permanent committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise; the acceptance and erection of a memorial bell tower on the Capitol grounds as a memorial to the late Senator Robert A. Taft—Senate Concurrent Resolution 44; authorizing the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing—Public Law 461; the establishment of a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt—Public Law 372; the acceptance of a gift from the Ericsson Memorial Committee of the United States of a replica of a bronze statue of Leif Ericsson, the original of which had been presented to the people of Iceland by the United States Government as a gesture of good will on the 1,000th anniversary of Althing, the Icelandic Parliament—Senate Joint Resolution 93.

At various times the committee has approved and recommended the appointment of Members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Committee on House Administration conducted hearings on 11 bills providing for the establishment of a National Library of Medicine to be located in Chicago, Ill. Action by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in reporting S. 3430 to the House removed any obligation of the House Administration Committee in recommending legislation.

Fifty-seven bills and resolutions were referred to the Committee on House Administration during the 84th Congress providing for the printing of certain documents. Each proposal was carefully examined, and the committee recommended passage of only such resolutions as it deemed necessary and in the public interest.

In addition to authorizing the printing of many committee reports, hearings, and documents, the following outstanding publications were approved and authorized to be printed:

The Capitol in Story and Pictures—House Document 232.

The Prayer Room—House Document 234.

How Our Laws Are Made—reprint of House Document 210, 83d Congress.

Our American Government, What Is It? How Does It Function?—House Document 465, 79th Congress, brought up to date.

Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives—revised edition; Public Law 230.

Prayers Offered by the Chaplain of the House of Representatives, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., at the opening of the daily sessions of the House during the 83d and 84th Congresses—House Resolution 439.

The Constitution of the United States, as Amended to February 27, 1951, Together With the Declaration of Independence, Printed With an Index—House Concurrent Resolution 243.

The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States—House Resolution 549.

Printing of the song Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag—House Concurrent Resolution 161.

Preparation of a history of momentous scenes in Congress since the Revolutionary War—House Joint Resolution 689.

The subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration, authorized pursuant to House Resolution 262, 84th Congress, to study Federal printing and Government paperwork management, has made fine progress. Several elements of congressional printing have been examined to focus attention on those which warrant the greatest need for correective action. In this connection, a resolution has been prepared to correct the present condition in the House folding room, resulting from unsatisfactory distribution practices. Need is indicated for further action to eliminate waste in congressional printing by making more effective distribution.

Through the efforts of this subcommittee, the issuance of the Digest of Public General Bills was put on a more current schedule, providing for 4 cumulative issues and biweekly supplements to the first 3 issues. Studies have been made, which, it is hoped, will bring about some worthwhile recommendations for the best method to handle jointly sponsored bills.

Hearings have been held with officials of Government agencies most closely related to the paperwork management phase of the study. The subcommittee has filed a report on forms management which comprises the first part of the full report, entitled "Paperwork Management and Printing Facilities in the United States Government." The printed hearings, in connection with part I, Forms Management, are now being made ready for public use.

Due to the fact that the Committee on House Administration has jurisdiction over administrative procedures in the House, much of the work of the committee is necessarily not reflected in legislation, but in administrative details assigned by the chairman to the clerk and committee staff. This includes the enrollment of bills and their delivery to the President of the United States for signature.

The Committee on House Administration feels that it has made a distinct contribution to the 84th Congress through its consideration and recommendation of legislation providing the tools which the committee believes are necessary for the efficient administration of a congressional office, such as additional clerk hire allowances, additional telephone and telegraph allowances, broadening of the regulations governing electrical and mechanical office equipment, and the printing of pertinent committee hearings and reports which prove to be of value both to Members of the House and their constituents.

In addition, the committee has worked closely with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in determining the means by which the Library can be of the greatest service to Members and committees of the House of Representatives.

Voting Record of Representative James T. Patterson on Major Legislation of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like

to submit at this time my voting record on what I consider to be the 16 most important pieces of legislation which have come before the House of Representatives during the 84th Congress. It is my firm belief that every individual residing in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent has the right to know how I have stood on this important legislation, and I am proud to present it herewith:

Voting record of Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON, 5th District of Connecticut, on major legislation considered by the House of Representatives in the 84th Cong.

How I voted	The issue	Status
Voted for	Agricultural Act of 1956 with Soil Bank	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 per hour	Became law.
Voted for	Increased social security benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Increased railroad retirement benefits	Became law.
Voted for	Bill increasing veterans' pensions	Passed House only.
Voted for	Public housing bill	Became law.
Voted for	Interstate Federal-aid highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis	Became law.
Voted for	Veterans' farm home loans	Became law.
Voted for	Bill strengthening and improving the Small Business Administration	Became law.
Voted for	Mutual security program to strengthen the free world	Became law.
Voted for	Federal aid for school construction	Defeated.
Voted for	Postal rate bill	Became law.
Voted for	Civil rights bill	Passed House only.
Voted for	Omnibus public works bill (Torrington and Winsted)	Vetoed.
Voted for	Flood insurance	Became law.
Voted for	Supplemental appropriations (Thomaston Dam)	Became law.

The Truth About Our Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, by virtue of the Mutual Security Act of 1956, we have voted away $3.7 billion of this country's money. This type of thoughtless extravagance is by no means new or unique. When Woodrow Wilson took office on March 3, 1913, our national debt was $1,195,684,244.

Then after World War I, through his Secretary of the Treasury, William Gibbs McAdoo, money was loaned in sums totaling $2,521,121,825.45. Now, how much of this money was repaid? Repayments totaled $14,361,173.38. The two figures do not match very well, do they?

I wish to insert at this point a table showing the amounts loaned and the amounts repaid. The little country of Finland was the only country repaying its loan.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Money loaned in the following amounts

Belgium	$177,434,467.89
Cuba	61,974,041.10
France	1,027,477,800.00
Great Britain	581,000,000.00
Greece	15,000,000.00
Italy	617,034,050.90
Liberia	26,000.00
Rumania	25,000,000.00
Yugoslavia	16,175,465.56

Money repaid in the following amounts

Belgium	$2,003,656.21
France	64,301,901.29
Great Britain	72,171,061.42
Italy	364,319.28
Rumania	1,798,632.02
Yugoslavia	720,600.16

Mr. LANGER. I call your attention to the fact that under the Republican administrations of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, these loans were not increased, that interest was demanded, and in some instances paid, although these countries, angry because Uncle Sam wanted his money back, called Uncle Sam, Uncle Shylock.

Instead of making more loans under the Republican Presidents, $3,108,000,000 was paid in the reduction of the national debt.

Our national debt today is $272,719,052,855.57—July 1, 1956.

At the end of World War II came the visit from Winston Churchill. We saw Great Britain receiving a loan of $3,750,000,000, under promises, not a single one of which was ever kept.

Then we find—leaving out the war and the billions of dollars we contributed to it—that since July 1, 1945, and through March 31, 1956, we have given $54,150,000,000 away for foreign aid.

I wish to insert at this point a table showing the amount of loans made to foreign countries since World War II, up to 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Post World War II

Western Europe and dependent areas	$25,857,000,000
Austria	1,013,000,000
Belgium-Luxembourg	806,000,000
British Commonwealth	7,441,000,000
Denmark	291,000,000
Finland	128,000,000
France	5,070,000,000
Germany	3,891,000,000
Greece	1,209,000,000
Iceland	28,000,000
Ireland	147,000,000
Italy	2,647,000,000
Netherlands	1,243,000,000
Norway	328,000,000
Portugal	47,000,000
Spain	41,000,000
Sweden	112,000,000
Trieste	46,000,000
Turkey	239,000,000
Yugoslavia	525,000,000
Unspecified Western Europe	605,000,000
Other Europe	1,160,000,000
Czechoslovakia	213,000,000
Poland	443,000,000
U. S. S. R.	465,000,000
Unspecified Other Europe	39,000,000
Near East and Africa	448,000,000
Egypt	19,000,000

Past World War II—Continued

Iran	$42,000,000
Israel	218,000,000
Liberia	24,000,000
Saudi Arabia	21,000,000
Union of South Africa	28,000,000
Unspecified Near East and Africa	97,000,000
Asia and Pacific	5,600,000,000
Afghanistan	17,000,000
Australia-New Zealand	27,000,000
Burma	17,000,000
China	1,070,000,000
India	258,000,000
Indochina	37,000,000
Indonesia	208,000,000
Japan and Ryukyu Islands	2,414,000,000
Korea	717,000,000
Philippines	807,000,000
Thailand	17,000,000
Unspecified Asia and Pacific	11,000,000
American Republics	818,000,000
Canada	150,000,000
International and unspecified	928,000,000

Mr. LANGER. Apparently Uncle Sam had learned nothing from his experience of the giveaway program after World War I.

Although these World War I debts are still carried on the books of the Treasury as obligations owing the United States, we allowed ourselves to be bilked into loaning many times this amount following World War II.

In fact, this Democratic administration went around begging countries to take money, and created such a scandal in foreign countries that Sweden refused to take $20 million, even as a gift.

Charity begins at home. Evidently this is an axiom that has not entirely penetrated the governmental mentality. After World War I we were the epitome of ludicrous laxity about collecting our accounts receivable on the international level. We see in this the incipient beginnings of the grotesque notion that friendship may be bought in the market place. Look at the treatment accorded our own farmers.

Did our Government, like Canada, cancel the seed and feed loans to them? It most certainly did not. Foreign governments which we had already aided to the limit, and in many cases beyond all reason, were accorded preferential treatment over productive citizens of our own country.

Time enough to worry about the economic plight of foreign nations when our own backyard is swept clean.

But this giveaway doctrine continued in 1953 when we donated $7,900,000,000. In 1954 when we donated $5,927,000,000. In 1955 when we gave away $3,676,000,000, and this year $3,766,570,000 was voted away for foreign aid.

The overwhelming percentage of this $3.7 billion is nothing more than an outright gift to our so-called allies, who are the same gentlemen who, after receiving billions of dollars from us in the Korean war, allowed 95 percent of the dying to be done by American boys and 95 percent of the paying to be done by the taxpayers of the United States.

The people of the United States are entitled to know the truth about this so-called foreign aid and giveaway program—how it began, how it was developed, and what it cost American peo-

ple in the blood of their sons and daughters.

Mr. President, I have voted against every dollar of this giveaway program.

When I was back in North Dakota, some critics of these loans asked me why President Eisenhower, after being elected on the platform that the taxpayers thought would stop the making of these loans, continued to seemingly throw good money after bad.

The answer I was obliged to give was that the Democratic Presidents, Roosevelt and Truman, had made so many commitments that our Government was obliged to fulfill that the Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had to make these commitments good just like ordinary farmers and businessmen have to when they have made a commitment to the bank.

In order that you may know what a billion dollars is, in ascertaining what these figures are I have a statement from the State tax commissioner of North Dakota, Mr. J. Arthur Engen, showing that in 1954 all the real and personal property in the State of North Dakota was assessed at $1,678,952,473. The public utility and railroad property was assessed at $182,352,363.

Last year the interest on the national debt was $6,791,000,000; just the interest, you understand. That is nearly $7 billion. This is enough to buy the entire State of North Dakota, lock, stock, and barrel, three and a half times over.

It is hard to understand why this spending to no purpose continues, why we constantly milk our own financial resources with no hope of any reasonable return on our investment. I leave you with a question. When will we, the Senators and Representatives of the United States of America, learn that among nations, even as among individuals, friendship is won, not bought?

Brownson: A Man To Be Proud Of

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, those of us from Indiana are certainly proud of the role one of our colleagues has played in promoting the passage of civil rights legislation during this session of the Congress.

Early in February of this year the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] was appointed to a special six-member committee which worked with the Department of Justice and House Judiciary Committee for legislation to provide the machinery for making sure that the civil rights of all of our citizens are protected.

Mr. Clarence Mitchell, director of the Washington bureau of the NAACP, in his article The Civil Rights Football, printed recently in a national magazine, accurately credits my colleague [Mr. BROWNSON] for introducing a discharge petition which helped to force the civil rights bill, H. R. 627, ultimately to the floor.

I recently noted a well deserved article of praise and recognition for my colleague's efforts entitled "Brownson: A Man We Can Be Proud Of." This appeared as the lead editorial in the Indianapolis Recorder, Indiana's largest and leading Negro newspaper.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following editorial:

BROWNSON: A MAN WE CAN BE PROUD OF

• • • One of the most impressive speeches made by a civil-rights advocate in the House was made Tuesday of last week by Representative CHARLES B. BROWNSON, Indianapolis Republican from the 11th district.

Representative BROWNSON'S talk—it's a long one, taking six pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—is a praiseworthy reminder of which side Indiana fought on in the Civil War. He himself did a magnificent job in helping put the current civil-rights bill in its proper historical perspective. That, of course, was his purpose. His remarks, he said, "may serve to establish our action this week in its true perspective and to emphasize the long struggle for equal rights which has made our Negro friends justly suspicious of those who would cry 'moderation' and mean 'stop.'"

His tracing of the Negro's struggles for equality carried him through the reconstruction, from reconstruction to the First World War, war and depression, and the last 15 years. While naturally focusing the spotlight on the big strides made under Republican administrations of Congress, BROWNSON throughout his speech showed a fairness and apparent sincerity which, coupled with the hard facts he hurled one after another, should constitute a major contributing factor to the success of the civil rights bill's passage.

Indiana and its Hoosiers, as we said, should be proud. Our Representative has spoken as a man firmly holding to that which he believes is right. It really takes little courage to stand on the House or Senate floor and toss out invective, play upon emotions, or otherwise grandstand for the public interested in theatricalism. The type of courage BROWNSON displayed—that which permitted him to dare to point up uncompromising history—is the type which will help sustain America as the land of the free.

• • • Eliminated in accordance with the House-Senate rule of comity which forbids the inclusion of derogatory references to a Member of the Senate or the Senate as a whole.

Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 7, 1956

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I have received a report from the Executive Committee of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, of which I am a member, which will be of use to Members of Congress and those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who will be called upon in the remaining months of the centennial year to participate in programs honoring Woodrow Wilson.

The activities enumerated in this report include: The list of colleges presenting seminars, forums, and other similar programs; the list of libraries presenting exhibits; the contributions of the Library of Congress and a listing of all the materials entered in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the first 6 months of the centennial year.

The following excerpts from the Commission's report include but a few of the activities presented in the first 6 months of the centennial year.

I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Universities and colleges, acting in cooperation with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, have presented a wide variety of lectures, seminars, and institutes. The following is a listing of many of the universities and colleges which have presented Wilson centennial programs in the first half of 1956:

Bryn Mawr College, St. John's College, Kansas State College, the University of Chicago, University of Vermont, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Rochester, Madison College, Amherst College, Washington and Lee University, Haverford College, University of Mexico, Princeton University, Johns Hopkins University, Clark University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, University of Mississippi, Bowdoin College, Harvard University, Yale University, University of Cincinnati, University of Kentucky, Texas Christian University, University of New Mexico, Notre Dame University, Vanderbilt University, Cornell University, Northwestern University, University of Virginia, New Jersey State Teachers College, Lawrence College, Davidson College, Fordham University, Rutgers University, University of Oregon, University of Michigan, Pace College, Dartmouth College, Sarah Lawrence College, George Peabody College for Teachers.

LIBRARY EXHIBITS

More than 350 libraries—all those in cities of 35,000 or more population—have been furnished with the Commission's Handbook and have been requested to arrange Wilson exhibits during the centennial. The American Library Association is cooperating by publicizing library events throughout the year. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation has initiated innumerable exhibits and has supplied the materials and otherwise assisted most of the following university, college, and public libraries who have held or are currently holding commemorative exhibits by displaying literary, documentary, and photographic material during the Wilson Centennial Year.

Alabama: University of Alabama; Arizona: University of Arizona; Arkansas: University of Arkansas; California: Fresno State College, Stanford University, University of California, San Francisco Public Library; Colorado: University of Colorado, Denver Public Library; Connecticut: Trinity College, Wesleyan University, University of Bridgeport; Delaware: Wilmington Institute Free Library; District of Columbia: Howard University; Florida: Florida State University, Rollins College, University of Florida, University of Miami; Georgia: Emory University, University of Georgia; Idaho: University of Idaho; Illinois: Loyola University, Northwestern University, Rosary College, Southern Illinois University, University of Chicago, University of Illinois, Chicago Public Library; Indiana: Indiana University, Purdue University; Iowa: State University of Iowa; Kansas: Municipal University of Wichita, University of Kansas, University of Kansas City; Kentucky: University of Kentucky, University of Louisville;

Louisiana: Louisiana State University, Tulane University; Maine: University of Maine; Maryland: Johns Hopkins University, St. John's College, University of Maryland, Enoch Pratt Free Public Library; Massachusetts: Amherst College, American International College, Clark University, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, Springfield College Library, Wellesley College, Boston Public Library; Michigan: Michigan State University, University of Michigan, Wayne University; Minnesota: Macalester College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis Public Library; Mississippi: University of Mississippi; Missouri: Kansas City Public Library, St. Louis Public Library; Nebraska: Creighton University, Midland College, University of Nebraska, Omaha Public Library; New Hampshire: Colby Junior College, Dartmouth College, University of New Hampshire, St. Paul's School, New Hampshire State Library; New Jersey: Rutgers University, State Library, State of New Jersey; New Mexico: New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque Public Library; New York: Brooklyn College, College of the City of New York, Cornell University, Hofstra College, Queens College, Syracuse University, University of Buffalo, Vassar College, New York City Public Library, Association of International Relations Clubs; North Carolina: Davidson College, Duke University, University of North Carolina, Wilmington Public Library; Ohio: Miami University, Mount Union College, Oberlin College, Ohio University, Ohio State University, Western Reserve University, Public Library of Cincinnati (2); Oklahoma: Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; Oregon: Oregon State College, University of Oregon, Willamette University, Library Association of Portland; Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr College, Bucknell University, Haverford College, Lehigh University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Pennsylvania, University of Pittsburgh, Free Library of Philadelphia; Rhode Island: Brown University; South Carolina: University of South Carolina; Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers, Southwestern at Memphis, University of Tennessee; Texas: University of Texas, Dallas Public Library; Utah: Brigham Young University, University at Utah; Vermont: University of Vermont; Virginia: College of William and Mary, Hampton Institute, Longwood College, Mary Washington College, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Sweet Briar College, University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Richmond Public Library; Washington: State College of Washington, University of Washington; West Virginia: West Virginia University; Wisconsin: Beloit College, Lawrence College; Wyoming: University of Wyoming; Hawaii: University of Hawaii; Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

On March 14 the Library of Congress opened a centennial exhibit of Wilson papers representing him as "teacher, writer, orator, statesman, human being."

Selected from the Woodrow Wilson collection at the Library and the Ray Stannard Baker papers relating to Wilson, the exhibit consists of Wilson manuscripts and those of other contemporary public figures and pictorial material such as prints, photographs, and cartoons. More than 220 items of Wilsonia will be on view, ranging from state papers to personal letters dating from Wilson's youth.

Among the exhibits are drafts of the Covenant of the League of Nations, the 14 points, messages to Congress, notes to school-day friends, communications from his publishers, and pictures spanning his entire lifetime.

The exhibit was arranged by Katherine E. Brand and Herbert J. Sanborn of the Library. A catalog of the exhibit is available in the Library's Current Quarterly Journal.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the first 6 months of the centennial year printed the following Wilson materials:

Senate authorizes President to issue proclamation (S. 276).

House joint resolution to President to issue proclamation (H. J. Res. 444).

Request for Wilson memorial in Washington, D. C. (H. R. 7912).

President's proclamation (H. J. Res. 444, 460).

Speech by Gen. E. Walter Opie, Commission Chairman, delivered during Washington Cathedral memorial service (A1102).

Editorial from Richmond News Leader, Moral Strength (A1378).

Excerpt from New History of Democratic Party on Wilson (A1722).

Former United States Senator Tom Connolly's speech before Virginia Assembly (2684).

Article in Commission Handbook, What It (Wilson centennial) Is and Why We Celebrate It.

Material from Commission Newsletter on centennial events.

Wilson speech, The Rights of the American Jew (4983).

Staunton Week article from Commission's Newsletter (p. 5681).

Speech by the late Senator Alben Barkley given at the Woodrow Wilson centennial dinner, April 21, 1956 (A6185).

Remarks by Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH on Wilson film, Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Tomorrow (9793).

Excerpt from book Through These Men by John Mason Brown entitled "Wilson and the Elder Lodge" (A3855).

Reprints of speeches given by Arthur Krock, New York Times correspondent; Gov. T. R. McKeldin, of Maryland; and Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State, during Staunton Centennial Week (A3627, A3631, A6734).

Presidential proclamation.

Editorial, Partisanship Set Aside from St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Sermon, We Have This Treasure, delivered by Dr. Graham G. Lacey, pastor of Central Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

The Living Heritage of Woodrow Wilson, by Dorothy Fosdick, New York Times magazine, January 1, 1956.

Addresses at the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration at the First Unitarian Church, Baltimore, Md., delivered by Dr. W. Waldemar W. Argow, minister of the church; Hon. Emory H. Niles, chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City; Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland; Hon. Simon E. Sobeloff, Solicitor General of the United States; and Dr. Carl B. Swisher, professor at the Johns Hopkins University, inserted in the RECORD by Hon. J. GLENN BEALL, Senator of Maryland, and separately reprinted and obtainable on request.

Address by Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, of Maryland, preceeding the preview of the documentary film Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Tomorrow, at the Coolidge Auditorium of the Library of Congress, on June 28, 1956, 37th anniversary of the signature of the Covenant of the League of Nations at the Paris Peace Conference.

Highlights of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 enacted by the Republican 83d Congress was the most monumental legislative undertaking in the history of the Congress.

It represented the first comprehensive revision of the internal-revenue laws since before the turn of the century and the enactment of the income tax.

Approximately a half a million man-hours of work went into this gigantic achievement.

Over 3,000 changes in the revenue laws were contained in the tax-revision measure. In general, the purpose of these changes were to remove inequities, to end harassment of the taxpayer, and to reduce tax barriers to future expansion of production and employment.

The new law closed over 50 loopholes through which taxpayers were able to avoid paying their fair share of taxes.

The new law contained $827 million relief for individuals and $536 million relief for business. In addition, the new law extended the present 52 percent corporate income for 1 year which meant an additional $1.2 billion tax on business. This increased tax on business practically paid for all of the tax relief granted so that the net cost to the revenue was only $163 million.

The Republican Party is continuously charged with enacting tax legislation primarily for the benefit of big business. Just how ridiculous and unfounded this assertion is can be demonstrated by the fact that, after 4 years in office, the Republican administration has never proposed reducing this 52 percent corporation income tax rate. The Republican Party reduced the individual income tax, and it reduced excise taxes but it left the regular 52 percent corporation income tax alone.

Without attempting to give a technical interpretation, the following represents some of the highlights of the new tax law.

DEPENDENTS

First. A parent can claim a deduction of $600 for each child regardless of the child's earnings if the child is under 19 and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Second. A parent can also claim the $600 dependency deduction for a child over 18 regardless of the child's earnings if the child is attending school or college, or receiving on-the-farm training, and the parent continues to furnish more than half the child's support.

Third. An aged parent or other dependent cared for by several members

of a family can be claimed as a deduction by one of the members of the family.

Fourth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a foster child.

Fifth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a child awaiting adoption.

Sixth. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for any other person, regardless of relationship, if the taxpayer supports that person in his home.

Seventh. A taxpayer can claim a $600 dependency deduction for a cousin who is institutionalized because of physical or mental disability.

Savings to taxpayers, $85 million.

CHILD-CARE EXPENSES

First. Single working parents, such as a widow, are allowed a deduction up to $600 for the expense of child-care for children up to 12 years of age.

Second. The same deduction is allowed for a married woman who must work because her husband is incapacitated.

Third. The same deduction is allowed with respect to any dependent, regardless of age, who is mentally or physically incapable of caring for himself.

Fourth. A similar deduction is allowed a married woman if the combined income of her husband and herself does not exceed $5,100.

Savings to taxpayers, $130 million.

MEDICAL EXPENSES

First. Medical expenses can be deducted when they exceed 3 percent of income, instead of 5 percent as under present law.

Second. Example: A family with $3,000 gross income and medical expenses of $150 can deduct $60. The same family could deduct nothing prior to the 1954 law.

Third. The 1954 law doubled the maximum limit on the amount that can be deducted.

Savings to taxpayers, $80 million.

HEAD OF FAMILY

First. A single taxpayer who has a dependent son or daughter becomes entitled during the first 2 years after the death of his spouse to the same income-splitting privilege as is accorded married couples.

Second. A single individual can receive half the benefits of income splitting if he has a dependent parent and if the taxpayer maintains a household for the father or mother.

Savings to taxpayers, $11 million.

RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT

All retired people 65 and over, including schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, and civil servants, are in effect exempt on all retirement income up to $1,200. This means a tax reduction for these retired people of up to $240 a year.

Example: A retired single individual over 65 who has a total retirement income of $3,000 paid about $300 in income tax prior to 1954. Under the new 1954 law, his tax is reduced to $60—a saving of $240.

The same exemption extends to individuals under 65 if they receive a pension from a public retirement system, such as do teachers.

Savings to taxpayers, $141 million.

CREDIT PURCHASES

The law allows a deduction for interest up to 6 percent on installment purchases.

Total saving to taxpayers, 10 million.

CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

The law increased from 20 to 30 percent the allowable deduction for charitable contributions to churches, hospitals, and educational institutions.

Total saving to taxpayers, $25 million. The gain to charity has been incalculable.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

First. Deductions up to 25 percent of farm income are allowed for soil and water conservation.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

SICKNESS AND ACCIDENT PLANS

First. Premiums paid by employers to health and accident plans are not taxable to their employees.

Second. All accident and health benefits paid as reimbursement for actual medical expenses to employees, their wives, or children, are completely ex-exempted from tax.

Third. Payments to employees for loss of wages due to injury or illness are exempted up to $100 a week.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

DEATH BENEFITS

The new law exempts all death benefits up to $5,000 paid by an employer to the widow or other beneficiary of an employee.

Savings to taxpayers: No estimate possible.

PENSIONS AND ANNUITIES

In addition to the $1,200 exemption extended to retirement income, the law also provides a simpler method for the taxation of pensions and annuities, ends annual 3-percent tax paid on annuities and provides instead a method of computing tax on basis of cost divided by years of life expectancy.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

DIVIDEND CREDIT

The law excludes the first $50 in dividends from taxation and provides a credit against tax equal to 4 percent of the balance.

Example: An individual with $50 or less in dividends from his savings is entirely exempt from tax on that amount.

Example: An individual with $250 in dividends from his savings excludes the first $50 entirely and then reduces his total tax by $8—4 percent of the balance of $200.

Savings to taxpayers, $204 million.

DEPRECIATION

The new law permits the more liberal writeoff of the cost of new equipment. For example, in the first year of life of new equipment, the taxpayer is able to write off twice the amount now allowed.

Savings to taxpayers, $375 million, of which $75 million represents savings to individuals such as farmers, shopkeepers, and salesmen. Of course, no permanent loss of revenue is involved because the provision simply shifts the timing of tax payments.

DECLARATIONS OF ESTIMATED TAX

The requirements are eased for filing declarations of estimated tax. Upward of a million taxpayers have been relieved of the requirement for filing.

FILING TAX RETURNS

Tax returns are due April 15 instead of March 15, giving taxpayers 1 additional month in which to prepare their final tax returns and make their final tax payments.

RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTATION

The law grants taxpayers an option to either deduct as an expense or to amortize research and experimental expenditures.

The provision is designed to encourage business research with the objective of creating new products, new processes, and new jobs.

METHODS OF ACCOUNTING

The law has brought tax-accounting rules into harmony with business accounting, thereby eliminating to a great extent the necessity for taxpayers to maintain two set of books. It provides realistic computation of net income for tax purposes in conformity with sound business practices.

DEPLETION

The law increases the rate of percentage depletion on a variety of critical and strategic minerals in order to encourage the development of domestic sources of supply.

Savings to taxpayers, $34 million.

INVENTIONS

The law extends capital-gains treatment to proceeds realized by an inventor on the sale or exchange of a patent.

The new provision is designed to encourage invention and thereby promote a healthy economy and an improving standard of living.

NET OPERATING LOSS

The law extends the net operating loss carryback to two years and makes certain other adjustments.

Savings to taxpayers, $120 million.

LIFE INSURANCE

The law lessens the estate tax on the proceeds of certain life-insurance policies.

Savings to individual taxpayers, $25 million.

CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

The law removes the two percent penalty tax with respect to consolidated returns filed by regulated public utilities.

Savings to taxpayers, $35 million.

IMPROPER ACCUMULATIONS

The law eases the penalty tax on certain accumulated earnings in order that business, especially small businesses, may have greater freedom in retaining their funds for legitimate business purposes.

Savings to taxpayers, $10 million.

Congresswoman Knutson's Student Loan Bill Gets Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COYA KNUTSON
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, after my bill was introduced to provide means for any person to go to college by means of interest-free loans while in school, a poll was taken in Minnesota which gives the bill overwhelming acceptance. Colleges and universities over the country have written to me in support of this legislation. I deem it necessary to have this material put at everyone's disposal. I have high hopes that this legislation can be passed. Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the bill itself, findings of the Minnesota poll, and some of the many responses I have received, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone's access and study:

House Resolution 11414

A bill to provide a program of Federal student loans to assist students to pursue programs of higher education

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "National Student Loan Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "student" means a person who has successfully completed his secondary school training;

(2) The term "educational institution" has the meaning given it by regulations of the Board, except that such term shall not include any institution which fails to meet the standards prescribed by the educational agencies of the State and local political subdivision where it is situated;

(3) The term "State" includes each of the Territories and possessions of the United States, and the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(4) The term "fund" means the National Student Loan Fund; and

(5) The term "Board" means the National Student Loan Board.

NATIONAL STUDENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby created a fund on the books of the Treasury to be known as the "National Student Loan Fund," which shall be used as a revolving fund for the making of loans to students in accordance with this act.

(b) The fund shall consist of the amount appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) of this section and the amounts repaid by persons to whom scholarship loans have been made under this act.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the fund the sum of $10 billion.

(d) Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in direct obligations of the United States or obligations guaranteed as to the principal and interest by the United States.

CREATION OF NATIONAL STUDENT LOAN BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a National Student Loan Board to be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons who are learned in the social sciences or are experienced student counselors. Two members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. The President shall designate the member who shall serve as Chairman of the Board.

(b) The term of office of a member of the Board shall be 6 years, except that—

(1) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, 1 at the end of 10 years, 1 at the end of 8 years, and 1 at the end of 6 years, after the date of the enactment of this act;

(2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and

(3) upon the expiration of his term of office a member shall continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(c) Members of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $25,000 per annum.

(d) The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise its powers in any other place, and it may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary.

(e) Subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949 and the civil-service laws, the Board may appoint such employees as it deems necessary to carry out its duties under this act.

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall make a loan to any student who submits an application if, in the judgment of the Board, such student is unable to obtain sufficient funds from other sources. The loan shall be in an amount which the Board determines is sufficient to reimburse the student for the expenses incurred by him while attending school for board, room, tuition fees, and nominal spending money.

(b) Loans made by the Board shall be paid in increments as the education of the student progresses, but no payment of any part of such a loan shall be made by the Board until it has received a certification from the school that the student has successfully completed his first examination with passing grades.

(c) Loans made under this act shall bear interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum. The interest shall begin 1 year after the student leaves school.

(d) The Board shall prescribe the terms and conditions governing (1) when repayment of the loan shall begin and (2) when the loan must be paid in full. The Board may prescribe such other terms and conditions as it may find necessary or desirable. In prescribing the terms and conditions of loans, the Board shall take into account all factors bearing on the ability of the student to repay the loan. The Board shall consider as a factor bearing on the ability of the student to repay a loan his eligibility for educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952.

(e) The Board may, when justified by the circumstances of an individual student, amend the terms and conditions of a loan so as to suspend its payment for a period or to alter in other respects such terms and conditions in a manner advantageous to the student. However, the Board may not make any amendments in the terms of a loan which would impair the ultimate obligation of the student to repay the loan.

SEC. 6. All sums paid by students as repayment of loans, or as interest on loans, shall be deposited to the credit of the fund.

SEC. 7. The Board may suspend the payment of increments of loans for such period as it may determine, in any case where in its judgment such suspension of advances is appropriate because (1) such student is making an unsatisfactory record in his studies, or in attendance, or (2) the educational institution in which such student is enrolled has failed, upon request of the Board to advise the Board as to the record being made by such student in his studies, or in attendance, or (3) such student is not in good faith pursuing his studies.

SEC. 8. The Board shall make an annual report to the Congress with respect to the administration of the provisions of this act, including information as to the status of the fund.

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary for the payment of administrative expenses of the Board in carrying out this act.

PUBLIC LOANS BACKED FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

Although a majority of Minnesotans don't think a college education is necessary to be a success in life, they want to make college life more available to today's young people.

That's the sense of a survey of public views on higher education conducted by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll among a cross section of adults in all parts of the State. Here are some of the highlights of the study:

Approximately 2 out of every 3 persons interviewed do not consider a college education essential for success in life.

Six out of every ten persons think entrance requirements for colleges should not be raised, despite crowding on campuses.

Six out of ten also believe there are quite a few young people who don't attend college because they can't meet expenses.

Three-fourths favor use of Federal or State funds to provide low-cost loans to help students go to college.

Minnesota colleges and universities face the problem of record enrollments in the years ahead. By 1970, it is estimated more than 42,000 students will be attending the University of Minnesota.

In the Minnesota poll survey, one of the questions was:

"Do you think a college education is necessary to be a success in life?"

The answers:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Yes, think it is	22	25	19
No, think it is not	67	68	68
"Not necessary, but helpful"	6	5	8
Other answers	5	2	6
No opinion	(1)	(1)	------
Total	100	100	100

[1] Less than 1 percent.

Some persons say it has not been necessary in the past, but it will be in the future, or it is for boys, not for girls, or it depends on the individual.

College-educated men and women are no more convinced than others that a college education is necessary for success—but a greater share of them say it's helpful.

Another question was:

"Many colleges and universities are crowded these days. Do you think they should raise the entrance requirements for students, keep them as they are, or lower them?"

The replies:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
Raise requirements	14	13	15
Keep them as they are	61	59	63
Lower them	6	8	5
Other answers	2	2	1
No opinion	17	18	16
Total	100	100	100

People with college education are most strongly (75 percent) in favor of keeping entrance requirements as they are.

Sixty-one percent of the total sample said they believe quite a few young people don't go to college because of the money it takes. An even larger proportion are in favor of a loan program to help more young people enter colleges or universities:

"It's been suggested that Federal or State funds be used for loans at low-interest rates to help young people attend college. Are you in favor of, or against, that idea?"

The answers:

[In percent]

	Total	Men	Women
In favor	75	73	77
Against	18	20	16
Qualified	2	3	2
No opinion	5	4	5
Total	100	100	100

Of all people in the statewide sample 7 percent said members of their immediate families are now students in college, and 9 percent said members of their immediate families will be college or university students "when schools reopen next fall."

The following are excerpts from letters I have received in support of my bill:

From the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.:

"At this minute we have in our files hundreds of applications from outstanding young men from every State in the country who are anxious to attend Notre Dame next year, but must have the aid of financial assistance from some outside source to continue their education. Our scholarships available and loans made possible by private endowment will help a few of these young men, but the great majority must be told we cannot assist them. It is disheartening to tell these young men of average family income that the doors are closed to them as far as financial assistance is concerned. It is also a great loss to the Nation and each community when these young men discontinue their education to seek some employment.

"This matter is one that I assure you gives all of us concerned in college education a great deal of worry. In the scientific and engineering field the costs of educating a student far exceed the tuition. We are able to accept more students with present facilities, but worthy young men are unable to finance such a program. Yet, we hear almost daily the warning of national leaders that the Soviet Union is greatly expanding their facilities for educating engineers and scientists and are going forward at a fast pace. We have many privately endowed colleges with the facilities and personnel to educate men in these fields, and thousands of high type young men anxious for the training, but cannot finance their education."

From the president of the Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.:

"I am president of a college with more than a thousand students enrolled on a full-time basis. Many of them find it very difficult to stay in college, because of the lack of funds. Some of them work so much on the outside that they injure their bodies and make it difficult to do the work which they ought to be doing in their classes, because of the lack of funds. Should such legislation be introduced which will provide such students with the privilege of borrowing as long as the scholastic standing passes the minimum standard, it would be a great blessing to the individual and would draw into our national assets, some of the finest brains that otherwise would be lost to our country. I am especially grateful that this bill will make it possible for a student to select whatever school he wishes to attend, whether it be in the United States or abroad.

"I note with appreciate that this bill will provide that any student may borrow without interest and that there will be no interest charged until he has settled into his occupation. I am confident that there will be little loss in trade by the Federal Government under such a program. Sometimes I think we should introduce a bill that would give to every good student coming out of the public schools a bill comparable to the GI bill now being enforced in our country. The Government could afford to take some risks with those who will die from natural causes and leave their bills unpaid. The Government can well afford to assume such burdens, in contrast with the tremendously huge and mammoth sums now being spent outside of the country where we get no returns whatever."

From Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.:

"It goes without saying that Harvard is interested in the problem of financing the higher education of able young men and women. As you probably know, our annual disbursements for direct student scholarships in all departments of this university exceeded $2,600,000. This total does not include several hundred thousand dollars of repayable student loans, nor do our available scholarships and loans, taken together, suffice to meet all legitimate demands in this field. With the increasing number of students of college age applying for admission during the next few years, we anticipate the necessity of a further expansion of scholarship operations in general."

From Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.:

"Far too few people in America today realize what an acute manpower shortage we face, especially of persons with college training for scientific, technical, and professional occupations. Our chief means of solving this problem is to encourage college attendance by all youth who have the mental ability to benefit from it. Studies show that only approximately half of such youth are now attending college. I am sure the legislation you propose would be most helpful in this regard."

From Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.:

"I want to congratulate you on your efforts to establish a Federal loan fund program where students may borrow as long as their scholastic standings pass the minimum standards. Today, when the cost of education and the whole educational problem is of eminent concern to all of us, I feel that a loan program of this sort would be an immense blessing to the country. Certainly it would be of great advantage to many students who are in that financial bracket where they need the assistance of a non-interest-bearing loan to see them through to their college degree."

From Arizona State College, Tempe, Ariz.:

"I believe this is one of the most sound educational proposals I have heard in a number of years. I believe it has more merit than some of the great scholarship programs of which we have heard so much, and it would help to counteract one of the most serious evils we meet today, namely, that of students who are trying to go to school and work 30 and 40 hours a week in order to pay their expenses. These students are not able to do justice either to themselves or to their education. Yet that is the only way many of them can go to school today. More important, however, is the fact that financial limitations are keeping many students of superior ability out of college, while our colleges and universities have too many students with less ability. The result of all of this is a tremendous waste of our great national human resources."

Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Ky.:

"I am in complete agreement with a national student loan fund for capable, needy, and deserving college students. My experience of 27 years in recruiting high-school graduates enables me to know the need. I venture to state that for every high-school graduate in the upper 10 percent of his class who gets to college, another graduate in the upper 10 percent does not attend because of financial reason."

"For 5 years I have administered a student loan fund of approximately $15,000 which I raised through private donations. I have found that carefully selected young people will repay their loans faithfully to a very high degree."

University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.:

"I believe that every qualified boy or girl who wishes to have a college education should be given such an opportunity. However, it is my considered judgment that any program of assistance should require cooperation on the part of the recipient. I am wondering why it is these days that whenever the costs of higher education are considered, whether for capital expenditures or operation, we think only of how much more government should give. Such a philosophy may add to the learning of the Nation at the expense, however, of character.

"I like your plan because the assistance given is in the form of a loan. The student really pays for his education, as he should, but at a time when he is able to do so."

Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa:

"Just last night, in an address to a group of church leaders, I proposed that the State of Iowa loan high-school graduates $500 per year to attend non-tax-supported colleges with the additional provision that 1 year of the loan be forgiven for each year that the student taught or worked in the State of Iowa after graduation with the stipulation that the 4 loans must be forgiven in a 5-year period. In other words, this would provide for a young woman, who might teach and might need relief to start her family.

"I am completely opposed to outright gifts, and frankly we have reduced our scholarship budgeted to about $10,000 a year as contrasted to $70,000 a year in 1 of our neighboring institutions because of my opposition to gifts."

The Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson, S. C.:

"Any assistance we can give worthy young people which will help them attend college will be most meritorious. I favor loans rather than gifts. Students who are worthy of an education will be glad of the opportunity to borrow money and will pay it back."

University of Mississippi, University, Miss.:

"This, however, I do know. The Creator has endowed young men and young women with good minds regardless of their financial status. Some type of proper aid is needed so that the good minds of our young people can be further educated for the welfare of their local communities and the Nation. Not only is financial assistance needed at the undergraduate level, but there are great needs for financial aid to those students who have graduated and who have demonstrated that they have outstanding minds and need assistance to continue in the graduate field. From such sources much good can be expected as a result of research and teaching."

Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebr.:

"I have read with a great deal of interest your letter concerning the scholarship and loan bill which you are proposing. Please know that you have my most sincere support."

San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.:

"We think the idea an excellent one. Unquestionably, the greatest national resource this Nation has is its youth. Moreover, we know that there are as many deserving youth out of college as are now enrolled in the institutions of higher learning due primarily

to lack of finances. Any scheme that would enable more deserving students to attend college would warrant our support.

"We are specially pleased with your idea of permitting students to borrow money. However, we feel that there are several considerations that are probably unintentionally passed over in your letter. Although you suggest that a student should be able to borrow as long as his scholastic standing passes the minimum standards, we are inclined to think that a student who borrows from the Government should be in the upper scholastic bracket, at least above average.

"Also, we assume that there would have to be some limit to the indebtedness of any given student.

"We are quite concerned that your proposed legislation is so written that a student could use the money to cover living expenses as well as tuition. We have recently had a scholarship bill enacted here in California that is a sop to the private schools. The bill is written so that it covers tuition and the only schools that have high tuition are the private schools. We do not feel that the Federal Government should enact legislation that is designed primarily to benefit private schools."

Report to My Constituents of the 11th Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of each 2 years I have rendered a report to the 600,000 citizens I represent in Marion County which makes up the 11th Congressional District of Indiana.

In 1952, at the end of the 82d Congress, my first summary was written as a Republican Congressman serving as a minority Member in a Democratic Congress under a Democratic President, Harry Truman. The chairman and majority of the members of each subcommittee and committee were Democrats, the leadership was Democratic. The Republicans were knit tightly together as the party of loyal opposition fighting for economy, integrity, decentralization of Government, freedom from controls, and security for the country from enemies abroad and at home.

In 1954, at the end of the 83d Congress, my report was written from the viewpoint of a majority Member in a Republican Congress under a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. The responsibility of the Republican Party was clearly identified and readily accepted by both the executive and the legislative. In 1953, according to Congressional Quarterly, the new President submitted 44 proposals. Congress approved 32, giving President Eisenhower a record of 72.7 percent cooperation by a Republican Congress in his first year. In 1954, Congressional Quarterly states that President Eisenhower submitted 232 legislative requests of which 150 were approved by a Republican Congress for a cooperation score of 64.7 percent.

EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS ENACTS 68.7 PERCENT OF EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Averaging the percentages for the 1st and 2d session of the Republican 83d Congress it becomes apparent that President Eisenhower received an overall support of 68.7 percent based on the Congressional Quarterly figures. The White House itself credited the Republican 83d Congress with passing 53 out of 64 bills requested by the President for a cooperation score of 83 percent for the 2-year period. This 83d "do something" Congress cut Government expenditures and reduced taxes by a whopping $7.4 billion of which individuals received $4.7 billion. Besides, it added 10 million to those eligible to receive social security benefits.

After 230 days in session and over 935 hours of debate, the House of Represenatives of the 84th Democratic Congress will adjourn today. This report to my constituents is prepared from the viewpoint of a Republican Congressman serving as a minority Member in a Democratic Congress under a Republican President. Again, the chairman and the majority of the members of every single subcommittee and committee are Democrats. The Committee on Rules, legislative traffic policemen for the House, again has 8 Democrat members and but 4 Republican members. The leadership is Democratic.

In spite of promises to support the Eisenhower program which were offered by the Democrats during the 1954 congressional campaigns, the record clearly indicates that the Democratic 84th Congress fell short of the record of cooperation with President Eisenhower made by the Republican 83d. According to Congressional Quarterly, a news service which has never been accused of being pro-Republican, the President submitted 207 proposals in 1955, of which only 96 were approved by the Democratic Congress which is a percentage score of only 46.3 percent cooperation. In 1956 the White House submitted 224 proposals of which 103 were approved by Congress, a percentage score of only 45.9 percent.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS ENACTS ONLY 46.1 PERCENT OF EISENHOWER PROGRAM

Averaging the percentages of the 1st and 2d sessions of the 84th Democratic Congress, it is apparent that President Eisenhower received an overall support of 46.1 percent based on the CQ figures. When you compare this 46.1 percent with the 68.7 percent which represents the cooperation extended by the Republican 83d Congress, it becomes obvious that it does make a difference as to which party controls the 2 Houses of Congress.

It makes quite a difference to the taxpayer, too, as to which party controls the Congress. A compilation of appropriations over the past 12 years established beyond question the difference between the 2 parties in the matter of spending and proves that the Republican Party, by its record, is truly entitled to be known as the economy party. In the past 25 fiscal years our Federal budget has been balanced only 4 times, twice during the Republican 80th Congress, once during fiscal year 1951, and again this year under the administration of a Republican President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. Let us look at the record:

APPROPRIATIONS (EXCLUDING PAYMENTS FROM TRUST FUNDS)

Democratic 79th Congress, fiscal 1946–47: $105,514,346,275.

Republican 80th Congress, fiscal 1948–49: $77,658,368,665.

Democratic 81st Congress, fiscal 1950–51: $127,542,497,308.

Democratic 82d Congress, fiscal 1952–53: $187,117,415,308.

Republican 83d Congress, fiscal 1954–55: $123,316,700,300.

Democratic 84th Congress, fiscal 1956–57: $128,566,274,914.

These appropriations during the 12 years indicated exclude approximately $83,325,000,000 payable from trust fund receipts. It is interesting to note that appropriations by the Democratic 82d Congress were the second largest in our entire history as a nation being exceeded only by the $204,863,924,329 appropriated by the 77th Democratic Congress during World War II.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS HAS BEEN WEAK BUT NOT VICIOUS

Mr. Speaker, even the kindliest of critics must admit that his has been a weak Congress. The Democrats have advanced no challenging legislative programs and no major reforms. They have been so busy finding new ways to squander money that they have failed to build up a legislative record to which they can point with any great pride, althought the leadership responsibility was clearly theirs. To the Republicans, this was a frustrating Congress.

Only five times since the Civil War have both Houses of Congress been controlled by a political party opposed to that of the President. Contrary to predictions, there was no violent opposition to the President's program as such. It wasn't that kind of a war. It wasn't a cold war either. It was a disorganized struggle of sabotage and sit-down strike with plenty of time out for looting and raiding the Treasury. The sense of positive drive which was sometimes evident in the Republican 83d Congress was lacking.

THE BUDGET—SPENDING

The 84th Democratic Congress has apparently cinched two records. It looks like 2,875 to 2,880 bills will be passed during the 234 days it has been in session during the past 2 years for a new, all-time high. It is equally obvious that this Congress has appropriated more money to run the Federal Government than any other Congress in peacetime or time of cold war.

That the Federal budget was balanced this year with a $1.7 billion surplus to be applied to the Federal debt was no fault of the Democrats. The appropriations made this year at the height of the congressional spending spree will not be felt until next year, meantime unusually large revenue resulting from the high level of business and individual prosperity during the Eisenhower peacetime prosperity has enabled the Treasury to end the year in the black.

For fiscal year 1957, the President submitted to Congress requests for appro-

priations aggregating $59.9 billion. The House approved $57.7 billion while the Senate voted some $2.6 billion more for a total of $60.3 billion. Conference agreements between the House and the Senate on the individual bills resulted in a final total of $59.7 billion. The major increases of the Senate were $1,149,000,000 for defense, $686 million for foreign aid, $81 million for public works, and $75 million for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Labor. Eight hundred million dollars more was actually approved for the Department of Defense than the President requested. Two billion, five hundred million dollars was authorized for farm price supports more than in the January budget.

Only a Presidential veto can now save the taxpayers from authorizations for rivers and harbors projects, many of which have not been adequately screened. The commendable restraint of recent Congresses which refused to add new authorizations during debate on the floor was suddenly scrapped and authorizations were added on a "pork-barrel basis." While some of these projects may have been worthy, failure to provide for scrutiny by the Bureau of the Budget and consideration by trained subcommittee and committee personnel evidenced little concern for economy as compared to election year politics by a Democrat-controlled Congress. This may well be characterized as the "giveaway Congress of the century."

I believe it is fair to say that the foundation for today's prosperity was worked out in close cooperation between President Eisenhower and the 83d Republican Congress. Controls were removed, a $7.4 billion tax cut was made of which $4.7 went to individuals and the budget was brought into balance. The effect of the spendthrift programs of the last 2 years will be felt for at least 5 years in the future. What this fiscal irresponsibility will do toward increasing inflationary pressures and preventing future reductions in taxes is difficult to predict.

CIVIL RIGHTS

After introducing a resolution to make a discharge petition possible so that H. R. 627, President Eisenhower's civil rights bill might be brought to the floor, it was gratifying to me to have the Committee on Rules agree, finally, to schedule floor consideration for this measure.

The House approved this moderate and evolutionary civil rights bill by a vote of 279 to 126. This civil rights bill extended no new privileges. It would have set up a commission to investigate denials of civil rights, would have elevated the civil rights group in the Department of Justice to a separate division under the control of an Assistant Attorney General and would have protected the right to vote by empowering the Attorney General to initiate special civil suits against groups depriving, or about to deprive persons of their civil rights. The Senate did not consider the civil rights bill. The House vote was 168 Republicans for, 24 against and 111 Democrats for, 102 against.

DEFENSE

President Eisenhower's defense proposals sent to the 84th Congress stressed continued improvement in our armed services' combat readiness and effectiveness without straining the Nation's economy. For defense in the current fiscal year the President requested $34.1 billion in new funds. The Democratic Congress approved $34.6 billion, insisting on authorizing $900 million more for the Air Force than requested, finally agreed in conference committee that the additional funds need not be earmarked for B–52 bombers alone but, "the added funds should be utilized to expedite production of heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential Air Force weapons to the optimum limit of existing facilities."

The Democratic Congress did not renew its veto power, enacted in the first session, which made it easier for the Defense Department to remain in civilian type commercial operations that often competed directly with private businesses. Instead of having to come before the Committee on Appropriations to justify dispensing with these commercial operations, the Department is now given greater latitude.

Besides extending the Defense Production Act with provisions to require industrial dispersion of new plants, the 84th Congress extended the Renegotiation Act for 2 years and increased the exemption to $1 million, provided for an $87 million stockpile of tungsten, asbestos, and so forth.

Public Law 963 appropriated $2.1 billion for military bases, housing, and so forth.

The 84th Congress gave career status to Reserve Army and Air Force officers, put the Armed Forces under social security effective January 1 and equalized survivors benefits.

FARM PROGRAM

The farm problem was one of the most stubborn problems confronting the Congress. The farm bill which finally became law after exasperating delays and emphasis on partisanship by the Democrats was a barely statisfactory compromise.

The Democrats and a few Republican members of the farm bloc, chiefly from one-crop States, wanted a return to rigid price supports, the very system under which today's surpluses had been accumulated and today's low prices generated. Accordingly, the Democrats passed a bill to return to rigid price supports of 90 percent of parity. Parity is a formula intended to correlate the price a farmer gets for his crop with the price he paid for his supplies.

The President vetoed this bill. Although 173 Republicans and 38 Democrats voted to sustain President Eisenhower, 182 Democrats and 20 Republicans opposed him. The two-thirds vote required to override a veto was not obtained. The House and Senate Agriculture Committees went to work again and produced what is now Public Law 540.

It includes a $1.2 billion, two-part soil-bank plan with no authority for 1956 prepayments on 1957 crops. Administration foes in Congress argued that such payments might influence voting in November. Agriculture Secretary Benson decided to make soil-bank payments this year to farmers who plowed up some of their plantings. He did so and by the sign-up deadline of July 27 had obligated $224 million, which will be paid out this fall.

One-year spending under the soil bank is limited to $750 million for the short-term acreage reserve, $450 million under the long-range conservation reserve.

Public Law 540 also retains flexible supports for the basic commodities but gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to try a two-price plan on rice if he wishes; places feed grains at 76 percent of parity for this year; and increases from $300 million to $500 million the amount of surpluses that can be donated for disaster, famine, and foreign relief.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Government employees fared well sometimes as a result of administration pressures on Congress, othertimes as a result of a generous Congress opposing the President.

Legislation protecting classified employees against salary cuts in cases of job reclassification, bills given regular status to indefinite and temporary postal substitutes are cases in point. Last years 7.5 percent pay increase for classified employees and 8.6 percent pay boost for postal workers plus fringe benefits, gave Federal workers one of the largest single pay increases in history.

Many new retirement benefits for Federal employees are contained in Public Law 854 which was passed by this Congress. Annuities are increased for Federal workers and their widows and dependent widowers on the average of approximately 25 percent and those for surviving children by approximately 150 percent.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The first session of the 84th Congress authorized the President, by an overwhelming bi-partisan vote to use American Armed Forces to defend Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions.

Both chambers adopted unanimously, a resolution putting Congress on record as opposing the United Nations seating of Communist China. The Democrat leadership and majority in the Senate did not bring up the Bricker amendment for final action.

FOREIGN AID

The President requested $4.9 billion in new appropriations for mutual security, or foreign aid, compared to $2.7 for the fiscal year just ahead.

The House approved $3.7 billion, the Senate approved $4.1 billion the House-Senate finally agreed on $3.8 billion. I voted against the entire foreign aid program on the basis that Congress has lost control of the funds for the whole area of spending. There is now an $8.7 billion carryover in the pipeline even if not one cent were appropriated this year. This carryover plus the counterpart funds available abroad, together with the new authorization makes $12.9 billion which the Executive can obligate, deobligate, and reobligate without checking back with the Congress. I do not believe that represents responsible legislative stewardship over the taxpayers' money, no matter which party is in power.

There is a definite and noticeable restiveness about annual renewals of the blank check aid authorizations evidenced by the fact that both the Senate and

the House have authorized sweeping investigations of foreign aid. Both debate and voting on mutual security this year disclosed some decline in enthusiasm on the part of many southern Members who had once been strong supporters.

FOREIGN TRADE

The President barely succeeded in getting through his reciprocal trade extension bill last year. The vote on the resolution to consider H. R. 1 was probably the critical vote. It passed 193 to 192 on February 17, 1955. I supported the President. The President's major foreign trade achievement in Congress this year was in winning further simplification in customs procedures. Public Law 927 shifts valuations to export value alone, with certain exceptions. Authorization for United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, a key point in President Eisenhower's foreign trade program, was not brought to the floor in either House.

HEALTH

Public Law 911 is an omnibus law designed to reduce the shortage of nurses and health facilities and to improve mental health care authorizing Federal grants for training and extending the Hill-Burton Act which authorized up to $210 million a year for hospital construction. Public Law 835 authorizes $90 million over 3 years for the construction of research facilities. The 84th Congress also authorized $4 million for a dental research building at the National Institutes of Health and the establishment of a National Library of Medicine.

HOUSING

The 84th Congress revised the National Housing Act through Public Law 1020 extending to September 30, 1959 FHA home improvement loan authority. Loan maturities all increased from 3 years to 5 and maximums are raised to $3,500 for single-family dwellings, to $15,000 for nonsingle family units. FHA can insure up to 90 percent on dwellings costing not more than $8,100 per family unit built for elderly residents by nonprofit organizations. FHA mortgage insurance authority is increased by $3 billion. The military housing program is changed to allow a $16,500 maximum per unit with an overall ceiling of $2.3 billion and a cutoff date at the end of 1957.

Additional public housing is authorized at 35,000 units a year for this fiscal year and next but is tied to urban renewal in the local community. This is almost exactly the program the President wanted. The Democrats wanted a much larger program, 135,000 public housing units a year for 4 years. Public Law 898 extends the Veterans' Administration's home loan guaranty program to July 25, 1958.

IMMIGRATION

The President asked fundamental revision of the McCarran-Walter immigration law, which opponents had long contended was unfair to some racial and ethnic groups. Nothing substantial was done by Congress. The result: An Eisenhower defeat.

LABOR

The President for the fourth time vainly recommended amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act. The Democratic leadership, although making a campaign issue of Taft-Hartley repeal never seriously took up the issue in either house when they had a healthy Democratic majority to work with. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Education and Labor in the House met less frequently than in many other sessions. Since a majority of both parties supported the Taft-Hartley Act when it was originally passed in the 80th Congress, the Democratic leadership evidently feared that their party, too, would have been deeply split had the issue reached the floor for consideration.

NATURAL RESOURCES—POWER

The Republican administration and the Democratic Congress fought inconclusively over power projects. The Democrats compiled a pro-public-power record; the Republicans took a pro-private-power stand, combining the resources of Federal, local governments, and private capital to get the maximum power at the lowest cost to the taxpayer. The Hells Canyon public-power project on the Idaho-Oregon border was killed in the Senate. The House in turn killed a Senate-approved bill granting the State of New York authority to develop powerplants along the Niagara. Likewise, the House rejected a $156 million Fryingpan-Arkansas water diversion bill, but both bodies came to an agreement to authorize the $1.6 billion development of the upper Colorado River Basin in a 5-State area. The only inroads Federal power could make in the State of Indiana would be through authorization of federally built atomic reactors. Efforts by advocates of public power to put the Government into the atomic electric power business were halted by House Republicans when a bill, S. 4146, granting $400 million to build pilot reactors failed 203 to 191. This measure came to the floor without the sanction of the administration and without any consultations with the Atomic Energy Commission.

Due to the devastation and hardship wrought on many sections of the country during recent floods, this Congress was prompted to pass the Flood Insurance Act of 1956, establishing a $5 billion insurance and reinsurance program to assist flood victims.

This Congress also passed Public Law 660, increasing by $1 million annually Federal research grants to the States for water pollution and passed 8 significant reclamation and flood-control projects.

POSTAL

The administration supported a raise in postal rates to overcome the deficit of the Post Office Department. In 1955, in spite of the wage increase to postal workers, the deficit was whittled to $363 million, as compared to the 1952 Democratic administration's postal deficit of $727 million.

The House passed by 217 to 165 a bill to require a 4-cent stamp on first-class letters and to raise the airmail rate from 6 cents to 7 cents an ounce. This measure was killed in the Senate Post Office Subcommittee by a Democratic majority and the administration's efforts to offset the Post Office Department deficit failed.

REORGANIZATION

Pending before the 84th Democratic Congress were 19 major reports of the Second Hoover Commission Reports and 309 bills to implement the recommendations contained in these reports. The bipartisan Hoover Commission made a total of 314 recommendations of which 142 require legislative action. The balance can be enacted by administrative orders. A majority of the bills introduced were referred to the committee on which I serve, the House Committee on Government Operations. I constantly contacted our Democratic chairman, urging that action be taken on these measures which would result in increased efficiency and economy, but only one ever came out of committee to be passed by the Congress. Public Law 863 implements some of the Hoover Commission's recommendations for the reform of Government budgeting and accounting procedures. The law requires submission of budget information on program costs and accomplishments, departmental budgeting and accounting on an accrued cost basis and simplification of the subdivision in appropriations for funds. Even then, the bill was weakened by the House refusing to go along with the proposal that Congress appropriate funds on an accrued expenditure basis. Meanwhile, those recommendations which needed no legislative action were being implemented in the Federal Government by the Eisenhower administration at a savings of several billions to the taxpayer.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Federal aid to school construction bill drew heavy support from the Democrat majority and lesser enthusiasm from the Republican side of the aisle. After days of debating, the House approved 225 to 192 an amendment to deny Federal funds to school districts or States that did not comply with the United States Supreme Court's decision against racial segregation in public schools. Then, by a vote of 261 to 158, the House refused a motion to send the bill back to its Labor and Education Committee for reconsideration and defeated the bill on a final rollcall vote of 224 to 194. The 84th Congress did authorize a $378 million extension of Federal aid to school districts overburdened by Federal activities.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND RETIREMENT

When the Republicans replaced the previous administration in Washington, only 47 percent of the aged were eligible for social-security benefits. The Republicans immediately brought into the social-security program 3,600,000 self-employed farm owners and operators and 4,500,000 others, including domestic workers, ministers, accountants, architects, engineers, State and local government employees, and so forth, as well as increasing retirement and death benefits. The first session of the Democratic 84th Congress showed a callous indifference

to continuing improvements in the Social Security System. The single exception was a bill supported by both parties raising the limitation on the amount of railroad retirement annuities for spouses to the maximum payable under social security. The second session, however, enacted two changes in the social-security law. The first places some 800,000 women on Federal pension rolls by dropping the retirement age from 65 to 62, with reduced benefit payments. Widows can claim benefits at 62 with no reduction in payments. The second allows 250,000 totally and permanently disabled workers to draw retirement pensions at the age of 50. Social security payroll deductions beginning January 1957, will be increased one-fourth percent each for employer and employee, and three-eights percent for the self-employee.

TAXES

The contrast between Democrat tax-and-spend policies and Republican economies is dramatically presented in the record of the Eisenhower administration. In addition to the huge $7.4 billion tax cut of the Republican 83d Congress, Government spending was reduced more than $19 billion. These two factors contributed in a major way to the generation of unparalleled prosperity based on a record of economy of almost $400 billion. Fiscal 1956 ended with a balanced budget. The national debt was reduced. The budget for fiscal 1957 promises another surplus.

The Democrats who said that individuals would not benefit from the Republican tax cuts which actually put $4.6 billion directly into the pockets of the wage earner and his family, returned to Washington last January with tentative plans to carry out an individual income tax reduction. Even though the leadership was theirs, the only move they made toward a tax reduction was to have a subcommittee of the House Committee on Ways and Means study the Internal Revenue Code during the adjournment of Congress this fall.

In fact the record on income taxes shows during the period of 1900–56:

Democrats: Enacted the first Federal income-tax law in 1913.

Democrats: Voted 14 out of the 15 tax increases since 1913.

Democrats: Have put low-income workers on the tax rolls. During 20 years, Democrats added 44,900,000 persons, chiefly low-income workers, to the tax rolls.

Democrats: Have drastically increased taxes on low-income families by reducing exemptions from $2,500 for a married couple, to $1,000; from $1,000 for a single worker, to $500.

Republicans: Enacted 7 out of the 10 reductions in income taxes.

Republicans: Have enacted only 1 of the 15 tax increases since 1913.

The 84th Congress extended the 52 percent corporation income tax rate to April 1, 1957—Public Law 458—and declined to cut excise taxes generally. Public Law 1010 is the exception which drops the 10 percent excise tax on amusement admissions of 90 cents or less.

TRANSPORTATION

The Democrat-controlled Congress delayed passage of the administration's comprehensive highway plan in 1955 because of a disagreement over the method of financing. The second session finally approved the proposed legislation, and President Eisenhower signed into law the biggest highway building program in history. It is to cost an estimated $32.9 billion of which the Federal share will be $27.7 billion. A Federal user's tax is expected to provide an income of $14.8 billion in added revenue over a period of 16 years. This program will provide a 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System linking State capitals and major cities with dual-lane, limited-access highways. It will take 13 years to complete.

Also authorized is an additional 3-year regular Federal-aid highway program in which the cost is shared equally between the Federal and the State governments.

In the line of shipping, this Congress authorized the building of the atom-powered merchant ship. This new ship will be a joint undertaking of the Maritime Administration and the Atomic Energy Commission.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

The House voted increases in veterans' pensions and disability payments, but the Senate shelved the legislation. Both Chambers extended the veterans' home-loan program; extended social-security coverage to all military personnel; provided medical care for dependents of military personnel; raised the pay of medical and dental officers in the Armed Forces; continued the veterans' educational-aid program; raised the pay and allowances of military personnel; extended the dependents' assistance law; authorized loans to veterans for farm homes.

Voting record of CHARLES B. BROWNSON on major legislation of Eisenhower program

1ST SESS., 1955

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
3	H. J. Res. 159.—Authorize President to use Armed Forces to protect Formosa, the Pescadores, and related positions. Passed. Yeas 410, nays 3.	Jan. 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
4	H. R. 587.—Veterans' education benefits, continued accrual of education benefits. Yeas 366, nays 0	Jan. 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
5	H. R. 3005.—Draft extension amendment extends military draft and dependent's assistance benefits. Yeas 394, nays 4.	Feb. 8	Yea	Yea	Supported.
6 (17)	H. R. 3828.—Salary adjustment for judges of United States courts, United States attorneys, and Members of Congress. Yeas 283, nays 118.	Feb. 16	Yea	Yea	Supported.
10 (8 and 9)	H. Res. 142.—The resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 1, reciprocal trade bill. On agreeing to resolution. Yeas 193, nays, 192.	Feb. 17	Yea	Yea	Supported.
11 (12 and 83)	H. R. 1.—Reciprocal trade, extends authority for President to make tariff agreements. On motion to recommit with instructions. Yeas 199, nays 206.	Feb. 18	Nay	Nay	Supported.
15 (16 and 33)	H. R. 4259.—Extends existing corporation and excise tax rates for 1 year. On motion to recommit with instructions to delete $20 credit for each personal exemption. Yeas 205, nays 210.	Feb. 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
19	H. R. 4720.—Provides incentives for members of the armed services by increasing certain military pay and allowances. Yeas 399, nays 1.	Mar. 10	Yea	Yea	Supported.
27	H. Res. 170.—Declares that the House of Representatives opposes sale of synthetic rubber facilities to private enterprise. Yeas 132, nays 283.	Mar. 22	Nay	Nay	Supported.
29	H. Res. 171.—Disapproves of sale of synthetic rubber facilities to Shell Oil Co. as recommended by Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission. Yeas 137, nays 276.	Mar. 23	Nay	Nay	Supported.
37 (23, 38, 39, 50, 51)	H. R. 4644.—Moss amendment to raise postal pay an average 8.2 percent instead of 7.5 percent administration proposed. Yeas 224, nays 189.	Apr. 20	Nay	Nay	Supported.
48 (46 and 47)	H. R. 12.—Restore rigid supports at 90 percent parity for 5 basic commodities. Yeas 206, nays 201, present 5	May 5	Nay	Nay	Supported.
52 (57)	H. Res. 223.—Would prohibit amendments to Hawaii and Alaska statehood bill including amendments to permit separate action on each territory. Yeas 323, nays 66.	May 9	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
62	On Vinson amendment to Department of Defense Appropriation bill to eliminate sec. 639 which forced Defense Department to come to congressional committees before terminating business-type activities. This section was the subject of a strong Presidential attack when he signed the legislation. Yeas 184, nays 202.	May 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
72	H. R. 2851.—Makes available agricultural commodities owned by the CCC to persons in need in areas of acute distress. Yeas 344, nays 1, present 3.	May 25	Yea	Yea	Supported.
79	S. 2061.—Raises pay of postal workers an average of 8 percent. Administration proposal after President's veto of 8.59 percent raise had been sustained. Yeas 410, nays 1.	June 7	Yea	Yea	Supported.
80	H. R. 5923.—Expedites survey and construction of Inter-American Highway. Yeas 353, nays 13	June 8	Yea	Yea	Supported.
93	H. R. 6040.—Custom's simplification. Motion to recommit bill which amends Tariff Act of 1930 and repeals obsolete provisions. Recommit with instructions. Yeas 143, nays 232.	June 22	Nay	Nay	Supported.
95	H. R. 6992.—Extends for 1 year existing temporary increase in the public debt ceiling, to $281 billion. Yeas 267, nays 56.	June 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
99 (100)	H. R. 3005.—Conference adds doctor's draft law to draft extension as passed by House. Motion to recommit conference report including doctor's draft. Yeas 171, nays 221.	June 28	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
105 (110)	S. 2090.—Mutual Security Act of 1954 amendments (foreign aid). Authorizes $3,285,800,000. Yeas, 273 nays 128.	June 30	Nay	Yea	Opposed.

Voting record of CHARLES B. BROWNSON on major legislation of Eisenhower program—Continued

1ST SESS., 1955—continued

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
109	H. R. 3210.—Water diversion. Authorizes increased diversion of water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway. (Similar pocket-vetoed in 1954.) Motion to recommit. Yeas 74, nays 316.	July 6	Yea	Yea	Supported.
129	H. R. 7000.—A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve Forces, referred to by its opponents as a modified UMT measure. It spells out the individual's military obligation. Yeas 315, nays 78.	July 25	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
132 (130 and 133).	H. R. 7474.—Highway construction. On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute Eisenhower program for Democrats 12-year plan with increased fuel and highway taxes. Yeas 193, nays 221.	July 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
141	S. 2576.—Housing. Authorizes construction of only 35,000 public housing units a year for 2 years, improvement of housing, elimination of slums and the conservation of urban communities. Yeas 396, nays 3.	July 29	Yea	Yea	Supported.

NOTE.—Using Congressional Quarterly, the congressional record of debate, and information from the White House as a basis, this record indicates that I supported President Eisenhower 21 times and opposed him 4 times during the 1st sess. of the 84th Cong. for an Eisenhower support percentage of 84 percent and an opposition percentage of 16 percent with the opposition centered around separate consideration for Hawaiian statehood, the doctor's draft amendment, $3.3 billion of mutual security authorization (foreign aid) and the increase of individual military contribution by those largely under 21 years of age. In the ground rules employed, all appropriation bills have been eliminated as being more or less noncontroversial and an attempt has been made to select 1 decisive vote on each matter.

2D SESS., 1956

House rollcall	Description and result	Date	BROWNSON vote	Eisenhower position	BROWNSON support
3	H. R. 8780.—Farm machinery tax. Relieves farmers from paying excise taxes on gasoline and special fuels for farm use. Yeas 387, nays 0.	Jan. 31	Yea	Yea	Supported.
5	H. R. 7993.—Navy shipbuilding and conversion. Authorizes $1.4 billion for construction of 22 combat vessels, an ammunition ship, landing and service craft, for converting 4 aircraft carriers and a nuclear reactor. Yeas 360, nays 3.	Feb. 1	Yea	Yea	Supported.
14	H. R. 3383.—Authorizes construction of the $760 million upper Colorado River irrigation and reclamation project. Yeas 256, nays 136.	Mar. 1	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
16	H. R. 9166.—Extends for 1 year existing corporate tax income rates and existing excise tax rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, gasoline, automobiles, trucks, and buses. Yeas 366, nays 4.	Mar. 13	Yea	Yea	Supported.
20 (19)	H. R. 8320.—Extends the school milk and brucellosis eradication programs through June 30, 1958. Yeas 406, nays 0.	Mar. 21	Yea	Yea	Supported.
23 (24)	On Martin (Republican, Massachusetts) motion to recommit the conference report on H. R. 12, Agricultural Act of 1956, with instructions to substitute 82.5 percent supports instead of Democrats rigid 90 percent of parity for the 1956 crop. Yeas 181, nays 238.	Apr. 11	Yea	Yea	Supported.
25	H. R. 9893.—Authorizes $2 billion for military construction at certain installations. Yeas 377, nays 3	Apr. 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
27	H. R. 12.—Passage of Democrat's rigid farm support bill over President Eisenhower's veto. Yeas 202, nays 211.	Apr. 18	Nay	Nay	Supported.
36	H. R. 10660.—Amend Federal-Aid Road Act by authorizing a $51.5 billion 13 year national highway construction program. Provides for increased taxes to finance program. Yeas 388, nays 19.	Apr. 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.
46	On Allen amendment to Department of Defense Appropriation bill to delete provision which makes it more difficult for the Government to get out of business-type activities. Yeas 222, nays 156.	May 10	Yea	Yea	Supported.
54 (39, 40, 41, and 42).	H. R. 10875.—Revised farm bill including soil bank provisions. Yeas 305, nays 59	May 23	Yea	Yea	Supported.
56	H. R. 10285.—Merges production credit corporations in Federal intermediate credit banks, provides for retirement of Government capital and for supervision of production credit associations. Farm credit. Yeas 246, nays 4.	May 31	Yea	Yea	Supported.
63	H. R. 11356.—Mutual Security Act of 1956. Provides for a 1-year extension of act and authorizes appropriations of $3.6 billion for the mutual security program. Yeas 275, nays 122.	June 11	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
72 (71)	H. R. 9540.—To authorize Federal money to help States combat water pollution. Yeas 338, nays 31	June 13	Yea	Yea	Supported.
78 (77)	H. R. 7886.—Veterans' benefits. To increase rates and liberalize the basis for payment of non-service-connected pensions. Yeas 364, nays 51.	June 27	Yea	Nay	Opposed.
92 (82, 89, 90, and 91).	H. R. 7535.—Federal aid to school construction. Yeas 194, nays 224	July 5	Nay	Yea	Opposed.
94	H. R. 11380.—Postal rates. To raise postage rates in an effort to decrease the Post Office Department's deficit. Yeas 217, nays 166.	July 6	Yea	Yea	Supported.
101	H. R. 12038.—Service-connected pension rates. Increases service-connected disability compensation and dependency allowances. Yeas 391, nays 0.	July 12	Yea	Yea	Supported.
104	H. R. 11708.—Agricultural trade. Amends the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954 to provide an additional $1.5 billion to dispose of surplus agricultural commodities. Yeas 369, nays 6.	July 18	Yea	Yea	Supported.
111 (106, 110)	H. R. 627.—Civil rights. To provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. Yeas 279, nays 126.	July 23	Yea	Yea	Supported.
115	On amendment to Defense Department appropriation bill requiring Secretary of Defense to notify Congress of proposed transfer of work to private industry and providing a 60-day period during which either Chamber of Congress could disapprove. Yeas 201, nays 185.	July 24	Nay	Nay	Supported.
117 (116)	H. R. 12061.—Federal civilian atomic powerplant acceleration. On motion to recommit. Yeas 203, nays 191	July 24	Yea	Yea	Supported.
119	Housing bill.—Compromise between Senate version of 135,000 units a year, House committee version of 60,000 units, and House version of 35,000. Extends and improves FHA property improvement loan program, authorizes $3 billion FHA insurance, etc. On amendment to rule to provide for striking out title V. Yeas 92, nays 299.	July 25	Nay	Nay	Supported.
123	Rule on authorizing construction of Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado. Yeas 179, nays 194	July 26	Absent	Yea	Absent.
131	H. Res. 604 to consider H. R. 7850 authorizing the construction of the Little Wood River reclamation project in Idaho. Yeas 173, nays 168.	July 27	Yea	Yea	Supported.

NOTE.—Support of the President's program is measured by many things; work in the committee, debate on the floor of the House, cooperation with the executive department and supporting as many administration measures as possible. Statistically, the best compilation of legislation in which the President was interested indicates that I supported him 20 times, opposed him 4 times, and was absent attending a meeting with General Twining at the time I rollcall vote was taken. It is, of course, impractical to indicate support on voice votes, division and teller votes, which are not recorded but are often of far greater importance than the final rollcall vote.

Madison and the Empire of Free Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, last September 11 the Bar Association of Madison County, Ill., held most impressive public ceremonies commemorating the creation of Madison County. But it was far more than just a civic occasion. It was, in fact, a program of rededication to the principles of constitutional government to which James Madison and other selfless patriots of his day devoted their lives. In the present climate, when the ideals and principles of free men stand in jeopardy, it is appropriate for all of us to recall and to rededicate ourselves to the political philosophy of that great American—the philosophy which found expression in our Constitution and which is embodied particularly in the Bill of Rights.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I commend to the careful attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the principal speech delivered on that occasion—an eloquent and provocative address entitled "Madison and the Empire of Free Men," by the former St. Louis newspaperman and distinguished historian, Mr. Irving Brant. Mr. Brant, as

many Members of the Congress know, I am sure, has already published four volumes of a definitive study of the life of James Madison and that turbulent period in the growth of our Nation, and is now writing the fifth of what will be a six-volume history—a study which, I am confident, will prove of inestimable and abiding value to all students of American history, politics, and government.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks made on the occasion in question by Mr. Burton C. Bernard, of Granite City, Ill., on behalf of the Madison County Bar Association, in presenting a plaque commemorating James Madison, and the acceptance remarks by Mr. Irving Dilliard, editor of the editorial page of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who is past president of the Illinois State Historical Society and director of the Madison County Historical Society.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the messages sent for the occasion by the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson; by the Governor of Illinois, William G. Stratton; by my colleagues in the Congress, Senator Paul H. Douglas and Representative Melvin Price; by the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Illinois, Harry B. Hershey; and my own message for this historic celebration.

There being no objection, the addresses and messages were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADISON AND THE EMPIRE OF FREE MEN

(By Mr. Irving Brant)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, during the first 70 years of our national history, naming counties after Presidents of the United States was a good American pastime. It was about as common as fiddling at a wedding. There are 20 Madison counties in the United States, scattered from New York to Idaho, from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico. In most of them the choice of a name meant only that James Madison was one of a quartet of Presidents, the others being Washington, Jefferson, and Jackson, who were thought to rate that treatment when the lines of the governmental checkerboard were being drawn. However, there was nothing so routine as this in the relationship of Madison County, Ill., to the fourth President of the United States.

I do not merely have in mind that Madison occupied the White House when the first government of Illinois Territory was being organized, in 1809, and that he appointed all of its early officers. It was likewise natural that when new counties were being established in the young territory, one of them should have been named for the President then in office. Such obvious facts do not illumine, they rather conceal, the real connection between Madison and Madison County, Ill.

Before going into that, let us consider what sort of man James Madison was. He is generally recognized as the foremost of American political philosophers, the leading architect of the Constitution and the draftsman of its Bill of Rights. All of his work in this field was performed in the first 17 years of his adult life. Thereafter he served 7 years in Congress, 8 years as Secretary of State, and 8 years as President—23 years of public life which most historians have dealt with by progressing from moderate to severe disparagement. The verdict upon him as President could easily be represented by the following syllogism:

A great political philosopher cannot be a great President.

Madison was a great political philosopher.

Therefore, Madison was not a great President.

Ask for tangible evidence to support that conclusion and you will be told: Why, Madison was a timid pacifist who was pushed into the War of 1812, against his will, by the congressional War Hawks. But that is not evidence: it is accusation. Is the accusation true? Read the dispatch written by French Minister Turreau on November 2, 1810, a year and a half before the outbreak of the war. On that day, 5 weeks before Congress assembled, President Madison issued a proclamation cutting off commercial relations with England. And on that same day, said Turreau, the President directed the Secretary of State to tell him (I quote) "that the measures he (Madison) will take in case England continues to interfere with our communications with Europe will necessarily lead to war."

The evidence, it seems, contradicts the chief count in the indictment. The same is true, I might add, right down the line. But when was a syllogism ever overthrown by facts? Aristotle laid down the rule, which went unchallenged for 2,000 years, that the velocity of a falling body depends upon its weight. That is, a 10-pound stone falls 10 times as fast as a 1-pound stone. Galileo droped 2 such rocks from the Leaning Tower of Pisa and then repeated the experiment before an audience of Italian mathematicians. The scholars saw the big stone and the pebble strike the ground at exactly the same moment. Then they reread Aristotle and said that Madison was wrong. So I guess you had better accept the verdict that Madison was not one of our great Presidents.

Having made that as clear as the Missouri River, let us glance at some intriguing facts connected with the appointment, by Madison, of those first officers of Illinois Territory. In general, they were chosen on the recommendations of a Kentucky admiration society consisting of Senators Pope and Thurston and Representative Howard, leagued with ex-Kentuckian Jesse Thomas, who was congressional delegate from Indiana Territory and later Senator from Illinois. Of course, these Kentucky colonels were not seeking or bestowing political patronage. Their State was the only one that touched the new territory. Illinois had no Federal officeholders of its own, to give disinterested nonpolitical advice to the President, so the Kentuckians took this way of manifesting a benevolent interest in their neighbors' welfare. It was a cold spring, however, for Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Kentucky, the black sheep of the Democratic flock. "I was opposed to the election of Mr. Madison," he explained apologetically to a disappointed aspirant, "this accounts for my not mentioning your name for governor."

Ninian Edwards, for whom Edwardsville was named, is commonly regarded as the first governor of Illinois Territory. Actually, he was the second. John Boyle of Kentucky was appointed to that post 2 days after Madison became President. Boyle performed only one act as governor, he drew 3 weeks' pay as governor, but he never left Kentucky. Instead, he resigned to become a judge of the Kentucky Court of Appeals; the duties of his Illinois office were carried on by the new territorial secretary, who was a brother of Kentucky's Senator Pope. In his letter to Madison explaining his resignation Governor Boyle wrote: "Permit me now, sir, to recommend Ninian Edwards as a proper person to fill the appointment of governor."

Since Edwards was then chief justice of the same court that Boyle was entering, this was in effect a plan to exchange jobs. Edwards also was endorsed for the Illinois governorship by his and Madison's close friend, William Wirt of Virginia, and by his own Kentucky relative, the ubiquitous Senator Pope. The latter, however, said be believed that Edwards would prefer to governorship of Mississippi Territory. Imagine the effect on American history if that suggestion had been carried out. In that case Ninian Wirt Edwards, who was 4 days old when Pope wrote his letter, might still have married Elizabeth Todd. But Abraham Lincoln never would have set eyes on Mary Todd. Without her, many students of history believe, Lincoln would not have become President. Without his leadership, could the Union have survived? Verily, in the choosing of a governor, what was good for Illinois Territory was good for the country.

Governor Edwards furnished the link in the special relationship, to which I referred, between President Madison and Madison County, Ill. That relationship was a thing of the spirit, a part of the American people's struggle for equal political rights, with Madison letting them know what rights they were entitled to.

What happened in Illinois Territory at the beginning of the 19th century is not part of the dead and buried past, to be exhumed for antiquarian display. The struggle that went on here in 1812 goes on today in the minds of men and women in every State, city, and hamlet of the American Union. In many States it is the theme of open controversy, and it is rising in acuteness in nearly every other part of the world. When you unveil a plaque to James Madison 143 years after his name was given to your county, you span the years with the principles he lived by, and make them a visible, vibrant part of the present and the future.

Illinois Territory, it is hardly necessary to say, was formed by splitting Indiana Territory in two along the Wabash River, with the line of division extending straight north from post Vincennes to Canada. This vast area, including the present States of Illinois, Wisconsin, and much of Minnesota, was divided at first into only two counties. In September 1812 the Territory was divided into 5 counties, 1 of them Madison—not solely Madison County as we know it today, but reaching from the Mississippi River to Indiana, and up to Canada. Most of this county, in the language of the day, was a loathesome wilderness with the warriors of Tecumseh making it more so. This redivision into five counties was not a simple reflection of the growth of population. It was a political maneuver in a struggle for power between two groups in the community, between the haves and the have-nots, between those who believed in the republican form of government as it was defined by James Madison, and those who sought to concentrate political control in a handful of privileged monopolists.

The act creating Illinois Territory, passed in the closing days of the Jefferson administration, gave it a government similar to that provided by earlier laws for more extensive territories. This meant, at the outset, government by Presidential appointees, without a legislature. However, the Illinois act required the Governor to call elections for a general assembly, whenever he was given satisfactory evidence that this was the wish of a majority of freeholders—a freeholder being defined as the owner of 50 acres of land.

In the spring of 1812, various freeholders began petitioning Governor Edwards to poll the qualified voters on the establishment of a legislature, and if a majority approved, to order the election of its members. On the surface this was a fair and natural move toward democratic self-government. At bottom it was the opposite.

Under a 1789 law which Congress made applicable to Illinois Territory, the right to vote was limited to adult males with a 50-acre freehold. To qualify for office, a citizen must own 200 acres. The expectation had been that with the Federal Government sell-

ing raw land at a dollar and a half per acre, practically every settler in the newly opened country would quickly become a freeholder. Suffrage would be practically universal.

In Illinois Territory, however, settlers streamed in before Congress established new land offices. The only freeholders were two or three hundred farmers and farmer-lawyers—my apologies to the bar association; I should say two or three hundred farmers and prospective candidates for office. These individuals had managed to secure Government land patents. The great mass of the people were unable to do so. They staked out claims, built homes, planted and harvested crops. But in law they were trespassers on the public land, and they could not vote.

When the freeholders began to petition for the election of a legislature, Governor Edwards saw what was up and wrote to his old friend Congressman Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky. The census of 1810, Edwards said, gave Illinois Territory a population of 12,282. Among these he was able to count 220 freeholders. This handful of men, the Governor wrote, would have the exclusive right of determining whether a new form of government should be established. They would then have the exclusive right to vote for the members of the legislature. The Territorial house of representatives, consisting of only 7 members, would nominate a legislative council of 5 members, to hold office for 5 years. These 12 men would write the laws and in joint session they would elect a Delegate to Congress.

Thus, Governor Edwards pointed out, he was being forced to call an election which would enable 220 persons—better say a few more than half of that number—to fix the measures of the Territory for the next 5 years. These freeholders, he declared, were men having an interest distinct from that of the great body of the people. They were a handful with power to act in opposition to the interest and wishes of the rest of the population. And what did the disfranchised masses think about it? Said the Governor:

"Even if the danger to be apprehended should be considered problematical, still such are the jealous and independent dispositions of freemen that they never will be satisfied to depend for the security of their rights upon the mere courtesy of others."

The situation was made worse, Governor Edwards went on, by the fact that there were only two counties in Illinois. He had power to create additional counties, but was deterred from doing so by the reported fact that in the entire area from the Kaskaskia River to the Ohio—an area containing one-third or more of the whole population of the Territory—there were only 3 or 4 persons who owned enough land to entitle them to vote and apparently not a single one with a large enough freehold to qualify him for public office.

Furthermore, if he established the new form of government while there were but 2 counties, these 2 would get the entire membership of the legislature. Once the legislature came into existence, it alone would haev the power to create new counties. He was not sure that the two existing counties would relinquish their power.

Congress, Governor Edwards suggested, could speedily remedy this extraordinary situation. "Under these circumstances," he wrote to Congressman Johnson, "I am sure I do not miscalculate when I suppose your attachment to republican principles will lead you to wish to extend their salutary influence to the people of this Territory by endorsing the right of suffrage." If he received word that Congress was likely to act quickly, he would hold back the elections until the mass of the people were given the right to vote.

Petitions went to Congress from Illinois Territory. From William Rector and 13 others came this sturdy assertion of American rights, including the right of protest:

"We cannot but view with the aversion natural to free men, Republicans, and lovers of equal rights, every manifestation of a desire among our fellow citizens to limit the exercise of all the rights aforesaid to a few individuals, to the exclusion of the great body of the people."

The last signature on that petition was "Laurance McClosky his mark." That man deserves a plaque all to himself—an American who didn't have to know how to write in order to know his rights.

Then there was a petition from 146 residents of the region below the Kaskaskia, men with still sharper words for the little group that was trying to seize control of the Territory. "To all our privations hitherto," they wrote, "we have submitted with patience in consequence of their resulting from the peculiar form of government adopted for the Territory." They had felicitated themselves with the pleasing anticipation of "an enjoyment of the equal rights of free men." But now they were sorry to see a disposition in some of the present freeholders "to exclude us from an equal participation in the benefits of government and to monopolize the whole power in their own hands."

Fittingly enough, the only petition sent to Congress from the other side was anonymous. Since freeholders must pay the added expenses of the general assembly, these nameless gentlemen asked, "would it not be unjust that those who do not contribute to it, should have a voice in the representation?" Nearly half of the entire population of the Territory, they remarked, lived south of the Kaskaskia, and all but 4 or 5 of those people were lawbreakers—unlawful intruders, guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to punishment. Extension of suffrage to them would not only countenance their infraction of the law but "by giving them equal rights with other citizens render their situation much more eligible."

It might be contended, the anonymous petitioners went on, that these intruders would purchase their lands whenever a land office was opened. A few might, they conceded, but a look at the history of the West would show "that the first settlers (being intruders generally) are but mere birds of passage." A few ambitious men, the petitioners concluded, were trying to throw the Territory into ferment and confusion, if not anarchy.

Well, there was the issue, thrown into the laps of Congress and the President—rule by the self-anointed few, or rule by the great body of the people; a helping hand to those who struggled to make a living, or fostering care for those who sit on top of their pile. Similar questions have come up in our own time. Should the Government play footie with corporation farmers, or help the sharecropper get a stake in the soil he lives by? In the field of civil rights, the issue is typified by the long struggle to abolish the poll tax as a qualification for voting, and by the disfranchisement of a half million secondclass citizens, including myself, who have the dubious privilege of living in the District of Columbia. Judging by the speed with which Congress has undertaken to correct these current departures from democratic principle, one might suppose that it would have taken 50 years at least to secure action on the appeal by Governor Edwards and the supporting petitions from the disfranchised people of Illinois Territory.

Well, Ninian Edwards wrote his letter on March 14, 1812. It should have reached Washington during the week that ended April 7. On April 9, Congressman Johnson moved the appointment of a committee to consider extending the right of suffrage in Illinois Territory. Just 5 weeks later, President Madison signed a bill fulfilling that objective. In 5 weeks, Illinois Territory was converted from an incipient aristocracy into a republic with something very close to universal manhood suffrage. Besides other democratic features, the 1812 law provided that as soon as the governor should divide Illinois Territory into 5 districts, the voters in each of them should elect 1 member of the legislative council. Governor Edwards proceeded to subdivide the territory into five counties, coinciding with the districts of the legislative council, and that is how Madison County, Ill., came into existence.

If you search the public records for President Madison's official connection with these developments, you will find only that he signed the bill passed by Congress. But if you turn to the published writings of James Madison, as they were then known to the country, you will find that he laid the groundwork 25 years earlier for these 1812 occurrences in Illinois and in Congress. Running through the letter of Governor Edwards to Congressman Johnson, running through the petitions for relief sent to Congress by residents of Illinois Territory, are the thoughts and principles voiced by Madison in The Federalist No. 39. These men of Illinois used the very words in which Madison defined the republican form of government, as established for the Nation in the Constitution of 1787, and as guaranteed by that Constitution to every individual State of the Union.

What, asked Madison in The Federalist, are the distinctive features of the republican form of government? Were an answer to be sought, he said, not by recurring to principles, but merely by noticing what countries were called republics, that question could never be answered satisfactorily. Holland, in which no particle of the supreme authority was derived from the people, was called a republic. "The same title (I am quoting) has been bestowed on Venice, where absolute power over the great body of the people is exercised, in the most absolute manner, by a small body of hereditary nobles." In contrast with these and other examples, Madison defined the republican form of government within the meaning of the new Constitution:

"If we resort for a criterion to the different principles on which different forms of government are established, we may define a republic to be, or at least may bestow that name on, a government which derives all its powers directly or indirectly from the great body of the people, and is administered by persons holding their office during pleasure, (or) for a limited period, or during good behavior."

He continued:

"It is essential to such a government that it be derived from the great body of the society, not from an inconsiderable proportion, or a favored class of it; otherwise a handful of tyrannical nobles, exercising their oppressions by a delegation of their powers, might aspire to the rank of republicans, and claim for their government the honorable title of republic."

Again and again in those few paragraphs, Madison emphasized that under the republican form of government, all power must be lodged in the great body of the people. Observe how his words were echoed by Governor Edwards and the Illinois petitioners to Congress. Power was sought in Illinois, said the Governor, by a handful of men who had "an interest distinct from that of the great body of the people." When Edwards appealed to Congressman Johnson on the basis of his "attachment to republican principles," he was not referring to their common allegiance to what was then called the Republican Party, and is now the Democratic Party—the party of Jefferson and Madison. On the contrary, this attachment to republican principles was to help "extend their salutary influence * * * by endorsing the right of suffrage." The right to vote, not the way men voted, was in the mind of Gov-

ernor Edwards, as it had been in the mind of Madison when he laid down the guiding principle.

So too, the thoughts and words of James Madison were in the minds of those Illinois petitioners who protested against the limitation of political rights "to a few individuals, to the exclusion of the great body of the people." These men of Illinois Territory were talking about their rights as freemen, as citizens of a republic, as lovers of equal rights. They contrasted the republican form of government with the "peculiar form" then existing in the Territory—existing quite by accident—under which a minority was seeking to "monopolize the whole power in their own hands."

In the 143 years since that political crisis gave birth to Madison County, Ill., the American people have gone far ahead in their concern for the general welfare. Some human rights have been fortified, others jeopardized or weakened. Education has been recognized as a responsibility of government. The Constitution has been enshrined for public worship, without regard to its contents. But do we know as much about the republican form of government as that illiterate Illinois farmer did when he drew a cross—Laurance McClosky his mark—on that petition to Congress in 1812? Just a few years ago one of the great liberal newspapers of the country, not, I am glad to say, the great liberal newspaper, dealt with this subject in a discussion of the poll tax as a prerequisite to voting. Its editorial writer challenged the assertion that Congress had power to abolish the poll-tax requirement under article IV of section 4 of the Constitution, which guaranties to every State in this Union a republican form of government.

"But a republic," said the editorial rebuttal, "is a state in which the sovereign power resides in the electorate without reference to any basis of election."

In other words, nine-tenths of the people may be legally disfranchised, and, if the remaining one-tenth have sovereign power to elect officers, you still have the republican form of government. James Madison thought otherwise. So did Ninian Edwards. So did Laurance McClosky. So would anybody else who approached the subject with a knowledge of history and devotion to the principle of human equality under the law.

Madison's connection with Illinois Territory goes much farther back, and has a broader basis, than this contest over the electorate. He is universally known as the father of the Constitution. Few indeed are those who know that he might also be called the father of the public domain. And it has passed virtually unnoticed in American history that the public domain and the Constitution form an interwoven chain of cause and effect, each reacting on the other.

At the outbreak of the American Revolution, the State of Virginia claimed ownership, under her royal charters, of all vacant land running west and northwest from her Atlantic waterfront, as far as the Mississippi and up to Canada. Illinois was at one time regarded as part of Orange County, Va., whose modern residue contains Madison's lifetime home. It was also regarded as part of Massachusetts and Connecticut, whose westward extensions to the Mississippi were intersected by Virginia's extension to the northwest. And it was claimed by the State of New York, which bought it from Indians who did not own it. Quite a mess. Anyway that was what Maryland thought. Maryland stoutly averred that she would never ratify the Articles of Confederation unless these vacant western lands, secured from the British Crown by the blood and treasure of all, were to be considered as a common stock of the 13 States, to be parceled out by Congress into free and independent governments.

Madison did not like the atitude of Maryland, New Jersey, and other landless States, whose righteous outlook was tainted by the ambitions of big land speculators. But he recognized the justice of the demand they made, and the impossibility of disregarding it without imperiling the Union. So, as a Member of the Continental Congress, at the age of 29, he took the lead in a campaign of political persuasion and pressure, directed against the land claims of his own State, and finally brought about a cession of the western lands from Virginia to the Nation. Other States gave up their claims and the public domain came into existence—a Federal domain born in the birth pangs of the Nation.

Then, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, eastern commercial interests attempted to deny political equality to the western Territories. They were to be kept as colonies or admitted to the Union in an inferior status. Otherwise, with the westward spread of population, the seaboard States might lose their control of the National Government. Madison led the fight for equality, and won it. New States were to be admitted to the Union on a par with the Original Thirteen.

In taking this stand, Madison was fortified by the fundamental article of his political faith—his confidence in a large Federal republic democratically organized and subject to checks and balances. The Constitution of 1787 was founded on the doctrine he laid down in convention, that when a republic of free men is federally organized—that is, when it consists of a union of states with a supreme federal government properly constructed—every enlargement of the republic makes it more stable and makes liberty more secure. That is true, he told the convention, because every enlargement of the country increases the diversity of economic and other interests. Federal organization leaves local matters to local control, while diversity of regional interests reduces the likelihood that any one interest or element will gain complete control of the General Government.

The framers of our Constitution were men of property, but they were not tories. Accepting Madison's thesis, they gave the United States a Constitution which, in the federal realm, entrusts the protection of property rights and human rights to the checks and balances of a democratic government. Inherent in Madison's concept of government was a unique incentive to territorial expansion, not of a colonial empire held together by tyrannical force or doomed to explosive disruption, but an empire of free men—the expansion of a self-governing federal republic which would grow at the same time in freedom and stability. It would be erroneous to say that recognition of this fact governed the westward expansion of the United States. Pressure of population, hunger for cheap land and a sense of destiny were enough to carry American sovereignty from sea to sea. But Madison's political prophecy proved true, and territorial expansion was aided to an extraordinary degree by the ease of political assimilation on a democratic basis.

Today, much of this is forgotten. Especially in the last 3 years, we have heard men saying that the United States should go back to first principles, that we should give up the Federal ownership of the public lands and turn them back to the States from which the Federal Government hungrily snatched them away. In other words, national forests and national parks, Federal grazing districts and watersheds, great river systems, tideland oil and uranium reserves, belong traditionally to the States (that is, to lumber companies, big stockmen, private power interests, oil, and mining companies) and are held in Federal ownership because of a lapse from pure and pristine State rights principles. The time of the lapse is left somewhat vague, but with an impression that Presidents Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt were the principal culprits.

That is quite a mental achievement, considering that the question was actually settled, in favor of Federal ownership, between 1776 and 1784. But, as I said, people are forgetful, and some of them began to forget long before they were aided by the modern art of brain washing.

In 1831, former Gov. Edward Coles, of the State of Illinois, wrote to Madison, whose private secretary he once had been, that an agitation was going on in some of the newer Western States for the transfer of the public lands from the Nation to the States. People were saying that State ownership was the traditional American policy. Governor Coles wanted Madison to give him an answer at length to this unfounded claim. Madison replied that age and infirmities—he was then 81—made it impossible to comply. However, he was willing to express his private view of the argument for State ownership:

"I have always considered the claim as so unfair and unjust; so contrary to certain notorious intentions of the parties to the case, and so directly in the teeth of the condition on which the lands were ceded to the Union, that if a technical title could be made out by the claimants it ought in conscience and in honor to be waived."

That certainly leaves no doubt that the father of the public domain looked on it as a Federal domain. However, one fact must be admitted which at the present moment may reduce the value of his testimony. Madison, alack and alas, was a creeping Socialist. Worse than that, he made Gov. Ninian Edwards his accomplice in a nefarious plot against the noble institution of free enterprise. Edwards had not yet moved to Illinois when Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin wrote him that President Madison was placing the public salt deposits of the territory under his superintendence. The object of the Government, said Gallatin, was to reduce the price of salt. Under the old lease, he said, the Government had tried to achieve this by charging a very low rental and reserving a right to buy all salt at a fixed low price. Unfortunately, the contract price had been set so extremely low that the lessees felt no stimulus to supply the public demand, while the rental charged by the Government was so small that a low production would cover it. The result was that a shortage of salt sent the market price still higher, enabling the buyers of the Government salt to resell it at a huge profit. This infuriated the Illinois farmers who wanted cheap salt for curing their pork and beef.

Governor Edwards was directed to pursue a new policy, more practical, but alas, no less cruelly socialistic. He was to raise the rental of the salt springs, thus forcing the lessees into heavy production to pay for their lease. The contract price of salt was to be raised, both to encourage production and to prevent profiteering resales by the purchasers. Listen to the reasons given for this policy. Listen and weep:

"My reasons for proposing that it should still be fixed somewhat below the market price, are the prevention of monopoly, and the hope of a reduction of that market price, during the continuance of the lease."

Just think of that, outdealing the New Deal, offering competition to monopoly, way back in 1809. It would be possible to go on at length with the sad story of Madison as a creeping Socialist. One could tell how, in 1777, he signed a petition for compulsory limitation of tobacco acreage by the State of Virginia—regimenting the farmers, with (horror of horrors) an extra allowance for the poor. Then there was Madison's brazen advocacy of the welfare state.

This began with his assertion, in 1787, that protection of seamen was one of the recognized objects of tonnage taxes. He picked

up that idea from England, whose ruler, George III, was already showing other symptoms of insanity. When this subject came before Congress, of which Madison was a member, in 1792, it was proposed to combine the tonnage tax, which fell solely on the shipowners, with a compulsory deduction from seamen's wages. A direct anticipation, you see, of the mixed contributory system of the Wagner Social Security Act. When the bill finally passed, early in the Presidency of John Adams, the tonnage tax was omitted. That threw the entire cost of sick relief, hospital construction and old-age support onto the payroll tax. It relieved the shipowners, except as wages went up to cover the tax, but left the country saddled with a maritime social security system and with socialized medicine.

Well, you can imagine what President Thomas Jefferson did to this socialistic scheme, when he entered office with the slogan, which, oddly enough, nobody has ever been able to locate in his writings, that the prime business of government is to do nothing about anything. Jefferson took care of it all right. He put a bill through Congress extending the payroll deduction system to the owners and crews of Mississippi River flatboats.

Then came the crowning touch by President Madison. In 1813 he approved a bill creating a Federal vaccination agent, a public officer whose duty was to procure and distribute the new Jenner smallpox vaccine throughout the United States. But enough of this. The American Medical Association has plenty to feel bad about without adding Presidents John Adams, Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison to its painfully long list of deviators from the true American spirit.

Let us, if we can, forgive and forget Madison's creeping socialism. We shall then see more clearly the link between his zeal for liberty and for westward expansion, a merger of turbulent ideas which stems more directly from his participation in the American Revolution than from his staid and proper private life. The United States has been throughout its history a disorderly country. It has been in general a free country. In the popular mind, disorder and freedom are closely linked and both of them are given a western locale. This doctrine of innocence by association can be carried too far. In the wild west movie, there is plenty of disorder, but nobody is really free except the bully, until the visiting cowboy plunks him and restores the reign of law. Nevertheless, even in the older Eastern States some of the most notable examples of disorder, in the early days, had justice and freedom as their motives. And with curious unanimity they originated in the western precincts of the States concerned.

Shays' rebellion—I don't suppose there's a representative of the Committee on Un-American Activities in this audience. * * * Still, I'll take no chances, Shays' rebellion, a wicked communistic revolt(!) against 40 percent interest on farm mortgages and imprisonment for debt, arose in the western part of Massachusetts.

Similarly, it was the mountaineers of western Pennsylvania who conducted our famous Whisky rebellion, an uprising against an excise tax and distillery charges which in combination (whisky being the only form of money in the community) were the equivalent of a $300 tax on a $600 corn crop.

To shift from spirits to spirituality, it was in the westerly portions of Virginia, which then included West Virginia and Kentucky, that the people rallied behind James Madison when he called on them to defeat the 1784 scheme for a State tax to support the teachers of religion.

Again, it was in the new State of Kentucky, and in the western counties of Virginia, that Jefferson and Madison found the majorities needed for their resolutions against the alien and sedition laws of 1798.

Madison's 1784 victory for freedom of religion was won within the orderly processes of legislation. Nevertheless, his famous memorial and remonstrance against the establishment of religion through taxation employed language which could only be called an incitement to forcible resistance if the tax should be imposed. The preservation of free government, he wrote, forbade any branch of it "to overleap the great barrier which defends the rights of the people. The rulers who are guilty of such an encroachment * * * are tyrants. The people who submit to it * * * are slaves." As if this were not enough, he piled up praise on the freemen of America who, not waiting for usurped power to strengthen itself by exercise, fought the War of the Revolution against a three-penny tax on tea. Prudent jealousy for the preservation of liberty, he told his readers, was the first duty of citizens.

As a believer in public order, Madison was no supporter of armed uprisings against a democratic government. But when the Federalists in Congress made the Whisky Rebellion an excuse to assail the political liberties of American citizens, he was in the forefront of their defense. In the House of Representatives, a resolution was offered to censure the new and Radical Democratic Societies as alleged abettors of the revolt. Madison offered to join in denouncing those who actually took part in the uprising. But, said he, the Democratic Societies took no part in it. Their members were not in the public service. This was a proposal to censure private citizens for their political opinions. It was a sound principle, said Madison (and I am quoting), "that an action innocent in the eyes of the law could not be made the object of censure to a legislative body. * * * Opinions are not the objects of legislation."

The holding of opinions, Madison asserted, was one of the reserved rights of the people—that is, one of the unspecified rights and powers reserved to the people by the 9th and 10th amendments. The right to express opinions was specifically guaranteed by the first amendment. Start invading the reserved rights, he warned, and the censure would soon extend to freedom of speech and of the press. Furthermore, what would this proposed congressional resolution do to the people condemned by it? I quote his next remark:

"It is in vain to say that this indiscriminate censure is no punishment. * * * Is not this proposition, if voted, a bill of attainder?"

No, ladies and gentlemen, those words were not uttered by some recklessly courageous Congressman, during the last 10 years of governmental witch hunts and character assassination. They were not put forth in some judicial argument against the unconstitutional bills of attainder that have been flowing of late in a steady stream from Congress, congressional committees, and the executive branch of government. They were spoken in the year 1794, by the author if the American Bill of Rights, and Madison followed them with this fundamental rule:

"If we advert to the nature of republican government, we shall find that the censorial power is in the people over the government, and not in the government over the people."

If that is an axiom of American Government, it is one which this country now honors only in the breach. How was it in 1794? Madison won his fight against that resolution of censure, but it would be too much to say that he won it by converting the repressive majority which then ruled Congress. Confronted with his statement of principle, a number of Federalists suddenly realized that they were censuring too many people back home who had the right to vote. So they joined with the opponents, first in limiting the censure to four counties in Pennsylvania, and then subjecting the remnant of the motion to overwhelming defeat.

A victory so won is not to be belittled. On the contrary, it gives point to one of Madison's cardinal beliefs, not fully put into words by him, but distinctly present in what he said and did. The best defense of civil liberties, he believed, lay in general safeguards against autocratic government. Ardently devoted to freedom of religion, speech, and press, he saw little chance of maintaining these liberties intact against laws passed during great gusts of popular passion. Yet by solemn written affirmation, he remarked in 1788, declarations of liberties would gradually become axioms of free government, with the independent courts as their special champions. That is, the courts would stand up for oppressed or threatened minorities. The majority of the people, as long as they chose their own rulers and kept their senses, could protect themselves against the arbitrary acts of government. Preservation of civil rights would preserve civil liberties, and be thereby preserved.

This attitude of mingled skepticism and faith goes far to explain why Madison made no effort to incorporate a bill of rights in the original Constitution, yet drafted one willingly—the first 10 amendments—in response to popular demand. That his skepticism was justified has been demonstrated in our two great American brainstorms—the one that produced the Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798, and the one that followed the Second World War.

In the first of these emotional upheavals, the French Revolution was equated with Jeffersonian democracy in a vain endeavor to perpetuate the rule of the Federalist Party. In the second, the menace of international communism swept us into panic, partly genuine, partly simulated, over the handful of impotent neurotics who make up the American Communist Party—a panic shrewdly utilized for political though not for strictly partisan advantage. Yet we are recovering, and we are recovering the more surely because our fundamental right as citizens—the right to choose our governors in fair and free elections—is embedded in the very fabric of government.

Civil liberties must be protected in the minds and hearts of men, as well as in constitutional guaranties. But the empire of freemen can be sure of freedom only as long as the people control their governors.

When the citizens of Illinois Territory sent their appeal to Congress for genuine self-government, they were acting for future generations of Americans as well as for themselves. When the name of President Madison was given to Madison County, Ill., that action, as far as this area was concerned, amounted to a second ratification of the Constitution and all the rights and liberties embodied in it. The commemoration today, of that 1812 event, turns the lamp of liberty toward the future.

REMARKS OF BURTON C. BERNARD OF GRANITE CITY, ILL., ON BEHALF OF THE MADISON COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION IN PRESENTING TO THE PEOPLE A PLAQUE COMMEMORATING JAMES MADISON, FATHER OF THE CONSTITUTION AND FOURTH PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE COURTHOUSE, EDWARDSVILLE, ILL., AT 3:30 P. M. SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1955

The Madison County Bar Association is happy and gratified to participate in this commemorating of James Madison on the occasion of the 143d anniversary of the creation of Madison County.

James Madison and his contemporaries faced community problems which were just as challenging to them as the problems of our own day are to us. We will profit by emulating the high purpose and dedication to the cause of liberty and good government which marked the lives of our early leaders.

The participation of the community in these ceremonies serves to counteract the influence of cynicism, defeatism, and apathy—

those deadly enemies of liberty and good government. To recall now the faith of Madison in the ability of the people to govern themselves fairly and effectively; the struggle of Madison to improve the caliber of Government; and the unswerving dedication of Madison to the rights of the individual—these recollections will help to sustain our faith in and impel our implementation of the underlying principles of our Government. Our meeting here places in proper perspective those who may say that the people of Madison County, or of this Nation, no longer believe in those principles.

It is appropriate that we meet at our county courthouse to pay tribute to James Madison. Here, the people have continuous contact with their government; here, courts of justice function; and here, important county officials confront the responsibilities of their offices. And so, here, past our time, will remain the plaque which is now presented to the people of Madison County.

[Unveiling:] Engraved on the plaque under the likeness of James Madison are these words:

"James Madison. He was a member of the Virginia Legislature, Continental Congress, Federal Constitutional Convention, and the United States Congress. He later served as Secretary of State and fourth President of the United States.

"Forty years a public servant, he helped to lead the Nation through its formative years, and is known as the Father of the Constitution. He fought for religious liberty, the Bill of Rights and good government.

"He appointed as first Governor of the Illinois Territory, Ninian Edwards, of Kentucky, for whom Edwardsville is named. Madison County, named for President Madison, was created on September 14, 1812.

"Presented to the people by the lawyers of Madison County acting through the Madison County Bar Association.

"September 1955."

As we view this plaque, let us enshrine upon our minds and hearts these words of John Ruskin:

"Therefore, when we build let us think, that we build forever. Let it not be for present delight nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for and let us think as we lay stone on stone that a time will come when these stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them and that men will say as they look upon the labor and the wrought substance of them, 'See, this our fathers did for us.'"

ACCEPTANCE REMARKS BY IRVING DILLIARD, COLLINSVILLE, PAST PRESIDENT, ILLINOIS STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, DIRECTOR OF MADISON COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY, AND EDITOR OF THE EDITORIAL PAGE OF THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

Mr. Brant, Mr. Monroe, Mr. Bernard, members of the Madison County Bar Association, the Madison County Historical Society, members of other civic and historical groups, fellow citizens, as one of the 200,000 residents of Madison County I humbly but proudly accept for the people of our county this memorial to James Madison, for permanent preservation and display at this seat of our intimate local government. I would have gladly come here as a spectator to see the presentation that the Madison County Bar Association has so wisely arranged and to congratulate its members upon it. I would have been content to listen to my friend over nearly a quarter century, Irving Brant, the one most appropriate speaker among the 160 million Americans for this occasion. In all the United States no one—and this does not exclude Dolley Madison—has ever lived from day to day with our fourth President as has the historian, and biographer, and student of government who so graciously has come out from Washington to be with us today in the county Illinois named for James Madison. To have heard from Irving Brant is almost to have heard from the Father of the Constitution himself.

The least each of us can be is appreciative of the lives and works of the great men who have built the Nation we enjoy. One of the very greatest of these builders was the Virginian who became Thomas Jefferson's Secretary of State in whose administration the vast Louisiana Territory was purchased fram France. Under this same Secretary of State Madison, two young captains, Lewis and Clark, set out into the danger-fraught wilderness of the Northwest and pushed on 150 years ago to the Pacific Ocean—all from a winter campsite and recruiting and provisioning ground on the bank of the Mississippi, in this very county, at the point where old Wood River joined the Father of Waters. Thanks to public-spirited citizens and officials, some of whom are with us here today, that historic spot will soon be commemorated in an Illinois State Park in Madison County opposite the wonder of the Missouri-Mississippi confluence which men have wanted to look upon since the great river valley was first inhabited.

But Madison did a far greater service to this country than to participate in the purchase of Louisiana Territory, epochal as that act of statesmanship was. He more than anyone else gave us the words of the first amendment to the Constitution—the first article of the Bill of Rights with its guaranties of freedom of religion, speech, press, and assembly. One way or another we, here at this gathering and at this very hour, are exercising all these liberties. Above all else Madison saw the necessity for keeping church and state separate. Indeed, he espoused the idea so firmly and so persuasively that it became known as Mr. Madison's Principle. If we are as wise as he and if we do our work a fraction as well as he did his, we will make sure that the wall of separation remains strong and high for the protection of members of whatever faiths. For only where no church enjoys special advantages can religion be wholly free and churches prosper as they have in the United States. Let us at this moment thank Madison and the other architects of our religious freedom that a Catholic priest could open this ceremony and that a Protestant clergyman soon will close it. Let us and our children and our children's children keep it ever thus in Madison County in the United States of America.

And now I ask that each and everyone present join in accepting this gift that makes Madison County richer, more understanding, more appreciative of its honored name and our priceless heritage.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Madison County Bar Association,
Collinsville, Ill.:

The purpose of this ceremony I heartily applaud, as must any person who cares at all deeply about the theory and practice of democracy. I think no man has made a greater, more permanent contribution to democratic theory than did James Madison; few have contributed more, through personal example, to the practice of democracy; and it is my sincere hope that the plaque you unveil there will stimulate many people to renew their acquaintance with James Madison's contribution to the Federalist Papers. The message of these papers to us of today is quite as urgent, and as wise, as it was in the late 18th century, for the problem it deals with—namely, the proper balance of freedom and authority in effective government—is, I suspect, a permanent one.

It gives me immense pleasure, therefore, to send to all of you assembled there my heartiest congratulations.

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

JAMES MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

To have been named in honor of the father of the Constitution is a distinction that Madison County rightfully deserves. The free exercise of religion clause in the Constitution established him as an historic symbol of freedom-loving people everywhere. On behalf of the people of Illinois I want to congratulate the Madison County Bar Association for honoring its county's namesake on the 143d anniversary of its founding.

WILLIAM G. STRATTON,
Governor.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

I deeply regret that I cannot be with you in person for the ceremonies to honor James Madison, after whom your fine county was named, and to hear my friend, Irving Brant, deliver what I know will be a magnificent address. Madison has been a much-neglected figure in American history. More than any man, he drafted our Federal Constitution and was instrumental in getting it adopted by the States. Then he led the battle for the Bill of Rights and the first 10 amendments of the Constitution, the full meaning of which is not fully appreciated by some Americans even at this very day. He was a good Secretary of State and President; in all a splendid American, whose close association with Jefferson was one of the most fruitful partnerships in American history. All credit to you for seeing Madison's greatness and moving to honor it. Please give my best regards to the distinguished orator of the day, Irving Brant, the great authority on Madison.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

JAMES MONROE, Jr.,
President Madison County Bar
Association, Collinsville, Ill.:

Sorry that previous committee assignments prevent me from attending dedication ceremony commemorating creation of Madison County. I want to congratulate Madison County Bar Association in sponsoring this event, recognizing the historic dedication of the great county of Madison which provided most of the early leaders in the government of the old Territory and the State of Illinois.

MELVIN PRICE,
Member of Congress.

SUPREME COURT OF ILLINOIS,
Taylorville, Ill., September 8, 1955.

To the MADISON COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Care James O. Monroe, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: This is to acknowledge with thanks your kind invitation to attend the James Madison ceremonies this coming Sunday.

I regret very much that I will be unable to attend, because of my necessary presence in Springfield in preparation for the convening of the supreme court the following day.

Allow me, however, to congratulate the lawyers of the Madison County Bar for sponsoring this event. James Madison was in a large way responsible for the Bill of Rights, and the Bill of Rights is, without doubt, the crowning feature of American constitutional law.

Lawyers, above all, should keep these things in mind, and your association is a most appropriate group to lead any meeting commemorating Madison and the principles of constitutional freedom.

With best regards to your association and to my many friends among the lawyers of Madison County, I remain,

Sincerely,

HARRY B. HERSHEY,
Chief Justice.

JAMES O. MONROE, Jr.,
Collinsville, Ill.:

The Madison County Bar Association deserves the highest commendation and the wholehearted gratitude of all thoughtful citizens for this program of rededication to those principles to which James Madison dedicated the greater part of his life.

Madison lived in an era not dissimilar to ours—an era of wars and threats of war, of deprivation of liberty, of turbulence. He fought these evils; it is our duty now to protect the liberties we gained from this struggle against those who consciously or unconsciously under the guise of patriotism would undermine and destroy them.

We must go about this calmly, in a rational manner, in full possession of our best commonsense and good judgment. We must refrain from actions nurtured in emotion or hypothesis. Hysteria is our greatest enemy.

Only by proceeding in the typically American way, in an orderly fashion and with proper respect for the rights of all citizens can we succeed in this struggle to preserve our priceless heritage and remain true to the ideals of Madison and the other great men of his day to whom we owe our existence as a constitutional democracy.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr.,
United States Senate.

The Republican Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republican 83d Congress in 1954 provided an overall tax reduction program of $7.4 billion. Of this amount, individuals received a total tax saving of $4.7 billion. This tax-reduction program surpassed any previous total in the history of Congress.

The tax program of the Republican Party in 1954 comprised the following:

(a) A 10-percent reduction in Federal income taxes which took effect January 1, 1954. This reduction saved individuals a total of $3 billion annually. This tax cut would not have been possible if the Congress and the Eisenhower administration had not cut the Truman budget for fiscal 1954 by $12 billion.

(b) A $2 billion tax savings represented by elimination of the wartime excess-profits tax.

(c) A comprehensive tax revision represented by the new Internal Revenue Code of 1954, providing tax savings of $1.4 billion. Of this amount, a total of $827 million was for the benefit of individuals, the balance of $536 million representing tax relief for business.

(d) A $1 billion excise tax, the largest excise reduction in history. Excises were reduced on a wide variety of items such as home appliances, ladies' handbags, telephone calls, movie admissions, travel, and so forth.

The corporation tax rate has remained at 52 percent without change during this Republican administration.

The excise reduction which I have described above primarily benefited individuals. This is because excises, even those which are paid in the first instance by businesses, are in fact universally passed on to the consumers of the country.

I would now like to examine how some of the other aspects of the Republican tax program have affected individuals.

Of the total tax reduction contained in the tax-revision bill, about 60 percent, or $827 million, went to individuals and only about 40 percent, or $536 million, went to corporations.

Now, let us see how the $827 million individual income-tax reduction in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was distributed between different income groups. It is estimated that approximately 40 percent of that relief was for the benefit of taxpayers with incomes below $5,000 and that about 60 percent of the relief went to individuals with incomes above that amount.

Perhaps there are some who will say that this proportion represents an improper and inequitable distribution of the tax relief. In that connection, let me point out this fact—taxpayers with incomes below $5,000 today bear about 29 percent of the total individual income-tax burden. Therefore, the tax-revision bill gave 40 percent of the individual income tax relief to those who bear 29 percent of the existing burden. On the other hand, the same bill provided 60 percent of the individual income tax relief to those who bear 71 percent of the burden. I would never for a moment deny that taxpayers of small incomes are hard pressed by present taxes. Those taxes must be reduced at the earliest possible time. But let us be fair in this matter. Let us not seek to create the false impression that people with incomes above $5,000 are somehow escaping taxation. Let us not be carried away by demagogery.

It is, of course, true, Mr. Speaker, that some of the particular relief provisions in the 1954 code were more to the benefit of one group than another. For example, I recognize that a substantial portion of the tax reduction on dividends is for the benefit of those with incomes above $5,000. On the other hand, almost the entire $130 million provided for working-mother child care is estimated to go to those with incomes below $5,000. In addition, approximately two-thirds of the tax relief for retired people goes to those below $5,000. These two provisions alone provided together about $50 million more tax relief for those with incomes below $5,000 than does the entire dividend provision provide with respect to those with incomes above $5,000.

Therefore, those who seek to create the impression that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides little or no relief for small taxpayers are simply not telling the truth.

Let us turn now for a moment to the 10-percent reduction in individual income taxes which took effect January 1, 1954. The $3 billion tax reduction amounted to about 10 percent for those in the lower brackets and ranged down to a reduction of only about 1 percent in the upper brackets. That was no rich man's tax bill.

The total $3 billion individual income tax reduction of 1954 was distributed by income groups as follows: 31 percent of the relief went to individuals with incomes below $5,000 and 69 percent of the relief went to those above $5,000. Approximately 25 percent of the reduction went to those with incomes between $5,000 and $10,000. As a result, more than half of the relief went to those with incomes below $10,000. Again, I would like to point out that this distribution of the relief almost exactly paralleled the existing distribution of the total income-tax burden. Moreover, the 1954 tax reduction was distributed in almost exactly the same manner in which the 1951 tax increase had been distributed. Under the 1951 Revenue Act, almost 70 percent of the tax increase was imposed upon those with incomes above $5,000. It seemed only fair that we should reduce taxes in the same manner by which we had previously increased them.

It can properly be pointed out that the $3 billion tax reduction which took effect January 1, 1954, had been written into the law by a Democratic Congress. Of course, that reduction could never have been given reality had not the Republican Party succeeded in slashing at least $11 billion from the Democratic spending program. But, to be fair, the law was written by the Democrats. Now let me remind you that that tax cut, designed by the Democrats, gave only 31 percent of the relief to those with incomes below $5,000. The Republican tax-revision bill, on the other hand, gave 40 percent of the relief to this same group—almost half again as much.

Personally, I regret exceedingly this continued Democratic emphasis on income classes. I was brought up in the tradition that we did not have classes, as such, in this great country of ours. I was taught that every American stood as an equal among his fellow Americans. I still believe that this principle is basic to our way of life. I have demonstrated that the continued Democratic efforts to label the Republican tax program as a rich man's program and as discriminating against the little taxpayer are without any foundation in fact. Such political propaganda adopts the theory of class struggle which is foreign to everything for which America stands.

Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Commerce reported that some 41 percent of American families have incomes of $5,000 a year or more. Fifty-five percent receive incomes of more than $4,000 a year. More and more, we are becoming a Nation of middle-income people. As a result, I have been shocked at the persistent campaign of slander and vilification directed at this great group of Americans. I do not think that it is even good politics. I believe that this propaganda will be repudiated by the great majority of independent-thinking citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is also timely to recall that prior to the advent of the New Deal in 1933, income-tax exemptions amounted to $2,500. The average person of small means paid no income taxes. Little by little, Democratic ad-

ministrations and Democratic Congresses whittled away at the personal exemption until in 1948 it reached $500. The New Deal discovered that soaking the rich was not enough to support its extravagant programs. First, it had to soak the middle class and then finally it had to put the squeeze on even the lowest income groups.

The Republican 80th Congress reversed this trend and passed legislation increasing the level of the exemption to $600 and providing a double exemption for the blind and for those over age 65. President Truman vetoed that legislation but the Republican 80th Congress passed the law over his veto.

In light of some of the charges being made against the Republican tax program, it is useful to look at the record. It helps to keep these charges in their proper political perspective.

Report of the National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, some 18 months ago, the Attorney General of the United States issued the Report of the National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. Set forth in this report was a total of 85 legislative and administrative recommendations for amending and interpreting the Federal antitrust laws.

At this time, it seems appropriate to review the extent to which these 85 recommendations have been implemented by Congress or by the antitrust agencies. Not 1 of the 12 legislative recommendations made by the Attorney General's National Committee has as yet become law. Of the 73 administrative recommendations made by the national committee, the reports by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission speak for themselves.

I ask unanimous consent to include the reports in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, July 18, 1956.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I have for reply your letter dated January 27, 1956, addressed to Assistant Attorney General Barnes. There you request we "have prepared for the information and use of the committee a report advising how many of the administrative recommendations made by the National Committee have been adopted or otherwise followed by the Antitrust Division."

That report, as you know, was submitted to the Attorney General March 31, 1955. Any report to you indicating how many of its administrative recommendations have been adopted, we felt, should await the passage of at least 1 full fiscal year after the report's submission. That year ended June 31, 1956.

With this in mind, I send on a copy of the Committee's "general guides or recommendations to enforcement agencies and the courts." Those recommendations checked in asterisks represent (1) recommendations for enforcement procedure this Division has followed during the past year, and (2) guides to existing law which, to our view, fairly restate current case law.

Those not checked involve (1) recommendations regarding Division procedure we have not adopted, (2) statements of existing law with which we disagree, or (3) antitrust aspects involving, not this Division's activities, but the Federal Trade Commission or antitrust enforcement by private parties.

Our delay in replying to your letter was simply to insure that we had enough experience since the report's submission to fairly indicate which of its recommendations we would adopt.

We trust that this proves useful to you.

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR R. HANSEN,
Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division.

The Committee's task, in its own words, was "to analyze the main course of * * * antitrust policy, its interpretations and decisions. From this analysis, an evaluation of antitrust developments is made in light of established antitrust goals. On this evaluation the committee bases its conclusions and recommendations as future guides to enforcement agencies, Congress and the courts."

Attached are (1) a list of this Committee's specific legislative proposals and (2) a summary of its general guides or recommendations to enforcement agencies and the courts.

MARCH 31, 1955.

LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S NATIONAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE ANTITRUST LAWS

1. Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act generally: No legislative change.

2. Trade or commerce with foreign nations: (1) Defense Production Act (50 U. S. C. App. sec. 2061 et seq., as amended June 30, 1953) should be extended. And a separate statute should provide antitrust immunity beyond the Defense Production Act's expiration for presidentially approved projects requiring large investment. (See report, pp. 108–109.)

3. Mergers: No legislative change.

4. Distribution:

(1) The Miller-Tydings amendment to the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C. sec. 1) and the McGuire amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act should be repealed. (See report, pp. 149–155.)

(2) Robinson-Patman section 2c (brokerage provision) (15 U. S. C. sec. 13 (c)) should be amended to revitalize except "for services rendered" clause. (See report, pp. 187–193.)

(3) Robinson-Patman section 3 (criminal penalty for discriminatory practices) (15 U. S. C. sec. 13 (a)) should be repealed. (See report, pp. 198–201.)

5. Patents:

(1) Recommend that, in addition to repealing section 33 (b) (7) of the Trade-mark Act of 1946, the Congress enact the following amendment to section 46 (a) of that act:

"The benefit of incontestability under section 15 of this act shall not be deemed to affect the jurisdiction of any Government agency to institute proceedings under the antitrust laws of the United States against the owner of such registered mark in any case in which the mark is alleged to have been used or is being used as an instrumentality of violation of the antitrust laws." (See report, p. 260.)

6. Exemptions:

(1) Regulated industries: No legislative change.

(2) Organized labor: "To the extent that union restraints on commercial competition not effectively curbed by either antitrust or Labor-Management Relations Act exist, then * * * [the Committee] recommends appropriate legislation to prohibit these union efforts at outright market control." (See report, pp. 303–305.)

(3) Agricultural cooperatives: No legislative change.

7. Economic indicia of competition and monopoly: No legislative change.

8. Antitrust administration and enforcement:

(1) New statute authorizing the Attorney General to issue a civil investigative demand compelling potential antitrust defendants in civil cases to produce relevant books and documents. (See report, pp. 343–347.)

(2) Amendment of Sherman Act, section 1 (15 U. S. C. sec. 1) to increase maximum criminal penalties from $5,000 to $10,000 on each count. (See report, pp. 351–353.)

(3) Amendment of Federal Trade Commission Act, section 5 (15 U. S. C. sec. 45) repealing present $5,000 per day ceiling on fines for violating orders, leaving instead a ceiling of $5,000 per violation. (See report, pp. 372–374.)

(4) Amendment of Clayton Act, section 4 (15 U. S. C. sec. 15) to provide for discretionary treble damages in private antitrust suits. (See report, pp. 378–379.)

(5) Amendment of Clayton Act, section 4 (15 U. S. C. sec. 15) to provide a 4-year Federal statute of limitations, running from accrual of the cause of action, for private antitrust suits. (See report, pp. 380–384.)

(6) Amendment of Clayton Act, section 4 (15 U. S. C. sec. 15) to give the United States Government the right to sue for single damages stemming from antitrust violations. (See report, pp. 383–385.)

GENERAL GUIDES OR RECOMMENDATIONS TO ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE COURTS

I. Sections I and II of the Sherman Act generally

A. Section I of the Sherman Act

1. Recommend to enforcement agencies continued vigorous enforcement. Thus the committee states: "The committee unanimously adheres to antitrust fundamentals with full vigor. Although many forces and other Government policies have materially promoted our creative American economy, we believe the antitrust laws remain one of the most important" (Rept. No. 2).

"There have undoubtedly been fluctuations in the vitality and wisdom of antitrust administration and enforcement as well as occasional setbacks in Congress and in the courts. Nonetheless, a backward look across the 64 years since the Sherman Act reveals on the whole a healthy process of growth through which antitrust fundamentals have gained in strength and effectiveness (Rept. No. 3).

2. Recommend to courts that certain conduct be deemed unreasonable per se. "Certain forms of conduct, such as agreements among competitors to fix market price or control production, are 'conclusively presumed to be illegal, by reason of their nature or their necessary effect,' so that they can quickly and positively be adjudged violations of the Sherman Act. In such cases, inquiry under the rule of reason is over once it has been decided that the conspiracy or agreement under review in fact constitutes price rigging or production control. For further example, group boycotts are deemed unreasonable as clearly anticompetitive in character or effect" (Rept. No. 11).

3. Recommend to courts that market division among competitors be conclusively presumed illegal. "While in no Supreme

Court case have the facts been limited exclusively to simple market division among competitors, there is little doubt, either as a matter of principle or of precedent, that agreements among competitors for market division should be and are treated like price control arrangements" (Rept. No. 26).

4. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re exclusive dealerships. "Where an exclusive dealership forms part of an attempt to monopolize prohibited by section 2, or the lesser degree of unreasonable restraint prohibited by section 1, it should be held a violation. On the other hand, where an exclusive dealership is merely an ancillary restraint reasonably necessary to protect the parties' main lawful business purposes, such a dealership should be upheld where its effect is not unreasonably to foreclose competition from the dealer's market" (Rept. No. 29).

5. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re intraenterprise conspiracy. "Most members of the Committee disapprove any application of this doctrine to joint action between members of a corporate family not intended to or resulting in coercive undue restraint on their customers or competitors. However, they believe, for example, that when a parent and its subsidiary, though short of an attempt to monopolize, nonetheless plan to drive out a competitor, section 1 may be transgressed.

"Some members feel, in contrast, that in no instance can a parent and its subsidiary be held guilty of an offense that must be committed by more than one person. Since there would concededly be no liability under section 1, if a company does business through unincorporated branches, divisions or departments, they believe it is wholly unreal to impose liability where it employs subsidiaries instead. To distingush between these types of operatons, they feel, is to sacrifice substance for mere form" (Rept. No. 35).

6. Recommendation to enforcement agencies and courts re "conscious parallelism." In the language of the Theatre Enterprises Supreme Court decision (*Theatre Enterprises, Inc.* v. *Paramount Film Distributing Corp.*, (346 U. S. 537, 540–541 [1954])), the Committee concludes: "To be sure, business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the factfinder may infer agreement [citing cases]. But this Court has never held that proof of parallel business behavior conclusively establishes agreement or, phrased differently, that such behavior itself constitutes a Sherman Act offense" (Rept. No. 39).

7. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re relevance of trade association membership to proof of antitrust conspiracy to "avoid blanket findings based on mere 'guilt by membership'." The Committee recommends courts and agencies insist on proof of participation by particular members in conspiratorial action of other members (Rept. No. 42).

B. Section II of the Sherman Act

8. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re inclusion of substitute products in market definition. Adopting the language of the Times-Picayune case (*Times-Picayune Publishing Co.* v. *United States* (345 U. S. 594, 612 n. 31 [1953])), the Committee urges, "For every product, substitutes exist. But a relevant market cannot meaningfully encompass that infinite range. The circle must be drawn narrowly to exclude any other product to which within reasonable variations in price, only a limited number of buyers will turn; in technical terms, products whose 'cross-elasticities of demand' are small" (Rept. No. 47).

9. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies that searchers for monopoly power start with the primary fact of relative size. Thus the report states: "All judicial searchers for monopoly power start with the primary fact of relative size—the percentage of supply controlled. For 'size is of course an earmark of monopoly power' " (*United States* v. *Griffith* (334 U. S. 100, 107 n. 10 [1948])).

However, the report cautions, in the language of *Columbia Steel* (*United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.*, (334 U. S. 495, 527–528 [1048])), " 'We do not undertake to prescribe any set of percentage figures by which to measure the reasonableness of a corporation's enlargement of its activities by the purchase of the assets of a competitor. The relative effect of percentage command of a market varies with the setting in which that factor is placed' " (Rept. No. 49).

10. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that for purposes of monopolization under section 2, "no showing of intent is required beyond 'the mere intent to do the act.' " (*United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* (148 F. 2d 416, 432 [2d Cir. 1945])) (Rept. No. 56).

11. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that antitrust not impair business efficiency. Thus, in the language of the recent *United Shoe* decision, the report urges: "[T]he defendant may escape statutory liability if it bears the burden of proving that it owes its monopoly solely to superior skill, superior products, natural advantages (including accessibility to raw materials or markets), economic or technological efficiency (including scientific research), low margins of profit maintained permanently and without discrimination, or licenses conferred by, and used within, the limits of law (including patents on one's own inventions, or franchises granted directly to the enterprise by a public authority" (*United States* v. *United Shoe Machinery Corp.* (110 F. Supp. 295, 342 [D. Mass. 1953], aff'd per curiam 347 U. S. 521 [1954])) (Rept. No. 57).

*II. "Trade or commerce * * * with foreign nations"*

12. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re Sherman Act's extra territorial jurisdiction.

(a) The Committee feels "that the Sherman Act applies only to those arrangements between Americans alone, or in concert with foreign firms, which have such substantial anticompetitive effects on this country's 'trade or commerce * * * with foreign nations' as to constitute unreasonable restraints" (Rept. No. 76.)

(b) Further, the Committee believes "that conspiracies between foreign competitors alone should come within the Sherman Act only where they are intended to, and actually do, result in substantial anticompetitive effects on our foreign commerce. The 'international complications likely to rise' from any contrary view convince us, as they did the Court in Alcoa 'that Congress certainly did not intend to cover' such arrangements when they have no restrictive purpose and effect on our commerce" (*United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* (148 F. 2d 416, 433 [2d Cir. 1945])) (Rept. No. 76).

13. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re scope of "trade or commerce * * * with foreign nations." The report urges "that the words 'trade and commerce * * * with foreign nations' should be construed broadly to include not only the import and export flow of finished products, their component parts and adjunct services, but also, as in domestic commerce, capital investment and financing" (Rept. No. 79–80).

14. Recommendation to courts and enforcement agencies re inquiry relevant to determining damage to this country's foreign commerce.

(a) The report approves "judicial recognition that, under the rule of reason, defendants may proffer evidence that their activities abroad constitute no undue restraint on our foreign commerce since, even absent the challenged conduct, trade and investment in a particular foreign area would be virtually impossible. We believe that defendants should be allowed to show that, due to foreign economic or political barriers, their conduct at bar was prerequisite to trade or investment in a foreign country" (Rept. No. 83).

(b) But the report cautions, "Under no circumstances, however, can impossibility of trade or investment in one country justify consequences illegal under the antitrust laws outside that country; nor can impossibility of export or import of goods justify what would in effect be an unreasonable restraint of American investment." And "we feel that the rule of reason cannot be used to justify concert of action among competitors by showing that, despite a primary purpose to fix market prices, control production, divide markets or allocate customers, foreign trade conditions made such restraints a more profitable way of doing business" (Rept. No. 83).

15. Recommend to enforcement agencies "advance discussion with affected agency concerning projected antitrust proceedings seriously involving any of the Government's foreign programs" (Rept. No. 97).

16. Most members recommend to Congress that Webb-Pomerene "may well be retained until facts are adduced to show some changes in the present pattern abroad of State controlled buying agencies, State monopolies, and other combinations now part of the cartel policy prevalent in many parts of the world" (Rept. No. 114).

III. Mergers

17. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that the "congressional objective of establishing more effective rules against mergers," provide "the main guide to the administrative and judicial construction" of section 7 (Rept. No. 117).

18. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that the legal test for vertical acquisitions under section 7 be whether there is a "reasonable probability that the merger will foreclose competition from a substantial share of the market" (Rept. No. 122).

19. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that the legal test for horizontal mergers under section 7 be "whether the competition lost as a result of the merger may, in the context of the market as a whole, constitute a substantial lessening of competition or tend toward monopoly" (Rept. No. 123).

20. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that "no one pattern of proof can meet the requirements of all cases. * * * Thus, it will always be necessary to analyze the effect of the merger on relevant markets in sufficient detail, given the circumstances of each case, to permit a reasonable conclusion as to its probable economic effect" (Rept. No. 123).

21. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that section 7's "tendency to monopoly clause * * * should be construed to slow an appreciable growth toward monopoly by even relatively minor acquisitions" (Rept. No. 124).

IV. Distribution

22. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that generally theirs is the "duty to reconcile [interpretations of the Robinson-Patman Act] with the broader antitrust policies that have been laid down by Congress" (346 U. S. 61, 63, 73–74 (1953); Rept. No. 132).

23. Recommend to courts and agencies regarding individual refusals to deal "only thoroughgoing factual inquiry into the surrounding business circumstances can characterize a refusal to deal as part of a restrictive court of conduct incompatible with antitrust objectives.

"However, the Committee subscribes to vigorous condemnation of concerted and conspiratorial refusals to deal" (Rept. No. 137).

24. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that "tying arrangements that involve the 'wielding of monopolistic leverage' generate the requisite probability of economic harm whenever the seller occupies a dominant market position for the 'tying' commodity or if his arrangements cover a substantial volume of trade in the 'tied' product" (Rept. No. 144).

25. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that testing the legality under Clayton Act section 3 of exclusive dealerships "the central inquiry * * * is whether a system of challenged exclusive arrangements in fact 'forecloses' competitors from a substantial market" (Rept. No. 146).

26. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that, regarding the "goods of like grade and quality" limitation in Robinson-Patman section 2 (a): "Actual and genuine physical differentiations between 2 different products adapted to the several buyers' uses, and not merely a decorative or fanciful feature, probably remove differential pricing of the 2 from reach of the Robinson-Patman Act" (Rept. No. 158).

27. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that "the 'prima facie' case mentioned in section 2 (b) hence refers not to any discrimination, but only to discriminations affirmatively prohibited when causing the adverse market effects described in 2 (a) and unlawful unless justified by the seller through one of the several defenses" (Rept. No. 163).

28. Recommendation to the Federal Trade Commission that it "devote serious effort to vindicating its expert administrative status through precision in the mandates its orders impose (Rept. No. 169).

29. Recommend to courts and the Federal Trade Commission that construing the cost proviso of Robinson-Patman section 2 (a), "a reasonable approximation of production or distribution cost variances to price differentials—when demonstrated in good faith through any authoritative and sound accounting principles—suffice as a matter of law to meet the requirement for justification under the section 2 (a) cost provision. Applied in this way, the act should impede no price variation reasonably related to economies in any of the seller's costs deriving from significant differences among customers or broad categories of commercial transactions" (Rept. No. 175).

30. Recommend to courts and the Federal Trade Commission that "an independent and significant meaning might be accorded to the statutory phrase 'changing conditions affecting the market' to which a competitor might respond by revising his price—wholly apart from the 'marketability of the goods concerned,' the second statutory factor which the enumerated examples in the proviso illustrate. In any event, we view the significant common denominator in these far from homogeneous examples not as a deterioration of the seller's goods or business position, but as a spontaneous shift in market conditions beyond the seller's control. The proviso should enable a seller to reflect such commercial adjustments in good faith by revised price quotations on short notice, though this may incidentally prejudice some customers who bought at less favorable prices in the immediate past. We equally recommend a realistic interpretation to protect a seller's flexibility in adopting his prices to perceptible market shifts, whether already under way or only impending" (Rept. No. 179).

31. Recommend to courts and the Federal Trade Commission that "Whatever the interpretation of the substantive price discrimination offense, we think that a seller's right to meet a competitor's prices by granting price differentials to some customers without reducing his prices to all must remain an essential qualification to any anti-price-discrimination law" (Rept. No. 181).

32. Regarding Robinson-Patman sections 2 (d) and (e), the report recommends to the Commission that the "proportionally equal" criteria be met if a seller offers "bona fide alternative means enabling all buyers to participate in some form" (Rept. No. 190).

33. Recommend to the courts and Federal Trade Commission that regarding functional discounts "suppliers granting functional discounts either to single-function or to integrated buyers should not be held responsible for any consequences of their customers' pricing tactics" (Rept. No. 208).

34. Recommend to the Federal Trade Commission that "a distributor should be eligible for a discount corresponding to any part of the function he actually performs on that part of the goods for which he performs it" (Rept. No. 208).

35. Regarding basing point pricing, "the Committee recommends that the law carefully differentiate competitive and collusive 'delivered' pricing. It is our view that overall antitrust policy is served when sellers are free to meet competition in distant markets by quoting 'delivered' prices to equalize the freight advantages of more favorably situated competitors. Conversely, however, basic antitrust considerations firmly dictate that 'delivered' pricing employed to effectuate price-fixing conspiracies be relentlessly pursued" (Rept. No. 219).

V. Patent-antitrust problems

36. Recommend to courts that "violation of the Sherman Act should, as the cases suggest, require abuse of the patent grant or proof of intent to monopolize beyond the lawful patent grants" (Rept. No. 226).

37. Recommend to courts that the legality of grant backs should turn on: "(1) the licensor's position as to patents or the products they cover, and (2) each party's incentive to research" (Rept. No. 229).

38. Recommend to courts and enforcement agencies that "an improper purpose unduly to restrain trade, to monopolize or attempt to monopolize through individual nonuse should give rise to antitrust liability. On the other hand where there is no affirmative showing that the purpose or effect of nonuse is unreasonably to restrain trade, to monopolize or attempt to monopolize, the patentee's conduct does not transgress the antitrust laws. Clearly, however, contracts, combination or conspiracy among patentees to refrain from using or to refuse to license others to use patented inventions should be deemed unreasonable per se" (Rept. No. 231).

39. Most members recommend to courts that "Absent any concert or arrangement aimed at or resulting in industry-wide price fixing, * * * a patentee who is engaged in manufacturing and marketing the patented product may fix the prices at which his manufacturing licensee or licensees may sell" (Rept. No. 233).

40. Recommend to courts that "From an antitrust standpoint, a tying clause in a patent license is like a tying clause in any other contract" (Rept. No. 238).

"Accordingly, where the tying product is patented, the patentee should be permitted to show that in the entire factual setting, including the scope of the patent in relation to other patented or unpatented products, the patent does not create the market power requisite to illegality of the tying clause" (Rept. No. 238).

41. Recommend to courts that, regarding patent pools, "In any given case, a determination of legality requires an examination of the purpose of the interchange, the power possessed by the interchange when formed, and its operating practices. Depending upon the situation, some of these factors, or even one of them, may be decisive. In other instances, all demand consideration" (Rept. Nos. 246–247).

42. Regarding patent infringement suits, the committee recommends to courts "that antitrust violation should be considered a defense to a patent infringement action only when it is shown that the patent in suit is integral to the violation or that the grant of customary patent relief conflicts with antitrust goals. Further, in any patent infringement suit in which antitrust violation is the basis of defense, or counterclaims, the court, pursuant to rule 42 (b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, should order separate trials of the antitrust issues and the patent issues. Such separation may be essential not only 'in furtherance of convenience and to avoid prejudice,' but also 'to serve the ends of justice.' Trial of the infringement issue should precede trial of antitrust questions except where, in court discretion, a balancing of all factors favors prior trial of antitrust issues" (Rept. No. 249).

43. Regarding the scope of the patent misuse doctrine, recommend to courts that "the dactrine should extend only to those cases where a realistic analysis shows that the patent itself significantly contributes to the practice under attack" (Rept. No. 251).

44. Recommend to courts against "the view that any violation of patent law necessarily violates the antitrust laws. From some abuses of patent policy may flow consequences not drastic enough to meet antitrust prerequisites of effect on competition. In addition, many patent abuses are more effectively curved by simply denying equitable relief as a matter of patent policy. Holding every patent law transgression to be at the same time an antitrust violation would, moreover, put the patent owner on a different footing than owners of other property subject to antitrust" (Rept. No. 254).

45. A majority recommends that courts "deem compulsory license free of royalties and dedication penal rather than remedial in character, and hence beyond the Sherman Act's authority to 'prevent and restrain' violations" (Rept. No. 256).

VI. Exemptions from antitrust coverage

A. Regulated Industries

46. Recommend to courts that "Even in the areas where Congress has adopted the policy that 'competition may [not] have full play,' (*Federal Communications Commission* v. *R. C. A. Communications, Inc.* (346 U. S. 86, 92 [1953])) we feel that unless Congress has expressly provided to the contrary, the regulatory guide consistent with the 'public interest' as applied to mergers must 'include the principles of free enterprise which have long distinguished our economy' (*McLean Trucking Co.* v. *United States* (321 U. S. 67, 94 [1944] [dissenting opinion]))" (Rept. No. 269).

"In all instances, the courts, in reviewing agency discretion, should recognize that 'administrative authority to grant exemptions from the antitrust laws should be closely confined to those (instances) where the * * * (regulatory) need is clear'" (*McLean Trucking Co.* v. *United States* (321 U. S. 67, 93 [1944] [dissenting opinion]); (Rept. No. 270).

47. Recommend to courts that "if the esence of an antitrust action is an agreement already approved by agency action within the scope and policy of an enabling statute which provides for antitrust exemption, then the antitrust charge should be dismissed" (Rept. No. 282).

48. Recommend to courts that "where no express statutory exemption is provided * * * [and] the agency has found that the challenged conduct is necessary to carry out duties imposed on the defendants by the regulatory statute * * * such conduct cannot form the sole basis for antitrust suit" (Rept. Nos. 282–283).

49. Some members recommend to courts that "where there is no finding that the challenged conduct is required by regulatory goals but the agency has found the conduct not inconsistent with regulatory provisions * * *, even this agency approval, if

in accord with regulatory guides, warrants dismissal of the antitrust complaint" (Rept. No. 283).

"Other committee members feel, however, 'that, though agency approval of disputed conduct should normally bar its antitrust litigation, that fact alone in all cases may not warrant denial of antitrust relief'" (Rept. No. 283).

50. Recommend to Department of Justice "broader and more formalized liaison procedures" with regulatory agencies "regarding complaints involving matters subject to their regulation" (Rept. No. 286).

B. Agricultural Cooperatives

51. Recommend to courts regarding agricultural cooperatives' antitrust exemption that "where cooperatives attempt to or actually obtain monopoly power by means not sanctioned by section 1 of Capper-Volstead, the Sherman Act should apply even though the monopolized product's price is not unduly enhanced" (Rept. No. 311).

52. Recommend to the Department of Justice and the Secretary of Agriculture: "first, the formulation of administrative criteria, particularly for the guidance of smaller cooperatives, in determining whether or not particular conduct comes within the exemption; and second, a more formalized coordination between the Secretary and Government antitrust agencies for exchanging information involving complaints and investigations pertinent to agricultural cooperatives charged with antitrust violation. In this way, possible conflicts between these agencies can be avoided or minimized" (Rept. Nos. 312-313).

VII. Economic indicia of competition and monopoly

53. Recommends to courts and enforcement agencies that "workable or effective competition supplies no formula which can substitute for judgment. It suggests leads to data of significance, and a means of organizing the data bearing on the question whether a given market of itself is sufficiently competitive in its structure and behavior to be classified as workably competitive. And it provides some benchmarks or criteria, representing somewhat different points of vantage, for the process of making that judgment" (Rept. No. 337).

54. Recommend "that the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, in carrying out their enforcement and investigatory responsibilities, systematically examine the domestic market effects of tariffs and appropriately transmit their findings to the President, Tariff Commission, or the Congress. We recommend also that tariff legislation expressly recognize the purposes of the antitrust laws as one of the justifications for and objectives of both unilateral and negotiated tariff reductions" (Rept. No. 342).

VIII. Antitrust administration and enforcement

55. Recommended to the Division that, in demanding divestiture, it "bear in mind these guides: (1) It should not be decreed as a penalty; (2) it should not be invoked where less drastic remedies will accomplish the purpose of the litigation; (3) it is important to consider the effect of a possible resultant disruption upon the industry involved, its cognate markets, and the public needs in peace and war; (4) though we recognize it is not feasible to prepare before trial a final plan for effectuating such relief, we feel that once divestiture has been ordered, the Division must take account, in submitting a plan to effectuate the order, of its effect on the public as well as on the defendant and persons interested in it, as investors, customers, and employees. Such appraisal, we emphasize, seems a prime responsibility of any antitrust enforcement agency" (Rept. Nos. 355-356).

56. Recommend that the Assistant Attorney General "designate ad hoc or continuing groups as the need and the problem at hand may suggest" to "review any matter submitted by the Assistant Attorney General on his own initiative or in response to the request of a potential or actual defendant." Most members recommend:

"(a) Where a substantial question of policy or a serious doubt exists as to whether any proceedings should be instituted and, if so, whether such proceedings should be civil or criminal;

"(b) Where important issues arise involving the relief of be sought in civil proceedings—either in advance of a complaint or at the close of litigation;

"(c) Where deadlocks have arisen in the negotiation of consent judgments;

"(d) Where proposals have been made by parties under investigation for settlement by negotiation of a consent judgment prior to the filing of a complaint" (Rept. No. 359).

57. Recommend to the Antitrust Division "prefiling negotiation whenever the Division deems it feasible for efficient enforcement" (Rept. No. 360).

58. Recommend that the Department continue "to negotiate consent judgments with fewer than all defendants" (Rept. No. 360).

59. Recommend that "renewed and separate negotiation [of consent settlements] after agreement has once been reached should be minimized" (Rept. No. 361).

60. Recommend that the Department should not require in all cases that defendants submit an "initial draft" of a possible consent judgment (Rept. No. 361).

61. Recommend that "In consent negotiation, the Department should not seek relief (1) deemed by the Supreme Court to transgress constitutional boundaries; or (2) which, in the particular case, could not reasonably be expected after litigation" (Rept. No. 361).

62. Recommend to courts that "Each antitrust case, public and private, should be assigned, as a regular practice in all districts, promptly after the action has commenced to one judge for all purposes" (Rept. No. 362).

63. Recommend to courts "Where pleadings do not present issues of fact or law with sufficient particularity for efficient trial preparation, the court and counsel should promptly undertake to particularize the issues to be tried by some suitable procedure" (Rept. No. 363).

64. Recommend to courts that "If either party, in a private or Government case, anticipates the use of any discovery process, on an extensive or minor scale, with respect to some or all issues, the court, where feasible, should require a pretrial statement stating to its satisfaction the issues as to which discovery is sought. When approved by the court after hearing, the pretrial statement, unless modified for a good cause, would constitute the plan for discovery and mark its permissible limits" (Rept. No. 363).

65. Recommend to courts "In all civil Government proceedings, private actions or Federal Trade Commission hearings, the Oregon State Medical Society opinion (*United States v. Oregon State Medical Society*, 343 U. S. 326 (1952)) should be the guide where the proof offered by either party reaches back more than a reasonable number of years" (Rept. No. 364).

However, "The plaintiff should never be prevented from offering direct evidence of the commencement of an alleged antitrust offense—whether under the Sherman, Clayton, or Federal Trade Commission Acts—no matter when it occurred" (Rept. No. 364).

66. Recommend to courts that "separate trials are desirable":

"(a) In nonjury treble-damage cases, the issues of liability should be tried before the issue of damage. * * *

"(b) Where the validity of patents is in issue, that issue should be segregated. * * *

(c) "Where the Government seeks dissolution, divesture, or other complex relief posing knotty economic problems, hearings on relief should be conducted after trial on the merits" (Rept. No. 365).

67. Recommend to the Department that it "conduct regular studies to determine whether its judgments have been effective to restore competition" (Rept. No. 366).

68. Recommend to the Department that it "consent to judgment modification where the defendant can show that a change in circumstances makes its continuation unchange incompatible with antitrust goals" (Rept. No. 366).

69. Recommend to the Department that where decree provisions "which, designed to dissipate the effects of past unlawful practices, ban conduct which would otherwise be lawful," the decree should include: "(1) a provision which expressly expires after a stated period, and (2) a provision under which defendants may after a stated period show that conditions have changed so that relief is no longer necessary" (Rept. No. 367).

70. Recommend to the Department "no change in the existing procedures of the Department of Justice for advance clearances and releases" but recognize "value of informal discussion of problems between counsel for the Department and for private parties" (Rept. No. 368).

71. Recommend the Commission continue its new orders governing consent settlement procedures which:

"(1) Eliminates the previous requirement that consent settlements contain findings of fact or a statement of the alleged unlawful practices.

"(2) Permits disposition of a case by consent at any stage of the proceeding.

"(3) Allows settlement of a case as to some or all of the issues or respondents.

"(4) Authorizes hearing examiners to accept or reject stipulations containing proposed consent orders, with acceptance subject to Commission review and with rejection subject to appeal to the Commission. However, such an appeal may be taken only if the trial staff joins with respondents in seeking review" (Rept. No. 371).

72. Recommend that the Commission continue its new judgment enforcement procedures involving:

"(1) Closer coordination between the general investigation staff and those primarily responsible for compliance with orders, stipulations, and trade-practice rules.

"(2) More frequent use of procedures for requiring the filing of special followup reports showing the manner and form of compliance with cease-and-desist orders.

"(3) A more informative letter of notification to (a) respondents under orders and (b) parties to stipulations concerning the action taken in response to their reports of compliance.

"(4) A more effective program for enlisting the cooperation of industry members to effect industrywide observance of trade practice rules" (Rept. No. 374).

73. Recommend to Antitrust Division and Federal Trade Commission:

"(1) Extension of the present card exchange procedure to all proceedings and rulings of both agencies. * * *

"(2) To avoid duplicating investigations, the investigative files should, to the extent permitted by existing law, be made fully available to the other.

"(3) Commission economists should regularly consult with their division counterparts * * *.

"(4) Antitrust investigators, now somewhat scattered through the Federal Bureau of Investigation, should be consolidated into a distinctive unit of the Bureau and made readily available to the division and the Commission as well.

"(5) The two agency heads should regularly meet to review significant investigations contemplated or commenced, discuss what proceedings, if any, should be brought, and which agency is best equipped to handle them. * * *

"(6) Both [agencies] should never for any reason, including differences in views as to the law or the facts, proceed against the same parties for the same offense growing out of the same factual situation" (Rept. No. 377).

73. Caution courts against "unreliable estimates of damage, essentially based on speculation and guesswork contrary to the Bigelow requirement of a 'just and reasonable estimate of the damage based on relevant data'" (Rept. No. 380).

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, March 16, 1956.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your letter of January 27, 1956, in which you requested "a report advising how many of the administrative recommendations made by the national committee have been adopted or otherwise followed by the Federal Trade Commission" and as to the recommendations adopted, a description of what effects each will have upon antitrust administration and enforcement.

Of the 73 general recommendations of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws referred to in your letter, many, as you know, do not apply to the Federal Trade Commission but are addressed to the Congress, to the courts, and to the Department of Justice.

Recommnedations 2, 3, 36, 37, 39–49, 51, 62–66, and 73 (the second of two recommendations bearing the number 73) are recommendations to the courts. Numbers 50, 52, 55–61, and 67–70 are addressed exclusively to the Department of Justice. Recommendation No. 16 is addressed to Congress. In addition, insofar as the Federal Trade Commission is concerned, implementation of recommendation 54 would require congressional action. Since the proposed study does not fall within the statutory functions assigned to the Federal Trade Commission, it would not be consistent with the public interest to divert any part of our limited appropriations to such work.

Additionally, many of the recommendations in whole or in part represent endorsement by the National Committee of decisions, rulings, or procedures which had previously been issued or adopted by the Federal Trade Commission. These recommendations include 1, 17–21, 23–27, 29, 32, 35, and 71–73 (the first number 73).

As to the remaining recommendations, most could not result in affirmative action by the Federal Trade Commission in the absence of specific cases. Included in this category are 4–15, 22, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 38, and 53. It is impossible for the Commission to state what it would decide until a case arises and the facts and circumstances have been developed. In any such proceeding, the decision of the Commission would be based upon the record in accordance with the terms of the Administrative Procedure Act.

In view of the above, the Federal Trade Commission has not adopted any of the recommendations of the national committee. While this information satisfies the requirements of your request, I believe that additional information may be of value to your committee.

The Commission cannot, in a vacuum, adopt or refuse to adopt any specific recommendation found in the report, for the Commission must decide each case before it on the merits of that particular case. Commission policy develops as a composite of the majority views of the Commission applied to individual cases coming before it for decision.

Recommendations 12–16 relate to trade or commerce with foreign nations. The Commission's action reported in Export Trade Association Bulletin 1–55 of July 15, 1955, with which you are fully familiar (see your letters of July 19, 1955, and September 22, 1955, and Commission's letters of July 26, August 16, September 30, and November 7, 1955), reflected the Commission's view that the Webb-Pomerene Act and the Sherman Act must necessarily be administered as interrelated rather than conflicting statutes, and sought to bring the Commission's administration of the Webb-Pomerene Act into conformity with ruling case precedents under the Sherman Act. Thus, it was held that, insofar as an export association enters into restrictive agreements with foreign competitors, those agreements will not be considered "in the course of export trade" within the meaning of the Webb-Pomerene Act, and their lawfulness will be determined according to traditional Sherman Act criteria. The Commission will require elimination of such activities outside the scope of the Webb Act's exemptions or, in the alternative, refer the matter to the Department of Justice for appropriate action.

Recommendations 17–21 relate to enforcement of the Antimerger Act. The Committee is familiar with our work in this field. Eight complaints have been issued since June 16, 1952, but no final decisions have been made, although hearings have been completed in one case which is now awaiting decision by the hearing examiner and Commission presenting of evidence has been concluded in two other cases. It would be improper for the Commission at this time to attempt to forecast the results in these cases.

In order to strengthen its effectiveness in the merger field and generally under the Clayton Act, the Commission has recommended to Congress during this session specific changes in the Clayton Act.

I hope that the above information will be of aid to your Committee. In the event that further information is desired, please do not hesitate to call upon me or upon any member of the Commission's staff, all of whom have been directed to cooperate completely with congressional committee requests for information.

By direction of the Commission.

JOHN W. GWYNNE,
Chairman.

Projects and Achievements for Benefit of First District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 years have been productive and good for the First District of Florida. It has been a pleasure and privilege to participate in the many projects and achievements that have made these years so successful. The following outline of my activities which have been of prime interest to the people of the district has been made and, under unanimous consent, I include their program as a part of the RECORD:

Project and problem	For fiscal year	Amount	Action and results
Rivers and harbors:			
1. Tampa Harbor ($11,000,000 project)	1956–57	$4,977,000	Work now underway.
2. St. Petersburg (Salt Creek and Bayboro)	1957	22,000	Completes harbor.
3. Anclote River (Tarpon Springs)	1957	68,000	Completes project.
4. Gulfport Harbor (channel survey)	1957	6,500	Study project.
5. Intracoastal Waterway	1956	12,000	To complete surveys.
Military public works:			
1. MacDill Field:			
Buildings, runways, etc.	1956	5,400,000	
Housing, operations, etc.	1957	3,626,000	
2. Air Reserve Squadron (Pinellas Airport)	1957	2,732,000	Authorized.
Civil public works:			
1. Pinellas International Airport (new buildings)	1956–57	423,000	Will complete 1956.
2. Tampa International Airport (additional buildings)	1956–57	395,000	Additional facilities.
3. Bay Pines (laundry and dietetic)	1956–57	800,000	Construction underway.
4. Tampa Municipal Hospital (construction)	1957	162,500	Underway.
5. Reserve armories (St. Petersburg)	1956	225,000	Planned.
6. Reserve armory (Tampa)	1956	225,000	Do.
7. New post offices:			
St. Petersburg	1956	1,500,000	Underway.
Tampa (mail handling)	1957	----------	Survey underway.
Dade City	1956	----------	Under construction.
Mango	1956	----------	Under study.
Safety Harbor	1956	----------	Completed.
Palma Ceia, West Tampa, New Port Richey, Ybor City.	1957	----------	Under study.
8. Tampa Federal Building	1957	----------	Survey started.
Research programs:			
1. Red tide (3-year program)	1956	164,000	Research underway.
2. Sponge industry (Tarpon Springs)	1956	20,000	Grants and study.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS

1. Introduced bill for immigration of needed sponge divers.

2. Acquired conveyance to Pinellas County of 24 acres from GSA for two schools.

3. Requested of White House a reduction in tariffs on imported Havana leaf tobacco to offset reduction in tariff on Cuban cigars.

4. Acquired Federal aid in planning for mosquito problem (spray plane and trucks).

5. Worked for location of National Institute for Physically Handicapped in Hernando County.

6. Assisted in release of Henderson Field for Hillsborough County industry.

7. Introduced bill for 1,000 additional beds at Bay Pines.

8. Introduced bill for making Fort DeSoto a national Spanish-American War memorial.

9. Four hundred thousand dollar low-cost housing project for Plant City authorized.

10. Worked with Ybor City Redevelopment Committee to establish Latin center.

11. Acquired survey of Gulfport Harbor and Federal designation of channel by lower bay bridge.

12. Recommended action on interbay peninsula to mainland bridge causeway connection.

STATE AND NATIONAL PROBLEMS

1. Helped in acquiring $5 million Federal money for fruitfly fight.

2. Acquired 100 percent customs' inspection in fruitfly fight added money. Cooperated to get adequate Federal funds for spreading decline fight ($365,000 in 1957).

3. Worked for more funds to step up central and southern flood-control program.

4. Helped write $37 billion national highway program with roads to First District, including third bay bridge.

5. Helped write national water-pollution control and hyacinth-eradication programs.

6. Helped write beach-erosion control bill providing greater Federal participation.

Producers in Each State Receiving the Five Largest Cotton, Wheat, Rice, and Corn Loans for the 1955 Crop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Agricultural Act of 1954 which provided for continued price supports for agricultural products, I included with my speech in the RECORD—July 1, 1954, pages 9556–9557—a list prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture listing individual farms and corporations in each State receiving the largest corn, wheat, and cotton crop loans for 1953.

On August 2, 1955, I included in my remarks in the RECORD—page A6236—a similar list of recipients of the 1954 crop loans.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD at this point a breakdown I have just received from the Department of Agriculture listing producers in each State with the five largest cotton, wheat, rice, and corn loans for the 1955 crop:

Producers with largest quantity of cotton under loan, 1955 crop

ALABAMA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
	Bales	
J. B. Hain, Sardis, Ala	656	$124,996.14
W. C. Gray, Mathews, Ala	606	103,067.62
W. A. Ganguet, Cuba, Ala	506	90,560.20
T. W. Oliver, Montgomery, Ala	489	75,962.38
Wm. H. McLemore, Montgomery, Ala	508	75,760.10

ARIZONA

	Bales	
Finley, Bros., Gilbert, Ariz	4,013	$621,977.54
B. F. Youngker, Buckeye, Ariz	3,088	490,717.30
Chas. Urrea & Sons, Mesa, Ariz	1,947	319,228.00
W. R. Neely, Chandler, Ariz	1,874	306,141.00
C & V Growers, Stanfield, Ariz	1,845	286,518.72

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, rice, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

ARKANSAS

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
	Bales	
J. G. Adams & Son, Hughes, Ark	4,966	$769,377.43
Lawerence Bros., Driver, Ark	2,519	455,650.67
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	2,516	395,090.11
Lee Wilson & Co., Wilson, Ark	2,296	389,823.41
Miller Lumber Co., Marianna, Ark	1,989	345,012.25

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, rice, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

ARKANSAS—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
RICE		
	Hundredweight	
George Smith & Tenants, DeWitt, Ark	57,582	$300,310.37
W. B. Bynum Cooperage Co., Dermott, Ark	39,501.9	199,241.66
J. O. Bennett & Sons, Lonoke, Ark	34,700	168,557.64
Alice Sidney Farms, Jerome, Ark	28,385.1	149,827.06
Tillar & Co., Tillar, Ark	27,625	148,736.21
Estimated State average per rice loan		8,496.43
WHEAT		
	Bushels	
Wesson Farms, Victoria, Ark	16,028.5	36,261.90
Keiser Supply Co., Keiser, Ark	8,959.05	20,078.25
Chiles Planting Co., Joiner, Ark	8,878.89	18,695.69
Lewis Gin Co., Manila, Ark	6,598.6	13,885.54
Armorel Planting Co., Armorel, Ark	6,299.21	13,335.05
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,638.85

CALIFORNIA

COTTON		
	Bales	
Giffin, Inc., Huron, Calif	10,635	$1,801,321.27
Kern County Land Co., Bakersfield, Calif	5,991	997,156.68
Westlake Farms, Stratford, Calif	4,331	709,716.00
Crockett & Gambogy, Corcoran, Calif	3,256	493,567.60
J. G. Boswell, Corcoran, Calif	2,592	447,252.86
RICE [1]		
	Hundredweight	
Palm Farms, Inc., Buttonwillow, Calif	22,422	96,638.82
Central Valley Rice Growers (a cooperative), Stockton, Calif	14,940	70,221.76
Fratus Bros., Oroville, Calif	1,849	8,567.67
Estimated State average per rice loan		58,476.08
WHEAT		
	Bushels	
Jackson & Reinert, Paso Robles, Calif	84,511	174,162.41
Hansen & Miller and C. W. Clark Co., Paso Robles, Calif	43,124	88,490.45
Nels Beck & Sons, Santa Margarita, Calif	37,738	80,188.84
Pinole Land & Cattle Co., Palo Alto, Calif	36,876	77,791.54
White Ranch Co., Shandon, Calif	33,156	68,036.20
Estimated State average per wheat loan		9,241.50

[1] Rice loans made to only 3 producers in California.

SOUTH CAROLINA

COTTON		
	Bales	
Coker's Pedigreed Seed Co., Hartsville, S. C	1,014	$169,319.73
McColl Realty Co., Inc., Bennettsville, S. C	841	132,646.05
J. A. McDonald, Bennettsville, S. C	652	96,819.93
J. E. Mays, Mayesville, S. C	516	81,360.85
P. A. Wallace, Wallace, S. C	444	69,814.76
RICE		
No rice loans made in South Carolina in 1955.		
WHEAT		
	Bushels	
J. V. Spigener, Allendale, S. C	4,925	10,745.78
J. M. Sikes, St. Matthews, S. C	4,419	9,228.22
W. L. Long, Estill, S. C	3,247	6,787.27
R. V. Segars, Oswego, S. C	3,010	6,700.00
Robert Lee Searborough, Eastover, S. C	2,810	6,294.40
Estimated State average per wheat loan		985.02

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, rice, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

TEXAS

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
	Bales	
Chandler Co., Fort Stockton, Tex	5,091	$971,627.23
Lowe Bros., Midland, Tex	3,781	667,092.95
Ivey & McKinney Farms, Pecos, Tex	3,107	571,928.98
Buchanan Farms, Pecos, Tex	2,646	496,491.36
G. & G. Farms, Pecos, Tex	2,076	391,361.52
RICE		
	Hundredweight	
South Texas Rice Farms, Rosharon, Tex	152,224	830,662.80
Chocolate Bayou Rice & Canal Co., Alvin, Tex	42,546	216,807.22
George P. Nelson, Katy, Tex	35,279	193,056.75
Koop Bros., Edna, Tex	33,037	173,976.26
Peltier Bros., Danbury, Tex	28,305	157,142.33
Estimated State average per rice loan		11,500.00
WHEAT		
	Bushels	
Thomas L. Moran, Dumas, Tex	17,351	35,396.04
James E. Crabtree, Dalhart, Tex	15,000	28,650.00
Callihan Wheat Co., Floydada, Tex	11,248.97	24,769.25
Clay Harbert, Channing, Tex	10,555.86	23,993.27
D. G. Cluck, Groover, Tex	10,059.04	22,355.44
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,900.00

Producers with largest quantity of corn and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

DELAWARE

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
	Bushels	
Reese O. Gordy, Laurel, Del	8,926	$15,531.24
Draper Foods, Inc., Milford, Del	5,973	10,393.02
J. William Brittingham, Pittsville, Md	4,968	8,644.32
S. Rodman Smith, Jr., Odessa, Del	3,834	6,671.16
Wilson E. Campbell, Dagsboro, Del	3,430	5,968.20
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,399.44
WHEAT		
J. N. Kirk, Middletown, Del	7,025.6	15,279.37
Randall C. Willin, Seaford, Del	5,377.12	11,990.98
S. Rodman Smith, Jr., Odessa, Del	3,193.17	6,941.96
Richard S. Rodney, New Castle, Del	3,032.5	6,667.40
James T. Shallcross, Odessa, Del	3,005.67	6,559.92
Estimated State average per wheatl oan		1,665.19

ILLINOIS

CORN		
	Bushels	
Coultas Bros., Winchester, Ill	78,716	$125,945.00
Charles R. Bartels, St. Marys, Mo	68,805	113,084.10
Peter Scully Farms, Dwight, Ill	68,031	108,849.60
Valley Farms Co., Robert W. Weltzer, manager, Carrollton, Ill	51,600	83,592.00
Funk Farm Trust, Shirley, Ill	42,109	67,795.49
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,988.81
WHEAT		
Valley Farms Co., Robert W. Weltzer, manager, Carrollton, Ill	26,840.51	58,225.53
Shafer & Losch, Easton, Ill	15,000	33,011.62
Leslie L. Cooke, trust, Chicago, Ill	11,851	25,631.50
Coultas Bros., Winchester, Ill	11,436.33	24,359.38
Theo. C. Kaseberg, Granite City, Ill	11,403	23,797.76
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,399.34

Producers with largest quantity of corn and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

INDIANA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
William Gehring, Rensselaer, Ind.	*Bushels* 100,260	$160,416.00
Richard Gumz, North Judson, Ind.	93,608	149,772.80
Emil Savich, Rensselaer, Ind.	73,638	116,220.80
Graham Farms, Washington, Ind.	39,536	63,652.96
Otto G. Fifield, Crown Point, Ind.	37,814	60,502.40
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,606.72
WHEAT		
C. G. Fowler, Oxford, Ind.	14,439	34,319.49
Graham Farms, Washington, Ind.	10,024	21,151.34
Benj. F. Clark, West Lebanon, Ind.	6,941	15,063.05
William Rader, Hebron, Ind.	6,736	13,741.62
Gettinger Farms, Sullivan, Ind.	5,506	11,755.76
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,206.49

IOWA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Adams Bros. & Co., Odebolt, Iowa	*Bushels* 134,109	$202,504.59
J. C. Hamilton, Hampton, Iowa	37,661	56,868.11
M. M. Payne, Hamburg, Iowa	34,801	53,941.55
C. C. Davis, in care of George Oxley, Corwith, Iowa	31,782	47,673.00
Varro E. Tyler (trustee for Martha P. Cresap), Nebraska City, Nebr	30,296	46,958.80
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,050.44
WHEAT		
Varro E. Tyler (trustee for Martha P. Cresap), Nebraska City, Nebr	26,475	59,830.23
M. M. Payne, Hamburg, Iowa	14,776	33,448.59
Walter Brothers, Little Sioux, Iowa	13,427.82	27,929.87
A. W. Fulton, Omaha, Nebr.	9,964	22,410.35
Jess A. Twell, Little Sioux, Iowa	10,018.25	20,969.67
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,648.75

KANSAS

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Walter Kelmig, Atchison, Kans.	*Bushels* 25,575	$40,229.33
Vernon Laipple, Wathena, Kans.	15,625	24,531.25
John O. Armstrong & Sons, Muscotah, Kans.	13,511	21,304.27
E. H. Reese, Dean Reese, and Charles Reese, Robinson, Kans.	10,068	15,806.76
Virgil Rush, Severance, Kans.	8,685.5	13,636.23
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,445.00
WHEAT		
Garvey Farms, care of O. A. Snell, Colby, Kans.	119,461.99	270,603.76
J. Ernest Bertrand, Oakley, Kans.	49,267	101,993.00
H. A. Hills, Sr., Colby, Kans.	41,435.01	88,509.01
Marshall Farms, Brewster, Kans.	41,079	87,148.96
Sam Medford, Levant, Kans.	32,977	64,729.72
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,595.00

Producers with largest quantity of corn and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

MARYLAND

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
R. C. Mitchell, Kennedysville, Md.	*Bushels* 8,702	$15,141.00
Richard T. White, Gaithersburg, Md.	5,798	10,088.52
Elmer Bryant, Trappe, Md.	5,568	9,688.32
William A. Hardy, Jr., Queenstown, Md.	4,930	8,578.55
Russell Price and Fred Magruder, Cecil County, Md.	4,497.97	7,824.73
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,358.00
WHEAT		
Samuel Firebaugh, Glenrock, Pa.	9,660.33	20,695.81
The B. F. Shriver Co., Westminster, Md.	10,892.15	24,969.01
W. B. Schiller, Easton, Md.	6,160.17	13,338.31
Emmett Sylvester, Queen Anne, Md.	5,679	12,347.89
Herbert Carter, Queenstown, Md.	5,591.45	12,171.29
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,175.00

MINNESOTA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Lee Ruebel, Olivia, Minn.	*Bushels* 26,848	$40,272.00
Norling Bros., Svea, Minn.	25,687	38,530.50
James S. Thompson, Windom, Minn.	24,681	36,527.88
Hiniker Bros., Mankato, Minn.	24,313	36,469.50
Harold Duncanson, Mapleton, Minn.	24,062	36,093.00
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,933.00
WHEAT		
Victor Youngren, Northcote, Minn.	14,020	29,812.82
Kiene Farms, Inc., Kennedy, Minn.	9,929	20,575.84
William Sczepanski, Stephen, Minn.	9,196	19,955.32
Fanfulik Bros., Angus, Minn.	8,149	17,355.69
Al Kiene, Kennedy, Minn.	7,314	15,302.55
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,290.00

NEBRASKA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Robert Hundahl, Tekamah, Nebr.	*Bushels* 63,390	$96,980.70
John Tobin & Sons, Tekamah, Nebr.	38,864	59,461.92
Dobson & Sons, Cedar Rapids, Nebr.	20,304.29	29,965.46
Edwin Fasse, Cozad, Nebr.	19,397	29,871.38
Ray and Ralph Phelps, Trumbell, Nebr.	19,050.07	29,115.66
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,462.00
WHEAT		
Bailey Partnership, Big Springs, Nebr.	31,593.34	74,047.21
Rosener & Sons, Daykin, Nebr.	24,839.33	58,235.31
Robert Hundahl, Tekamah, Nebr.	19,419.33	43,814.55
Louis Knipp, Big Springs, Nebr.	18,000	37,440.00
Alvin Thompson, Elsie, Nebr.	17,802	38,085.73
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,035.00

Producers with largest quantity of corn and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

NEW JERSEY

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Edwin Brasch, Red Bank, N. J.	*Bushels* 7,670	$10,277.80
Jay C. Garrison, Elmer, N. J.	4,499	8,008.22
Cole Bros., Monroeville, N. J.	4,343	7,730.54
J. Ernest Synder, Englishtown, N. J.	4,732	6,340.88
Francis Wilczynski, Lawrenceville, N. J.	2,812	5,005.36
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,300.00
WHEAT		
William J. Clayton & Son, Freehold, N. J.	9,930	22,640.40
William T. Smith, Freehold, N. J.	9,231	21,046.68
Henry D. Suydam, Hightstown, N. J.	7,789.99	17,899.85
Elison R. Gordon, Trenton, N. J.	6,773	15,681.89
Cross Bros., Holmdel, N. J.	6,038	13,766.64
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,800.00

NORTH DAKOTA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
John Fink and William Fink, Mooreton, N. Dak.	*Bushels* 10,655	$15,556.30
Walter Loff, Colfax, N. Dak.	10,560	15,417.60
E. M. Pogue, Media, Ill.	8,653	11,897.58
Ed Goerger, Barney, N. Dak.	8,385	12,242.10
Robert Nagel, Wyndmere, N. Dak.	8,266	11,651.16
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,413.00
WHEAT		
Elk Valley Farms, Larimore, N. Dak.	27,000	57,580.00
The Whitman Co., Mohall, N. Dak.	26,105	52,511.95
Peter A. Nygaard, Alexander, N. Dak.	21,125	42,764.50
Meyer Bros., Westby, Mont.	20,000	41,000.00
Ryan Farms, East Grand Forks, Minn.	19,652.99	40,624.81
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,220.00

OHIO

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Orleton Farms, London, Ohio	*Bushels* 47,757	$77,843.91
Russell P. Case, Prospect, Ohio	38,802	63,636.44
Chaswil Farm, Sabina, Ohio	38,605	62,540.92
Landen Farms, Foster, Ohio	23,125	37,462.50
J. M. Stambaugh, Ada, Ohio	21,143	34,251.66
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,200.00
WHEAT		
Case Farms Co., Prospect, Ohio	15,348	32,844.72
Charles A. Potter, Rudolph, Ohio	14,750	33,960.00
Agriculture Foods, Inc., London, Ohio	12,071	25,424.73
Orleton Farms, London, Ohio	10,000	21,400.00
Dale Walton, Upper Sandusky, Ohio	9,988	21,257.44
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,000.00

SOUTH DAKOTA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
W. M. Scott Livestock Co., Hecla, S. Dak.	*Bushels* 23,117	$25,422.10
Bones Hereford Ranch, Parker, S. Dak.	14,820	21,785.00

Producers with largest quantity of corn and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

SOUTH DAKOTA—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN—continued		
Milton Ayers, Madison, S. Dak.	*Bushels* 14,064	$20,533.44
Louis T. Meehan, Junius, S. Dak.	11,417	16,668.82
H. M. and J. O. Lee, Colman, S. Dak.	9,677	14,225.19
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,500.00
WHEAT		
J. E. Cheek, Pierre, S. Dak.	58,144	121,655.98
W. J. & Stanley Asmussen, Agar, S. Dak.	19,132	39,874.39
McKenzie, Crothers & White, Geary, Okla.	19,155	39,804.01
Hugo Kinkler, Littlefield, Tex.	17,213	36,072.54
Hammer Bros., Mellette, S. Dak.	15,045	32,039.14
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,200.00

WEST VIRGINIA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
Homer Smith and W. T. Burris, West Columbia, W. Va.	*Bushels* 5,422	$7,048.05
John C. Davis, Glennwood, W. Va.	3,035	3,929.90
Howard G. Buckley, Williamstown, W. Va.	2,668	3,468.40
Oliveboy Stock Farm, Charles Town, W. Va.	1,872	3,257.28
Clair L. Cottrill, Point Pleasant, W. Va.	2,220	2,957.42
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,816.00
WHEAT		
Oliveboy Stock Farm, Charles Town, W. Va.	1,546	3,401.20
Paul D. Chapman, Rippon, W. Va.	896	2,024.96
Willard O. Lloyd, Charles Town, W. Va.	720	1,627.20
C. Arlington Linton, Martinsburg, W. Va.	687	1,428.96
Alice J. Knott, Shepherdstown, W. Va.	450	943.30
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,142.00

WISCONSIN

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
CORN		
A. T. Westmus, Delavan, Wis.	*Bushels* 20,322	$32,516.00
Malvin Busse, Windsor, Wis.	12,227	19,441.97
Earl Putney, Beloit, Wis.	11,586	18,537.60
Jerome Blaska, Sun Prairie, Wis.	11,037	17,550.03
Milo Hagan, Rio, Wis.	10,448	16,612.32
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,640.52
WHEAT		
Kiehlbauch Bros., Sturtevant, Wis.	2,231	4,908.20
Leo Hribar, Sr., Franksville, Wis.	2,077	4,569.40
Henry and Charles Kuiper, Union Grove, Wis.	1,851	4,072.20
Harold Kuiper, Kenosha, Wis.	1,709	3,751.14
Arno Voss, Sheboygan, Wis.	1,300	2,782.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,162.04

Producers with largest quantity of cotton and rice under loan, 1955 crop

FLORIDA

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
C. W. Grant, Jay, Fla.	*Bales* 21	$3,415.89
S. P. Owens, Atmore, Ala.	11	1,984.96
Jake Hollingsworth, Atmore, Ala.	10	1,737.34
John R. Johnson, Baker, Fla.	8	1,393.26
Rufus Jones, Jay, Fla.	3	513.66
RICE [1]		
A. Duda & Sons, Belle Glade, Fla.	*Hundredweight* 1,849	6,920.21
Fritz Stein, Chosen, Fla.	798	2,745.12
Estimated State average per rice loan		4,832.66

[1] Only 2 producers.

LOUISIANA

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Geo. B. Franklin & Son, Holly Ridge, La.	*Bales* 2,840	$482,691.33
Epps Plantation, Epps, La.	2,017	356,478.61
R. R. Rhymes, Rayville, La.	1,030	182,848.59
Estate of M. P. Utz, Tallulah, La.	870	146,390.01
Scopena Plantation, Bossier City, La.	818	128,197.62
RICE		
Louisiana Irrigation & Mill Co., Crowley, La.	*Hundredweight* 97,939	455,547.59
W. J. Gayle & Sons, Gueydan, La.	32,118	177,468.63
Sweet Lake Land & Oil Co., Lake Charles, La.	32,814	127,021.57
Stein & Kinney, Edgerly, La.	18,457	106,266.74
Donald & Webster Todd, Bell City, La.	16,405	88,664.41
Estimated State average per rice loan		5,000.00

MISSISSIPPI

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Delta Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss.	*Bales* 11,773	$1,974,356.12
Roy Flowers, Mattson, Miss.	1,941	323,047.37
S. H. Kyle, Clarksdale, Miss.	1,739	280,876.66
Estate of J. Levingston, Ruleville, Miss.	1,417	244,110.15
C. P. Owens, Robinsonville, Miss.	1,516	242,052.72
RICE		
James K. and Cecil E. Greer, Isola, Miss.	*Hundredweight* 33,476	171,391.22
J. C. O'Neal, Cleveland, Miss.	19,272	110,036.37
Aaron W. Laudig, Boyle, Miss.	18,215	102,467.59
Dockery Farms, Cleveland, Miss.	14,277	80,874.64
S. L. Reed, Belzoni, Miss.	12,721	72,143.13
The estimated State average per rice loan		14,708.00

Producers with largest quantity of cotton and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

GEORGIA

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Fred C. Evans, Barton, Ga.	*Bales* 657	$109,203.49
Jackson Farms, Wrightsville, Ga.	558	94,350.78

Producers with largest quantity of cotton and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

GEORGIA—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON—continued		
Singletary Farms, Blakely, Ga.	*Bales* 513	$83,333.61
Magruder Farm, Midville, Ga.	376	63,196.79
W. H. Lovett, Dublin, Ga.	261	38,913.47
WHEAT		
Gunn Farms, Byron, Ga.	*Bushels* 6,049	13,616.02
F. H. Willie, Louisville, Ga.	6,208	12,838.13
Marvin Hartley, Davisboro, Ga.	5,711	12,047.60
Arthur Hartley, Sandersville, Ga.	4,046	8,537.06
Ralph Collier, Colbert, Ga.	5,162	10,840.71
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,015.49

NEW MEXICO

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Hayner Ranch, Las Cruces, N. Mex.	*Bales* 1,219	$221,278.82
Hal Bogle, Dexter, N. Mex.	945	149,957.40
T. L. Simpson estate, Las Cruces, N. Mex.	689	130,185.72
Thigpen & Funk, Lake Arthur, N. Mex.	730	124,958.71
J. F. Apodaca, Lamesa, N. Mex.	438	120,378.81
WHEAT		
J. M. Ross, Rogers, N. Mex.	*Bushels* 25,292.00	51,840.41
J. W. Garrett, Clovis, N. Mex.	13,440.00	26,342.40
Jennings Stock Farm, Clovis, N. Mex.	11,517.00	23,725.02
Leon Beaver, Clovis, N. Mex.	8,533.33	16,725.33
W. L. Lockmiller, St. Vrain, N. Mex.	7,078.00	14,580.68
Estimated State average per wheat loan		4,079.54

OKLAHOMA

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Wayne Winsett, Altus, Okla.	*Bales* 601	$94,573.98
G. H. Thomas, Altus, Okla.	338	51,483.75
George Pearson, Webbers Falls, Okla.	298	49,487.88
H. E. Pickett, Humphreys, Okla.	212	35,799.01
R. P. Roudebush, Humphreys, Okla.	201	32,648.63
WHEAT		
Stephen Bros., Anadarko, Okla.	*Bushels* 20,740	42,896.24
Leo Hewitt, Oakwood, Okla.	11,746.75	26,938.70
Stafford Bros., Keys, Okla.	11,250	21,375.00
James W. Kinder, Randlett, Okla.	9,787.28	19,567.41
George Chain, Oakwood, Okla.	10,130.17	19,348.62
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,070.00

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, corn, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

KENTUCKY

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
Robert Sanger, Hickman, Ky.	*Bales* 114	$17,859.08
Whipple & Middleton, Hickman, Ky.	58	8,227.21
J. A. Whipple, Hickman, Ky.	38	5,611.75

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, corn, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

KENTUCKY—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON—continued		
Worden Gray, Hickman, Ky	*Bales* 30	$4,881.82
Rupert Hornsby, Hickman, Ky	26	4,264.83
CORN		
S. S. Wathen, Owensboro, Ky	*Bushels* 45,407	74,921.55
T. J. Bartlett, Owensboro, Ky	32,150.91	51,077.43
James Wilson and Paul Harmon, Wickliffe, Ky	23,748	39,659.16
James Wilson, Wickliffe, Ky	22,667	37,853.89
J. H. Wathen, Morganfield, Ky	22,074	36,422.10
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,091.60
WHEAT		
E. G. LaMatte, Hopkinsville, Ky	3,584	7,385.28
Henry R. Vinson, Cadiz, Ky	3,555.86	5,525.64
A. D. Sprague, Sturgis, Ky	3,574	7,684.10
D. C. Dawson, Jr., Olmstead, Ky	2,807.20	5,810.90
R. W. Tyler, Adairville, Ky	2,800.46	5,864.39
Estimated State average per wheat loan		795.50

NORTH CAROLINA

COTTON		
Long Bros., Garysburg, N. C	*Bales* 278	$48,307.63
Mrs. Agnes U. Johnson, Raeford, N. C	246	39,887.76
H. L. McIntosh, Fayetteville, N. C	237	36,207.96
V. L. Wall, Morven, N. C	173	30,999.91
J. H. Wright, Raeford, N. C	188	27,808.39
CORN		
A. D. Swindell, Pantego, N. C	*Bushels* 20,320	35,356.80
Parrott Farms, Kinston, N. C	12,420	20,287.56
Alvin N. Staples, Old Trap, N. C	7,445	11,492.10
G. D. Ross, Belhaven, N. C	7,417	11,793.65
Romaine Howard, Tarboro, N. C	7,356	12,799.44
Estimated State average per corn loan		530.06
WHEAT		
S. P. Jackson, Kinston, N. C	4,532	9,610.04
John J. Crowder, Lattimore, N. C	3,844	8,214.24
A. M. Waddell, Rockingham, N. C	2,929	6,629.65
A. D. Swindell, Pantego, N. C	2,563	5,422.89
J. H. Smith, Goldsboro, N. C	2,417	5,099.87
Estimated State average per wheat loan		348.50

VIRGINIA

COTTON		
William H. Ligon, Emporia, Va	*Bales* 70	$12,668.62
William A. Robinson, Skipper, Va	72	12,538.12
P. L. Smith, Emporia, Va	57	10,062.63
H. L. Bain, Capron, Va	38	5,996.82
George B. Ligon, Skipper, Va	33	5,723.85
CORN		
Hill Bros., Princess Anne, Va	*Bushels* 7,006.96	12,192.11
N. B. Perry, Fentress, Va	5,808.82	10,107.34
W. E. Hudgins, Fentress, Va	5,400.60	9,397.04
James P. Lilley, Churchland, Va	3,749.78	6,524.62
E. P. Leary, Camden, N. C	3,892.89	6,695.77
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,979.17
WHEAT		
Brandon Farms, Spring Grove, Va	8,685.81	17,755.86
Upper Brandon Farm, Spring Grove, Va	5,350.82	11,573.99

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, corn, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

VIRGINIA—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
WHEAT—continued		
Adolph Hula, Charles City, Va	*Bushels* 6,713.81	$14,855.17
Evelynton Plantation, Charles City, Va	5,348.93	11,609.69
Stanly Hula, Charles City, Va	4,823.02	10,789.94
Estimated State average per wheat loan		922.55

Producers with largest quantity of wheat and corn under loan, 1955 crop

MICHIGAN

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
WHEAT		
Walat Farms, St. Charles, Mich	*Bushels* 15,646.25	$35,736.10
I. J. and B. L. Cousino, Erie, Mich	12,522	28,753.03
Richard Price, Saginaw, Mich	8,465	19,762.05
Gerald Wright, Vandalia, Mich	8,389	17,952.46
Claude Wood, Brown City, Mich	7,920.10	17,978.62
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,098.26
CORN		
Albert Heath, Milan, Mich	19,940	32,710.60
Foster Mitchell, Breckenridge, Mich	15,222	24,964.08
Mueller Bros., Britton, Mich	15,002	24,603.28
Bainbridge, Inc., Glenwood, Mich	13,087	21,070.07
E. B. Schwaderer, Cass City, Mich	12,384	15,232.32
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,401.41

PENNSYLVANIA

WHEAT		
Samuel B. Firebaugh, New Freedom, Pa	*Bushels* 5,632.49	$12,103.57
Rice Farms, Jersey Shore, Pa	4,108	9,119.76
Neshaminy Farms, Newtown, Pa	4,035.18	8,995.67
J. L. Miller et al, York, Pa	3,889	8,882.21
Wingert Bros., Chambersburg, Pa	3,585.39	8,117.15
Estimated State average per wheat loan		925.00
CORN		
Slack Bros., Furlong, Pa	6,920	12,110.00
Joseph E. Klock, Easton, Pa	5,175	9,056.25
Peter J. Camiel, Phoenixville, Pa	4,986	8,725.50
Stewart Grimes, Bloomsburg, Pa	3,755	6,571.25
Penrose Taylor, Glen Rock, Pa	3,443	6,025.25
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,215.00

Producers with largest quantity of wheat under loan, 1955 crop

COLORADO

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
Harry Brinkema, Amherst, Colo	*Bushels* 25,267.33	$50,155.10
James Burns, Venango, Nebr	23,867.18	47,779.25
William Stretesky, Julesburg, Colo	23,305	48,100.39
Hodges & Sons, Julesburg, Colo	23,301.67	49,695.04
Gilbert Smyth, et al., Julesburg, Colo	23,031	47,443.86
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,850.00

Producers with largest quantity of wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

IDAHO

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
Roy Green, Grangeville, Idaho	*Bushels* 48,653	$89,470.00
Shayne Linderman, Newdale, Idaho	45,132	82,901.00
Prairie Ranches, Fenn, Idaho	37,601	68,789.00
Merritt Meacham & Sons, Culdesac, Idaho	32,500	60,039.00
Max Parkinson, St. Anthony, Idaho	31,755	62,731.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,670.00

MONTANA

Campbell Farming Corp., Hardin, Mont	*Bushels* 237,568	$456,650.83
E. G. Onstad, Carter, Mont	95,523	185,033.12
Elton Good, Floweree, Mont	59,604	115,115.81
McNutt Bros., Eugene, Oreg	55,842	106,065.60
Meyer & Meyer, Inverness, Mont	49,615	95,325.86
Estimated State average per wheat loan		7,543.89

NEW YORK

L. L. Lamb & Sons, Hamilton, N. Y	*Bushels* 10,608.32	$25,131.48
Norman C. Demler, Niagara Falls, N. Y	10,344.50	23,785.51
John B. Martin, Brockport, N. Y	7,426	15,948.21
William Hamilton, Perry N. Y	6,604.84	16,287.80
John Donovan, Mount Morris, N. Y	6,446.83	15,298.32
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,337.56

OREGON

Kosmos & Georgarus, Helix, Oreg	*Bushels* 52,927.27	$100,341.99
Hill Ranches, Helix, Oreg	50,625.89	96,378.61
H. A. Miller, Bend, Oreg	47,619.01	101,036.36
Mrs. H. L. Duval, Heppner, Oreg	47,174.23	102,028.43
R. W. Potter & Sons, Condon, Oreg	45,663.25	100,925.12
Estimated State average per wheat loan		4,600.00

UTAH

Potato Marketing Co., Milford, Utah	*Bushels* 9,267	$17,421.96
George Gardner, Bear River City, Utah	9,271	16,224.83
Lloyd and Eugene Mayer, Milford, Utah	7,569	14,229.72
A. D. Rich, Garland, Utah	7,647	14,070.48
Ray Holdaway, Tremonton, Utah	7,753	13,918.39
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,850.00

WASHINGTON

B. H. Phillips, Lind, Wash	*Bushels* 84,780.23	$189,112.54
McGregor Land & Livestock Co., Hooper, Wash	77,806.78	171,386.10
Broughton Land Co., Dayton, Wash	80,378.83	161,561.45
Marvin Tucker, Walla Walla, Wash	57,326.11	117,615.55
S. T. S. Farm, Walla Walla, Wash	58,659.52	114,194.51
Estimated State average per wheat loan		6,465.00

WYOMING

Arthur Nicholas, Spearfish, S. Dak	*Bushels* 12,285	$24,867
Joe Matje, La Grange, Wyo	11,770	23,893
Kirby Tremain, La Grange, Wyo	10,525	20,523
Gene Harris, Lost Springs, Wyo	9,728	18,822
Harold Nighswonger, La Grange, Wyo	9,389	21,343
Estimated State average per wheat loan		2,500

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, rice, corn, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

MISSOURI

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
E. P. Coleman & Co., Sikeston, Mo.	*Bales* 3,432	$544,309.65
Acom Farms, Inc., Wardell, Mo.	2,446	388,277.68
P. M. Barton, Catron, Mo.	1,352	255,867.66
Nesselrodt & Campbell, Lilbourn, Mo.	1,316	201,746.85
David Barton, Catron, Mo.	981	153,898.97
RICE		
D. P. Land Co., Leachville, Ark.	*Hundredweight* 6,975	36,618.75
Dirl Bagby, Dexter, Mo.	6,094	29,190.26
Leon Starnes and H. W. Mahan, Parma, Mo.	5,924	23,006.03
Manuel B. Ainley, Jr., Corning, Ark.	4,728	21,559.68
J. D. Till & O. H. Acom Farms, Inc., Wardell, Mo.	4,451.8	18,571.08
Estimated State average per rice loan		7,617.40
CORN		
Saline County Farms, care of W. P. Lyman, Marshall, Mo.	*Bushels* 72,240	116,306.40
Esther R. Giffen estate, Tarklo, Mo.	57,185	89,208.60
Green Top Farms, Inc., Richmond, Mo.	47,000	70,030.00
Dr. A. H. Marshall, Charleston, Mo.	39,935	65,493.40
Meadow Brook Farm, Elsberry, Mo.	36,498	59,126.76
Estimated State average per corn loan		2,276.70
WHEAT		
C. O. Donath, Palmyra, Mo.	20,625.09	41,955.42
Sonnenmoser Bros, Rushville, Mo.	16,077	35,534.67
Filger Bros., Kansas City, Mo.	16,119.99	35,068.32
W. D. Earnst, Sarcoxie, Mo.	14,144	30,551.04
James H. Pettijohn, Oregon, Mo.	14,448.82	30,053.54
Estimated State average per wheat loan		1,926.70

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, corn, rice, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop

TENNESSEE

Name of producer and address	Quantity	Amount
COTTON		
N. J. Henderson, Ripley, Tenn.	*Bales* 447	$71,392.32
T. C. Chapman, Brownsville, Tenn.	407	65,983.30
T. E. Hutcherson, Ripley, Tenn.	295	45,147.14
M. M. Pierce, Oakland, Tenn.	204	36,777.47
J. W. Rhea, Somerville, Tenn.	158	28,728.72
CORN		
Felix Bryan, Guthrie, Ky.	*Bushels* 13,097	21,010.00
Dale Glover, Obion, Tenn.	11,950	19,838.00
R. V. Taylor, Guthrie, Ky.	9,380	16,040.00
O. S. Harris, Guthrie, Ky.	8,718	14,908.00
Smith Crockarell, Clarksville, Tenn.	8,661	14,811.00
Estimated State average per corn loan		1,890.00
RICE [1]		
Norman Burks, Dyersburg, Tenn.	*Hundredweight* 2,171	9,076.00
WHEAT		
G. S. Moore & Son, Springfield, Tenn.	*Bushels* 6,003	12,182.00
Lawrence Teeter, Guthrie, Ky.	5,047	9,892.00
C. S. Crockarell & Co., Clarksville, Tenn.	3,775	8,127.00

[1] Rice loans made to only 1 producer in Tennessee.

Producers with largest quantity of cotton, corn, rice, and wheat under loan, 1955 crop—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

Name of producers and address	Quantity	Amount
WHEAT—continued		
B. E. Glass, Jr., Burlison, Tenn.	*Bushels* 3,424	$7,188.00
Mrs. J. S. Brock and H. A. Dewberry, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.	3,325	6,344.00
Estimated State average per wheat loan		736.00

Benefits for Women Under the 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, some rather important social security changes affecting women were recently enacted. I believe it is important that these changes be clearly understood.

Beginning with November 1956, a woman worker, who has done enough work to be insured under the social security law, may, if she wishes, become entitled to social security payments as soon as she reaches 62 years of age instead of having to wait until she reaches 65.

If she chooses to take the payments before she reaches 65, the amount of the monthly payments will be reduced. The amount of the reduction depends on the number of months before she reaches 65 that she starts getting benefits. If she has her benefits start as soon as she reaches age 62, the amount of each month's payment will be 80 percent of what she would get if she were 65. If she waits until her 63d birthday, the amount of the payments will be 86⅔ percent of what she would receive if she were 65, and if she waits until she reaches 64, the amount will be 93⅓ percent.

The table below gives some examples of the benefits that will be paid at different ages:

Women workers' benefits

Average monthly earnings [1]	Amount of monthly benefit: If claimed at 62d birthday	If claimed at 63d birthday	If claimed at 64th birthday	If claimed at 65th birthday or later
$45	$24.00	$26.00	$28.00	$30.00
$100	44.00	47.70	51.40	55.00
$150	54.80	59.40	64.00	68.50
$200	62.80	68.10	73.30	78.50
$250	70.80	76.70	82.60	88.50
$300	78.80	85.40	92.00	98.50
$350	86.80	94.10	101.30	108.50

[1] After 1950, and after drop-out of up to 5 years of lowest (or no) earnings.

If a woman chooses to take benefits in a reduced amount before she reaches 65, she will continue to get a reduced amount even after she becomes 65. However, if there are 3 or more months before she reaches 65 for which she does not receive benefits because she is working, her benefit will be automatically refigured when she reaches 65 to make allowance for the months in which she did not get a benefit.

PAYMENTS TO DEPENDENTS

Even if a woman chooses to take her benefits at a reduced rate, the payments to her dependents (her children or dependent husband or, in case of her death, her dependent children, widower, or dependent parents) will not be reduced. These dependents will receive their benefits at a rate based on the unreduced amount of her old-age insurance benefit.

AMOUNT OF WORK REQUIRED

The amount of work required to make payments possible on a woman's social-security account depends on the date she reaches age 62 or the date of her death. At least 1½ years of work are required but never more than 10 years. Two examples will give an idea of the requirements: For a workingwoman who died or reached 62 before July 1, 1954, no more than 1½ years of work is now needed; the woman who dies or reaches 62 in the first 6 months of 1958 will need no more than 3½ years.

Changing the retirement age from 65 to 62 makes payments possible for some women now over 65 who did not have enough work to qualify under the old law and for the survivors of some women who died after June 30, 1954, and were between 62 and 65 years of age at death.

THE WIFE OF A RETIRED WORKER

If a woman is the wife of a man who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits, she may become entitled to wife's insurance benefits at any time she chooses after she reaches 62 instead of having to wait until she is 65. If she takes the payments before she reaches 65, however, the amount of each monthly benefit will be reduced. The amount of the reduction depends on the number of months before she reaches 65 that she starts getting benefits.

If she chooses to start getting the payments as soon as she reaches 62, the amount of her payment each month will be only 75 percent as much as it will be if she waits until she is 65. If she waits until she reaches 63, she will get 83⅓ percent, and if she waits until she reaches 64, she will get 91⅔ percent of the amount she would get if she waits until she is 65.

The table below gives some examples of the benefits that will be paid at different ages:

Wife's benefits

Worker's benefit amount	Amount of monthly benefit: If claimed at 62d birthday	If claimed at 63d birthday	If claimed at 64th birthday	If claimed at 65th birthday or later
$30.00	$11.30	$12.50	$13.80	$15.00
$55.00	20.70	23.00	25.30	27.50
$68.50	25.80	28.60	31.50	34.30
$78.50	29.50	32.80	36.10	39.30
$88.50	33.30	37.00	40.70	44.30
$98.50	37.00	41.10	45.20	49.30
$108.50	40.80	45.30	49.80	54.30

If a woman chooses to take benefits in a reduced amount before she reaches 65, she will continue to get a reduced amount even after she is 65. However, if there are 3 or more months before she reaches 65 for which she does not receive benefits because she or her husband work—or in which she gets a mother's unreduced benefit because she has in her care a child entitled to child's benefits—her benefit will be automatically refigured when she reaches 65 to make allowance for those months.

If her husband should die at any time after she has begun to receive her reduced benefits, she may receive a lump-sum death payment and the widow's unreduced monthly benefits.

Example: Mary Jackson decides to claim benefits at the same time her husband claims his. He is 65; she is 62. Her husband's monthly benefit is $88.50. She will draw $33.30—her wife's benefit reduced from $44.30 because of her age. After a year, Mary's husband dies. Mary will then receive an unreduced lump-sum death payment of $255 and widow's unreduced monthly benefits of $66.40.

APPLYING FOR BENEFITS

If a woman is now 62 or over—or when she becomes 62—and if she is a workingwoman insured under social security, or the wife of a beneficiary, or the widow of an insured worker, or the dependent mother of an insured worker who died leaving no widow, widower, or child eligible for benefits, she may apply at her social-security office for the benefits described above. The first checks to women who qualify under the new provisions will be for the month of November 1956. If she is eligible for a benefit for November 1956, she can get it even if she does not apply until the end of November 1957.

Of course, monthly payments will be withheld under certain circumstances if she continues to work or returns to work.

IF A WOMAN HAS A CHILD IN HER CARE

If a woman has a child in her care and the child is entitled to child's insurance benefits based on her husband's earnings, she may be entitled to unreduced monthly payments regardless of her age. Under the old law, only a child under 18 could be entitled to benefits. Under the amendments a child 18 or over may also receive benefits beginning with January 1957 if he has been disabled since before he reached 18. This makes it possible for the mother of the disabled child 18 or over also to get payments beginning with January 1957 regardless of her age.

Mr. Speaker, the following question is one which many women are asking about the new law:

Suppose I claim my benefit now, rather than waiting until I am 65. How long will I be ahead in total benefits paid?

The answer is that as a workingwoman, if you choose the reduced benefit at any age between 62 and 65, you will be ahead for the first 15 years. However, if you receive a retired worker's benefits at the reduced rate for more than 15 years, the total amount you receive will not be as large as if you had waited until age 65 for the higher benefit. As the wife of a retired beneficiary, if you choose the reduced benefit at any age between 62 and 65, you will be ahead for the first 12 years. However, if you receive wife's benefits at the reduced rate for more than 12 years, the total amount you receive will not be as large as if you had waited until age 65 for the higher benefit.

Of course, certain events can cause a change in the total amount you will receive. A workingwoman may lose some checks because of return to work. A wife's reduced benefit would be changed to a widow's unreduced benefit if her husband should die.

A woman must make her own decision on whether it is worth more to her to have the benefits now, at reduced rate, or to wait awhile and get a higher rate. The people in the social-security office will be glad to furnish information, but they cannot tell her what her decision should be.

TO SPEED HANDLING OF WOMEN'S CLAIMS

A woman's payments may be started sooner if she can bring the proofs indicated below to the social-security district office at the time her claim is made. What proofs are needed depends on what type of benefit is claimed.

WIDOWS

The marriage certificate, the worker's death certificate, and proof of the widow's age are needed. Proof of age may be a birth or baptismal certificate, insurance policy, record of age on marriage license, or other old documents which clearly show date of birth or age.

DEPENDENT MOTHERS OF DECEASED WORKERS

Proof of the mother's age, the worker's death certificate, and any documents which may establish the extent to which the wage earner was contributing to the support of the dependent mother are needed.

WIVES

Proof of the wife's age is needed. It will help to have her husband accompany her to the district office, since a form signed by him will also be required.

The Chairman's Progress Report on Activities of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am presenting at this time the chairman's progress report on the activities of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives. That committee was created in the 84th Congress by House Resolution 114, agreed to on January 27, 1955.

INTRODUCTION—ECONOMIC HEALTH OF SMALL BUSINESS

It is believed that this report on the activities of our committee will be more understandable when considered in the light of the facts regarding the present state of the economic health of small business. Therefore I shall introduce my report on our activities by pointing to a number of the indicators of the health of small business.

The past few years have seen unprecedented volumes of new investment in business enterprise. Furthermore, since a somewhat tentative business downturn in mid-1954, there has been a continuously increasing output of goods and services, and general business prosperity, with corporate profits and stock prices setting alltime records in the first half of the present year.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this business boom is that it has been accompanied by increasing rates of small business failures and by a general worsening of the economic position of the small-business sectors of the economy.

THE PACE OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Measured in 1955 dollars, the gross national product—that is, the value of goods and services produced in the Nation—grew from $295.8 billion in 1948 to $357.5 billion in 1952, an average annual growth of 5.2 percent. By 1955, the economy was turning out $387.2 billion of total annual product, an average annual increase of 2.8 percent over 1952.

At the same time, the Nation's population has also been growing—from 147 million in 1948, our population had increased to 167 million by March of 1956.

With the growth in population and general business it would be normal to expect the number of businesses to grow in rough proportion. But this has been far from the case. The business birth rate has fallen off while the death rate has increased.

Omitting the rapid and abnormally large growth of the business population in the years immediately following World War II, we may note that from 1948 to 1952, there was an average net increase in operating firms of 54,700 firms a year. The total number of firms in operation at the end of 1952 was 4,167,000.

During the past 3 years, however, net growth slowed down to an average of 28,300 a year.

In the manufacturing field, the field in which there has been the greatest volume of new investment and business expansion, there was actually a net loss of 19,000 firms during the past 3 years.

SMALL BUSINESS FAILURES ON THE RISE

Dun & Bradstreet reported 11,000 business failures last year—the highest number in any year since the early years of World War II, when business mortality was abnormally high as a result of war shortages, drafting of operators and key personnel of firms not essential to the war effort, and so forth.

Furthermore, the rate of small business failures has continued to rise during the first 6 months of this year—the

period when big business profits and stock prices set all-time records. Comparing the past 6-month period with the same period in the previous 2 years, the total number of failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet is as follows:

Year (first 6 months):	Number of failures
1954	5,778
1955	5,626
1956	6,496

Dun & Bradstreet's failure rate, which is the number of failures per each 10,000 firms in operation, has increased from a rate of 5 in 1946 to a rate of 49 in the first half of the present year. These rates are shown as follows:

Business failures per 10,000 reporting firms

Year:	Rate
1946	5
1947	14
1948	20
1949	34
1950	34
1951	31
1952	29
1953	33
1954	42
1955	42
1956 (first 6 months)	49

THE PROFIT POSITION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Although no data exists for comparing the profitability of different sizes of firms in all fields of business enterprise, such information is available for profits of corporations classified in the manufacturing field. This field includes most of the giant corporations; and while they are classified as "manufacturers", many also engage in distribution, trade, and service.

In 1952, the profit rate of the smallest size group of corporations—those with less than one-quarter million dollars of assets—was 9.3 percent after taxes. This rate dropped to 6.8 percent in 1953; to 3.2 percent in 1954; and then recovered somewhat—to a rate of 5.5 percent—in the boom year of 1955. In other words, in 1954, the profit rate of the smallest size group had dropped by 66 percent from 1952, and last year, 1955, the profit rate of these companies was 41 percent below 1952.

On the other side of the coin, the profit rate of the corporate giants—those with more than $100 million of assets—has shown a remarkable increase. In 1952, their profit rate, after taxes, was 11.8 percent. This increased to 12.1 percent in 1953 and 1954, and to 14.6 percent in 1955. In other words, the profit rate of the giant corporations as a group, last year, was 24 percent higher than in 1952.

When the profit rates are averaged for the period 1953–55, it is found that the smallest firms—those with assets of less than one-quarter million dollars—have been 44 percent less profitable in the past 3 years, than they were in 1952. In contrast, the giants with over $100 million of assets have been 9.3 percent more profitable over the past 3 years than they were in 1952.

Similar comparisons are made for each available corporate size class in the table below. In order to take account of changes in investment, and changes in the number of firms in each size class, profits after taxes have been stated as a percentage of stockholders' investment—which is the amount of capital paid into the firm plus all profits in previous years which were not paid out in dividends.

Rates of profits on stockholders' investment—after taxes in manufacturing corporation by size of corporations

Asset size of corporations (in millions)	1952	1953	1954	1955	Average, 1953–55	
					Rate	Percent of change from 1952
Less than $¼	9.3	6.8	3.2	5.5	5.2	−44.1
$¼ to $1	7.2	7.1	6.4	8.4	7.3	+1.4
$1 to $5	8.0	7.5	5.6	9.0	7.4	−7.5
$5 to $10	8.8	9.2	7.4	9.7	8.8	0
$10 to $50	9.7	9.9	8.7	11.0	9.9	+2.1
$50 to $100	9.9	9.4	8.7	11.5	9.9	0
Over $100	11.8	12.1	12.1	14.6	12.9	+9.3
All corporations	10.3	10.5	9.9	12.6	11.0	+6.8

Source: Federal Trade Commission-Securities and Exchange Commission Quarterly Financial Reports of United States Manufacturing Corporations.

SMALL BUSINESS' SHARE OF PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES

Since 1952 the relative position of the smallest-sized firms—those with less than one-fourth million dollars of assets—has worsened most markedly. Their proportion of all the assets owned by manufacturing corporations has dropped from 3.6 percent to 2.4 percent.

At the end of 1952 the 500 or so largest corporations—those with assets over $100 million—owned 51.5 percent of all the assets of all the manufacturing corporations in the country. By the end of 1955 the share of this size group had increased to 57.1 percent. If concentration of assets continues at this rate, which amounts to 1.9 percentage points a year, our Nation's entire manufacturing capacity will be in the hands of a relatively few $100 million—and bigger—corporations in a matter of 22 years.

DEFENSE CONTRACTS AND SUBSIDIES

One of the most portentous developments of recent years, bearing upon the future of small business, is the prodigious rate at which the United States economy is spending for research and development work. According to estimates of the National Science Foundation, the funds spent during the past 5 years on scientific and industrial research and development of all kinds have equaled the total funds spent for such purposes during the previous 60 years, or substantially the full span of the Nation's industrial and scientific history.

According to estimates prepared by the Department of Defense, the Federal Government is now supplying more than half of the funds spent for research and development in the Nation—Department of Defense, Secretary for Research and Development, Resources Division. According to the Federal budget for 1957 the Federal Government will supply $2,557,000,000 for these purposes in the current fiscal year.

Our principal concern here is with Federal funds supplied to private business concerns for research and development work of an industrial nature. The Department of Defense, which is the principal source of such funds, is currently disbursing between $1 billion and $1.5 billion per year for research and development pursuits in almost all fields. Such funds are awarded not merely for development of specific military items in which the Armed Forces are interested, but for both process and product developments in basic industrial fields such as metallurgy, chemistry, electronics, and so forth. It has long been a truism that military production contracts tend to follow the grants of research funds—in that those firms which make the developments on items in which the Armed Forces are more directly interested usually have the inside tract for receiving the contracts for producing those items. But what is perhaps of greater importance, the firms gaining the know-how with new products and new production techniques having commercial applicability naturally forge ahead in the commercial race. Furthermore, inquiries made by your Small Business Committee last summer brought out that the usual conditions under which the Department of Defense grants research funds to a private firm allow the firm making a patentable invention through the use of these funds to acquire the patent, and this is without any requirement that others be licensed to use the patent for commercial purposes.

The allocation of such vast funds for industrial research and development by the Department of Defense seemed a matter of sufficient importance, to several members of your Small Business Committee, to warrant a requirement that the Department of Defense make some periodic report on the amount of such funds being spent, with a like indication of the proportion allocated to small business.

Consequently, when a bill for extending the life of the Small Business Act was under consideration by the House Banking and Currency Committee during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, I made, on behalf of these Members, a recommendation that the new law require the Department of Defense to make a monthly report to Congress on this subject. This recommendation was accepted; and the information is now available for the period beginning July 1, 1955.

From July 1, 1955, through May 31, 1956, the Department of Defense awarded contracts to private firms committing $1,728,372,000 of Federal funds for research and development uses. Of this total only 5.9 percent was committed to firms having less than 500 employees.

Since the significance of the Department of Defense's subsidy for industrial research has been pointed out, along with the fact that 95 percent of these funds are going to a relatively few big corporations, several Members of the House have expressed grave concern, and have requested that the Small Business Committee make a more detailed investigation and study to determine what feasible steps should be taken to allow small business to share in the research and development work. Your Small Business Committee has this matter under study, and has dispatched to the Department of Defense questionnaires which are designed to throw more light on the distribution problem.

Contracts for defense supplies and facilities continue to account for a substantial share of the manufacturing and construction activities of the country. In the fiscal year just ended the Department of Defense awarded contracts for supplies, services, and construction totaling between $14 and $15 billion. Of the total for the first 11 months of the fiscal year—$13.4 billion—83 percent was awarded to contractors selected on the basis of negotiation; or conversely, only 17 percent was awarded on the basis of advertised competitive bid.

It is manifest that an inequitable distribution of such a huge volume of business as between large and small competitors would have, or is having, a decided impact upon the competitive structure of American industry. Congress has long been keenly aware of the consequences of an inequitable distribution, as well as the tendency for the lion's share of this business to find its way to bigger competitors; in no less than three separate statutes Congress has declared the national policy to be that small business shall have a fair proportion of such business.

Administrative efforts to carry out this policy have for the most part consisted of a joint determination, or as it is more recently called, a joint set-aside program, whereby representatives of the SBA obtain the military procurement office's agreement to earmark certain specific contract procurements for award on the basis of competition limited to small firms. This program involves a somewhat novel approach to diffusion of administrative responsibility, the efficacy of which is yet to be demonstrated.

The controlling statutes would seem to place responsibility directly with the Department of Defense for carrying out the declared national policy that small business shall have a fair proportion of the defense contracts. But in the absence of both targets and systematic procedure for carrying out the policy, within the Department of Defense, the SBA maintains a representative in each of a large number of military procurement offices over the country, whose representative's job it is to screen proposed procurements and recommend to the military procurement officer in charge that certain ones be earmarked for small business. Small business is taken to be a firm with 500 employees or less without respect to what line of work it may be engaged in or what its competitive position within its industry may be.

In the past 3 fiscal years, since the set-aside program has been in operation, contracts earmarked for small business amounted to $1,042,520,489, or 2 percent of the value of all the military contracts awarded in the period. In the same period, the contracts earmarked for small business and actually awarded to small business amounted to $706,091,117, which was 1.4 percent of the military contracts awarded in this period.

It is not known what portion of the contracts earmarked for small business would inevitably have gone to small business anyway, as for example contracts for many types of garments or for blueprints, where there is no firm having as many as 500 employees. In any case, the contracts which went to small business as a result of the set-aside program amounted to only a small fraction of the contracts which small business managed to obtain with the set-aside assistance. In the 3 fiscal years mentioned small business received 22.4 percent of the value of all military contracts awarded, with or without set-aside assistance.

Despite the set-aside program and other efforts by SBA and the Department of Defense to give small business an equitable opportunity to compete, the lion's share of the defense contracts continues to be placed with a few giant corporations. Moreover, there is some evidence of a recent tendency for the defense business to become more concentrated.

From June 1950 through June 1953, 63.6 percent of the value of all the defense contracts awarded were placed with the 100 largest contract holders. During the subsequent 18 months—July 1953 through December 1954—the latest period for which a report is available, 68.8 percent of the value of the contracts went to the 100 largest contract holders.

Beyond an occasional report on the 100 largest contractors, the Department of Defense makes public no meaningful report on the question how its contracts are distributed as between small firms and large firms, and appears to have no such report for its own information.

The Small Business Act of 1953 seems clearly to contemplate that the national policy will be concerned about the small competitors in each of the various industries. But the Administrator's decision to define small business as a firm with less than 500 employees, irrespective of industry, makes the national policy one which in theory is concerned about the small competitors in some industries and not those in others. For example, the policy would not be concerned with how the defense contracts may be distributed within the motor-vehicle industry, since even the smallest truckmaker in this industry has well over 500 employees. In practice moreover, since the Department lumps its data for all industries indiscriminately, the 500-employee definition results in a national policy which is concerned about the smaller competitors in no industry.

The percentage of the value of a fiscal year's contracts going to small business has ranged from 17 percent to 25 percent during the past 5 fiscal years. Such year-to-year variation may indicate, in part, that a better or a poorer job is being done to bring small business into the picture. Moreover, the indications on this question may be completely obscured by the addition or subtraction of a few more or less huge long-term contracts awarded for such items as aircraft, tanks, or ships. Such additions or subtractions may materially change the small business percentage in any fiscal year, irrespective of whether there is any real change in the small business share of such contracts as firms with less than 500 employees might actually perform.

The Department of Defense periodically treats the public to a statistic on what has been called the amount of contracts which are suitable for award to small business, but here again the statistics raise more questions than they answer. The suitable contracts consist, in the first instance, of contracts for items for which the contracting officer happens to know of a small business source but from these there are then subtracted, first, such suitable contracts which were awarded to big firms, in order to maintain such firms in the mobilization base; and, second, such suitable contracts which were awarded to big firms in an emergency situation requiring schedules that cannot be met by a small business firm. In Department of Defense procurement practices emergency situations are more the rule than the exception. For example, according to a recent study made by the House Armed Services Committee 94 percent of the value of the nonconstruction contracts has been awarded, not according to the general policy requiring advertising for competitive bids, but under an exceptional provision of the law applicable to a period of national emergency. Report to Hon. CARL VINSON, chairman, House Committee on Armed Services, from chairman, Subcommittee for Special Investigations, on use of section 2 (c) (1) through (17), Armed Services Procurement Act, 1947, period January 1, 1953, to June 30, 1955, United States House of Representatives, 84th Congress, 1st session, under the authority of House Resolution 112.

The most that can be said of the Department's statistics on contracts suitable for small business is that they show that certainly small business has not received more than 67.8 percent of its fair proportion during the past 3 years. In short, the contracts awarded small business in this period amounted to 67.8 percent of the amount which the Department reported to be suitable—or which it has more recently called the small business potential.

THE CREDIT SQUEEZE

In April of this year, the Federal Reserve Board announced a hike in the discount rate—the Board's fifth such action to squeeze commercial bank credit since April 1955. These credit restrictions, far from being general and undiscriminating, turned out to be highly selective and discriminatory against small borrowers.

Not only do small firms depend almost exclusively on commercial banks as a source of credit, having little practical access to the stock market, commercial paper, the insurance companies, and other sources available to big firms, but a general result of squeezing commercial bank credit is that the banks cut off their smaller borrowers and use their limited credit supply to serve their big borrowers.

The preferential treatment which big firms receive in bidding for a limited credit supply is of course no new phenomenon. As an indication of the extent to which small firms have recently been squeezed out of the credit picture, however, attention may be given to a report of the Standard Factors Corp. of New York, giving the results of its survey of some 127 banks and 727 manufacturing concerns in 33 industries.

This survey found that in April 1955, before the first boost in the discount rate, 89 percent of the companies surveyed were regular borrowers from the commercial banks. Just 1 year and 5 rate increases later, only 53 percent had bank lines of credit. Furthermore, it was the smaller firms that had been cut off, and the smaller the firms the greater the proportion among them that had been cut off.

For example, in the smallest size class of firms—those with a net worth between $5,000 and $25,000—53 percent of the firms had a line of credit with their local banks in March of 1955; but in March of 1956, only 18 percent of these firms had a line of credit. At the other end of the size scale—firms with a net worth of more than $2,500,000—the effects of the credit squeeze were not visible. In March 1955, 99 percent of the firms of this size had a line of bank credit; and in March of 1956, 99 percent still had a line of bank credit. The direct relationship between size of firm and ability to get bank credit is manifest in the table below:

Net worth of companies	Percent of companies with bank lines March—	
	1955	1956
$5,000 to $25,000	53	18
$25,000 to $100,000	82	44
$100,000 to $500,000	94	79
$500,000 to $1,000,000	99	98
$1,000,000 to $2,500,000	99	98
Over $2,500,000	99	99

The results of the Standard Factors report are entirely in accord with the impressions which this Committee has gained from a flood of letters from small-business people—except that there are two additional features to the problem.

First, small firms need increased credit—not less credit—to carry inventories and work in process—as a result of the almost continuous increases in the prices of products and materials coming from the big-business sectors of the economy.

Second, small firms, like big firms, use their credit lines with commercial banks to discount bills, carry inventory for processing or for sale, or to cover payrolls and other current operating payments until payments are forthcoming from sales.

Such current, or short-term, working capital is, of course, all that commercial banks are theoretically intended to supply—and about all they are, in practice, suited to supply. But in truth, small firms normally must, and do, make use of commercial-bank credit for their longer-term plant and equipment capital—for the lack of adequate sources of genuine long-term credit.

When small borrowers turn to commercial finance companies to replace their lost bank credit, they find that the finance companies—which, by and large, depend on bank lines of credit—are themselves squeezed. Consequently, only the very large commercial finance companies, those which are independent of the banking system for credit, can even begin to meet the demand for funds.

CREDIT ROLE OF SBA

That the present banking system and organization of the capital markets leaves small-business credit starved has long been recognized. This recognition gives the Small Business Administration one of its principal reasons for being. It was created to make sound loans to small business wherever private sources proved inadequate to small-business needs.

The SBA has promulgated definitions of "small business," for loan purposes, which are quite narrow. Nevertheless, according to these definitions an estimated 3½ million firms are potentially eligible for small-business loans. These 3½ million firms account for somewhere between one-third and one-half of total volume of nonagricultural business done in the United States.

In June 1955, when the Small Business Committee of the House investigated, SBA had been receiving inquiries about loans from small-business people at the rate of 11,000 per month. Since that time small businesses' needs for loans have been greatly increased, as a result of price increases and the successive squeezes on commercial bank credit.

It has been SBA's policy, however, to discourage small-business people from filing formal applications. SBA instructs its field offices to discourage the filing of an application unless the field office thinks the loan is going to be approved. From past experience, moreover, the field offices have learned that only a few applications with gold-plated security will be approved.

In 3 fiscal years—1954 through 1956—SBA accepted only 9,688 aplications. Of these 2,950 were approved, not counting some that were approved and subsequently canceled or withdrawn.

SBA has made disbursements on only 2,220 of these.

The applications approved were in the amount of $136 million, including amounts to be lent by the local banks in bank participation.

SBA's share of the total loan commitment was $113 million, including $39 million of contingent commitments on deferred participation loans. Deferred participation loans are those on which the bank makes the entire loan, but has the option of calling on SBA to make good a certain share of the loan.

In the 3 fiscal years, SBA had actually disbursed only $52.6 million, of which $10.5 million had been repaid.

Some perspective may be given to this $52.6 million lent to United States small business during the past 3 fiscal years, by considering the organization and operations of 3 other lending organizations in which the United States Government participates.

The Export-Import Bank, financed wholly by the United States Government, makes loans to private importers and exporters. Principally, it is for the benefit of United States big business, in financing their exports. The bank is authorized to have a capital stock of $1 billion and may borrow from the United States Treasury up to $5 billion at any time. The bank is authorized to have outstanding loans and guaranties up to $5 billion.

In the 3 fiscal years—1954 through 1956—the Export-Import Bank authorized 325 credits, totaling $1.3 billion. In this period it actually disbursed over $1 billion.

In other words, the Export-Import Bank disbursed in the 3 fiscal years approximately 20 times as much, principally to finance big business exports to foreign countries, as the SBA lent to small-business people in the United States.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, called the World Bank, finances the projects of foreign governments and projects guaranteed by foreign governments. The United States Government has subscribed $3.175 billion to the bank. Our large United States big business profits from the bank's operations. It is big businesses who construct these foreign projects, supply the machinery and equipment for the projects, and profit in export trade from the dollar exchange made available by the bank.

In the 3 fiscal years 1954 through 1956, the World Bank authorized 72 loans, in the total amount of $1.192 billion and it actually disbursed $860.4 million.

In other words, the World Bank disbursed to foreign governments and foreign companies more than 16 times as much as the Small Business Administration disbursed to small business firms in the United States.

In addition, we now have a new subsidiary of the World Bank known as the International Finance Corporation, which is for the purpose of making loans to foreign projects without the guaranties of foreign governments. This new organization was provided for in Public Law 350 (84th Cong., 1st sess., approved August 11, 1955). The IFC is authorized to have a loan limit of $100 million, of which the United States has put up $35 million. The IFC has just now been organized, and is ready to do business. Here again we have another organization to make loans abroad, principally for the benefit of foreign companies and for the benefit of big business in the United States who will supply most of the plants and equipment that are to be put up abroad.

PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS ARE DESTROYING SMALL BUSINESS

During October and November 1955, the House Small Business Committee held extensive hearings dealing with the practice of price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and related matters. Scores of witnesses appeared. The record of those hearings covers more than 1,000 printed pages. Representatives of large groups of small-business concerns appeared and testified. They complained that price discrimination practices of big business concerns were destroying small-business concerns wholesale. They appealed for a stronger law against price discrimination and asked that the Robinson-Patman Act be amended through the enactment of H. R. 11, which they had come to know as the "equality of opportunity bill."

Subsequently, during the period April

18–26, inclusive, 1956, the Antitrust Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, held extensive hearings dealing with the practice of price discrimination and the need for the amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act as was provided for in H. R. 11, the equality-of-opportunity bill. Again representatives of large groups of small-business concerns appeared and asked for the enactment of that bill. During the course of those hearings, Administrator Wendell Barnes of the Small Business Administration appeared and testified in opposition to H. R. 11. He did that despite the fact that representatives of small business had asked for its passage to provide them with additional protection against monopolistic and destructive price discrimination practices of big business.

In the statement of his reasons for his opposition, Mr. Barnes pointed to the fact that Mr. Weeks, the Secretary of Commerce, had opposed the bill, and that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice also had opposed the bill. He stated he was guided by the opinions of the representatives of those agencies. To that statement, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary responded:

I know, but we set up the Small Business Administration primarily to feel the pulse of small business all over the country, and the pulsation of small business all over the country might reflect entirely different views than the enforcement views of the Federal Trade Commission and/or the Department of Justice. (P. 258 of the record of the hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, April 20, 1956.)

When Mr. Barnes of the SBA persisted in his opposition to H. R. 11, he was questioned closely in an effort to ascertain whether he was reflecting views of small business concerns. The record on that point is quoted as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Did you get any correspondence or were any views presented to you from the small retail organizations which indicate a disposition to oppose H. R. 11?

Mr. BARNES. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an anomaly here that I sort of cannot understand.

Yours is a Small Business Administration, and all the small-business associations, from your own statement, have indicated that they want H. R. 11 passed.

Now isn't there an inconsistency there? You are supposed to represent small business, small business wants this bill, and you say there should not be such a bill. (Pp. 258–259 of the record of the hearings before the Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary, April 20, 1956.)

Although the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate reported favorably on the equality of opportunity bill and recommended its passage, the opposition to it persisted. It failed of passage when on the last day of the session in the Senate, Senator BRICKER, of Ohio, objected to the taking up of the bill for consideration in the Senate.

ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE, ITS SUBCOMMITTEES AND ITS STAFF—SERVICES RENDERED IN THE HANDLING OF INQUIRIES AND COMPLAINTS

Small business concerns without knowledge of the organization of the Federal Government direct their inquiries and complaints either to their Representatives in the Congress or directly to the House Small Business Committee. During the 84th Congress the staff of the House Small Business Committee has received and handled literally thousands of such inquiries and complaints from small business concerns.

When small-business people come to see or write to the Members of the House about problems that are especially knotty and take a lot of time and work to get straightened out, our committee usually gets those problems. Those are problems for the most part where the small-business firm is being mistreated or has gotten snarled up in some procedure of the executive agencies, such as when a defense contract has gone haywire or a loan application has fouled up in a backlash of redtape. All of these cases require a great deal of staff time in conferences as well as in the handling of the correspondence.

Since the beginning of the 84th Congress the committee has received 663 requests and cases from 202 Members of the House about problems of small business. In each of those instances a small-business man was involved and needed help. The Small Business Committee responded by assisting the Member and the small-business concern in getting the needed help. In a great many of such instances the staff participated in conferences and investigations regarding actions by the agencies of the Government and in getting reports thereon to the Members for their use in advising their constituents. That service has been rendered to the Members on both sides of the aisle. Our staff is devoted to the cause of assisting all Members in dealing with small-business problems. As I have said, the inquiries, requests, and complaints handled by the staff of the Small Business Committee during the 84th Congress have numbered in the thousands, including those which have been referred to us by the Members. The total of the inquiries, requests, and complaints which have been handled during the 84th Congress, up to and including July 31, 1956, amounted to more than 15,000.

STUDY AND ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS FOR LEGISLATION

The staff of the House Small Business Committee has devoted a great deal of time and effort in studying and analyzing the need for new legislation to help small business. In some instances the result of that effort has reflected itself in bills I introduced and fought for during this term of the Congress. In other instances members of the staff have worked with and assisted representatives of the legislative and standing committees in studying and analyzing proposals for legislation and in the drafting of some proposals. One example is the pooling provision which was included in the Small Business Administration Act of 1955. That pooling provision I think is one of the greatest provisions of that act. It provides for a group of small business concerns to pool their resources in the formation of a corporation to buy or produce raw materials used in their respective businesses. Also provided is the opportunity for corporations thus formed to secure loans from the Small Business Administration. The top limit of such loan would be $250,000, multiplied by the number of small business concerns which pooled their resources in the forming of the corporation to produce materials for the needs of their respective business. That was for the purpose of enabling small business concerns to assure themselves of their needed supplies in times of critical shortages. Other examples of instances where members of our staff assisted representatives of the legislative and standing committees in providing information for use in the consideration of proposed legislation which would affect small business are those involving the disposition of synthetic rubber manufacturing facilities and H. R. 8710, a bill which was introduced by Chairman Vinson of the Armed Services Committee providing for more competitive bidding in the procurement of supplies for the armed services.

An indication of the amount of time and effort required to even keep up with and give some study to bills which were introduced during the 84th Congress relating to or affecting in some way some small business may be gathered from a listing of some of those legislative proposals. A description of some of those are as follows:

(a) Bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act:

The bills in which small business showed the greatest interest during the 84th Congress were bills to amend the Robinson-Patman Act, to correct the weakening of that act which has resulted from several court decisions beginning with the Supreme Court's decision in Standard Oil of Indiana against Federal Trade Commission.

A number of bills were introduced to correct this weakness; principally among these are the following:

H. R. 11, and a number of companion bills, including H. R. 1840.

(b) Tax bills:

A number of bills were introduced in the 84th Congress which would accomplish the following purposes:

First: Make the corporate form of business more attractive to small firms now under the partnership form of organization, so that such small businesses could enjoy the same advantage in accumulating retained business earnings at corporation rates; and

Second. To reduce taxes on smaller corporations and provide in place of the now substantially flat rate on corporate incomes, a graduated, or progressive, rate similar to that applicable to individual income tax.

In the Congress the principal bills introduced were:

First. H. R. 9067.
Second. H. R. 9851.
Third. H. R. 10081.
Fourth. S. 3128.
Fifth. S. 3129.

(c) Antitrust bills:

There were several bills which recognized problems growing out of the new structure of business which has been emerging for a number of years. This is an organization under which a few giant corporations control the raw materials,

processing, and manufacturing segments of industry, which a large number of very small-business firms serve as retail distributors for these corporations. Retail gasoline dealers and automobile dealers to illustrate the problem.

At least two bills were introduced which would tend to restrict suppliers' freedom for canceling dealer's franchises without good cause, and particularly, to restrict suppliers' freedom to coerce dealers to follow policies, or to deal only in the brands of merchandise dictated by the suppliers. These are: H. R. 8395, S. 3879.

As a result of the great wave of corporate mergers which have been taking place, with obvious rapid deterioration of the competitive enterpise system, a number of bills have been introduced to strengthen the antimerger law. These include the following:

First. H. R. 6748.
Second. H. R. 5948.
Third. H. R. 7229.
Fourth. H. R. 8332.
Fifth. H. R. 9424.

The most important of the antitrust laws from the immediate standpoint of small business is the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. Perhaps the two most important sections are that restricting illegal monopolistic price discriminations, and that which prohibits exclusive dealing contracts and tie-in sales of such a nature which tie up entire markets and foreclose opportunity to small firms.

The Federal Trade Commission enforces the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act. At present this law has a loophole in it. After the Federal Trade Commission proves a violation and issues a cease-and-desist order, there is no time limit within which the violator may file an appeal in a Federal court. If the Federal Trade Commission wishes to force compliance with its order it musst petition a Federal court, and it must moreover prove that its order is being violated. In other words, the FTC must prove two violations, and the violator gets one free violation.

H. R. 11454, introduced by Congressman ROOSEVELT, would correct this problem by making Clayton Act orders automatically final unless the company on which the order is issued fails to file an appeal within 60 days.

H. R. 3659, introduced by Congressman CELLER, increased the maximum fine for criminal violations of the Serman Act from $5,000 to $50,000. This bill was passed and signed by the President.

Another bill, which became law, S. 2127, extended the life of the Small Business Administration, and increased the maximum loan which the Small Business Administration is authorized to make to small business firms.

(d) Government procurement:

H. R. 8710, introduced by Congressman CARL VINSON, was designed to assist small business in obtaining a fair proportion of Government contracts. It would tighten the requirement of awarding Government contracts on the basis of advertised competitive bids, so that small business would have a better opportunity—during the past 3 years the Department of Defense has been awarding approximately 95 percent of the value of all contracts on the basis of negotiations. It would also authorize the Department of Defense to negotiate contracts with small business, by reason of the fact that contracts in question are suitable for small business.

STUDY OF THE PROPOSALS FOR DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED SYNTHETIC RUBBER FACILITIES

Early last year the staff of the House Small Business Committee analyzed the proposals for selling the Government-owned synthetic rubber plants. That study led to the conclusion that the proposals did not meet the standards laid down in the Rubber Disposal Act of 1953, in that it would not create a free and competitive industry and that the sales contracts provided for in the plan did not provide assurance that small rubber fabricators would receive a fair share of available rubber supplies. On March 21, 1955, the staff prepared a report on the facts concerning the plans for the disposal of the plants, and I directed that a copy of that report be made available to each Member of the House, before it was necessary for the House to consider and vote on the question of whether the proposals should be approved or disapproved.

During the debate in the House on the proposals and as a result of the findings made in the report submitted by the staff of the House Small Business Committee, the big rubber and oil companies purchasing the rubber plants gave Members of Congress firm assurances that the small and independent fabricators would not be mistreated and that the price of synthetic rubber would not be advanced, if Congress should approve the plans as proposed.

After the plants were sold the price of natural rubber continued to rise. The price averaged better than 42 cents per pound during the last 9 months of 1955 and the price of synthetic rubber could have been raised to that level, but during that period of time the new owners of the former Government synthetic rubber plants held the price at 21 cents per pound. If they had raised the price of synthetic rubber up to the going price of natural rubber it would have meant the doubling of the price. On that basis the 1.6 billion pounds which they sold in the last 9 months of 1955 would have cost the consumers at least $337 million more. Several Members of the House have therefore expressed the view that the factfinding set out in the staff report from the House Small Business Committee was instrumental in saving the consumers of rubber in this country $337 million. I would hesitate to accept full credit for effecting such a result, but I am inclined to think we were in part responsible for that result.

I am also happy to report that to date there have been very few complaints that small rubber fabricators are finding it difficult to get supplies of synthetic rubber.

IRON AND STEEL SCRAP INDUSTRY

The staff of our committee has spent much time and effort in studying complaints which were received from semi-integrated steel companies and steel and iron foundries that they had been caught in a squeeze due to shortages and rising prices of scrap. It was pointed out that many of them are dependent wholly upon scrap in order to carry on operations, and that in instances in shortages and high prices of scrap, they are therefore in a much more difficult position than the large fully integrated steel companies which own or have ready access to plentiful supplies of ore.

When the staff of the House Small Business Committee initiated its consideration of this problem the price of No. 1 heavy melting scrap at Pittsburgh was up to $55 a ton. That compared with only $58.55 a ton for new basic pig iron. Two years earlier No. 1 heavy melting scrap was $30 a ton and basic pig iron was $56 a ton.

As the study of the problem progressed with the members of the staff holding conferences with members of the different segments of the industry, the situation which had been faced by the small semi-integrated steel companies greatly improved from their standpoint. Prices of scrap dropped substantially. Despite that drop in the prices a greater supply of scrap appeared to be available to the small buyers than there had been earlier. In view of the changed circumstances, I did not order that hearings be held dealing with that problem. However, it has been noted that during the first week of August, 1956, the price of No. 1 heavy melting steel scrap rose sharply—$11 per ton at Cleveland to $56 to $57, $9 per ton at Pittsburgh to $55 to $56, and $10 per ton at Youngstown to $59 to $60. It appears that those matters will call for further study on the part of our staff.

HEARINGS ON PRICE DISCRIMINATION, THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT, AND RELATED MATTERS

During October and November 1955, the committee held hearings on price discrimination, the Robinson-Patman Act, and related matters. Many complaints had been made to the effect that price-discrimination practices were rampant, particularly in the food industry. It had been reported that the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, which are charged with the duty of enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act against price discriminations, were slowing down in their work in that respect. Representatives of those two agencies had served on the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws and had participated in writing a report which had ridiculed the Robinson-Patman Act and had advocated its emasculation. The purpose of our hearings was to record the facts about such matters.

Our committee held extensive hearings and heard testimony from more than 50 witnesses, covering more than 1,200 printed pages of record.

The record shows that the practice of price discrimination is practiced widely. Testimony of several witnesses from the manufacturing-baking industry was received. The testimony was to the effect that price discriminations are destroying the small and independent manufacturers of bakery products and that the situation is developing into one of a monopoly in the hands of a few

chain bakers and a few chainstore operators.

What was said about price discrimination corroborated what we have learned about it each time we have studied that practice—that is, it is a weapon of sellers who have some degree of monopoly power and that it is effectively employed only by those who have such power.

Also, notwithstanding the wealth of factual information which heretofore has been gathered by the Congress regarding the unwholesome character of the practice of price discrimination, a lobby was formed to present and disseminate arguments in favor of price discrimination and against the laws designed to curb that practice.

It was discovered that the arguments in favor of price discrimination are part and parcel of the cleverest piece of propaganda ever conceived. That propapaganda is one of the instruments of the high-powered lobby which has been working against small business and the Robinson-Patman Act. It has enveloped almost every office in Washington. It has influenced the thinking in the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the position of those agencies regarding price discrimination and their attitude toward the Robinson-Patman Act.

Therefore, it did not come as a surprise when representatives of those agencies came before the Congress in March of 1956 and opposed the strengthening of the laws against the monopolistic practice of price discrimination. In 1955 the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and the person, who was at that time, serving as the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, were members of the Attorney General's National Committee To Study the Antitrust Laws. As I have said, the report published by that Committee in March 1955 ridiculed the Federal antitrust laws which were designed to curb the monopolistic practice of price discrimination.

STUDY OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT

The staff of the committee is continuously reviewing the record of the work of the Federal agencies charged with the duty of enforcing the antitrust laws. Particular attention has been given to the enforcement of those laws which directly affect small business. Out of those studies developed a staff report dated October 31, 1955, entitled "Statistics on Federal Antitrust Activity." A second staff report dealing with that subject was published January 2, 1956, entitled "Volume of Federal Trade Commission Antitrust Complaints." The latter report covered the record of the Federal Trade Commission in the handling of cases arising under the Clayton Antitrust Act over the period of 5½ years ending December 31, 1955. That report shows that for the last half of that period the Federal Trade Commission issued 59 new complaints charging violations of the Clayton Antitrust Act. In the first half of that period—covering a period of 33 months—the Federal Trade Commission issued 56 such complaints. However, the number of complaints did not tell the full story. The 56 complaints issued in the first half of the period were against 66 companies, the assets of which averaged $256,200,000 per company, while the 59 complaints issued in the last half of the 5½-year period ran against 60 companies with average assets of only $32,500,000. It was also found that during the last half of that period one small company was charged with violating the Clayton Antitrust Act, whose total assets were only $16,000. The company in question reported to the Small Business Committee that its total income from the sale of citrus fruits during the year 1954 was only $460. The disclosure of those facts has given rise to the question as to whether or not our Federal agencies have turned their big antitrust guns on small business and away from big business.

STUDY OF SUPPLY VERSUS DEMAND FOR PORTLAND CEMENT

When our committee began investigating the cement shortage last year, it was plain that there was a demand for a substantial expansion of cement capacity. Cement was generally short throughout the United States, and in many sections of the country there were acute shortages. Small distributors could not get cement and small contractors could not get enough cement to finish projects they had underway. The prospects were that those situations would worsen upon the enactment by the Congress of legislation providing for a vastly increased highway building program.

I called attention to this matter and sent questionnaires to cement users which called attention to the cement companies of unsecured demand.

Here again it may be coincidental that after this investigation was underway, there was a rapid increase in the cement companies' expansion programs. I suspect we may have helped make these companies aware of the need for expansion. At least several of the companies wrote to the committee telling us of their decisions to expand even before they announced it publicly.

THE STAFF HELD ROUNDTABLE CONFERENCES REGARDING PROBLEMS OF PARTICULAR INDUSTRIES

In certain instances when members of an industry brought to the staff of the committee a problem that needed consideration and when time and resources were not available to make an investigation, resort was made to the device of the roundtable conference. That was done in the hope that by bringing together persons who had responsibility for dealing with the problem, we would be able to discuss it with those directly concerned and, through an exchange of views, perhaps reach a conclusion that would facilitate an appropriate disposition of the matter. Some examples of such instances are those involving the manufacturing-baking industry, the importation of watch cases, the leasing of aircraft, and the importation of peanuts.

INVESTIGATIONS, STUDIES, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE VARIOUS SUBCOMMITTEES

A. Subcommittee No. 1, regulatory agencies:

Subcommittee No. 1 is composed of the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, chairman, and the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, and the Honorable WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio.

Earlier reports regarding the activities of this subcommittee pointed out that its goal is a careful study and investigation of the organization and procedures of the several independent Federal regulatory agencies. The duties of the agencies include the enforcement of trade and monopoly laws directly and vitally affecting small business. One allegation that the subcommittee has been looking into is that these regulatory agencies have lost their independence and have fallen under the influence and control of the executive branch and of the interests they are supposed to be regulating.

Extensive hearings, therefore, were held covering the organization, procedures, and operations of the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Many witnesses have testified and the records of the printed hearings approximate 1,000 pages. The hearings were concluded on July 20, 1956, and a report dealing with those hearings of this subcommittee is being prepared.

B. Subcommittee No. 2, Small Business Administration and problems related to procurement, loans, and disposal:

This subcommittee is composed of the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, as chairman, and the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee, and the Honorable R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, of New York.

The Small Business Act of 1953 expired June 30, 1955. Therefore, when this subcommittee was established in January 1955, its first order of business was to appraise the operations of the Small Business Administration and to determine whether there was a substantial need for continuing this agency. Consequently, during the first few months of its existence the subcommittee devoted a substantial amount of time commencing during March 1955 in holding hearings, studying, and reporting upon the activities of the Small Business Administration.

The subcommittee's report on the Small Business Administration, House Report No. 1045, and the record of the hearings held by the subcommittee were considered by the members of the House Banking and Currency Committee before the enactment of Public Law 268, which reestablished and provided for the continuation of the Small Business Administration until June 30, 1957.

The report of the subcommittee found that there was a substantial need for continuing a Federal small-business agency to carry out the functions which the Small Business Administration had been authorized to perform. The committee, however, also found that SBA's performance had fallen considerably short of the success that had been hoped for.

Subsequent to its hearings and report on the Small Business Administration,

the subcommittee held formal and informal hearings on related subjects within its jurisdiction. Those included the following:

First. Urban renewal projects and slum clearance.

Second. Problems of small business doing business with the Government.

Third. The exclusion of small business from the disposal of surplus products and the difficulties encountered by small business in participating in the stockpile program.

Fourth. The definition of small business.

Fifth. The subcommittee continued its activities in overseeing the operations and procedures of the Small Business Administration, the agency in the Government which was created by Congress to aid and assist small business.

Numerous complaints were received by the subcommittee that small business was being treated inequitably in the dislocation and upheaval caused by urban renewal and slum-clearance projects. The situation appeared to be prevalent throughout the country. It was because of the great number of complaints received that this problem was recognized as extremely serious and difficult and that small-business concerns were being treated inequitably in the dislocation caused by the urban renewal development projects.

The subcommittee held public hearings on May 3, 1956. The committee heard complaints from witnesses from Chicago, Ill., Baltimore, Md., Washington, D. C., and New York City. Testimony was also taken from officials of the various Government agencies involved and participating in the urban renewal and slum clearance projects. The subcommittee's report, House Report No. 2303, was filed with the Clerk of the House on June 11, 1956. This report confirmed the findings of the subcommittee in its report which was filed in the 1st session of the 84th Congress, House Report No. 1588, which was based upon public hearings held by the subcommittee on April 19, 1955. The witnesses who participated and testified at this hearing were officials of the Government agencies involved and small-business men affected by the dislocation caused by the urban renewal project. The subcommittee found that small business concerns who find themselves on a site which is being taken over for an urban renewal project are in double jeopardy, first, with the closing of their business, and second, the financial problem of the displacement of the small business concern in weathering the long period of transition, whether it be to a new place of business in a new area or a place of business in the old area when reconstruction has been completed. The report pointed out that the law, as then in effect, made no mention whatsoever of aid to small-business men and the subcommittee felt that this was a grave oversight.

The committee found that attention was given to families who lose their residences because of such dislocation and suggested that similar provisions should be enacted to safeguard the business segments of the community. Such aid should go beyond the clearinghouse provisions utilized to replace families in living quarters because moving a business entails a great deal more than the moving of a family. Costs are often higher and in some cases suitable markets are left and new markets are yet to be obtained. It was unanimously recommended by the subcommittee that the Federal Government should alleviate these problems wherever possible, both through direct financial aid and expert guidance.

The subcommittee therefore concluded that, first, direct financial grants be awarded to small business concerns dislocated by urban renewal developments; and, second, a new loan program be created to aid dislocated small business concerns in the relocation and reestablishment of their businesses. Pursuant to the conclusions and recommendations submitted by this committee, action was taken by the legislative committees of the Congress and it should be noted that the Housing Act, as amended by the 84th Congress, carries a provision for compensation to small business concerns dislocated by urban renewal and slum-clearance projects.

The Small Business Administration was directed by the Small Business Act of 1953 to establish and publish a definition for small business on an industry-by-industry basis. To date, no such definition has been established for procurement purposes by the Small Business Administration. It was not until July 1956 that a proposed definition for procurement purposes as prepared by an Interagency Task Force, created by the SBA, was submitted to this subcommittee for prior opinion and advice. Upon examination of the proposed definition, the subcommittee concluded that it was necessary to hold hearings on the proposed definition. Such hearings were held on July 5, 1956. The witnesses who appeared at these hearings were the Administrator and Deputy Administrator of SBA and the members of the Interagency Task Force. It is interesting to note however, that the Interagency Task Force was only created by the Small Business Administration subsequent to the issuance of House Report No. 1045 by this committee filed with the clerk of the House on July 1, 1955. The report found that the SBA had not acted expeditiously on a revised definition applicable to Government procurement. The Interagency Task Force was established only after this subcommittee indicated that the 500-employee rule was arbitrary and failed to follow the intent of Congress.

After 18 months the Interagency Task Force finally submitted the proposed definition and it then became apparent to the committee that the intent of Congress had again been thwarted. This new proposed definition again fails to follow the will of Congress in that it does not establish a definition on an industry-by-industry basis. It is evident that the 500-employee rule is not a sufficient definition, and Congress has time and again stated that the only definition which would be suitable is one which would be flexible and adaptable, and one that would be based on an industry-by-industry criterion.

A report is now being prepared by the subcommittee for submission to the House on the hearings on the definition of small business.

The subcommittee received a large number of complaints from small business concerns alleging that they were not being treated fairly and equitably in the awarding of contracts by the Government. Furthermore, such concerns were afraid to testify before the committee because of the fear of reprisal. However, the committee was able, through executive and private sessions with officials of such small business concerns, to ascertain the basis for their complaints. It also became quite apparent to the committee that unless it went to the small business concerns and gave them an opportunity to be heard, the small business concerns would not have an opportunity to voice their complaints to Congress. Therefore the subcommittee conducted a series of field investigations and hearings in Atlanta, Ga., and Jacksonville and Miami, Fla., in April 1956. The evidence adduced at these informal hearings established that small business is not receiving its fair share of Government procurement and is not being treated fairly and equitably in doing business with the Government.

The subcommittee found that the procurement practices of the Government in relation to small business concerns are unrealistic. The practice by the procurement agencies of utilizing change orders after the opening of bids and the awarding of contracts, specification requirements of crash programs, and the emergency deliveries on short-supply items or items stocked and warehoused only by big business and the delay of payment and the refusal of progress payments to small business, all worked to the detriment of small business.

The committee continued to watch and work for improvements in the operations and activities of the Small Business Administration. In this connection, the SBA sought out the opinion and advice of the subcommittee and the subcommittee gave informal advice and opinions to the SBA. In this connection, the Small Business Administration requested an opinion of the subcommittee as to the intent of Congress regarding certain amendments to the Small Business Act of 1953, as contained in Public Law 268 of the 84th Congress.

On September 14, 1955, a letter was directed to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration in which the subcommittee indicated what, in their opinion, was the intent of Congress in the enactment of Public Law 268. The chairman of the subcommittee stated that it was the intent of Congress to expand and strengthen the duties and responsibilities of SBA. The letter from the chairman of the subcommittee stated further that nothing in the new act can or should be otherwise construed. The SBA is authorized, first, to determine whether business concerns of a particular size in a given industry are in fact small business concerns, and such determination is binding on all

other Federal departments and agencies; second, to insure that a fair proportion of all Government contracts, including those for research and development, is awarded to small business; and, third, to participate in a joint determination program with procurement officers to insure that contracts go to small business in the interest of maintaining as well as mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity.

In the late summer of 1955, the New England area was devastated by floods incident to heavy rains causing extensive damage to small businesses in this area. The chairman of the subcommittee immediately toured the area to determine the extent of the damage, its effect upon the small business concerns located therein, and what help, if any, would be needed to assist these small business concerns. The chairman of the subcommittee conferred with State and local officials, as well as Members of Congress whose districts had been affected by this catastrophe. In September of 1955, because of the urgency and emergency created by the floods in the New England States and the request for disaster loans, based upon complaints received by the subcommittee, the chairman of the subcommittee directed a letter to the Administrator of SBA, dated September 29, 1955, in which it interpreted section 207 (b) (1) of the act which deals with disaster loans, specifically in connection with the requirement of collateral for such loans. And again in this same connection, the SBA requested aid and advice from the subcommittee on how to deal with the disaster loan program in view of the fact that it did not have sufficient funds to meet this dire emergency. On September 30, 1955, the chairman of the subcommittee directed a letter to the Administrator of SBA and gave its opinion and advice on this subject.

The committee received numerous complaints from small business concerns that they had been discriminated against and, because of the stringent regulations by the Government agencies, were unable to participate in the disposal of surplus products by the Commodity Credit Corporation, particularly in its barter program for the stockpile of strategic and nonstrategic items. Formal hearings were therefore held on July 11, 12, and 17, 1956, on this problem. Witnesses were heard from the various Government agencies and the small and large concerns involved in the barter program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, General Services Administration, and Office of Defense Mobilization.

The hearings have been adjourned subject to the call of the chair and the staff of the committee is presently studying the voluminous amount of material submitted at the hearings in preparation for further hearings on this most important subject.

On February 23, 1955, the chairman of this subcommittee in announcing the program of the subcommittee stated:

> The procedures and practices surrounding the Government's transactions with private firms are vastly complex. It was largely for this reason that the programs of the Small Business Administration were established. In instituting these programs, Congress created an agent to stay on the job constantly, to work continuously at finding ways to carry out our public policy on safeguarding small business in these procurement and disposal matters—

In order to build up the Nation's economic strength, the chairman of this subcommittee introduced an amendment to the highway bill which was adopted by the House and in commenting on this statement, the chairman of the subcommittee stated that the adoption of the amendment by the House is another clear indication of the clear intent of Congress to aid and assist small business, since small business is the backbone of the American economy and extremely vital to our competitive enterprise system.

C. Subcommittee No. 3, minerals and raw materials:

Subcommittee No. 3 is composed of the Honorable SIDNEY R. YATES, of Illinois, chairman, and the Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

As reported earlier, this subcommittee had undertaken an investigation and study of recurring shortages of certain raw materials. In that connection it was pointed out that a vast number of small businesses depend upon adequate production and ready availability of certain basic minerals and production materials, and that where recurring shortages of such minerals and materials are acute, small businesses cannot survive unless steps are taken to see that they get a fair share of whatever supplies are available.

Because complaints were received at the beginning of the 84th Congress from the non-integrated aluminum fabricators, that industry received the attention and consideration of this subcommittee. Hearings were undertaken in an effort to help alleviate the shortages. During the course of those hearings scores of witnesses testified and the record of their testimony covers 1,144 printed pages. The report on that investigation and study, consisting of 150 printed pages, was submitted to the House on July 26, 1956, as House Report No. 2954. It stated in its summary and recommendations that the most significant question in the aluminum industry today appears to be that, absent a reversal of present trends, whether the position of small business will fail to improve and expand in keeping with the growth of the industry as a whole. This is particularly true of the segment of the industry dependent upon a fluid supply of primary metal.

The committee found that in this highly concentrated industry with only three prime producers that the two competitors to Alcoa, Kaiser, and Reynolds, had made substantial amounts of primary aluminum available to the trade. However, both Kaiser and Reynolds have already instituted and financed expansion programs for new fabricating plants which will mean relatively less primary metal for sale on the open market.

The committee recommended that the Office of Defense Mobilization study the problem of the small nonintegrated aluminum fabricators to determine whether the suggestions and recommendations of the committee to establish a buying corporation of these nonintegrated fabricators pursuant to the Small Business Act of 1953, is proper and within the law, or whether additional legislation would be needed to enable such buying corporation to enter into buying contracts.

In addition, the subcommittee recommended that the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice undertake studies and investigations of the aluminum industry with respect to those factors which may hinder the growth of small business in the aluminum industry.

The committee pointed out that some of these factors are, first, the prices of aluminum pig, ingot, and billet and its effect upon smelters and foundries; second, the effect of scrap acquisitions by the primary producers upon smelters and foundries; third, the complaints of nonintegrated users that they are subjected to price squeezes by the primary producers of certain alloys; fourth, the extent to which metal made available to nonintegrated users is taken by large concerns and not small business; and fifth, the reasonableness of the price spread between aluminum pig, ingot, billet, and semifabricated products.

D. Subcommittee No. 4, aircraft industry:

Subcommittee No. 4 is composed of the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, chairman, and the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, and the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.

This subcommittee held public hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., on May 21 and 22, 1956, and in Washington, D. C., on June 27, 28, and 29, 1956, on the problems of small business in the aircraft industry. The hearings included testimony from 15 witnesses and cover 350 printed pages. These hearings were necessitated because of the numerous complaints received by the subcommittee that small business was not receiving its fair and equitable share of contracts in the aircraft industry. The committee pointed out that with the defense budget of close to $34 billion, the impact on the economy of such tremendous defense procurement necessitated a guarantee to small business that it would receive its fair share. Unless this tremendous expenditure by the Defense Department is permitted to enter into the small-business community it will endanger the free-enterprise economy of our country.

The committee in its study established that the aircraft industry is the largest employing industry in the country. It employs 797,000 men and women directly and hundreds of thousands more indirectly, in the form of subcontractors and suppliers. Such an impact of employment and dollars spent in the aircraft industry necessitated the examination of the problems in the aircraft industry to determine whether the policy of Congress to aid small business is being complied with.

The committee, upon conclusion of its hearings, determined that this important segment of small business must continue to have the careful scrutiny and examination of the Small Business Com-

mittee to insure that a fair share of Government contracts in the aircraft industry is placed with small business.

E. Subcommittee No. 5, distribution problems:

This subcommittee is composed of the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, chairman, and the Honorable TOM STEED, of Oklahoma, and the Honorable TIMOTHY P. SHEEHAN, of Illinois.

The title of this subcommittee indicated the broad sweep of its jurisdiction and foretold to some extent that the problems it would tackle would make it one of the most active investigating units of the 84th Congress. Indeed it has become one of the most active investigating subcommittees in the history of the Congress. It has held public hearings in many States covering a period of many days. It has heard a total of 152 witnesses, whose testimony covers more than 1,800 printed pages. There have been submitted to the House of Representatives two reports dealing with the activities of this subcommittee:

First. House Report No. 1423: This report dealt with the subcommittee's investigation and hearings on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices of the major oil-company suppliers. That report summarized the record of testimony to the effect that major oil companies were coercing their lessee dealers into handling a full line of products sold by the lessor oil companies to the exclusion of competing products. The report also dealt with the testimony of witnesses to the effect that the major oil companies were engaging in the practice of price discrimination destructive of small-business enterprises.

Second. House Report No. 2895: This report summarized testimony which had been received by the subcommittee regarding problems faced by small-business concerns due to air pollution.

The subcommittee also studied the antitrust consent decree in the A. T. & T. case, and the record of its hearings on that matter is said to reflect a failure on the part of the Department of Justice to protect adequately small-business concerns in its agreement with the A. T. & T. in the settlement of that case.

The subcommittee studied the problems involved in a consent decree for settling the antitrust case against the United Fruit Co. A number of complaints had been received from importers and other traders, who had been handling bananas and who feared that the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice would settle the case through an agreement with the United Fruit Co. which would not protect adequately the interest of small business. Before the hearings on that matter were concluded the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice announced that it did not appear that the United Fruit case would be settled by an agreement, although he admitted, before this subcommittee had undertaken hearings, that representatives of the Department of Justice and the United Fruit Co. had held conferences in an effort to reach a disposition of the case.

Foreign Aid Bill Is Not the Same as Defense Bill in Spite of CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 the Members of the House of Representatives debated and voted on the mutual security appropriations bill of 1957, commonly referred to as the foreign aid bill. I joined 119 of my colleagues in voting against the bill, because I am convinced the spending of the taxpayer's money in this way is neither as effective, efficient, or economical as is consistent with sound government and our national interest. While I am sure that the majority of my constituents agree with me in my opposition to this present foreign aid bill, I recognize that there are some, perhaps significant numbers, in my district who still favor foreign aid. I have no quarrel with their position or their right to hold to that position, but I can no longer cast my one congressional vote in favor of the continuation of the present scheme for large-scale foreign assistance.

Misrepresentation of facts is, however, another question entirely. The Indiana CIO Council publishes, from time to time, a bulletin known as the CIO Fact Sheet which is mailed as matter from a nonprofit organization at Evansville. The CIO Fact Sheet is apparently edited by the CIO Council on Education and Research and sent to CIO members throughout the State. The pamphlet has an attractive format, is usually printed in two colors, and presents quite effectively the propaganda prescribed by the CIO leaders for consumption by the rank and file.

In spite of the name CIO Fact Sheet, this publication has been known to print and to reprint material which is not exactly factual—in fact, material which is distorted, twisted, and sometimes bluntly untrue. On one recent occasion I called to the attention of the editor of this Fact Sheet one definite misstatement of fact in an article quoted from the New York Post. The editors of the New York Post admitted the error, but I have never heard from the editors of the CIO Fact Sheet nor seen a correction of the erroneous statistics to which I called their attention. Evidently, the CIO Council on Education and Research believes that labeling an untruth as a fact settles the matter for all time—truth, proof, and right to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand volume 5, No. 14, of the CIO Fact Sheet for Tuesday, July 17, 1956. On page 5 of this issue, right at the top of the page, there is a very short article entitled "From the 'Hoss's Mouth'." So that this gem of misstatement may be shared by all present here today and by all who read the RECORD, under unanimous consent I ask, after I read this short item, that it may be included in the RECORD exactly as I have read it. I hope the Government Printing Office will preserve, if at all possible, the underlining, liberal use of punctuation marks and the underlining of the original so that this extract will appear exactly as it is in the copy which I read from today:

FROM THE "HOSS'S MOUTH"

On July 11, during the debate in the House on Ike's defense bill, Indiana Republican Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK was fighting hard to save Ike's defense program from being torn to shreds by his own Republican colleagues in Congress.

In the course of the debate, Mr. HALLECK said that all those who voted against funds to provide defense against Communist Russia would be "friends" of the Reds. Now, let's see who from our Indiana Congressmen are "friends of the Reds."

"Friends of the Reds": 3d District, CRUMPACKER, Republican; 4th District, ADAIR, Republican; 5th District, BEAMER, Republican; 7th District, BRAY, Republican; 9th District, WILSON, Republican; 10th District, HARVEY, Republican; 11th District, BROWNSON, Republican.

"Friends of Uncle Sam": 1st District, MADDEN, Democrat (paired for); 2d District, HALLECK, Republican; 6th District, HARDEN, Republican; 8th District, DENTON, Democrat.

He (HALLECK) remarked further, that the debate on the bill was a "spectacle" and called "shame on you for your conduct here today." We think Congressman HALLECK, after being around for a long time, should know whereof he speaks. Thanks, CHARLIE, for enlightening us on your colleagues; we sort of suspected it all along.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the editorial staff of the CIO Fact Sheet have a perfect right to operate as a propaganda arm of the Democratic State committee, if that is their desire. My only contention is that they do have an obligation to present as facts material which is factually correct. May I, line by line, point out the absolute errors in fact contained in just these short paragraphs.

CIO ERROR NO. 1 AND CORRECTION

On July 11 the debate in the House concerned the mutual security appropriations bill for 1957, not "Ike's defense bill." Page 11180 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House, gives to the debate this exact title I have just mentioned. The major appropriation bill for the Department of Defense for 1957 which would be "Ike's defense bill" was H. R. 10986. This bill was voted on in the House on May 10, 1956, and passed 377 to 0 with only 1 vote of present. In other words, the CIO is discussing what is commonly known as the foreign aid bill. Could it be that because the CIO knows that foreign aid is an unpopular subject among many of its own members in Indiana, it deliberately chose to list this debate under the title of "Ike's defense bill" to create the impression that it authorized funds for our own Army, Navy, and Air Force?

It does not. In fact, of the $5.7 billion originally requested in this bill, H. R. 12130, only $3.1 billion was for military assistance to our allies and so-called allies. One billion one hundred million dollars was for defense support or installations somewhat connected with military assistance. One hundred and

fifty-seven million dollars was for nonmilitary technical cooperation or point 4 aid. Other programs accounted for $401 million. It is significant that, in a Democrat-controlled Congress, a committee with a Democrat chairman and a majority of members from the Democrat Party cut the administration's request of $3 billion for military assistance by $1.2 billion for a total of $1.7 billion recommended for 1957. It is also significant that the actual defense bill did not receive one vote of opposition—of course not, you would never find 120 Members of the House voting to leave this Nation without arms as the CIO infers we did.

CIO ERROR NO. 2 AND CORRECTION

The CIO Fact Sheet goes on:

On July 11, during the debate in the House on Ike's defense bill, Indiana Republican Congressman CHARLES A. HALLECK was fighting hard to save Ike's defense program from being torn to shreds by his own Republican colleagues in Congress.

This just is not true. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana spoke twice on July 11. His remarks were not directed primarily at his own colleagues, but rather represented an attempt to restore $550 million, cut in the Democrat-controlled committee which brought the appropriation level that much below the total authorized for foreign aid, or mutual security for 1957.

The speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is printed on page 11205 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 11. It is in the form of an exchange of remarks between Mr. HALLECK and the gentleman from New York, the Democratic chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. ROONEY]. A little earlier in the debate, as recorded on page 11203, Mr. ROONEY interjected in his discussion of the history of mutual defense a dispatch which he said he had just read on the AP wire that morning.

I am for Eisenhower—

Said Malik.

The people of Europe know him. They like him and trust him. We can do business with President Eisenhower.

Mr. HALLECK'S speech was in answer to Mr. ROONEY. His attack is directed toward Mr. ROONEY'S reading of the AP dispatch in connection with the debate on the mutual-security bill and against the action of the Democratic controlled Appropriations Committee in drastically cutting below the total amount authorized. The exact interchange follows, taken from page 11205 of the RECORD:

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], for whom I have the highest regard, read something that he said was on the teletype. I do not know whether it was or not. But what he read was the Soviet Ambassador Jacob Malik said, "I am for Eisenhower." He said, and I refer to Ambassador Malik, "the people of Europe know him; they like him and trust him. We can do business with President Eisenhower."

Now, I do not know for sure just what the gentleman's purpose was in reading that, but I would like to remind some of my friends on the right that a few days ago the policy committee of my party in the other body issued a staff report, and they said in that statement, "that some convicted Communist in this country wanted the Democratic Party to win." I never heard such an outcry in my life from the people of your party as a result. Why, you said, that is associating us with communism, you are accusing us of being soft on communism, and we resent it.

I want to say to all of you and to the gentleman from New York, again may I say I respect and admire him, to use whatever Malik said for what seemed to be an obvious purpose hits something of new low, and I think the people of this country will resent it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman understand that I merely read verbatim what appeared in the Speaker's lobby as an AP dispatch? And I should like to inquire what interpretation does the gentleman place on Mr. Malik's remarks, assuming they are correct?

Mr. HALLECK. I would not know what interpretation to put on his remarks, but the very fact that the gentleman saw fit to bring that press report in here and read it, in my opinion, is susceptible to but one interpretation, because the gentleman speaks too well and too brilliantly to be up here for exercise only.

There is another thing I would like to point out to my friends on the right. As far as action her today is concerned and the action yesterday, in the Appropriations Committee as it has now been disclosed, who would be the friend of the Russians? Would it be the people who voted to provide the requested military assistance to develop our offshore strength to counter the threat of the Russians or the Communists, or do you find the people who oppose it in the corner with the Russians and their threat to us?

Mr. HALLECK is fighting hard, that much is true. He is fighting hard against the same Democrats on the Appropriations Committee who slashed the mutual-security program the day before and who are now debating the issue by dragging in partisan innuendo. From the viewpoint of those who favor foreign aid, the program has been torn to shreds already by the Democratic-controlled committee. The context of the speech clearly identifies the CIO Fact Sheet error.

CIO ERRER NO. 3 AND CORRECTION

The Fact Sheet continues:

In the course of the debate, Mr. HALLECK said that all those who voted against funds to provide defense against Communist Russia would be "friends" of the Reds. Now let's see who from our Indiana Congressmen are "friends of the Reds."

Mr. HALLECK just did not say this, at all. It is a paraphrase by the CIO editors for specific and rather tawdry political purposes. What Mr. HALLECK did say is clearly stated in my exact quotation from page 11205. He answered Mr. ROONEY'S accusation based on Malik's remarks by pointing out that his friends on the right, the Democrats sit to the Speaker's right in the halls of the United States House of Representatives were in no position to throw the Malik statement in the Republicans' faces since the Russians undoubtedly would like the cuts made by the Democrats the day before in committee. Evidently, the CIO is so used to considering the "right" as identical in meaning to the GOP that the editors forgot the term can also indicate a simple spatial relationship.

CIO ERROR NO. 4 AND CORRECTION

The Fact Sheet continues:

He [HALLECK] remarked further that the debate on the bill was a "spectacle" and called "shame on your for your conduct here today." We think Congressman HALLECK, afer being around for a long time, should know whereof he speaks. Thanks, CHARLIE, for enlightening us on your colleagues; we sort of suspected it all long.

Let us look at the RECORD. Mr. HALLECK never made the quotation attributed to him. What he did say is clearly printed in the paragraph of his remarks on page 11205 which follows the previous quotation I made from the RECORD. May I read it to the Members? Please note that the term "friends on the right" is again used to identify the Democrats, as represented by their spokesman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]:

I deeply regret that this matter has taken such a turn. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] was correct when he pointed out this sort of legislation should not be the subject of politics. But I would like to remind my friends on the right that when we look in the RECORD to see what happened in the past, we find that I was majority leader of a Republican 80th Congress. The President was of your party and his name was Harry S. Truman. Communist aggression and infiltration threatened the world. I could make quite a speech, as I did when the Marshall plan was here on the floor, as to why something had to be done at that time. But may I say, as I said then, mistakes of the past many times must be forgotten and what we must do is to provide for the present. Your President asked the Republican 80th Congress to provide interim aid to France and Italy and to give aid to Greece and Turkey. Why? To meet Communist aggression. Yes, and he asked us for the Marshall plan.

I would like to remind you that it was the Republican 80th Congress, under Republican leadership acting out in front, that responded to the request of your President to meet the Communist threat. In the light of such history, it seems to me your conduct here today comes with poor grace, to say the least.

That is the story of four mistakes in fact in the CIO Fact Sheet. To answer the vicious insinuation that seven Republican Congressmen who did not happen to vote as the CIO wanted are "Friends of the Reds" is beneath the note of an elected official. It is interesting to see the depths of smear, innuendo, and emotionalism the vaunted protectors of civil liberties sing to when they think it will help the Democrats toward victory. It makes some of the CIO's protestations over the loyalty program, their professed indignation over the speeches of the Vice President and the aroused criticism of the actions of congressional committees sound a little hypocritical. Apparently, freedom from abuse is to be extended only to Democrats or those with 100 percent pro-CIO voting records. Friendly cooperation with local unions and local labor officials apparently does not count for much when the top level labor politicians move in just before election time.

A Graduated Corporate Income Tax Would Prevent the Growth of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most challenging problems facing the country today is how small business can best be strengthened. Small business is the backbone of our economy. Its continued vitality is essential to our economic health. The fact that this Congress has done so little in this regard is a matter for widespread concern.

Most discussions of the small-business problem center around proposals for tax relief of various kinds. Actually, the difficulties confronting the small-business man arise from many different sources, and the tax structure is not solely responsible. The difficulty of obtaining new capital, advertising costs, the high price of labor—all of these and many other contribute to the small-business problem.

However, I certainly recognize that tax policy plays an important role in this area. Indeed, in 1954, the Republican 83d Congress enacted a number of new tax provisions which had long been recommended as particularly desirable from the standpoint of small business. Depreciation allowances were substantially liberalized for purchases of new plant and equipment. Greater freedom of action was granted to small companies to retain their earnings for their own business purposes without penalty. More realistic accounting provisions were adopted. These are but a few of the tax benefits provided by the Republican 83d Congress for small business. Again, I say that it is unfortunate that the Democratic 84th Congress has not compiled a similar record of accomplishment. True, Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk here and shaking of heads about the plight of small business. However, these protestations of sympathy have been singularly unaccompanied by any constructive action.

One of the plans which has been advanced in this Congress for the alleged relief of small business consists of a graduated corporation income tax. Such a proposal, if enacted, would pronounce a death sentence to the American free-enterprise system. Normally, Mr. Speaker, it would not even be necessary to dignify such an unsound scheme by serious consideration. However, there is no question but that it has a certain superficial appeal to certain businessman, and for this reason, I believe it to be essential that the proposal be examined with the utmost care. A failure to understand its implications could lead to tragic results.

The present corporation income tax is made up of two parts. A so-called normal tax of 30 percent applies to all of a corporation's taxable income. In addition, a so-called surtax of 22 percent applies to that portion of a corporation's taxable income which is in excess of $25,000. In effect, therefore, there is a surtax exemption amounting to $25,000. Such an exemption has been contained in the law for many years as a special provision for small business. On the other hand, while a system of graduated or progressive corporation income-tax rates has been suggested from time to time, it has always been rejected by responsible individuals as completely unsound. Such a system has never been considered seriously by any of the tax committees of the Congress.

In order to appreciate the basic fallacy of this proposal, it is necessary to understand that the corporate tax burden is borne primarily by the individual stockholders who own and in fact constitute the particular corporation. As a result, in determining the taxpaying ability of a given business entity, it is essential that one look beyond the mere amount of its income. It is necessary to determine also the number of its stockholders or other owners and the amount of their individual investments. Suppose that one corporation has an income of $100,000 and has 10 owners, each having invested one-tenth of the capital of the business. Now, take the example of another corporation with only $10,000 of income but, by the same token, with only one owner. Under the theory of a graduated corporation income tax, each of the owners of the first corporation would be called upon to bear a substantially higher burden of taxation with regard to his share of the corporate income than would the single owner of the second corporation, even though the actual dollar amounts of their proportionate shares of the income are identical.

Let us look at it in another way. Let us take the case of two elderly individuals, each of whom has managed to save $10,000. One of these individuals invests his $10,000 in a large corporation, and the second invests his $10,000 in a smaller corporation. Under a graduated corporation income tax, the first individual would bear a proportionately heavier tax burden than would the second. I challenge any one to show me any justification, either in logic or in equity, for such a discriminatory tax system.

One of the unfortunate aspects of this proposal is that it is apt to have a superficial appeal to some small-business men. I can only say, in this regard, that their acceptance of such a fallacious and dangerous doctrine would be very shortsighted at best. The benefits of a graduated tax would prove completely illusory.

Every small-business man is ambitious to expand his business. That is as it should be. It is that very competitive urge which has made our free-enterprise system great and which has brought to the American people an abundance of goods and a way of life which are the envy of the world. However, adoption of a graduated corporation tax system would spell the doom of that system and its benefits.

Look at what would happen under such a system. The enterprising small-business man who develops a new product and thereby increases his earnings will immediately be penalized by a higher rate of tax. Should he develop more efficient methods of production or marketing, he would immediately pay the price in higher tax rates. If he expands his capacity through better machinery or by larger plant facilities, he will be punished for his enterprise by higher tax rates.

Therefore, small-business men who support a graduated corporate income tax are in reality digging their own graves. They seek tax relief, and properly so, in order to permit their businesses to grow and expand. What they forget is this—under a graduated tax system, the moment that their companies do in fact grow bigger, they will be slapped down by a higher rate of tax. In other words, the scheme contains a "built-in" mechanism designed to prevent the growth of small business. As a result, it is in reality an anti-small-business proposal. Advanced as a panacea for the ills of small business, the proposal has sinister implications for the entire economic system. It is the very antithesis of all that has made American enterprise strong and vigorous. Mr. Speaker, when Karl Marx declared that the graduated income tax could be relied upon to destroy the capitalistic system, he must have had a plan very similar to this in mind.

I am convinced that we can develop a constructive tax policy designed to strengthen small business and to foster its growth. On May 31, 1956, President Eisenhower appointed a Cabinet Committee on Small Business. I am confident that this Committee will be instrumental in developing a vigorous, forward-looking program. I am likewise confident that this Republican program will be designed to encourage the growth of small business and not to stifle and paralyze small business as would proposals such as that for a graduated corporation income tax.

Mr. Speaker, I am including at this point a copy of President Eisenhower's letter of May 31, 1956, to Chairman Arthur Burns, establishing the Cabinet Committee on Small Business:

MAY 31, 1956.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The important contributions made by small business concerns to the progressive spirit and vitality of the American economy have repeatedly been stressed in my economic reports to the Congress and on various other occasions. Such enterprises, of which there are some 4 million currently in operation, serve continuously as a dynamic influence in our enterprise system. It is often through them that new products and new processes are first brought into use. Equally important, it is in small concerns that many men and women find an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to serve constructively in the business world. For these and related reasons, Government policies that make it easier for new businesses to be established and that foster the growth of small concerns enhance the welfare of the whole economy.

The Federal Government has a number of programs now in operation that are significantly helpful to small business.

The Department of Commerce helps constantly in the solution of management problems for small business through its Office of Technical Services, Office of Area Develop-

ment, Business and Defense Services Administration, and Office of Business Economics.

Financial assistance is available to small concerns through the Small Business Administration.

Jointly with the Department of Defense and with other Federal departments and agencies, the Small Business Administration assists small concerns in obtaining Government procurement contracts.

Many small construction companies and related businesses benefit from the home-financing programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The Office of Defense Mobilization seeks to strengthen the production potential of small firms in our defense programs.

Through its enforcement of antitrust laws, the Department of Justice helps maintain the competitive environment that is essential to the Nation's economic welfare.

These and other programs and policies of the Federal Government facilitate the establishment of new concerns and foster the growth of small businesses. Yet the conditions of our modern economy are such that many small concerns confront substantial hindrances to their growth. It is my wish that the Federal Government keep fully abreast of developments that affect small businesses. Its programs and policies aimed at assisting small businesses should be carefully reviewed at this time with the object of strengthening them where necessary, and of making recommendations for steps that will provide such enterprises with additional constructive assistance.

To this end I am establishing a Cabinet Committee on Small Business of which I would like you to serve as chairman. By copies of this letter I am designating the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce, Labor, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency as members. Other department and agency heads will participate on an ad hoc basis as may be deemed desirable. The committee is to have the continuing assignment of making specific recommendations to me for administrative actions, and where necessary for additional legislation, to strengthen the economic position of small businesses and to foster their sound development.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

William Rowland Hopkins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a great Clevelander and true American, William Rowland Hopkins, recently celebrated his 87th birthday.

During these past 87 years, Mr. Hopkins has distinguished himself with a peerless record of unselfish devotion to the life and progress of our community and Nation, and he has been an inspiration to all with his friendly, intelligent approach to each of the many problems which have confronted him in the course of his outstanding service to mankind.

The life and philosophy of William Rowland Hopkins might well be a criterion for those others of us who have devoted ourselves to public life and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article from the July 25 Cleveland Plain Dealer which highlights his brilliant career.

The article follows:

HOPKINS, 87, LETS MEMORY OF CITY PLAY

(By J. C. Daschbach)

"For generations the trouble with politics has been that politicians live by exchanging favors regardless of the effect on the public."

That was the verdict of William Rowland Hopkins, Cleveland's first city manager, as he sat in his room in the Cleveland Athletic Club yesterday contemplating the approach of his 87th birthday anniversary tomorrow. He was city manager from January 7, 1924, to January 13, 1930.

Hopkins reviewed his personal interest in politics, which ran back to his days at Western Reserve University. There he received his bachelor of arts degree in 1896 and his bachelor of law degree in 1899. His first public office was as a member of the Cleveland Council, to which he was elected in 1897.

"I never have believed in running for office in the usual sense," he summed up. "If a man understands something that is really important and thinks he can carry it out, he should go out and explain that project and how it can be carried out. If the voters want him in office, they can elect him to carry out that project.

"But the trouble with politics is that politicians live by exchanging favors. They demand compensation from those whom they have helped to elect. The seat of all corruption in politics is the exchange of favor for favor regardless of the effect upon the public.

"It has been that way for generations. It is that way now. It will continue to be that way."

Hopkins gave great credit to immigrants from other lands and their immediate descendants for their keen interest in politics.

"These first immigrants," he said, "were brought from other countries to a land whose language they did not understand, whose customs they did not understand, and whose industry they did not understand.

"These people always have taken an interest in politics. They always vote in large numbers. For instance, 87 percent of our Polish population vote. All of these groups have taken a lot of trouble to find out how they should vote to have a proper government, and they have voted accordingly."

When Hopkins was brought to Cleveland by his parents in 1874, he said, the Scotch had come to handle the technical problems of the growing iron industry. The Welsh came, he said, to operate the mills, and the Irish to wrok as laborers in the mills.

"Now we have them from all the countries of the world," he added.

TROLLEYS, WRU TOPIC

Hopkins said his own interest in public affairs started when a professor of English at Western Reserve University proposed to his class the argument of how to operate the street railways of Cleveland.

The Ohio Legislature, Hopkins said, had just passed a law allowing cities to give companies franchises for 50 years with the provision that the fare be 5 cents for the 50 years.

"When I went to the operators of the railway company," he said, "I was amazed at their insulting attitude. They told me it was none of my business how they ran their company. They said it was their property and it was not the business of outsiders how they ran it."

Later he obtained full information, Hopkins said, from "a fellow Welshman, Windham C. Jones, who had just completed the Cleveland Eastern Interurban to Gates Mills."

WORKED WAY AS STUDENT

Hopkins, who had to leave school at 11, had earned his own way by working in the mills and other jobs as he went through Western Reserve Academy, then the unicersity. There also had been a 6-month course in economics at the Univcrsity of Chicago.

The idea of becoming a teacher of economics was given up, Hopkins said, when another professor advised him to take up law.

Later Hopkins was one of the developers of the Belt Line Railroad, now owned by the New York Central System. He is now president of the Belt & Terminal Realty Co., with offices in the Society for Savings Building. The company, he said, is engaged in disposing of industrial properties obtained in the development of the Belt Line Railroad, which circles the city and provides shifting of trains from one line to another.

Hopkins said the protective tariff act of 1843 had a direct bearing on his family coming to Cleveland. His grandfather, John Hopkins, brought his family to the United States in 1843.

TARIFF ACTS BENEFIT

"Up to the passage of the tariff act," Hopkins said, "the British had killed off iron making and mining in this country. They undersold our companies, and the result was the sheriff moving in."

John Hopkins worked in the coal mines around Johnstown, Pa. Later he moved to Pittsburgh to work in the iron mill that has developed into the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.

William R. Hopkins' father, David J. Hopkins, first worked in the mines at Johnstown, then in the mills in Pittsburgh. Next the family moved to Alliance, Ohio., where there was a new mill, and then on to Cleveland.

The birthday observance will be a quiet affair with a family party at the home of a nephew, David J. Hopkins, 3121 Fairmount Boulevard, Cleveland Heights. Originally there were eight brothers. Now there are only two. Martin L Hopkins, the other survivor, will be at the party with nephews and nieces.

Nonmilitary Operations of NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from documentary material assembled by me to indicate the extent of the nonmilitary operations of NATO.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATO POLITICAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

This Congress remains the legislative branch of our National Government until the 31st of December. For every hour of that time we are responsible for our country.

I call your attention to the fact that significant developments are likely to take place, in foreign affairs, in this period, when our attention is centered on the national election.

Important developments are already taking place in NATO.

We have recently heard many references to plans for expanding the political, economic, and cultural activities of NATO.

This is curious, because NATO has, from its inception, been given political, economic, and cultural responsibilities, and has been developing the governmental organs needed to put them into effect.

The following quotations are meant to assemble in one place some of the basic documentary material which many people have been asking me to send them in connection with the following problems:

1. Implementation of article 2 of the treaty, giving NATO political, economic, and cultural powers and responsibilities.

2. Relation of NATO with the U. S. S. R.

3. The propaganda program for support of this transformation.

I hope every member of this body will follow with the closest attention every bit of the limited information we are allowed to see, on the growth of this new star in the galaxy of international organizations, operating above, and in restraint of, our constitutional government.

SOURCES

The principal sources of information on developments of NATO policy and governmental machinery are:

1. NATO. The First 5 Years, 1949–54, by Lord Ismay, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Paris, France, 1954.

2. NATO letter. North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Information Division, Paris 16. Monthly. Available from the United States Department of State.

3. Reports of the United States Department of State and the International Cooperation Administration.

Recommendations of the NATO Council to the member governments, dealing with military affairs and other matters, are classified, and therefore not available to Congress, the press, or the public.

MILITARY ACTIVITIES

The military accomplishments of NATO have been fully discussed elsewhere.

We may note, as evidence of the trend, first the loss of the northern anchor of NATO, when the Icelandic Parliament asked the United States to withdraw its troops from NATO's military bases but to continue paying for them. Second, we may note the weakening of the southeastern anchor, with the split between Greece and Turkey over Cyprus, the rapprochement of Yugoslavia with the Soviet Union, and the neutralization of the Austrian spearhead between Germany and Italy. Third, we may list the series of delays in the rearming of West Germany.

I quote from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of July 22, 1956, the following question and the answer by Henry Wales, Paris bureau chief, during the Tribune roundtable conference in London:

"Question. What does France think about NATO and SHAPE?

"Answer. I don't think any Europeans except such individuals as have soft jobs in NATO and SHAPE (Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe) take them seriously. At SHAPE's recent fifth birthday celebration about 400 generals and colonels watched a parade of 84 soldiers of the 15 nations which are members, with a half a dozen French gendarmes pinch hitting for Iceland, which has no army."

The political, economic, and cultural activities of NATO have always been important, but they grow increasingly important as military activities dwindle.

Congressman STEWART L. UDALL, of Arizona, who was 1 of 6 House Members at the NATO Parliamentary Conference last summer, said, "As a peacetime military economic alliance, NATO is without a precedent in history" (House Committee on Foreign Affairs, hearings on Bow resolution of repeal of Status of Forces Treaty, 1956, p. 499).

CIVIL POWERS IN THE NATO TREATY

Article 2 of the NATO Treaty reads as follows:

"The parties shall contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being.

"They seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

The first clause, "strengthening their free institutions," gives NATO political powers. The third, "promoting conditions of stability and well-being," gives them duties in the field of social welfare. The clause about economic collaboration gives them economic responsibilities. The phrase about "eliminating conflict" in economic policies establishes the goal of a directed, rather than a free and competitive economy.

The phrase "bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded" is a mandate for NATO to engage in propaganda activities.

This statement of objectives was ratified by the United States and other parties, as indicated in article 11, which says the treaty shall be ratified by the parties "in accordance with their respective constitutional processes." This section refers to the method of ratification only, and does not imply that the constitutional system of any of the parties is unchanged by ratification.

This treaty was signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

NATO AREA

The NATO area is defined in article 6 of the treaty in connection with the area involved in event of armed attack.

The NATO area includes—

"The territory of any of the parties in Europe or North America.

"The Algerian departments of France.

"The occupation forces of any party in Europe.

"The islands under the jurisdiction of any party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

"The vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the parties."

NATO civil activities thus may apply to all of the United States, including Alaska, Western Europe, French North Africa, the territory of Turkey in Asia, and possibly to wider areas.

DEVELOPMENTS, 1949–55

We can follow the general development of NATO's political, economic, and cultural activities from documents published by the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration.

I quote from a pamphlet, NATO—Its Development and Significance, published by the ICA, in September 1955:

"While first priority has been given to the strength of their military defenses, the NATO countries are giving atttention to cooperation for building and maintaining their collective political, economic, and moral strength" (p. 8).

"Since the economic capabilities of all the NATO countries, including the United States are limited, NATO is constantly concerned with the problem of balancing political and economic needs against defense needs. The NATO agencies must offer whatever advice and assistance they can contribute to the solution of the difficult economic problems produced by the defense program and must make sure that defense plans themselves remain within the bounds of realism (p. 11).

All NATO governments have accepted the principle stressed by Secretary of State Dulles that NATO planning should not be based on short-term, emergency measures but should instead be adapted to the long-haul. In other words, NATO is seeking types and levels of military power that can be maintained over a long period of years without intolerable political or economic risks. The NATO countries each year conduct an annual review in which the defense plans and economic capabilities of all member countries are jointly studied by member governments for the purpose of keeping NATO's total defense program balanced and realistic.

"While NATO has given top priority to defense problems, it offers many opportunities for useful cooperation in other fields. Article 2 of the treaty explicity calls for cooperation in political, economic, and similar matters and the NATO organization structure affords readymade channels for the practical development of such cooperation" (p. 11).

"The Council is assisted by a number of committees that work on specialized problems. Some of these committees are formed to do one particular job and are temporary. In addition there are about 20 permanent civilian committees, which deal with such matters as defense production, labor mobility, civil and military budgets, war-time commodity problems, civil defense, plans for mobilizing ocean shipping and inland surface transport and information and cultural relations" (p. 16).

"Equally significant is the development of NATO's civil structure which not only guides and supports the military program but also provides a channel for cooperation in other fields of activity. Particularly important has been the growth of the practice of regular political consultation within NATO, which helps all member governments to understand one another's special problems and interests and to harmonize their global policies. There has also been useful cooperation on information, economic and cultural matters, emergency planning, labor problems and other non-military activities" (p. 23).

1949—WASHINGTON

We can trace these developments year by year, from communiques and resolutions issued by the North Atlantic Council.

The first session of the council took place in Washington on the 17th of September 1949.

Lord Ismay says:

"At this first session the Council recognized that comprehensive questions of military production and supply, and of economic and financial factors, would have to be studied. At their second session held in Washington on the 18th of November 1949, it was decided to set up two new agencies, namely; a Defense Financial and Economic Committee, and a Military Production and Supply Board.

"The Defense Financial and Economic Committee was to be composed generally of Finance Ministers and to report direct to the Council. It was to have, in particular, the following tasks:

"1. to develop, in coordination with the Military Committee (including the Standing Group) and the Military Production and Supply Board, overall financial and economic guides to, and limits of, future defense programs which North Atlantic Treaty countries as a group and individually should undertake within available financial and economic resources.

"2. to appraise the financial and economic impact on member countries of major individual defense projects formulated by the Military Production and Supply Board or the Military Committee (including the Standing Group); to consider also the availability of raw materials, capital equipment and manpower; and to make recommendations as to action on such projects.

"3. to recommend financial arrangements for executing military defense plans, and particularly financial arrangements for the interchange among North Atlantic Treaty countries of military equipment, surplus stocks, or materials and equipment to be used in producing military equipment.

"4. to measure and to recommend steps to meet the foreign exchange costs of imports of materials and equipment from nonmember countries required by defense programs under the North Atlantic Treaty.

"5. to consider, as may be found desirable and appropriate, plans for the mobilization of economic and financial resources in time of emergency" (Ismay, pp. 25–27).

1950—LONDON

Specific implementation of article 2 was made by formal resolution at the fourth session of the London Conference of the North Atlantic Council, May 15–18, 1950.

The resolution was needed because a year's experience had shown that there was "insufficient exchange of views" on the political side.

The resolution read:

"In view of this situation, the Council will in particular undertake the following tasks:

"(a) Study the inter-relationship of the various programs to support the plans for the defense of the North Atlantic area and ensure coordination of the work of the Defense Committee, and all other bodies established under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

"(b) Recommend to governments the steps necessary to insure that effect is given to the coordinated plans prepared for the defense of the North Atlantic area;

"(c) Exchange views on political matters of common interest within the scope of the treaty;

"(d) Promote and coordinate public information in furtherance of the objectives of the treaty while leaving responsibility for national programs to each country;

"(e) Consider what further action should be taken under article 2 of the treaty, taking into account the work of existing agencies in this field" (Ismay, p. 184).

1951—OTTAWA

The North Atlantic Council said in a formal declaration, at its meeting at Ottawa, September 20, 1951:

"The peoples of the North Atlantic Community are united under the * * * treaty to preserve their freedom and to develop their common heritage of democracy, liberty, and the rule of law * * *

"They will continue to work closely together to consolidate the North Atlantic Community. All obstacles which hinder such cooperation on an equal footing should be removed * * *

"The strengthening of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the past 2 years has developed in the minds of the peoples a strong sense of their common interests and ideals. There is a desire within the North Atlantic Community to meet specific needs in all fields where close collaboration will advance the welfare of the community. * * *

"A clear sense of the direction in which the community is developing should make it easier to take practical steps toward that end.

"The Council has therefore decided to set up a Ministerial Committee composed of representatives from Belgium, Canada, Italy, Netherlands, and Norway, to consider the further strengthening of the North Atlantic community and especially the implementation of article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

"The Committee, assisted by the Council Deputies, will, in particular consider and make recommendations to the Council on the following matters:

"(a) Coordination and frequent consultation on foreign policy, having particular regard to steps designed to promote peace;

"(b) Closer economic, financial and social cooperation, designed to promote conditions of economic stability and well-being, both during and after the present period of the defense effort, within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or through other agencies;

"(c) Collaboration in the fields of culture and public information.

"In these and other ways the Council will build up the inner strength of the North Atlantic community, without implicating the work of other international organizations which promote the same objectives.

"The Council endorses the recent declaration of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation which called on all sections of the European community to increase production and play their part in the collective effort for peace and well-being.

"In developing the North Atlantic community, the Council will act in conformity with and seek to strengthen the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. It is only by the work and by the enlightened understanding of the free peoples everywhere that the cause of freedom and democracy will be upheld against any challenge" (Ismay, pp. 201–203).

1951—ROME

The final communique of the eighth session of the North Atlantic Council, November 24–28, 1951, stated:

The report stressed the importance of further developing the habit of consultation on matters of common concern. The Council directed that fuller study be given to a number of proposals relating to economic, social and cultural matters and to the coordination of the activities of NATO civilian agencies with those of other international organizations. In this connection the Council recommended that particular consideration be given to facilitating the movement of labor from member countries with excess manpower to others where it could be effectively utilized" (Ismay, p. 190).

"Labor migration" and "manpower mobility" are similar to problems we refer to as "immigration."

Lord Ismay reports that changes made in American immigration policy have been recommended on the ground of "strengthening the Atlantic community" (Ismay, p. 153).

1952—LISBON

At the very important ninth session of the North Atlantic Council, at Lisbon, February 20–25, 1952, the Council said in its final communique:

"The Council adopted a report of the Atlantic Community Committee, established at its Ottawa meeting. This report emphasized the importance of economic cooperation, the expansion and liberalization of trade, and the possibility of working out closer cooperative arrangements with other bodies, particularly the OEEC. In approving the analysis of the problem of the movement of labor between member countries in the report of the Atlantic Community Committee, the Council acknowledged the importance of this problem and endorsed the resolution of the Temporary Council Committee on this subject. It was agreed that the permanent North Atlantic Treaty Organization should keep this problem under continuous review, and make recommendations for the elimination, by the most effective utilization of manpower resources, of general or specific manpower shortages which hinder defense production. As cooperation in the field covered by the Five Power Atlantic Community Committee is of direct and common concern to each member of the Council, it was decided that the future work in this sphere should be transferred to the Council" (Ismay, pp. 191–192).

Lord Ismay reports farther on the Lisbon meeting:

"The Council also considered the report of the Atlantic Community Committee. This document, which covered topics ranging from political consultation to the liberalization of trade, from the mobility of labor to cultural relations, did not pretend to be a blueprint for NATO action; but it rendered useful service in sorting out the problems to which the Alliance should devote its attention in the future" (Ismay, p. 47).

Chairman of this Atlantic Community Committee was Hon. Lester Pearson, now Foreign Minister of Canada, and one of the three wise men appointed by NATO in 1956 to work out the implementation of article 2. In 1952 the Pearson Committee reported, according to Lord Ismay, that "little ground had been left untrodden, either in the economic, social, or cultural fields" (Ismay, p. 151).

1952—PARIS

The Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council, at Paris, December 15–17, 1952, said in its final communique:

"The council received a progress report by the Secretary General, which outlined the structure of the International Secretariat. It described the work accomplished in the last 8 months by the council, meeting regularly through the permanent civilian and military authorities. It also dealt with the constructure work of the Council's Committee on Civil Defense, and of those concerned with non-military aspects of the Treaty covered by article 2, such as overpopulation and social, cultural, and informational matters" (Ismay, p. 192).

The council also passed the following resolution at the Paris meeting of the North Atlantic Council and the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Defense, Economics, and Finance:

"Convinced of the necessity of a continuing review and of an adequate solution of economic problems which face member states, not only to provide the defense effort with a firm foundation but also to promote social progress and the ideals of freedom which are the bases of the North Atlantic Community; and

"Having in mind article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty and the work already initiated within the Organization to give effect to the report of the Committee on the North Atlantic Community, approved by the council at its Lisbon session and particularly as far as over-population problems are concerned:

"Agrees that member governments should seek by individual and collective measures to strengthen their political and economic capacities by finding solutions to their problems such as balance of payments, increase of output, internal financial stability and manpower; and that the results of their endeavours should be examined periodically by the council" (1952) (Ismay, p. 194).

THE END OF A PERIOD

Lord Ismay sums up the political achievements of NATO, by 1954:

"The increasing responsibilities assigned to NATO by member governments necessitated the centralization and simplification of the civilian agencies still too complex and scattered despite the measure of co-ordination already achieved by the Deputies, whose work had been outstanding. Their main triumphs lay in the political field: It was they who practiced and daily developed what might be called the NATO method; that is, the technique whereby the representatives of 12 (later 14) sovereign governments reach unanimous agreement without formal vote. By bringing to bear on their governments the weight of opinion in NATO they assisted the attainment of an agreed common view which normally received the assent of the Council without further ado. For instance, it was largely due to the Deputies that Scandinavian hesitations about the inclusion of Greece and Turkey were overcome; it was they who did the most to obtain agreement on the principle of a German contribution to the defense of the NATO area; and it was they who reached agreement on the financial contribution to be made by governments to NATO military and civilian agencies" (Ismay, p. 48).

Congress has no official access to such agreements on financial contributions to be made by the member governments to NATO military and civilian agencies. Such reports are made to the executive branch, and are classified.

WAR POWERS

NATO has latent powers which may become explicit in time of war or emergency.

Lord Ismay speaks of the need for governments to make extensive preparations, in time of peace, for "the stability of the home front" (p. 142).

This area of operations apparently includes production, raw materials, labor supply, allocation of workers, refugees, and civil defense. Ismay says it is "imperative for partners in any modern alliance to work together in the civilian field." This involves, he says, "the organization and protection of the civil population" and "the direction of civilian activities in time of war" (p. 142).

The NATO Council has a Committee on Civil Organization in Time of War, which has full-time staff members working on "control of mass movements of persons anxious to escape from threatened bombardment," protection of industrial plants and other facilities against sabotage, and medical care, among other problems (p. 143).

NATO has also set up the Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, so that in time of war or emergency (not defined), "the great bulk of ocean-going merchant ships under the flags of NATO countries would be pooled and, for allocation purposes, put at the disposal of an interallied body to be called the Defense Shipping Authority."

This authority will be responsible for "the allocation of ocean-going shipping throughout the whole area controlled by and friendly toward the member governments of NATO, its allies and partners" (Ismay, p. 145).

A large part of American coastal shipping and shipping through the Panama Canal is ocean-going.

Since many NATO members have territory, allies, and dominion partners in Asia, Africa, and Australia, it is difficult to decide what are the limits of NATO's operating area and its authority in this field.

The Board has been making its plans and choosing key personnel so that it will be fully operative at the outbreak of war.

Control of shipping involves in practice control of highways, railroads and ports. NATO has a planning board for control of these facilities in Europe.

NATO is also at work on plans for control of civilian requirements of imported commodities "on a strict austerity basis" (p. 147).

The Council has set up a Food and Agriculture Planning Committee (including agricultural machinery), a Coal and Steel Planning Committee, and an Industrial Raw Materials Planning Committee (p. 148).

They are at work on drafting the necessary governmental decrees, staff requirements for "preparing the measures in peacetime and operating them in wartime," rationing and preparation of the documents for rationing and price controls, including organization "within each country" (Ismay, p. 148).

FURTHER EXPANSION OF NATO

Secretary of State Dulles recently recommended expansion of NATO to "the totality of its meaning." He said:

"No NATO member, I suppose, wishes to drift into some new and ill-defined relationship which could be provocative of future misunderstandings. But the unanimity of our thinking upon the great basic issues makes it apparent that the time has come to advance NATO from its initial phase into the totality of its meaning.

"The North Atlantic Treaty already serves as an indispensable and vital instrument of the Atlantic community. But the time has, I believe, come to consider whether its organization does not need to be further developed if it is adequately to serve the needs of this and coming generations. If that be the common desire of the NATO member nations, the United States will join eagerly in exploring the possibilities which now beckon us forward" (Department of State Bulletin, April 30, 1956, p. 710).

Newspapermen questioned the Secretary of State at his news conferences. Among other points the Secretary stated that the President has the power to conduct foreign relations through whatever persons and means he chooses.

From the transcript of the news conference:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, I believe the United States has always been opposed to the maintenance of political standing groups in NATO as opposed to military groups. Is there any change in that position?

"Answer. Well, the question of whether we make the Atlantic community, through NATO or otherwise, into a body of greater political importance is one of the matters that is being considered. So far there has been no decision by any of the governments concerned to do that. So far, it has been operated primarily as a military alliance, and, while there have been reports from time to time on political matters, those have been primarily for the purpose of keeping the other Ministers informed on matters of interest rather than on the basis of the common position on these matters. We are quite prepared to consider, with an open mind and with the other countries, an evolutionary step which would place greater political responsibility upon representatives of the NATO or the Atlantic community countries.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, do you draw a distinction between NATO and the Atlantic community, when you or the President use those terms? And, if so, what is it, in your mind?

"Answer. There is a difference, I think, in this respect, that NATO is technically a creature of a treaty and that treaty is primarily a military alliance. As far as the treaty itself goes, the provisions of, let's say, article 2 and article 4, which are the two articles which deal with nonmilitary topics, those provisions are rather narrow and rather sketchy. And it may very well be that, if, these broader aspects are to be developed, they could be developed through steps which were additional to, or you might say superimposed upon, the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty. I do not think we need to be limited by the terms of the treaty, because there is within the President an authority to conduct foreign relations, and to negotiate through persons and by means that he chooses. If he chooses to conduct foreign relations through persons who at the same time are members of the NATO Council, he can do so. In other words, they would in a sense be wearing two hats" (Department of State Bulletin, June 4, 1956, p. 926).

At a news conference, the Secretary was asked:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, on the NATO business, could you say whether you have reached any opinion on whether the NATO treaty, as it now stands, has jurisdiction over political questions, if member countries are willing to commit such questions to NATO for consideration?

"Answer. Well, the NATO Council which exists is not only in the form of occasional meetings by the foreign ministers but, also in the form of a permanent council and does now discuss from time to time political matters. The question is whether or not it is important and desirable and agreeable to all concerned to develop that function. It is a function which to some extent is now used. You may recall that prior to the summit meeting, for example, there was a meeting of the ministers that was especially called for that purpose. And then, prior to the meeting of the foreign ministers that was held at Geneva in October-November, there was a meeting. There have been other meetings which have discussed political problems. So that, if we develop this, it would not be really breaking new ground. It would be developing further the ground that has already been broken.

"Question. Is it clear, sir, that the whole idea, as now considered in developing NATO, is entirely in the political field and not in the economic field? Your remarks would indicate that.

"Answer. Well, I cannot speak except for the United States in that respect. Certainly consideration is being given to development in the economic field, and there are certain respects in which it is hard to draw a clear line between what is political and what is economic. Economic policies are often part of your political machinery; and, to that extent, if there was to be a more full discussion of political policies, that would also embrace, I would assume, the economic policies of the member countries insofar as they concern the treaty area.

"Now, as far as being an operating mechanism in the economic field is concerned, it is the view of the United States that there are enough operating mechanisms there. We have the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation), the EPU (European Payments Union), the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), the International Monetary Fund—all of which are operating agencies in the economic or related financial fields. And there would not seem to be much room or occasion to create a new operating agency. As I say, insofar as economic policies are involved as a part of the policies of the member states, those would be embraced within political exchanges of views.

"I want to emphasize that those are just the views of the United States that I am expressing. I don't know what the views of the other members will be" (transcript of Secretary Dulles' news conference) (Department of State Bulletin, June 25, 1956, p. 1069).

NATO AND THE SOVIET UNION

There is nothing in the North Atlantic Treaty, or in the organizational structure of NATO which requires it to oppose communism or restrict the influence of the Soviet Union or its fifth columns. NATO staff members are "international civil servants," not subject to American security requirements.

Mr. Dulles has stated that, at Geneva, in November 1955, the three western powers offered the U. S. S. R. a treaty of assurance, that is, an overall security treaty against "armed aggression."

Unless defined, this could mean that the NATO powers would be committed to assist the Soviet Union, in the event of an armed uprising from within the satellite countries.

Sir Winston Churchill proposed in May 1956 a grand alliance between the western powers and the Soviet Union, if its change since Stalin's death was sincere.

The NATO letter gives the following account:

"On May 10, Sir Winston Churchill was presented at Aachen with the Charlemagne Prize, for his services to Europe. In his speech of thanks, he said that the main theme of salvation should be the grand alliance between the European powers, the United States, and the British Commonwealth. Russia and the Eastern European States should not be excluded, and this could lead to the solution of grave issues such as the reunification of Germany.

"Much had happened, said Sir Winston, since he last visited Germany to attend the Potsdam conference in 1945. The Soviet Union had pursued a policy dividing her from her wartime allies. Then had followed

the historic reconciliation between the United States and the Commonwealth, on the one hand, and West Germany on the other hand, and the formation of NATO. The North Atlantic Treaty, in which Germany was a partner, was a solemn affirmation of the unity of Europe.

"One of the supreme duties and privileges of France, Sir Winston Churchill went on to say, was to bury all bitterness and lead Germany back by the hand into the European family. The French contribution to European unity was very large, and the German reception of it had been invaluable.

"NATO itself was a very striking product. It was the expression of a world wearied of war and determined to build its own organization in such strength and power that there would be peace henceforward. The principle was simple and majestic: We all joined hands and swore to fight the aggressor whoever he might be. A new question, however, had been raised by the recent Russian repudiation of Stalin. If it were sincere, we had a new Russia to deal with, and if this were so he did not see why the new Russia should not join in the spirit of this solemn agreement.

"We must realize, Sir Winston Churchill said, how deep and sincere were Russian anxieties about the safety of her homeland from foreign invasion. In a true unity of Europe, Russia must have her part, and he was glad to see that Poland was already not unaffected by the recent changes in the Russian outlook. Other changes might follow. Czechoslovakia might recover her freedom. Above all, he added, Germany will be reunited.

"Sir Winston Churchill said it would be rash and blameworthy to attempt to solve the problem of European unity, of which German reunification was a vital part, by any violent stroke; the only unity that might come from violence would be a unity of ashes and death. It would be equally fatal for NATO to relax and let apathy overtake what had been achieved in the past 7 years, but he did not regard NATO as the sole effective expression of the moves towards European unity. No one could doubt the usefulness of the Western European Union, the OEEC, the Coal and Steel Community, and the Council of Europe, but he believed that the main theme of salvation should be the grand alliance of European powers, linked with the United States, Canada, and other members of the British Commonwealth.

"The spirit of this arrangement should not exclude Russia and the Eastern European States. 'It may well be that the great issues which perplex us, of which one of the gravest is the reunification of Germany, could then be solved more easily than they can by rival blocs confronting each other with suspicion and hostility,' he said.

"In view of the interest which attaches to any remark of Sir Winston Churchill it is important to bear in mind exactly what he said in this context. This was that if the recent repudiation of Stalin by Soviet leaders was sincere he did not see why 'the new Russia should not join in the spirit of this solemn agreement' (that is, the North Atlantic Treaty).

"This is very far from saying that the U. S. S. R. should soon be invited to accede to the North Atlantic Treaty. M. Molotov, it will be recalled, suggested this at the Berlin Conference of Foreign Ministers in 1954. There are, however, at present insuperable objections to Russia joining NATO. As Mr. Harold Macmillan, then United Kingdom Foreign Secretary, said at the Geneva meeting of Foreign Ministers in Geneva last October:

"'The answer to this is made plain by the wording of the NATO Treaty itself. NATO is a system of States, sharing common aims and views. Unfortunately, it has not yet been possible for the members to establish common aims and views with the Soviet Union. Therefore, we cannot accept the membership of the Soviet Union in our organization; for since all the decisions of NATO must be unanimous we should be giving the right of veto to a State pursuing different aims and ends. It may not always be true, but we have to face the facts as they are'" (NATO letter, June 1, 1956, pp. 11–12).

STATE DEPARTMENT COMMENT ON THE CHURCHILL PROPOSAL WAS GENERALLY FAVORABLE

"Sir Winston Churchill has stated that, 'if' the Russian repudiation of Stalin is sincere, we have a new Russia to deal with and that, if so, there is no reason why the new Russia should not join in the spirit of the solemn agreement of the North Atlantic Treaty to fight the aggressor, whoever he may be. Sir Winston went on to say that 'that is for the future' and that in the meanwhile we should go forward toward that future by reinforcing patiently and surely the arrangements which we have so far achieved. He also spoke of the vital need for German reunification.

"The first suggestion of Sir Winston is in accord with the proposal which the three western Foreign Ministers made to the Soviet Union at Geneva on October 27, 1955, during the consideration of the linked problems of European security and the reunification of Germany. In this connection, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States proposed a 'treaty of assurance' which contemplated reciprocal renunciation of force and withholding of support from aggressors and an agreement that armed attack in Europe would endanger the peace and security and that all parties would then take appropriate action to meet the common danger. This proposal has never been accepted by the Soviet Union, even as a basis for discussion.

"Sir Winston's second suggestion for 'reinforcing' the arrangements which we now have is a welcome support for the action taken at last week's meeting of the NATO Ministerial Council, which established a committee of three of the Foreign Ministers to study ways and means to improve and extend NATO cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop their unity within the Atlantic community.

"The United States welcomes the spirit and substance of Sir Winston's important address on these points" (State Department Bulletin, May 21, 1956, pp. 837–8).

The press questioned Secretary Dulles on the proposal at his news conference:

"Question. Mr. Secretary, last week, as you know, Mr. Churchill made a suggestion that under certain conditions Russia ought to be included in a kind of expanded NATO. And I believe that was the same day that you testified something to the effect that in 10 years or so we might hope to look on the Russians as more respectable citizens. Could you comment first on Winston Churchill's proposal and, second, spell out a little bit more what you meant by your remark?

"Answer. I read quite carefully the full text of what Sir Winston Churchill said, and it seemed to me that he was saying in effect much the same thing which the three western powers had said last November at the Geneva Conference where we met with the Soviet Foreign Minister. At that time we proposed, as part of the European settlement which would bring about the reunification of Germany, that there should be some kind of overall security treaty which would engage the members of NATO, or certain of them, and certain powers on the other side to a comprehensive agreement which would assure that, in the event of armed aggression of any one against the other, we would all stand against the aggressor. That proposal was made by us with the British and the French at the Geneva Conference last November. And, as I say, I interpreted Sir Winston Churchill's remarks as being in essence a repetition of the thought and spirit of those remarks.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, is it correct to interpret the sense of your comments on Mr. Churchill's remarks as being that at Geneva we proposed to the Soviet Union that she participate in a European collective security or European nonaggression pact, that Churchill was at Aachen repeating that proposition or the sense of it, and that the United States is still backing such an invitation of the Soviet Union; that is, to enter a collective nonaggression pact and to come into NATO?

"Answer. I do not want to say whether or not what Churchill said was consciously based upon what had been said at Geneva. It may have been, quite likely was, his own spontaneous thinking. What I pointed out was that it was quite parallel with what we had done at that time. We had proposed what was called then a Treaty of Assurance to cover all of the essential parts of Europe and containing mutual guaranties, consultations, and the like. The United States is still adhering to that position.

"Question. Mr. Secretary, let me clarify that. I want to understand it completely. Churchill, I understood, at Aachen—that is the impression I had—urged that Russia be included in the NATO alliance. Is that the American position? Is that what we are saying?

"Answer. I do not think that Churchill proposed the inclusion of Russia in the NATO alliance. I think that what he proposed was that the Soviet Union should support the principles of the NATO alliance" (State Department Bulletin, May 28, 1956, pp. 884–886).

Additional comment on such an agreement was made by the Honorable Livingston T. Merchant, Ambassador to Canada:

"I honestly believe that some day the Soviets will understand and accept this fact. So far they have refused to, and they continue to direct their efforts to destroy NATO and divide its members one from the other. These efforts are more subtle than they once were. There is, however, no evidence that their long-term purpose and objective of world domination has been abandoned. The shifting tactics of international communism, however, require that we members of the North Atlantic alliance consider in what ways we can develop further our alliance in the interest of expanding cooperation in areas other than the military. The latter has rightly held the priority since the treaty was signed. Behind the defensive military shield which has been erected there are now the opportunity and the need to strengthen the relationship under the treaty in other directions. At the ministerial council meeting in Paris last month it was agreed that a committee of three Foreign Ministers should advise 'on ways and means to improve and extend NATO cooperation in nonmilitary fields and to develop greater unity within the Atlantic Community.' Fittingly, your distinguished Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Pearson, was one of the three Foreign Ministers selected by the Council for this task.

"Just as the United States believes that its security can best be assured by collective security arrangements, so also do we believe that no opportunity should be overlooked for peaceful negotiations to seek just settlements of the great issues which divide the Communist and the free worlds. In the past 3 or 4 years I have myself participated in literally months of negotiations with the Soviets, in company with the British and the French—at Berlin in 1954, at Geneva in the spring and summer of the same year, at Vienna in May 1955, at San Francisco a year ago, again at Geneva at the summit conference last July, and once more at Geneva last fall.

"Our fundamental policy is clear and simple—to join with our friends in measures to assure our common defenses in the face of a threat and yet to avoid no opportunity to seek peaceful solutions through negotiations" (State Department Bulletin, July 9, 1956, p. 57).

NATO CULTURAL AND PROPAGANDA ACTIVITIES

Activities designed to reshape public opinion were developed side by side with more tangible activities, in the first 5 years, and are increasing rapidly as emphasis on the civil powers of NATO increases.

NATO educational and propaganda activities have been carried on through all the standard media of mass communications—press, radio, moving pictures, teachers' conferences, international summer camps, information polls, and the rest.

Lord Ismay mentions, in the earlier period, the following activities of the Information Division, among others.

1. Tours of journalists.
2. Fifth anniversary, coverage in radio, television, film, and press.
3. NATO Caravan of Peace.
4. Films.
5. NATO letter, handbook, picture book.
6. Briefings (including the United States National Defense College and "several groups of parliamentarians," and various pro-NATO organizations).

Over 100,000 copies of the NATO handbook are distributed every year.

"Some 250,000 copies of (the 'simple picture book') aimed at the schools and the armed forces, have been published in all languages of the member countries," said Lord Ismay in 1954 (Ismay, pp. 155, 156).

Troop information and what is called "military community relations" are high on the agenda. Here as elsewhere NATO emphasizes "coordination" and lets national agencies carry out the approved programs. This "solar system" of propaganda agencies has, says Ismay, "resulted in a marked increase both in the volume of troop information exchanged between countries and in the space given to NATO in national publications for the armed forces" (Ismay, p. 157).

NATO is also deeply interested in influencing the opinion of members of the Parliament of Member countries.

NATO also has a planetary system of voluntary agencies helping to spread its views. These include organizations working for an Atlantic Community. An Atlantic Community Study Conference has met periodically.

NATO encourages support by voluntary societies. Ismay says, "The value of such spontaneous enterprises would be diminished if they became too closely linked with either NATO or member governments" (Ismay, p. 158).

Speaking in 1954, Ismay says NATO's information activities "demand the most patient and careful tending" because people "will be prepared to support further cooperation under the Treaty only when they are convinced that, as cooperation has increased their security, so it can increase their well-being" (Ismay, pp. 158, 159).

"Should the risk of aggression become less pressing than it is today," he continues, "it may be discovered that article 2 is the real battlefield."

Subsequent activities give evidence of the widening sphere of NATO information and propaganda activities since 1954.

The themes include:

1. The Atlantic Community.
2. Our common heritage.
3. We cannot stand alone.

The theme of "elements of strength" was developed by Mrs. Eleanor Dulles, of the State Department, as follows:

"The immediate question before us is to discern the elements of strength and try to increase them.

"The first of these lessons we have learned in recent years, as I see it, is that no nation can stand alone. Many have seen the handwriting on the wall and have shaped their national policy along lines of cooperation and mutual support. The North Atlantic Treaty countries are obvious illustrations.

"The second lesson in how to increase our strength is to realize that what we do locally in our own work and in our education and cultural activities makes a difference. This is a point of view that requires thought as to how our daily tasks conform to our accepted principles as a nation, whether we personally are in line with the policy of our Nation among nations. This takes us into the matters of foreign economic and financial relations. It requires an extension of our professional and business activities beyond the local scene and calls for seeing our own lives in a world setting.

"It is hard for us to realize that what is done in our local communities affects our international position.

"Recently this connection has been made very close. Impressions regarding our civic standard, the maintenance of order, the pursuit of justice, and the development of education in its broadest sense are of incalculable importance. In all these things we play a daily part. Our lives mirrored by press and movies, reported by visitors, and finding expression as we deal with persons from other lands shape foreign policy. It is the essence of our democracy that this should be so. We cannot escape these facts. We have shaped our Government and chosen our systems or national life along these lines. We as individuals are representatives of our nations. By our actions will the meaning of our national policy be judged" (Department of State Bulletin, July 9, 1956, p. 62 ff.).

The theme of "a common heritage" was developed by Deputy Under Secretary of State Murphy, at a symposium on NATO, sponsored by the College of William and Mary and the Norfolk Chamber of Commerce, at Norfolk, Va., on April 2, 1956, in the following words:

"According to the 1950 census, there were wore than 33 million people living in the United States who either were born abroad or had parents born abroad. Of this number, nearly half came from the 14 other NATO countries. Of the remainder of our population, an even larger percentage can trace their ancestry back to one of the NATO nations.

"We Americans have developed over the years a political and constitutional structure that is peculiarly our own. But its basic principles, including representative authority, and guaranties of human and property rights, had European origins. Most of our European allies, despite varying political structures, still govern themselves under these basic principles. In simple terms, we and our allies share a devotion to the concepts of human freedom and political liberty. These concepts are what set the free nations apart in the world today.

"A look at the content of our educational program shows even more concretely our common heritage with Western and Southern Europe. Here at William and Mary, the second oldest university in the country and one of our best, we find as in other American universities numerous studies in literature, science, art, and the social sciences. If we forget for a moment the portion of this accumulated knowledge that has been produced by the minds and hands of our own countrymen, we will quickly recognize that the greatest part of the remainder has come from the NATO countries of Europe" (Department of State Bulletin, April 16, 1956, p. 645 ff.).

Skillfully planned efforts are being directed especially at teachers and students.

Fellowships are one instrument:

"The Department of State announced on April 4 that M. Margaret Ball, professor of political science, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass., is the United States winner of one of the 11 NATO research fellowships offered by the North Atlantic Council. Simultaneous announcement of the award was made at NATO headquarters in Paris.

"The NATO Fellowship and Scholarship Program was announced last July in implementation of article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which provides for cooperation in nonmilitary fields. It is designed to promote the study of historical, political, constitutional, legal, social, cultural, linguistic, economic, and strategic problems which will reveal the common heritage and historical experience of the Atlantic countries, as well as the present needs and future development of the North Atlantic area considered as a community." (Department of State Bulletin, April 16, 1956, p. 649).

International study conferences are another among the many tools for forming the opinions of teachers and students.

"A study conference on 'The Role of the School in the Atlantic Community' will be held at the Palais de Chaillot from September 3 to 7, 1956. It is being organized by the Atlantic Treaty Association in collaboration with the NATO International Staff.

"The purpose of the conference is to consider the best means of promoting in schools greater knowledge of the international structure of the world today, including the Atlantic Community, the organizations serving it, and the peoples composing it.

"Membership of the conference will be limited to persons nominated by the official education authorities, or such other authorities as Governments may designate in the 15 States signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty. They will necessarily include representatives of certain Provinces, Laender, or States in the three Federal countries concerned, Canada, the German Federal Republic, and the United States of America.

"The reason for this decision, which has been approved by NATO, is that the ATA considers it necessary, as a first step toward obtaining the cooperation of teachers and of increasing the intelligent interest of boys and girls in the Atlantic Community on any considerable scale throughout the countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, to secure the active support of the highest educational authorities.

"In order to insure genuine discussion, the membership of the conference will be limited to a maximum of six members for each national delegation, even allowing for the Federal States. It will be for the national authorities to decide whether they will send officials from the central or other educational administrations, inspectors or experienced heads of schools, or one or two of each.

"Schools, for the purposes of this conference, are understood to mean educational establishments below university level. The majority of young citizens in all the allied countries do not receive a university education. It is with the problem of increasing the standard of knowledge of certain essential facts of international life within that majority of the younger generation, as well as among boys and girls proposing to go to universities, that the conference will be concerned.

"The subject matter of the conference will be divided under four headings:

"1. Civic Education in the School: The Facts of International Life.

"2. Civic Education in the School: The Free Institutions of the Atlantic Nations.

"3. Mutual Understanding and Friendship Within the Atlantic Community.

"4. Practical Aids to Teachers." (NATO letter, July 1, 1956, p. 25 ff.)

The size and range of information activities are determined in part by the funds available.

It is not possible to trace what funds are available for NATO information activities, from United States tax sources.

Secretary Dulles testified on May 28, 1956, in connection with congressional hearings on the State Department budget, and espe-

cially on a cut in new funds for press officers for international organizations:

"The House reduced our request for this appropriation by $328,410. Three hundred thousand of this amount is of particular interest to me and to our efforts in redesigning the objectives of NATO, with emphasis and cultural aspects as well as military."

The closing of one channel of financing by Congress does not, however, mean that others were closed.

The executive branch can allocate funds from other appropriations, such as "Presidential funds," or assign any personnel from executive agencies, to serve on the staffs of international agencies.

There are so many channels through which financial support could be piped from American Government resources to NATO or other international agencies that no estimate would have any meaning.

The Rights of Disabled People Under the Social Security Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Over a period of nearly 20 years, old-age and survivors insurance under the social-security law has become well known to most Americans. Now there is social-security protection against a third risk—the risk of being unable to work because of severe disability.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it will be useful to explain carefully exactly what this new law provides.

If an individual is so severely disabled that he is unable to work, he may have rights under one or more of these three parts of the social-security law:

First, if he is disabled and is 50 years of age or older, he may be eligible for disability insurance payments after June 1957.

Second, if he is disabled and his disability began while he was under 18 years of age, he may be eligible after 1956 to receive child's insurance benefits even after reaching age 18 if either his father or his mother is receiving old-age insurance payments or if he has lost the support of a parent through death.

Third, if he is disabled and has not yet reached 50 years of age, he may be eligible to have his social-security earnings record "frozen" to protect his own and his family's rights to future benefit payments because of old age, disability, or death.

HOW MUCH WORK IS REQUIRED?

In order to qualify for disability insurance payments at age 50 or to have his earnings record frozen while he is disabled, he must have social security credit for:

(a) Five years of work in the 10 years before the established beginning date of his disability; and

(b) One and one-half years of work in the 3 years before that date.

The amount of work required for him to get disability insurance payments is always at least as much as would be required for old-age insurance payments.

Active military service at any time after September 15, 1940, and work in the railroad industry after 1936 may count toward the disability freeze but can count toward disability insurance payments only under more limited conditions.

HOW DISABLED DOES HE HAVE TO BE?

An individual can meet the requirements of these provisions of the social security law only

(a) If he is so severely disabled that he is not able to engage in any substantial work; and

(b) If his disability is expected to continue indefinitely.

If he is temporarily disabled, or if he is only partly disabled, he is not eligible.

The disability may be either mental or physical, but he must submit medical evidence to show what his condition is and how long it may be expected to continue. To have his earnings record frozen or to get disability insurance payments, he must have been disabled for at least 6 months.

The determination whether he is so severely disabled as to qualify under these provisions is made in accordance with the social security law. The fact that he may be receiving payments for "total disability" from another agency does not necessarily mean that he will be considered disabled under the provisions of the social security law.

WHEN DID THIS DISABILITY BEGIN?

The evidence in the individual's own case will show when he actually became disabled. If he met all the requirements at that time, the date he became disabled will be used by the Social Security Administration as the official beginning date of his disability.

If he did not meet all the requirements at the time he became disabled but does meet them at a later date, this later date will be established as the official beginning date of his disability.

DISABILITY BENEFITS AT AGE 50

If an individual is between 50 and 65 years of age and meets the work and disability requirements previously explained, he may be entitled to monthly disability insurance payments under the social security law.

The amount of the disability benefit depends on his average earnings it is the same as the amount of the old-age insurance benefit for which he would be eligible if he were 65.

Disability insurance benefits are not paid in addition to old-age or survivors insurance benefits. If an individual is eligible for more than one benefit at the same time, he will ordinarily receive an amount equal to the largest.

The first month for which disability insurance payments can be made is July 1957. No application can be accepted before October 1956.

Dependents do not get social security benefits based on an individual's social security account until he applies for retirement benefits.

His dependents may be eligible for survivors insurance benefits if he dies while he is receiving disability insurance benefits.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE IS ELIGIBLE FOR DISABILITY INSURANCE PAYMENTS

If an individual has received notice that his application for a disability freeze has been approved, and he is between 50 and 65 years of age, he may file an application for benefits on or after October 1, 1956. However, it is not necessary that he apply during October. He should make his application at some time between October 1, 1956, and July 1957. His social security office will let him know what proofs are required when he applies.

If he has applied for a disability freeze but has not yet been notified of the decision, he must wait until he receives his official notice. His social security office needs to know what decision was made on his freeze application in order to take the appropriate action on his claim. However, if he has not received official notice of the decision before June 1957, he should get in touch with his social security office and make his application.

If an individual's application for a disability freeze is denied, he probably does not meet the requirements for disability insurance benefits. However, if he believes that he now meets the requirements, he should get in touch with his local social security office.

If an individual believes that he is eligible for disability insurance benefits or a disability freeze, he should make an application for a disability freeze at once, if he has not already done so.

NO PAYMENTS AFTER 1957

If an individual meets all the requirements for disability insurance payments in July 1957 and makes his application for the payments no later than December 1957, he will get payments beginning with July.

If his application for disability insurance payments is made after December 1957, no payments can be made for any month before the application was made.

DISABLED CHILD'S BENEFITS

An individual may receive child's insurance benefits after he reaches age 18 if—

(a) He has been disabled since before he reached 18,

(b) He is unmarried, and

(c) He is dependent on a parent, stepparent, or adopting parent who is entitled to old-age insurance benefits under social security, or he was dependent on a parent who died after 1939 and was insured for survivors benefits at the time of his or her death.

It is not necessary that an individual himself have any record of work under the social-security law to get payments as a disabled child.

Two examples will help to show how this part of the law works:

Jim Hawkins was disabled at the age of 15 when his father was 50, and has been disabled ever since. His father is now 65 and is receiving old-age insurance payments under the social-security law. Jim may get child's insurance benefits after 1956 even though he is now 30 years of age.

Joe Burton became severely disabled 4 years ago when he was almost 13. His

mother was working, but she died this year, and Joe was eligible for child's insurance benefits based on her social-security account. Under the old law his payments would have stopped in the month before he reached 18. Even though Joe will reach 18 next year, his social-security payments will now continue as long as he is disabled.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE MAY BE ELIGIBLE FOR BENEFITS AS A DISABLED CHILD

If an individual believes that he may be eligible for social-security benefits as a disabled child, he or someone in his family should get in touch with his social-security office after September 1956.

If he is now receiving child's insurance benefits under the social-security law and he is disabled, he or the person who receives the payments in his behalf should get in touch with the social-security office a few months before he reaches 18.

The first payments possible under this part of the law will be for the month of January 1957. An individual will not lose any of the payments due in 1957 if his application is made before the end of January 1958.

THE DISABILITY FREEZE

If an individual is disabled but not eligible for disability insurance payments, he may be eligible to have his social-security earnings record frozen. Unless his earnings record is frozen, the period while he is disabled and has little or no earnings can reduce the amount of his own and his family's future benefits.

To be entitled to a disability freeze he must meet the work and disability requirements explained previously.

WHAT AN INDIVIDUAL SHOULD DO IF HE BELIEVES HE IS ENTITLED TO A DISABILITY FREEZE

If an individual believes that he is entitled to a disability freeze, he should get in touch with his local social-security office right away and make his application for it. He should not delay, because his earnings record cannot be frozen until he has filed an application.

If he was disabled in 1956 or earlier, he should be sure to apply to have his earnings record frozen by June 30, 1957. If he has already applied to have his record frozen, he does not need to make another application.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

If an individual applies for disability insurance benefits, the disability freeze, or disabled child's benefits, his name will be referred to the vocational rehabilitation agensy in your State. That agency may be able to provide him with rehabilitation services that will help him return to work.

Benefits will be withheld if he refuses without good cause to accept rehabilitation services offered by the State rehabilitation agency.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly remarkable what can and is being done today in the field of vocational rehabilitation. Thousands of individuals are being returned annually as useful and productive members of their community. The dollars and cents saving to the economy is enormous. The gain in terms of increased human dignity and self-respect is incalculable. I am proud to have been one of the early fighters for this program.

REDUCTION BECAUSE OF OTHER DISABILITY BENEFITS

The amount of any social-security benefit based on disability is reduced by the amount of any other Federal benefit an individual receives based on disability, and by the amount of any State or Federal workmen's compensation benefit he receives.

FINANCING DISABILITY INSURANCE

To meet the costs of the benefits for disabled workers, an increase in the social-security tax will go into effect January 1, 1957. The amount of the increase is one-fourth of 1 percent each for employee and employer and three-eighths of 1 percent for self-employed people on the first $4,200 of earnings in a year.

THE LOCAL SOCIAL-SECURITY OFFICE

If an individual wishes to apply for disability benefits or for the disability freeze, he should get in touch with his social-security district office.

If he is unable to visit the social-security office, he may telephone or write or someone else may make the call for him.

He can get the address of his social-security office from the post office or from the telephone directory under "United States Government, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration."

Says United States Policy Operates in Dark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article from the Tablet of July 7, 1956, entitled, "Says United States Policy Operates in Dark."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAYS UNITED STATES POLICY OPERATES IN DARK—STATE DEPARTMENT 17 YEARS IN ARREARS, CHARGES BRYTON BARTON

In the matter of foreign policy, as reflected in treaties and executive agreements, the United States is operating pretty much in the dark.

That's the opinion of Bryton Barron, former head of the treaty staff of the United States State Department, as expressed at a seminar on historical research in foreign relations held at the Columbia University Club June 28, under the auspices of Telefact Foundation, a nonprofit organization. C. M. Bertolette, one of the founders of the foundation in 1948 and its president, was master of ceremonies.

SCORES SECRET AGREEMENTS

The real understanding of any particular treaty or agreement requires at least three types of information, Mr. Barron asserted, in an attack on secret agreements which bypass the Senate and the Constitution.

"First, of course, there must be available a full and complete official text, as signed. But the lawyers and general students cannot stop there," he said.

"It is necessary, second, to know as much as possible about the negotiating history of the agreement and thereby to be sure what it was that each party to the agreement sought to obtain by the undertsanding, what concessions each country made in the process of obtaining agreement, and what statements if any, were made on the side that might affect application to this document.

"Then, third, after a treaty or agreement has come into force, it is important to know all the subsequent developments with respect to its application, what other governments became a party to the understanding and what reservations, if any, did they make similarly, what subsequent exchanges of notes have there been which modify the scope or force of any of the provisions; if certain clauses call for action to be taken, it is important to have a record of the extent to which those requirements have been fulfilled, and the date thereof; and if there have been court decisions invalidating or otherwise affecting the application of any of these provisions, it is important that such information be available."

Despite the clear requirements of law, the State Department is 17 or 18 years in arrears in providing this information, Mr. Barron charged.

"We have a vital need for study," he said, "not as an academic exercise but as a means of preserving that form of government wherein the sovereignty and the ultimate decision must rest with the people.

"Theirs must be an informed opinion, based on facts which they have a right to know; otherwise in bewilderment and confusion they may be led into a further surrender of the things that have made America great."

Woodrow Wilson Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a summary of the principal activities of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Year to date.

This partial report was furnished me by the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, which is coordinating observances of the 100th anniversary of President Wilson's birth:

SPECIAL EVENTS

Association of International Relations Clubs, which met April 4–7 in Philadelphia, Pa., took Woodrow Wilson as the theme for its 9th annual conference. Speakers included: Mr. August Heckscher, president of Woodrow Wilson Foundation, Mrs. Vera M. Dean, editor, Foreign Policy Association, and Dr. Harry D. Gideonese, president, Brooklyn College.

Princeton University dedicated 1956 to events commemorating Wilson Centennial Year, including talks by President Harold W. Dodds and Harold Medina, special Wilson issue of College newspaper, a 3-day conference on The Political Executive in the Na-

tional Government," under the direction of Prof. Stephan K. Bailey, attended by more than 60 leaders and scholars of American public life, including Harold Stassen, Joseph Dodge, and Arthur Fleming; dedication of the Stafford Little lectures to Wilson; and a most extensive library exhibit and other events.

Tri-Faith Panel: Talks by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Father George B. Ford, and Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, representing the three major faith groups of America, in a special service presented at King Auditorium at Mary Baldwin College. Tape recordings of an edited version of these talks are available from the Commission.

Woodrow Wilson Institute was held April 26 at Mary Baldwin College with Virginius Dabney, editor of Richmond Times-Dispatch as chairman. This all-day session included Arthur Krock, New York Times correspondent, Dr. Robert C. Clothier, president emeritus of Rutgers University, Sir Leslie Munro, Ambassador from New Zealand, Princeton University's T. J. Wertenbaker and Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton, as among its participants. The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of Virginia sponsored an outdoor drama, "The Eleventh Hour," based on the life of Woodrow Wilson. (See July-August issue of Centennial Newsletter for details.)

Bryn Mawr Conference was held January 5 and 6, taking as its theme "Woodrow Wilson and the World of Today." Speakers included William Langer of Harvard, Arthur Link of Northwestern, and Eric Goldman of Princeton. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation shared sponsorship of the conference with Bryn Mawr.

A special session of the Virginia General Assembly was held to commemorate the Woodrow Wilson Centennial. United States Senator HARRY S. BYRD and former United States Senator Tom Connolly addressed the group.

MEMORIALS

A 7-cent stamp was issued early this year to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. The stamp bears a likeness of Wilson from a drawing by F. Graham Cootes and is maroon in color with white face gothic lettering.

The commission sponsored legislation by Congress directing that the proposed new bridge across the Potomac River connecting Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia be named "The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

A bronze bust of Wilson, together with a tablet, was unveiled at the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. Wilson was elected to the Hall of Fame in 1950 and is the 82d American and the 12th President to be memorialized in the open-air collonnade of the hall. Walter Hancock, American sculptor, modeled the bust and tablet.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral in Washington, D. C., announced earlier this year that plans have been completed for a special memorial service to be held on November 11 of this year when Wilson's final resting place will be moved to the nave of the cathedral from the chapel of the cathedral. Bernard Baruch will be the guest speaker and he will talk on religious freedom and Wilson's philosophy. Government, diplomatic and church dignitaries will take part in the service.

TRIBUTES FROM AMERICAN LEADERS

Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, the only living former Presidents of the United States, each issued a statement paying tribute to Woodrow Wilson and recalling his many contributions to the development of the Nation.

Tributes to Wilson were also accorded by many other American leaders including Adlai Stevenson and John Foster Dulles.

RADIO AND TV

In the first 6 months of the centennial year local and national radio and television broadcasts were devoted to Wilson. These programs included dramatic, forum, interview, and other types of presentations. The following listing of radio programs includes both network and local originations:

The National Broadcasting Co. featured a talk on Wilson by Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer on Monitor; an interview with August Heckscher, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, by Margaret Truman and Mike Wallace on Weekday, and the dramatic presentation, Nor Reach the Uplands, a story of Woodrow Wilson and Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, supervised by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, on the Eternal Light program.

The CBS network presented a panel discussion on Town Meeting of the Air with the following participants: Colgate Darden, president of the University of Virginia; August Heckscher, and the late Senator Alben Barkley. This is New York, CBS, presented interviews with Mr. August Heckscher, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, and Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, daughter of President Wilson.

Cooperating very closely with the Commission has been the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, a nonprofit organization established by the voluntary donations of more than one million American citizens and dedicated to perpetuating the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson.

One of the foundation's outstanding contributions has been the production of Woodrow Wilson—Spokesman for Tomorrow, a newsreel documentary of the life and times of our 28th President.

It is most appropriate that this film should be made available during this centennial year when so many schools, churches, and other civic and cultural groups are planning Wilson programs.

This new film, produced for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation in honor of the centennial of his birth, is made up entirely of newsreel shots of Wilson, as well as reproductions of documents and cartoons of his time and highlights many of his most famous speeches. The film stresses the two Wilsonian concepts stated in the theme of the centennial—Freedom for Man—A World Safe for Mankind.

This film is primarily an analysis of Wilson's career in the White House and as spokesman for peace through international cooperation. It reconstructs the intellectual and political growth of a President whose first term saw the enactment of the greatest number of reform laws that has ever been passed in an equal length of time. Among them were: The Underwood tariff revision; the Federal Reserve System; the Federal Trade Commission; the Clayton antitrust law; and measures to aid farmers, reform credit and guarantee labor's rights.

Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Tomorrow was produced for the Woodrow Wilson Foundation by Caravel Films, Inc., and was written and supervised by Norman Borisoff, who wrote "The Titan; The Story of Michaelangelo," the Academy Award winning feature documentary of a few years ago. It is narrated by Alexander Scourby, a well-known stage, screen and television actor, and Woodrow Wilson's words are spoken by William Johnstone.

The film may be rented from usual film rental sources (public libraries or college and university firm libraries) or ordered for direct purchase from: The Text-Film Department of the McGraw-Hill Book Co., 330 West 42d Street, New York 36.

Warning to Those Who Would Put the Atom in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, during the coming months, the American people will hear a great deal of oratory, overstatement, oversimplification, and just plain nonsense about foreign relations, the farm program, the budget, taxes, and so on. In the great political tradition of this Nation the policies and programs of the party in power will be attacked vigorously by the party out of power, and with equal vigor defended by the party in power. Now, within the bounds of honesty and good taste, this will be a good thing, for in the course of public debate the truth usually emerges, though oftimes dim and cloudy, and the people of this Nation are thereby aided in their exercise of the sovereign right to choose their leaders and through that choice to indicate their approval or disapproval of past actions.

I shall do my part in this coming debate to tell the people of the solid, substantial programs of this administration, for I believe never has this country risen to such heights of technical excellence, economic and political freedom, prosperity, and well being as it has in the past 4 years under the enlightened and progressive leadership of President Eisenhower. I shall fight for the continuing leadership of this Government by the great Republican Party, but there is one area of national interest over which I beg for an absence of political debate and campaign oratory.

I do not here wish to deliver a political speech. Quite the contrary. I wish to make a nonpartisan plea that, at least in this one area of national interest and activity, prudence prevail over pique, progress over partisanship, perspective over personalities, and patience over petulance to the end that our Nation's development of atomic energy for the good of mankind everywhere shall proceed expeditiously and not become bogged down in the quagmire of partisan politics and personal venom.

Atomic energy is far too important to our Nation to be used as cat's-paw for some selfish political advantage, or to by sidetracked by insistence on controversial programs such as placing the Federal Government in the electric business and socializing this great new atomic-energy industry.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which I have been a member since its creation 10 years ago, and of which I was chairman during the 83d Congress, has traditionally approached its responsibilities in the field of development, use, or control of atomic energy in a truly nonpartisan manner. For 10 years that has been the policy and practice of the Joint Committee, but, alas, that admirable record has been marred

and deeply scarred in the 84th Congress by some Members. So meticulously was this policy respected during my chairmanship that I refused to make a political speech on any subject lest I be charged with political bias and the work of the Joint Committee be thereby impaired.

Regretfully, I have observed a growing tendency by some in the present majority party in the Congress to attempt to use atomic energy for political advantage, and to use the powerful position given them by fact of majority control to work petty vengeance upon devoted and talented civil servants and officials whose viewpoints have differed from theirs. The recent and shameful action of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee comes to mind. So scurrilous and unsubstantiated was his attack upon the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission that the vicious report he drafted was rejected by his own committee and redrafted, but not before he had distributed it to the press, resulting in libelous news articles. And this nefarious attack was made under the cover, under the pious purpose, of accelerating the Nation's atomic-energy program. It was made by the same man who last year, until reversed by action of this House, refused to include in the AEC appropriations bill any funds whatsoever for building plants and facilities needed in the AEC civilian power development program. I say with pride that the members of the Joint Committee, Republican and Democrat alike, successfully fought side by side on the floor of this House to restore those funds.

Now, I do not believe that the cause of moderation, of temperate action, of nonpartisan consideration that I am here pleading will be furthered by a recitation by me of all the events that have given rise to my concern. I shall not, in hoping to cure the situation, aggravate it instead, although many instances of deliberate political depredations on the atomic program could be cited and partisan purposes be established.

Rather would I seal my lips on some of the regrettable instances of political assault and instead call upon my friends of the Democratic Party to join with me in a concerted effort to keep the atom out of politics. The atom should be and must be above partisan politics—our national interest, security, and prestige require no less. If we do not, our national position will gravely suffer and we shall fail in our solemn obligation to bring the blessings of atomic energy to our fellow man throughout the world at the earliest possible time.

Let me cite, however, a recent example to illustrate my concern. The House had before it a bill written by the Joint Committee and reported without adverse vote by that committee, which had as its stated purpose the acceleration of the development of peacetime atomic power. I for one was not satisfied with the bill as it came from the Joint Committee and, therefore, offered a series of amendments in the course of debate in the House to remove its objectionable features. My amendments remove the last vestige of resemblance between the bill before the House and the original so-called Gore-Holifield bills which were an admitted attempt to place the Federal Government in the electric business and to socialize the atomic industry.

In the course of a lengthy debate, it became apparent that the vast majority of Members of the House were suspicious of the real purposes and intent of the measure. They were unwilling to take a chance on its subsequent perversion even though the amendments adopted made the bill more palatable. Therefore, the House killed the bill by sending it back to the Joint Committee.

Let me say that the defeat of that bill was the direct result of an attempt to use atomic energy as a vote getter in the public power areas and, under the cloak of a laudable purpose, to attract the votes of people everywhere who are eager to advance the atomic program.

I said that the stated purpose of the bill was to accelerate the development of peacetime atomic power. My great and good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] underlined in his remarks on the floor that the bill was not a public power bill. So too, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] reiterated that the purpose of the bill was in no way connected with the issue of public power. My amendments, among other things, made this clear; but, if the bill was intended solely to do what its title stated to be its sole purpose, it is most difficult to understand why those amendments were called "crippling" by one of the authors of the discredited public power bill I referred to previously.

The reason is simply this: Those amendments strengthened and accelerated the development of peacetime atomic power in accordance with our American philosophy of free and competitive enterprise. But they also removed the hidden avenues to Federal entry into the electric business of generating and selling electricity produced, not from falling water as in connection with flood control, reclamation or navigation, but from atomic energy. Those amendments exposed the original Gore-Holifield bills as the "Trojan horse" of the atomic industry.

If the bill as reported from the Joint Committee was solely what it was stated to be, why did the gentleman from California describe the amendments I proposed and which were adopted by the House as "crippling"? The only explanation is that the amendments were indeed needed to keep the bill in accord with its stated purpose and that the suspicions of the great majority of Members of this House who believe the Federal Government should not become involved in the electric business were well founded.

The situation facing the House on the motion to recommit was this: The bill, as presented, was clearly shown to have hidden features which place the Federal Government in the business of generating and eventually selling electricity produced from atomic energy. It had passed the Senate without the amendments written in by the House to correct this weakness. As pointed out by the assistant minority leader, it was very likely that the bill, if passed by the House, would come back from conference in a form that would not be acceptable to the majority of Members of the House in that the necessary changes made in the House would not be accepted by the conferees.

The defeat of the bill was caused by the doubt and misunderstanding generated directly as a result of the efforts of a few dyed-in-the-wool proponents of socialized power production and distribution, aided and abetted by the repugnance the gentlemen of the House felt to the politically motivated and slanderous attack upon the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission by one of the recent, but I am afraid insincere, converts to a strong atomic development program.

Fortunately, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 already contains all the authority needed to proceed with any atomic power reactors needed to speed the development of atomic power. The Gore-Holifield bills were not needed to accelerate the atomic program. The Atomic Energy Commission has undertaken to appraise the entire field by a panel of eminent scientists and the Chairman has committed himself to push ahead on all fronts with the aid and assistance of private companies or cooperatives and, in the event no such participation is forthcoming, solely with Federal funds. That is the proper, the wholesome, the natural, and American way to progress.

Defeat of the Gore bill does no harm whatever to our national atomic program. In fact, the rejection of a Federal socialized power development program has given private industry new courage and hope. After the objectionable features of the bill were removed by adoption of my amendments, I voted against recommittal because I shall never vote against passage of any bill which, although not necessary, is directed solely at speeding atomic progress.

The action of the House in recommitting this bill is a warning to those who would put the atom in politics. It is a warning we should all heed lest, by mixing the atom in controversial matters such as the generation and sale of electricity by the Federal Government, we shall so cast suspicion upon any proposed action as to make its acceptance by a majority of the Congress doubtful, if not impossible.

The atom must not be socialized. Its tremendous force and power will not accept the straitjacket of Government monopoly.

I previously referred to pique and petulance. Pique over failure of the Gore bill to pass was apparently the basis for the refusal of the Democratic leadership of the House and Senate to consider and pass the measure which the atomic industry has been awaiting and without which real progress will be seriously hindered. I refer to the measure which would delineate the public liability of an owner and operator of an atomic reactor. For 2 years, the joint committee struggled to prepare an acceptable proposal which was adopted by the committee with but one dissenting vote. It was of such importance to the peacetime atomic program that President Eisenhower personally wrote to Vice President NIXON and Speaker RAYBURN urging enactment before adjournment.

The President's plea fell on deaf and unyielding ears. The consequence of petulance in the Democratic leadership deplorably and needlessly hinders our free, competitive atomic program.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I repeat my opening plea. The atom has no nationality, it has no religion—and, above all, it has no politics. It is neither Republican nor Democratic. But neither is it static; it will not await the machinations and manipulations of maneuvering politicians. It demands attention and action with a minimum of governmental restraint and regulation. If America does not give the atom the green light of go-ahead, it will find its proper place in foreign lands where its benign power is not only appreciated but will be realized.

Again, I beg that the atom be kept off the platform of political acrimony and out of the arena of partisan competition.

Republican Social Security Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration has compiled a magnificent record in the field of social security. The system has been strengthened, its finances put on a sounder basis, the benefits increased, and its protection extended for the first time to many millions of Americans. It was in the field of social security that the Republican Party, when it took power after nearly 20 years out of office, demonstrated once and for all that its policies were forward-looking and that its domestic program was based upon a fundamental and deep-rooted concern for human welfare.

The social-security legislation which has just become law contains some very significant changes, particularly with regard to the payment of disability benefits and the lowering of the benefit age for women. This legislation had bipartisan support in the Congress. After the legislation had passed the House, the administration quite properly evidenced concern over some aspects of the bill. It will be recalled that the Committee on Ways and Means which has jurisdiction over social-security legislation and which initially developed this legislation had refused to hold public hearings on the matter. Thus, this legislation, involving billions of dollars and the economic security of millions of Americans and their families, was developed in closed, secret sessions. The Republican minority of the committee strenuously objected to this procedure on the ground that it did not safeguard the vital interest of millions of Americans. This protest was a matter of public record.

As part of the Republican protest against the secret proceedings in which this legislation was developed, it was pointed out that there were a number of other areas in the social-security law to which consideration should be given. Among these was an increase in minimum benefits and a further liberalization in the so-called work clause which reduces an individual's benefit if he continues in gainful employment after 65.

In view of the method by which this legislation was considered, it was not surprising that the administration, which after all is responsible for administering the law, discovered certain problems under the bill as it passed the House. As a result, very lengthy public consideration was given the bill in the Senate and very substantial improvements made. Among these improvements were a very large reduction in cost, the establishment of a special trust fund to handle the financing of the disability-insurance program, and a smaller tax increase to finance the new program. There is no question but that a sounder law resulted from these changes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to recall some of the more important provisions of the administration social-security program which was enacted as the Social Security Act Amendments of 1954. I have a personal interest in that law, not only because it clearly symbolizes the Republican record in this field, but because I personally sponsored the legislation.

I. EXTENSION OF COVERAGE

First. Farmers: The Republican Social Security Act Amendments of 1954 extended social-security coverage for the first time to self-employed farm owners and operators. This meant that old-age and survivors insurance protection has been extended to about 3.6 million farmers, their wives, and their children.

Second. Farm workers: The law also extended coverage to about 2 million farm workers. The 1954 law extended this same protection to those farm workers who earn $100 or more in the course of a year from one employer. Unfortunately, some of these same individuals whom we brought into the system in 1954 will now be removed from coverage as a result of the new 1956 law.

Third. Professional groups: The law extended social-security coverage to accountants, architects, engineers, and morticians. Lawyers and dentists would also have been covered by the bill as I introduced it and as it passed the House. These individuals will now be covered under the 1956 law.

Fourth. Ministers: The law covered ministers and members of religious orders, whether self-employed or employees, if they elect individually for coverage on the same basis as self-employed individuals. It was estimated that this amendment would extend coverage to about 260,000 persons.

Fifth. State and local employees: The 1954 law extended coverage to the employees of State and local governments who were covered by State and local retirement systems—other than policemen and firemen—under voluntary agreements between the States and Federal Government, if a majority of the members of the system voted in a referendum in favor of coverage. There were about 3.5 million persons in this group.

Sixth. Domestic workers: The law extended coverage to domestic workers in private homes—and others who perform work not in the course of the employer's place of business—who are paid $50 in cash wages by an employer in a calendar quarter, regardless of the 24-day test required in the prior law. This provision extended coverage to about 250,000 persons.

Seventh. Miscellaneous: The law also extended social security coverage to the following groups for the first time:

(a) American citizens employed outside the United States by foreign subsidiaries of American companies, under voluntary agreements between the Federal Government and the parent American company—about 100,000.

(b) Homeworkers who were excluded from coverage as employees—whether or not they were covered as self-employed persons—because their services were not subject to State licensing laws—about 100,000.

(c) Employees engaged in fishing and related activities, on vessels of 10 net tons or less or on shore—about 50,000.

(d) American citizens employed by American employers on vessels and aircraft of foreign registry.

(e) Cotton-gin workers.

The following is a breakdown of the additional coverage provided by the Republican social security law of 1954: 3,600,000 farmer operators, 2,100,000 farmworkers, 200,00 domestic workers, 3,500,000 State and local employees, 250,000 ministers, 100,000 homeworkers, 50,000 fishermen, 100,000 employees of foreign subsidiaries, 50,000 in employment not in course of trade or business, 100,000 professional self-employed, and 150,000 Federal employees; totaling 10,-200,000.

II. INCREASE IN BENEFITS

First. More than 6.5 million persons then on the benefit rolls had benefits increased as of September 1, 1954. The average increase for retired workers was about $6 a month, with proportionate increases for dependents and surivors. The range in primary insurance amounts for those then on the rolls became $30 to $98.50, as compared to $25 to $85 under the then existing law.

Second. Persons who retired or died in the future would, in general, have their benefits computed by the following new formula under the 1954 law: 55 percent of the first $110 of average monthly wage—rather than $100 as in prior law—plus 20 percent of the next $240—rather than 15 percent of the next $200. Thus, an individual's retirement benefit was made as high as $108.50 a month, and he and his wife together would receive as much as $162.75 in retirement benefits. These benefits have not been increased by the 1956 law.

Third. The minimum monthly benefit amount for a retired worker was increased to $30, and the minimum amount payable where only one survivor is entitled to benefits on the deceased insured person's earning, was made $30. This minimum benefit was not increased by the 1956 law.

Fourth. The maximum monthly family benefit of $168.75 was increased to $200; the provision of the then existing law that total family benefits could not exceed 80 percent of the worker's average monthly wage would not reduce total family benefits below 1½ times the insured worker's primary insurance amount, or $50, whichever is the greater.

III. EARNINGS BASE

The total annual earnings on which benefits will be computed and contributions paid was raised from $3,600 to $4,200. This has not been changed.

IV. COMPUTATION OF BENEFITS

The individual became entitled under the 1954 law to drop out from the computation of his average monthly wage for benefit purposes up to 5 years of his lowest earnings.

V. RETIREMENT TEST

The earnings limitation was removed entirely at age 72—instead of at 75, as under prior law. For beneficiaries under age 72, the earnings limitation was made the same for wage earners and self-employed persons. A beneficiary can earn as much as $1,200 in a year from covered work without loss of benefits. He loses a month's benefit for each unit of $80—or fraction thereof—of covered earnings in excess of $1,200, but in no case can he lose benefits for months in which he neither earns more than $80 in wages nor renders substantial services in self-employment. Beneficiaries engaged in noncovered work outside the United States have their benefits withheld for any month in which they worked on 7 or more days.

No further liberalization of the work test was considered by the last Congress.

VI. ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS

(a) As an alternative to the then existing requirements for fully insured status, it was provided that an individual would be fully insured if all the quarters elapsing after 1954 and up to the quarter of his death or attainment of age 65 were quarters of coverage, provided he had at least 6 quarters of coverage after 1954.

(b) It was provided that benefits would be paid to the surviving aged widow, widowed mother, and children, or parents of any individual who died after 1939 and prior to September 1, 1950, and had at least 6 quarters of coverage.

VII. PRESERVATION OF BENEFIT RIGHTS FOR DISABLED

The 1954 law provided that the period during which an individual was under an extended total disability would be excluded in determining his insured status and the amount of benefits payable to him upon retirement or to his survivors in the event of his death. Only disabilities lasing more than 6 months would be taken into account. Determinations of disabilities generally would be made by State vocational rehabilitation agencies or other appropriate State agencies pursuant to agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

VIII. RECOMPUTATION OF BENEFITS FOR WORK AFTER ENTITLEMENT

It was also provided that an individual may have his benefit recomputed to take into account additional earnings after entitlement if he has covered earnings of more than $1,200 in a calendar year after 1953 and after the year in which his benefit was last computed.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, the Republican social security record is one of solid accomplishment. It is a proud record, one which guarantees a more secure future for millions of Americans and their families.

Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JERE COOPER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means since July 14, 1932. During that period I have always been impressed with the industry and competence of my committee colleagues. This impression has recently been greatly enhanced by the information I have developed in the preliminary work I have done with respect to the preparation of this report of the committee activity during he 84th Congress. This preliminary work has entailed a review of the activity of the 84th Congress to date, which has left me convinced that the Committee on Ways and Means has worked as hard and as effectively in this Congress as any committee of Congress has ever worked.

At the outset of my remarks I would like to express my grateful appreciation to my committee colleagues who have served so constructively and so ably on the committee during the Congress that is now drawing to a close. As members of the committee, they have been instrumental in the preparation of legislation that proffers great benefit to the American people they represent. As members of the Committee on Ways and Means they have worked diligently for long hours, for long days, for long weeks, and for long months. They may derive satisfaction from the knowledge of the great accomplishments they have achieved. To all the members of the committee, Democrat and Republican alike, goes my grateful and heartfelt appreciation for their cooperation and endeavors without which our accomplishments would not have been possible.

In citing this record of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 84th Congress, it has been my purpose to devote special attention to the activities during the second session of this Congress, in view of the fact that a similar report in regard to the first session activities was set forth on pages A6085 and A6086 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 25, 1955. However, so that the record may be complete, the statistical information that I will present will be for the entire 84th Congress, and I will necessarily refer to major legislation to which reference was made in my above-mentioned previous remarks.

Before proceeding to discuss the overall statistics and the details of particular measures, I should like to merely list at this point a few of the major bills which became public law and which were handled by this committee, to indicate the heavy responsibility which the committee bears with respect to our Federal legislation and the great importance of the committee's work in many complex areas of legislation. Some of these leading measures are: The social security amendments of 1956; the Federal Highway Revenue Act of 1956; the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955; the Customs Simplification Act of 1956; the Philippine Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955; the Narcotic Control Act of 1956; the Renegotiation Amendments Act of 1956; and the exemption of farm uses from the Federal excise tax on gasoline.

That the workload of the Committee on Ways and Means has greatly increased is evident from a review of statistics from the 81st Congress to date. More bills were referred o the committee during the 84th Congress than were referred to it in the 81st and 82d Congresses combined. During the 84th Congress the committee had 1,324 bills referred to it for consideration as compared to 458 for the 81st Congress and 696 for the 82d Congress. In the 83d Congress 1,203 bills were referred to the committee.

During the 84th Congress the committee took favorable action with respect to legislation affecting the major subjects coming within the committee's jurisdiction, including social securty, tariff laws and customs, the narcotic laws, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Renegotiation Act. In addition to legislation with respect to the major subjects, the committee also acted on legislation affecting the statutory debt limit and authorizing certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department.

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means reported on 99 bills to the House of Representatives compared to 54 bills in the 81st Congress, 64 bills in the 82d Congress, and 52 bills in the 83d Congress. In the 81st Congress 44 bills were reported by the committee which became public law, 51 in the 82d Congress, and 41 in the 83d Congress; whereas, 72 bills became public law during the 84th Congress.

Of the 102 bills coming within the committee's jurisdiction on which some favorable legislative action was taken during the 84th Congress, 29 of them related to tariffs and customs, 60 to tax matters, 3 to social security, 2 to the Renegotiation Act, 3 to narcotics, 2 to the public debt, and 3 to miscellaneous subjects. Ten of these bills might be regarded as major legislation. Specific requests for favorable action had been received from the administration on 24 of the 102 bills on which favorable legislative action was taken.

In order that the splendid record compiled by the Committee on Ways and Means in the 84th Congress may be publicly available, I will insert at this point in the RECORD a report I have prepared

of the committee's activity for the 84th Congress:

RECORD OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, 84TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

There follows a summary of the record of the Committee on Ways and Means briefly setting forth the activities and accomplishments of the committee during the 84th Congress:

I. STATUS OF LEGISLATION

The status of bills referred to the committee during the 84th Congress is indicated in the table set forth below:

Status:	*Total bills*
Reported by the committee	99
Passed by the House	91
Reported by Senate Finance	76
Passed by the Senate	76
Enacted into law	72

(NOTE.—One bill, H. R. 9083, passed the Senate with amendments in the closing days of the 2d session and time did not permit the House to take action with respect to the Senate amendments. Memorandums of disapproval were issued by the President on H. R. 4392, 6887, and 7634.)

The committee met 129 times in executive session during the 84th Congress and held a total of 54 days of public hearings on a variety of subjects. Testimony was received from 526 witnesses in the public hearings in addition to which a large number of individuals and organizations submitted statements for the record with regard to the subject matter under consideration in lieu of appearances. Data concerning these hearings follow:

Subject	Days	Witnesses
Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955	16	214
Prepaid income and reserves for estimated expenses	4	29
Revision of Philippine trade agreement	1	7
Customs Simplification Act of 1955	2	14
Individual Retirement Act of 1955	2	41
Bonding period for distilled spirits	1	12
Upjeweling of watch movements	2	11
Highway Revenue Act	6	44
Organization for Trade Cooperation	12	101
Public assistance	5	33
Public debt limit	1	2
Railroad Retirement Act	1	7

II. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

A. Social-security legislation

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means prepared and presented to the Congress for favorable consideration major amendments to the Social Security Act. The principal bill was H. R. 7225, the Social Security Amendments of 1956, which became Public Law 880. The major features of this legislation included (1) monthly benefits for permanently disabled insured individuals who have attained age 50; (2) a reduction to 62 years in the benefit eligibility age for women; (3) continued monthly benefits to disabled children after they attain age 18; (4) expanded old-age and survivors insurance coverage; (5) adjustments to the OASI contributions schedule to assure the continued actuarial soundness of the program; (6) a liberalization of the public assistance matching formula so as to assure the availability of increased Federal funds to the States for old-age assistance, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children; (7) a new program of medical care for the needy aged, disabled, etc., whereby the Federal Government matches on a 50–50 basis State expenditures for medical care of public-assistance recipients; and (8) provision of Federal funds for research and personnel training with respect to public welfare.

One of the important considerations with respect to H. R. 7225 is that it removed serious benefit gaps that previously existed in the social-security system. These benefit gaps in the program were removed by providing for social-security payments for disabled workers at age 50, continued benefits for disabled children 18 or over whose disability began before they reached age 18, and monthly benefits for women at age 62 instead of 65. It is estimated that in the first year of operation these amendments will make old-age and survivors insurance benefits in the amount of $550 million payable to approximately 800,000 persons. In the long run, it is estimated that 2.3 million people will be added to the benefit rolls who will receive approximately $1.5 billion in annual benefits.

The coverage provisions of H. R. 7225 extended for the first time social-security protection to a large group of people who are self-employed in certain professions such as lawyers, dentists, chiropractors, veterinarians, naturopaths, osteopaths, and optometrists. Doctors of medicine are now the only self-employed people who are not covered by social security. In addition, several important improvements were made in social-security coverage of farmers and farm workers which were directed to the clarification of the status of a farm landowner or tenant who derives income from a share-farming arrangement, to liberalized farm income reporting procedures so as to benefit small farmers, and to simplified reporting requirements with espect to occasional employees. Another improvement in the coverage provisions of the social-security laws that were provided by H. R. 7225 makes OASI coverage available to the employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the Federal Home Loan Bank. The 1956 changes in the law restore a remarried widow's benefit rights on the earnings record of her first husband under circumstances of her second husband's death within a year of their marriage. The 1956 amendments provide that social-security coverage will be denied for service in the employ of any organization that is Communist associated.

It is estimated that the amendments to the public assistance titles of the Social Security Act provided by H. R. 7225 will make available in the first year of operation approximately $160 million in increased Federal funds which will be available to the States for augmenting the public assistance payments received by slightly over 5 million needy American citizens. The new medical care program authorized under the public-assistance payments is estimated to cost $65 million in the first year of operation and will do much to assure adequate medical care for our public-assistance recipients.

Amendments to the Social Security Act continuing OASI wage credits for military service and permitting application for lump-sum death benefits by dependents of deceased military personnel was separately enacted as was other legislation providing that members of the uniformed services of the United States—approximately 3 million persons at the present time—will be covered by the social-security laws beginning January 1, 1957, in the same manner as civilians.

The humane purpose and meritorious nature of these improvements in our social security law resulted in the overwhelming support which the legislation received in the two Houses of Congress.

B. Tax legislation

During the 84th Congress the Committee on Ways and Means took favorable action with respect to 60 bills which amended the Internal Revenue Code. Many of these bills made important changes in our tax structure. Five of these bills might be deemed to be major legislation either as they were enacted into law or as they passed the House of Representatives.

Of the five that might be labeled major legislation, one of them passed the House of Representatives in the form of a major revenue bill but a major feature of the bill was deleted in the Senate. The House-passed version of H. R. 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955, provided a $20 tax credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption claimed by a taxpayer. The legislation also provided a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates. The House version of H. R. 4259 granted across-the-board individual tax relief amounting to over $2 billion to an estimated 71 million taxpayers. Because of extending existing corporate and excise tax rates for 1 year the net revenue effect of the legislation as passed by the House was to increase receipts toward a balanced budget. The Senate deleted the $20 tax credit from the bill and as H. R. 4259 was enacted into law (Public Law 18) it merely provided for a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain existing excise tax rates.

A major bill amending our Federal tax laws that became public law during the 84th Congress was H. R. 7201 which provided a revised formula for the income taxation of life insurance companies. The legislation made several changes in the taxation of life insurance income so as to improve the definition of income and to prevent abuse of the life insurance treatment by companies which are not entirely life insurance companies. The taxing method provided under this bill was intended to become a permanent formula as the legislation passed the House. The Senate-passed version provided that the formula would be in effect for 1 year. Because of the Senate action it was necessary to extend the formula for an additional year by the enactment of H. R. 11995 (Public Law 784) pending the development of further recommendations with respect to the establishment of a permanent formula for the taxation of life insurance companies' income.

A third bill that might be considered major tax legislation because of its effect in preserving the Federal revenue was H. R. 4725 which closed two loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It is estimated that these loopholes would have cost the Treasury in excess of $1 billion if they had been permitted to remain in the law. In taking this action to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the 1954 code (relating to prepaid income and to reserves for estimated expenses), the Committee directed a staff study to be made with a view to preparing legislation embodying the principles of these sections but providing adequate safeguards to prevent the existence of any loopholes.

A fourth major tax bill prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means was embodied in H. R. 10660 (Public Law 627) as title II of that bill to provide the necessary funds to pay on a sound and current basis the costs of the gigantic Federal highway program enacted during the 84th Congress. This legislation made moderate increases in the Federal excise taxes applicable to gasoline and other types of motor fuels, tires and tread rubber, and trucks, buses, and truck trailers. In addition, the bill provides for revenues to be raised from a use tax on heavy vehicles. It is estimated that in the 16-year period from 1957 to 1972 approximately $14.5 billion will be raised by the new or increased taxes provided under H. R. 10660 and that in addition to this amount there will be allocated to the Highway Trust Fund for road development purposes $23.7 billion from taxes imposed under present law. As the contemplated improvements in our highway system are accomplished, the motorists of America will realize a saving in their annual motoring costs despite the tax increases included in this highway legislation. For example, it is estimated that the tax increases will cost the average motorist $8.60 per year but that the average motorist will save in annual oper-

ating costs on his vehicle $96 per year with the result that he will actually realize a net saving annually of $87.40 for the privilege of driving on a modern up-to-date road system. It is inevitable that the development of a modern highway system in the United States will contribute to the safety and economic welfare of the American public and will provide an increased measure of national security.

Difficult problems were involved in working out this equitable and sound method for financing the new Federal highway program, and the solution reached by the Committee contributed in a major way to the overwhelming vote which the combined highway bill received in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The fifth tax bill that might be termed major legislation relieved farmers from Federal excise taxes in the case of gasoline and special fuels used on the farm for farming purposes by authorizing annual refunds of such taxes paid on gasoline and special motor fuels. Under this bill some relief was granted to the American farmer from the severe price-cost squeeze confronting him. This legislation will provide farmers with approximately $60 million in tax relief each year.

The remaining 55 tax bills which were approved by the Committee on Ways and Means were designed to eliminate existing inequities in our Federal tax structure and to grant appropriate tax relief in certain hardship areas.

C. Tariffs and customs legislation

During the 84th Congress the committee took favorable action on 4 major bills affecting tariff and customs laws and 25 minor bills. The four major bills are as follows:

H. R. 1: One of the most important pieces of legislation to be favorably considered by the Congress in the 84th Congress was the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955. This legislation became Public Law 86 and continued through June 30, 1958, the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. The legislation made significant improvements in the administrative safeguards available to domestic producers against excessive imports and made other improvements in our reciprocal trade program. H. R. 1 also prescribed the delegation of authority to the executive department for the establishment of our foreign economic policy which the President described as the cornerstone of our foreign policy.

Pursuant to the authority provided in H. R. 1 trade negotiations were conducted among 22 nations of the free world including the United States during the winter and spring of 1956. As a result of this conference the United States obtained concessions on American exports valued at approximately $400 million annually and expects to receive indirect benefits from other concessions of a substantial dollar amount. Products on which concessions were obtained by the United States cover a wide range of agricultural and industrial commodities and articles.

H. R. 5550: This legislation was favorably acted on by the committee to authorize the President to accept membership in behalf of the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation. The principal objective of the establishment of the organization and United States membership therein was to make possible the creation of improved international machinery for administering the most important trade agreement entered into by the United States under the Trade Agreements Act—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. During the course of the public hearings held by the committee on H. R. 5550, 6 members of the President's Cabinet and 1 Assistant Secretary testified as to the urgent need for the legislation on the grounds that the United States had as much to gain from membership in the organization as any other country by virtue of the fact that the organization would provide a means whereby our country could undertake to guard against impairment of the trade concessions granted to us. In reporting this legislation to the House, the committee adopted several amendments to the bill to make it clear that enactment of H. R. 5550 and the resulting membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation could not result in the overriding of domestic law by an international body and would not commit the United States to make further tariff reductions or adopt any other trade measures. The amendments adopted by the committee also made it clear that the legislation was not to affect the existing safeguards contained in present law for domestic producers.

H. R. 6040: During the 84th Congress further revision of our customs structure was enacted by the favorable consideration of the Customs Simplification Act of 1956 which provided improved procedures for the valuation of imports and the conversion of foreign currency into dollars for the purpose of existing customs duties. In addition, this legislation repealed certain obsolete provisions of our customs laws and streamlined other provisions so that the procedural aspects of our international trade may be handled more expeditiously. It has been stated that the enactment of this legislation will also introduce increased certainty and greater commercial realism in our customs laws. This legislation became Public Law 927.

H. R. 6059: This legislation, the Philippines Trade Agreement Revision Act of 1955, authorized revision of the 1946 Trade Agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines. This legislation became Public Law 196.

Comparable legislation passed the Philippine Legislature and the authorized charges in the existing trade agreement have been proclaimed by the respective chief executives of the two countries. It has been stated that the trade relations that will ensue from these modifications will further serve to strengthen the historic bond of friendship between the peoples of the two countries and will improve the economic relationship between the United States and the Republic of the Philippines.

In addition to the above-enumerated 4 major bills affecting our tariff and customs laws, the committee also took favorable action with respect to 25 other tariff and customs bills of somewhat lesser importance. Among other things these bills continued the suspension of duties on certain strategic and critical materials, extended the free-entry period on gifts for members of the Armed Forces abroad, and household and personal effects brought into the United States on Government orders, and made appropriate adjustments in the tariff and customs status of certain other articles.

D. Narcotics legislation

One of the most insidious and heinous crimes occurring in the United States involves violations of our Federal drug laws and the illicit trafficking in drugs. Not only does drug addiction that is encouraged and spread by this illicit trafficking dissipate the lives of the persons who become addicted, but other socially undersirable consequences result from the violence and crime that attend drug violations. To review the experience with narcotic legislation enacted during the 82d Congress in deterring the illicit drug traffic and to develop additional legislation that might be necessary in this area, the Committee on Ways and Means established a Subcommittee on Narcotics during the close of the first session of the 84th Congress. This subcommittee was composed of Mr. HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, as chairman; Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; Mr. IKARD, of Texas; Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin; Mr. SADLAK, of Connecticut; and Mr. BAKER, of Tennessee. This subcommittee utilized the adjournment period between the first and second sessions of the 84th Congress and continued its work into the second session and reported to the full committee its findings and recommendations resulting from its study. This subcommittee activity was the initiating factor in the development of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956 (H. R. 11619) which became Public Law 728. This legislation provided more severe penalties for narcotic-drug law violations and provided improved enforcement authority for Federal agents charged with this responsibility. This subcommittee activity has also resulted in the introduction of legislation which has been referred to another committee in the House of Representatives to provide for the control of barbiturates and amphetamines. During the course of the consideration of this legislation the Commissioner of Narcotics, the Honorable Harry J. Anslinger, informed the Committee on Ways and Means that the enactment of this legislation would represent a major step forward in the eradication of the illicit drug traffic.

Favorable action was also taken on legislation (H. R. 2369) to correct an inadvertent error in the 1954 code relating to narcotic penalties and on legislation (H. R. 7018), to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to subpena witnesses, require the production of records, and to take other specified actions in connection with the enforcement of the narcotic laws.

E. Miscellaneous legislation

The Committee on Ways and Means acted favorably with respect to seven bills that might be incorporated under this miscellaneous category in the absence of listing them elsewhere in this report. Two of these bills, H. R. 4904 and H. R. 11947 related to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended. The latter bill was major in character in that it included important changes and liberalizations in the renegotiation authority. The bill increased from $500,000 to $1 million the statutory floor below which sales are not subject to renegotiation. The standard commercial article provision was changed and clarified, and the number of executive departments, contracts with which are subject to renegotiation, was reduced. The bill also provided for a 2-year carryforward of losses on renegotiable contracts so that losses sustained in 1954 and later years may be carried forward 2 years for purposes of renegotiation computations. In addition, filing requirements under the law are streamlined so as to minimize the administrative inconvenience of doing business with the Federal Government. These and other improvements in the Renegotiation Act became public law during the 84th Congress.

At the request of the administration, the Committee on Ways and Means twice acted to increase for 1 year in each instance the statutory debt limit. These bills, H. R. 6992 and H. R. 11740, became Public Laws 124 and 678, respectively.

Two other bills relating to certain Treasury administrative expenses (S. 1727, Public Law 57) and to the collection of State sales and use taxes on cigarettes (H. R. 6886, Public Law 335) were favorably acted on by the Committee on Ways and Means.

In addition, the committee acted on House Resolution 475 which was a resolution of inquiry regarding settlement of a tax claim by the Internal Revenue Service of a tax claim against the American Distilling Co.

III. SUBCOMMITTEES

During the closing days of the 1st session of the 84th Congress three subcommittees were established. These subcommittees were (1) the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies, (2) the Subcom-

mittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, and (3) the Subcommittee on Narcotics. With the exception of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems, the legislative work of the subcommittees has been referred to in connection with the discussion of legislation in the preceding paragraphs.

The Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems held extensive public hearings and met many days in executive session to develop legislation that would provide administrative simplicity in connection with our Federal excise tax structure and would remove inequities existing in present law. As a result of this subcommittee activity a report was submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means which was the basis for the preparation of legislation by the committee proposing major revisions in our Federal excise-tax laws. This legislation, H. R. 12298, was introduced by the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, and will receive continued study by the reconstituted subcommittee which is to be known as the Subcommittee on Excise Taxes and which will have added to the scope of its jurisdiction questions involving excise-tax rates. The membership of the reconstituted subcommittee is as follows: Hon. AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, chairman; Mr. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri; Mr. HERLONG, of Florida; Mr. JENKINS, of Ohio; Mr. MASON, of Illinois; and Mr. HOLMES, of Washington.

In addition to the subcommittee activity described above, it is expected that two other subcommittee studies will be undertaken during the adjournment period.

The Subcommttee on Internal Revenue Taxation under the chairmanship of Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, includes in its membership Mr. GREGORY, of Kentucky, Mr. O'BRIEN, of Illinois, Mr. IKARD, of Texas, Mr. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, and Mr. BAKER, of Tennessee. This subcommittee will review the 1954 Code to determine what technical and substantive corrections and changes in the Code may be necessary. The subcommittee will also study the correlation between the statute and the regulations promulgated thereunder and inquire into the administration of the Internal Revenue laws under the Reorganization Act of 1951.

The Subcommittee on Customs, Tariffs, and Reciprocal Trade Agreements, under the chairmanship of the Honorable HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana, includes in its membership Mr. KING, of California, Mr. HARRISON, of Virginia, Mr. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, Mr. MACHROWICZ, of Michigan, Mr. REED, of New York, Mr. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, Mr. SADLAK, of Connecticut, and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is expected that this subcommittee will make extensive inquiry into our tariff and customs laws and the administration thereof so as to determine the relationship and effect of these matters on the foreign economic policy of the United States and their effect upon domestic producers and employment.

These subcommittees which will be active during the adjournment period following the 2d session of the 84th Congress, will submit reports to the full committee prior to the convening of the 85th Congress so as to inform the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means as to the activities and findings of the respective subcommittees. It is expected that these reports will make important contributions to the development of legislation in the related fields of inquiry.

Social Security for Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant changes provided by the Eisenhower social-security program has been the extension of this essential protection to the Nation's farmers and their families. This was accomplished by the Social Security Act amendments of 1954, which I sponsored and led the fight for on behalf of the administration.

The coverage of farmers had been resisted for many years prior to 1954 on the ground that farmers typically do not retire at age 65 and, thus, would seldom be in a position to take full advantage of the benefits of the system. In my opinion, this argument overlooked one vitally important fact. We are apt to forget that the social-security program provides not only retirement benefits for the covered individual himself but also provides very substantial survivorship benefits for his widow and his young children in the event of his untimely death. I agree that many farmers frequently do not retire at 65. I likewise agree that these individuals as a group are relatively more able to make adequate provision for their own security. But even accepting all that as true, the fact remains that the unexpected death of the family's breadwinner frequently spells economic disaster to his loved ones. How many young men in their twenties and thirties, for example, have been able to set aside enough to provide comfortably for their wives and children in the event that something should happen to them? Obviously, the answer is very few.

The social-security program provides substantial survivorship benefits. For example, a young widow with 2 children under age 18 can receive as much as $200 a month in such benefits, and these benefits are exempt from Federal income tax. Again, when his widow herself reaches age 62, she can receive as much as $81.40 a month, also tax free. These are not enormous amounts but they can spell the difference between family tragedy and decent security.

It is for this reason that I led the fight to extend social-security protection to our 6 million farm families. I grew up on a farm, and I remember from my own personal experience how suddenly a tragic accident would strike on one of our neighbor's farms. Today, with the ever-increasing use of machinery on farms, the danger of accident is even greater. I believe that the extension of the basic protection of the social-security system to our farmers has brought a new peace of mind into farm homes throughout the breadth of the land.

I have always wished that there could be some sound basis whereby coverage under social security could be made a matter of free individual choice, in line with our American traditions. Certainly, a voluntary system would have much to recommend it and would avoid many of the complaints which one hears today. However, if the system were made voluntary, experience shows that only those who would gain the most would elect coverage while those who would gain the least would stay out of the system. This would result in vastly increasing cost of social-security protection. It would then cost approximately as much as private insurance, or about 10 times as much as it does today. This would, of course, destroy the practical utility of the system.

Some rather important technical changes were made this year with regard to the social-security coverage of farmers. I would like to describe these changes briefly as I believe they will be of interest to many of our farm families.

OPTIONAL METHOD OF FIGURING SELF-EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS

Self-employed farmers who report on a cash basis have had an optional method of figuring their net earnings ever since they were first covered by the 1954 law. The 1956 amendments permit members of a farm partnership and individual farmers who keep books on an accrual basis also to use a revised optional method.

Under the new optional method, for taxable years ending on or after December 31, 1956:

(a) If a farmer's gross income from agricultural self-employment is not more than $1,800, he may count as his net earnings from farm self-employment either his actual net earnings or two-thirds of his gross farm income.

(b) If his gross farm income is more than $1,800 and his net farm earnings are less than $1,200, he may use either his actual net earnings from farming or $1,200.

(c) If his gross farm income is more than $1,800 and his net farm earnings are $1,200 or more, he must use the actual amount of his net farm earnings.

INCOME FROM LAND FARMED BY SOMEONE ELSE

Beginning with 1955, earnings from self-employment as a farm operator have counted toward social security benefits. Under the old law, however, an individual did not get social security credit for cash or crop shares he received as rent for his land.

Under the 1956 amendments, the cash or crop shares received from a tenant or share farmer will count for social-security purposes if under the individual's arrangement with the tenant or share farmer he participates materially in the production of the crops or livestock or in the management of the production.

In order to participate materially the individual must take an important part in the management decisions or in the actual production.

SHARE FARMERS

If a farmer uses farmland owned by someone else and he receives a share of what he produces, his earnings may have been covered by the social-security law since the beginning of 1955. The 1956 amendments make it clear that if, under an ordinary crop-sharing arrangement, the crops or livestock he produces are divided between him and the landlord, with his share depending on the total amount produced, then he is considered a self-employed farmer for social-security purposes. This is true even if the landowner takes an active part in the farm operations. This rule is effective for all taxable years ending after 1954.

WHEN FARMWORKERS ARE COVERED

If an individual worked for a farmer before 1957, he got social-security credit if the farmer paid him $100 or more in cash wages in the calendar year.

Under the new law, beginning with 1957 his earnings from farmwork will count toward social-security benefits under either of these conditions:

(a) If a farm employer pays him $150 or more in cash during the year, his cash pay from that employer is covered by the law.

(b) If he does farmwork for an employer on 20 or more days during a year for cash pay figured on a time basis (rather than on a piece-rate basis), his cash pay for that employer is covered by the law.

For the $150-a-year test, both piece-rate and time-rate cash pay count. The total number of days worked does not matter so long as he is paid $150 in cash by the employer in the year.

For the 20-day test, the total amount of his cash pay does not matter so long as he works for one employer on 20 days or more for cash pay based on some unit of time such as an hour, a day, or a week.

FARM LABOR CREWS AND CREW LEADERS

Wages paid to members of a labor crew, such as those used to pick cotton and harvest fruits and vegetables, may be covered by the social security law, but in the past it has sometimes not been easy to tell whether the employer of the members of the crew was the farmer who was having the work done or the crew leader (or "labor contractor" or "row boss"). The new amendments make it easier to tell which is the employer.

If an individual is a crew leader, the crew members he furnishes and pays are his employees unless he and the farmer have entered into a written agreement which shows that the crew leader is his employee.

If an individual is a farm operator using crew workers, and he has entered into a written agreement with the crew leader which shows that he is his employee, then the crew members are also his employees.

This provision is effective for work performed after December 31, 1956.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS

The 1954 law did not cover agricultural work performed by workers from Mexico hired under contract or by foreign workers lawfully admitted from the British West Indies on a temporary basis.

Under the amendments, agricultural work performed by foreign workers admitted to the United States on a temporary basis from any foreign country will not be covered by the law after 1956.

ACTION TO TAKE NOW

If a person's work was brought under social security by the 1956 amendments and he does not have a social security card, he should go to his social security office and get one without delay. If there is no social security office near him, he should ask for an application blank—Form SS–5—at the post office, fill it out, and mail it to the nearest social security office.

After he gets his card, he should show it to his employer. He needs the social security number to report the wages properly.

If he is self-employed he will need his social security card when he makes out his social security self-employment tax report. This report is part of the individual Federal income tax return.

If a person is an employer and he is paying or expects to pay farmworkers taxable cash wages during the year, and if he does not already have an employer identification number, he should apply for one without delay. He can get the proper blank at his social security office or at his Internal Revenue Service office.

Further information about social security cards or social security benefits can be obtained from the social security district office.

Further information about social security employment taxes or self-employment taxes can be obtained from the local Internal Revenue Service office.

The addresses of these offices can be obtained at local post offices.

The Workingman Deserves To Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach another national election and the climax of the first Republican administration to hold office in over 20 years, the great workingmen of America deserve to know how their economic status has changed, if any, during the past 3½ years.

As congressional Representative of one of the greatest and most important industrial areas in the United States, it is only natural that I am strongly concerned with the welfare of workingmen of the Naugatuck Valley and only proper that I continue to work unceasingly in Congress for their economic interests, as I have during my nearly 10 years as their Representative in Congress.

In this report it gives me great satisfaction to review the record of the past 3½ years and cite the tremendous advancements that have been made on behalf of labor during that period. In this connection, one of the most significant statements made thus far came from an outstanding leader in the American labor movement, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, who declared that "right now we never had it so good."

Why did Mr. Meany make this statement, and upon what did he base his remarks? The answer is simple and not hard to find. Today wages are higher than ever, and more people are enjoying the fruits of employment than ever before. These facts are reflected by accurate statistics taken from both Government sources and private industry. For example, in January of this year the Department of Labor announced that weekly earnings had risen to the record peak of $71.92 for workers with 3 dependents, and to $64.59 for workers with no dependents. This unprecedented spiral of prosperity is further indicated by record-breaking sales of consumer goods in department stores—and this is of vital importance to industrial workers of the Naugatuck Valley, since they manufacture many consumer products.

In my judgment, however, one of the most significant facts is that there is no indication whatsoever that the present spiral of economic prosperity will come to a halt. And I feel that if we in Congress continue to pursue certain labor policies of the past 3½ years, the prosperity that we now enjoy will continue, and the great American workingmen will remain in the best status that they have ever enjoyed.

Another aspect of major importance is the fact that the present prosperous conditions of American workingmen have been built in an era of peace. In early 1953, certain prophets of doom declared that an economic recession and possibly a depression would set in after President Eisenhower brought the Korean war to a close. How wrong they were. In sharp contrast, wages increased and continued to increase, individual purchasing power continued to rise, consumer goods continued to sell at record-breaking levels, and as a result the American workingman was elevated to an unprecedented peak of prosperity.

As your Representative in Congress, I intend to vigorously support any policy in the future that will advance the interests of American workingmen, just as I have in the past. As you may recall, I was one of the very first Members of Congress to openly advocate and call for a minimum wage law of $1.35 per hour. And as you read this report, you may wonder why I am so strongly pro-labor. There are several reasons. One reason is that I was born and raised among the industrial workers of the Naugatuck Valley and am therefore entirely familiar with conditions of American workingmen and aware that we in Congress must constantly work to improve their economic welfare. Another reason is that the economic welfare of the entire Naugatuck Valley is dependent upon the individual welfare of its thousands of workingmen who turn the wheels, run the machines, and produce some of our Nation's most important products.

Toward the advancement of their interests I shall always work as long as I am honored with the privilege of serving and representing them in the Congress of the United States.

Patterson Reports to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with intense gratification that I am able to report to the working men and women of my district on the tremendous advances made on their behalf under the leadership of Republicans in Congress and the Federal Government.

During the past 3½ years—as it has been during my entire 10 years in Congress—it has given me great satisfaction to work for those measures which were in the best interest of the American laborer.

Now the fruits of those labors are becoming more and more evident in the rapid flowering of benefits for all Americans, and particularly for the men and women who work with their hands.

And as the results of our work flow into the paychecks and the homes of the American laborer, our Nation is experiencing a shift of opinion on the part of working population with respect to political parties. In a very short span of years, the Democrat claim to be the only party working for the good of laboring groups in this country has been thoroughly debunked. In recent weeks, public opinion polls show sentiment among unionized workers shifting to Republican candidates. More and more union leaders are coming to the conclusion first expressed by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, that "right now we never had it so good."

On June 13, James C. Petrillo, head of the 25,000-member American Federation of Musicians and a lifelong Democrat, told a convention in Atlantic City that he had never talked to any man "as friendly and understanding about our problems as President Eisenhower."

The reason for increasing labor satisfaction with what we have done during the past few years is not hard to find. I have no hesitancy in saying that our record of achievements for the workingman is one of the great phenomena of the decade. It is fairly screamed by every statistic available to Government and private research organizations.

For example, employment—that vital take-home pay factor so essential to the working men and women—smashed all existing records in 1955. An average of 63,200,000 persons were employed and that figure is 4,500,000 more than in the last peacetime year under the Democrats. What is more, the level of jobs is even better in 1956. In May, a total of 65 million Americans had jobs and this means 3 million more jobs were held during the first quarter of 1956 than during any first quarter under the Democrats—even in war periods.

As you all know, the coal industry was having very rough sledding when the Republicans first took office. Now, almost unnoticed in the tremendous tide of events, that industry is staging such a dramatic comeback that L. C. Campbell, president of the National Coal Association, told that organiaztion's 39th annual meeting on June 13 that coal "may well be entering its golden years."

This optimism stems from several developments of importance. One is the fact that under Republican policies, exports of bituminous and anthracite coal and coke are running at an annual rate which may make 1956 the highest year in history. Another is that the Republican atomic energy development program is producing a great demand. W. Kenneth Davis, reactor development director for the Atomic Energy Program, said the demand for coal will run well ahead of the demand for other fuels in the next 20 years.

During 1955, unemployment in all industries and fields of endeavor averaged less than 2,700,000—nearly three-quarters of a million below the last peacetime year when the Democrats were in control of Congress and the Government. The three GOP years from 1952 through 1955 averaged less unemployment than Truman's last term despite a nearly 3 million increase in the civil labor force in those years and despite the fact that two-and-a-half of the Truman years were war years.

At the same time, under the prosperity which we have developed, both hourly and weekly wages are at all-time record highs—averaging nearly 13 percent higher in peacetime 1955 than in wartime 1952. The average hourly pay of factory workers was $1.88 compared with $1.67; weekly wages were $76.61 compared with $69.97.

And this increase in take-home pay under the policies which we have adopted is continuing during 1956. I would remind you also that during the last 3 years under the Democrat Truman administration, the dollar bill lost 12 cents, or nearly one-eighth of its buying power through inflation. In the 3 Republican years, the inflation rate was cut to three-fourths of 1 cent.

Combined with lower taxes voted by us in the Republican 83d Congress, this means that labor's average take-home pay, adjusted for cost-of-living changes, was up 13 percent in 1955 over 1952 for the single worker. It was up 10 percent for the average family man with a wife and two children.

Added to this is the fact that, during the Republican years, our working men and women lost less time at work because of strikes. In 1955, for example, strike losses were down 53 percent from the last year under President Truman. During the 7 Truman years after World War II, the average man-days idle were 93 percent greater than in the 3 Republican years.

More directly, we of the Republican Party raised the minimum wage for the Nation's workers to $1 an hour. This affected more than 2 million workers and indirectly aided millions more through its great impact on general wage levels and purchasing power.

In another highly important sphere we tightened up the enforcement of the labor standards laws. The Republicans undertook 1,143 enforcement actions in 3 years. This compared with only 476 actions in the last 3 years of the Truman administration. More than $6 million in back wages due under the Fair Labor Standards Act were paid to over 80,000 employees by 15,000 firms following the Labor Department's investigations last year alone.

At the same time, the Republican campaign to encourage the employment of physically-handicapped workers, helped 250,000 of our less fortunate members of the working force to obtain gainful employment.

During our stewardship of the Federal Government, the Republicans also recognized the need for some changes and refinements in the Taft-Hartley law. Consequently, President Eisenhower submitted 14 proposed improvements, covering such subjects as secret strike ballots, non-Communist oaths, strike settlement recommendations, contract reopening, welfare funds, injunctions, check-offs, free speech.

However, the President's program was defeated by the solid vote of 46 Democrat Senators and no Taft-Hartley revision program has come from the Democrat 84th Congress.

In conclusion, I should like to say that the Republicans have more than kept their pledge to do everything possible to better the lot of the American working men and women. It is true, as Mr. Meany has said, that American workingmen have never had it so good. But, we Republicans feel that they can and will have it a lot better. If our policies are permitted to be carried through to fruition, American labor will enjoy the fruits of more leisure, higher pay, better goods and services at less cost. In fact, the working men and women of America will benefit more than any other single group.

Truman Speaks on the "Insanity" of Stalin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat recently featured a story by an eminent writer on its staff, Mr. John R. Hahn, a reporter who has achieved distinction with each evidence of his ability to differentiate between the significant and the trivial and to convey to his readers the essence of an event.

We are currently observing on the international scene a seeming shift in policy on the part of the Soviet Union. Old methods have outlived their usefulness; but given the psychological atmosphere in which Communist doctrine and attendant strategy is developed, the process of adjustment requires more than mere announcement. The divinity of Stalin must be destroyed before old directives surrounded with his sanctity can be rescinded.

In following this development, John Hahn recognized that one of the persons best able to judge the significance of present-day Soviet moves would by

Harry S. Truman, who had the unequalled opportunity as President of the United States to observe Stalin in action after the war. With his experience and his insight into the inflexible purpose which lies behind all Soviet maneuvers, Mr. Truman places this latest example of opportunism in its proper perspective.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN WAS "ANYTHING BUT INSANE," TRUMAN DECLARES

(By John R. Hahn)

Former President Harry S. Truman yesterday gave the lie to the new Red line that the late Russian dictator Joseph Stalin was a madman.

"He was a smart hombre," Mr. Truman said of Stalin. The former President spent considerable time with Stalin in Big Three conferences at Potsdam, Germany, in 1945.

When the Globe-Democrat asked Truman by telephone what he thought of the stories now pouring out of the Communist world to the effect that Stalin was insane, he replied:

"No, indeed, he was anything but insane."

Truman said the new Kremlin line is a "cover-up."

"The Russians are trying to win the world to communism without fighting," he said. "I don't think we can trust them."

He explained that it was impossible to trust someone who feels that lies are legitimate tools of diplomacy.

"Joseph Stalin," Truman said, "impressed me at the time of Potsdam as a man with whom you could deal. I learned better later.

"He broke 32 agreements in the first year after Potsdam—32 in 1 year—and he broke a great many more later.

"The agreements they made have never been kept. They are all broken. But there was nothing insane about Stalin. The Russians are just trying to get under our skins so they can beat us in the cold war.

"If the agreements had been kept, there never would have been a cold war."

Truman said the Russians have been outmaneuvered in the cold war.

Dean Acheson, who was Truman's Secretary of State for several years, but not at the time of the Potsdam Conference, was asked his opinion of the matter by the Globe-Democrat.

He said there were many reasons why the Russians would want to switch their policy on Stalin. Acheson said that it is difficult to understand why the new Red leader decided to do it so soon and take the risks involved.

Acheson said he wasn't giving any interviews on Stalin, but he added:

"If anyone thinks Stalin was out of his mind, I think they ought to think that over again."

Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet Communist Party chief, accused Stalin of massacre, torture of children, and a personal reign of terror in a sensational speech behind closed doors at last month's party congress in the Kremlin.

He is supposed to have said that in spite of warnings by Sir Winston Churchill, Stalin refused to believe that Hitler would attack him and when the Germans did attack, Khrushchev said Stalin's first order to his troops was not to return the German's fire.

Since then, riots have been reported in Stalin's native Soviet Georgia. Some reports say the decision by the Russians to degrade Stalin was reached as the only way to break the magic of the 30-year Stalin cult.

Khrushchev is said to have accused Stalin, among other things, of gross conceit, persecution mania, and anti-Semitism.

The Issue Is: Shall We Have More Carloads of Coffins?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the issues in the forthcoming political campaign.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am not unmindful of the many invitations given me both in private conversation and in public speeches on the Senate floor, inviting me to join the Democratic Party, nor shall I soon forget the public invitation of the distinguished chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Paul Butler, who at a democratic dinner in Minot, N. Dak., publicly invited me to leave the Republican Party, promising that I would lose neither my committee assignments nor my seniority.

For these invitations, and for this support given me by many liberal Democrats in my State and in various election campaigns, I am grateful.

Every man must make his own decisions, and I have made mine as I have made others before. It has never been difficult for me to make an important decision because as a boy my parents taught me "to do what I thought was right."

In my first statewide political campaign I was honored by endorsements on the Republican ticket from the progressive Republican organization, the Society of Equity, the Scandinavian Total Abstinence League, and the Nonpartisan League, and to each pledged an honest record should I be elected.

These organizations kept on endorsing me, election after election, win or lose.

Particularly did I pledge to the Nonpartisan League members in open convention in 1940 as follows: "Fathers and mothers of America. I pledge you that if I am elected I will never vote to send your boys and girls to the slaughter fields of any foreign country."

That pledge I have kept.

Approximately 1 year ago I pledged to the Nonpartisan League advisory committee and other members at a public banquet that "I will go where the league goes."

That pledge I must break.

I must break it in order to keep faith with the dead rather than the living. I must break it to satisfy my own conscience as a man and as a member of that organization, and face whatever consequences may result.

Abraham Lincoln once said "A bad promise is better broken," and I break this promise regretfully, openly, and honestly, without rancor to anyone.

Two days after I made the promise last alluded to in the newspapers all over this country, particularly in North Dakota, I stated that I was supporting Dwight D. Eisenhower for reelection.

At that time, I felt that I could support Mr. Eisenhower and still support my many friends running as Nonpartisan League candidates, even if they chose to go on the Democratic ballot, but as time went on I found that as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, there were grave doubts as to whether I could do that, and events have multiplied since which makes it impossible.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, many confidential matters and much classified and secret information comes to its membership.

Executive agreements made by preceding Presidents, testimony of highly placed officials, warnings by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and revelations by Cabinet members, gradually makes a member of that Foreign Relations Committee realize the awful responsibility that is his.

Responsibility to those who have given their lives, to those who are blind and crippled by war, to those out in the hills and mountains and valleys, who are relying upon their Senators down here in Washington.

When Woodrow Wilson took office, the United States was happy, prosperous, and contented. Up to that time we had heeded the advice of George Washington not to become entangled in foreign alliances. We were a free and independent nation.

William Jennings Bryan, when he was Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson, had negotiated treaties of friendship with 51 countries.

The people of the United States had elected Mr. Wilson on the pledge that he had kept us out of war and the inferential promise that he would do so in the future.

The records now show that although he was elected upon that pledge in November, that in the preceding April he was already committed to World War I.

The advice of George Washington was ignored, and when this country got through with that war there were 320,565 dead and casualties.

In 1932 we elected another Democrat for President, Franklin Roosevelt. During the campaign he promised and reiterated that promise, "I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again; your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars." And again our people were fooled.

In rapid succession we saw 50 ships worth hundreds of millions of dollars given to Great Britain in what was known as lend-lease.

We saw the drafting of our sons into military service, the same service that our forefathers thought they had left behind forever in Europe when they founded this great country. We saw our sons sent into military service in every country in the world, and the business of the coffin manufacturers flourished as never before, as the bodies of our heroic sons were brought back by the carloads for burial, or were lowered into graves in foreign lands.

And when we got through with World War II there were 1,078,674 dead and injured.

On the death of Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Harry S. Truman, another Democrat, succeeded him as President, and one night without consulting Congress, Mr. Truman announced what he termed a "police action" in Korea.

When he left office, he left 136,927 dead and wounded American boys on our foreign battlefields.

As is well known, during all of my tenure in the Senate, I have never voted for the death or maiming of one single American boy upon foreign battlefields. I have kept faith with the people who elected me, and I have never sold a truth to serve the hour.

To me one of the most courageous episodes in public life has been the example of William Jennings Bryan who resigned as Secretary of State when Woodrow Wilson declared war upon Germany, and who was perfectly willing to sacrifice the remainder of his years of public life for what he thought was right.

Three times under the administration of President Eisenhower we have been, as Secretary Dulles recently wrote on the "brink of war," and three times President Eisenhower has averted war.

Today, for a fourth time we face war, and again I am hopeful that under President Eisenhower, not a single American boy will be sent to the bloody battlefields of Europe or Asia.

On the Senate floor, I have heard distinguished orators say, "What would you have done when the Germans sank the *Lusitania*?" or "What would you have done when the Japanese attacked us on Pearl Harbor?"

My answer is that under a Republican President by skillful diplomacy this never would have taken place, just as the Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, averted war over Venezuela by waving the big stick.

No one realizes better than I, the many important issues involved in the coming campaign, such as the questions of public power, parity prices, conservation of our natural resources, wiping out monopoly, lower taxation and many others that I might mention, but under my conscience, and my oath as a United States Senator, I feel that the safety of our Government is paramount, and that the lives of our young men and women should not be needlessly sacrificed.

During the years that I have been in the Senate, my honest conviction is that the interests of peace have been best served under Republican leadership and that I would be remiss in my duty as United States Senator if I did not say so and if I did not prove that these actions spoke louder than words.

Today the Senate is evenly divided, save but one Democratic vote, which gives the Democrats a majority of one.

I shall do whatever I can in the coming campaign to reverse that majority, and to do that I cannot support the candidacy of any governor who in the case of a Republican vacancy would replace that Republican with a Democrat.

The choice is up to the people of this country, but as a loyal follower of Republicans like Abraham Lincon, Theodore Roosevelt, Robert La Follette, Sr., and George Norris, all of whom left the Republicans at one time or another, I remember only too clearly that none of them in leaving the Republican Party ever joined the Democratic Party.

I repeat that Abraham Lincoln did not do so; that Theodore Roosevelt did not do so; that Robert La Follette, Sr., did not do so; and that George Norris did not do so.

They were either independents or they returned, after a brief period of time, to the Republican Party.

Their actions were significant; and I believe, if they were alive today, they as true patriots would do what I propose to do in the coming campaign.

If my constituents in North Dakota do not agree with me, I want them to remember what the men who signed the Declaration of Independence did, and I quote. "And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunates, and our sacred honor."

What they said then is my guide today. Many of these men, in signing that Declaration of Independence to get rid of British rule, sacrificed their lives and fortunes; and, as a United States Senator, I gladly follow in their footsteps, proudly facing the consequences and saying, "I will serve my country because I am an American."

We all know that today our Republic is again faced with a great crisis—a crisis so great that, except under the most skillful leadership, we may again see carloads of coffins, containing the bodies of our brave heroes, sent to every State of this Union. My sworn duty is to serve my country the best way and in every way I can under my oath of office.

I know that my constituents would not want me to do less. On the record, I am firmly convinced that the best chance for peace for our country would be served by a Republican President, a Republican Vice President, and a Republican Congress.

This, my friends, is my honest judgment in the light Almighty God has given me, and I would be nothing less than a traitor to you and to our Government if I did not act in accordance with the right as I know it.

Report to the People of the 17th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, this marks the 10th year that I have been privileged to represent the 17th Congressional District of New York in the House of Representatives.

From 1939 to 1946 I served in the New York State Senate, where I sponsored a substantial volume of legislation and was chairman of the Rapp-Coudert legislative committee, which unearthed the Communist and other subversive conspiracies in the New York City public educational system. In commenting upon this investigation the New York Times said:

The Rapp-Coudert committee is to be congratulated.

Through my congressional years I have fought for national security, stable money, tax reduction, and sound economy; civil rights; less restrictive entry of displaced persons; adequate school facilities; solution of housing problems, of problems of the aging, and for many other worthwhile objectives.

During the past 4 years I have supported the Eisenhower administration's legislative program in the conviction that this was in the best interests of all the people. To my gratification, President Eisenhower saw fit to endorse me in the following letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 28, 1956.

DEAR FRITZ: I should feel remiss if I failed to express to you my appreciation of your cooperation in the Congress in connection with a number of matters of vital importance to our country which have come before the Committee on Appropriations. I am aware that on several occasions your efforts have contributed a great deal to the success of key programs, and for this I am personally grateful. I look forward to the continuance of your effective public service in the years to come.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Space limitation permits me to present here only the highlights of my 10-year congressional record.

The first objective of our Government during these difficult and troubled times has been safeguarding the security of the United States and the welfare of its people. Within the limitations of that framework I have worked ceaselessly as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations to reduce waste and unnecessary Federal expenditures—to the end that the people of the United States may one day be relieved of much of their paralyzing tax burden.

TAXES AND INFLATION

I am a strong advocate of reducing taxes whenever that can be done without endangering the national security or adversely affecting the public welfare. I have favored adoption of the recommendations of the Hoover Commissions, aimed at lowering the cost of governmental operation and thus making lower taxes possible.

When I became a Member of Congress, one of my first concerns was to provide tax relief for our citizens, who had borne the burden of providing funds for defense of the free world for so many years. In the Republican 80th Congress we passed three tax bills to provide needed relief, but President Truman vetoed all 3. I voted for all 3 and voted to override all 3 vetoes. The first veto was sustained in both Houses, the second in the Senate, and it was not until April 2, 1948, that we were able to override the veto and reduce tax rates from World War II levels.

In 1950 I voted for a bill passed by the House to cut excise taxes by a little over $1 billion. But the Korean war intervened before the Senate could act and Congress then had to increase taxes, rather than cut them, to provide weapons against the Communist aggression.

The Truman administration asked for further tax increases in 1951. Believing the increases recommended by the Democrat-controlled Ways and Means Committee were excessive, I voted to recommit the Revenue Act of 1951 to the committee and also voted against its passage. With many of my Republican colleagues I felt that additional cuts in nondefense expenditures should be made before tax rates were further increased.

It was again my privilege to vote for a tax reduction in 1954. I voted on 4 rollcalls in favor of President Eisenhower's tax reduction program. Early in 1955 the Democrat majority in Congress tried to embarrass President Eisenhower by a further income tax reduction. This would have prevented achievement of the President's objective of reducing inflationary pressures through maintenance of a balanced budget. I was convinced that such a reduction would not benefit the low-income groups it was supposed to help, because it would ultimately be translated into an increase in the cost of living. Therefore I supported President Eisenhower's position in opposition to the Democrat-sponsored tax cut.

I have long sponsored and fought for legislation to compel a balanced budget in absence of war or national emergency in order to prevent the dangerous inflation resulting from Federal budget deficits.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee I have done all in my power to reduce unnecessary Government expenditures and to eliminate waste. It has been my objective to reduce the burden on individual incomes whenever possible so as to increase the incentives of our people to produce more and thus to expand our economy and its tax base.

Accordingly, on March 16, 1950, I proposed a constitutional amendment that would ultimately permit the Federal Government to resort to an income tax only in a national emergency and to reduce the national debt and pay interest thereon.

In 1956 I introduced a bill to establish a Hoover-type Commission on Federal

Taxation to consider the defects and inequities of the present tax structure, particularly the income tax, and to recommend constructive changes. It is worthy of note that T. Coleman Andrews, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the Eisenhower administration, has called for repeal or drastic modification of the Federal income tax law and has recommended a similar commission to study this question.

For some years I have been concerned about problems confronting many of my constituents who are self-employed or engaged in professional work. Employees of corporations are not taxed on part of the payments made into approved retirement plans. But the professional person or small-business man must provide for his own retirement from his income after taxes. On October 20, 1951, I first introduced and fought for a bill to allow an income-tax deduction to individuals for premiums paid on annuities and life insurance contracts. I intend to continue the fight.

Through the years I have supported rent-control and price-control measures when needed to protect the people from the ravages of inflation. I voted for such anti-inflationary measures from my first year in Congress until 1953, when upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, Federal price, wage, and rent controls were repealed in order to stimulate the national economy. At that time New York State had its own rent-control laws.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

In the struggle against the forces of communism the United States has long been committed to leadership of the free world. I have supported the necessary action to make this leadership effective.

I have supported a broad program of foreign aid under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations, but have sought to prevent misuse and waste of the taxpayers' dollars. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I have frequently called attention to specific instances of waste and bad management. This in no way reflected lack of sympathy with the basic and necessary objectives of the program.

During my first year in Congress I voted for a relief program for war-devastated countries and also voted for the Greek-Turkish aid bill, authorizing $400 million aid to Greece and Turkey in their resistance to communism. I voted in 1948 for establishment of the Marshall plan, a program that has been continued with modifications ever since.

The first important action of the 84th Congress was the resolution to authorize the President to use the Armed Forces in defense of Formosa, necessitated by 5 years of promises to defend the Chiang Nationalist Government in the event of attack from the Red China Government on the mainland. I voted for it.

The fact that the President came to the Congress for the authority, thereby setting a precedent for the first time in such circumstances, was particularly gratifying to me. It was gratifying because of my long fight to amend the law so as to require Presidential consultation of the Congress before committing American troops to armed combat, except in self-defense or pursuant to the obligations of our mutual security treaties.

Believing it essential that we expand our foreign trade, I have supported the reciprocal trade agreements program. I voted for this program in 1948, 1949, 1951, 1954, and 1955. Our present law extends the program until 1958.

As another step to expand our international trade, President Eisenhower asked legislation to simplify custom procedures. I supported this program, which became law this year.

I have worked to facilitate the investment of capital in overseas businesses so that American techniques and resourcefulness can accompany our dollars overseas. I believe this is one of the best ways to stimulate development of the economies of friendly nations. With this in mind, I voted in 1949 for a bill, which became law, to permit Federal Reserve member banks to deal in and underwrite securities issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In this same field I voted in 1950 for a bill, part of the point 4 program, to expand the authority of the Export-Import Bank. This provided that the bank could guarantee, for an appropriate fee, private capital invested abroad up to $250 million against losses through expropriation or restricted conversion of foreign currency into United States dollars. The following year I voted for a bill to increase the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank by $1 billion.

In another phase of foreign affairs, I was recorded in 1947 in favor of statutory authorization for the State Department's information program. This included the Voice of America.

I supported the passage of a bill in 1948 to authorize admission of 202,000 additional displaced persons into the United States. Through the years I have consistently supported such legislation.

In 1952, I favored the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act as a means of strengthening the Attorney General's authority to deal with subversives, Communist or otherwise. The act was faulty in a number of respects and President Eisenhower has recommended a revision with which I am in accord.

DEFENSE

Provision for the military security of our country is the most important matter with which Congress and our Government must deal. I have voted for the multi-billion-dollar appropriations and other defense measures deemed necessary to make and keep our country strong.

As far back as 1948, I was one of those who recognized that our national defense must be based in large part on air superiority. In that year I voted for a bill to provide funds to start immediate expansion of our Air Force to 70-group strength, over the protests of President Truman. I have consistently supported the authorization of funds to provide adequate research in the defense field and development of new weapons.

While recognizing the vital importance of maintaining an adequate defense establishment, I have been ever mindful of the danger of waste and extravagance in military expenditures. I have fought to assure the greatest value out of every taxpayer's dollar.

In the course of this never-ending struggle, I participated with Representative HOWARD SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, in 1952 in a move to impose an overall ceiling of $46 billion upon Defense Department spending during fiscal 1953. I did so because the Defense Department had available, with new funds requested and carryover funds, a total of over $100 billion legally spendable in 1953.

There were loud outcries from the professional military, their civilian chiefs and a section of the press that the limitation passed by the House would hamstring the military and endanger national security. The House limitation did not become law because of failure of the Senate to agree. But it turned out in fact that the military was wholly unable to spend during 1953 even the $46 billion which the House had been prepared to allow. This fact completely vindicated the House action and my position.

To promote the efficient operation of the Military Establishment, I supported the National Security Act of 1947, which unified the Armed Forces under a Secretary of Defense with Cabinet rank. It also created a Department of the Air Force coequal in rank with the Army and Navy.

VETERANS

Having served overseas as an infantry soldier in World War I, I have always had a deep appreciation of the problems of veterans of our Armed Forces. I voted for legislation to increase allowances for veterans receiving college training; to pay half the cost of special housing for wheelchair disabled veterans; to permit holders of terminal leave pay bonds to cash them after September 1, 1947, instead of holding them 5 years; to permit payment to veterans of retroactive benefits withheld during hospitalization; and to grant additional allowances for veterans paralyzed from service-connected injuries.

HOUSING

The need for decent housing for all our people has long been one of the great problems facing the Nation. I have proposed and pressed for passage of legislation to facilitate the private construction of homes for middle-income families in metropolitan areas. I consider this one of the most acute needs in the housing field.

I have supported measures for public housing where needed. From my first year in Congress I have supported measures to aid in construction and repair of homes, to expand and liberalize mortgage insurance programs of the Federal Housing Administration, to eliminate and prevent slums, and to conserve and develop urban communities.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Perhaps the most important matter within this broad field is the vast social-security program. Throughout my congressional career I have favored broadening the coverage of the social-security system and increasing the amount of

benefit payments, while at the same time maintaining the program on a sound fiscal basis.

In 1948 I voted to override President Truman's veto of a bill which included, among other provisions, increased Federal grants for old age assistance, aid to dependent children and the blind. The following year I voted to extend coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance program to 11 million additional workers and to increase retirement annuities an average of 70 percent. In 1952 I voted for amendments increasing old age and survivor benefits and raising to $75 a month the amount of earnings permitted without loss of benefits.

In 1955 I introduced a resolution to establish a commission on problems of the aging, with a view toward a program of care, encouragement, and rehabilitation, based upon authoritative study and recommendation.

I voted in 1955 for a proposal passed by the House to lower the pension age for women to 62 and to make totally disabled workers eligible for pensions at 50. A slightly different version, for which I also voted, became law in 1956.

To advance national health, I voted for a bill to establish a National Science Foundation to encourage scientific research, which was vetoed by President Truman. I also voted to establish a National Institute for Research and Heart Diseases.

In legislation on education, I supported establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education and a bill authorizing the President to call a White House Education Conference. In the last session of Congress I voted for the anti-segregation amendment to the Federal school aid bill and for passage of the bill.

In the field of civil rights I voted for a number of constructive measures, including the antipoll tax bill. I supported the original House bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission and fought a Democratic filibuster against it. In the last session of Congress I supported President Eisenhower's civil rights program, which was passed by the House.

AGRICULTURE

In the field of agriculture, I have sought to protest the American farmer, who represents an important segment of the national economy. But at the same time I have worked to protect the consumer against unnecessarily high food prices. To keep down the cost of living, I voted for repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine. I have consistently voted against high rigid farm price controls which boost the cost of food to the consumer.

VOTING RECORD

The foregoing record is evidence that the voters of the 17th district have been faithfully represented in the significant and controversial issues acted upon by the House since I have been a Member of Congress. In the 84th Congress just closed I have voted on 90 percent of all rollcall votes and upon hundreds of additional votes taken by voice, division, and tellers.

In concluding this report, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the voters of the district who have given me the honor and privilege of representing them in Congress.

Building the Path to Peace and a Richer World

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the hour for our adjournment draws near. The 84th Congress soon will become a part of the history of these United States of America. I am proud to have shared in its deliberations and I am humbly grateful to the men and women of the Second District of Illinois for the opportunity they gave me of using the authority of their vote in helping to build the path to the tomorrow of peace, of good will and of broadened horizons of life for everyone.

We have come a long way in the 84th Congress in the building of that path to a richer tomorrow. To every nation, as to every person, is given by divine Providence a mission. Always mankind looks upward, and the climb is toward the heights. It is the mission of our country, now charged with world responsibility, to open new and loftier heights and to ease the climb.

Ahead is a world without poverty, a world without hatreds, a world in which man can live at peace with his fellow man and in the dignity intended for all the children of God. The 84th Congress has made its contribution to that end.

ATTENDED EVERY SESSION

Mr. Speaker, I have attended every session of the 84th Congress. As in the 83d Congress, I have answered all rollcalls. Each day as I have approached the Capitol, my eyes fixed untiringly and strengtheningly on the beautiful and inspiring dome, I have voiced a quiet prayer that in the deliberations and votes of the day I should represent to the full extent of my ability the thinking and the aspirations of all the quarter of a million men and women and children in the district that three times has honored me with the delegation of casting its vote in the greatest deliberative body in the world. I have felt that any day would be a lost day unless it marked some progress, small or large, toward the heights for which we were reaching.

FIGHT AGAINST DISEASE

The Democratic 84th Congress will be remembered long after we are gone as the Congress that prepared the way for the final conquering of dread diseases, those of cancer and of heart included. We have authorized the greatest program of medical research ever undertaken by any nation in any age of the world's history. From this will result, as sure as day follows the night, the ultimate lifting from the homes of America, and of the world, of the tormenting fear of illnesses, for which there now is no remedy, striking down the loved ones in our family circles. We have prolonged the span of human life, not only for our own people but for those of all other lands.

This is the true way to peace on earth. When from the study and the research, resulting from the program we have mapped, the cures are found for ailments, now incurable and we share our knowledge with other peoples then indeed will the name of the United States be blessed.

In my active support of this frontal attack on the physical ills that plague our people I am confident that I have truly represented, as they would have wished it, the people of the Second District of Illinois. I shall report to them, equally confident of their approval, my support of an extension and enlargement of the school milk program, of medical and dental care of our school children, and of the free distribution of polio vaccine.

SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING

The physical well-being of our people is the proper concern of the Congress. The spiritual well-being also is of concern. The Congress has recognized that we are a nation under God by placing that affirmation in our pledge to the flag, by setting aside a room for meditation and prayer for Members of the Congress, and one of the laws of the 84th Congress commands that all coins and currency of our country there shall appear the words "In God We Trust."

BUILDING NATIONAL FAMILY

The 84th Congress will be remembered long after we are gone as the Congress that prepared the way for the elimination of sectionalism and the uniting at long last of all our people into one national family. When people meet and know one another differences not of character dissolve. In enacting the largest public works program in history, that providing for a $33 billion highway construction, the 84th Congress did more than any other Congress in our history to unite into one family the American people. With the completion of this program, making easily and quickly accessible one section of the country to all others, one State of the Union will be to the family of the Nation not as a separate and removed residence but as one room in a family home of 48 rooms.

REAL HEMISPHERIC SOLIDARITY

The 84th Congress also provided for the quick completion of the Pan-American Highway, so that soon from Alaska to the Panama Canal, and later I vision to the tip of South America, there will flow unendingly a stream of travelers, coming and going, getting really to know peoples in sections and lands visited, and thus cementing in understanding the bonds that unite.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the way to peace. It is this that will keep the peoples of this hemisphere in a unity as strong and enduring as the Rock of Gibraltar. This is one of the proud accomplishments of the Democratic 84th Congress.

OPPOSED SADDLING WITH DEBT

Mr. Speaker, I think at this point I should make some comment on why I could not and did not support the administration's original highway construction bill. I do not believe that one generation has for its own advantage the moral right to mortgage generations as yet unborn. The progress made by each generation should be paid for by the toil and the sacrifices of that generation. It is only when war comes, and national survival requires the departure from rules of prudence, that debts morally may be acquired that carry over into succeeding generations.

The administration bill provided for the $33 billion construction with money raised from the sale of bonds. That meant an interest charge of over $1 billion a year continuing indefinitely. Recently in my own State of Illinois a bond issue was sold to finance a new turnpike. The bonds have been sold, and the people of Illinois are now paying $50,000 a day in interest even though work on the turnpike construction is still far from the starting stage. Had the administration's bill been accepted this would have resulted on the national level to a devastating extent.

In prudence and in honor I felt we should pay for our highway construction as we went along, and thus avoid its financing becoming a weight around our necks to strangle our future. Happily, the Democratic bill was adopted. It provides for paying as we go and on a fair basis of use and abuse.

CONGRESS WITH A HEART

Mr. Speaker, my time is almost gone, and I must hurry along. There is not time remaining to mention the many other achievements of the 84th Congress, including the increase of the minimum wage from 75 cents to $1 an hour and the liberalizing of the social security provisions. I do wish before closing to mention some matters especially of interest and concern to my own constituents.

CAL-SAG A DREAM COME TRUE

In the campaign of 1954 I presented to my constituents what I termed a positive program for Chicago. The items included the Calumet-Sag Channel, water diversion, and Federal aid against beach erosion. The 84th Congress both in its 1st and 2d sessions made appropriations assuring the early completion of the great and important inland waterway so vital to Chicago's future. In the three Congresses of which I have been a Member, Cal-Sag has commanded my unceasing effort. I am very, very happy that the 84th Congress has made the dream come true.

LAKE MICHIGAN WATER DIVERSION

The 84th Congress passed in both the 1st and 2d sessions the Lake Michigan water diversion bill; and I am very glad to have a part in cooperation with my colleagues from the Cook County area, both Democratic and Republicans working as a perfect team under the leadership and inspiration of the beloved Congressman O'BRIEN. The bill we passed in the 1st session the President vetoed. The bill we passed in the 2d session is now on the President's desk. Whatever action he shall take is of course within his determination. We in the Congress have done our part, and all the members of our delegation on both sides of the aisle share in the credit. There are no politics in serving Chicago.

I am happy too that the 84th Congress made substantial progress in the matter of controlling beach erosion and water pollution.

CLASSICS OF DEMOCRACY

To the leadership and my colleagues I extend my deep thanks for the support so generously given me, and for which I always shall be grateful, in two matters in which mine was the responsibility of initiation and advocacy. I refer to the program for making available to all peoples the classics of American democracy, translated into all languages and printed in inexpensive editions, and to the provision in the Housing Act of 1956 reimbursing small-business tenants, displaced by urban redevelopment plans, for moving expenses up to $2,000 and displaced individuals and families up to $100.

It is good, Mr. Speaker, to contemplate that at this moment, when the gavel is soon to fall on the deliberations of the 84th Congress that adopted the classics of democracy program, that the works that inspired our forefathers are actually reaching in translated editions the peoples of the world and we are on our way to winning the war for the minds and hearts of people everywhere. This is the true road to peace.

AID TO DISPLACED TENANTS

It is good to know, Mr. Speaker, that small-business tenants and families that are thrown out of old locations and homes by the march of progress in the rebuilding of our cities can find in the Federal Government an understanding of their problems and at least some relief in meeting the expenses of moving to new locations.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbly grateful to the Providence that guides our course for the opportunity of participating in the good works of a good Congress and with the diligence made possible by desire and by good health, of serving to the utmost of my ability the constituents who three times have voted me the priceless honor of their confidence.

With God's help, wherever we serve may we continue to follow the path to a true peace and a richer world for all.

Statistics on Accomplishments of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the almost 19,000 bills and resolutions put into the legislative hoppers of the 84th Congress was the largest number in 20 years. The combined figure was 18,989—11,914 in the first session and 7,025 in the second. Not since the 74th Congress of 1935–36 has the number reached such heights. Of the total, in the biennial period, 14,104 were introduced in the House and 4,835 in the Senate.

The 18,939 of the 84th Congress exceeded the 16,385 of the 83d, the 14,164 of the 82d, the 16,670 of the 81st, and the 12,090 of the 80th.

During the past 20 years the totals have ranged between 9,536 and 17,245. In the 74th Congress the total was 19,745.

Measures reported totaled 5,751—2,954 in the first session, and 2,797 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,698 and 3,053, respectively. The total compares with 5,263 for the 83d Congress, 4,601 for the 82d, 5,880 for the 81st, and 4,272 for the 80th.

Measures passed totaled 5,713—2,922 in the first session and 2,791 in the second. Figures for the House and Senate were 2,833 and 2,880, respectively. The total compares with 5,201 in the 83d, 4,593 in the 82d, 5,764 in the 81st, and 4,132 in the 80th.

Laws enacted reached the number of 1,028 for public laws and 893 for private laws, making an aggregate of 1,921 measures enacted during the Congress. The first session accounted for 390 public laws and 490 private laws; the second session for 638 public, and 403 private. By comparison, the 83d Congress enacted 781 public laws; the 82d, 594; the 81st, 921; and the 80th Congress, 906.

Measures vetoed totaled 34 for both sessions, 11 in the first and 23 in the second. Among those vetoed were the 10 percent increase in postal salaries—S. 1, continuation of purchase of domestic minerals—H. R. 6373, agricultural price supports—H. R. 12, the natural gas bill—H. R. 6645, and the $1.6 billion rivers and harbors bill—H. R. 12080.

The Senate confirmed 82,694 executive nominations. This was considerably in excess of the 68,563 confirmed during the 83d Congress, the first during the Eisenhower administration.

Britain Caught in Cyprus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, by request I include an article appearing in the National Review of April 4, 1956, which reads as follows:

BRITAIN CAUGHT IN CYPRUS

(By F. A. Voigt)

None of the interested powers—except, of course, Russia and her dependents—wishes Great Britain to withdraw militarily from Cyprus.

Greece, in particular, has gone out of her way in offering Great Britain every facility that would make the island serve the strategic needs of the Atlantic Powers. She has even offered to place other positions, whether on Greek islands or on the Greek mainland, at our disposal for strategic purposes. America is constructing military installations on Crete, and there has been no trouble on the island in consequence, or any protest

on the part of Greek public opinion, for Crete is being turned into an American base without any American interference with the administration or the politics of the island. Thus, Greek national sentiment is, if anything, comforted rather than offended by the presence of a powerful ally on Greek soil.

As I pointed out in National Review before (December 28, 1955) Cyprus would have been at peace, the strategic needs of the Atlantic powers would have been satisfied, and the Anglo-Hellenic alliance would have been consolidated, if Great Britain had agreed to transfer the civil administration of the island from the British to the Hellenic crown. To have done so would have meant no sacrifice whatever and no loss of prestige. Did Great Britain lose prestige when, in 1864, she agreed to the union of the Ionian Islands with Greece? Cyprus has, in fact, been a liability all along. The Cypriots have never been British subjects willingly.

From our point of view, the sole importance of the island today is strategic; and this has been so only since we withdrew from the Suez Canal zone.

What, then, is the case for British persistence in rejecting the Cypriot demand for union (or Enosis, as it is called)? The answer is that there is no case at all.

All the arguments urged by the British Government and its supporters are either invalid or irrelevant or of so little weight that they should never have been allowed to affect British policy. Cyprus has become a party matter and, in its comments, the press follows conventional lines. The Conservative press makes Cyprus a matter of prestige and "standing by the empire." The Liberal and Labor press is, for once, right. But it is right for the wrong reasons. It supports the Cypriot demand for union with Greece; but it underrates the overriding necessity—that we must stay in Cyprus strategically, whatever happens.

We are told that Turkey does not wish Cyprus to unite with Greece. And indeed she does not. But what has Turkey to fear from the union? It is true that the Turkish minority in Cyprus—composed of British, not Turkish, subjects, by the way—would rather continue to live under British rule. This is a matter of preference which certainly deserves respect. But can it count against the deeply rooted wish of the Greek-speaking Christian majority (one of the oldest Christian communities in the world) to live under Hellenic rule? It would be a different matter if the Turkish majority had any reason to fear oppression under the Greek crown. But there are, today, more Turks in Greece than there are in Cyprus; and they have nothing to complain of.

It is alleged that Greece is an unstable country and, by implication, an unreliable ally. The fact is that she decided in favor of the Western powers as far back as 1936; that she did not depart from her decision even after Poland and France had fallen and Yugoslavia had come to terms with Germany; that she did not capitulate even when overrun by the German, Italian, and Bulgarian armies; and that of all countries in the world, she fought the hardest battles against communism. Until a year ago, she could be counted upon to fight on our side in all circumstances—even if she herself were not directly attacked. Today Greece will certainly fight—if attacked. Today she will fight for no other reason. To this extent she has become unreliable. But this unreliability is wholly the result of Britain's Cypriot policy.

Under the Greek crown—and under British military command—the Cypriots will have an interest in the defense of their island and of Greece. The Cypriot Communists, who, through the absence of representative government, have been left as the only well-organized political party on the island, will no longer have a chance of causing trouble, for their temporary alliance with the Cypriot nationalists against us will have come to an end and the newly installed Greek administration will, in case of need, deal with them by methods which our own public opinion does not favor—methods that are recognized as the only effective ones in a country that has experienced terrorism and massacre at Communist hands.

By refusing the Cypriot demand for union with Greece, via home rule, we strike at our own security in Cyprus. By granting the demand before it is too late, we shall have security against all forms of subversion on the island. What, then, is the explanation for so indefensible a policy as that of the British Government?

There are two answers. First, the military advisers of the British Government rate Turkey above all other allies in Europe. They are assiduous in avoiding anything that might cause offense in Ankara. The result is that Turkey grows more and more exacting in her pretensions. (No country dependent on American aid has been as self-willed in rejecting American advice as Turkey.) British governments can no more help appeasing some foreign power than a kitten can help chasing its own tail; and Turkey is today the object of appeasement. It is, of course, true that the Turkish alliance is vital to the security of the Mediterranean and the Middle East. But this alliance is not strengthened by British obsequiousness toward Turkey.

Secondly, having withdrawn from India, Abadan, Egypt, the Sudan, and so on, we felt we ought to make a stand somewhere. This "selling out the Empire" simply could not go on. And this is the root of the matter: Our attitude with regard to Cyprus is weakness posturing as strength. We regard Turkey as strong and, therefore, we go out of our way—and much further than is necessary—to appease her. But in Greece we discovered or thought we discovered, a power sufficiently weak to defy.

Again and again we were warned by the Greek Government of what would happen if we persisted in our refusal even to discuss the demand for Enosis. These warnings were fully justified by events which no conceivable Greek government could control. We then were, to our own surprise, but to the surprise of no one else, faced with a rebellion waged with a treachery and a ferocity which had seemed commendable when used against the Germans but were to be condemned when used against ourselves. We could no longer refuse discussion. We negotiated with the real leader of the rebellion, Archbishop Makarios, while deprecating what we regarded as his un-Christian toleration of rebellion—forgetting that, in Greece, the nation and church are as one, and that the church militant is identical with the nation at war. We have now deported the rebel leader for leading a rebellion. The result is that there is no one left to negotiate with.

Now America seems to have spoken, and the Conservative Daily Mail no less than the Liberal News Chronicle protests with full lungpower against American "interference."

But what do we expect? The Balkan Alliance is shattered, the Anglo-Hellenic Alliance nearly so. The danger in the Middle East is appalling. It is only a matter of time before the Communist advance on the Aegean develops. We shall need every fighting man we can find—and are losing about 100,000 of the best (the present effectives of the Greek Army). Some thousands of our own are immobilized by terrorists and schoolchildren in Cyprus. British security and prestige are declining and, with them, the security and prestige of the Atlantic Alliance. Then can the United States remain inactive?

This observer is forced into the humiliating conclusion that there is only one remedy: that Great Britain be jerked out of this mire (in a friendly fashion, of course) by her transatlantic ally; and that this same ally take upon herself the task, long overdue, of putting Turkey in its proper place.

Your Congressman Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns, I wish to again make my report to the people I am honored to represent in our 17th District of California. For the past 14 years I have had the privilege of serving this district as its Representative in the Congress of the United States, one of the most populous and fastest growing constituencies in the country with perhaps more industries and varied problems than any other district. It includes two of the Nation's greatest ports of entry—our Los Angeles harbor and our Los Angeles international airport—as well as a major portion of the Navy's Roosevelt base on Terminal Island, the Army's Fort MacArthur at San Pedro, and the world-renowned Catalina Island. It also includes the greatest food-fish producing port in the world; the greatest aircraft production, with hundreds of subsidiary manufacturing concerns; one of the greatest oil-refining and export centers; one of the greatest shipbuilding centers during the war; and is one of the heaviest industrial areas in the West.

It will not be possible to discuss in detail or even touch upon all the bills considered, as the Democratic 84th Congress was one of the most productive in our history—in fact more bills were passed than in any other Congress, and we are proud of a constructive, substantial record of achievement.

As a member of the most important Committee on Ways and Means, having so much vital legislation before it, including social security, tax revision, reciprocal trade agreements, narcotics legislation, and the great highway program, the 84th Congress proved a very busy one for me. I will be obliged to confine my report to those proposals that have dealt largely with the general welfare of our people and in which my constituents have indicated their greatest interest.

SOCIAL SECURITY

From my first days in Congress, I have consistently supported the Social Security Act and have sought to liberalize it over the years. I derived considerable satisfaction from my part in the enactment of amendments to the Social Security Act that became law during the 84th Congress, as I was the original author of the amendment allowing women to receive benefits at age 62 rather than 65. I was also privileged to have made the motion providing benefits at age 50 to persons permanently disabled, which was enacted into law this session. Although these measures were opposed by the administration, I am pleased to say they are now a part of the social-security law, and considered one of the outstanding achievements of this Congress. My proposal granting increased benefits to the aged, blind, and dependent children was also included in the new social-security measure adopted

this session, in addition to extension of coverage to lawyers and other self-employed groups.

There were, however, a number of proposed amendments which I regret were not approved by the committee. One of the most important was the increase in earnings allowed retired persons before forfeiting their benefits. I was not only in favor of raising the present limit, but introduced legislation and advocated that the limitation be removed altogether.

Despite misguided opposition to social security through the years, and the selfish, prejudiced attempt by reactionaries to tag it as a form of creeping socialism, the law is now an integral part of the American way of life. The sooner the law is perfected and made more adequate, the sooner will be abolished the fear of insecurity that attends the approach of later life, and the sooner we will be rid of the heavy burden of direct relief from local tax rolls. What greater bulwark against communism could there be than the contentment of a citizenry assured of a security in retirement that they have earned in their productive years?

NARCOTICS

I have been deeply concerned over the serious threat that confronts our Nation from the vicious narcotic traffic. In my long and continuing study of this pernicious evil, I have worked closely with Federal Narcotics Commissioner, Harry J. Anslinger, who is recognized worldwide as the outstanding authority on narcotic traffic matters. I introduced appropriate legislation to strengthen enforcement and administration of the narcotic laws and am pleased to report the 84th Congress has incorporated my bills into law as amendments to our narcotic control laws.

Although narcotic agents are forced to deal with the most dangerous and unscrupulous criminals, I found no statutory authority for narcotic agents to make arrests or carry guns with which to protect themselves, such as the authority granted FBI agents. I therefore introduced H. R. 7018 which was enacted into Public Law 362 this session which, in addition to providing some measure of protection to our narcotic agents, grants Federal narcotic enforcement agencies the power to subpena witnesses and demand production of pertinent records in cases relating to narcotic violations. Narcotic agents inform me this authority helps them immeasurably in enforcement of our Federal narcotic laws.

One of the very important features of the new narcotics control law pertains to penalties applicable to the illicit sale of heroin to juveniles. The law provides that any adult selling or furnishing heroin to any person under 18 years of age may be fined $20,000 and shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 years, with a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, and upon recommendation by the jury a death penalty may be imposed. Effective enforcement of this new Federal law will be most helpful in eradicating the dope peddler who spreads his poisonous influence over the youth of our land.

To further aid Narcotic and Customs Agents in their war upon the underworld, important provisions of my bill H. R. 3676, providing improved customs procedures and increased authority for Customs officials with respect to narcotic violations were enacted into law as sections of the Narcotic Control Act of 1956. We on the West Coast are most crucially confronted with the drug problem, as the major opium and heroin export centers are Tientsin and Canton, China. It is my firm determination to see that this vicious drug traffic is eliminated, and it is my hope that combined Federal, State, and local endeavors can achieve our common objective of ultimately abolishing the pernicious drug evil as a problem of national concern.

TAXATION

It was my hope that a reduction in the individual income tax rate could have been accomplished during this session, and I again introduced legislation calling for an across-the-board tax reduction credit. However, the unfortunate international situation, coupled with determination to bring about a balanced budget, precluded successful efforts during this Congress.

I believe the 85th Congress holds great promise for overall tax relief, as the Ways and Means Committee has established two subcommittees for this purpose. If the Congress remains under Democratic control, the subcommittee on Internal Revenue Taxation will conduct an overall study of our entire income tax structure with the view toward removing existing inequities and providing a reduction in tax rates.

FULL EMPLOYMENT

The huge highway construction program which I was pleased to support will aid materially toward maintaining full employment. The pay-as-we-build measure adopted this session will save taxpayers at least $11 billion which would have been spent in interest charges had the bond financing program as advanced by the administration, been approved.

While employment today is of paramount importance, we should always be mindful of the time when the productive years are over, and I was pleased to take an active part in passage of the bill increasing railroad retirement benefits. It was also with deep satisfaction that my bill which liberalized the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act was enacted into law. This legislation has been referred to as the model workmen's compensation bill, which provides increased benefits and other important improvements, and sets the scale of workmen's compensation payments for more than 400,000 longshoremen, harbor workers, and ship servicemen and repairmen. By extension of its provisions, it also served as the basic workmen's compensation law for many thousands of other workers under Federal jurisdiction.

EDUCATION

I have been an active advocate of every possible aid to education. One of the prime problems in our great State—and particularly southern California—is the extreme overburdening of local educational facilities with the constant influx of citizens from other sections of the country. It has been most gratifying to have taken an active part in having the benefits extended to federally impacted areas for school construction which have been of considerable benefit to a number of school districts within our own 17th Congressional District.

America's educational needs are well known to every parent who sends a child to an overcrowded classroom operating several shifts a day. They are well known to every overworked teacher responsible for handling a classroom jammed with children. I believe that every possible incentive should be offered to the teaching profession, particularly in the matter of adequate compensation, to encourage and insure the perpetuation of a high standard of education.

I was one of the authors and sponsors of the legislation enacted in the last Congress that has eased the tax burden on our retired teachers, and later retired firemen, policemen, and civil service were added as beneficiaries of this legislation. A number of school districts in our area have been included in the program of assistance to schools in crowded defense areas, and I am pleased to have been instrumental in having obtained Federal funds which eased the tax burden for these school districts.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Consistently through the years, as in this Congress, I have supported legislation in behalf of our veterans and servicemen and their dependents. I was very gratified to have my proposal enacted into law during this session of Congress extending the retirement income-tax credit to members of the Armed Forces. I was also pleased to support provisions which were enacted into law to grant educational benefits to children of veterans who lost their lives in World War II and Korea; social-security coverage extended for military personnel; increased pay of trainees under the Reserve program; legislation to provide medical care for the dependents of members of the Armed Forces; extension of Veterans' Administration program of guaranteed loans for home purchase or construction; increased pay of medical and dental officers in the armed services and Public Health Service; authorization of loans for the purchase of farm homes by veterans under the same terms as for residential housing; extension to 1960 of the unemployment program for veterans of the Korean war; extension of mustering-out pay provisions for Korean veterans; as well as the important increase in pay of all members of the armed services.

Leading veteran organizations have rated my voting record in behalf of our veterans at 100 percent, and I shall continue to work to expedite correction of inadequacies for their benefit and comfort.

SMALL BUSINESS

Recognizing the great importance of small business in our national economy and defense-production efforts for the preservation of our democratic system of free competitive enterprise, I have consistently supported and protected their interests, and have continuously

encouraged subcontracting practices to our small businesses by large corporations having defense contracts.

I have assisted in the establishment of industries in our area—both large and small—and through the years have devoted my best efforts to aid the businesses of my district where discrimination or other inequitable treatment was evident, and have succeeded in enacting corrective legislation for their relief.

During the closing weeks of this session, I was successful in having one of my excise tax revision bills approved by both Houses of Congress and enacted into law. My bill removed the 10 percent tax on admissions of 90 cents or less. This measure will greatly aid many thousands of community motion picture theater operators throughout the country, of which more than one-half are in trouble, and make it possible for them to remain in business. Since January of this year, 1,073 theaters have closed, and it is estimated that 5,500 theaters are operating in the red and 5,400 are operating at the break-even point. This exemption also applies to sporting events, concerts, and amusements generally.

I was also successful in having several of my bills enacted into law this session providing for the easing of certain restrictions and import duties which brought about material aid to several important local industries. It is my firm intention to devote continuing diligent effort to foster the welfare of our business community so that our 17th Congressional District will realize economic progress and job opportunity for all.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The world's largest fishing industry operates out of our port of Los Angeles. I have worked very closely with this important industry all through the years of my congressional service and am constantly in touch with the industry's local and Washington representatives on their problems.

Included in the numerous measures I have sponsored in behalf of our great fishing industry is my proposal for the protection of our fishing vessels on the high seas, and another of vital interest to the sports fishing and water-taxi craft operators which were enacted into law last session. Additional proposals I introduced in behalf of our fishermen during this session of the Congress—all of which have been opposed by the present administration—include H. R. 7238 which would grant fishing boat subsidies; H. R. 322 which would extend more favorable income tax treatment to our fishermen such as has long been accorded farmers; and my most recent bill, H. R. 11342, establishing a national policy for fisheries, is a companion bill to Senator MAGNUSON's S. 3275 which was enacted into law during the closing days of this Congress in a modified form.

Following my efforts with appropriate officials in the interested executive departments, with regard to the plight of our domestic tuna industry, effective action was taken to double the duty on imports of canned-in-brine tuna where such imports were in excess of 20 percent of the domestic peak.

The National Fisheries Institute lists me a leader in the House of Representatives for championing the welfare of the fishing industry.

SHIPPING

The shipping industry is of vital importance to our port and to the 17th Congressional District. I have long been associated with those interested in shipping and our United States merchant marine, and served for several years on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives. I authored, and was successful in securing enactment into law, legislation providing relief for the shipping industry from the imposition of certain unfair and arbitrary duties. This legislation was enacted, keeping in mind the highly competitive conditions American shipping meets from foreign lines.

I was also the sponsor of a successful legislative effort providing for a program of merchant ship construction in American shipyards, as well as legislation to promote and maintain domestic ship-construction and ship-repair yards, in addition to the law providing that 50 percent of all cargoes originating in the United States be carried by American shipping.

My bill on behalf of our Los Angeles Harbor gained Federal assistance for the dredging and improving of the East Basin to enhance the usefulness of our $8 million terminal, which is rated the largest and most modern passenger-cargo terminal in the world. A recent resolution by the board of harbor commissioners expressed their appreciation of my efforts in successfully obtaining Federal funds to cover reimbursement for dredging the East Basin in the sum of $485,000 and a Federal contribution of $245,000 toward cost of removal of the West Basin Drawbridge.

NATURAL RESOURCES

I have remained alert at all times in my determination to protect and preserve our vast national forests and parks that have been set aside for the enjoyment of all our people, to insure against the incessant attempt at encroachment for selfish privileges by special interest groups. I am also alert to the attempts of certain private power interests to acquire for personal profit the remaining great water and power potentials, and I am coauthor of the resolution creating the National Conservation Commission.

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we as a nation may be abandoning some of the proven conservation policies that in the past have done so much to preserve our irreplaceable natural resources.

It was very gratifying to have the proposal, of which I was author, passed by the Congress this session, authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting our shores, having for its purpose prevention of damage to public and private property and promoting and encouraging the healthful recreation of the people.

We need firm national conservation policies putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of our great natural resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA WATER

I am pleased to be considered one of the leaders in Congress in the fight to protect southern California's water rights. Water represents to the people of southern California a basic necessity to insure the needs of its thriving, ever-growing population, industry, and agriculture. Southern California has been confronted since the turn of the century with the problem of an adequate water supply. Very critical complications are presenting themselves due to the threatened encroachments from other States that are parties to the Colorado River compact, because of the machinations of land speculators and promoters who seek to deprive southern California of its contractual rights and its fair share of the water of the Colorado River.

The Los Angeles County flood-control district has expressed its great appreciation for my assistance in securing Federal appropriations which approximate $20 million for Los Angeles basin jood-control projects.

POSTAL AND FEDERAL WORKERS

The 84th Congress enacted several laws to improve civil-service employment and liberalize retirement benefits of Federal workers. Benefits upon retirement have been substantially increased, as have family survivorship benefits, and all other phases of retirement and survivorship benefits have been liberalized under the new legislation.

The pay increase granted by Congress last year for civil-service workers and postal workers was much needed legislation, but, in my opinion, fell short of the amount necessary to compensate them for the increased cost of living which is at an all-time high. I have always supported improved and just compensation for our Federal workers and believe the general unattractiveness of Federal pay scales has been the paramount reason that many civil servants are leaving Government services for private industry, where they secure wages more in line with the increased cost of living.

REDONDO BEACH HARBOR

I am pleased to report that success has finally been achieved in my efforts to provide Redondo Beach with a small boat harbor which will not only give this city and the surrounding area a priceless asset, but will protect the shoreline from the devastation caused by winter storms which eroded away a once beautiful beach, and encroached into the very streets of the city, causing serious damage to public utilities and property.

Initial success came in 1950, when I brought the plight of Redondo Beach to the attention of Congress and the President. I was successful in gaining approval for the project; however, the Korean conflict precluded construction of such nondefense projects by the Government. In 1954 I obtained an appropriation of $50,000 for further planning and engineering to bring the harbor to the construction stage. This was one of the first appropriations by the Federal Government for a nondefense project following the Korean war. In the first session of this Congress, I was successful in securing an appropriation of $1,500,000 to start actual construction of

the harbor; and in this session of Congress, gained approval of an additional $250,000 to insure earlier completion of this much-needed shore protection and boat haven.

CONCLUSION

Being mindful that the voters of my district have reposed trust and confidence in me for many years, my energies and efforts have been dedicated to fulfilling my responsibilities. My overall voting record is one of the best in the Congress, attested to by the records of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Confronted with the difficulty of having to serve the better part of each year 3,000 miles distant from my constituency. I have conscientiously endeavored to serve you and bring credit and progress to our district. My office staff and I take pride in the reputation our office has gained for promptness and efficiency in handling congressional services.

My files are replete with letters of appreciation from individuals and organizations for services rendered. I treasure these "thank you" expressions and encouraging good wishes, and shall always strive to justify your confidence and good will. The measure of success we have achieved has been with your guidance and encouragement that I have always welcomed in our partnership in public affairs.

Schedule of Meetings in the 11th Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. BROWNSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, for the past 6 years I have had the privilege of representing Marion County, known as the 11th District of Indiana, in the United States Congress. My district totals approximately 610,888 persons, which is well over half again the population of the average congressional district. I maintain a congressional office in downtown Indianapolis the year round, where a secretary is available to assist callers and to help them with requests for aid in dealing with the Federal Government, so that I can be of every proper assistance to them.

During the official congressional recess this year, I am scheduling meetings in the post offices throughout the county so every citizen of Marion County can have the opportunity of a personal conference with me. Special appointments are not necessary. I sincerely urge individuals or groups to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient to them. The knowledge obtained through these meetings will help me to render better service, both legislative and personal, to all of the people of Marion County.

The schedule is as follows:

Monday, October 1: Post office, West Newton, 9:30 a. m.; post office, Camby, 10 a. m.; post office, Bridgeport, 10:30 a. m.; post office, Speedway, 11:15 a. m.

Tuesday, October 2: Post office, New Augusta, 2 p. m.; post office, Clermont, 4 p. m.; post office, Speedway, 4:45 p. m.

Wednesday, October 3: Post office, Southport, 2 p. m.; post office, Acton, 3 p. m.; post office, Wanamaker, 4 p. m.

Thursday, October 4: Post office, Beech Grove, 11 a. m.

Monday, October 8: Post office, Castleton, 9:30 a. m.; post office, Oaklandon, 10:30 a. m.; post office, Lawrence, 11:15 a. m.

Tuesday, October 9: Post office, Cumberland, 2 p. m.

American Bar Association Views in Opposition to the International Organization for Trade Cooperation, the International Trade Organization, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, during the 10 years I have served in the Senate of the United States, I have consistently taken the position that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act and the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT, constitute an illegal delegation of powers conferred by the Constitution, article 1, section 8, exclusively on the Congress. The proposed International Organization for Trade Cooperation likewise would violate the Constitution of the United States.

The American Bar Association has expressed similar views on this important constitutional question. In 1950 the association denounced the International Trade Organization—ITO—contributing to its deserved death in committee. In 1955, by formal resolution, and in this year 1956, through its official representative, the association expressed equally vigorous disapproval of OTC, described as "the State Department's second attempt to create an international trade organization."

The Secretary of State has testified before the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member, that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act—reciprocal trade—not only transferred the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate the foreign trade to the President but also by that act conferred full authority upon him to transfer that responsibility to Geneva, Switzerland, under the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—with 34 foreign-nation members each with 1 vote. This was done in 1947.

The resolution of the American Bar Association opposing this position and a statement of its views were presented to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 8, 1956, by Albert MacC. Barnes, of New York City, the association's designated representative, but were virtually ignored both by the committee and the press.

Referring to the 1934 Trade Agreements Act as amended, the American Bar Association spokesman emphasized:

> There is no intimation here that Congress granted to the President any authority to enter into an international compact creating an international body to control our foreign trade.

The statement specifically cites 11 OTC–GATT articles which it declares "contrary to our entire constitutional concept of justice," and further asserts that OTC–GATT "is an attempt at a world trade constitution without a bill of rights."

Mr. President, in the belief that the American Bar Association position deserves the widest possible dissemination and public knowledge, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the complete text of this important statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION VIEWS IN OPPOSITION TO H. R. 5550, SUBMITTED TO THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 8, 1956, BY ALBERT MACC. BARNES, DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Albert MacC. Barnes, of the New York Bar. I am appearing here today as the representative of the American Bar Association to oppose H. R. 5550. On August 24, 1955, at the annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Philadelphia, Pa., the House of Delegates, the ruling body of that organization, approved the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the bill H. R. 5550, authorizing the President to accept membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation is hereby disapproved on the grounds (a) that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 (Tariff Act of 1930, sec. 350) confers no such power on the President, and (b) that neither the President nor Congress has the legal authority under the Constitution to delegate the regulation of our commerce with foreign nations to a foreign controlled group, and the Committee on Customs Law is hereby authorized on behalf of the American Bar Association to present these views to the Congress, and that the President of the American Bar Association be authorized to select a representative or representatives to appear before the proper congressional committees."

This is not intended to be a fully documented brief but rather a collection of thoughts which we hope the committee may find useful.

Any consideration of H. R. 5550, by the very phraseology of that bill, necessitates consideration of the charter of the Organization for Trade Cooperation (known as OTC), and the charter of OTC states that it is to implement and administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (known as GATT). It seems obvious, therefore, that H. R. 5550 and OTC and GATT must be considered together as part of a general plan to take away from Congress the constitutional obligation imposed upon it and delegate it to a supernational or international organization in which the United States, with 20 percent of the world's foreign trade, is relegated to a minor position. The United States must even obtain the consent of that body, in which it has 1 vote out of 35 and no veto, before it can attend to what may well be considered the sovereign right of the people to mind their own business.

Much talk has been heard and many warnings sounded about the disastrous consequences which will flow from refusal of the

Congress to approve H. R. 5550. Much of this propaganda smacks of deliberate effort to pressure the Congress into approval of a course of action to which it is claimed the United States has already committed itself, seemingly without regard to the fundamental questions of whether the proposed action is in accord with the law of the United States. Whether or not there be validity in such fears, the Congress must determine four basic questions:

1. Has the President any sovereign power to enter into an executive agreement to join a supernational or international organization designed to direct and control our foreign trade?

2. Can Congress under its constitutional power over foreign trade delegate to the President the authority to become a member of OTC?

3. Did the Trade Agreements Act of 1954, as amended delegate in advance an authority to the President to make and proclaim the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)?

4. Has the President usurped a nondelegable power of Congress in creating GATT?

Discussion of these questions should be prefaced by refreshing the recollection of the Committee as to certain specific provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

Article I, section 1, provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

Article I, section 8. "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

Article I, section 8, clause 3. "Congress shall have power * * * To regulate Commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

Article II, section 2, clause 2, under powers of the President provides: "He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."

The most casual inspection of these clauses forces the conclusion that so far as the matters involved in this foreign trade control plan are concerned, the Constitution gives to the President only one power, i. e., "to make treaties with the advice and consent of the Senate." GATT has no status as a treaty.

Lest we lose sight of the main path, and drift off into the realm of sovereignty as a basis for so-called Executive agreements, perhaps it would be well to again consider the phraseology of the Constitution. The preamble thereof states:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

Sovereignty, wrested from the British Crown, was assumed by "the people," of the Colonies. It certainly could not have descended upon thirteen separate collections of people whether known as Colonies or States or Territories.

The Declaration of Independence states: "When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another * * *."

And further:

"We, therefore, the representatives of the United States of America * * * in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies * * *."

The concept of sovereignty, suffered a severe change from the old idea of the ruler being the state. No longer could one say, "the sovereign is dead—long live the sovereign." Here sovereignty for the first time was reposed in an indestructible and perpetual power—the "people."

And so when the Constitution came to be written it was "We the people," who granted to officers and divisions of the Government established thereby, certain prerogatives of their sovereignty. To Congress they, "the people," delegated the sole and exclusive right to legislate, and specifically mentioned the right to tax and to control foreign commerce. To the President they gave only one direct trade power—that, to make treaties.

It seems almost self-evident that the President has no rights of sovereignty from the British Crown or elsewhere unless they were passed through "The people" in the Constitution. Therefore, we must look to the Constitution only for the power to engage in any activity involving sovereign rights, as well as for any power involving foreign trade.

Any powers which Congress has under the Constitution must be exercised by Congress, and by Congress alone. What is not written in a delegation of authority cannot be assumed under any theory of a sovereignty in the President superior to that of the people or the Constitution.

The administration of laws can be delegated to the Executive or other agents of Congress, only in case Congress sets up an intelligible principle or legislative yardstick by which the delegate is governed. In *Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388) the Supreme Court passing on the question of delegation of authority in the National Industrial Recovery Act, and construing the exclusive power of Congress to regulate commerce under the Constitution stated:

"The Congress manifestly is not permitted to abdicate or to transfer to others the essential legislative functions with which it is thus vested."

This principle is definitely applicable to GATT in spite of the dictum of Mr. Justice Sunderland in *United States* v. *Curtiss Wright* (299 U. S. 304). Certainly in that case the delegated power was sufficiently described and limited by Congress to be well within the established rule regarding legislative yardsticks, limits, or principles necessary in any delegation of power. Such cases as *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649 (1892)), *Buttfield* v. *Stranahan* (192 U. S. 470, 1904), and *Hampton* v. *United States* (276 U. S. 394) have clearly supported the principle that where Congress incorporates in a delegation of authority, phraseology establishing an intelligible principle, definite limitations of activity and leaves nothing involving the expediency or just operation of such legislation to the determination of the President, the delegation is within the Constitution.

The delegation was not of the right to make law but to fill in the facts or conditions under which a congressionally made law was to take effect, be disregarded, or made inoperative.

H. R. 5550 provides only for membership in a so-called administrative body. The charter of that body (OTC) which must be considered a part of this legislation, contains no legislative yardstick, limitation, or intelligible principle established by Congress. The operation is left to the discretion of the membership without any control by Congress. If GATT is to be considered a part of this executive program then it will be found that GATT goes far beyond the limitations of authority granted the President in section 350, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

GATT was put into effect by signature to a protocol of provisional application. On behalf of the United States it was signed by a division chief of the Department of State. In our case the alleged delegation to the President was in fact redelegated by him to the Secretary of State, and redelegated by the Secretary of State to a division chief. Now it is sought to redelegate the power to an international or supernational organization. The President's proclamation, T. D. 51802, only amplifies the view that no such power was reposed in the President by the provisions of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

H. R. 5550 is a delegation of authority to the President to accept membership in the OTC. No limitations or control or statement of an intelligible principle accompanies this delegation. On the contrary, for example, the bill carries an appropriation to the Department of State of "whatever sums may be necessary" for the payment of the United States "share of the expenses" of OTC. These expenses are to be "in accordance with article 9 of the agreement referred to in subsection (a)," OTC charter. But it is significant that this is a delegation of unlimited authority because the fixing of expenses and shares is left to the OTC assembly, by article 9. The delegation also carries with it the fixing of salaries on an unknown basis, and of employees in unknown number. It delegates to the Secretary of State the authority to fix "other expenses which he may deem necessary." The bill itself does not comply with any of the rules governing the delegation of an authority, and seems of itself to be unconstitutional.

OTC, ARTICLE 9 (B)

"The Assembly shall apportion the expenditures of the Organization among the members, in accordance with a scale of contributions to be fixed by the Assembly, and each member shall contribute promptly to the Organization its share of thdese expenditures."

H. R. 5550 presents for congressional approval an international trade body to be known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC), designed to provide permanent administration and implementation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) which, in itself, has not been approved by Congress. This GATT is, in turn, the creature of a broad interpretation by the State Department of the authority delegated to the President in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act (section 350, Tariff Act of 1930), the constitutionality of which has been raised in two cases now pending in the courts. *Morgantown Glassware Guild, Inc.* v. *George M. Humphrey, Secretary of the Treasury* (C. A. No. 876–55, U. S. District Court for the District of Columbia); *Star Kist Foods, Inc.* v. *United States* (Bruno Scheidt, Inc., Party in Interest, Protest 258737–K before the U. S. Customs Court).

It will be remembered that an International Trade Organization (ITO), familiarly known as the Havana Charter, was denounced by the Americn Bar Association after recommendation by 3 of its committees and the Association's position was presented to Congress in 1950. Public opposition to the ITO caused its ultimate withdrawal by the State Department.

This is the State Department's second attempt to create an international trade organization, in which the United States is 1 out of 35 nations represented; where it has 1 vote; where it has no veto; where it subscribes to a permanent policy of tariff reduction; deprives our elected representatives of control of our own foreign trade fiscal policies; commits the United States to review its own tariff rates and policies at the request of any one of the said members; and takes away even our right to vote on any question where we are one of the parties in dispute.

This bill, H. R. 5550, is simply a roundabout method of placing Congress in the anomalous position of indirectly approving GATT, a thing which it has several times specifically refused to do. GATT should not be approved indirectly by subterfuge, but should be thoroughly aired before legislative action takes place. The reasons for such airing become

apparent when consideration is given to the subject matters dealt with in GATT. Many of them vitally affect our domestic laws and international trade practices. For example:

1. International taxation (GATT, pt. II, art. IV, par. 8).
2. Identifying marks of foreign merchandise (art. IX (3) (4) (5)).
3. Bases of customs valuation (GATT, art. VII (2) (3).
4. Antidumping law (GATT, art. VI (4) (6a) (6b) (c)).
5. Countervailing duties (GATT, art. VI (4) (6a) (6b)–(6c)).
6. Embargoes or quotas (GATT, art. XI (1) concluding unnumbered paragraph).
7. Currency restrictions (GATT, art. XII (1)—balance of payments—monetary fund).
8. Subsidies by Government (GATT, art. XVI, sec. A (3) (4)).
9. Emergency action on certain imports (clearly GATT, art. XIX (1a) (3a) is at variance with our safety device called the escape clause).

We would not be permitted to find that an industry of our own was injured by foreign competition, without submitting the contemplated remedy to the OTC for approval. This seems to be one situation in which the sovereign right to attend to our own business, should not be abridged. Shall we abandon our Tariff Commission and its procedures for a foreign dominated OTC Executive Committee?

The ITO (Habana Charter) was repudiated. The OTC contains many of its provisions in substantially identical form as disclosed by a comparison.

Comparison of articles of proposed organization and corresponding articles of Habana Charter for an international trade organization

	Article No. OTC	Corresponding article No. ITO
Structure	4	73.
The Assembly	5 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e).	73 (1), (7), 76 (1), (2).
The executive committee.	6 (a), (f), (ii), (iii), (b), (c).	78 (1), (2), (a), (c), 80 (a), (4).
The secretariat	7 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e).	84 (1), (2), 85 (1), (2), 88 (1), (3).
Voting	8	75.
Budget and contributions.	9 (a), (b), (c)	77 (6), 91.
Status	10 (a), (b), (c), (d)	89, 90 (1), (3).
Relations with other organizations.	11 (a), (b), (c)	87 (1), (2), 86 (1).

If the principle of control of our foreign trade by a foreign dominated group was undesirable when the ITO was before Congress in 1950, it is infinitely more undesirable today.

Certainly the Constitution contains no specific authority for the President or the executive department to enter into a so-called executive agreement transferring the policy and control of our domestic and foreign trade affairs to an international body, beyond the control of our legislators. Nor can such authority be spelled out as an incident of sovereignty.

If the President has such power it can only be by lawful delegation from the legislative branch of the Government.

Whether Congress itself has any authority under the Constitution to create such a foreign controlled body having virtual charge of our foreign commerce, is at best highly doubtful, limited as that power is by article I, section 8 of the Constitution granting solely to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

The OTC Charter contains in article I the following statement:

"The Organization for Trade Cooperation (hereinafter referred to as 'the Organization') is hereby established to further, as provided for in the General Agreement and herein, the achievement of the purposes and objectives set forth in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (herein referred to as 'the General Agreement')."

The objectives of GATT are set forth as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"1. The contracting parties recognize that their relations in the field of trade and economic endeavor should be conducted with a view to raising standards of living, ensuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods, and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties."

"2. The contracting parties desire to contribute to these objectives through this agreement by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

This ambitious statement is strangely similar to the stated objectives of the National Industrial Recovery Act which read substantially as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce which tend to diminish the amount thereof; and to provide for the general welfare by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups, to induce and maintain united action of labor and management under adequate governmental sanctions and supervision, to eliminate unfair competitive practices, to promote the fullest possible utilization of the present productive capacity of industries, to avoid undue restriction of production (except as may be temporarily required), to increase the consumption of industrial and agricultural products by increasing purchasing power, to reduce and relieve unemployment, to improve standards of labor, and otherwise to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources."

The NIRA was held to be a delegation of "unfettered discretion" to the President and was contrary to the Constitution. It was before the Supreme Court in *Panama Refining Company* v. *Ryan*, 293 U. S. 388, and again in *Schechter* v. *United States*, 295 U. S. 495, and in both cases held to be too broad a delegation, containing no legislative yardstick, nor enunciating an intelligible legislative principle.

The OTC without GATT is nothing—with GATT it raises the question of whether GATT has any legal authority for its existence.

This leaves for consideration the question of whether the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended, contains within it a legal basis for the delegation of authority therein contained to include GATT. That Act, Section 350, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, provides as follows:

"(a) (1) For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States (as a means of assisting in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce) by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by affording corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States, the President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—

"(A) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof: *Provided*, That the enactment of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1955 shall not be construed to determine or indicate the approval or disapproval by the Congress of the executive agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

"(B) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder."

It will be seen from the foregoing extract of section 350 that the purpose of that act were apparently broad enough to cover a complete reorganization of the world. But only two specific powers were granted to the President; (a) to enter into foreign trade agreements, and (b) to proclaim such modifications of existing United States duties and other import restrictions as are required or appropriate to carry out the agreement. There is no intimation here that Congress granted to the President any authority to enter into an international compact creating an international body to control our foreign trade.

It is significant that reference is made in paragraph 2 D (ii) to the fact that "The standards of valuation contained in section 402 of this act" (i. e., the Tariff Act of 1930) "(as in effect during the representative period) shall be utilized by the President, to the maximum extent he finds such utilization practicable, in making the determinations" required under combination ad valorem and specific rates, or a combination of rates producing an ad valorem equivalent above 50 percent. Thus again is raised a conflict of authority between Congress and the sections of GATT having to do with determination of dutiable values.

Article VII of GATT departs radically from the provisions of section 402 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and provides that the contracting parties recognize the vitality of the general principles of valuation set forth thereafter and undertake that they shall "upon a request of another contracting party review the operation of any of their laws or regulations relating to value for customs purposes in the light of these principles." This leaves the United States open to complaints by any of the members of GATT of any specific customs valuation scheme which we may adopt and obviously if we adopt one which someone does not like and we change it, someone else may not like the latest one, and so ad infinitum.

If authority is given to the President to become a member of OTC he must accept that membership with the full knowledge that he must abide by all the rules, regulations and policies of GATT—or "walk out" with all the caustic criticism or censure generally attached to such an action. It is better not to go in than to incur the displeasure of any of the world's friendly nations.

Authority is claimed under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to bind this Nation to GATT as an executive agreement (which "authority" stands at best on shaky ground), as evidenced by 4 congressional

refusals to commit itself. Thus the present consideration of H. R. 5550 is probably as close as Congress will come to having GATT before it. Approval of H. R. 5550 carries with it, by implication, approval of GATT. Congress should not even consider passage of this bill without having GATT before it.

As the Supreme Court stated in *Buttfield v. Stranahan* (192 U. S. 525): "The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is expressly conferred upon Congress, and, being an enumerated power, is complete in itself, acknowledging no limitations other than those prescribed in the Constitution."

An analysis of GATT and OTC will readily show why Congress should not delegate its constitutional powers by direction or indirection to this international body.

In its preamble (which will now become article I (GATT lists its broad objects: "raising standards of living, insuring full employment and a large and steadily growing volume of real income and effective demand, developing the full use of the resources of the world and expanding the production and exchange of goods." To this was added this proposed language in 1955: "and promoting the progressive development of the economies of all the contracting parties." These objectives are to be accomplished "by entering into reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reductions of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international commerce."

This article I sets the theme for GATT: an international organization which is actually an attempt at a world-trade government in which we are merely a satellite having 1 vote in 35.

As a member of GATT we subscribe to at least one objective we have refused to espouse in our own domestic legislation. In the Employment Act of 1946 Congress was careful not to declare it to be the policy of the Federal Government to ensure full employment, but instead to promote maximum employment, and there is a world of difference between those two phrases. To ensure full employment—which means to ensure everyone's having a job at all times—a nation must of necessity be either socialistic or communistic. Where everyone works for the state, jobs can be guaranteed or ensured for all. On this point consider this excerpt from the constitution of Soviet Russia, chapter X, article 118:

"Citizens of the U. S. S. R. have the right to work, that is, the right to guaranteed employment and payment for their work in accordance with its quantity and quality. The right to work is ensured by the socialist organization of the national economy."

Under article II each member shall accord nondiscriminatory treatment to all other members with respect to import and export duties (with few exceptions). This seems to mean that if we make a special trade concession to Haiti, Communist Czechoslovakia must be accorded the same treatment. If this be so this provision presents a direct conflict with the policy of the Congress as expressed in the trade agreement statute, that Communist controlled countries shall not receive the benefits of reduced trade agreement rates. To get out of that difficulty it was necessary for the United States to get permission to withdraw Czechoslovakia from the list of nations entitled to most-favored-nation treatment.

Under article III, no member shall alter its method of determining dutiable value or of converting currencies so as to impair the value of any of the concessions provided for in GATT.

H. R. 6040 now before the Finance Committee of the Senate changes most of our existing laws on the subject of customs valuations which were in effect at the time GATT was negotiated. If H. R. 6040 becomes law it may be found to be a violation of Article III of GATT and will require at least the giving of compensatory concessions to any country interested.

Under Article IV imported products must be treated the same as domestic products regarding all laws affecting their internal sale. There is a specific provision that would prohibit Congress from requiring that a certain proportion of a given product must be supplied from domestic sources.

Under article VI a member may levy a special dumping duty if dumping by an export nation threatens the domestic industry—a provision generally in accord with our domestic dumping statute. On countervailing duties, however, the GATT requirement "material injury" to a domestic industry is not found in our law.

Quotas—embargoes—price supports: In this area GATT and our domestic policies and laws are in direct conflict. GATT has decided that the United States violates the General Agreement Article II and Article XI when it applies quotas or fees under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, noting that

"The United States Government has taken positive steps aimed at reducing 1955 crop supplies by lowering support price levels, or by imposing marketing quotas at minimum levels permitted by legislation", and has assured GATT that "The United States will discuss proposals under section 22 with all countries having substantial interest prior to taking action."

Under this same prohibition against quotas the United States has been attacked and has been compelled to give compensating concessions where it obtained a waiver to impose quotas on dairy products. In return GATT authorized the Netherlands Government to suspend the application to the United States of its obligations under the General Agreement to allow the United States to supply Netherlands a limit of 60,000 metric tons of wheat flour during the year 1955. (See Decision, 3rd Supplement, Basic Instruments and Selected Documents of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, Geneva, June 1955, p. 46.) This in spite of the provisions in section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act that "no international agreement entered into by the United States shall be applied in a manner inconsistent with this section."

In this area GATT is in direct conflict with our farm price-support legislation formulated by Congress. It creates a definite conflict with H. R. 7925; H. R. 8954; H. R. 9595, and others.

Although no waiver has yet been requested, it is probable that our Export Control Act of 1949 also violates article XI. This act authorizes the President to prohibit or curtail export of any materials in order to protect the national security, or protect the domestic economy from excessive drain of scarce materials, or further the foreign policy of the United States. The act was originally scheduled to terminate June 30, 1953, and was subsequently renewed for another 3 years until June 30, 1956. If it is again renewed, one could hardly say it represents "temporary" legislation, and there would be a question as to whether it was being temporarily applied so as to come under the article XI exemption. But the exemption applies only to restrictions "temporarily applied to prevent or relieve critical shortages of foodstuffs or other products essential to the nation involved." GATT thus cuts down the scope of Presidential action permitted under the congressional declaration of policy.

With so many provisions of GATT at variance with domestic policy or requiring approval or direction of domestic policy by the OTC–GATT, the question might well be raised as to whether it is not wiser to stay out of such an organization that will impede our domestic action, and enter into agreements on a point-by-point basis that is in keeping with congressional regulation of foreign commerce provided by the Constitution.

Under article XI, any nation that does place import quotas on agricultural products and receives an exemption because it similarly restricts domestic production must maintain the same ratio between the two as existed prior to the restrictions. Under article XIII, proper trade volume proportions among importing nations must be maintained when import quotas are invoked. It is probable that the OTC would supervise both these procedures to insure that importers did not suffer. Article XIII provides that a member shall consult with OTC regarding adjustment of such proportions, on request.

The interesting thing about GATT's quota ban is that apparently the United States is one of the very few of the members that would be forced to ask for a waiver—most of the rest have built-in exemptions either in article XI, XII, or XVIII. Article XII permits quotas where needed to prevent serious decline in monetary reserves or to increase them if they are low. Thus no so-called soft currency nation need worry about waivers when it imposes quotas. Article XVIII provides that increased tariffs or quotas may be used for economic development purposes by underdeveloped countries if the prior approval of OTC is obtained.

Article XVI deals with subsidies. There probably is inevitable conflict between these GATT regulations and our domestic subsidy program. It is provided that if a member maintains a subsidy which increases exports or decreases imports of any product, a report must be made to OTC. If the subsidy is causing a serious prejudice to another member's trade, consultations must be held. Recently added language would ban the use of export subsidies on nonprimary products or manufactures after January 1, 1958. Export subsidies on primary products may continue to be used but they must be applied so that the subsidizing country will not acquire more than an "equitable share" of the world export trade in that product. Just who determines this "equitable share" is left unsaid, but of course it would be the OTC–GATT.

Article XIX is the so-called escape-clause provision. It provides that if as a result of unforeseen developments and of obligations incurred under GATT, a product is being imported into a country in such increased quantities and under such conditions that serious injury is caused or threatened to domestic producers, a member is permitted to suspend the obligation or modify the concession. If this is done, other affected members can suspend substantially equivalent concessions if the OTC approves. This "escape clause" differs from the one written into our own tariff laws by Congress (trade agreement extension law 1951), in that, in order to suspend the effect of a concession, it is only necessary under our law that a product, as a partial result of the concession, is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities that serious injury is caused or threatened to the domestic industry producing like products. No "unforeseen developments" are required as under GATT. It is therefore entirely probable that we could take advantage of the escape clause in our own law and still be in violation of GATT. The conflicting interpretations of the two provisions may be measured by the storm of protests and second guessing on the facts by member countries of GATT following each of the few instances in which the United States has taken action to protect its own industries from injury under the escape-clause provision of our laws.

Under the new language of article XXVIII, concessions are open for withdrawal or modification only once every 3 years starting January 1, 1958. However the OTC may at any time, in special circumstances, authorize a member to enter into negotiations for

modification or withdrawal, such negotiations to be supervised by OTC.

The new article XXIX (of GATT) gives OTC authority to sponsor tariff negotiations. Althought no member is obligated to participate in such negotiations, the "moral suasion" of paragraph 2 (b) of the article is of interest:

"The contracting parties recognize that in general the success of multilateral negotiations would depend on the participation of all contracting parties which conduct a substantial proportion of their external trade with one another."

Thus it could be said that a United States refusal to participate in negotiations sponsored by OTC would be in violation of the spirit of GATT.

Under the new article XXX, if a nation does not agree to amendments to articles IV to XXX of GATT already accepted by two-thirds of the members, it can be eased out of OTC, or remain a member, at the discretion of OTC.

Article XXX provides for OTC, which carries out the provisions of GATT as well as other activities set up by the OTC agreement.

It is most interesting to note here that although we can keep Communist China out of the United Nations through use of the veto, we would be powerless to ban Red China from OTC discussions if two-thirds of the membership voted against us. Furthermore by a two-thirds vote Red China could be admitted as a member of OTC–GATT if she wished. OTC–GATT is an attempt at a world trade constitution without a bill of rights.

Next we come to article 13, where we find that waiver of an obligation under GATT can be granted by OTC if approved by a two-thirds majority, such majority to comprise more than half of the members. Congress thus delegates to OTC the power to allow any member to violate any provision of GATT. Such a delegation is unconscionable.

Let us briefly catalog at least some examples of the extent to which Congress would delegate its rights under OTC–GATT.

1. Delegation of authority as to what questions of international trade and commercial policy to study, what recommendations to make, and what propaganda to publish in keeping with GATT's broad world-trade-state objectives (OTC art. 3, GATT new art. I).

2. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to levy a dumping duty if dumping in the United States by another country injures an industry in a third country—say Cuba (GATT art. VI).

3. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to enact import quota legislation. A general national policy against import quotas is one thing. Having to ask OTC for permission to enforce our laws—such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—is quite another. Enactment of H. R. 8954 or similar legislation would send us on our knees to OTC again.

4. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to enact any other legislation contrary to provisions of GATT (OTC art. 13).

5. Delegation of authority to obtain from the executive branch of our Government numerous reports on various matters, including the steps taken in pursuance of the various provisions and policies set forth in GATT (e. g. GATT art. VII—Valuation for Customs Purposes; GATT art. X, XVII).

6. Delegation of authority to cause the United States Government to review the operation of its laws and regulations in the light of provisions of GATT (GATT art. VIII).

7. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States, through giving subsidies on the export of a primary product, is gaining more than an equitable share of world export trade in that product (GATT art. XVI).

8. Delegation of authority to permit or forbid the United States to suspend substantially equivalent concessions of another nation invokes GATT's escape clause (GATT art. XIX).

9. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States can put into force a customs union or free-trade area (GATT art. XXIV).

10. Delegation of authority to force the United States to confer with a nation designed by OTC in addition to the nation with which the concession was originally negotiated if we wish to modify or withdraw a trade concession at the end of its term.

11. Delegation of authority to decide whether the United States is actually in violation of any provision of GATT, and to direct us to take corrective measures. That is one meaning of article 3 of OTC, saying that OTC will administer GATT. There is no appeal from OTC's interpretation of the facts. In the United States violation of a law would be determined by the courts. Not so here. This is contrary to our entire constitutional concept of justice.

We realize that H. R. 5550 comes before this committee as part of the President's program. But on that point we ask your indulgence for other quotations from the Panama Refining case, page 418 and at page 420:

"The Congress left the matter to the President without standard or rule, to be dealt with as he pleased. The effort by ingenious and diligent construction to supply a criterion still permits such a breadth of authorized action as essentially to commit to the President the functions of a legislature rather than those of an executive or administrative officer executing a declared legislative policy."

"The question whether such a delegation of legislative power is permitted by the Constitution is not answered by the argument that it should be assumed that the President has acted, and will act, for what he believes to be the public good. The point is not one of motives, but of constitutional authority, for which the best of motives is not a substitute."

And also from the Schechter case, in striking down the codes of fair competition sections of NIRA as unconstitutional delegations of authority, page 537:

"But Congress cannot delegate legislative power to the President to exercise an unfettered discretion to make whatever laws he thinks may be needed or advisable for the rehabilitation and expansion of trade or industry."

We think the conclusion forced upon us by a study of section 350 is that Congress never intended the President to use it as a basis for joining an association of "contracting parties" governed by majority rule without veto, amounting in every sense of the word to an international organization even though not denominated as such.

If OTC-GATT were made into a purely advisory international trade body without power to compel action; with no rulemaking power; with no decision-making authority; with no authoritative regulatory power; with no voting; with no sanctions, and with no compulsion, it might be useful as a tribunal which could hear governments and individuals alike, and advise the governments as to the best course to follow to simplify, amplify, and promote international trade.

It is not necessary to have finality of judgment or enforceability of decree which in the last analysis cannot be enforced, and can only impel a noncomplacent nation to "walk out."

Respectfully submitted.

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION,
By ALEBERT MACC. BARNES,
Designated Representative.

NEW YORK, *March 8, 1956.*

NOTE.—It might be well for the Congress to consider the situation of the secret treaty and executive agreement culminating in the Lansing-Ishii agreement with Japan in 1905. Mr. Lansing told your Foreign Relations Committee that the agreement had no binding force on the United States—but it took an international conference, two complete treaties, and a series of notes to get rid of it in 1921. (See Constitution of the United States of America, revised and annotated, 1952, by Edward S. Corwin, editor, p. 426.)

Accomplishments of TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD advertisements which have been carried in the magazine Editor and Publisher and which tell of the accomplishments of the Tennessee Valley Authority and their meaning and benefit to the Nation.

There being no objection, the advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Editor and Publisher of December 10, 1955]

WHAT THE PRESS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT 6 MILLION AMERICANS WHO LIVE IN THE VALLEY OF THE TENNESSEE RIVER

SOME BASIC FACTS

The TVA is not a way of life. It is neither creeping nor galloping socialism. It is an important and integral part of the economic life of 6,000,000 American citizens.

WHO WE ARE

Both in and out of the Valley, there exists a considerable lack of knowledge of the Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, and its purpose. Composed of the distributors of TVA power, the association represents 98 municipalities and 50 cooperatives who buy TVA power and retail it to 1,300,000 customers who live in the valley. Collectively they represent an investment of nearly $450,000,000, which can only be paid from the revenues from the sale of electricity. Business and professional men, farmers and other Valley residents comprise the boards of these 148 agencies—and we daresay that you won't find one out of the 1,028 board members who could be classed as socialistic, or even sympathetic to such ideas.

TVA AND US

The only relationship of these distributors to TVA is that of buyer to seller. A close cooperation regarding the electric business is maintained between buyer and seller. But in the 22 years of its existence, TVA has yet to interfere with any local agency or State government in the Valley.

As responsible business and professional men, we ask the American Press to watch for future releases, telling the TVA story as the people of the Tennessee Valley see it.

(Sponsored in the interest of an enlightened press by Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.)

[From Editor and Publisher of February 4, 1956]

WHAT THE PRESS SHOULD KNOW ABOUT SOCIALISM AND THE TVA

"Creeping socialism"—were the words used by a poorly advised chief executive in a hectic press conference about the TVA—and they've caused untold damage to the people of the Tennessee Valley, despite any explanations. Why did he say it? Until 1950, ugly smear tactics using the word "socialism" or its more sinister companion "communism" were seldom employed. Publicly owned operations did little to advertise that the price of electricity was too high, the supply too low. Yet it was being effectively demonstrated in the Tennessee Valley that an abundant supply of power at reasonable rates not only built the economy of a region, but paid off for the utility.

WHO STARTED IT?

The following quotes from a survey made in 1950 for the electric companies advertising program clearly indicates the genesis of the smear campaign * * *

"Some fewer people in 1949 approved of TVA than did in 1947 * * * but still, only 10 percent say they disapprove."

"It is apparent that to link our fight to the TVA question would run us into a lot of opposition * * * But to link our fight to socialism is something else again. The people do not want socialism.

"We're on favorable ground there * * * will stress the fight against the socialistic state more in the future."

In less than 4 years, a program based on half-truth, using smear tactics, swept from ECAP to the Chief Executive of the Nation, and into the minds of millions. Hitler's Nazis never created more effective propaganda.

(Sponsored in the interest of an enlightened press by Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.)

[From Editor and Publisher of April 21, 1956]

WHY TVA ONLY?

What are the facts behind the charge that TVA is a step in a socialistic trend? Publicly owned utilities operated for 68 years (and TVA was in business for 17 years) before any such charges were leveled.

After 17 years of violent attack on TVA, private utilities frankly admitted that only 10 percent say they disapprove. And, the socialistic tag resulted from the private utilities having to lower rates—as a result of TVA's record. Socialistic? TVA is no more so than the first municipal system—in business long before the 20th century. No more so than public schools, public health, postal service—or publicly owned water systems. Yet these are never referred to as steps in a socialistic trend.

One plain fact is that there is not a great deal of profit in any of these enterprises—certainly nothing compared to the profits from the sale of electricity.

It reflects on the intelligence of the American businessman for private power companies to say they are the first line of defense for the free-enterprise system. And no straight-thinking public power advocates want to take over the entire electric business of the Nation. All they want is:

1. To permit the people to choose how they should be served.

2. To operate an efficient Federal-local partnership, clearly demonstrating to the consumer what his electric rates should be.

Let's face it: the power business, public or private, is a monopoly. And monopolies are not controlled by competition.

(Sponsored in the interest of an enlightened press by Tennessee Valley Public Power Association.)

Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the late Senator Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The commemoration this year of the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Food and Drug Act of 1906 recalls how much of the credit for this legislation belongs to the late Senator Edwin F. Ladd, of North Dakota. He was one of the most outstanding men ever produced by the State of North Dakota, a man who achieved the respect and devotion of not only his own State but of much of the Nation.

When he died in 1925, Dr. Ladd was a Member of the United States Senate from North Dakota, but long before he came to Washington he had become a world renowned personage, known at scientific congresses abroad and in demand as an expert in his field of chemistry.

Although primarily interested in the problems of agriculture, he never failed to take a stand on the side of justice and for the rights of the people. For 35 years, Senator Ladd fought the battles of the people of his own and other States, often almost singlehanded.

Born in Maine, Dr. Ladd studied chemistry at the State university and from 1884 to 1890 served the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station as chief chemist. In 1890 he went to North Dakota where his work began in the chemistry department of the Agricultural College at Fargo.

Within a short time he found himself involved in a series of food and drug adulteration controversies and these in turn led to the enactment of a pure food and drug law by the State of North Dakota. This law, passed largely at the instigation of Dr. Ladd, preceded by 3 years the enactment of the Federal law.

By the time the State legislation was passed, Dr. Ladd was so well known that his appointment as administrator of the law was taken as a matter of course. He proved to be as able and efficient an executive as he was a chemist.

It is interesting to trace the steps that brought Dr. Ladd to his pre-eminence. In the first place, before he ever had anything to do with politics, he had for years been engaged in food and drug analysis in his laboratory.

As a citizen of North Dakota this man of science became acutely conscious of what happened to what the farmer raised for sale, and conversely, what had happened to what the farmer bought.

His researches had some astonishing results. For example, he analyzed the brands of paint sold in the State and, when his work was published, a group of paint manufacturers were so impressed with the thoroughness of the job that they raised a fund and turned it over to Dr. Ladd for paint investigation. This, in turn, was followed by the practice of using on the college campus itself paints that were under investigation, leaving it to the weather to demonstrate the shortcomings of the merits of the product. Demonstrations of this character are commonplace now, but in Dr. Ladd's time they were not.

Gradually his work expanded.

One of his most celebrated accomplishments was the exposure of wheat bleaching. At the time certain types of North Dakota wheat commanded a high premium because they made an intensely white flour. Competing millers discovered that inferior wheat could be chemically bleached so as to produce a flour as white as they produced from Dakota wheat. Dr. Ladd got a law passed which required millers to stamp the word "Bleached" in large letters on every sack of such flour sold in the State. Action of this character spread to other States and eventually to a successful Federal Supreme Court case. In a way somewhat similar to his experiences with paint, Dr. Ladd's flour researches and the resulting pressures led to experiment and new and superior methods of blending wheat.

Canned corn bleached with sulphite and sweetened with saccharin, peas and string beans preserved with copper and alum salts, embalmed beef—the Spanish-American War had made this last notorious—phony maple sirup, and candy made of glucose and stained with coal-tar dyes were some of the products that Dr. Ladd helped to expose. In all this Dr. Ladd worked closely with the famous Dr. Wiley, Chief Chemist of the Department of Agriculture, and proved to be a devastating witness before the congressional committees when the pure food and drug bill was up for consideration.

Colored oleomargarine branded "butter" and 3½-ounce spice containers labeled 4 ounces got short shrift from Dr. Ladd. Half-strength formaldehyde—useless in treating seed grain for smut or potatoes for scab—did not long survive his attacks. He insisted upon the enforcement of the laws against the adulteration of drugs—digitalis was a case in point—and he made his enforcement stick. In commenting upon the North Dakota pure food law, he said: "The pure food law does not prohibit the selling of ground olive stones or coconut shells as such but it does forbid selling them for pepper or other food products."

A tireless worker, he was a member of numerous scientific bodies and a steady stream of his papers appeared in their professional proceedings. In this day when so many people have come to believe that all powerful government has the answers to everything, it is instructive to recall that Dr. Ladd had no such ideas. Regulatory legislation to him was a leverage, not a triumph of the police power. In his last years, before Stalin had pulled down the Iron Curtain, Senator Ladd visited Soviet Russia and with a detached and penetrating eye examined the new utopia. His conclusion was, as Senator King, of Utah, put it, that "the knout of the Czar had produced repercussions and the mailed fist of the Communist was to be expected."

Senator Ladd was one of the most illustrious of all North Dakota public servants. He was a great man—great in his faith, great in his purpose, and great in his love of humanity.

The Adoption of the Reed-Dirksen Amendment Would Save Income-Tax Payers $10 Billion a Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, during the two sessions of the 84th Congress proposals were introduced for constitutional

amendments limiting the Federal power to tax incomes except in time of war or great national emergencies and requiring the President to submit to Congress each year proposals for a balanced budget. The so-called Reed-Dirksen joint resolutions—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182—proposed the repeal of the 16th article of amendment to the Constitution, and enacting in its stead a new amendment limiting the taxing power of the Federal Government on incomes to a maximum top rate of 25 percent and also eliminating taxes upon inheritances and gifts.

The so-called Byrd-Bridges joint resolution calls for a constitutional amendment requiring that "on or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimates of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of receipts."

Mr. Speaker, both of these worthy objectives now rest in the hands of the next Congress for their revival. I have taken time today to point out a few of the possible savings to the taxpayers that could come through the adoption of the proposed Reed-Dirksen amendment to our Constitution. The table which follows shows the difference between the taxes on incomes under the Internal Revenue Act of 1954, as amended, and the savings under the 25 percent maximum possible under the Reed-Dirksen joint resolution:

Income level	Taxes under 1954 Revenue Act	Taxes proposed under Reed-Dirksen [1]
$0 to $1,000	20 percent of net taxable	1 percent of net taxable.
$1,000 to $2,000	20 percent income	$10 plus income 2 percent.
$2,000 to $4,000	$400 plus 22 percent over $2,000	$30 plus 3 percent over $2,000.
$4,000 to $6,000	$840 plus 26 percent over $4,000	$90 plus 4 percent over $4,000.
$6,000 to $8,000	$1,360 plus 30 percent over $6,000	$170 plus 5 percent over $6,000.
$8,000 to $10,000	$1,960 plus 34 percent over $8,000	$270 plus 6 percent over $8,000.
$10,000 to $12,000	$2,640 plus 38 percent over $10,000	$390 plus 7 percent over $10,000.
$12,000 to $14,000	$3,400 plus 43 percent over $12,000	$530 plus 8 percent over $12,000.
$14,000 to $16,000	$4,250 plus 47 percent over $14,000	$690 plus 9 percent over $14,000.
$16,000 to $18,000	$5,200 plus 50 percent over $16,000	$870 plus 10 percent over $16,000.
$18,000 to $20,000	$6,200 plus 53 percent over $18,000	$1,070 plus 11 percent over $18,000.
$20,000 to $22,000	$7,260 plus 56 percent over $20,000	$1,290 plus 12 percent over $20,000.
$22,000 to $26,000	$8,380 plus 59 percent over $22,000	$1,530 plus 13 percent over $22,000.
$26,000 to $32,000	$10,740 plus 62 percent over $26,000	$2,050 plus 14 percent over $26,000.
$32,000 to $38,000	$14,460 plus 65 percent over $32,000	$2,890 plus 15 percent over $32,000.
$38,000 to $44,000	$18,360 plus 69 percent over $38,000	$3,790 plus 16 percent over $38,000.
$44,000 to $50,000	$22,500 plus 72 percent over $44,000	$4,750 plus 17 percent over $44,000.
$50,000 to $60,000	$26,820 plus 75 percent over $50,000	$5,770 plus 18 percent over $50,000.
$60,000 to $70,000	$34,320 plus 78 percent over $60,000	$7,570 plus 19 percent over $60,000.
$70,000 to $80,000	$42,120 plus 81 percent over $70,000	$9,470 plus 20 percent over $70,000.
$80,000 to $90,000	$50,220 plus 84 percent over $80,000	$11,470 plus 21 percent over $80,000.
$90,000 to $100,000	$58,620 plus 87 percent over $90,000	$13,570 plus 22 percent over $90,000.
$100,000 to $150,000	$67,320 plus 89 percent over $100,000	$15,770 plus 23 percent over $100,000.
$150,000 to $200,000	$111,820 plus 90 percent over $150,000	$27,270 plus 24 percent over $150,000.
$200,000 and over	$156,820 plus 91 percent over $200,000	$39,270 plus 25 percent over $200,000.

[1] Comparison prepared by Roger J. Moure, Arlington, Va.

Mr. Speaker, the adoption of the proposed Reed-Dirksen amendment would help every segment of our economy. It would relieve the strain upon family budgets, on small and independent business and upon the American farmers as well.

The savings to the American taxpayers are estimated at not less than $10 billion a year in income taxes alone. Now you will ask how can we offset these savings to the taxpayers and still carry on the necessary and normal functions of Government?

The answer is right at hand and needs only congressional action.

Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1955, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created by Public Law 108, 83d Congress, wound up its work and submitted a report to Congress in which recommended savings of not less than $8,565,100,000 a year for the next 4 fiscal years were listed: These savings would be effected through detailed reorganizations as follows:

Budget and accounting	$4,000,000,000
Depot utilization (defense forces)	253,000,000
Federal medical services	290,000,000
Lending, guaranteeing, insurance	200,000,000
Overseas economic operations	360,000,000
Paperwork management	288,300,000
Personnel and civil service	48,500,000
Real-property management	185,000,000
Personnel problems, Defense Department	388,800,000
Food and clothing procurement	$400,000,000
Transportation economies	151,500,000
Use and disposal of surplus property	2,000,000,000
Recommended possible savings	8,565,100,000

This Commission report highlights the need for drastic reorganizations to reduce the bureaucracy which rides the backs of all our taxpayers and all our enterprises large and small. It is pertinent to observe, Mr. Speaker, that in the 25 years between 1930 and 1955, while the population of the United States increased approximately 30 percent, employment in the Federal Government's executive branch increased by more than 300 percent and the payrolls increased even faster than that to the amazing total of $10,400,000,000 in 1955 compared with $1,100,273,000 in 1930.

CUT OUT FOREIGN AID TO IRON CURTAIN SYMPATHIZERS AND COOPERATORS

Mr. Speaker, if we would adopt the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and also cut out the foreign-aid programs for countries sympathetic and cooperating with the Russians, we could reduce taxes as envisioned by the Reed-Dirksen proposed constitutional amendment.

BALANCING THE BUDGET WOULD HELP, TOO

And, Mr. Speaker, of course there can be no doubts about savings that would be effectuated with a balanced budget as required under the proposed Byrd-Bridges constitutional amendment. We now pay nearly $7 billion a year in interest on the public debt—an amount greater than the cost of Government in any peacetime year prior to 1937.

Mr. Speaker, the rates of taxes levied upon incomes and the failure in peacetime to balance the Federal budgets have had their dual effects upon our entire economic structure. Changes in the internal revenue laws have been followed by changes in the price indexes at the wholesale and consumer levels. Every dollar added to the tax burden is reflected by movements upward in the price indexes which reflect a decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Thus the tides of inflation rise and fall, but seeming always rising to new heights as indicated by the special table which follows, showing the price indexes and surplus or deficits in the 22 years prior to 1913 when the 16th amendment became effective, and in the 43 years from 1913 to 1955 inclusive since the 16th amendment became effective.

Income year	Range of tax rates (percentages)	Single	Married	Dependent	Wholesale price index 1926=100	Budget surplus or deficit (−)
1890					56.2	$85,040,273
1891					55.8	26,838,543
1892					52.2	9,914,453
1893					53.4	2,341,676
1894					47.9	−61,169,965
1895					48.8	−31,465,879
1896					46.5	−14,036,999
1897					46.6	−18,052,454
1898					48.5	−38,047,248
1899					52.2	−89,111,558
1900					56.1	46,380,005

Footnotes at end of table.

Income year	Range of tax rates (percentages)	Single	Married	Dependent	Wholesale price index 1926=100	Budget surplus or deficit (−)
1901					55.3	$63,068,413
1902					58.9	77,243,984
1903					59.6	44,874,595
1904					59.7	−42,572,815
1905					60.1	−23,004,229
1906					61.8	24,872,168
1907					65.2	86,731,544
1908					62.9	−57,334,413
1909					67.6	−89,423,387
1910					70.4	−18,105,350
1911					64.9	10,631,399
1912					69.1	2,727,870
1913	1 percent to 7 percent	$3,000	$4,000		69.8	−400,733
1914	do	3,000	4,000		68.1	−408,264
1915	do	1,000	2,000	$200	69.5	−62,675,975
1916	2 percent to 15 percent	1,000	2,000	200	85.5	48,478,346
1917	2 percent to 67 percent	1,000	2,000	200	117.5	−853,356,956
1918	6 percent to 77 percent	1,000	2,000	200	131.3	−9,032,119,606
1919	4 percent to 73 percent	1,000	2,000	200	138.6	−13,362,622,819
1920	do	1,000	2,000	200	154.4	291,221,548
1921	do	1,000	2,500	400	97.6	509,005,271
1922	4 percent to 58 percent	1,000	2,500	400	96.7	736,496,251
1923	3 percent to 43.5 percent	1,000	2,500	400	100.6	712,507,952
1924	2 percent to 46 percent	1,000	2,500	400	98.1	963,306,737
1925	1.5 percent to 25 percent	1,500	3,500	400	103.5	717,043,353
1926	do	1,500	3,500	400	100.0	865,143,867
1927	do	1,500	3,500	400	95.4	1,155,364,766
1928	do	1,500	3,500	400	96.7	939,083,301
1929	0.5 percent to 24 percent	1,500	3,500	400	95.3	734,390,739
1930	1.5 percent to 25 percent	1,500	3,500	400	86.4	737,672,818
1931	do	1,500	3,500	400	73.0	−461,877,080
1932	4 percent to 63 percent	1,000	2,500	400	64.8	−2,735,289,708
1933	do	1,000	2,500	400	65.9	−2,601,652,085
1934	do	1,000	2,500	400	74.9	−3,629,631,943
1935	do	1,000	2,500	400	80.0	−2,971,052,100
1936	4 percent to 79 percent	1,000	2,500	400	80.8	−4,424,549,230
1937	do	1,000	2,500	400	86.3	−2,777,420,714
1938	do	1,000	2,500	400	78.6	−1,176,616,598
1939	do	1,000	2,500	400	77.1	−3,862,158,040
1940 [1]	4 percent to 79 percent	800	2,000	400	78.6	−3,918,019,161
1941	10 percent to 81 percent	750	1,500	400	87.3	−6,159,272,358
1942 [2]	19 percent to 88 percent	500	1,200	350	98.8	−21,490,242,732
1943 [2]	do	500	1,200	350	103.1	−57,420,430,365
1944	23 percent to 94 percent	$500 per capita exemption			104.0	−51,423,392,541
1945	do	$500 per capita exemption			105.8	−53,940,916,126
1946	19 percent to 86.45 percent	$500 per capita exemption			121.1	−20,676,170,609
1947	do	$500 per capita exemption			152.1	753,787,660
1948	16.6 percent to 82.1275 percent	$600 per capita exemption			165.0	8,419,469,844
1949	do	$600 per capita exemption			155.0	−1,811,440,048
1950	17.4 percent to 84.357 percent	$600 per capita exemption			161.5	−3,122,102,357
1951	20.4 percent to 91 percent	$600 per capita exemption			184.0	3,509,782,624
1952	22.2 percent to 92 percent	$600 per capita exemption			189.0	−4,016,640,378
1953	do	$600 per capita exemption			195.0	−9,449,213,457
1954	20 percent to 91 percent	$600 per capita exemption			195.0	−3,116,966,256
1955	do	$600 per capita exemption			196.0	−4,180,228,921

[1] Exclusive of the defense tax of 10 percent of the total tax due.
[2] Exclusive of the victory tax applicable to 1943, which was imposed at the rate of 5 percent on net income after a specific exemption of $1,248 for a married couple filing a joint return and $624 for other taxpayers.

NOTE.—The relative purchasing power of the dollar can be ascertained for any year by dividing the wholesale price index into 10,000. Thus in 1890 the dollar was worth $1.77⅞o in purchasing power while the 1955 dollar was worth but $0.51⅔oo.

Statement Concerning the Activities of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure and pride that I report that, with adjournment of the 84th Congress, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has produced a record of constructive activity unequaled in any prior Congress since the formation of its present jurisdiction pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

During the first session, there were a total of 86 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees. Eighteen pieces of legislation considered by the committee became law. During the second session, there were 131 meetings of the full committee and its subcommittees. As of this date, 56 legislative measures reported from the full committee in this session have been approved by the President.

Major legislation included authorization for the world's first atomic powered merchant ship; the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956; granting of permanent status to the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y.; authorization of 100 percent mortgage insurance on privately financed loans for the construction of vessels; bills increasing the safety of operation of small craft, including the inspection and certification of vessels carrying more than six passengers for hire; and, several bills authorizing the sale of Government-owned ships to expand or inaugurate essential shipping service.

During the two sessions of this Congress, the committee launched and carried through a number of highly important inquiries pursuant to special investigative authority or in accordance with section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

At the outset of this Congress, it was decided that the greatest value could be rendered to the committee, a majority of whose members were freshmen Congressmen, by holding a series of hearings concerning the functions and workings of the several administrative agencies under the jurisdiction of the committee. Accordingly, during February and March of 1955 extensive hearings were held in Washington, studying the operations of, first, the Maritime Administration and the Federal Maritime Board of the Department of Commerce; second, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, third, the United States Coast Guard, Department of the Treasury; fourth, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce; and fifth, the Panama Canal Company and Panama Canal Zone Government. These hearings proved of great value and were welcomed not only by the new Members, but by those who had served with the committee during previous Congresses. They were strictly informative in nature and provided much useful background for the Members to enable them better to appraise legislation subsequently considered concerning the agencies involved.

During this same period, the committee held follow-up hearings on legislation enacted in the previous Congress to

determine the effectiveness and administration thereof.

Hearings held before the committee in the 83d Congress disclosed the critical need for modern, large-capacity, high-speed tankers to keep the merchant marine in a state of readiness in case of emergency. All testimony indicated that the minimum speed for the tankers proposed to be constructed under a special trade-in and build program was 18 knots. However, when it came to the attention of the committee that the maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, was consummating trade-in transactions for new vessels to operate at a maximum speed not in excess of 16 knots, immediate inquiry was held. No acceptable explanation was given for the change in requirements, but it is gratifying to report at this time that the program has been proceeding substantially as originally represented to the committee.

Probably, one of the most important aspects of American merchant-marine policy has been the concept that the United States should carry "a substantial portion of its water-borne foreign commerce" which has generally been construed to mean an ultimate goal of about half of the tonnage moved in the foreign commerce. In the free flow of American foreign trade, of course, this goal is subject to the fluctuations of normal competition and the willingness of the Congress to realize that the goal cannot be approached without recognition of the differential between American and foreign costs of operation and standards of living. However, in view of the extensive foreign aid and rehabilitation programs conducted under Government auspices following World War II, virtually all aid programs contained provisions to the effect that at least 50 percent of Government cargoes should be carried in American bottoms, provided such were available at fair and reasonable rates for American-flag vessels. This requirement, initially written into individual foreign-aid laws, enabled American-flag shipping to participate in the foreign commerce of the United States under the abnormal conditions of the postwar years. In the 83d Congress, the principle was enacted into permanent law in recognition of the apparent fact that United States Government programs would continue for some time to come. Notwithstanding the previously well-established principle, supported by precedent as far back as 1904, certain Government Departments, either misinformed or under pressure from foreign sources, charged that the law was thwarting important Government programs involving the exportation of surplus agricultural commodities. Full hearings failed to disclose any substance to these charges. Contrarily, they proved the soundness and workability of the so-called 50–50 law.

Another matter of considerable importance which was investigated during the first session of this Congress was labor-management relations in the maritime industry. The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was enacted at a time when the American shipping industry was at a perilously low stage, and industrial relations were substandard to the rest of American industry. Much of the philosophy of that act was aimed at bringing maritime labor up to the levels enjoyed by other groups in the citizen labor forces of the United States. Over the years, however, certain provisions of the act seem to have been ignored or not properly implemented. As a result, an impression has developed in more recent years that maritime labor is strangling the American shipping industry. With a completely wide-open mind on this subject, I called for a full-scale investigation of all phases of maritime labor-management problems. Staff members were sent to the Pacific, Atlantic, Gulf, and Great Lakes areas to interview and gather material from all key figures in labor and management, concerned with sea-going and shoreside personnel. A voluminous and valuable record of hearings was compiled over a period of 2 months in 1955. A unanimous committee report—House Report No. 1658—filed in the House on January 19, 1956, carefully analyzes all phases of this problem.

Hearings were also held on the vessel replacement program of the 16 subsidized operators holding contracts under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. These operators, representing the hard core of the common-carrier segment of the American merchant marine, are all soon to be confronted with obligations to replace and modernize their fleets. In the face of rising construction and operating costs, the committee was interested to hear a discussion of replacement plans and a recounting of the particular problems confronting the lines.

During the 1st session of the 84th Congress, H. R. 6243, by Mr. BONNER, and H. R. 6276, by Mr. TOLLEFSON, were introduced to authorize the construction of a nuclear powered merchant ship to promote the peacetime application of atomic energy. Hearings held on these bills resulted in the reporting of H. R. 6243 to the House, and eventual favorable action by the Senate in slightly amended form in the second session. Implementation of this law will be a landmark in maritime history.

Other matters of importance during the first session were the investigation of longshore labor problems in southern California; the inauguration of extensive investigation of the ocean freight-forwarding industry; hearings on various fisheries and wildlife conservation bills; a study of the proposed abolishment of the Panama Railroad, and other matters relating to Panama Canal operations; and, bills authorizing the sale of the Government-owned warbuilt passenger-cargo vessels the SS *Monterey* and SS *La Guardia*, to private operators for expanding the essential passenger-carrying segment of our merchant marine.

EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

During the first session, emphasis was placed on indoctrination, orientation, and investigation of various problems of concern to the committee as a whole. With the exception of certain legislation which was referred to special subcommittees on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Panama Canal, and the investigations of longshore labor in southern California and of the freight-forwarding industry, the greater part of all activity was before the full committee. At the beginning of the second session, however, four standing subcommittees were appointed to distribute the workload and make possible more expeditious handling of the legislative backlog. These subcommittees are, first, Subcommittee on Merchant Marine; second, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation; third, Subcommittee on Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Navigation; and fourth, Subcommittee on Panama Canal. When considered preferable, some matters were held for the attention of the full committee, irrespective of category.

By subject matter, the principal activities of the second session may be summarized as follows:

I. MERCHANT MARINE

The convening of the second session found the Cargo Preference Act again subject to misinformed or prejudiced attack. In line with previous committee policy to give all interested parties an opportunity to be heard, full hearings were held in January and the first half of February to determine the substance, if any, of the current charges against the 50–50 cargo law and the possibility of need for change to avoid conflict with other national policy. Testimony from the Departments of Agriculture, State, and Commerce, agricultural and American shipping interests, and a leading representative of European shipping, either supported or failed to negate the soundness of the basic principle involving cargo preference where Government sponsored cargoes are concerned. These hearings are covered fully in a report entitled "Cargo Preference and Its Relations to the Farm Surplus Disposal Program," February 27, 1956—H. Rept. No. 1818.

As a followup to the extensive hearings on maritime labor relation problems, steps were taken via hearings and conferences to bring about the establishment of a uniform termination date of labor agreements in the maritime industry. Progress was made and much support was given to the idea that this would be a stabilizing force in maritime labor relations. No legislation was involved.

In the field of legislation, the second session was noteworthy for several important measures designed to strengthen existing law and in other ways encourage the further development of our merchant marine.

Bitter experience in World Wars I and II has shown that inadequacy of shipbuilding and ship repair potential can be our Achilles heel in time of national emergency. Therefore, with depressing statements on the health of the ship construction and repair phases of the maritime industry before it, the committee (a) sought to provide for more effective information on shipyard availability by a bill to require periodic surveys of national shipyard capacity and capability, (b) extended the Emergency Ship Repair Act for an additional 2 years, (c) prohibited the use in coastwise trade

of vessels rebuilt outside the United States, and (d) recommended the establishment of a modern shipyard for use in emergencies in lieu of an existing reserve shipyard considered to be obsolete. This latter matter raised serious questions as to the adequacy of other reserve shipyards and the committee plans to make appropriate inquiry into the entire subject of standby shipyards.

After protracted debate in the House, and deep consideration in the Senate, the question of whether or not to make the first application of atomic energy to the merchant marine was resolved in the closing months of Congress when the Senate adopted the House bill with amendments. The amendments, while preserving appropriate division of authority between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Commerce, assure the development of a practical nuclear-powered merchant ship. The first ship will unquestionably be experimental but it should go far toward proving the feasibility of this great source of power in ship construction and design.

At the beginning of the second session, the President's budget message requested appropriations for the construction of a nuclear-powered tanker and two austerity prototype ships of new design designated as the *Freedom* and *Clipper* classes which would be especially suited for mass production in time of national emergency. The chairman and rank-members of both the majority and minority sides of the committee appeared before the Commerce Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee to present arguments showing the necessity for legislative authority to construct these new special types of vessels intended for purposes other than the fulfillment of "the long-range program previously adopted" under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. The committee representatives contended that, however desirable the construction of these vessels might be, existing law did not provide sufficient authority. In other words, since the proposals were distinct departures from the 1936 act, specific requests should be referred to and approved by the appropriate legislative committees before appropriations were granted. The Appropriations Committee agreed with the position of the Merchant Marine Committee members, and in due course legislation was proposed to authorize the construction of prototype vessels of the *Freedom* and *Clipper* design, together with the experimental conversion of one Liberty ship.

After full hearing, the committee acted favorably upon House Joint Resolution 614, with an amendment eliminating the construction of the *Freedom* class prototype. This amendment was due to disclosure during the hearings that a private operator was already under commitment to build seven vessels of the *Freedom* class for its regular trade routes. Accordingly, it did not appear that the expenditure of some $8 million for the construction of one such vessel for Government account was justified. This legislation has since been enacted into law.

Other important legislation dealing with merchant marine matters included authority to use the Maritime Administration revolving fund to meet the expense of activation, repair, and deactivation of Government-owned vessels chartered to private operators; a bill to provide for biennial instead of annual inspection of merchant vessels; an amendment to the 1936 act to permit the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of Government personnel on commercially operated American-flag ships; a bill to provide a single standard of evaluation, and otherwise clarify existing provisions of law relative to marine war-risk insurance; and a bill to remove an inequity in the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 affecting those who purchased war-built vessels prior to the enactment of that act.

In the close of the committee's activities during this Congress, forcible attention has been brought to the fact that, despite the needs of an expanding waterborne commerce, major gaps exist in several areas. One of the most serious deficiencies is in the important domestic coastwise and intercoastal trades. Essential trade routes 3 and 4 from the Atlantic Coast to Cuba and Mexico are not adequately served at present. Only two American-flag passenger ships are in service between the United States and northern Europe, with trade route 8 from New York to Antwerp/Rotterdam not presently being served by any American-flag passenger vessels. And excellent possibilities appear to exist for expansion of commerce between United States southern Atlantic ports and the Caribbean area.

The committee considered and favorably reported several proposals which would have authorized the sale of war-built vessels to citizens for operation in trades not presently being adequately served. Several of these matters contemplated the conversion of vessels to new types which would enhance their potential use for national defense purposes as well as increase their commercial efficiency. Some have been enacted into law, while others, due to misunderstanding or opposition from other forms of transportation, and misinformation after being reported by the committee almost unanimously failed of passage and will have to be reconsidered in the next Congress.

Probably the most important single piece of maritime legislation successfully acted upon in this Congress was that which authorizes the Government to guarantee up to 100 percent of privately financed mortgages or loans for the construction of new merchant vessels. Existing law permits direct Government financing of essential ship construction. However, in order to increase public participation in the merchant marine program and reduce appropriation pressure, there was enacted in the 83d Congress legislation which authorized 90 percent Government guaranty of ship construction mortgages and loans, except in the case of so-called special purpose vessels where 100 percent could be guaranteed. Experience with this law proved that, as a practical matter, it was not workable and would not serve the intended purpose of encouraging the development of the merchant marine. Private financing institutions were unwilling to tie up large sums of money over long periods of time and also assume a portion of the substantial financial risk involved. It is anticipated that the recent amendments to this law will make possible the early replacement of existing but obsolescent vessels, and will encourage expansion of American-flag shipping with new operators and additional modern vessels.

Shortly before the end of the session, Department of Commerce and Department of Defense officials were called to discuss with the committee the matter of the replacement of the Steamship *America* which, under the terms of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, will become obsolete in 1960. This hearing was purely preliminary and solely for the purpose of learning the plans of the executive branch in this matter so important to the national security and the prestige of the United States as a maritime Nation. It is desirable that this subject be followed up early in the first session of the next Congress.

II. FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION

A major portion of the committee's activities were devoted to problems concerning commercial and sports fishing and wildlife conservation.

In recent years, the growth of population and the unprecedented expansion of our national economy have simultaneously increased the importance of these subjects and created serious difficulties demanding attention and correction.

The commercial fisheries are an important source for the Nation's food supply. Recreational hunting and fishing, becoming more popular each year, are affording employment to many thousands and adding millions of dollars to our gross national product. At the same time, fewer areas of our country are available for the conservation and management of our wildlife resources. Existing areas are being sought by conflicting interests for mineral or industrial exploitation.

One of the first legislative proposals referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine ind Fisheries in this session of Congress called for a sweeping reorganization of the governmental setup concerned with the problems of the commercial fisheries. Increasing costs of production of boats and gear, the need for discovering and developing new sources of fishery products, together with the problems of research and resource management, brought about the introduction of a number of bills designed to aid the commercial fishery industry. Extensive study and hearings over a period of several months resulted in the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956, giving recognition to the increasingly difficult problems of the commercial fishing industry, establishing a revolving loan fund, placing the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act on an expanded and permanent basis, and, through the process of amendments to the original proposals, emphasizing the growing importance of sports fishing, hunting, and

wildlife conservation as sources of recreation. This act makes substantial changes within the Department of Interior and materially up-grades the status of the functions previously performed by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department.

A companion act to the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956 provides for the education and training of high school, college, and university students for the fishing industry. There is a growing shortage of manpower ranging all the way from the crews of fishing boats to laboratory researchers and other technicians. This act will meet the problem by authorizing funds for high school vocational training and grants to colleges and universities.

Among the major conseravtion matters considered by the committee during this session was a bill to establish the United States section of an international commission between the United States and Canada for the control and eventual elimination of the predatory sea lamprey in the Great Lakes. Over a period of years, the Congress has authorized research and experiment to find ways and means of controlling the sea lamyrey which has virtually destroyed the once extensive white fish and lake trout fisheries of the Great Lakes. The successful discovery of control methods will now be implemented through the international commisison created by this legislation.

The committee considered and favorably reported to the House some six bills authorizing the establishment or modernization of fish hatcheries throughout the country. Five of these bills have become law and will result in new or expanded facilities in Vermont, West Virginia, North Carolina, Virginia, and Montana. An additional bill, introduced by Representative WINT SMITH of Kansas, was before the committee but departmental reports were not received in sufficient time to hold hearings and take action thereon prior to adjournment of Congress. In each case, substantial need was shown for the hatcheries legislation. It seems desirable, however, that the subject be thoroughly explored in the first session of the next Congress to examine the policies of the Fish and Wildlife Service regarding the location of hatcheries, their overall need, and the formulation of standards by which applications for new hatcheries can be evaluated on a national basis.

Other conservation legislation included a bill to provide for adequate protection against drought for the unique Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia; a bill to provide for the continued preservation for conservation purposes of federally owned lands adjacent to the Jim Woodruff Reservoir in Florida and Georgia; and, a bill to prevent the extinction of the Key deer, a vanishing species inhabiting the Florida keys.

At the opening of the session, serious charges were made that wildlife refuges, or parts thereof, were being disposed of or dangerously exploited by conflicting interests. Several bills were before the committee which would have required congressional consent to any proposal to dispose of any refuge or part thereof for any purpose. The committee held extensive hearings on this subject and issued a report entitled "Preservation of National Wildlife Refuges"—House Report No. 1941—setting forth an arrangement arrived at with the Secretary of the Interior, whereby, in lieu of legislation, the committee would review any proposed changes in the national wildlife refuges. Since the establishment of this arrangement, the informal procedure has worked well. In only two instances, involving oil and gas leases, has it been deemed necessary to hold public hearings. In these cases, committee approval was forthcoming.

Hearings also were held on a proposal to transfer some 11,000 acres of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge to the Department of Defense. While no action was taken on the legislation involved in this case, it points up the need for constant vigilance on the part of the Congress to protect and preserve the remaining wilderness areas against unnecessary encroachment.

III. COAST GUARD, NAVIGATION, AND MERCHANT MARINE SAFETY

Several disasters have occurred in recent years involving extensive loss of life of passengers and crews aboard small craft operated for hire. These vessels, despite the large number of passengers carried, were not subject to inspection and certification by the Coast Guard with regard to seaworthiness, safety equipment, or qualifications of the operators. In each case, however, the evidence showed that the casualties would not have occurred had the vessels been subject to proper inspection. Legislation to provide for necessary regulation by the Coast Guard of small vessels, such as party fishing craft, carrying more than six passengers for hire, was thoroughly considered by the committee and favorably acted upon in this session.

Other proposals to improve safety of boat operation included a bill to clarify existing confusion by centralizing jurisdiction over navigation lights on fixed structures, and another to standardize lights on motorboats.

To increase the efficiency of the Coast Guard, one proposal establishes a supply fund to modernize accounting procedures along the lines of Hoover Commission recommendations.

The temporary promotion authority of the Coast Guard was extended for another 5 years, and its authorized officer strength was increased to 3,000.

Starting in May of this year, the committee embarked upon a full-scale study of the possible need for additional regulation of recreational boating. This sport has grown explosively in recent years, particularly in the field of boats of less than 16 feet propelled by outboard motors. At this time, the committee has held some 6 days of hearings in Washington on this important subject. Further hearings will be held in boating centers throughout the country during the balance of the year. No legislation is before the committee, and the investigation will be as thorough and as objective as possible before report and recommendations are made. It should be noted that this study was initiated at the suggestion of the manufacturers of pleasure boats, engines, and other equipment.

Just before adjournment, the Nation was shocked by the disastrous collision of the Swedish passenger ship, motor vessel *Stockholm*, and the Italian luxury liner steamship *Andrea Doria*. That such a catastrophe could occur today with all of the modern communications and safety equipment, and international standards of ship construction and navigation, raises serious questions as to whether existing requirements are high enough. Ocean passenger traffic is increasing yearly with American citizens comprising the great proportion of the traveling public patronizing the American and foreign passenger vessels which operate to and from the United States. Immediate authority was requested of and granted by the Congress to make thorough studies and investigations of merchant marine safety on the high seas, including the facts and circumstances surrounding the tragic collision of the *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria*. Investigation is presently in progress and will continue throughout the balance of the year.

IV. PANAMA CANAL

Serious questions have been raised concerning the need to continue the operation of the Panama Railroad across the Isthmus of Panama in the Canal Zone versus proposals to depend upon highway transit from the Atlantic to the Pacific side of the zone. Some hearings have been held on this subject, and a railroad expert has been employed by the committee to make a special survey of the situation.

In addition to a number of minor bills, the committee approved a proposal authorizing the construction of a bridge across the canal at Balboa, C. Z., to carry out treaty agreements reached in 1955.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

In addition to continued study and action predicated on the investigations currently underway relative to the safety of recreational boating, and the adequacy of international standards of construction and operation of passenger vessels on the high seas, the following subjects appear to be of importance for consideration early in the next Congress:

First. Tramp shipping under the American flag. Bills have been introduced on this subject several times in recent years including the second session of this Congress. The subject is difficult and carries many implications which should be studied with the greatest care and attention. Time did not permit full deliberation of the pending legislation in this session. Yet it is obvious that the present conception of liner services on fixed trade routes is not sufficient to even approximate the commonly accepted goal of quantity of shipping needed under the American flag. The present American-flag tramp fleet is composed mostly of vessels of obsolete design and well past middle age in service. Introduction of a bill similar to the one presently before the committee would afford an appropriate vehicle for the careful consideration of this important subject.

Second. Reserve fleet, ship transfer, and trade-in policy: The past several years have seen these subjects become so obscured as to make it impossible to determine whether there is any policy or any program of an organized and generally understood nature. Full investigation and hearings should be most helpful.

Third. Reserve shipyards: Investigation of 1 of the 4 reserve shipyards suggests the need for examining all of these yards to determine their adequacy and value in the event of future mobilization effort.

Fourth. Tourism by passenger ship: The startling fact that American vessels are carrying only 18 percent or less of the busy waterborne passenger traffic across the North Atlantic and are losing ground with air competition in other areas suggest that a study of tourism by ship would be of value in determining the possibilities of future development of this type of service. The popularity of passenger ship travel on the available ships suggest that expansion of American shipping, in private operation, is entirely feasible and desirable.

Fifth. Coastwise, intercoastal, and noncontiguous domestic shipping: Recent study by the Department of Commerce and hearing by the committee in this Congress show that the important domestic trades can be revived. However, further planned study is needed.

Sixth. Unsubsidized shipping—tax deferment of earnings for new ship construction: This was considered in connection with the Long-Range Shipping Act of 1952, but no action was taken due to opposition from certain sources. Approximate equalization of opportunity for nonsubsidized operations with that of subsidized operations with that of subsidized operators on essential trade routes merits the most careful consideration. Hearings commenced this year and additional statements requested by the committee will provide useful background on the prospective value of this type of legislation.

This Congress has seen material development in our merchant marine, and other fields under the committee's jurisdiction. I pledge my continued and full support to carry out and advance all of the objectives of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

In closing, I would like to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to all of the members of the committee and its staff who have labored hard and devotedly to bring about the substantial and constructive achievements of this Congress.

A Report to the People of the Seventh Congressional District in Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching the close of the 2d session of the 84th Congress. In all probability we will adjourn sine die before this day is over.

In evaluating the legislative actions of this Congress there naturally will be honest differences of opinions. Bitter partisans will naturally claim too much while their opponents will admit too little in the way of accomplishments.

However much Republicans and Democrats may differ, I believe all reasonable Members will avoid extreme views by claiming that the work of this Congress was all good or all bad. A true appraisal will show, I believe, that this Congress passed much good legislation, defeated some bad, but perhaps could have written a better record. One must never be satisfied with his present achievements.

AGRICULTURE

More than 2 years ago, on Monday June 28, 1954, in the Congressional Record, I made the following remarks:

We all recognize agriculture as our basic industry and that dairying comprises the most important segment of it. I firmly believe that dairy products should be supported under the same system as basic commodities. It is manifestly unfair to force the dairy farmer to pay inordinately high prices for grain and feeds supported by high fixed Government subsidies at the same time he has his milk, cheese, and other dairy products sold on a lower flexible scale.

Actually, the basic crops—wheat, cotton, corn, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—account for only about 23 percent of the Nation's total farm income. Yet nine-tenths of the $6.5 billion committed to price-support operations is tied up in these basic commodities.

During 1953 Missouri farmers received $705 million for their livestock and livestock products while crops returned only $310 million. This works a distinct hardship on our Missouri farmers because only 14 percent of Missouri's farm income is supplied by the so-called basic commodities. No one branch of agriculture should be favored over another.

During the middle of this session Congress attempted to return to the high fixed 90 percent parity price supports on the so-called basic commodities. That would have increased the prices for grains and feeds for the dairy farmers and poultry raisers in my district. That bill would have worked a tremendous hardship on farmers in the Ozarks and would have further added to the surpluses and storage costs from which we have been suffering. I voted against the passage of that obnoxious and harmful measure—when we had $8 billion of surplus agricultural commodities and were paying almost a million dollars a day storage on them.

President Eisenhower wisely vetoed the measure and I voted to sustain his veto. The Committee on Agriculture immediately brought in a revised farm bill which provided for a soil bank, whereby the Secretary of Agriculture enters into contracts with producers for a minimum period of 3 to 10 years, under which the producer receives payment for taking parts of his surplus croplands out of production and puts them to conservation uses. The cost of the program is limited to $450 million annually but $1,200,000,000 were set aside for the soil bank.

While I do not consider this, by any means, the final solution to our farm problem, I did reluctantly vote for this bill and gladly for several other constructive farm measures.

To further relieve the economic stress of the farmers, the Congress voted to exempt farmers from paying Federal excise taxes on gasoline and other special fuels used on the farm. This will result in a savings of $60 million in tax relief annually.

Congress voted to extend for 2 years soil conservation payments of the Federal Government to our farmers and appropriated $250 million for the next fiscal year for this purpose providing a maximum payment of $2,500 to any individual farmer.

Another benefit to the farmers of the Nation, as well as to our citizens generally, was the allocation of funds to establish certain research centers in various sections of the country for the purpose of studying the forestry program, eliminating animal and plant diseases, improving marketing methods, and improving machinery for the disposal of our farm products abroad. It opened wider the doors of our warehouses to provide food for needy people in our own country, and enacted legislation to protect the interest of small farmers and to improve the agricultural credit system with special emphasis on the well-being of family-operated farms.

We also enacted legislation and appropriations to expand and improve rural electrification and telephone service. We increased appropriations from sixty to seventy-five million dollars to provide milk in our school lunch programs for millions of schoolchildren.

We authorized the greatest appropriations for agriculture that any Congress in history has ever authorized. The total for all agricultural purposes for the fiscal year 1957 was nearly $2 billion. This is $1 billion more than was appropriated for agriculture during the last fiscal year. Of course, $1.2 billion of this year's appropriations has been earmarked to finance the soil bank program. The remainder of the funds will go to continue the work of the Agriculture Research Service, Soil Conservation Service, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Service, Marketing Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Commodity Credit Administration, Farm Credit Administration, and other assistance programs administered by the Department of Agriculture.

I was happy to support and vote for all these constructive measures and the present price of farm products and livestock shows that we are on the right road to a sound and stable agriculture. We are bringing production and consumption into proper balance without the artificial demands created by war.

HIGHWAYS

One of the major accomplishments of this session of Congress was the passage of the biggest roadbuilding program in our Nation's history.

Congress appropriated $33 billion to construct 41,000 miles of super interstate highways by 1969, and to improve primary and secondary highway systems as well as roads on Federal land.

The matching formula for the Interstate System will be 90 percent Federal

and 10 percent State. Allocations for primary, rural, and urban roads will be made on a 50–50 matching fund basis. This gigantic highway construction program will take care of our rapidly increasing population and expanding cargo traffic. It will not only aid our domestic commerce, but builds up our national defense.

EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I have always believed that no nation is stronger than the intelligence and character of its citizenry. A great philosopher once said: "Nothing is great but man, and nothing in man is great but mind." The Father of Our Country spoke of the necessity for having an enlightened citizenry and we all, regardless of party, realize the inadequacy of our school plants over the Nation, and the dire need of more teachers, better teachers at higher salaries.

Notwithstanding this realization, the Federal aid to education bill was defeated because certain racial and religious considerations were injected into the measure. There are many of us who fear the ultimate possibilities of Federal interference or thought-control of our State and local school systems should any improper type of Federal aid to education bill be adopted. This question is fraught with grave danger and we need no better examples than Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin.

The Congress must move with great care and caution in extending Federal aid to education, but I was happy to vote with other Members of both parties for legislation authorizing the expenditure of $7,500,000 a year for a 5-year period—the funds to be allocated to States matching grants for educational aid and rural library service. This bill will serve to improve if not equalize educational opportunities in this regard for our rural citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Speaker, I have always and consistently supported social security and have helped literally thousands of our old people in getting their pensions. I am glad that in the last Republican-controlled Congress we expanded social security to bring more than 7 million additional citizens into the program. At this session of Congress we approved major innovations in the social-security program which would give additional benefits to about 1,225,000 workers in this Nation.

The two major changes in the act would allow, first—totally disabled persons to obtain cash benefits at age 50, and second—reduce the retirement age of women workers from 65 to 62. The measure also extends old-age and survivors insurance coverage to about 200,000 lawyers, dentists, and other self-employed persons who have been excluded from social-security coverage.

VETERANS

My record on veterans' legislation has been clear and consistent ever since I came to Congress. Always I have supported and voted for the benefits for the veterans of all our wars and their dependents.

Our is a grateful nation, and the Congress appropriated $4.7 billion for all veterans' benefits—an increase of $20 million over the amount appropriated for the 1956 fiscal year and $8 million more than was recommended by the President.

This Nation has the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. This program includes education and training, insurance, housing, compensation and pensions, medical services, and many other benefits for veterans and their dependents.

This Congress appropriated $51,635,000 for hospital and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration for the next fiscal year. In spite of the fact that the veterans' hospitals of this Nation represent an investment of more than $2½ billion, many of the buildings are in need of repair or replacement, and it is difficult to understand why we have to wait so long to get disabled veterans hospitalized.

Of particular interest is the fact that during this session of Congress we passed legislation which will allow 10,000 more widows of World War I veterans to be eligible for veterans' pensions. The House passed a bill that would take care of the veterans of World War I who have been overlooked or neglected.

Under the House bill all veterans of World War I upon reaching the age of 65 would automatically draw a pension of $90 per month, but the Senate has taken no action on the measure.

The Congress did approve legislation which provides assistance to children of veterans of World War I, World War II, and Korea who died from service-connected disabilities. Monthly payments to the children range from $110 for full-time training to $80 for three-fourths and $50 for half-time training. This measure will provide educational benefits to more than 150,000 children of soldiers who died in the service of our country.

FEDERAL EMPLOYERS

Mr. Speaker, I was happy to vote for legislation increasing pay and granting additional benefits to all classified Government employees to meet the sharp rise in the costs of living. Particularly was I happy to vote increases and benefits for our postal employees, who have always been my good friends and to grant retirement benefits to all employees at the Federal medical center at Springfield, Mo., and other similar institutions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be of assistance to other people outside the Government service. I supported the original Railroad Retirement Act, and was happy to vote for amendments liberalizing it.

I also supported Senate bill 3879, a bill enabling automobile dealers to bring suit in Federal district courts against manufacturers not acting in good faith in complying with terms of franchises.

Without injury to members of our medical profession, I have succeeded in getting recognition and establishing standing for the doctors of dentistry, osteopathy, and optometry, all of whom can now receive commissions in our armed services. It has been my privilege and pleasure to address the national associations of these three branches of our healing arts, and I am pleased with the fine letters of appreciation and commendation received from their associations. Osteopathy and optometry are at last getting the consideration and recognized dignity that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration established the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, giving it Cabinet rank. No other administration in our history has been so concerned over and helpful to the mental and physical health of our citizens. During the past 4 years the 83d and 84th Congresses have voted enormously increased appropriations for the control and eradication of heart, cancer, and all kinds of physical and mental diseases.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Everyone knows that we are living in trying and troublesome times. The cold war is still on and the conflict between Christianity and communism, freedom and slavery continues. The greatest guaranty of security for the free world against aggression is to maintain an adequate national defense.

When I became chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the last Congress we were spending $53 billion a year on national defense. That was twice our national debt at the end of World War I. That is two-thirds of all the taxpayers money today. By wise management and honest administration we have reduced that expenditure to about $36 billion a year without weakening our security. We still have nearly 3 million men in all our Armed Forces, and will maintain that approximate strength for the forseeable future—at least until 1960.

While more emphasis is being placed on scientific research and technologial development in this atomic and hydrogen age, we annot depend altogether on nuclear power and guided missiles to protect this Nation. We will always need the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. Men will always be needed along with machines but manpower perhaps can be reduced as we increase our firepower with new weapons in units of mobility, speed and flexibility.

At this session of Congress $34,656,727,000—or more than half of the taxpayer's money, $508,877,000 more than the budget estimate—was appropriated for our Defense Department. Our expenditures for the present fiscal year will be more than the amount appropriated because we have several billion dollars in unexpended funds and balances.

We have a well balanced defense and this administration will never weaken the security of the Nation in order to balance the budget. However, we must realize that no nation can have military might without economic strength. Destroy one and you will destroy the other.

Our firm but considerate foreign policy has ended the shooting war in Korea, avoided a war in Formosa and Indochina, successfully stopped the spreading of communism in Guatemala, helped settled the knotty problem in Trieste, and thus far succeeded in preventing a violent eruption of world conflagration at Suez

and in the Near East. It has required patience, perseverance, endurance, understanding, broad vision, and strong leadership to chart the course of our ship of state through the many troubled waters to the harbor of safety and peace. Much nonsense, distortion, and misstatement of facts have been recently made by cynical critics who would better serve their Nation by cooperating with this administration in its mighty efforts to maintain peace among ourselves and all nations. Much more I will have to say about our national defense and international relationships when I return home to tell the people first hand.

SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, MISSOURI

Mr. Speaker, neither time nor space will allow me here and now to discuss fully many of the issues that will confront us in the campaign this year. In closing I do want to express my deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to the good people of the Seventh Congressional District of Missouri for their unfaltering confidence and steadfast friendship over the many years it has been my honor and privilege to serve them.

For nearly a quarter of a century I have been a Member of this body and my people well know that for 8 of the 24 years I have represented them in Congress I was the only Republican from Missouri. For 20 long years I have struggled under the New-Fair Deal, most of the time a lone wolf against great odds.

However, under this Republican administration in the past 3 or 4 years I am glad to see Table Rock Dam, an $87.5 million project, started, and it is now almost half completed. Fort Crowder, near Neosho, has been made a permanent military post, and we are now building two permanent barracks there and 66 housing units.

After a long, hard struggle Fort Leonard Wood has been made a permanent military installation and is destined to become one of the outstanding training centers in the Nation. While it is not in my congressional district, it has a vital economic impact not only on my district but on the entire State of Missouri. I was happy to work for the reactivation of Whiteman Air Force Base at Knob Noster near Sedalia, which is a B–47 base of our Strategic Air Command. Neither is this installation in my district, but I was glad as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the last Congress to get $22 million allocated for military housing there, and in the session just closed I got an additional $3 million as a backlog added. My efforts also were put forth to expanding and developing our Air Force Base at Grandview, near Kansas City, Mo.

After many weeks and months of hard work we got established and built at Joplin the Pacific Mercury plant, now manufacturing wiring and cables for the Boeing B–52 bomber.

One of the great enterprises to come to southwest Missouri will be a guided missiles plant being built by Aerojet at Fort Crowder, but it will be developed and operated by the Rocketdyne division of the North American Aviation, Inc. The first unit of this plant will cost approximately $10 million and will ultimately employ around 3,000 people.

It was my pleasure recently to dedicate a new armory at Anderson. A new armory is assured for Carthage, and we are hoping to get one at Springfield in the not distant future. It must not be forgotten that we already have a splendid Naval Reserve training unit at Joplin, one at Drury College, Springfield, and I also worked hard to get established the ROTC unit at Southwest Missouri State College at Springfield.

Marshfield will get a new post-office building and Lockwood has already moved into their new post-office building.

Dropped into my lap when Springfield and Greene County were added to my congressional district was the O'Reilly Hospital, which was closed by the Veterans' Administration in the former administration on the President's orders. I have been pleased to help the Assemblies of God Church in establishing Evangel College there and pray for its continued growth and success.

I am sure Carthage will not forget the flood-control levee which I have worked for during several years—and which is now becoming a reality. I know I will be pardoned if I remind the people at Diamond and in Newton County that I introduced the original bill for the George Washington Carver National Monument and later former President Truman, then a United States Senator, introduced a companion bill in the United States Senate, and we got that legislation through under the Roosevelt administration. Quite an accomplishment for this Ozark Hillbilly Republican.

It is my intention, if returned to Congress, to introduce a new bill for the creation of a national park or memorial at Wilsons Creek at Battlefield, south of Springfield. This project has a personal interest for me since my Grandfather Short fought in that battle to preserve the Union. He lost that battle, but won the war.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the things we have done recently for southwest Missouri. I would not be so conceited or selfish as to claim credit for these accomplishments, but I think I can humbly and truthfully assure the people I represent that these installations and activities would not have been accomplished without DEWEY SHORT. The only reason I succeeded is because of the many friends—Democrats as well as Republicans—that I have made during the past 24 years I have been a Member of Congress. Seniority counts in this body and a newcomer here is like a freshman in college. It requires time, training, experience, and friends to get things done, I care not who the man is or to what political party he belongs. He might be the richest, smartest, and best man in the country but he will have to serve 2 or 3 terms in the Congress before he can become effective.

God has been good to me and my people have been very kind. I know that they rejoice with me in the Dewey Short scholarship that has been established by Aerojet, giving some bright, energetic, and ambitious young man in our district a chance to acquire a 4-year course of education in engineering at the school of his choice. After his graduation he will be in a position for a brilliant career with Aerojet or some other great company.

Mr. Speaker, recently my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee in the House, along with some other personal friends, raised a fund to have a portrait done of me, which will hang longer than I am on this earth in the room of the House Armed Services Committee. Naturally, I am deeply touched and shall forever remain grateful to you and others who participated in the unveiling ceremonies of that portrait. I know I do not deserve all the fine, complimentary things said about me on that occasion, but I am naturally pleased to know that long after I have left this body my friends from back home when they visit the Nation's Capitol, can get a look at this Ozark hillbilly's portrait hanging on the wall near the portrait of our fine colleague and beloved friend, Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia.

I trust no one will think I have been boasting unduly, but this is an election year, Mr. Speaker, and "He that tooteth not his own horn, the same shall not be tooted."

Correspondence Concerning Use of Fluoride Compounds in Drinking Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, like many other Members of Congress, I have received considerable correspondence concerning the use of fluoride compounds in drinking water, and the role of the United States Public Health Service in distributing information about fluoridation. Many Oregon citizens have requested that Congress make an impartial study of the effects of fluoridated water and of the Public Health Service insofar as its work deals with this question.

Many of these individuals have also requested that their letters be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because of the volume of this mail, I have selected several that express this view, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask to have listed below them the names and addresses of other of my constituents who have written similar letters to me.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASHLAND, OREG., *April 27, 1956.*
The Honorable WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Congress is being asked to appropriate a sizable sum to the Public Health Service to combat dental disorders. Before any such an appropriation is considered we should have a congressional investigation of the Public Health Service activities. Please have

the Committee selected from those who have no connection with the Public Health Service or American Dental Association to conduct this investigation.

Will this same committee, with well qualified statisticians, analyze the Public Health Service statistics, especially the inadequate controls they allow with testing of the two "control" cities, Newburgh and Kingston, N. Y.?

I would appreciate my letter beng read to Congress and inserted in the RECORD.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. CARL NEELY.

(Copy to Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER.)

MOSIER, OREG., *May 4, 1956.*

The Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to express our antifluoridation thoughts.

As American citizens, we feel it is our right and our privilege to do as our conscience dictates in the matter of medication.

The present controversy has been brought about by the seeming determinaton of some to force the use of fluorides in water on all of us.

This, to us, appears to be an unwarranted and unjustified invasion of the liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution (amendment 14) and by State constitutions.

We request a joint congressional investigation by a committee independent of both the promotion and the promoters. Please read this letter to Congress and insert it in the RECORD.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and Representative SAM COON.

Very truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. S. L. LOYD.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 7, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We request a joint congressional investigation into this fluoridation question by a qualified, independent committee. This is a Federal issue and United States Public Health Service officers promoting it.

There has been much written by reputable physicians and scientists about the dangers of fluorides to the health. Much of this news has been suppressed which is a violation of our civil rights.

We ask that this letter be read to Congress and inserted in the RECORD. Similar letters are being sent Senator NEUBERGER and Representatives GREEN, NORBLAD, COON and ELLSWORTH.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. G. B. KNUDSON.

ALBANY, OREG., *May 4, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I hear an appropriation has been asked to United States Public Health Service to combat dental disorders.

I would like to ask that a joint congressional investigation by a committee independent of both promotion and the promoters be held.

It should not be used to force fluoridation on folks who do not want it.

This is an unwarranted and unjustified invasion of liberty guaranteed by United States Constitution, amendment 14, and by State constitutions. No medication is safe for everyone. News of its harm is being suppressed sometimes by intimidation. No one in free United States has the right to force me to drink fluoridated water.

Please read this letter Congress and insert it in the RECORD.

Respectfully,

Mrs. JOHN KOHL.

A similar letter is being sent to Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Congresswoman Mrs. EDITH GREEN, and Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, all from Oregon.

GRANTS PASS, OREG., *May 5, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am impelled to write you about a matter that concerns me deeply—the fluoridation of public drinking water—that is being thrust upon the American people.

I simply cannot understand why the sudden departure from the orthodox method of administering medication—by the individual dose as needed and prescribed by the professional doctors and dentists. An accurate, measured does of any medication is the only satisfactory way it can be administered. One can scarcely imagine a more haphazard way of administering any medication than by putting an estimated portion into the reservoir of public water and then letting who will drink what they want of whatever concentration comes out at the tap. The argument advanced that mothers will not bother to give their children a spoonful of sodium fluoride solution in a glass of water, or them a pill the same as they do when they give vitamins, cod-liver oil, or what have you, is a very weak one. Any mother who would neglect the above would just as likely neglect to see that her child drank the necessary amount of water.

Personally, I am not at all convinced that the addition of sodium fluoride as a therapeutic agent will do what is being claimed for it in the way of preventing dental caries. However, I have no objection to it being used on an individual basis as are all other medications. If those who are so valiantly promoting this scheme were truly sincere about its value, they should have been using it extensively in individual doses all these years they have been talking about putting it in the water.

There is something wrong about this pressurized movement that insists it must be added to the drinking water. When intelligent citizens of unquestionable repute who oppose this measure are labeled stupid, ignorant, psychopathic, faddists, cultists as has been done via radio, television, and news articles, one cannot but feel there is more behind this pressure than appears on the surface. One cannot but feel that their concern is not for the welfare of the people.

I believe it is the duty and purpose of the Congress to protect the rights and freedom of the American people as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I believe that fluoridation of public drinking water is an infringement on those rights, as it forces those who oppose the measure to drink a water which they feel is harmful.

I believe that fluoridation is a fraud—that can have serious consequences.

I believe that Congress should launch a full-scale investigation by a committee which is unbiased, unprejudiced, and independent of the proponents.

I should like to have this letter read to Congress and inserted in the record, and to know that you, as our elected representative, will give this matter your personal attention. I am concerned only, with the welfare of our people.

Sincerely yours,

CELIA M. MASSIE,
Registered Nurse.

This letter is sent also to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Representative HARRIS ELLSWORTH, Representative SAM COON.

LEBANON, OREG., *April 30, 1956.*

Senator WAYNE E. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Honorable SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter in hopes that my small voice will help bring to your mind the wishes of many people. That wish being that a joint congressional investigation be held regarding the fluoridation of public water supplies. I believe this investigation should be done by a committee independent of the promoters of the idea of fluoridation.

I have done considerable reading on the effects of fluoridation, and though I have children, I do not believe the condition of their teeth and the questionable possibility of benefit of fluorides to their teeth is as important as the health of children who are already suffering from deficiencies and illnesses who could receive harmful effects from sodium fluoride in the water supply.

There has not been an investigation and report to show the statistics of the high disease incidents in the fluoridated areas. This investigation should be made by impartial persons and presented to the public so that all may see that fluoridation is not as safe and favorable as those promoting it would have us believe.

Mass medication is not safe for everyone—no two people drink the same amount of water or react the same to a drug. Fluorides can be administered in many ways, individually and inexpensively to those who desire them. For example—in tablets, drops, or by local application to the teeth, thus not forcing it on us who do not want it.

I believe the investigation of the effects of sodium fluoride is very important to the health of the people.

I would like this letter read before Congress and inserted in the RECORD.

I greatly appreciate your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully,

Mrs. J. L. GROSS.

P. S.—I have also written to Representative E. GREEN for her consideration.

Miss Elizabeth U. Liard, 1000 North Holladay Drive, Seaside, Oreg.

Mr. A. L. V. Smith, D. C., Post Office Box 95, Silverton, Oreg.

Mrs. Ernestine Hartley, B. A., M. M., 130 Third, Ashland, Oreg.

Miss Anna M. Streed, Post Office Box 1304, Medford, Oreg.

Mrs. W. O'Dell, 231 Southwest Taylors Ferry Road, Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. W. E. Leppert, 794 Southeast Ochoco Street, Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. Aneta A. Curtis, Route 1, Box 461 A, Ashland, Oreg.

Mr. David E. Curtis, 586 North Main Street, Ashland, Oreg.

Miss Anna Windberg, 508 Palm Avenue, Ashland, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Ray G. Woodle, 10033 Southeast Long, Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. Alta Lisonbee, 2909 Diane Street, Ashland, Oreg.

Mr. C. J. Conner, 308 Liberty Street, Ashland, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Stella Malick, 1610 Seventh Street, Lebanon, Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Orville C. Maynard, 6119 Southeast 94th, Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. June Griswold, Route 1, Box 308A, Molalla, Oreg.

Mr. Dennis Kier, 2530 Hilyard, Eugene Oreg.

Mr. and Mrs. Allan Harder, 4444 Northeast Campaign Street, Portland, Oreg.

Mrs. Florence Cornell Foster, 233 South Ivy Street, Medford, Oreg.

Miss Kristen Mercer, Reed College, Portland, Oreg.

Mr. Ralph M. Gibson, 517 Elm Avenue, Tillamook, Oreg.

Mrs. Leo A. Larfield, 706 10th Avenue, Seaside, Oreg.

Mrs. Jane C. McKenna, 734 11th Avenue, Seaside, Oreg.

Mr. Eric W. Cooper, 1275 East 24th, Eugene, Oreg.

Mr. Roy Webster, Roy Webster Orchards, Hood River, Oreg.

Miss Martha B. Frost, 365 Siskiyou Boulevard, Ashland, Oreg.

Mrs. Grace Keller, 320 Garfield, Ashland, Oreg.

Regulation of Our Foreign Trade and National Economy and Its Effect on American Workingmen and Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE

OF NEVADA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the effects on the national economy of the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the abdication by Congress of its constitutional responsibility to regulate our commerce with foreign nations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the foreign trade and the national economy of this Nation are now being regulated in Geneva, Switzerland, by 35 nations, of which we are 1, each with 1 vote; in direct contravention of article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which places that responsibility directly in the Congress of the United States.

Our markets are being divided among them, through the simple expedient of multilateral trade agreements, lowering the duties or tariffs that this Nation had adjusted for a century and a half to equalize our wage-living standards with the European and Asiatic sweatshop labor costs, thus assuring American workingmen and investors equal access to American markets.

CONGRESS AUTHORIZED GATT AT GENEVA IN 1934

The Secretary of State has testified before the Senate Finance Committee that the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, as extended by Congress, not only transferred the Constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate foreign trade and the national economy to the President, but by that same act authorized the President to set up the Geneva organization of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, which he did in 1947.

ONE-HUNDRED-AND-FIFTY-YEAR PRINCIPLE ABANDONED

The 150-year principle of the regulation of foreign trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—adjusting the duty or tariff to take the profit out of the foreign sweatshop wages at the water's edge—was abandoned in 1934 along with the workingmen and investors of this Nation.

As a result, the textile, crockery, machine tool, precision instrument, mineral, wool, chemical, livestock, and several hundred other industries are continually threatened through cheap labor produced imports—while our economy is being steadied through a war expenditure of $40 billion per year.

CONVENTION RESOLUTION

Mr. President, the Nevada State Republican Convention in Winnemucca, Nev., May 18 and 19, 1956, passed the following resolution:

"The Republican Party urges the Congress of the United States to resume its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce through the adjustment of duties, imposts, and excises, through its agent, the Tariff Commission, and allow the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, which transferred such responsibility to the President to expire in 1958."

If the Congress shall repeal the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, or not extend it in 1958, and revert to the Constitution, as the resolution sets out, then the Tariff Commission, an agent of Congress, would be guided by section 336 of the 1930 Tariff Act on principle which says that:

"If the Commission finds it shown by the investigation that the duties expressly fixed by statute do not equalize the difference in the costs of production of the domestic article and the like or similar foreign article when produced in the principal competing country, the Commission shall specify in its report such increases or decreases in rates of duty expressly fixed by statute (including any necessary change in classification) as it finds shown by the investigation to be necessary to equalize such differences."

SENATE DEBATE

Mr. President, on March 31, 1954, in the debate on the proposed extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, I said on the Senate floor:

"Mr. President, the United States has the resources, the ability, and capital to maintain a strong, balanced economy. But, over a period of two decades there have been five approaches in an effort to destroy this Nation's living standards, built up over a period of 175 years, and to average them with the lower standards prevailing elsewhere in the world.

"First, the political approach, which has been identified as communism, did not start yesterday; it began in 1934, with the recognition of Communist Russia without any safeguards whatever.

"Second, there is the economic approach, beginning in 1934 with the passage of the Trade Agreements Act, when Congress transferred to the Executive its constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign trade, and of determining and adjusting duties, imposts, and excises.

"The third approach has been the continual whittling away of constitutional provisions and safeguards through the medium of Executive orders, executive agreements, and other types of agreements, which needed the approval of only a majority of each House of Congress, instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate; and also by other means, including United Nations actions.

"Fourth, there has been the taxation approach, with the continual rise in income taxes, and the consequent inability of companies and individuals to build reserves with which to carry on through lean years, while at the same time they are taxed out of the international market.

"The fifth approach has been irredeemable currency. The gold standard was abolished in 1934, and the Government proceeded to print money and to go into debt.

"The American workingman and investor is entitled to a protection equal to the difference in wages and taxes paid in this Nation and those paid in the chief competing countries.

"The American taxpayer deserves relief from subsidizing foreign competitors reluctant to bear tax burdens necessary to support themselves.

"American industries and American workers deserve security from ruthless, unfair foreign competition subsidized by American aid in dollars, new equipment, and prodigal trade concessions.

"Give foreign nations equal access to American markets but no advantage."

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Mr. President, in 1860 Abraham Lincoln's platform stated that tariffs should be adjusted to "encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country." For almost a century following that statement the Republican Party held to that principle, supporting a flexible duty or tariff adjusted to at all times equal the difference in the effective wages and general cost of doing business here and in the chief competing country on each product.

Such flexible duty or tariff would be adjusted then as the wage-living standard in such foreign country improved, and when it equals our own, free trade would be the automatic and immediate result.

The 1956 Republican Party platform to be prepared at San Francisco should include the Nevada foreign trade plank which supports a return to the Constitution in the regulation of foreign commerce and the century-old Republican principle of adjusting duties or tariffs on the basis of fair and reasonable competition—a practical way of taking the profit out of cheap foreign labor at the water's edge and assuring American workingmen and investors of equal access to American markets.

As a matter of fact, if the profit is taken out of foreign cheap labor at the water's edge through an adjusted duty or tariff, the incentive to hold down foreign wages for profit is removed and such foreign nations might allow the workingmen's lot to improve and create a market of their own.

The subject at issue is the American system versus international socialism.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in view of the need for continuing efforts by Congress to insure efficiency in the operation of our Federal Government, I should like to submit for the RECORD a series of articles concerning the recommendations of the second Hoover Commission.

These articles, entitled "Timely Observations," were prepared by the public-relations director of the St. Joseph News-Press, Paul I. Byrne, and have appeared in numerous newspapers throughout the State of Missouri.

In these articles Mr. Byrne presents an excellent analysis of the Commission's recommendations and points out how they may save a great deal of our taxpayers' money. I have supported many of these recommendations, and for these efforts have received a leadership award from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, but I am the first to recognize that much remains to be done to increase the efficiency of our Federal Government.

For this reason I believe that these articles are a great service to the people of Missouri, and I am happy to call attention to them. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 5, 1956]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Would you like to reduce the cost of Federal Government from 5 to 7 billion dollars a

year and get better and more efficient government in the process? In addition, would you like to see a start made toward reducing our $275 billion debt on which the interest alone—over $7 billion—is the second largest expenditure in President Eisenhower's current budget?

Recommendations contained in the second Hoover report are pointing up ways in which this could be accomplished. Back in 1947 Congress unanimously created the first bipartisan Hoover Commission. That Commission labored for 2 long years, and with the aid of 300 specialists called task-force workers gave Americans their first clear view of modern government in all its magnitude and complexity.

Against all precedents, and despite considerable opposition, some 75 percent of the first Commission's recommendations were adopted with savings that today run well into the billions. The first Hoover report paved the way for the second bipartisan Hoover Commission. As former President Harry S. Truman put it in 1951: "Reorganization is a never-ending task."

So it was that, in August 1953, Congress again, unanimously, created the second bipartisan Commission on Organization of the Federal Government and again former President Herbert Hoover was chosen as Chairman. The second Commission took up where the first Commission left off, but with one important difference. This time it had a broader assignment. It was authorized to go into matters of policy. It questioned not only whether a governmental function is properly and economically conducted but whether it should be conducted by Government at all.

There were 19 research committees, or task forces, composed of more than 200 of the Nation's most eminent experts in many fields. Working largely as volunteers, they gave freely of their time and energy to amass the 3,500,000 words of facts and figures which provided the Commission with background for its findings. No one asked and no one cared whether they were Republicans or Democrats. Regardless of their business or professional associations, they were just good Americans doing a job.

Among them were 3 former Cabinet officers, 5 men who had served as undersecretaries or assistant secretaries in Cabinet departments, many former members of Federal regulatory commissions, 3 former governors of States, and 7 college presidents.

The Commission made 19 separate reports, based on the research findings of its 19 separate task forces. The 19 reports contain a total of 314 recommendations for modernizing the conduct of the Government's business, eliminating waste and duplication, and removing the Government from unjustifiable competition with private business.

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 6, 1956]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

The second bipartisan Hoover Commission was established, unanimously, by Congress in 1953. After 2 years of research by about 200 of the Nation's top specialists in many fields, it completed its work last June. The Commission's reports contain, in all, some 314 recommendations. The Commission estimated that these recommendations, if fully applied, would yield eventual savings of from $5 to $7 billion a year. Additionally some $6 billion could be returned to the Treasury, thus helping to reduce the national debt.

Great though its potential financial rewards may be, many citizens who have studied the report believe that values of equal importance reside in the Commission's report as an educational document. By no other means, they say, could the Nation have gotten the facts which reveal to the executive branch, the Congress, and the citizens the mountainous dimensions of the problem of keeping "Big Government" within bounds.

Former Postmaster General James A. Farley said of the report: "This report is a majestic gift to the Nation. It gives us our big chance—at a critical juncture in our history—to get a grip on "Big Government" befor it overwhelms us utterly."

It is not practical to cover the complete 3,500,000 word report in limited space. Copies of the complete report are available from various citizen's groups which organized to disseminate information about Hoover Commission finding or through any public library.

Some of the high spots, however, can be reported.

Depression, war, emergency, cold war, more war and the creation of a huge peacetime Military Establishment have brought about a mushroom growth in Government. With 2,300,000 civilian employes and nearly 3,000,000 more in uniform, a vast structure of more than 2,100 departments, agencies, boards, and commissions operating on a budget of about $65 billion a year has been created.

The Hoover Commission found that the Government's $9 billion a year payroll suffers from a turnover of close to 25 percent per year. If this turnover were reduced 20 percent nearly $50 million a year could be saved in training and replacement costs. And a true career senior civil service could repay the Nation far more than can ever be reckoned in dollars and cents.

The Commission found that the Government creates and handles some 25 billion pieces of paper a year. This engages the efforts of 750,000 full-time employees and costs more than the whole Federal budget in the Taft Administration. The Commission found ways of simplifying or eliminating much unnecessary paperwork which might save as much as $255 million a year. For example, it found that over $22 million a year could be saved by removing a single line from a Government report—a line which duplicates information the Government already receives through other reports.

These are a few of the examples of confusion which the Hoover Commission found in our Federal Government.

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 7, 1956]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

The 314 recommendations for better Government at less cost made by the second Hoover report would correct many costly and inefficient practices in our Federal Government.

It should be pointed out that in all its research the Hoover Commission pursued no human "villains" and never singled out individuals for personal reproach. The overwhelming majority of Federal employes are sincere, diligent and conscientious. They find red tape, delay, organizational confusion, and waste just as distasteful and frustrating as other good citizens do. Without their active cooperation, the Hoover Commission and its task forces could never have amassed the facts it needed to complete the report.

The findings of the Hoover Commission illustrate that the real root causes of our governmental dilemma are to be found in haphazard, unplanned mushroom growth; in hasty ill-advised expansion; in tangled lines of authority, and responsibility; in a welter of conflicting laws; in pressure spending; and in outmoded and ill-organized budgeting and acounting procedures.

This confusion is manifest in spectacular illustrations of duplications, waste and sheer folly. Examples such as these run through all 19 reports: The Government spent $500,000 in an unsuccessful effort to fire one civil-service employee.

Some 800,000 pounds of tomato products were bought by the Government on the west coast and shipped to the East. Meanwhile some 700,000 pounds were bought on the east coast and shipped to the West. Shipped expensively by air in peacetime was such "military cargo" as dog food to Okinawa, ping pong balls to Berlin and 250,000 pounds of cement to Bermuda.

An 8-year supply of flashlight batteries was on hand in one defense unit (although batteries die young)—and a 128-year supply of simple gear drives in another. The Federal Government sometimes borrows money at 3 percent interest, then lends it at 2 percent.

The Hoover Commission found that the Federal Government now operates about 1,500 business-type activities that could be turned over to private industry. It competes with such private businesses as railroading, airline, laundries, retail groceries, window washing, hotels, customs tailoring, coffee roasting, and others.

The Federal Government conducts the largest insurance business, and is the largest truck-fleet operator, lender tenant, and shipowner. It is the largest holder of grazing land and grain and has a store inventory comparable to the inventories of all private enterprise combined.

The Federal Government has grown so huge that it is expected that its operations will be necessarily large. But the Hoover Commission points the way to huge savings for taxpayers who must pay for it all.

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 8, 1956]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

No one contends that the 314 recommendations for improved Federal Government made by the second Hoover Commission are infallible in every respect. It is estimated that about 84 percent of the Commission's recommendations have little or no opposition except perhaps from the agencies and bureaus affected. Human nature being what it is, it is, of course, natural for any agency to say a blueprint for economy is fine except as it affects that particular agency.

About 16 percent of the recommendations are deeply controversial in the sense that they face organized, outright opposition. Even these 16 percent, however, have strong support. A danger lies in the fact that there may be some vigorous efforts to discredit the entire report by finding fault with portions of it. Some of the controversial recommendations are contained in the Commission's recommendations on Federal medical services.

The Commission reported that waste and duplication abound in the management of the 26 Federal agencies which engage in medical activities. In its efforts to meet the needs of the 30 million citizens for whom it has assumed some degree of responsibility for medical care, the Government wastes money through ill-coordinated hospital construction and, worse still, fails to utilize wisely the scarce skills and talents of medical technical personnel, the Commission found.

"The Government," said the Commission, "is moving into uncalculated obligations without an understanding of their ultimate costs, of the lack of professional manpower available to discharge them, or of the adverse effect upon the hospital system of the country."

There is no criticism by the Commission of able medical personnel, devoted civilian staffs, or the beneficent purpose of the services. The Commission found that a large percentage of the available beds in Federal hospitals are unoccupied. It said that this produced a waste of scarce medical trained personnel. It recommended that no more

Federal hospitals be authorized until those available are fully utilized.

Those who oppose this recommendation say existing Federal hospitals are poorly placed. To be hospitalized, patients have to go too far away from home and loved ones. They believe, and no one questions their sincerity of purpose, that more hospitals should be built so that patients can be hospitalized as near as possible to family and friends.

Everyone agrees that veterans with service-connected disabilities should get the best service possible. Those who support the Commission's recommendations maintain that any program to be successful must be practical and possible of accomplishment. They maintain veterans would get better service if available facilities were more fully utilized and scarce medical personnel used to better advantage.

While practically everyone is agreed that veterans with service-connected disabilities should get the best possible care, all are not agreed that veterans with non-service-connected disabilities should receive medical care on an unverified statement of inability to pay. According to law, the Veterans' Administration is forbidden to check into ability to pay.

The Commission found that some veterans with salaries ranging as high as $50,000 a year were receiving free medical care for non-service-connected disability. There is opposition to a recommendation that the law be changed so that a veteran's inability to pay can be verified when he receives medical service for a nonservice ailment.

There is opposition to some of the recommendations dealing with water resources and power development—a lot of it based on the individual's philosophy with regard to public or private power development. There is some opposition to recommendations for taking the Government out of competition with private enterprise, especially as it affects so-called fringe benefits used as an inducement to recruit personnel for the Armed Forces. Regardless of feelings, every citizen should study the report and get behind the recommendations he believes worthy.

[From the St. Joseph News-Press of March 9, 1956]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Previously it has been pointed out that of the 314 recommendations for improved Government made by the Second Hoover Commission, about 84 percent have little or no opposition and about 16 percent have both strong support and strong opposition. Some opposition is a healthy thing. It arouses interest and causes debate and discussion. But regardless of the controversy over some of the recommendations, no sensible citizen can face the facts in the Hoover report without acknowledging the gravity of the problems it reveals and the urgent necessity for positive action.

There are many who feel that a major factor in the overall success of the first Hoover Commission was the effort put forth by the National Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report and the citizens committees within the individual States which carried on an extensive public education campaign. These groups are active again. In Missouri, the Missouri Citizen's Committee on Second Hoover Commission Findings, composed of civic, church, labor, and professional leaders from around the State, is disseminating information.

They are aided by many governmental research and other groups and the State junior chamber of commerce has pledged its help in the effort to bring the findings of the Commission before as many people as possible. Newspapers throughout the country are generally favorable on most of the report. An analysis made by the National Citizens Committee of 2,443 editorials, which appeared in 833 daily newspapers showed 85 percent of editorials favorable, 8.5 percent mixed and noncommital, and 6.5 percent critical.

Responsibility for implementing the Commission's recommendations rests in part with the administration and in part with Congress. Some 45 percent of the recommendations can be accomplished by administrative action with the executive branch. Most of the remainder will require congressional approval.

The second bipartisan Hoover Commission, established with the unanimous support of Congress, has produced a monumental study of the Federal Government. Made at a cost of some $3 million, these reports represent a fabulous contribution to the education of the American people on the functions and activities of their Government. Most of us can agree on most of the Commission's recommendations. Differences of opinion on the method of achieving the goal should not cost us this opportunity to build a stronger America to carry out its responsibilities of world leadership.

In the words of former Postmaster General James A. Farley: "We will be losing something precious if we become so preoccupied with the trees of controversy that we neglect the forest of fruitful and vital economies and improvements which are ours to command."

All good Americans can agree with the declaration of objectives unanimously adopted by the Commission. It reads as follows: "The problems before the Commission have by no means been purely financial. In our recommendations we have sought six objectives:

"First. To preserve the full security of the Nation in a disturbed world.

"Second. To maintain the functioning of all necessary agencies which make for the common welfare.

"Third. To stimulate the fundamental research upon which national security and progress are based.

"Fourth. To improve the efficiency and eliminate waste in the executive agencies.

"Fifth. To eliminate or reduce Government competition with private enterprise.

"Sixth. And perhaps the most important of all. To strengthen the economic, social, and governmental structure which has brought us, now for 166 years, constant blessings and progress."

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This concludes a series on the Second Hoover Commission. These columns have been prepared by Missouri Public Expenditure Survey, Inc. Further information on the Hoover Commission may be had by writing the Missouri Public Expenditure Survey, 222 East Dunkin Street, Jefferson City, Mo.)

Remarks by Gov. Frank G. Clement, of Tennessee, Before the Tennessee Municipal League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech by the Honorable Frank Clement, Governor of Tennessee, before the Tennessee Municipal League on May 15, 1956.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. FRANK G. CLEMENT, OF TENNESSEE, BEFORE THE TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, GATLINBURG, TENN., MAY 15, 1956

My fellow public officials of Tennessee and friends of the Tennessee Valley, today political clouds overshadow this State, this valley region, the whole South, and the Nation. And I suppose the beclouded territory could be extended to embrace the globe. But nowhere else are the political clouds as ominous as those that threaten the great conservation enterprise that provides our valley electricity and constitutes Tennessee's single source of power.

Disturbing as it is, this, perhaps, is no startling news for you. We have been living under the pall of a mounting political attack on TVA since the spring of 1953. We in the valley, protected by high political promise that TVA would be maintained at maximum efficiency, were incredulous when the cloud first rose above the horizon. It was no bigger than your hand: that spring the Federal Budget Director said TVA engineers had overestimated the power system's needs for expansion. Then we found that Budget Director Joseph Dodge was getting his so-called independent engineering estimates from the private power lobby itself. We were unbelieving of an ugly rumor about what was afoot, but the administration cut TVA appropriations that summer by 30 percent.

You all have lived through the disillusioning 3 years that have followed. You have been as close to it as I have.

The administration's defensive cry of economy was later abandoned for attack under the false charge of "creeping socialism." Then under the pretense of releasing TVA from atomic demands, came the ushering in and unveiling of the notorious Dixon-Yates deal, which collapsed under our exposure, but not without taking toll among us. And thence into the fog of self-financing legislation and the bog of the Budget Bureau recommendations on it, where we remain, ever more deeply sunk. And that early unbelievable ugly rumor has become today's undeniable grim reality. The enemies of TVA are bent on destroying it. And the outlook for the valley is extremely grave.

In this difficult hour there has been recently some uncertainty and apparent confusion among friends, allies, and even some of the partners in the valley of TVA. There is one nominal TVA leader in the valley strategically placed who has been and even now is industriously seeking to exploit this confusion. Certain uninformed or irresponsible persons have given him aid by trying to justify or misrepresent the true nature of his activities.

This could prove fatal for the future of TVA. History shows that more causes have failed from internal dissension and confusion than from the attack of enemies from without. I, along with others, have raised the cry for unity several times over the last 3 years. And to the confounding of the opposition we have until now kept up a united front in the valley.

Impelled by a sense of my public obligation as Governor of this State and by the extreme gravity of the situation into which Tennessee and the whole beleaguered valley have been drawn, I am determined here today to lay before you this man's record and activities in a detailed way, that you may have confirmation as to his purposes in the valley.

I speak of Herbert Vogel, Chairman of the TVA Board.

For many weeks the Senate Antimonopoly Subcommittee heard testimony relating to various sordid aspects of the Dixon-Yates affair. In the slow development of public information, questions of perjury were raised, conflicts of interest established, the abandonment of ethical standards in Government administration was demonstrated.

But Dixon-Yates was only a part of the conspiracy. The conspiracy is multiple in the methods adopted. It is single in its objective—and that objective is the destruction of TVA—by starvation, or by attrition and ultimately by dismemberment. Many public agencies and many persons in private and in official life are involved—the Bureau of the Budget, the private power lobby, and the White House itself. Each has a special function to perform. But the objective is clear: TVA must be throttled swiftly lest its operation stand as a limitation upon the greed of the private power companies of this Nation.

This war on TVA is not a new experience to the Tennessee Valley. We know the record of the private power companies' fight to prevent the creation of TVA. Our farmers have vivid recollections of the "spite lines" built to still the clamor for rural service from TVA. We have endured the hostility, the misrepresentations, and the attacks for many years. For the first time, however, the Government in Washington, appointees of the Executive elected by the people who own the wholesale end of this public system, have joined the hostile ranks, and the enemies of TVA have found their allies in the very public agencies which should be defending TVA.

I don't need to remind you of the lurid story of official involvement which was finally unfolded in the Dixon-Yates deal. You will recall the testimony of the representatives of the investment bankers, Mr. George Woods and Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell, whose program to destroy an agency created by the Congress was developed in deep secrecy and under the protection of the Bureau of the Budget in the office of the President. You will remember how AEC, a majority of whose commissioners were against the contract, was obliged to underwrite the wishes of its Chairman, Admiral Strauss, when ordered by "higher authority" to negotiate with Dixon-Yates. And then there was the chairman of the SEC who told how the hearings in progress before the once distinguished tribunal over which he now presides were abruptly cancelled on request of the Assistant to the President, Mr. Sherman Adams, lest the revelations of the witness, Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, might affect the vote on the question of funds for TVA about to be called up in the House of Representatives. "Higher authority" took over and from a central point all resources of the Federal Government were mobilized behind this one maneuver in the broad program of destruction.

This prostitution of the independence of agencies intended to be kept outside the partisan organization of government must be profoundly disturbing to every citizen. This evidence of centralized control is frightening in itself, but when it is combined with concealment and deceit, when suppression of the truth is demanded, the evil grows until, unless it is unmasked and halted, the very foundations of free government are menaced.

I am here to urge the people of the Tennessee Valley to examine the conduct of a man who took an oath to uphold the agency under attack, but who has instead become the eager agent of a cabal—directed, it appears, by Mr. Sherman Adams, the Assistant to the President, and the Bureau of the Budget—a cabal united against the TVA.

I charge, out of a conviction reached with great reluctance, that since he was confirmed in his appointment to the Board of TVA, General Herbert D. Vogel, designated by the President of the United States to be Chairman of its Board, has pursued a course of conduct in clear violation of his duty in that office. I assert that in the hearing preceding his confirmation he did not inform that committee as to his intentions, and through them kept uninformed the Senate of the United States. I believe that he threatens the integrity of the great agency he heads, that he has endeavored to destroy its independence, to frustrate its objectives, to suppress the facts in order to abet and to aid those who would deliver TVA to its enemies.

This, I recognize, is a grave indictment to bring against a public official, and I have given the matter careful consideration before deciding to speak out.

The record of the hearings preceding this confirmation shows that when General Vogel took the oath of office he had studied the statute creating TVA, and he knew something of the record and tradition of the agency developed over 20 years. He knew that TVA was made an independent corporation, that its status as a nonpartisan—not bipartisan—agency might be secure, and the efficiency of its operations promoted. He knew that the statute was administered by a three-man board, and that the judgment of the majority determined the position of the Board. He knew that the policies for the Board to follow were laid down in the act, and that members of its Board were not expected to be agents of political plans developed in Washington. He was acutely questioned on these points. His assurances were plain.

Friends of TVA hailed his statements as assurance that the magnificent record of 20 years would be continued.

My friends, the record of his stewardship is a record of betrayal. From the moment of his taking oath of office, General Vogel has performed, not as the responsible head of TVA but as the stooge of the Bureau of the Budget, where the liquidation plans of Mr. Wenzell and the charter of the First Boston Corp. have been substituted for the statute creating TVA. The record shows that, far from defending the integrity of the independent agency he was selected to head, he has connived to harass and destroy it; far from supporting as Chairman the decisions of the Board, he has tried to assume the prerogatives of one-man rule.

The record shows that while, on the one hand, he acts as cheerful errand boy and apologist for the enemies of TVA, on the other hand, he pursues a policy of unmatched arrogance—of rule or ruin within the organization. He has made no effort to conceal his contempt for his colleagues on the Board and for the staff of TVA.

I am not the possessor of any confidential information. No complaints have been made to me by his associates. But I care about integrity in Government. I care depely about what happens to TVA and I have examined the public record. I believe the truth should be presented to the people.

Let me call to your attention some persuasive items in the record.

Passing over that first "meeting of the minds" between the generals, Vogel and K. D. Nichols, former general manager of AEC, which got Vogel off to an irregular start, I should like to call your attention to a remarkable letter, one which I believe tells more about the Chairman of the TVA than any other available document.

I refer to a letter he directed to Mr. Rowland Hughes of the Bureau of the Budget on March 7, 1955—known to you more familiarly as the "resume-your-seat letter." It is an astonishing communication, reciting in some detail events that had apparently occurred in TVA's Board meeting a day previously.

By March of 1955 it appears the majority of the Board concluded that it was unlikely the Dixon-Yates agreement would ever provide capacity to meet the load anticipated on the TVA system by the end of 1957. The contract itself, as you will remember, was involved in litigation. Serious difficulties had arisen in the negotiations between AEC and TVA. Representatives of the city of Memphis had repeatedly stated that they would never accept power from Dixon-Yates, and without the Memphis load TVA had no way to utilize the power proposed to be generated in Arkansas, across the river. So General Vogel's colleagues on the Board came to the conclusion that the Bureau should be urged to reconsider the situation, and if, as TVA had been advised, the only objection to the construction of capacity by TVA lay in the administration's reluctance to approve the appropriation of funds, a method of financing was proposed to permit construction to begin without increasing TVA appropriation.

The Board proposed that the $6½ million earmarked in the pending appropriation request for TVA to start construction of a transmission line to connect Dixon-Yates with TVA should be used to start construction of a plant by TVA, construction to be continued with other funds already available until, with the adoption of the financing plan then being developed, revenue bonds could be issued by the agency to complete the plant. It was a reasonable, fair, considered statement, and the Board of TVA would have failed in its responsibility had such a communication not been forwarded to Mr. Hughes.

According to the transcript of hearings on TVA's 1956 appropriation, the staff of TVA was told to prepare a draft of a letter embodying the points agreed upon by the majority of the Board, and a draft was presented to the Chairman and each of the other two Board members for consideration preliminary to a discussion of the full Board. What happened then would be unbelievable if there were not so much collateral evidence to indicate that it represents an established course of conduct for the TVA Board Chairman.

The public is indebted to General Vogel for the recital. No word of the histrionics ever leaked out, but a vivid letter the general wrote to Mr. Hughes later on the same day eventually appeared in the appropriation hearings. General Vogel was outraged at the initiative displayed by his colleagues. His letter to Mr. Hughes submits a draft of the letter proposed to be sent by the Board, and suggests that if it should be sent (it was sent) no attention should be paid to it as in his opinion it expressed only the personal judgment of the other two Board members. The Chairman described the action of his colleagues in casting doubt on the effectiveness of Dixon-Yates as a solution to the problem of power supply for TVA as "premature and presumptuous." With respect to one point raised by his colleagues he wrote:

"As to the position of the city of Memphis, TVA has received no official communication from the mayor of Memphis or any other responsible person which would give substance to the threat that Memphis will build its own powerplant. No action, that is known, has been taken by the city council of Memphis that would lead to the building of such a plant."

(In view of the outcome of the matter the position of his colleagues on this point seems to have been more forthright than the general's.)

This is an astonishing letter from any angle. In an effort to convince his mentor of his fidelity to him, his valor in his behalf and of his ceaseless effort to obstruct the will of the majority, General Vogel even reported that, at one point, when Dr. Curtis rose to leave the meeting of the board after it had voted to send the letter in spite of the chairman's opposition, he "directed Dr. Curtis to resume his seat".

Just who is this man the general "directed to resume his seat"? Dr. Harry Curtis is one of the Nation's most distinguished chemical engineers. He is an educator, and has a long and honorable record of public service. But his dedication to the TVA, his personal integrity and courage—none of these saved him from the insolence of General Vogel.

Because he dared to write a letter reporting the facts he was told "to resume his seat".

I wonder if the general ever recalls a statement he made in response to the inquiry of Senator MORSE during his confirmation hearings. I find this colloquy on page 30:

"Senator MORSE. General, is it your conception of the meaning of an independent agency that your board of directors should make its recommendations on policy independent of any advance recommendations to you by the President, the Bureau of the Budget, or the Congress?

"General VOGEL. And without fear or favor based upon our own best conscience.

"Senator MORSE. You have a conference with the President of the United States, and he says, 'I want you gentlemen of the Board to know that I don't think that it is good public policy. I don't think TVA should build those steam plants. I am going to be opposed to it. I strongly recommend against it.'

"You have been so informed. You still have no answer, however, as to the engineering and economic facts that you developed when you decided you were going to make that recommendation. After you have been informed of the President's position, do you think the Board then, as an independent agency, should present to the American people a recommendation based upon the facts or present a modified recommendation based upon the political attitude of a President?

"General VOGEL. I think again we go back to the original act of TVA, and there is no way whereby a board so constituted and so subscribing, could do other than report to the best of its conscience upon the needs and desires of the region."

But Senator MORSE pursued the point further, and went on to say:

"But let me dwell on that a little bit longer, because I think it is a very vital policy. Let me put the question this way: Assuming now the studies are made that you indicate you want to rely upon for the formation of an opinion and those studies show there is a need to supplement the hydroelectric power by steam-plant power, am I to understand that it will be your position or would be your position as a member of this Board of Directors, as a matter of policy, those steam plants should be built within the TVA area by TVA and not by private companies?

"General VOGEL. Yes, sir."

Let's go back to the record to see how General Vogel has deserted and ignored his fellow Board members and changed his course in response to every whisper from the White House and the Bureau of the Budget. The pattern of his docility is clear.

In October of 1954, when the General had been only a few weeks in office, he appeared with his colleagues before the Budget in support of the TVA's appropriation request, but when the allowance letter—I believe it is called that—came from the Budget (this can be found on pages 165–166 of the House hearings), the request of TVA Board had been reduced from a total of $95,835,000 to $27,450,000. The bulk of the reduction came in the funds requested for power capacity. Mr. Wenzell had taken care of that. That was part of the plot.

When the majority of the Board appealed from the drastic cuts, General Vogel not only did not join theim, he resorted to another remarkable letter, eager to show the Bureau how completely he was prepared to uphold Mr. Hughes' judgment and accept the Hughes decision. In transmitting the letter of appeal from his fellow Board members, he argued vigorously against parts of the TVA program which he had joined with his colleagues in approving a few weeks earlier. Again, "higher authority" had spoken. And in this letter he reveals his willingness not only to starve the power system but to cooperate in liquidation of the nonpower activities of TVA.

Deserting his colleagues and supporting Mr. Hughes, General Vogel wrote in one paragraph (p. 168, House hearings) that "TVA must prepare * * * to develop * * * a greater degree of coordination with other Government agencies that they may gradually assume in this region the functions traditionally carried out by them in other parts."

In another paragraph he suggested that certain TVA expenditures for navigation operations should be suspended, "and meantime it can be determined what part if any can be delegated to another agency" and adds "care should be taken to avoid doing things here that are not properly or normally done elsewhere." And with respect to certain expenditures for flood control he said, "This is not necessary or essential work, and it is not duplicated in other parts of the country." That is correct—and look at the flood-devastated States in New England and elsewhere.

Someone should tell General Vogel that Congress itself directed that new methods should be undertaken in this valley to solve old problems. Someone should tell him that those methods have been successful, that TVA has been a pilot plant of progress. Someone should tell General Vogel he cannot destroy it.

From the beginning General Vogel has apparently regarded the probity and courage of his colleagues as a millstone around his neck frustrating him in the prompt execution of his assignment. Only 3 months after he took the oath of office he suggested to the Budget the introduction of legislation which would define the Chairman's responsibility by law "whereby he would become the executive head of the organization to dispatch details of business in accordance with broad general policies determined by the Board" (page 169, House hearings on TVA's 1956 appropriation). And while agreeing to the Budget decision to refuse a single kilowatt of capacity, and to cut existing programs right and left, the general was emboldened to request $100,000 for a management staff to be responsible directly to him. (Sometimes they call them hatchetmen, but a "management staff" is the elegant title used in this correspondence.)

The Budget did not go along with the idea of introducing legislation to make the general executive head. Recent experience with a similar request from the Chairman of AEC may have been a painful memory, but the Budget did agree to allow the $100,000 for a management staff. Not a dime was available for power capacity, studies of flood-control problems were reduced; the maintenance of secondary navigation channels was proposed to be eliminated; the information staff was disseminated. All other cuts were sustained, but the budget was willing to approve $100,000 for a special staff for the Chairman.

Once again the troublesome Board majority acted. They noted that TVA had not requested the $100,000, that it had not been included in the allowance letter, and they recommended that the item be deleted from the budget. So the budget retreated a little. Mr. Hughes concluded that the item would not be identified but could be carried in the estimates submitted to the Congress hidden as a "contingency."

When this peculiar history was revealed to the House Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of that committee, Mr. CLARENCE CANNON, called the TVA Chairman a would-be dictator. General Vogel would like to be, I think. Certainly, he would like to achieve the objectives decided upon in Washington more swiftly, with less embarrassment and in confidence that the facts would never be revealed.

But let us continue the examination of this man's record, and let the facts speak for themselves.

With its unanimous approval the Board of TVA on April 1, 1955, submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for transmittal to the Congress a plan developed by the staff of TVA, under which revenue bonds would be issued to provide capital for power investment. General Vogel voted for the plan. But even he underestimated the lengths to which the conspirators against TVA would go to destroy it. I am sure General Vogel would never have joined his colleagues in approving it if he had suspected that Mr. Hughes would not go along. As soon as the Budget Director came up with his suggestions for sabotage, however, the compliant general had a quick change of heart. On May 17, the Budget Director disapproved of the TVA plan in many particulars. And so did General Vogel.

On July 21 hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Public Works on a bill introduced by Senator KERR embodying the TVA plan. General Vogel appeared as the first witness, claiming the prerogative as Chairman of the Board, but appearing as a jaunty advocate of the budget plan and accompanied by a Mr. Schwartz of the Budget Bureau, as expert prompter and mental body guard. His statements there do not deserve analysis. But I dare say the occasion was of some interest. It is probably the first time in recorded history that the Chairman of an independent agency was on a leash when he testified.

And this is the same person who just a year prior, before the same committee, responded to a question from the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] who said:

"As you go down there, as a member of the TVA Board, may we look to you to stand up and fight for TVA?

"General VOGEL. You may, sir. I would say in that connection that I asked this question, at the time my name was first suggested—whether there would be any reason why I should not take that view.

"Senator HILL. And, of course, when I speak of fighting for TVA, we mean fighting for the purposes and the philosophy and the provisions of the TVA Act, and all that that means in the institution of TVA; is that correct?

"General VOGEL. I have so subscribed."

Let me relate on final episode in the conspiracy to destroy TVA in which General Vogel is playing a leading role.

We know from the hearings before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees that the administration is trying to prevent TVA from using its revenues to finance additional capacity. Having blocked appropriations and loaded TVA's self-financing plan with a multiplicity of crippling amendment, the administration has decided that its "grand plan" would be defeated if additional capacity could be installed by TVA through the use of its power proceeds. Once again we find General Vogel the administration's stooge.

Let us examine his position:

He "doubts" that TVA has authority to add units out of proceeds without the specific approval of Congress for each unit. He justified his doubts by claiming uncertainty with respect to the precise meaning of the word "project" in limiting language added to a TVA appropriation bill in 1948.

But General Vogel's colleagues on the Board of TVA have no doubt that the Congress intended only to prevent TVA from starting wholly new projects without congressional approval. The General Counsel of TVA has no doubts. Members of Congress who participated in the drafting of the language have no doubt. Congressman WHITTEN, of Mississippi, and the junior Senator from this State, Mr. GORE, were members of the Appropriations Committee. They have testified as to meaning out of actual experience. General Vogel was present when Senator GORE made the following statement

before the Senate Appropriations Committee on March 27, 1956:

"Senator GORE. I served on this committee, the Government Corporations Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, that recommended to the House not only the amendment in specific question here but also the provision in the 1948 act requiring TVA to amortize the Government's investments in these projects."

* * * * *

"Under section 26 of the original TVA Act, TVA was free to use all of its net proceeds in a business-type operation, replacement, expansion, what not, in the furtherance of its power program.

"I joined in the feeling of the subcommittee, and I joined in the authorship and in the writing of both of these amendments, both the amortization and the limitation.

"So I believe it is clear that this, as the Senator has said—this provision was recommended as a limitation, not a denial. The limitation was to the extent of new projects; not as has been spelled out here in the record, replacement of units or addition of generators or units in existing plants."

But the word of Senator GORE is suspect by General Vogel. The word of Representative WHITTEN is not conclusive. The testimony of Senator HILL, one of the authors of the TVA Act, is disregarded. The judgment of the General's colleagues on the TVA Board does not influence the Chairman. The well-reasoned opinion of TVA's General Counsel is disregarded by TVA's Chairman. The opinion of the majority of the House Appropriations Committee is not persuasive, even when the House report stated:

"The committee reaffirms its judgment, and believes that TVA should use its revenues to the extent they are available to add units at existing plants to meet the power requirements of the service area."

General Vogel doubts because the enemies of TVA claim doubts. He has associated himself with minority members of the House Appropriations Committee who signed a venomous attack on TVA and who have had an unparalleled record for fighting TVA on every occasion and every front over the years. He associates himself with Joseph Campbell, the present Comptroller General of the United States, who, as a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission, was the single member who joined with the Chairman, Admiral Strauss, to support the Dixon-Yates contract from the beginning.

If it were not a tragedy to this region and to the Nation it would be vastly entertaining to read the record of the Senate hearing and to find the Chairman of TVA urgently calling the committee's attention to a letter written by the Comptroller General to Congressman TABER the day before the Senate hearing (a coincidence, no doubt). General Vogel had no obligation to submit the communication to the members of the committee. It had already been released to the press, and we may be sure it was not intended to be kept secret. The picture of the Chairman of the Board of TVA ostentatiously directing the attention of the committee to a letter appropriately described by Congressman JONES, of Alabama, as a "spiteful attack on TVA" merits the indignation of the Nation.

General Vogel did not point out, as any fair-minded person would have been constrained to do, that although the Comptroller General recommended legislation to require congressional approval of each unit his letter did not say it was illegal for the Board of TVA to use its proceeds to add units at existing plants. And I call your attention to the fact that under the law the Comptroller General of the United States had a duty to advise the Congress if in fact there was such violation.

General Vogel did not point out the evidence of bias and of malice throughout the letter, the artful way in which the Comptroller General tried to play upon the prejudices of the enemies of TVA. No. The general was too intent upon his task of making certain that the opinions of the enemies of TVA would be extolled, its friends and their opinions diminished.

And now that the Senate-House conferees have agreed with the TVA majority on the use of power proceeds, we shall watchfully await the general's next move. Perhaps he will retreat from his present absurd and infamous position. But whatever he may do now is really of no moment. The Chairman has made his record and his course is crystal clear.

I find a recent article in the Public Utilities Fortnightly of April 26 of some interest in this connection. Public Utilities Fortnightly is no friend of TVA and in its pages an article by General Vogel recently appearing in the Military Engineer was reviewed. I find this paragraph:

"Its (TVA's) friends had succeeded in building a wall of suspicion about it, and in the face of such a barrier true facts were difficult to present or ascertain."

It is time someone told General Vogel that it is not TVA's friends who have built the "wall of suspicion." Senator HILL, of Alabama, Senator GORE, Congressmen EVINS, COOPER, PRIEST, BASS, etc., have not built a wall of suspicion. TVA's enemies have done the job, and General Vogel is helping them.

Let me recapitulate:

First, General Vogel is playing stooge for the administration that has denied appropriations for this Government-owned power system, while the same administration grants what amounts to interest-free loans with royal abandon to the private power companies who ask for rapid amortization of their power investments.

Second, he has eagerly joined with an administration which loaded TVA's self-financing plan with a multiplicity of crippling amendments.

Third, we now find him to be the spokesman for the brazen effort which is being made to prevent TVA from using its revenues to finance additional capacity, although every private utility in the country is encouraged by the present administration to do just that.

Thus I charge that Chairman Vogel has violated the oath of office he took in professing "belief in the feasibility and wisdom" of the TVA idea and in committing himself to the protection and promotion of the institution it represents.

I further charge that he violated the terms of office he accepted and the views he expressed in the Senate confirmation hearing when he has not only opposed but flouted the will of the TVA Board. I charge that in many oblique and ambiguous words and actions Chairman Vogel has given comfort and support to the promoters of the conspiracy aimed at corrupting the integrity of the institution he had sworn to preserve.

After 3 years of these practices and increasing ruthlessness of the power cabal it should be abundantly clear to all of us that there is no ground for compromise with these enemies of TVA. Compromise consists in giving something for something else worth while. True compromise is impossible with the present national administration and the private power lobby whom they are serving. Whatever their blandishments, whatever their arguments, whatever their pretenses, whatever their claims and protestations, they are bent on only one end. That end does not allow for any compromise with the customers of TVA in this unhappy valley. That end demands our surrender.

It is no secret in their private conversation, the leaders of the private power industry have been telling friends and acquaintances, "We don't care whether TVA is made self-financing or not; we don't even care whether it is divorced from the Federal Government. But we do want it broken up. We want it dismembered, so that it can never again serve as a yardstick and raise havoc with our rate practices."

That is what they are saying. The private power lobby, spearheaded by this national administration, is seeking the ultimate return of high rates. And they are blind—I will go even further and say that they are actually indifferent to the inevitable consequences of their high-rate policy; namely, the condition of power scarcity that will obtain throughout this country.

Yes, compromise. Compromise. It is the compromise of the big bad wolf and the suggestible little pig—or it will be if we crack the door to them. There won't be anything left of us except our squeal. I am told that there are some friends of TVA who are still under the delusion that a compromise with administration leaders on the so-called self-financing bill is possible. Let me abjure you. Listen not to the falsetto of the fawning wolf. Our junior Senator who is a member of the committee that has charge of this bill can apprise you—and I understand has apprised you—of the insuperable difficulties that he and other friends of TVA have encountered. Be not deceived.

The private power cabal will settle for nothing less than a return to high rates—that is their ultimate goal; and we in the Tennessee Valley who secure electric power—and in the State of Tennessee, virtually all of our electric power—from TVA will suffer a costly, if not calamitous dislocation in our power supply. We may suffer a permanent economic backset as a consequence.

So, my fellow Tennesseans and friends of the Tennessee Valley, this is the grim reality that we face today. We are witnessing the appalling spectacle, and one that threatens us with calamity, of a national administration that has undertaken by the practice of stealth, deceit, sabotage, and hoax, to destroy, not merely a great and profitable public power enterprise, but a billion dollars worth of the property of the people of the United States.

My fellow citizens of Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley, for us there can be no compromise. Whatever differences we may entertain among ourselves, let us keep this firmly in mind. We have got to do whatever there is within our abilities to do to preserve TVA, to preserve this great, low-cost power system intact.

A Factor of Important Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a factor of important public interest has been brought to light as a result of determinations recorded by the United States Supreme Court, by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and by the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The aforesaid determinations were the result of law actions encompassing over 20 years of proceedings in the courts which 3 private citizen companies were obliged to carry on in order to protect their rights to have returned to them the balance of their cash funds which they had deposited and entrusted into the escrow of the treasury of a Government-owned corporation; the companies had

faithfully performed their obligations which the aforesaid cash bond had guaranteed and the officers of that corporation had duly recognized the companies' performance and had ordered the return to the companies of the total of their cash bond amounting to over half a million dollars; however, only a minor part of the total of the companies' cash funds was returned to them by the corporate check of that Government-owned corporation, and the balance remained unreturned in the treasury of that corporation on invalid pretexts and was still in its treasury when that corporation was discontinued and dissolved and abolished by an act of Congress.

The Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary have recorded exhaustive reports on the facts and circumstances of this case, setting forth therein their judgment on court records, departmental reports, and the determinative probative evidence; such includes unrebutted evidence transmitted by the Department of Justice and by the United States Treasury Department's Bureau of Internal Revenue proving the companies' legal and equitable ownership of these cash funds; the recommendations of the aforesaid committees, and of Members of Congress of both political parties, have severely condemned therein the procrastination in the withholding of these private cash funds, and have recorded declarations that the integrity of the Government, expected and required of it in its dealing with United States citizens through Government-owned corporations which carry on corporate commercial business, requires the return of aforesaid funds to the depositors and owners thereof; for example, the companies.

There is on file with the aforesaid committees a memorandum dated June 30, 1956—in re S. 759 and H. R. 2940, 84th Congress—which sets forth the essential details of the aforesaid determinations and the pertinent facts and the applicable laws which are cited therein.

Members of Congress whose constituents deal with Government-owned corporations will obtain orientation by these determinations as to what occurs when such a corporation is discontinued and dissolved by congressional mandate and as to what concerns to its unfinished business. One of the important facts recorded in aforesaid memorandum is the determination by the High Court that the sovereign United States, when becoming the liquidator of a Government-owned corporation, merely takes the place of such a corporation, and is placed into a nonsovereign status and must carry on as if it were such a corporation until the unfinished business of such a corporation is fully terminated, unless Congress mandates otherwise.

A nonpartisan Commission appointed by Congress has recorded finding of facts pertaining to a number of government-owned corporations now in existence as corporate entities and Congressional investigation thereof may decide that some of these corporations have outlived the purpose for which they were created and no longer serve national interests and need no longer be supported by the expenditure of public funds; such corporations may be discontinued and dissolved by congressional action. Citizens who have unfinished business with such corporations will be helped by the determinations on record in aforesaid memorandum; its last paragraph is as follows:

A FACTOR OF IMPORTANT PUBLIC INTEREST

"The law actions which the companies in this case had to proceed with to preserve and establish their rights and their claim and which encompassed over 20 years of court proceedings, resulted in clarifying the confusion which prevailed in the past about Government-owned or Government-controlled corporations.

These corporations come into corporate and commercial existence by virtue of the corporate laws of a State or of the District of Columbia; they become active in commercial, industrial, public service or other pursuits like any other corporation in the respective fields of activities which was or is incorporated and financed by private United States citizens.

The following statement is pertinent:

"There are a large number of private corporations which have been created by, or availed of or by, the Government of the United States.

"The determinations in this case of the United States Supreme Court and of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia where the herein concerned Government-owned Merchant Fleet Corporation was incorporated, are therefore of transcendant importance to those who have dealt, are dealing, or may deal with such Government-owned or Government-controlled corporations, so they may know the extent of their rights against such corporations, after having dealt upon their faith in normal commercial practice with such corporations.

"The determinations of the aforesaid high courts are succinct and definite, and final.

"Likewise of importance is the determination in this case by the United States Bureau of Internal Revenue of the United States Treasury Department that companies which are associated and are operating under one coordinated management in dealing with such a Government-owned corporation and which are performing their obligations covenanted in an agreement with such a governmentally controlled corporation, are not permitted to make joint-returns but are required to make individual returns for each of the associated companies."

Your Social Security

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding achievements of this Democratic 84th Congress is the just completed House-Senate passage of the bill, H. R. 7225, amending the social security and public assistance programs. Following the action of the other body earlier today, this bill is now at the White House awaiting the President's signature.

In 1950 the Congress made extensions in the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance program, raised its benefit levels and afforded coverage to most self-employed Americans, outside the professions and the farm industry. Again in 1954, the benefits were increased and millions of additional people covered, so that 9 out of every 10 American workers are now within the scope of the system, and 9 out of 10 of the Nation's mothers and children have rights to survivor payments in case of death of the head of the family. I am glad to have had a part in 1950 and 1954 in supporting and voting for these improvements of our social security system.

I also voted for the passage of the present bill, H. R. 7225. In my opinion, it is a splendid piece of progressive humane legislation. Throughout the Nation there has been deep concern and interest in its provisions.

I believe that one of the most important provisions of the 1956 amendments is the reduction in the retirement age of widows, working women and wives from age 65 to 62. For quite some time I have advocated reduction in the retirement age for women. When the bill passed this body last year, the retirement age for all of these categories of women was reduced from 65 to 62. When the bill came back to us from the other body a provision was made for reduction in the retirement age to 62 with full benefits for widows, but it provided further for actuarial reduction in retirement benefits for wives and working women if they decided to retire at age 62 rather than 65. In the case of wives, 75 percent of full benefits may be received by them if they begin receiving them at 62 and in case of the working women 80 percent of their full benefits if they retire at 62 instead of 65. As I have indicated, under the House version of the bill, all women were permitted to retire at 62 with full benefits. I am still convinced that this was by far the better plan. However, I am cognizant of the fact that this modified version of the bill was apparently the only proposal acceptable to the Senate.

I have all along favored legislation providing for the lowering of the retirement age for women from 65 to 60 and it is my intention to advocate and work for legislation in the future in this regard.

Another extremely important provision of the 1956 amendments is the provision for disability insurance protection for the permanently and totally disabled after 50 years of age. The inclusion of this most desirable provision firms up the protection of our social-security program and inaugurates what, in my opinion, is one of the most humanitarian steps which could have been taken by this Congress. Formerly, a worker who was insured under the system and who became disabled, regardless of his age, was compelled to wait until age 65 before attaining eligibility for any benefits. This was, in my opinion, neither sound nor fair. A breadwinner who is unfortunate enough to become permanently and totally disabled at age 50, and who has been fully insured under social security, should certainly not be compelled to wait for 15 years before entitlement to benefits.

There are approximately 250,000 people who may become eligible for benefits during the first year under this humane provision of the bill and this basic protection is extended to some 35 million insured persons. I, personally, would have much preferred not to see the age limit of 50 placed in the disability-insurance provision and it is my intention to work on improvement in this regard.

Provision is also made for the payment of benefits after age 18 to the dependent child of a retired or deceased worker if the child has been permanently and totally disabled since before age 18. The mother of such child will also be eligible for benefits under this provision so long as the child continues to remain in her care. This provision originated in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and, in my opinion, is one of the most desirable and commendable provisions in the entire bill. The problems faced by those unfortunate individuals who have to care for a physically or mentally handicapped child are extremely sad and their suffering is increased as the result of their concern as to what may happen should the family's income be cut off by death or retirement of the wage earner. This meritorious provision will certainly help improve such a situation.

Coverage is extended to many additional individuals, so that now our social-security program is almost universal in its coverage. Some 250,000 persons are aided, and perhaps many additional people, depending upon State and local action. Almost all self-employed professional people are now included under the coverage of social security except physicians who were left out at their request; coverage is made available to more State and local employees; and additional groups are brought into the system, such as employees of Federal home-loan banks, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and others.

Several improvements are made with regard to grants-in-aid for public assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, and aid to dependent children. The Federal share for such programs is increased, and the program for aid to dependent children is considerably broadened and improved. Federal support for research is provided, and Federal funds for child welfare are also increased.

I believe everyone will agree that the social-security laws have surely given our elder citizens some measure of protection in contrast to the situation which confronted them before the first social-security bill was enacted into law in 1935—21 years ago. I have long advocated lowering the retirement age for men and women to 60. While this legislation does not go that far, I feel that the current amendments constitute a well-won victory for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, I have endeavored to briefly cover the major provisions of this humane legislation. It has afforded me great pleasure to support and vote for it. It is presently my intention to work for further improvements in our social-security system so as to afford adequate protection and security for all of our people.

Growing Industrial Eminence of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, before this session of Congress concludes its business, I wish to state again my intense interest in the growing industrial eminence of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio. Much has been published in national periodicals calling attention to the economic rebirth of the Ohio Valley. In the June 1956 issue of Fortune, these dramatic developments were discussed fully in an article entitled "The Boiling Ohio." I am proud to state that the area which I have the honor to represent in this Chamber is very much a part of this new industrial empire.

The recent decision by the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. to construct its $120 million integrated aluminum-production plant in Monroe County is the most spectacular in the industrial growth pattern in which other companies also have notably affected the economies of Washington, Muskingum, and Guernsey Counties.

Still, let me say that this area of southeastern Ohio is only on the threshold of developing the full economic potential of its people and its natural resources. Decades of chronic unemployment and economic adversity have beset this area despite the wealth of its resources. Coal, water, natural gas, oil, and salt are but a few of the resources with which nature has blessed this area. To this we may add a central location with respect to the Nation's market centers; highway, rail, and water transportation; and an abundance of electric power. Most notable of all are the people of the area who are eager to improve the local economy and who have organized themselves into chambers of commerce and civic associations which are actively seeking to interest industries in becoming a part of their communities. Such organizations are working vigorously in Guernsey, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, and Washington Counties. I have worked closely with these groups and am familiar with their programs and operations. I pledge to continue my efforts in their behalf.

To them must go the credit for the notable achievements which have been recorded thus far. The fact that large areas still remain to be developed industrially is the challenge which faces them today. Their challenge is also an opportunity for American industry seeking sites in areas near the center of our Nation's commercial heart, yet disbursed from the crowded centers of industry where additional industrial development is inadvisable.

House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs Statistical Summary and Accomplishments in the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment sine die of the 84th Congress, another Congress will have closed its official books; by that action Members are announcing to the world that they are heading home to stand or fall on the record of accomplishments during the 417 calendar days and 234 legislative days falling between convening on January 5, 1955, and—absent a special session—the July 27, 1956, adjournment.

As Members are aware, the measurement of the permanent record of accomplishments of the 84th Congress cannot be based solely on having attempted the physically impossible—listening to and observing the frequently simultaneous proceedings on the House and Senate floors, which consumed nearly 2,300 hours of total time, let alone attending the thousands of hours of proceedings in the 19 standing committees of the House and 14 standing committees of the Senate.

It is probable that perusal of the more than 60 million words contained in the some 25,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of proceedings, and more than 12,000 pages of the Appendix, might well tend to confuse, rather than clarify, the picture of accomplishments during the 2-year period—since it is particularly under our Federal system that reasonable men can, may, and do differ as to cause and effect.

A more positive measure of accomplishment might be reflected by a study of the history and disposition of the 18,939 measures introduced during the 84th Congress—but again, such a study would challenge even the most energetic and industrious individual among us.

In the end, it appears that the answer to the question of performance by any given Congress can only be found in the laws actually written into the books. In the end, there has merged from the 167 years' accumulation of billions of spoken and written words, millions of pounds of paper consumed, and tens of thousands of hours of debate and discussion by Congresses which preceded this one—just 68 volumes of United States Statutes at Large, occupying roughly 30 linear feet of bookshelf space. Just as volume 1, United States Statutes at Large, at pages 23 and 24, serves to preserve for all time the text of the first act approved by the 1st Congress of the United States, so will volumes 69 and 70 serve to preserve for tomorrow and the future the positive record, the real accomplishments of the 84th Congress.

In short, with gavels sheathed, the smoke cleared, the vocal thunder silenced, the galleries emptied, and the final rollcall tallied, the 417 calendar

days, 230 legislative days, 2,300 hours of House and Senate floor action, 37,000 pages of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and Appendix, 18,939 bills, and more than 60 million words officially spoken or written in the 84th Congress—boil down to just about 14 pounds of paper, ink, gold-leaf, cardboard, leather, thread, glue, and buckram, in two additional volumes of the official statutes.

Having in mind the foregoing, I would like to outline the contribution made by the committee which I serve as chairman, and refer to some of the factors which make possible our accomplishments during the 84th Congress.

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has broad responsibilities in the field of natural resources and the public domain, including administration and development of our national parks system, and in the field of human resources, with respect to the administration and welfare of our Indians and Indian tribes, and our fellow citizens in the Territories and possessions of the United States.

Reflecting recognition of the breadth of our assignment, the committee roster of 32 members shows representation from 19 States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. A substantial portion of our legislation deals with matters directly affecting the development and economy of the West and our offshore areas, which perhaps accounts for representation from 14 of the States west of the Mississippi River—Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Washington—and 5 east of the Mississippi—Florida, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

This geographic distribution of the membership results, I believe, in a balanced legislative approach in the national interest and, at the same time, retains the regional know-how which permits full understanding of the matters considered. For example, this distribution means that—

Members come from States, Territories, or possessions embracing approximately three-fourths of the land areas, continental and offshore, of the United States.

Of the 17 States of the reclamation West, 13 have members serving on the committee.

Of the 11 mining States of the West, 9 have representatives on the committee.

More than 320,000 of the approximately 405,000 Indians of the United States and Alaska have a direct voice by reason of the areas represented.

The achievements of the Congress just ended—and I believe the statistical references which follow emphasize this—were made possible only through the cooperation and diligence of all of the 32 members of our committee. But for the energy and leadership of our subcommittee chairmen—Chairman Wayne N. Aspinall, Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee; Chairman Leo W. O'Brien, Territories and Insular Affairs Subcommittee; Chairman Walter Rogers, Mines and Mining Subcommittee; Chairman Gracie Pfost, Public Lands Subcomittee; and Chairman James A. Haley, Indian Affairs Subcommittee; and the continuing cooperation, guidance, and counsel of the ranking minority member and former chairman, Dr. A. L. Miller, of Nebraska, and his colleagues, we would have been unable to perform our mission.

STAFF ORGANIZATION

Again during the 84th Congress our professional and clerical staff have met a high standard of performance in committee activities, in their service to members. The professional staff, composed of George W. Abbott, counsel; Sidney L. McFarland, engineering consultant; George H. Soule, minerals and lands consultant; and John L. Taylor, Territories and Indians consultant, have all made a substantial contribution to the achievements of the committee.

The clerical and stenographic staff headed by Nancy J. Arnold, chief clerk of the committee, and made up of Nelda Boding, Eve Fatzinick, Gertrude Harris, and Laura Ann Moran—supplemented during a part of the sessions just ended by Geraldine W. Eaker and Linda Glavey—complete the staff organization without which the committee legislative and administrative workload could not be met.

BROADENED LEGISLATIVE RESPONSIBILITY

A brief reference to some readily available statistics will serve, I believe, to sustain an assertion that the responsibility of the legislative branch had broadened immensely in its complexities in the past 100 years, and that the statistical work output of the 84th Congress approaches an all-time high, with a major contribution by our committee.

Between the convening of the 1st Congress in 1789, and the adjourning of the 83d Congress in 1954, a grand total of 31,782 public laws had been written into the Federal statute books—an average or roughly 383 public laws per Congress.

The 26th Congress, which sat from 1839 to 1841, wrote 55 public laws into the books, for the all-time low total, while the 84th Congress, with 1,028 public laws enacted, is second only to the all-time high total compiled by the 70th Congress which served 1927–29.

Of the 1,028 public laws enacted by the 84th Congress, the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs accounted for 191—which means that just under 1 of 5 bills which became public law originated with our committee. In sharp contrast, just 100 years ago, the total number of public laws enacted—by the entire 34th Congress, sitting 1855–57—was 157.

Finally, and put another way, the overall statistical comparison reveals that bills which became public law, processed by 1 standing committee alone—the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—equal or exceed in number the total output of any 1 full Congress of the 36 Congresses which sat between 1789 and 1861, excepting the 27th Congress—1841 to 1843—with a total of 201 public laws.

While I believe that such comparisons are of great interest from a historical standpoint, I hasten to add that I leave to others the conclusions to be drawn from their examination.

While a more detailed breakdown and description of the measures acted on by our committee in the Congress just adjourned will be carried in a committee print now being compiled, I wish to point here to some of the landmark legislation handled.

I. PUBLIC LANDS, LAND RESOURCES

Through its Public Lands Subcommittee, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has legislative responsibility for utilization, conservation, and development of more than 459 million acres of public lands and associated resources in the United States and Alaska, together with in excess of 24 million acres embraced within more than 180 units of the national park system, and nearly 160 million additional acres of lands within national forests created from the public domain.

THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

During the session of Congress just ended, our committee reported, and the Congress approved, legislation providing for the establishment or recognition of six new units within the national park system: Virgin Islands National Park, St. John-St. Thomas Islands, V. I.—Public Law 925; City of Refuge National Historical Park, Island of Hawaii, T. H.—Public Law 177; Pea Ridge National Military Park, Ark.—Public Law 744; Booker T. Washington National Monument, Va.—Public Law 464; Mikveh Israel Cemetery, Philadelphia, Pa., as a unit of Independence National Historical Park—Public Law 1009; and Horseshoe Bend National Military Park, Ala.—Public Law 800.

Four laws enacted direct studies of the desirability of bringing into the park system the proposed Brooklyn Monument, N. Y.—Public Law 75; historic properties in Boston, Mass., and vicinity—Public Law 214; Fort Clatsop, Oreg., as a national monument—Public Law 590; and historic properties in New York City and vicinity—Public Law 341.

In keeping with its policy of continuing reevaluation of existing units of the park system, the full committee and Congress voted to abolish Fossil Cycad National Monument, S. Dak.—Public Law 891; Castle Pinckney National Monument, S. C.—Public Law 447; Old Kaasan National Monument, Alaska—Public Law 179; and Verendrye National Monument, N. Dak.—Public Law 846; approve construction of a sewage disposal system—Public Law 454; and to permit certain land exchanges to ready Colonial National Historical Park, Va., for the Jamestown-Williamsburg-Yorktown celebration in 1957—Public Law 448—to exclude certain surplus lands from Acadia National Park, Maine, and thus make them available for recreational purposes for local governmental subdivisions—Public Law 755; provide recognition of the 50th anniversary of Devils Tower National Monument, Wyo.—Public Law 287; add certain lands to Pipestone National Monument, Minn.—Public Law 593; consolidate Zion National Monument and Zion National Park, Utah—Public Law 695; redesignate

Bedloe's Island in New York Harbor as Liberty Island—Public Law 936; relocate Trenton Massacre National Monument, Nebr.—Public Law 453; designate the General Grant Tree, King's Canyon National Park, Calif., a national shrine—Public Law 441; complete acquisition of non-Federal lands with the Cape Hatteras national seashore recreational area, North Carolina—Public Law 1000; authorize additional road construction in Grand Teton National Park, Wyo.—Public Law 275; and to revise the boundaries of Theodore Roosevelt National Park, N. Dak.—Public Law 438.

Two other public laws will contribute measurably in administration of the park program—Public Law 127, providing broader authority in managing the various museum properties within the system, and Public Law 712, to reduce substantially the number of proposed park concession awards required to be transmitted to the Congress prior to execution.

CEMETERIES LEGISLATION

Two measures dealing with national cemeteries were approved: One authorizing burial in national cemeteries of the remains of Public Health Service officers who served during World War II and the Korean war—Public Law 501; and the other amending a 1954 act so as to provide for erection of appropriate markers in national cemeteries for individuals who die or are killed while serving with the Armed Forces during peacetime, as well as those whose death occurred during wartime from reasons other than contact with an enemy and whose remains have not been identified, have been buried at sea, or have been determined to be nonrecoverable—Public Law 651.

PUBLIC LAND ENTRY, USE

Five measures enacted into law will help to assure fuller utilization and development of public lands and their resources: Public Law 171, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire rights-of-way and existing connection roads adjacent to public lands when needed to provide access to timber on public lands under his jurisdiction; Public Law 76, bringing uniformity into the laws governing entry under the Desert Land Act by permitting maximum entry on mineral lands up to 320 acres, the same maximum allowable for many years on nonmineral lands; Public Law 247, requiring recording of all "paper" in the form of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights outstanding as claims for rights to public lands by reason of more than 40 acts of Congress between 1815 and 1922 authorizing issuance of such "paper"; Public Law 39, extending to an additional 80,000 acres of land within Coconino National Forest, Ariz., present statutory authority providing for supervision of mining locations so as to preserve to the maximum public recreation and timber values while mineral resource development goes forward; and Public Law 834, suspending for 3 years from March 1, 1956, the requirement that entrymen under the Desert Land Act must reclaim and continue to reclaim entered land and put it in shape to produce crops—this in the face of the existing crop surpluses in several basic commodities.

LAND TITLE, CONVEYANCE

A number of measures enacted into public law after reporting by the committee reflect a continuing policy of attempting to equitably resolve historic land title disputes, remove Federal clouds on title by reason of erroneous surveys or faulty recording, and to assist local governmental subdivisions in carrying out their public functions which require use of real property.

Among acts in this category are those which provide legislative authority in Interior for the management and disposition of the Federal interest in approximately 20,000 acres of reconveyed Choctaw and Chickasaw Indian lands scattered in small tracts throughout a 6,000 square-mile area in eastern Oklahoma—Public Law 215; settling substantial title uncertainties to lands bordering the Indian River, Fla., by authorizing patent issuance to long-time occupants—Public Law 253; clarifying the law relating to granting of school sections to the States so as to pass title notwithstanding outstanding mineral leases at the time of survey, an act principally of interest to the State of Utah, but also applicable in California, Arizona, and New Mexico—Public Law 629; conveying land to the Lake County School District, Oregon, for school construction purposes—Public Law 456; extending for 5 years a 1950 act authorizing conveyance of certain public lands in Miles City, Mont., for essential city-planned industrial development—Public Law 191; removing narrow use restrictions on 154 acres of land deeded in 1923 to the ctiy of Chandler, Okla., and conveying the land for public utilization—Public Law 241; authorizing conveyance under the Recreation Act of certain lands in Phillips County, Mont., substantially improved and long utilized for public recreation by the local American Legion post, to the post—Public Law 589; to quitclaim to the city of Saginaw, Mich., all rights of the United States, if any, in a 640-acre key urban tract in the city and thus remove a 137-year-old cloud on the title to the lands involved—Public Law 444; to convey to the city of Henderson, Nev., upon payment of fair market value, 6,859 acres of arid, undeveloped public lands adjoining and confining this World War II federally-created, and now third-largest city in Nevada—Public Law 522; authorizing the State of Arizona to convey to an agricultural improvement and power district, a State political subdivision, for use as a building site, approximately 29 acres of land previously conveyed under restrictive covenants precluding the proposed public use—Public Law 36; removing a cloud on title resulting from a pre-1900 fraudulent survey to approximately 240 acres of lands located within the exterior boundaries of Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., which lands have for a number of years been improved and occupied by some 70 claimants, and treated as private lands by Federal administering agencies—Public Law 449; authorizing transfer to the State of Wyoming in the Camp Guernsey, Platte County, area 7,630 acres of land for National Guard and Air National Guard purposes, with reversion if not so used—Public Law 77; and quitclaiming Federal interest to certain real property in the city of Pensacola, Fla., where the United States had presumably acquired title when Florida was acquired in 1819, but in fact was in private title some 6 years earlier—Public Law 499.

II. MINING, MINERAL RESOURCES

The House Mines and Mining Subcommittee—reflecting its responsibility for mining interests generally, mineral land laws and the claims and entries thereunder, geological survey, and mineral resources and petroleum conservation on the public lands—during the 84th Congress considered, and the full committee and the Congress approved, several landmark pieces of legislation in the evolutionary Federal program for maximium development, utilization, and conservation of the minerals and materials resources of the public lands of the United States.

MULTIPLE SURFACE USE ACT

Probably the most significant change in the mining laws of the United States since adoption by Congress of the first general mining laws, in 1872, is the Multiple Surface Use Act of 1955, Public Law 167. Put succinctly, it operates to amend historic law so as to permit the use of the surface and subsurface of the same tracts of public lands for prepatent prospecting and mining activity at the same time management and utilization of forestry products, forage crops, grazing, fish and wildlife, wilderness, water, scenic, and related resources go forward; its provisions will also assure that existence of a mining claim cannot, prior to patenting, be used to block access to adjacent lands—all without limiting or interfering with prospecting and mining activities on the claim proper.

POWER WITHDRAWAL, COAL RESERVE ENTRY

Another public law put on the books by the 84th Congress, after lengthy committee consideration—the Mining Claims Restoration Act of 1955, Public Law 359—opens to entry approximately 7 million acres of public lands, all in the West, withdrawn or reserved for power development. Approximately 95 percent of these lands had been closed to mining development for 45 years, since around 1910. Its enactment is one more legislative step in the drive to encourage search for, and development of, the strategic and critical domestic minerals and materials resources so vital to our economy.

Similarly, in the area of compatible resource uses, the Congress approved legislation providing for entry and location of mining claims on the discovery of a valuable source material on public lands classified as or known to be valuable for coal—Public Law 357. This law was found necessary to clear title complications to a large number of mining claims located in the States of South Dakota, North Dakota, and Montana in good-faith compliance with the mining laws, and to further the exploration and development of uranium-bearing lignite coal deposits considered by the Atomic

Energy Commission as an important potential source of uranium.

CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE

As a major step in conservation of the all-important anthracite coal resources in Pennsylvania, Congress enacted Public Law 162, which provides for a Federal-State program, and authorizes up to an $8.5 million Federal contribution to the State on a matched-fund basis, to meet the capital cost of a program designed to control and drain water in anthracite coal formations. Effecting of this program will not only conserve irreplaceable natural resources and strengthen the national security, but will prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property constantly threatened by huge quantities of water in subsurface coal workings.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM

Pending development by the Executive agencies of a recommended long-range domestic minerals program, the committee moved in the 84th Congress to respond to an acute need for interim assistance which would help to deaccelerate the rapidly eroding domestic mining industry—an erosion brought on by the flow of raw materials from foreign mines, price manipulations in world markets, and the destructive effects brought about by the dumping of foreign production on American markets.

After assurance from the Executive that domestic purchase programs for high-grade manganese, chromite, mica, beryl, metallurgical grade fluorspar, and antimony were being extended, Public Law 733 was enacted to establish programs for the purchase of tungsten concentrates, 1.25 million short ton units; acid grade fluorspar, 250,000 short ton units; nonferrous asbestos, up to 4,000 tons, specified grades; and columbium-tantalum bearing ores and concentrates, 250,000 pounds, combined pentoxides, from mines in the United States. Initial appropriations of $21 million were voted by the 84th Congress to meet the maximum anticipated cost of the program—$92 million—with purchase authority terminating on December 31, 1958.

III. WATER RESOURCE UTILIZATION, DEVELOPMENT

In the field of water resource utilization and development so immediately vital to the Reclamation West, and so essential in the long run to our Nation's economic strength, the 2-year legislative period just ended stands out in two major respects: first, it marks a reversal of the trend which in the past several years brought the Federal reclamation program to a virtual halt; second, it stands not only as a reversal of that trend, but goes into the books as the Congress which approved 35 separate pieces of legislation authorizing the most far-reaching reclamation program to come out of a single Congress since the Federal program was initiated 54 years ago.

This monumental program, statistically, means this: against a $367 million program in 1950 which had dropped in 1954 to less than $150 million, and saw the 83d Congress authorized several small projects with an estimated total cost of about $56 million—and against all-time total accrued appropriations up to June 30, 1953, totaling slightly more than $3 billion—the 84th Congress authorized appropriations for new construction in excess of $1.3 billion.

Against 7.1 million irrigable acres ready to be served on Federal projects after 51 years, in 1953, this legislation provides for ultimately bringing—from 10 to 20 years hence—471,000 acres of new land under irrigation, and furnishing supplemental water to an additional 805,000 acres. It will result in creation of the long-range base for production of the food and fiber needed to meet the demands of a projected population in 1975 of as many as 220 million people.

This legislation adds to the 4.4 million kilowatts of installed hydroelectric capacity at Federal projects existing in 1953, an assurance of an additional 1.5 million kilowatts, and this additional power potential will furnish over 6.7 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually to the farms, cities, and industries of the West. Additional benefits resulting include flood control, stream pollution control, recreational benefits, stabilizing municipal and industrial water supplies, and preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife benefits.

A total of 9 new projects were authorized to be constructed in a total of 11 of the 17 States of the reclamation West.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

To initiate development of the last of the Nation's major undeveloped river basins—the upper Colorado—the committee reported and the Congress approved Public Law 485, to authorize construction of the $760 million Colorado River storage project in the States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona. Construction of the four main-stem storage units initially authorized—Glen Canyon, Flaming Gorge, Curecanti, and Navaho Dams and Reservoirs, with a combined storage capacity of about 32.5 million acre-feet—will operate to provide holdover storage to meet interstate compact apportionment commitments and to permit the upper basin States to make full use of their apportioned share of the water; produce an estimated 5.5 billion kilowatt-hours of electric energy to meet the ever-expanding power needs in the area and contribute to the overall financial feasibility; assure sound financial bases for the 11 participating—that is, reclamation—projects initially authorized—central Utah, Emery County, Florida, Hammond, Labarge, Lyman, Paonia, Pine River extension, Seedskadee, Silt, and Smith Fork—and future additional participating projects.

TRINITY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Legislation—Public Law 386—authorizing construction of the Trinity River addition to the Central Valley project, California, constitutes the third major leg of Federal participation in Valley development. The $225 million Trinity Dam and Reservoir on the Trinity River, a tributary of the Klamath River in northwestern California, will have a storage capacity of 2.5 million acre-feet. From this reservoir an average of about 700,000 acre-feet will be diverted annually to the Sacramento River Basin, and this amount, when coordinated with system operation, will provide about 1.2 million additional acre-feet of water annually for use in the Central Valley. In addition to fish, wildlife, and recreational benefits, the Trinity project will ultimately generate more than 1 billion kilowatt hours of electric energy annually at the dam's powerplants.

WASHOE PROJECT, NEVADA-CALIFORNIA

The $43.5 million Washoe project—Public Law 858—will regulate East Carson and Little Truckee Rivers flowing out of California into Nevada to supplement the present irrigation water supply for about 45,000 acres and furnish a full water supply to about 5,000 acres; will serve, when coordinated with flood control works existing and to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers, to protect the Reno area from repetition of several devastating floods in the last few years; will generate approximately 96 million kilowatt-hours of energy annually for the Reno area, and substantially restore fish, wildlife, and recreational benefits at Pyramid Lake.

WASHITA PROJECT, OKLAHOMA

An area that has been repeatedly hard hit by alternate drought and flood conditions over a number of years, the Washita River Basin in southwestern Oklahoma, will benefit from enactment of Public Law 419 authorizing construction of the $40.6 million Washita project. This project will furnish flood protection, vitally needed municipal water, irrigation water in an area which has seen crop production drop 50 percent in the past 20 years, and related benefits.

AINSWORTH, FARWELL UNITS, NEBRASKA

Northwest central Nebraska—through construction of the $26 million Ainsworth dam, reservoir, and delivery system, on the Snake River—Public Law 531; and central Nebraska, through construction of the $30.5 million Farwell unit—Public Law 952—on the Middle Loup River—both units of the Missouri River Basin project, will have provided in these key agricultural areas important irrigation, flood control, fish, wildlife, and recreation benefits. The Ainsworth unit ultimately will provide irrigation water for some 34,000 acres of land, while Farwell will provide water for about 52,500 acres.

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT, OREGON

Authorization of the $6.6 million Crooked River project, Oregon—Public Law 992—will operate to furnish assured water supplies for irrigation of approximately 20,000 acres of land, make available an additional 51,000 acre-feet of water annually for other lands, to to provide protection against floods which have in the past resulted in extensive damage to the city of Prineville and the surrounding area.

LITTLE WOOD RIVER PROJECT, IDAHO

Expenditure of $1.9 million for the Little Wood River project in Blaine County, Idaho—Public Law 993—will result in construction raising the height of an existing dam, increasing storage capacity

from 12,000 to 30,000 acre-feet, and thus provide—in addition to flood protection, fish and wildlife benefits—a supplemental water supply for irrigation of 9,550 acres of land which presently experience critical water shortages every year.

VENTURA PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The $27.7 million Ventura River project, California—Public Law 423—involves primarily the storage of water for irrigation, municipal, and industrial uses, and will meet the urgent need for an additional firm water supply for both agricultural and municipal uses because of the rapidly expanding population in this southern California coastal area.

WAPINITIA PROJECT, OREGON

Finally, legislation was enacted—Public Law 559—to authorize the $500,000 Wapinitia project in north-central Oregon, providing for construction of a dam on Clear Creek, a tributary of the White River, to assure supplemental water for 2,100 acres currently suffering from an inadequate water supply.

MEASURES NOT APPROVED

Three measures reported by the committee, but not enacted, had as their purpose authorizing project construction in three other areas: H. R. 4719, authorizing construction of the $484 million multipurpose Hells Canyon project, on the Snake River, Idaho-Oregon, was never taken up on the House floor after counterpart legislation was defeated in Senate floor action; the $156-million Fryingpan-Arkansas project legislation, proposing a self-contained multipurpose development on the Arkansas River in southwestern Colorado, passed the Senate but the rule on the House measure, H. R. 412, was defeated in the House; and House Joint Resolution 672, clearing the way for construction of a 230-kilovolt transmission line from Fort Randall Dam, S. Dak., to Grand Island, Nebr., was reported but failed of enactment.

Three measures constituting important supplements to reclamation law were reported and enacted into law, while several others amending existing law became public law.

SMALL PROJECTS ACT

The Small Reclamation Projects Act, Public Law 984, is probably the most important supplement to reclamation laws since the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. Applicable to the 17 western reclamation States, the new law provides for cooperation between the Federal Government and State or local public agencies in the development of small reclamation projects. It permits up to $5 million Federal participation in any single proposed locally planned, constructed, operated, and maintained reclamation project, such Federal funds to be made available in the form of loans for project benefits traditionally reimbursable under Federal reclamation law—irrigation and related benefits, such as power, municipal and industrial water supply, and drainage—or grants for benefits traditionally nonreimbursable because supplying public benefits—flood control, stream pollution control, fish and wildlife benefits—so long as the project requesting Federal assistance does not exceed in total cost $10 million.

DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ACT

In a similar vein, legislation applicable only to Federal reclamation projects, Public Law 130, as amended by Public Law 520, authorizes loans to local irrigation districts for construction of distribution systems, thus reducing overall costs to the districts by less complex local planning and associated costs, and while Public Law 575 is designed to facilitate completion of drainage systems and other minor construction work on authorized reclamation projects by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract with water users' organizations for the accomplishment of such work.

ADMINISTRATION, REPAYMENT LEGISLATION

The committee also reported, and Congress approved, legislation clarifying repayment provisions of existing reclamation law by removing several major objections directed against the water-service contract or utility-type contract written under existing law, particularly in the Central Valley, Calif., and the Missouri River Basin project area, Public Law 643; amending existing law to provide that excess lands in Federal reclamation projects acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily, but not more than 5 years, Public Law 690; resolving a question raised as a result of an Arizona Supreme Court decision holding that percolating waters are not subject to the doctrine of prior appropriation by declaring—Public Law 226—that entrymen under the Federal Desert Land Act in Arizona who had depended on percolating waters for reclaiming their entries are granted a waiver of the Federal requirement that such entries "shall depend upon bona fide prior appropriation"; providing a financial boost to organizations short of funds upon project completion by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire movable property with funds appropriated for reclamation project construction and to transfer such property to the organization when it assumes project operation and maintenance, thus accelerating the date of local takeover, Public Law 924; and striking from existing law an archaic and offensive provision prohibiting employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of Federal reclamation projects, Public Law 517.

Five measures cleared the way for execution of repayment contracts in connection with Federal projects, delayed for various reasons, and assuring sound businesslike operation of Tule Lake Irrigation District, California—Public Law 877; Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District of the Gila project, Arizona—Public Law 394; Yuma County Water Users' Association, Arizona—Public Law 633; Riverside Irrigation District, Idaho—Public Law 849; and the Toston Irrigation District, Montana—Public Law 374.

SPECIFIC PROJECT ACTS

Seven measures enacted into law relate to specific projects and are designed to transfer from Interior to Army the administrative jurisdiction over the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, and from Army to Interior similar responsibility from the Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska—Public Law 505; modify the boundaries of the Yuma Auxiliary Project, Arizona—Public Law 409; authorize construction of a sewerage system for the construction camp serving Glendo Dam and Reservoir, Wyoming—Public Law 283; authorize amendment of certain contracts with the city of Rapid City, S. Dak., for furnishing municipal water in connection with the Rapid Valley unit, and thus permit the city to issue bonds for constructing water system improvements—Public Law 964; quiet title to certain land in the city of Carlsbad, N. Mex., in the Carlsbad Irrigation District, where the improved lots involved were transferred by the district to the United States in 1905 as project repayment security, which obligation has been discharged—Public Law 762; designate the reservoir above the Monticello Dam, Solano project, California, as Lake Berryessa—Public Law 494; and legislation to repeal a provision included in a 1938 act as an antispeculation measure in connection with the Arch Hurley Conservancy District, Tucumcari, N. Mex., which provision has served its purpose and has subsequently worked hardships on parties involved in normal land transactions—Public Law 277.

Two other measures in separate categories were acted on, but were not finally approved: S. 3338, which would have required that rates for power and energy marketed to preference customers by the Southwestern Power Administration—in Missouri, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana—not be revised before July 1, 1957, a measure aimed at permitting further study before a proposed 40-percent rate increase took effect, meantime benefitting farmers in the area hard hit by drought conditions and depressed farm prices, was vetoed by the President; and H. R. 11685, providing for acquisition of Navaho Indian lands required in connection with the construction and operation of the Glen Canyon unit, Colorado River storage project, failed to get action in the House.

INTERSTATE STREAM COMPACTS

Three pieces of legislation became law which grant the consent of Congress to certain States to negotiate and enter into compacts relating to waters of interstate streams; the compacts, States, and streams involved are Red River compact, Public Law 346, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas; Klamath River compact, Public Law 316, California and Oregon; and a California-Nevada proposed compact involving the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers—Public Law 353.

Finally, the 84th Congress enacted Public Law 111, which extends the saline-water research program through fiscal 1963, and increases the amount authorized to be appropriated from $2 million to $10 million.

IV. TERRITORIAL, INSULAR AFFAIRS

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, through its Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, is responsible for legislation affecting Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and the coordinate responsibility of exercising a continuing oversight of the administra-

tion of these areas by the Department of the Interior.

Statistically, this responsibility involves more than 2,000 islands in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, the Bering Sea, and the Caribbean Sea, and the approximately 4 million inhabitants of these offshore areas. In terms of legislation, during the 84th Congress, a total of 49 public laws were enacted.

ALASKA MENTAL HEALTH

After several years of failing to secure enactment of predecessor legislation, the committee acted on, and Congress approved, one of the most significant of all the Territories measures reported: The Alaska Mental Health Enabling Act, Public Law 830. By its provisions: responsibility for the Territorial mental health program is vested in Alaska; grants-in-aid amounting to $6.5 million for construction of facilities, and $6 million over a 10-year period to implement the program prior to full assumption of financial responsibility; and authority is granted the Territory to select up to 1 million acres of otherwise unappropriated lands over a 10-year period, with income therefrom to be first applied to meeting the expenses of the mental health program; and necessary transitional provisions are included.

Enactment of this legislation represents not only a major step toward fuller self-government in the Territory, but in a very real sense speaks loudly for the ability of Members of Congress to arrive at a sound conclusion in the face of an antienactment campaign earmarked by assertions embracing gross misinformation, half-truths, patent untruths, scurrilous and abusive language, and personal attacks directed at the committee, its members, and Members of Congress at large.

GUAM OMNIBUS ACT

The Guam Omnibus Act, Public Law 896, is designed to carry out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam, and among the 25 Federal statutes made applicable to this unincorporated Territory are those extending certain educational, public health, opium and marihuana, agricultural, and library provisions to the area, together with a provision bringing the Governor's salary into line with that paid the Governor of the Virgin Islands.

HAWAII GENERAL MEASURES

A number of measures relate to governmental and fiscal matters in the Territory of Hawaii and operate to: reapportion the membership of the Hawaii Legislature—Public Law 895; increase the annual salaries of the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, as well as the salaries of circuit court judges—Public Law 500; extend from 4 years to 7 years terms of the Chief Justice and Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, and from 4 to 6 years the terms of circuit court judges—Public Law 508; authorize the issuance of not in excess of $50 million in highway revenue bonds, payable from highway vehicle fuel tax receipts—Public Law 716; amend existing law respecting territorial debt limit so as to make it clear that the ceiling is $95 million, or 10 percent of the assesed value of property, whichever is higher, and to ratify and confirm acts of the Territorial Legislature, thereby in effect declaring $17.7 million in authorized Honolulu city and Hawaii county school bonds to be within such limitation—Public Law 720; authorize the city and county of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the amount of $14.5 million for construction of a municipal auditorium, Kalihi tunnel and approaches, park and playground construction and improvements, and sewage, flood control, and drainage facilities—Public Law 694; establish, with attendant redesignation of existing positions, the position of post-auditor in the Territorial Government, his functions to somewhat parallel those of the Comptroller General of the United States on the Federal level—Public Law 906; and legislation directing the National Science Foundation to investigate the need and feasibility of locating a geophysical institute in the Territory—Public Law 909.

HAWAII LAND USE

Extended hearings held by a special subcommittee in the Territory of Hawaii in 1954 served as a sound base for consideration and final action on several measures involving land utilization and land resource development: return to the Territory of 69.90 acres of land comprising part of Fort Armstrong and Kakaukukui, Honolulu, for conversion from spasmodic and limited military use to concentrated essential usage for warehousing, dockage, and freight handling facilities along the Honolulu waterfront—Public Law 894; authorization for acquisition by the Territory of littoral rights to certain tidelands abutting Waikiki Beach to permit initiation of construction by the Henry J. Kaiser interests of a multimillion dollar hotel and tourist attraction to be known as Crescent Beach—Public Law 199; ratification of Territorial legislation providing a practical method of disposing of small public land remnants resulting from eminent domain proceedings and abandonment of all or portions of existing but unused public roads, streets, and other rights-of-way—Public Law 478; authority for amendment of restrictive covenants in patents to tracts of not more than one-half acre so as to broaden permissive use—Public Law 481; and to permit construction of a church—Public Law 476; authorizing sale, under special circumstances, of certain public lands at Weliweli, island of Kauai—Public Law 839—and Kaneohe Bay, island of Oahu—Public Law 900—to private individuals; making unnecessary a requirement for readvertisement of sale where public lands have once been offered for sale for residential purposes and not sold—Public Law 482; authorizing sale of 682 scattered and landlocked remnants of Territorial public lands—approximately 240 acres—with preference to abutting landowners without prohibitive expense of public auction—Public Law 869; amending existing law to increase the number of qualified farmers who may secure homestead lands in Hawaii—Public Law 903; permitting a number of eleemosynary organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry to file claims for lands conveyed by them to the Territory of Hawaii during World War II—Public Law 542; authorizing exchanges and sales of public lands within or adjacent to the Puna district, county of Hawaii, to persons whose lands were destroyed by volcanic action during March–April, 1955—Public Law 844; and legislation providing for establishment of the 180-acre City of Refuge National Historical Park, island of Hawaii—Public Law 177.

HAWAII-ALASKA WATER RESOURCES

Three measures deal with water resources development in Hawaii and Alaska: Authorizing the Hawaii commissioner of public lands to include in future conveyancing instruments future Territorial rights to enter on and to assess such lands for irrigation project development—Public Law 477; implementing the Hawaiian Irrigation Act of 1953 by giving clear statutory authority for orderly planning and construction of essential Territorial irrigation projects—Public Law 899; and Public Law 322, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to utilize more fully the Bureau of Reclamation facilities in Alaska to investigate and report to Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources in the Territory.

ALASKA GENERAL MEASURES

As in the case of Hawaii, several Alaska measures enacted into law relate to performance of governmental functions: Public Law 154, making members of the Territorial legislature eligible to qualify and to serve as delegates at the constitutional convention during November-December 1955; Public Law 201, making adjustments in boundaries between the second and fourth judicial districts; and Public Law 908, authorizing an increase in the amount retainable by United States commissioners from fees collected; Public Law 56, correcting a technical deficiency so that Alaska will be able to obtain full benefits of the Employment Security Administration Financing Act of 1954; Public Law 904, extending for 2 years, or until December 31, 1958, authority for the Territory to acquire, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, personal property surplus to the needs of the Federal Government; and Public Law 923, directing Interior to select a site for port-of-entry facilities on the Alaska Highway nearer to the Alaska-Canadian border than the present one, 97 miles distant.

ALASKA LAND, RESOURCES, USE

Very substantial accomplishment in the direction of assuring further resources utilization and future economic development is reflected in enactment of additional Alaska measures: Public Law 213, eliminating the former requirement that an 80-rod space be reserved between public land entries on navigable waters, thus permitting fuller utilization of key shoreline areas; Public Law 158, authorizing road-building activities on through highways within the boundaries of Alaska municipal corporations; Public Law 163, authorizing renewal of a lease of Annette Island Airport, southern gateway to Alaska, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration; Public Law 884,

providing for establishment of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission to develop comprehensive recommendations for location of rail and highway facilities deemed most feasible economically and from a security standpoint for connection of the continental United States with Alaska; Public Law 232, permitting the Alaska Railroad to execute 55-year leases for location of industrial warehouses on railroad property, thus qualifying under national bank and other loan requirements; Public Law 507, authorizing Federal construction of camp grounds, parking areas, and other public recreation areas, including necessary access roads thereto, in Alaska; Public Law 516, authorizing issuance of $12.5 million in bonds to finance additional needed public improvements; Public Law 625, permitting export and sale of walrus hides by Alaskan indigenes, and prescribing regulations for taking of walruses by non-indigenes for purposes other than food and clothing; Public Law 698, making unnecessary both a presurvey final proof and postsurvey final proof of compliance with homestead requirements where entry is made on originally unsurveyed lands; Public Law 892, permitting disposal of lands restored from highway, telephone line, and pipeline withdrawals, and permitting abutting landowners to acquire extension of their present holdings; and Public Law 931, broadening the homestead law in Alaska to permit sale or other conveyance of allotted Indian, Aleut, or Eskimo homestead lands.

PUERTO RICO, VIRGIN ISLANDS MEASURES

Finally, in the Caribbean area, Public Law 692 transfers from Interior to Agriculture responsibility for servicing Puerto Rico hurricane relief loans, and to the Public Housing Commissioner the duty of servicing the sales contract of the Falansterio Apartments in San Juan; Public Law 925 authorizes establishment of the Virgin Islands National Park; and Public Law 186 directs the transfer of 60 acres of lands on St. Croix, V. I., to the Department of Agriculture for use in the Department's extension and research program.

V. INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Indian and native—Eskimo and Aleut—populations of the United States and Alaska approximates 435,000; Indian landholdings and reservations subject to varying degrees of Federal control total approximately 52 million acres in some 28 States. With 189 measures proposing Indian legislation refered to the committee, and in turn to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, the committee made what I believe to be substantial progress in its continuing effort to aid effectively in the management and conservation of Indian human, natural, and economic resources and funds, to assist in improving individual and tribal economic conditions, and to resolve difficulties arising from claims against the United States.

While the bulk of the 50 Indian measures enacted into public law deal with specific areas or tribes, landmark legislation of general significance was approved.

INDIAN VOCATIONAL, EDUCATIONAL TRAINING

Heading the list, and having far-reaching effect on the future welfare of our Indian citizens is Public Law 959, authorizing a program of vocational training for adult Indians living on or near Indian reservations. With up to $3.5 million in Federal funds authorized to be appropriated annually, Public Law 959 is aimed primarily at improving the job skills of Indian workers in the 18–35 year age group, and provides authority for the Secretary of the Interior to contract with State and local agencies for the training, and to provide trainees with necessary transportation and subsistence.

In similar vein, and looking to a revitalized program in the field of Indian education, Public Law 702 directs the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study and investigation of Indian education in the United States and Alaska, and to report to the Congress on findings made.

INDIAN CLAIMS ACTS

Public Law 767, extending the life of the Indian Claims Commission for five years from the previously established expiration date of April 10, 1957, will permit the Commission needed time to tackle the job of disposing of 750 pending claims, while Public Law 717 provides for partial settlement of certain claims of the Uintah and White River Bands of Utes, by quieting in the tribes title to the mineral estate in more than 36,000 acres of land for which compensation is being claimed in the Court of Claims.

TERMINAL TRIBE MEASURES

Termination or adjustment legislation for three small tribal groups in northeastern Oklahoma, following tribal requests for terminal legislation, resulted in Public Law 887, affecting the Wyandotte Tribe; Public Law 921, the Peoria Tribe, and Public Law 943, the Ottawa Tribe. Three additional acts, Public Law 715, Public Law 721, and Public Law 718, will implement and facilitate the termination program for the Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, by amending the 1954 Termination Act to improve timber stands and resource management generally, and to relieve the tribe of costs incurred in developing management plans.

Public Law 920 corrects certain deficiencies in the 1954 Uintah-Ouray, Utah, Terminal Act, dealing with distribution of tribal property, while Public Law 696 transfers to the Kanosh Band of Indians, Utah, title to 600 acres of tribally-used land, in order to implement that group's terminal program.

INDIAN RESOURCES UTILIZATION

Significant legislation in Indian resource utilization and development legislation approved by the 84th Congress includes Public Law 255, the Indian long-term leasing act, permitting Indian owners of restricted lands to lease all or part of their holdings for a period of up to 25 years, for specified purposes, and should operate to add substantially to income received; Public Law 390 providing long-term lease authority during a 2-year trial period, applies only to unassigned lands of Mohave and Chimehuevi Indians, Arizont; Public Law 47, withdrawing from general mining law entry some 2.7 million acres of lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz., and conveying assets of very substantial value, the unappropriated mineral estate, to the tribe; Public Law 188 authorizing the Yakima Tribe, Washington, to purchase, sell, and exchange trust lands in heirship status, thus providing for blocking up to achieve more economic operation and improved management; Public Law 263, authorizing the State of Utah to effect exchange of state-owned mineral lands lying within the exterior boundaries of the Uintah-Ouray Indian Reservation, for mineral-bearing public domain lands outside, to the mutual advantage of both the Indians and the State; Public Law 252, supplemented by Public Law 686, authorizing the Pueblo Indians of San Lorenzo and Pojaoque, New Mexico, to sell certain lands to the Navaho Indians, making needed funds available to the former, permitting land-consolidation for the latter; Public Law 187, authorizing the Yakima Tribe, Washington, to lease to the State some 200 acres of tribal land for preservation of historic Fort Simcoe; and Public Law 480, transferring improved Federal lands used for educational purposes to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo, New Mexico.

INDIAN LAND CONVEYANCE, USE

Included in other enactments involving land conveyances or land use are Public Law 772, which restores to tribal ownership—without cost to the tribe—818,000 valuable acres of "open" and undisposed of lands on the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash.; Public Law 450, which simplifies the obtaining of loans from commercial sources by Indian landowners, by permitting encumbrance of trust or restricted property, subject to approval of the Secretary of the Interior; Public Law 736, which conveys to the Seminole Tribe, Florida, beneficial ownership of approximately 27,000 acres of land, a major contribution to the land and economic base of this tribe; Public Law 991, which is designed to provide authority for conveyance to Indian tribes of any Federally owned buildings or improvements on tribal or "administrative reserve" lands no longer needed for their original purposes; Public Law 857, which permits the subsurface storage of oil or gas on restricted Indian lands, assuring an additional source of income in several tribal jurisdictions; Public Law 261, providing for conveyance to the State of Federal and Standing Rock Sioux Indian tribal lands containing the original burial site of Chief Sitting Bull; Public Law 592, authorizing, at tribal request, partition or sale of inherited interest in allotted lands of the Tulalip Indian Reservation, Wash., to pave the way for location of a major oil refinery thereon, with attendant economic benefits; Public Law 539, directing issuance to holders of individual exchange assignments on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., patents to lands embraced therein; Public Law 572, directing transfer of 9 acres of Hualapai Indian Reservation land, Arizona, to a school district for school purposes; Public Law 443, providing for conveyance of the Lower Lake Indian Rancheria, California, to Lake County, for an airport; Public Law 252, to con-

vey 15 acres of Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation land, California, to a school district for use as a school site; and Public Law 563, providing for the sale of 10 acres of land owned by the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, California, for the same purpose.

INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS

Several measures involving Indian tribal funds will permit direct individual financial assistance by providing for fund distribution, or will simplify administration of funds programs: Public Law 202, providing for distribution of funds of the Creek Indian Nation, Oklahoma; Public Law 281, dealing with distribution of $2.1 million to members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Public Law 278, providing for quarterly—as against semiannual—per capita payments to members of the Shoshone-Arapahoe Tribes; and Public Law 794, extending for 2 years the time during which payments of tribal funds to members of these two tribes are authorized to be made; Public Law 553, to segregate, on the basis of approved membership rolls, some $4.2 million in trust funds held for the Three Affiliated Tribes, North Dakota; Public Law 560, authorizing a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band, Chippewa Indians, Minnesota; and Public Law 769, providing for payment and distribution to some 125 families of the Pine Ridge Sioux Indians, South Dakota, as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge Aerial Gunnery Range in 1942.

MISCELLANEOUS INDIAN MEASURES

Other Indian measures give authority, in Public Law 837, to the Secretary of the Interior to charge purchasers of Indian timber for special services such as scaling, cruising, and marking, provided by Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel; Public Law 348 extends the period of restrictions against alienation or encumbrance of lands belonging to the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes—Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, and Seminole—Oklahoma; Public Law 546, extends until 1965 the authority of Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for the payment, on a reimbursable basis, of operation and maintenance charges assessed on approximately 117,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands; Public Law 926 declares that the United States holds in trust for the Pueblos of Zia and Jemez, N. Mex., some 77,000 acres; Public Law 956 deals with administration of the Red Lake Indian Forest, Minn.; Public Law 203 repeals provisions of existing law providing for recoupment of certain public school construction costs attributable to the Indians attending schools in Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, and California; Public Law 568, relieves the Navaho Tribe of reimbursing certain costs of maintaining highways across the Navaho Indian Reservation, Ariz.-N. Mex.; Public Law 570, recognizes about 4,000 Indians of mixed blood presently residing in North Carolina as Lumbee Indians; and Public Law 912, which commends the organization known as the Memorial to the American Indian Foundation for undertaking to establish a permanent memorial in New Mexico to the North American Indian.

FIELD, SPECIAL HEARINGS

During the Congress just ended, and in order to lay a sound base for understanding of pending legislation or development of needed new legislation, the committee, through its subcommittees, conducted a number of field or special hearings.

The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation held hearings in the field on the Mid-State and Red Willow projects in Nebraska; Wapinitia project, Oregon; Coulee Dam municipal development, Washington; Tule Lake project, California; Washoe project, Nevada-California; Boulder City municipal development, Nevada; inspected existing or proposed irrigation projects in Nebraska, Wyoming, and Idaho; attended the National Reclamation Association meeting at Lincoln, Nebr.; and, with members of the House Public Works Committee, made an inspection trip of flood-stricken areas of northern California.

The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs held extensive hearings throughout the Territory of Alaska, described by Delegate BARTLETT as "the most extensive and intensive congressional inquiry in Alaska's history." Special subcommittees held hearings at Portland, Oreg., on operation of the Morningside Hospital for Alaska mentally ill, and in the Virgin Islands to inspect the proposed Virgin Islands National Park and to take testimony with respect to proposed changes in the Virgin Islands Organic Act.

Field hearings on Indian matters were held on the Seminole, Fla., Cherokee, N. C., Flathead, Mont., Crow Creek, S. Dak., Lower Brule, S. Dak., Pine Ridge, S. Dak., and Rosebud, S. Dak., Indian Reservations; at Muskogee and Anadarko, Okla.; Tucson, Ariz.; Browning and Great Falls, Mont.; Bismark, N. Dak., and Pierre, S. Dak.

Mines and Mining Subcommittee or special subcommittee members held hearings in Washington on the coal research program and on progress of the defense minerals program, and attended the annual meeting of the American Mining Congress at Las Vegas, Nev., while a staff employee inspected uranium and lead-zinc operations in Colorado, and manganese mines and ore-buying depots in Arizona and New Mexico.

In addition, a special research consultant formerly associated with the Bureau of Reclamation, Mr. Eugene D. Eaton, was retained to complete the preparation of a badly needed compilation of material relating to the Central Valley project, California.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

As it must in every Congress, the committee and staff devoted hundreds of man-hours to legislation or projects which fall under the hearing of unfinished business.

A partial and necessarily incomplete list of major projects for consideration in the 85th Congress includes investigation into, and development—or reintroduction and reconsideration—of legislation involving: Alaska statehood; Hawaii statehood; water rights settlement legislation; implementation of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission recommendations or alternatives; Territorial control of Alaska fisheries resources; Alaska land grants; possible revision of the Virgin Islands Organic Act; evaluation of Department of Defense security program in the Pacific Islands; native claims in Alaska; law and order on Indian reservations; evaluation of Indian relocation program; evaluation of public information regarding Indians and the overall Federal Indian program; centralizing in a single, permanent, Federal agency the responsibility for information and activities relating to Antarctica; policy respecting the comprehensive long-range National Park System program known as "Mission 66"; returning to Congress the direct control over withdrawal and reservation of public lands for defense purposes, and requiring strict compliance with State or Territorial fish and game laws within such reservations; authorizing a Federal program to develop recreational, wildlife, and related public benefits in national forests and woodlands; payments in lieu of Federal taxes; policies respecting sale and disposition of federally generated electric energy and power; and a comprehensive, long-range domestic minerals program.

CONCLUSION

I have said, Mr. Speaker, that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs processed nearly 1 of every 5 of the bills which became public law in the 84th Congress; I believe that statement, and the foregoing summary of legislation help to support the assertion that committee members and staff were kept busy.

Between the opening day of the 84th Congress, on January 5, 1955, and the adjournment sine die at the end of the second session on July 27, 1956, 417 calendar days elapsed, while Congress was in session a total of 230 House legislative days. There were a total of 294 working days—Mondays through Friday—during that period.

During those 417 calendar days, 294 working days, or 230 legislative days of the 84th Congress, our committee convened a total of 352 separate meetings—257 of them subcommittee meetings, and 95 meetings of the full committee. I believe those figures speak for themselves.

Committee output does not just happen, Mr. Speaker. It takes the energy, leadership, initiative, and cooperation of many individuals to fulfill the legislative mission; the Congress just ended has demonstrated how successfully that mission can be fulfilled. I am proud of the contribution of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, am grateful for the opportunity to again have served as its chairman, and sincerely believe the committee has contributed more than its share of what will serve as the permanent record of accomplishments of the 84th Congress—the official United States Statutes at Large.

The Importance of Highway Safety and the Meaning of Wisconsin's Great Highway Expansion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, here is a grim fact: From January through July 1956 there were as many as 21 percent more traffic fatalities in Wisconsin than in the first 7 months of 1955.

This is the serious toll reported to the people of our State by R. C. Salisbury, safety director for our State motor vehicle department at Madison.

FIVE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT BADGERS KILLED ON ROADS ALREADY IN 1956

In all of 1955 we hit a tragic new high in traffic fatalities. Nine hundred and thirty-two Badgers were killed.

Already this year 578 Wisconsinites have been killed on the roads and highways. Each day the press, radio, and TV report more accidents on the streets and in the countryside.

Five hundred and seventy eight already dead in 1956 represents a shocking record. It gives pause to every Wisconsinite to think.

WISCONSIN'S FINE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS

Let me state quite clearly that my State, despite these statistics, has done a great deal in the direction of increased highway safety.

Wisconsin has always had a fine safety program. It has always had an excellent road system. More than 11,000 miles of State roads, well maintained. We enjoy too some of the finest highway experts and builders in the nation in Madison and in our 71 counties.

Yet it is obvious from the above statistics that, despite our admitted progress, despite our high caliber of highway leadership, we still suffer from the heartbreaking accident toll which I have just mentioned.

I have prepared a statement on the issue of highway safety, and improved roads for my State—from the smallest secondary and feeder roads on State trunk highways to the most modern superhighways. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the final edition of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

It has always been my approach to "accentuate the positive."

I am glad, therefore, to mention at the outset some of other fine groups which are working very constructively to increase road safety in our State.

Foremost are, of course, as I have indicated, the top-grade men heading up and staffing ourt State highway department, and our county road departments. They are as hardworking and dedicated a group as we would be proud to meet almost anywhere.

There are other praiseworthy individuals and groups as well. Right now, for example, Wisconsin's highly respected Council of Safety, in cooperation with the Wisconsin Oil Industry's Information Committee, and the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, is enlisting the support of many motorists at our State fair. Drivers are asked to sign a safety pledge and are given a car sticker signifying that they are cooperating in the "Save a Life" campaign.

This work is being spearheaded by Mr. James Bolton, director of industrial expositions for the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.

GREAT JOB DONE BY AAA

Simultaneously, full credit is due to another great job which is being performed by the always alert Wisconsin division of the American Automobile Association. Few, if any, groups in our country have worked longer, harder, or more effectively in the field than has the pioneering AAA.

In Wisconsin, courteous, enterprising AAA offices, under the leadership of Stuart Wright, have been in the vanguard of encouraging greater safety, whether it is through the wonderful school safety patrol, or excellent driver training of youngsters and adults, or pedestrian protection, or other worthwhile programs.

GOOD RESULTS IN PEDESTRIAN PROTECTION

On this last point, fortunately, good progress can be reported in protecting pedestrians on our streets and highways.

Since 1937, Wisconsin pedestrian deaths decreased—I emphasize—decreased from 270 a year to 141 a year in 1955. Thus, pedestrian deaths dropped 48 percent, while motor vehicle registrations climbed 66 percent.

This shows that we can, indeed, improve protection of life and property.

One of the keys to this program is through better traffic engineering. The vast city of Milwaukee, in particular, has done an outstanding job in this respect. It handles huge numbers of shoppers, office workers, factory employees, and other folks walking along the streets—particularly in rush hours. It protects their lives, while keeping the wheels of traffic moving effectively. Our Milwaukee police are entitled to a salute for this record, just as are our hard-working police officers, sheriffs, highway patrolmen and other law enforcement protectors, throughout the State.

WARNING AS LABOR DAY WEEKEND APPROACHES

The approach of any holiday is, of course, a particular reminder of the need for highway safety. With Labor Day weekend coming up, it is especially important that every one of us bear in mind the importance of slowing down so as to save a life—including our very own.

The tragic fact is that in 1955, throughout the 48 States, motor vehicle accidents were the No. 1 killer. They killed 26,725 men, and 8,861 women. This is a greater number than the total of battle deaths in Korea, which was 33,629.

WE KILL MORE ON ROADS THAN DIED ON ALL BATTLEFIELDS

Further, the amazing facts are that more people have been killed by cars since the first auto appeared on the scene than have been killed in all the conflicts which we, as a nation, have waged.

Thus, from America's Revolutionary War through the Korean war, 1,130,000 Americans have been killed as a result of wars. But the National Safety Council reports that since 1900 alone, traffic accidents have taken 1,149,000 lives. Certainly, there is a statistic which every American should ponder. We actually have slaughtered more of our citizens on the highways than were killed by our enemies on the battlefield.

THE INTANGIBLE COSTS OF ACCIDENTS

The list of the killed is not, however, the only toll. Actually, in 1955, 1.3 million Americans were injured in some way from motor vehicle accidents.

Insurance experts may be able to compute the staggering direct cost of these injuries and fatalities. But they cannot compute the intangible costs—the inestimable heartbreak, the suffering, the pain, represented in that 1.3 million figure of the injured and the 38,000 death toll.

FROM WHITE HOUSE COME SAFETY APPEALS

It is understandable, therefore, why at all levels of government, we are redoubling our efforts for highway safety. From the White House, from State capitols, from county courthouses, from city halls, are coming renewed appeals for cooperation in protection programs.

I am particularly impressed with the fine job—the constructive theme—which has been emphasized by Presidential Assistant Howard Pyle, former Governor of Arizona. Speaking with the full support of our great Chief Executive himself, Governor Pyle has sounded a timely keynote to curb the ghastly toll on the highways.

STUDY BY HOUSE COMMERCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Meanwhile, a House of Representatives subcommittee, under the chairmanship of Congressman KENNETH ROBERTS is making very important studies on the safety factors in American cars themselves.

NEW 40,000-MILE SYSTEM WILL FURTHER SAFETY

Fortunately, under the new Federal-State highway system, as authorized just a few weeks ago, we are going to have a very important means to further highway safety.

My readers are well aware of the general provisions of the new $28 billion, 13-year program. Under it, Uncle Sam carries 90 percent of the cost in developing the 40,000-mile interstate highway system.

Some folks may not be aware that in section 117, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to make a full and complete study for the purpose of determining what action should be taken by the Federal Government to increase highway safety. The Secretary will submit a report to the Congress by March 1, 1959.

FINE GRASSROOTS LEADERSHIP FROM LOCAL OFFICIALS

Inherent in that section is the realization that Uncle Sam has a vital role to play. But it must never be forgotten that roads and road safety are basically a community job—a county job—in coperation with the officials of the 48 States.

I look, therefore, to Wisconsin's splendid highway department, and to our highway officials in the 71 counties of America's Dairyland for continued grassroots leadership.

WE ARE PROUD OF WISCONSIN ROAD OFFICIALS

We, of Wisconsin pride ourselves in our excellent road program. Our highway officials, including engineers, are numbered among the best in the Nation. Thanks to their foresight, our detailed plans were long ready for the new Federal-State program. Efficiency, honesty, reliability, have been the hallmarks of construction by our State and county highway departments and by private contractors.

Like other States, we could use a lot more engineers, of course. But we are certainly not caught short, the way some States are, in their highway plans. Under State Highway Commission Chairman Harold L. Plummer, we are moving full speed ahead, and we are planning for up-to-the-minute revisions, as fast as proves necessary.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS AFFECTING WISCONSIN

I should like to include now a summary of some of the principal features and advantages of the Wisconsin phase of the Federal-State highway program.

The interstate system in Wisconsin includes a route from the Illinois line straight

north into Milwaukee, a bypass around Milwaukee, a route west from downtown Milwaukee to Madison, a northwest route from the Illinois line near Genoa City to St. Paul, a route from Tomah on the west near La Crosse to Minnesota, and an extension from Duluth into Superior. A great share of the routes in Wisconsin will be built on new location. The total mileage has not been precisely determined, but it may reach nearly 500 miles. Milwaukee is the only city in Wisconsin with an interstate route through the heart of the city.

About 500 miles at a total cost of nearly half a billion in new work will call for additional common and skilled labor, new capital and equipment for contractors, and a large market for colcal sand, gravel, crushed rock. Oil and fuel to operate the machines will boost sales of local suppliers. The heavy industry in the State and the employment it provides will be enhanced by sales of highway construction equipment all over the Nation in addition to the sales for Wisconsin construction. Estimates have been made that this increase alone will amount to 200 to 300 percent in the peak years of the 13-year program for the National System of Interstate Highways. Milwaukee is the Nation's foremost center of manufacture for highway equipment.

Transportation will benefit the carriers as they bring in increased amounts of steel, cement, asphalts, products not generally originating in Wisconsin, and take out Wisconsin-made machinery and equipment for use in the rest of the country.

BENEFITS TO STATE WHEN COMPLETED

Manufactured products from Wisconsin centers of industry, Milwaukee, Waukesha, Racine, Kenosha, Eau Claire, Madison, La Crosse, Superior, will be in a better competitive position for out-of-State markets, as will the great Fox River Valley feeding into Milwaukee over an excellent new highway connecting there with the Interstate System. Excellent feeder roads, State and county trunks all along the I-system, will bring milk and dairy products into the I-system for faster arrival to out-of-State markets. Even now, Wisconsin ships more liquid out of the State by tank truck than is produced by the next three highest milk-producing States. Similar benefits will occur for pulp and paper products down from the central north.

The Interstate System will greatly enhance Wisconsin's position as a leading recreational State. The Interstate System passes through the Lake Geneva area, the Wisconsin Dells area, and skirts the bottom of the Indian Head country of northwest Wisconsin. Where the Dells, for example, is now about a 5- to 6-hour drive from Chicago, and varying greatly by congestion encountered depending on time and day chosen for the trip, Interstate System roads should cut this time by as much as 2 hours. Uniform speed, lower driving costs, much more comfortable travel with less strain, in addition to saving time, will bring many more tourists to Wisconsin attractions. The Northeast Lakeland, 200 miles away from the route of the Interstate, will greatly benefit from it to a marked degree, simply because Wisconsin will be so easily reached when the Interstate System is completed in the other States. More tourists will come, a lot more, and the excellent primary roads branching off from the interchanges on the Interstate System will bring many of these additional visitors into every part of the State.

Wisconsin roads now serving the areas to be reached by the Interstate System are the most congested in the State. Divided roadways planned for the Interstate System and limiting all access to interchanges a few blocks apart in Milwaukee to several miles apart in rural areas will eliminate much of the driving tension. Our own citizens using the Interstate System will get to work feeling fresher and will get home earlier and less tired from driving. Tourists will arrive relaxed. And with the Interstate System easily absorbing a great volume of the traffic in the State, the rest of our trunklines and local roads will be in a position to serve their normal traffic more efficiently.

On the Interstate System, sometime in 1957 will probably see the start of construction on a 60-mile section between Eau Claire and Hudson, and on a 26-mile piece between the Illinois line and Milwaukee.

Already under construction is a part of the Milwaukee expressways with more work to begin in 1957, and a portion of the Milwaukee-Madison leg in eastern Waukesha County.

WHY I AM COMMENTING IN THIS MUCH DETAIL

Let me point out that I am presenting these comments in this length because I feel that it is necessary that we take a truly broadgaged look at the whole highway scene.

SUPERHIGHWAYS ARE NOT ACCIDENT CURE-ALL

Let me mention, too, that superhighways in and of themselves are not accident cure-alls. A speedster who mistakenly thinks that he can casually operate at jet speeds along a 4-lane highway can be just as much of a danger as a man who has exaggerated notions of speed while operating on a limited 2-lane road.

Along superhighways there tend to be a considerable number of rear-end collisions, as cars attempt to overtake and pass other cars. There are accidents as well at entrances and exits to cloverleaf intersections. There are accidents, too, from following too closely behind the car in front of you—not realizing the enormous amount of space which you will require if you have to hit the brakes in an emergency.

At 40 miles per hour a car will go 44 feet between the time we see danger and the time we get our foot on the brake; then 84 additional feet to stop if our brakes are good. But at 70 miles per hour it will take 77 feet to get on the brakes, and then 256 more feet to stop. That is an enormous amount of driving room which we had better allow ourselves.

Wisconsin's speed limits—65 miles per hour in daytime and 55 miles per hour at night—will of course continue to be strictly enforced by our police departments, our sheriffs, and our judiciary.

BEWARE THE POOR CAR AND POOR DRIVER

Readers should note, too, that vehicles in poor driving condition—with bad brakes, improperly functioning headlights, and the like—are just as much of a menace or even more dangerous on a high-speed highway than on a less modern road.

And, of course, the negligent driver is a menace anywhere, particularly the man who has had "one too many." Alcohol and gasoline don't mix. The bleary-eyed fellow who mistakenly assures everybody, "I'm perfectly all right; I'm steady as a rock; I can stop on a dime—let's have another"—that fellow may end up in the hospital or morgue, and he may take some innocents with him as well.

Fortunately, Wisconsin's point demerit system should serve to rid us of that type of road menace by promptly denying him his license.

FULL COOPERATION NECESSARY

All in all, good roads are, therefore, an important device for greater highway safety, but they are not going, all by themselves, to solve the highway accident problem overnight.

Instead, we must all cooperate—every pedestrian, every driver—with city, county, State, and Federal officials, with fine organizations like the Wisconsin Council of Safety, the Wisconsin Division of the American Automobile Association, and others.

LANDSCAPING INCREASES ROAD BEAUTY

Fortunately, our improved highway system is going to contribute to our enjoyment of the beautiful Wisconsin countryside. This is especially important since tourism is Wisconsin's No. 2 industry. Along our estimated 483 miles of highways under the Federal-State system will be attractive trees and shrubbery. R. L. Williams, of Madison, State engineer of ways and landscaping with the highway commisison, estimates $200,000 is being spent yearly for roadside improvement work. Plantings along the roads not only furnish pleasant eye appeal, but help deaden noise and help screen homes and businesses from the rush of traffic.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AMERICAN CAR

Lastly, I point out that the American car remains as one of the key features of the American scene. The automobile has almost revolutionized American life, bringing untold benefits, economic and social. With 64 million vehicles already registered on the Nation's highways, it is inevitable that a safety problem results.

But in the years ahead, we are going to have 80 million, 90 million, and more vehicles—cars and trucks. We must, therefore, act now to establish sound patterns which will reduce the accident toll immediately, and in years up ahead.

Good highways are good business, and they are good protectors of life and limb, as well.

COOPERATION—FROM COUNTY TRUNKS TO SUPERHIGHWAYS

I pledge my continued cooperation with our highway experts—with the men striving to improve our road system, whether it be the smallest county trunk or the most modern four-lane superhighway.

A farmer transporting his goods to market, a vacationer heading for the muskies of the lake country, a truckdriver bringing in items for Wisconsin's thriving factories, a motorist commuting to work—all these are entitled to top roads and top protection.

Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the accomplishments in the 84th Congress of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman.

There being no objection, the report was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in reporting to you a year ago on the work of our committee in the 1st session of the 84th Congress I predicted that the 2d session, just concluded, would be busier and result in more legislation than the 1st session.

That prediction has been borne out. In fact, Mr. President, our committee has done about twice as much work this year as we did in the 1955 session. We reported to the Senate last year 46 measures as compared to 82 bills this year. The Senate passed 43 of our bills last year and approved 77 of them this year, while the President signed 24 of our bills last year and 71 this year.

Last year we held 21 days of open hearings in the full committee as compared to 65 days of such hearings this year, while our subcommittees in 1955 held open hearings on 30 days as compared to 84 days of such hearings this year. Here is a table showing exactly what we did in the 84th Congress:

Committee activities as of July 12, 1956

Number of bills (Senate and House), resolutions, and amendments referred to committee	295
Number of bills reported by committee	128
Number of bills passed by Senate	120
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	13
Number of Senate bills reported by House committees	63
Number of Senate bills passed House	59
Number of bills signed by President	95
Number of bills vetoed by President	1
Number of routine nominations referred to committee and confirmed	1,673
Number of major nominations referred to committee and confirmed	32
Number of executive meetings of full committee and subcommittees	56
Number of days of open hearings conducted by full committee	86
Number of days of open hearings conducted by subcommittees:	
Communications Subcommittee	4
Surface Transportation Subcommittee	8
Aviation Subcommittee	27
Merchant Marine Subcommittee	33
Subcommittee on S. 2060	1
Subcommittee on S. 2643	6
Subcommittee on Freight Car Shortage	5
Subcommittee on International Air Agreements	5
Subcommittee on Merchant Marine Training and Education	7
Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices	19
Total	114
Total	200

I would be remiss if I did not, first of all, extend my appreciation to the members of our committee for their fine cooperation during the past 2 years. Republicans and Democrats worked as a team and cooperated in producing the legislation that met your approval.

I especially want to tell the chairmen of our subcommittees of my gratitude for their unselfish cooperation in moving along the various bills which were referred to them. They worked long hours and participated in tedious study by our staff of the various bills until they were in shape to put before the full committee.

The Honorable JOHN A. PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, conducted most of the hearings on the bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, many of the hearings on the overall study of television as chairman of our Communications Subcommittee and advanced our 3-year study into the subject to the highest point we have yet reached. I conducted some of the hearings on each of these subjects.

The Honorable A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman of our Subcommittee on Aviation, deserves much credit for his work in the field of aviation. Under his skillful guidance, a legislative proposal, which I had the honor to cosponsor, reactivating our neglected airport program, was carried to a successful conclusion. And as chairman of a special Subcommittee on Automobile Marketing Practices, MIKE has been accorded nationwide recognition for the work he did which already has brought about voluntary changes in automobile marketing by the manufacturers that will benefit the dealers and the public.

The Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS, Democrat, of Florida, as chairman of our Surface Transportation Subcommittee, held long hearings on the trip-lease bill, his study of the International Air Agreements situation has had a beneficial effect for the Nation's airlines and his work with other transportation matters has been of great aid.

My own Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on and reported to you 66 bills which you approved.

We enacted much important legislation of which our committee is proud. We believe the bills we approved, and which the Senate and House enacted, will help ease the burdens of many of our Government agencies, solve conflicts in operations between the agencies and public, and provide safer air, truck, railroad, and shipping operations.

Mr. President, your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is proud of the fact that we initiated legislation, and are happy that you approved it, to construct a nuclear-powered merchant marine vessel. Congress approved a total of $22 million for construction of a specialy designed hull in which will be fitted a nuclear engine that will be designed under the auspices of the Atomic Energy Commission and bring the completed cost of this first step in peaceful use of the atom to more than $40 million.

When Congress approved this expenditure it made it possible for the United States to be the first country to put the atom to use in international commerce, and that will do more to encourage the peaceful use of atomic power than any step that has been taken. The cost is large, but, Mr. President, the experience and know-how this country will gain from building the ship and the engine will be worth far more in the future than the dollars it will cost.

My committee and I also are proud of the passage by the Congress and approval by the President of legislation we initiated to establish a sound and comprehensive policy to aid the Nation's fishing industry recover from administration neglect which has caused it to face ruin because of lack of needed aid and the free importation of fish which is in competition with products of our fishermen.

We, through congressional approval, have provided a revolving fund of $10 million from which loans can be made to fishermen, boatbuilders and processors. The good effects of this legislation, which sets up a new division within the Department of the Interior to supervise commercial fishing and encourage and aid sports fishing, will be enjoyed by fishing interests through the entire Nation and also will give our commercial fishermen high level representation in all international conferences affecting the fishing industry. The voice of our fishermen and their reaction to proposals for international agreements will be heard for the first time in future international negotiations.

Our legislation also provides for rehabilitating the Alaska salmon industry which has dropped to the lowest point in history because of neglect, overfishing, predators, and human indifference to the declining salmon runs. And, we hope, will bring new life to the Pacific tuna industry.

We reported favorably and you approved the trip-leasing bill, also a report urging construction of a second airport in the Nation's Capital where congestion in the present facility is becoming more dangerous each day. Our committee has repeatedly warned the administration officials that a serious disaster may occur at the National Airport unless prompt action to relieve the congestion. Enabling legislation authorizing and directing the Secretary of Commerce to construct this facility has been on the books since 1950.

Early in 1955, your committee reported out a resolution to establish a joint committee to study the air navigation facilities in the United States. This measure died in the House. Later, during hearings on a bill to make the CAA an independent agency, considerable evidence on this problem was heard. The committee staff attended the CAB hearing on the Grand Canyon crash, and we plan further inquiry into this whole navigation picture, looking to a system of navigation that will be geared to the jet age rather than the DC–3 age.

We also initiated the legislation to require the Civil Aeronautics Board to grant permanent certification for feeder airlines in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii. This legislation will enable the feeder lines to expand and provide better service for airminded American travelers.

The chairman of your committee also sponsored legislation which was enacted into law providing stiff penalties for the sabotage of airplanes, and for the elimination of fraud by radio aimed at fraudulent stock promotion schemes originating in foreign countries, also legislation to set up safety standards for the transportation of migrant farm workers. We also were successful in piloting through the Congress bills to construct new fish hatchery facilities in several States.

As a result of hearings held last fall on the west coast and Alaska, reports have been filed recommending numerous steps to be taken to assist Alaska and the west coast States with their transportation and fishery problems.

We took other important steps we hope will help alleviate the constant boxcar shortage which causes so much distress and loss to our grain growers and other shippers every year during harvest season. We will have more boxcar inspectors to expedite return of boxcars after they are unloaded. The Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads have promised their unstinted aid in this effort.

Mr. President, we have worked hard this year to try to solve the problem of better television service to the people of the Nation. The committee has felt such service is for the benefit of all of our citizens and we are determined that they get it.

After 3 years of work by your committee on the television subject, we are watching closely a proposal of the Federal Communications Commission which promises results, though it is expected to take as much as 7 or 8 years to make effective a program that will give good TV service to all parts of our Nation.

Our committee also has taken an active interest in the subject of international communications and probably will go thoroughly into this field in the next session of Congress.

The 84th Congress—It Emphasized Interest in People and Accomplished More Than Any Congress Since Social Security Was Passed Under F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is inventory time for the 84th, a Democratic Congress, as it adjourns. The U. S. News & World Report, certainly no Democratic organ, describes the 84th as "a Congress that did a lot." In the Democratic manner we put people ahead of other considerations. We put

America's welfare above all else. We approved 103 of President Eisenhower's 225 requests, but while we were highly cooperative, we knew when to say "No." The Democratic 84th Congress will be remembered for its enactments designed to help the average man and woman. Here are a few of them.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR WORKERS?

Minimum wages were raised from 75 cents to $1 per hour, over the Eisenhower suggestion of 90½ cents. Again, over his objections, we reduced from 65 to 62 the age at which women are eligible for social-security benefits and made the totally disabled eligible at age 50. We effected a pay raise for postal workers and for civil-service employees not in the top pay brackets.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR PUBLIC HEALTH?

We provided $90 million in grants to build medical research facilities in nonprofit institutions, over a 3-year period. We extended for 2 years the Hill-Burton Act, a hospital construction program, and authorized grants for training nurses and public-health specialists.

Provided $34½ million for polio vaccine.

Extended the Water Pollution Control Act and authorized $500 million to be spent in matching funds to help communities build sewage disposal plants, with a limit of $50 million per year.

WHAT WE DID FOR THE MILITARY AND OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

My committee in the House is Armed Services. In 1955 we passed the draft law which extended the Selective Service Act of 1948 until July 1, 1959. Authority to draft doctors was extended to July 1, 1957. In this day of a highly mechanized Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, career men as specialists are a downright first requisite. The 84th Congress provided pay increases ranging from 6 to 25 percent for career officers and enlisted men.

The Ready Reserve was authorized to reach a strength of up to 2.9 million men.

Established reserve obligations up to 11 years for men between 17 and 35, and authorized a new 6-month training program for up to 250,000 men between 17 and 18½.

The Defense Production Act was extended to June 30, 1958, which directed promotion of geographical dispersion of industry. This would prevent our Nation being taken out of a war by a well-aimed enemy bomb on Detroit, Philadelphia, or other strategic industrial center.

WHAT ABOUT THE FLOODS WHICH HAVE BEEN VISITING PENNSYLVANIA?

No conceivable engineering program could circumvent or give real alleviation to the floods which have devastated our area since we have lately been visited by hurricanes almost annually. It has been said that the huge volumes of waters which descend from the skies flow through the age-old channels which nature has carved out over the centuries. Insurance is the immediate answer. The 84th Congress passed S. 3732, authorizing a $7.5 billion Federal flood insurance and loan program.

The disaster-insurance rate was materially reduced.

WHAT DID WE DO FOR ROADS?

We passed a huge road building program after we rejected the Eisenhower plan which would have floated bonds and been costly to you and me but fine for the bankers. The 84th Congress authorized a roadbuilding program which will employ more than $30 billion in Federal-State funds over a 13-year period. Rather than the banker plan a modified pay-as-you go scheme will provide most of the costs through a tax on gasoline and other items purchased by the people who use the highways.

WHAT ABOUT THAT DELAWARE RIVER CHANNEL?

Delaware Valley, USA, is very much with us. Philadelphia is no longer just one of America's big cities. It is a center which projects into adjoining States and northward and westward and to its south. Modern personal and mass transportation have wiped out the municipal boundary lines, if not on the map, at least in influence.

So manifest is this to all, that both Republican and Democratic Members of the Philadelphia area joined in the fight to deepen the Delaware Channel to Trenton.

The Eisenhower administration took the unique view that the States affected and even private industry should share the cost. This plan was so unprecedented in our national history and Philadelphia was to be the guinea pig. Our national defense was involved along with the shipment of iron ore from Venezuela, sugar from Cuba and oil from many foreign nations. The 84th Congress refused to make an experimental laboratory of the Delaware River ports by forsaking its traditional responsibility for navigable rivers and harbors. We asked for $95 millions. We got $6 million which will start a 35-foot channel to Trenton. We had asked for 40 feet to take the large draft vessels of today.

It had been argued by the opposition that the channel was of particular benefits to the United States Steel at Morrisville. As a matter of fact, employment and small business throughout Delaware Valley are the beneficiaries. United States Steel interests us because it hires many workers, a number of them living in northeast Philadelphia. These deeper channels pay for themselves in bigger income tax returns and in customs collected at the ports. Sixty miles of waterfront will be opened for industries which will dot both sides of the Delaware now that raw materials can be delivered to dockside and the finished product shipped.

HOW DID THE 84TH, A DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS, DO IN FOREIGN POLICY?

Working with a Republican President and Secretary of State we demonstrated that we were American before we were Democratic and that politics ended at the shoreline. The records will show that we backed the Eisenhower foreign policy more completely than Members of his own party. This is because he followed the FDR-Truman line in foreign affairs.

In his quest for foreign aid, President Eisenhower was giving unspoken endorsement to the wisdom of the Marshall plan. When he showed an inclination to keep on arming Tito the 84th Congress balked. There was no inclination on the part of the 84th Congress to build Nasser's Aswan Dam on the Nile and thereby thwart our chances of selling cotton now stored in our warehouses. The 84th Congress had a feeling of "Love thy neighbor as thyself, but not more than thyself."

In an explosive age, the 84th gave full cooperation to the administration in foreign affairs. We have been a party of responsibility over the decades and participation is ingrained. Along with the late Senator Vandenberg, President Franklin D. Roosevelt set up the bipartisan foreign policy. Men like John Foster Dulles were given such high assignments as handling the Japanese Treaty. Other Republicans held high posts in the Department of State. This befitted the Government of a nation which believes utterly in the two-party system. It vanished in the past 4 years.

We have had Democratic cooperation without any visible Democratic participation. Democratic criticism of the administration's foreign affairs has been held to a minimum. But now we are in a campaign year and it is proper that the weaknesses of the Eisenhower-Dulles record be exposed in the national interest. Our foreign relationships have degenerated. Friends have become enemies. New dictatorships are on the rise. The Communist orbit is ever widening. The 1952 promises of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles have become mere words. America, the alleged world leader, itself suffers from lack of achieving leadership.

The Democratic 84th Congress has acted as an invaluable check on the Republican administration. Although we have not thwarted the legitimate measures proposed by the President he has been made ever mindful that the utmost scrutiny was being maintained by the 84th Congress in the best constitutional tradition of checks and balances. In the 1954 congressional elections he predicted a "cold war" if a Democratic Congress were elected. After the Nation elected a Democratic Congress he quickly apologized for the prediction. In many instances his measures would have failed of passage but for Democratic support.

DOES THE LACK OF PROSPERITY ON THE FARM AFFECT PHILADELPHIANS?

If you are old enough to remember President Hoover's administration, you know that depressions begin with lowered farm income, spotty unemployment like we have now, and an active and fluctuating stock market. These conditions existed through Harding and Coolidge and became the Hoover depression with accompanying apple selling and breadlines. President Eisenhower can well become the Coolidge of his day. As in the Coolidge administration we hear voices saying that the old order has passed and that a new era of endless economic expansion is at hand. How remindful of the same Polyanna phrases uttered when the Harding and Coolidge administrations set up the suffering under Hoover. Economic laws are immutable. Big business spawned the Hoover panic with "the new era talk." That same big business came, hat in hand, to F. D. R. to be bailed out.

When farmers' incomes are greatly reduced, as they have been under Eisenhower, less Philco radios and TV sets and washers and refrigerators are sold. Fewer Exide batteries are purchased. Smoke does not issue from stacks along Lehigh and Allegheny Avenues. Merchants on Frankford and Kensington and Germantown Avenues sell less and maybe go out of business. And all of this could have had its beginning on the farms of Kansas or Nebraska or California. Such is the interdependent nature of our national economy. The causes should be stopped before they ruin our national business health.

HAVE THE INVESTIGATIVE BODIES OF THE 84TH CONGRESS ACTED AS A CHECK ON THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION TO THE BENEFIT OF THE NATION?

Decidedly yes. The Dixon-Yates grab was identified despite White House secrecy. An executive of the First Boston Co., due to finance the Memphis Power & Light Utility in the TVA orbit, was found to be simultaneously the Budget Bureau adviser. This "conflict of interest" was disclosed and the deal was called off when the city of Memphis decided to build its own utility. Many of us liken this attempt to the infamous Teapot Dome scandals of the Harding administration. Alert investigation by the 84th Congress killed Dixon-Yates before it got completely off the ground.

The numbers game that was played with Federal employees, alleged to be guilty of Communist affiliations, was exposed by the 84th Congress. Disclosure of the political racket of Red hunting began with the Army-McCarthy hearings. It was carried over by the Eisenhower administration to prove that many dangerous subversives were hired by the Truman administration. Various numbers of "guilty" employees were said to have been discharged from Government service. The 84th Congress revealed that some of these had resigned for various reasons, in no way associated with Communist connections. Many were just plain, ordinary alcoholics. Most were in jobs that were in no way sensitive, such as doing clerical work for the Veterans' Administration. Records were being faked to support false political premise, heard much in the 1952 elections. Reputations were being sacrificed on the altar of political expediency. The Eisenhower security program proved to be too much for his Republican appointee, former Senator Cain. He resigned rather than be a part of making a political football of our Nation's security.

No Congress in these crisis years could accomplish all it hoped for. The greatest disappointment was the failure of the school construction legislation which became ensnarled with the segregation problem. Both of these issues have had their trial run in the 84th and will be met and decided as a result of these preliminaries.

The Egyptian crisis over the Suez Canal has been developed by urging Britain to withdraw her troops. The only democracy in the vital Middle East, Israel, has been treated like a stepchild. Nasser has said that he stands ready to shed the last drop of Egyptian blood. Hitler was just as generous with German blood. These little Caesars run to a pattern. What Chamberlain was to Hitler, Dulles without an umbrella has been to Nasser. The Eisenhower-Dulles team has practiced the art of losing friends. Massive retaliation talk had scared nobody. There are about 30 depressed areas in Pennsylvania. When you hear "peace and prosperity," have your mind stray to the Suez Canal and to the many unemployed in the textile and coal industries in our State. The people out of work are our people. The Democratic Party always puts its emphasis on people.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank here and now the people I represent in the House of Representatives. They have sent me to Congress five times. Most of them realize that being a Congressman is as much a business as any other calling and that there is no substitute for experience.

In the words of the poet:

A man must serve his time at any trade save censure.
Critics all are ready made.

Report to the 15th Congressional District of Ohio on the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, in these final hours of the 84th Congress, I wish to review some of the legislative actions which are regarded as especially important to the people of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio and to discuss as well some of the things which I have done in pursuance of their interests in Washington.

The 15th District is composed of Guernsey, Monroe, Morgan, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, and Washington Counties. In representing the people of these counties in the Nation's Capital it is necessary to argue for or against legislative proposals which will be of benefit or harmful to them and to the Nation. It is also necessary to represent their interests in the interpretation of existing laws and regulations by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. In this regard I have received several thousands of communications from individuals and groups seeking aid during the past 2 years. In pursuing these matters with all the vigor at my command, it has been a source of great satisfaction to me that I have been able to render assistance in many instances.

INDUSTRIALIZATION

One of the most distressing problems in southeastern Ohio has been the need to attract new industries to provide greater job opportunities and to stimulate improved economic conditions throughout the seven counties. This requires cooperative action in Washington with local groups seeking to reverse the three-decade trend whereby we have not prospered in accordance with the growth or prosperity of the rest of the country. I pledged 2 years ago to assist these groups in every possible way.

As a first step early in 1955, I requested that the Department of Labor classify all of the counties of the 15th District so that official recognition could be made of the unemployment situation there and to enable our area to take advantage of the Federal Government's program to encourage industrial development through the placement of Government contracts in such areas and the construction of defense plants in regions suffering high, chronic unemployment. Unless this official classification was made, our area could not participate in such special programs regardless of how much employment actually existed. Early in January 1955 only Perry County was accorded these privileges.

The 15th District was not regularly surveyed because none of the so-called "labor market areas" within it possessed sufficient population to meet the standards for regular classification which had been established by the Department of Labor. A special request was required.

In due course, all seven counties were found to have unemployment exceeding 6 percent of the available labor force and were accorded special privileges with relation to defense contracts. This also conferred upon the seven counties a great new advantage since companies which would construct plants that the Government deemed essential to national defense would be given special Federal tax privileges.

Under this labor classification, the Olin-Mathieson Chemical Corp. investigated the advantages of a Monroe County site and elected to locate its huge new integrated aluminum plant there. This $120 million plant marking the entry of Olin-Mathieson into the aluminum industry has immense economic implications for the entire 15th District. It will provide the basic aluminum metal which will be the source of supply for many new aluminum fabricating plants which will locate throughout our area. I have also been assured that Olin-Mathieson's present plans include a vast expansion of its facilities in Monroe County even before construction of the first plant is completed.

With a general pattern of industrial expansion developing in Cambridge, Zanesville, Marietta, and in all of the seven counties, actual and prospective employment opportunities have received a tremendous impetus.

In recognition of this fact, new labor surveys made by the Department of Labor late in 1955 resulted in the finding that unemployment in our seven counties had decreased markedly and that the region no longer suffered sufficient unemployment to justify a distressed labor area classification.

Despite these findings, I believed that some small areas in the 15th District might still deserve special consideration for advantages provided under Defense Manpower Policy 4, especially where classifications of several counties into one labor area might prove to be unrealistic. Therefore, several months ago, I began a series of conferences with the Department of Labor and the Office of

Defense Mobilization pertaining to this issue. As a result of my representations, I am informed that Defense Manpower Policy 4 will be amended shortly to permit certification largely at the State level of counties not regularly classified. This will allow tax amortization privileges for new defense plants. The amendment will be of benefit to our own area as well as to others in the Nation.

I am continuing my efforts to call the attention of American industry to the advantages of locating new plants in the 15th district. At this time I am in contact with over 50 corporations in carrying out this program.

PROTECTING LOCAL INDUSTRIES

Unemployment in the 15th district has traditionally resulted from the effects of our trade policies allowing low tariffs on the products of cheap foreign labor. This is particularly true in our potteries, glass plants, coal mines, and tile manufacturing plants. I, therefore, opposed the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts before the Ways and Means Committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. Although the act was extended last year, opposition to low tariff policies is growing in the Congress.

I also opposed H. R. 5550, the bill which would have permitted the United States to join an international organization known as the Organization for Trade Cooperation. This move would have, in effect, delegated much of the control over United States tariffs to the international organization. Fortunately, the opposition to this measure, although small at first, gathered strength in the Congress, and because of this fact the bill was never brought to the floor of the House, although it received the approval of a majority of the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

I have also undertaken a survey to learn the specific effects of foreign imports on our pottery, glass, tile, and coal industries. With this information, I intend to dramatize the need for greater tariff protection for these industries.

DILLON DAM

Two years ago, I pledged to work for the resumption of construction of the Dillon Dam on the Licking River above Zanesville. This dam was intended to provide the final link in the comprehensive flood control plan for the Muskingum River Valley. After an expenditure of nearly $9 million, work on the dam has been stalled since 1950. No funds were requested from the Congress by the Corps of Engineers to continue the construction because of strong local opposition near the site of the dam. In the meantime, the flood threat to Zanesville and the Muskingum Valley persisted.

With the excellent cooperation of the people of the Muskingum Valley and of both of our Senators, we were successful this year in obtaining an appropriation of $1.5 million to resume construction. I am now informed by the Corps of Engineers that with this expression of congressional approval, it will press for funds to complete this valuable project at the earliest practicable date.

MUSKINGUM CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

This year a levy of special assessments against thousands of residents of the Muskingum Conservancy District would have been required had the Federal Government not made its final payment on the United States' debt for properties in the District acquired many years ago. No appropriation request for this purpose was contained in the Federal budget. Therefore, with Congressman FRANK T. BOW, representing Ohio's 16th District, we were able to prevail upon the Bureau of the Budget to submit a request to Congress for a supplemental appropriation of $425,000 to pay this debt to the Conservancy District this year. The appropriation was approved by the Congress and the President and the payment is now being made. Thus, a special levy on landowners in the Muskingum Conservancy District was prevented.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

The need for better airport facilities and air transportation service is vital to the increased requirements of air traffic developing in the 15th District. This year, I was able to obtain approval for the construction of two new radio navigation facilities important for safer and better air navigation in bad weather. These omni-range radio stations will be built at a cost approaching $100,000 by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce. One will be built at Newcomerstown to direct planes flying over the District. The other is to be built at the Zanesville airport to provide safer instrument landings for planes there.

Unsatisfactory routes of the commercial airline serving the Zanesville airport have been an annoyance and inconvenience to residents of the district. To assist Lake Central Airlines in its efforts to gain approval of more favorable routes from the Federal Government, I recently appeared before the Civil Aeronautics Board to urge that it approve Lake Central's application to extend its route to operate from Zanesville to Erie, Pa. It is my understanding that the Board is favorably disposed toward this application.

LOW INCOME FARMERS

Although I was anxious for the passage of soil bank legislation, the elimination of agricultural surpluses, and the other means recommended by the President for dealing with the immediate problem of low market prices for farm commodities, I strongly supported the President's program for raising the income levels for family farmers. This program was long-range in character, yet it contained much which would be of benefit to southeastern Ohio. It involves a concentrated effort, using the resources of the Department of Agriculture to help farmers in low income areas to help themselves. The program did not receive the approval of Congress until this year—and then only half-heartedly, but the Department had already undertaken those parts of it which did not require Congressional action.

I urged the selection of counties of the 15th District where experiments in the rural development program could go forward and I was pleased that Monroe County was finally selected as the only such "pilot" county in Ohio. Within the near future, I understand that another county in the district may be selected for this program.

GENERAL LEGISLATION

Our seven countries are vitally affected in some way by virtually every legislative proposal before the Congress. Therefore, I believe the record of this Congress is of keen interest to southeastern Ohio. This record seems to me to be one which can be regarded with mixed feelings. It has accomplished much which will aid and assist the people of southeastern Ohio. Other legislation has not been favorable or has been disproportionately costly.

In casting my vote on the many issues brought before he House in these 2 years, I have carefully weighed each proposal against my convictions that the Federal Government must be responsive to the needs of the people. At the same time, I believe the vitality of local and State government has waned in this country. I have opposed the further absorption by the Federal Government of the proper rights and privileges of local and State Government. I believe we can best pursue our goal of a dynamic democracy operating for the common good if a maximum number of governmental functions are carried out at the level most responsive to the will of the electorate. Where all citizens are accorded the right to vote without undesirable obstructions, the local and State levels are, by all odds, the proper and most responsive forums for the expressions of people's will.

Our Federal Government has in the past several decades swelled to colossal proportions. Too often, there has been a costly tendency in the country to look to Washington for many decisions which could be better made in each of the 48 States. This tendency has been expensive and is directly related to high Federal taxes and the astronomical national debt. The past 4 years have seen an encouraging reversal of this process which I believe is very much in the interest of all of our people. The national budget has been balanced through effective management and favorable fiscal policies without sacrificing the services our citizens receive from their Government in Washington. With this, a relatively small but notable reduction in the national debt has been made. If such balances continue, we can justify needed tax reductions which will affect all our people. On the other hand, policies wihich cause us to spend ourslves into even greater debt will delay the day when taxes can be safely reduced. Every dollar spent by the Federal Government must eventually come out of the pockets of our citizens into the hands of the tax collectors.

DEFENSE AND FOREIGN AID

Our largest single expenditure has been the cost of maintaining our arsenal of defense in readiness should we need to defend ourselves. In 2 years, the 84th Congress has appropriated over $66 billion for this purpose. The foreign-aid

program received a total of almost $6.5 billion in these 2 years.

In the belief that the defense of the United States is the paramount consideration of our time, I supported the defense appropriations bills as they were referred to the House of Representatives. I did not support the foreign aid bills since I am convinced that this decade-long program requires redefinition to prevent the kind of free spending that has characterized it in the past. If aid is given to countries abroad by the American taxpayers, I believe we must be assured that we are investing in genuinely friendly countries who are sincerely anti-Communist, but who lack the means to defend themselves from Red encroachment. We cannot buy friendship abroad and our tax dollars are too urgently needed by our people at home to try to scatter funds over the globe to assist foreign nations in ill-defined programs of dubious or indirect value to the United States.

HIGHWAY ACT

The Federal Highway Act of 1956 was one of the outstanding bills passed in this Congress and will provide badly needed highways for our Nation over the next decade. This costly program will be paid for through added gasoline taxes on motor vehicle operators who will receive the greatest benefits from the new highway sytem. I supported this legislation.

SOCIAL SECURITY

The broadening of social security benefits this year will aid many citizens of the 15th District, particularly as it will apply to benefits for disabled persons at age 50 and to women at age 62.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN'S LEGISLATION

Legislation extending the World War II home loan provisions of the GI bill and the extension of medical care to dependents of servicemen were among several notable pieces of legislation enacted in this Congress. All laws relating to the service-connected disability or death compensation for servicemen, veterans, and their survivors were also simplified and codified for the first time. Legislation to provide pensions for World War I veterans and increased compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities was enacted by the House of Representatives but was not considered by the Senate.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A similar fate overtook the civil rights legislation recommended by the President when the Senate failed to act after the passage of a bill to guarantee civil rights by the House of Representatives.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The Federal aid for school construction bill was defeated in the House. I opposed this measure because I am convinced that Ohio's need for new and better schools should be taken care of in Ohio. I believe we should not invite Federal interference in our school system. We can maintain control over our schools and obtain a 100 percent return on the money we spend for them. Under this bill, Ohio taxpayers would have paid heavily increased Federal taxes and, in return, would have received back far less than its investment in the Federal program.

We need new school buildings, but I believe we must meet this problem at home. We must pay for the schools either way, but we shall lose much if we send our money to Washington first to have it returned to us in lesser amounts and with Federal strings attached.

COMMITTEE WORK

In my work as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, a great number of measures were considered. A total of 685 bills and resolutions were referred to the committee. Over 350 were considered either in whole or in part. Ninety-six hearings were held and eight investigative reports published. Forty-four bills were favorably reported, 38 of which became law.

The committee's work, among other things, resulted in a new classification and pay system for the postal field service, the rewriting of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the readjustment and rewriting of laws relating to the pay of Federal workers, and a new postal-rate bill.

Investigations by the committee have resulted in strengthening Federal Civil Service procedures and the stricter control on eliminating obscene and objectionable literature from the mails. In cooperation with departments and agencies, the work of the Manpower Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has resulted in recommendations for better utilization of Federal employees which will lead to reductions in the Federal payroll estimated at $500 million annually.

Sundry Articles by George H. Todt, from the Valley Times, of North Hollywood, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following articles by George Todt, which appeared in the Valley Times, of North Hollywood, Calif.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Valley Times of September 22, 1955]

DOG-EAT-DOG CREED

(By George H. Todt)

PRODUCTION, PROSPERITY, AND PHILOSOPHY

How America needs philosophy to accompany her material greatness and wealth in all categories.

We are rich in goods, and yet poor in matters of the spirit; we are smart with technical know-how but we do not possess great wisdom as a people; we have more leisure time on our hands than any other people in history, and still we do not know what to do with ourselves.

Our young people prance off to the schools to be taught; few ever learn to think properly for themselves.

The older ones try to find solace in their churches and temples, their synagogues and mosques; how many of them know any longer what to believe of modern spiritual values in our rapidly changing world today?

Some 65 millions of workers in the prime of life turn the wheels of our mighty capitalistic system of free enterprise throughout the week for 40 hours; they wonder what to do with themselves to escape boredom when they return to their homes at night.

It used to be said that the work of woman was never done, but that was before automation; now many must desperately seek out companionship in various clubs, charities, and elsewhere just to escape having time on their hands they do not want.

Television and radio sometimes help to alleviate the boredoom for the ladies; but the latter, being intelligent, and windy commercials being what they are—perhaps the least said about this the better.

The fact remains that, for whatever the reasons, we have more for ourselves of material things of life than any other people in all of history and more leisure time to develop our latent talents and potentialities—and, comparatively speaking, perhaps the least amount of happiness to go with it.

For we have become a grasping, not a happy, people. The only philosophy we seem to have developed in the middle of the 20th century is that of "dog eat dog." Many segments of our population appear to be at least partially frustrated, or even neurotic at times. Where much is given, much is expected; and modern Americans have not lived up to their great expectations.

What we must achieve is a mighty American philosophy to keep pace with our materialism if we hope to achieve a rightful balance for ourselves. It will not be perceived in the number of newly raised churches alone or in increased counts of attendance; for many attend church services in routine fashion and never perceive God's handiwork upon the earth. Nor will blind, unthinking protestations of faith constitute the philosophy we must seek; the former will be accepted by religion, with which I am in accord, but philosophy is different from religion.

"The glory of God is intelligence," is a religious maxim I have always believed in, and certainly, above all else, is this true in the realm of any great future philosophy Americana so necessary to be created for our future greatness as a leader of civilized nations upon the earth.

The twin cornerstones of such a new force ought to be firmly rooted in the concept of eternal progression for the American people, the latter to become a living symbol of inspiration and enlightened progress throughout the world. And the driving force behind it should be the Golden Rule, but intelligently applied through love instead of fear; voluntary methods rather than compulsion; free agency of mankind in lieu of enslavement or exploitation in any form.

Our aim should be to develop our intelligence, standard of living, morals, ethics, religious concepts, and other forms of conduct by which a great people are to be measured by future historians. To production and prosperity we must also add philosophy.

Attention to these three P's will insure American dominance in the world of culture and civilization as we know it today.

[From the Valley Times of September 26, 1955]

CAPITALISM'S FRUITS

(By George H. Todt)

NO OTHER SYSTEM DOES SO WELL

What do we usually think about at the mention of the word "capitalism"?

There are few terms in this country which are less understood by the majority of our people. This is mainly the result of misinformation and propaganda.

The extreme liberals and New Dealers have caused many of our people to wrongly assume that it is a system which has exploited the masses and created profits only for the few.

They would also have us believe that big government is responsible for all our social and economic gains. This is as completely untrue as the rest of the Socialist blarney which emanated many years ago from the twisted mind of Karl Marx—a false prophet of the first magnitude.

The real and actual truth is that capitalism is the only economic system in history to raise up the masses from the squalor of mediocrity and filth. It has given the American people the highest individual standard of living this world has ever known.

Instead of being ashamed of it, we should be proud—indeed, we should be jealous—of this great key to our present material riches and progress. Where else but in America is there so much of the goods of life for so many people.

Oh, certainly, exceptions to the rule may be found at nearly every hand. Instances of injustice do prevail in certain quarters. But take it from one who has spent 6 years abroad in Western Europe, there is really no place like home.

Actually, none of the Socialist states can even begin to approach us in the amounts of consumer goods which we produce and distribute to our people. We are the unabashed envy of all Western Europe—considered next to the United States in the overall per capita standard of living—and the Communist world behind the Iron Curtain is left far behind and gasping for air in comparison.

This is not intended to be disparaging of the European peoples, who do not live entirely by bread alone. Their lives have been enriched by their devout religious attitudes, and contrary to some prevalent notions, they are extremely attached to each other in their wholesome family relations, which are filled with love and respect, and are quite wholesome over the long haul.

But in the realm of economic competition between slothful socialism of the European variety and modern enlightened American capitalism—it is strictly no contest.

The record is the best evidence. When did we call for Socialist aid the last time in banking circles? Or anywhere else? And how often have the Socialists called on us?

[From the Valley Times of September 29, 1955]

WHO INCITES LABOR?

(By George H. Todt)

STIRRERS-UPPERS ARE ALIENS

Healthy American capitalism is built upon a basic foundation of respect and good will between capital and labor.

And that is where we part company with the mad rantings of Karl Marx who preceded us just a century in time. His socialist doctrine was predicated upon the war to the death within the capitalistic society of its two component parts—with the oppressed masses of laborites eventually springing in open rebellion against capital and management along the lines of the 1917 October Revolution in Russia.

Nothing like that ever happened in America.

In the first place, labor is not oppressed. In the second place, labor is not considered to be "the masses" in the United States. Here a workingman considers himself the equal of anyone, and to call him "downtrodden" might invite a punch in the nose. As a matter of arithmetic, the typical laborer in our country probably possesses more creature comforts and consumer goods than the lesser nobility of those nations outside our borders. Downtrodden, indeed.

The reason our American brand of capitalism never evolved along the lines erroneously predicted by Marx was simply this: here we recognized that capital and labor had to work in harmony and pull together over the long haul. Just as a mother and father are both needed to make a family work in wholesome manner, so are capital and labor necessary in the same sense if capitalism is to work successfully.

The simple fact that our present system has produced 52 percent of the wealth of the world for just seven percent of its population speaks more eloquently for our kind of capitalism than millions of words of blarney cooked up by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Aneurin Bevan and Norman Thomas in defense of slothful socialism. The latter looks seductive enough on paper, but falls down in just one all-important area: results on the line.

We would do well to consider that much of the trouble between capital and labor in this country during previous times has been stirred up by persons with selfish axes to grind. Many of these are of foreign birth, who have arrived lately to plague us with the untidy economic philosophies of Europeanism. Surely we want none of the nonsense they have brought to our shores.

Why should we trade away our capitalistic system which has made us the richest people in the world? And for what would we trade it? Only the economic backwardness of the European Socialists whose world affairs have so disintegrated and gone downhill that we must support many of them today by our taxes.

But such obvious facts seldom faze our do-gooders with their predilections for the great unwashed and antipathies for anything obviously made in America—such as our new kind of capitalism. The weird voices of the former are constantly being raised in favor of socialism, alias Europeanism, and their subtle, powerful forces behind the scenes do all in their ability to push us willy-nilly over the brink.

Despite the cunning of the Socialist travelers in the United States, the American people still recognize capitalism as being the key to our vast material riches and progress. They have no intention of trading it for a Socialist mess of economic pottage, no matter what the blandishments.

Joe Doakes is a pretty solid guy, and he knows full well that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad—and we would be little less than this if we foolishly imagined the grass on the other side was greener.

[From the Valley Times of November 30, 1955]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: GOOSE-STEPPING TO LABOR BOSSES

"No personal consideration should stand in the way of performing a public duty." (Ulysses S. Grant.)

Is the American economy destined to become the captive of selfish labor bosses who abuse the right to strike in order to promote their grasping schemes?

I think it is criminal to stop production of goods and services—which belong to all the American people—so that a few prima donnas may play their private brand of politics at our expense.

When the public reads that 1600 teamsters have been goose-stepped off their jobs in the present Los Angeles rock strike—is it also realized that 100,000 other related workers are simultaneously affected in their work, as well? That little contractors are being forced out of business? That this questionable action is seriously interfering with the entire economy of southern California? That vast numbers of innocent citizens are being made to suffer as selfish labor bosses use blackjack tactic to acquire a political war chest for themselves?

Why do these men need a political war chest in the first place? Why do they need more power when they already have too much? Are they, in truth, attempting to buy their way to a Socialist-Labor dictatorship over their fellow citizens? This is something which every thinking citizen should ask himself these days. For all too often the bosses reveal their predilection for Marxist methods, and some even effect a "made in Moscow" look at politics.

The truth is simply this: most American's don't want to be blackjacked into union domination against their will. Only some 18 millions of the entire labor force in the United States is union; almost 50 millions are not. Obviously those who are not in unions do not care to be in them. On the other hand, many who are have been placed in their unhappy union lot by force under the heaviest economic pressure and duress. They would come away in many cases if they could. These unfortunates are captive Americans who are held in an involuntary form of bondage which they bitterly resent—but can do nothing about it which is effective enough to free themselves from their chains at this time.

Now it is stupid to call ourselves the land of the free and the home of the brave as long as we abjectly submit to gangster techniques which cause our people to be enslaved by a few cunning schemers who manipulate the great American economy for their private political football.

Let me make my position clear: I am in favor of voluntary associations and unions where men come together in good faith to promote better working conditions and increased productivity. I think that where a union is exemplary in its practices and honestly diligent in its work in behalf of its members, it ought to be a privilege to join one if in that line of work. But the moment that any union is so bereft of moral wherewithal to appeal to American citizens without bringing an economic blackjack into play—that is where we part company in our affection, the union and I.

The unions are now violating the spirit of the Sherman Antitrust Act; it requires an amendment.

The idea of labor bosses extorting funds from employers, ostensibly as pensions or GAW but which may ultimately wind up for use as political power, is utterly reprehensible on the face of it. If the American people cannot come to their senses enough to see the handwriting on the wall at this time, they will deserve their eventual fate.

It will not be long in coming under these totalitarian bosses. The first thing they will do is to chuck our Bill of Rights right out the window. And then goodby to our Republic.

[From the Valley Times of December 1, 1955]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: TOWARD STOPPING OF STRIKE WALKOUT

"The wise man sees in the misfortunes of others what he should avoid." (Syrus.)

There is no more heinous crime against the economy of a nation than to wastefully curtail production of goods and services by means of a ruinous strike walkout.

The consequent loss of production can never be made up again. It is lost for all time—goofed away, as it were, because tyrannical methods were used somewhere along the line, without benefit of reason or common sense.

The effects of a strike walkout are much more far reaching than may appear from the first symptoms. Our complex economy in the United States is irremediably bound up into vast interlocking patterns of interdependent groups of capital, labor, and management. They must work together as a smooth-functioning team, and there is no room on this kind of a team for prima donnas.

The American free-enterprise system is incapable of comparison with the radical, reactionary, and revolutionary false concepts of Socialist Karl Marx 100 years ago. This doctrinaire envisaged capitalism as a ravenous monster which exploited the common people for the benefit of an uncommon few. He could not have foreseen the extraordinary and progressive development of American capitalism into a remarkable instrument which has benefited our people more than any other in the history of the planet. For workers are the most numerous capitalists in the United States today.

Never before in this world of ours has any other economic system fed, clothed, housed, and entertained so many millions of people quite so well. We are now the unparalleled envy of the balance of the earth, thanks to American capitalism and free enterprise. Results on the line indicate the latter has more than paid its way with us.

What has been the secret of this American dream of progress come true? What has given us the greatest technological advances and consumer economy in 5,000 years of recorded history? How can we account for the fact that American workers have more real goods of life than the lesser European nobility and all except the wealthiest aristocrats of Asia and Africa?

The answer to our obvious consumer superiority lies in the fact that we have produced and distributed more goods and services than anyone else. Mass production and superb transportation comprise a portion of the magic formula, but even more important is the overpowering personal initiative and incentive provided our people just by living in America and breathing its distinctively hallowed air of freedom of choice, equality of opportunity, individual liberty and dignity of the human soul.

Labor, capital, and management have all contributed their full shares in the past to the unique American free enterprise system, and their tremendous team play up to now has resulted in making us fabulously rich and powerful beyond the expectations of the founding fathers. This intelligent teamplay must continue in the future, or we shall all be the loser for our short-sightedness in allowing one of these three great component parts of the equation to engulf the other two at the expense of the American people.

At the moment, the gravest danger is coming from the direction of certain authoritarian and power-mad labor bosses who are presently attempting to high-pressure, blackjack, and otherwise extort funds from union members and management alike. This is an open and brazen attempt to create an all-powerful political machine for themselves in the future. Theirs is largely a self-anointed leadership which is vastly resented in the ranks of labor, and often even by those they purport to represent.

They are perfectly willing, these few willful men, to cause untold suffering and misery to the entire American people by their unprincipled usage of the wasteful strike walkout—a crime of studied cruelty and contempt against our production economy—in order to gain their selfish and tyrannical way.

And we, the people, are the collective American "fall guy" for their selfish schemes. Isn't it time we spoke up at long last? Or are we the stupid cattle they imagine us to be?

Frankly, I think the strike walkout is too vicious and wasteful to be allowed to continue.

Let labor and management wrangle to their heart's content, let them argue, let them rail against each other, let them arbitrate if they will—but both sides have a far greater duty than merely to themselves even while they are still at odds with each other. That greatest duty is to continue to serve the American people who have come to depend upon them both, the people who are not part to their quarrels. Why should the innocent be hurt? And "the innocent" means us.

Those segments of labor and management which cannot accept such overriding responsibility to the people of this Nation should not be in business in the first place.

If they are not grownup enough to settle their fair differences in honest labor arbitration courts—while needed production continues unabated as they hassle—then there is no room for such self-centered prima donnas in the American economy today, and they should be displaced.

The intelligent Japanese people have previously provided a new precedent for labor disputes. They have had strikes—but no walkouts while the actual strike was going on. Production continued just the same as before, while the arguments were being heard. Results obtained were quite as satisfactory as where cruder methods had been used previously. And the blameless citizens who did not make the strike conditions in the first place were not caused to suffer. We presently need some forthright legislation for a fact-finding agency that will cause some sort of reason to be recognized and respected by those who employ gangster methods selfishly against the American people to feather their own nests.

Why delay any longer in this crucial matter which affects us all?

[From the Valley Times of December 2, 1955]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: UN-AMERICAN TACTICS OF LABOR BOSSES

"Nothing is politically right which is morally wrong." (Daniel O'Conell.)

If eager Walter Reuther and others of his stripe continue to push their plans toward an arbitrary labor dictatorship over the American people—perhaps a new kind of Hatch Act will become necessary to restrain their unusually selfish ambitions.

It is not merely the fact that the AFL and CIO have accomplished a merger which is the cause for alarm. Mergers are legal enough, providing they do not become monopolies. It is quite another matter, and one which calls for a thorough legislative study of certain insidious implications for our future as citizens with inalienable rights.

I am referring to the multimillion dollar political war chests which labor leaders have amassed for themselves from union dues of individual members, regardless of whether the latter wished to contribute for partisan political purposes or not.

This is a potentially dangerous and un-American situation. For the labor bosses, New Dealers all, expect to expand their forcefully extracted millions to elect handpicked puppets in the Democratic Party of the future. And in sizable enough lots to seize control of the Government. This they have announced publicly by inference and action. In fact, it is not much of an open secret any longer that Walter Reuther is aiming for the Presidency of our Nation by 1960 on a revised "Socialist-Labor" ticket. It will simply be the old extreme "liberal" New Deal Democratic Party revised, resuscitated and restored, albeit largely warmed over. If necessary, strong-arm tactics will be used to force the rank and file of labor into line.

The reason I have labeled this selfishly ambitious movement as potentially un-American is for this obvious reason: fully 40 percent of labor in the United States belongs to the GOP, if not more, today. And Walter Reuther, or any other self-seeking Democrat labor boss, has a lot of brass to force money from a Republican labor man and pay it out to Democratic candidates at his own personal discretion. I consider this, when carefully analyzed, to be a form of political extortion.

Many of us have been forced to join unions against our will—or our families might not eat. I have been in such a position in the past, and did not then complain at my lot. But as a working member of the Republican Party, I bitterly resent the thought of Reuther or anybody else, causing one penny of my blood money to be turned over for socialistic New Deal purposes. Particularly for political electioneering of which I do not approve.

Frankly, I am indignant about such a brazen movement on the part of the labor bosses, and I think every Republican ought to demand his political rights shall be observed by these fawning, grasping New Deal apologists. If such is not to be the case, then it is time that legislation was passed at the earliest moment to insure the right of every American citizen not to be compelled to pay into the kitty of the opposite political party of his own persuasion.

If the labor bosses wish to part with some of their untold and unlisted millions held out from the workers' dues, then they should be absolutely required to submit their allocation directly to the national finance committees of the respective political parties—and, based on a proportionate head count within the ranks of labor, itself, let them apportion "X dollars for X number" for each party. And it should be presented with no political strings attached.

For no organization under the American system has any moral right whatsoever to force money from its members and then permit its leadership element to contribute secretly to personal political deals of their own making. This is simply tyranny of the smelliest kind, and it doesn't belong in the United States of America.

[From the Valley Times of December 21, 1955]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: EVERY MAN'S CHOICE OF FREEDOM

"Arbitrary power is most easily established on the ruins of liberty abused to licentiousness."—(George Washington.)

As long as we hold our freedoms dear to us, how can we do otherwise than insist upon the right of freedom of choice for every man to join—or not to join—a labor union according to his honest conscience in the matter?

Can we love liberty and watch unmoved as our fellow countrymen are terrorized, through economic duress and physical violence, and forcibly impressed into organization against their free will to be so organized?

Why should any free American be required to submit to tyrannical practices from any quarter? Why be made to bend his knee involuntarily and pay tribute to willful men who would strip him of his God-given liberties? Shall our people be required, against their will, to take arbitrary orders from dictatorial labor bosses—such as George Meany and Walter Reuther—without any effective say in the matter?

Where do Mr. Meany and Mr. Reuther get off? Is there anything in the birth, breeding, or education of either one to entitle him to any unwilling and unwanted politico-economic overlordship over Joe and Mary Doakes? Shall they be allowed to form their own private "government within the government" in the future?

Are two men, greedy for personal power, to be allowed to force 50 millions of America's wage earners to the wall by their unethical utilization—or manipulation—of the power of the organized 15 millions now held in their thralldom with little say in the matter?

Viewed from the moral standpoint, there is no basic reason why any American citizen should be a party to anything smacking of forcible compulsion by any kind of tyranny against his own free will in this, our great Republic.

If the labor bosses abuse their mighty power, the American people will surely rise up

and take it away from them. We want no dictatorships of any kind here—whether of business, labor, agriculture, special interests, or willful minorities.

What Messrs. Meany and Reuther are saying to us in their short-sighted way is this: "We dislike working with the other 50 million Americans in labor who will not embrace us voluntarily—and we are going to use the most overpowering kind of strong-armed tactics from now on to beat them into organized submission to us."

But what if the long-suffering worm should turn, and unorganized labor would strike back at its bullying tormentors? What if the larger and potentially stronger body decided that it, likewise, did not wish to work with the aggressive and militant minority which constantly threatened its existence?

And what if 50 millions of aroused workers and their families suddenly formed a voluntary "protective insurance association" among themselves? "Just enough to maintain and fully protect their freedom from the designs of the labor bosses? What if they used their pooled funds, which might become quite sizable, to counterthrust against the Meany-Reuther attacks which are sure to be launched against them in the future?

What if unorganized labor quickly organized itself for its own protection against outside marauders? Just enough to counteract the undesirable tactics of duress and pressure forced upon it by Messrs. Meany and Reuther? What then, indeed?

The only correct way to meet strong-armed organization is with effective counter-organization. If the AFL–CIO bosses are determined to involuntarily dominate their fellow citizens, without regard to their personal desires and feelings in the matter, then they may learn for themselves the costly price of attempted dictatorship in these United States—but the hard way.

For American Joe Doakes can be pushed only so far—and he has a habit of remembering one of Thomas Jefferson's finest sayings: "Resistance to tyrants is obedience to God."

[From the Valley Times of December 23, 1955]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: RIGHT TO WORK IS ISSUE IN DEBATE

"The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce." (Clayton Antitrust Act.)

Should any American workman be compelled to join a labor union against his own free agency in order to hold his job?

This was the $64 question, and heatedly debated, at a recent luncheon meeting between the two top spokesmen of labor and management. They were George Meany, newly elected president of AFL–CIO, and Charles R. Sligh, chairman of the board of the National Asociation of Manufacturers. The locale was the NAM conference held in New York City this month.

The two contestants lost no time in squaring off and going swiftly to the heart of the problem. The big argument was over the so-called "right to work" laws which have been successfully legislated into the statutes of 17 States throughout the Nation.

The effect of such laws, in these 35 percent of the States is simply to outlaw the compulsory union shop practices. The union shop—no less than the monopolistic closed shop—arbitrarily compels workers to join unions, like it or not, in order to hold their employment. It does not outlaw the open shop—where workers may voluntarily join, or not join, the union as they may personally see fit.

These right to work laws were strongly defended by Mr. Sligh, who pointed out that arbitray and compulsoy unionism is actually a form of discrimination against private American citizens and their equality of opportunity inherently promised in the Bill of Rights.

But this solid contention was rejected by Mr. Meany, who summed up the partisan position of the union labor bosses with this remarkably one-sided statement:

"We belong to a union and we want to work with union people, not with people who aren't in unions."

"It seems that the union is against discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or color—but not on a basis of unionism," was Mr. Sligh's quick reply.

Now what is Mr. Meany really telling us in his revealing statement? Actually, he is tipping us off in advance to the militant and aggressive plans which he and his political-action lieutenant, Mr. Walter Reuther, have in store for the great majority of free—and voting—American workmen who have desired no part of unions heretofore.

At this phase of the game, the two labor gentlemen are insisting that they have no particular plans for speeded-up political activity—at least for the present moment. This might conceivably mean the forthcoming presidential elections of 1956, which does not seem to be the most urgent target of their long-range designs.

What they are immediately interested in, they have indicated, is actually to throw the immense combined weight of their newly pooled strength into a crushing steamroller. It will be used in an all-out attempt to force every American workman now outside their self-appointed authority to do their authoritarian bidding. After such "organization" has been completed, they will then proceed to their true political aims—which may include nothing less than a labor dictatorship of this Nation.

So these two citizens, legitimate spokesmen for but a militant minority comprising 15 million of organized American labor, now declare that they shall abuse their considerable authority to forcibly overwhelm a three-times larger force of 50 million of unorganized workers—which comprise the legal majority of the labor pool within our country.

While the rights of minorities are assiduously protected in the Republic of the United States, and rightfully so, it seems that it is about time that we all commence to give more consideration to the rights of majorities, as well.

"It is my principle," said Thomas Jefferson, "that the will of the majority should always prevail."

Which means, simply stated, that the course of conduct which produces the greatest amount of good for the largest number of people is where our primary interest should lie.

We must never permit ourselves to be deterred from our goal by the selfish desires of ambitious men who place themselves before the best interests of the Nation.

[From the Valley Times of February 16, 1956]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: CIO–AFL CALLS TUNE FOR SOCIALISM

The frightening political implications of the new AFL–CIO labor merger were not long in turning into even grimmer reality—as predicted in these columns in recent months. The first major move of Walter Reuther's political action squadrons was to proscribe 12 Republican Senators up for reelection this November. No Democrats were opposed.

This confirms the previous contention that the eventual intent of the AFL–CIO leaders amounts to the virtual destruction of the GOP as presently constituted. Its accompanying corollary is to complete the capture of the Democratic Party—and then turn it into a Socialist-Labor regime. The model for the transformation would be the washed-out Fabianism of former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee.

Mr. Reuther is a better carbon copy of radical Aneurin Bevan than Mr. Attlee, however. He might recall that the British people—as well as the Australians and New Zealanders down under—repudiated Socialist stagnation at the polls, after having tried 5 years of this industrial bad medicine. It would not have lasted half this long except for the intervention of the then President Harry S. Truman. He managed continuously to stave off imminent defeat for the failing British Socialists by propping them up with many billions of United States dollars—courtesy of Taxpayer "Joe Doakes."

Many believe that Mr. Truman did this—among other reasons—to bolster his similar brand of New Deal socialism at home. His cronies in Washington pointed to the Attlee government as a preview of the ultimate utopian progress of the human family in the future. This made it easier to palm off the comparable socialistic New Deal to the American people.

But after the suffering Britons had exposed socialism for the rambling mediocrity it is—and had given the Socialist-Labor Party the gate in favor of Conservative Winston Churchill—we might have been expected profitably to learn something from their example. The British peoples threw away what otherwise could have been 5 fruitfully productive years in order to test socialism the hard way. When they repudiated it, we should have gone along with glad hearts.

Instead we find the same old siren voices of the New Deal are still at it hammer and tongs in our country today. Just as they have been for every day of the past quarter century. They are highly trained, well-disciplined, and intelligent. And they are also smooth as velvet. They insist to us from every side that socialism, with all its creepy ideology and practices, is in reality the finest kind of Americanism. In fact, it all looks good on paper—so good that the paper promises are extremely difficult to resist for many.

But this is the real test of socialism—the results, wherever to be noted, never live up to the grandiose promises. Take a look for yourself at other peoples and their fine Socialist governments. Where would most of them be without the capitalistic aid of the United States?

[From the Valley Times of February 17, 1956]

GEORGE TODT'S OPINION: RIGHT TO WORK—WHAT'S AT STAKE?

Socialism is demeaning and degrading to a strong, self-reliant people—and it is reactionary compared to enlightened capitalistic free enterprise of the American brand. Only fools or misinformed persons or helpless ones would permit themselves to be enslaved by the cunning purveyors of this modern fool's gold.

For socialism first turns a free people into bureaucratic big government—thence into the superstate—and finally the slave state. An author named George Orwell has given us a chilling insight into this kind of decadent political metamorphosis in his best seller, 1984.

If Mr. Walter Reuther, of the AFL–CIO merger, has his way with us in the future—and manages to make right-to-work legislation an impossibility in the United States—it will only be a question of time until the American people are delivered captive en masse to do his bidding.

The ultimate outcome of failure now to pass adequate legislative safeguards against the infringement of civil rights by Mr. Reuther later will eventually result in Socialist bondage to labor bosses by every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

Actually Mr. Reuther and his political action henchmen are shooting at no less than taking over the entire labor force in this country, which presently amounts to 67 million citizens. Today the AFL–CIO purports to speak for 15 millions, but tomorrow the whole works.

How this is intended to be accomplished is plainly advertised for all to see. It will be done, if it is to be done at all, by duress and force—wherever necessary—and constitutional rights will be thrown out the window. Free choice in the matter for the individual is unthinkable—and for this very reason all right-to-work legislation is the immediate target for destruction.

The right to work means simply that any worker has his own free choice to decide whether he will join a union or not. He cannot have his living subtracted from his family if he does not join the collective. His free agency in the matter is protected by law.

The right to work does not outlaw a union organization in any capacity. The latter has just as much right to organize as before. The only difference is that it must now be so good that it can persuade potential members to join without compulsion or duress. Otherwise, few or none might wish to join, and the union would fold up. Is this what the labor bosses fear?

Apparently this is the vulnerable "Achilles Heel" of the labor chieftains. Recently President George Meany waved the olive branch at the National Association of Manufacturers, and said the AFL-CIO is willing to concede an employee's right to work without becoming a union member if the NAM would concede the right of workers to refuse to work beside nonunion members.

This concession was not made without reason. What happened is that Mr. Meany has perceived, quite cleverly enough, that the NAM has a tremendous weapon at its disposal in the right-to-work legislation it has sponsored in the past. If the weapon is exploited—and the American people understand the stakes which are involved for themselves—it is entirely possible that right-to-work legislation might be passed in all the States of the Union, including Mr. Reuther's home State of Michigan.

Therefore, the AFL-CIO is calling for "peaceful coexistence" for the moment with NAM—in order to take advantage of the lull to "organize" the balance of labor to do its bidding. When the remaining 50 millions of workers are forcibly added to AFL-CIO banners, the period of coexistence will be over. Long before that time, the Government of the United States—to all practical intents and purposes—will be in the hands of Mr. Reuther and his men.

If such should prove to be the case, we might find that "Big Brother" will be watching all of us somewhat prior to 1984.

Hon. Brady Gentry

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, many kind and impressive remarks have been made here today about one of our valued Members from Texas who is not seeking reelection and will not be with us when Congress reconvenes next January. I refer to the Congressman from the Third District of Texas, BRADY GENTRY.

BRADY GENTRY'S office is directly across the hall from mine in the Old House Office Building, and by reason of that fortunate circumstance, I came to know him well. During the early months of this, my first terms, I had many occasions to seek the advice and assistance of other Members of Congress. BRADY GENTRY was always willing to be of assistance to a freshman Member. I was immediately impressed with his ability, integrity, and dedication to the principles in which he believes.

BRADY is, above all, a sincere and deeply modest and humble man. Despite an illustrious career in the public service in his State and to his Nation in this Chamber, his biography in the Congressional Directory states simply "BRADY GENTRY, Democrat, of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in these closing hours of the session, I shall not follow the lead of others who have spoken here in detailed praise of BRADY'S accomplishments. I do want to say, in all sincerity, that I shall miss him in Congress, and I am sure that his colleagues from the State of Texas and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle are going to miss his presence here.

I am confident that the people of the Third District of Texas are also going to miss the helpfulness and the devotion to duty of BRADY GENTRY, who, through these years he has served them, has followed without equivocation or compromise the deep-seated convictions which he believes are in the best interests of our Nation, and of his district.

BRADY GENTRY is a fighter for his principles. His choice not to seek reelection will not change these convictions. I am confident, therefore, that he will continue in whatever position he may attain to advocate and practice a line of thinking and action which will keep America strong and American. He will persist in his devotion to the principles of our Constitution and our Nation's great past and bright future. I know that the entire Congress joins me when I say, "Good luck, BRADY GENTRY. Thanks for your fine work and thanks for your friendship."

President Eisenhower's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the primary objective of every American should be to continue our effort for permanent peace, progress, and prosperity for all segments of our economy, including agriculture and small business. Prosperity secured through another war and inflation will only bring economic disaster and loss of American lives and resources.

The 84th Congress is about to close, and I believe that it is appropriate for me to briefly discuss some of the major proposals which have been enacted into law after originating in my Committee on Agriculture. The production of food is a basic industry and the most vital to every person. As a member of this committee, I have always believed in and worked for a strong and prosperous agriculture. I definitely feel that this policy is for the benefit of our Nation's economy.

A careful survey of the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress discloses that success or failure of the men and women engaged in business, profession, and labor, depends to a great degree on a strong and active purchasing power by the farm families in the trade area. It is estimated that in many cities and villages, the buying power of the farmers represents from 40 to 90 percent of the business done in the particular community. While I have diligently worked for policies and laws to assure a prosperous agriculture, I have also worked with the same degree of vigilance for the success of small business and other occupations.

This Congress has approved nearly all of the proposals made by President Eisenhower in his nine-point farm program, which are listed as follows:

First. We have approved the President's soil-bank plan and authorized $1.2 billion dollars a year for this program.

Second. We have strengthened the surplus disposal and commodity programs.

Third. Enacted the Great Plains program.

Fourth. Provided additional funds for agricultural research.

Fifth. Enacted new farm credit legislation.

Sixth. Approved a law providing for a refund of taxes on farm-used gasoline.

Seventh. Enacted laws to improve the soil and water conservation programs.

Eighth. We have enacted many other laws, including the interstate highway program, social security, and legislation relating to the general welfare which have been approved by the President to the benefit of all the people.

In addition, President Eisenhower, by Executive directive, increased the support price of soybeans to $2.15 a bushel, and flaxseed to $3.09 a bushel, which meant an additional income in 1956 of more than $1 million to the farmers of my district in Minnesota.

President Eisenhower, also by Executive directive, increased the support price on manufactured milk by 10 cents per hundred pounds, and the support price on butterfat to 58.6 cents a pound. This meant an additional income to the dairy farmers of my district of approximately $1,600,000 for the year 1956.

The President also established the support price for corn on allocated acreage at $1.50 a bushel, and $1.25 a bushel for corn grown in excess of the acreage allotment. He also increased the minimum support price of wheat to $2 a bushel. The action taken by the President on corn and wheat approximated additional income for the farmers in the First District by over $2 million for the crop year 1956.

The soil bank proposal as submitted by the President is undoubtedly the first realistic approach to reducing the production of surplus basic commodities, including wheat and corn, ever passed by Congress. As a member of the conference committee on the farm bill, I

helped write the soil-bank proposal. I wanted to see it tried out although I had some doubt as to whether or not it would be of any direct value to the small farmers who work on restricted acreage and use most of their production to feed their livestock and poultry. I hope that the plan will work and that it will be both a direct and indirect benefit to all of the farmers whether or not they place acreage into the soil bank. It seems to me, that the reduction in tillable acreage should materially raise the price level of all farm commodities, and narrow the price squeeze which is so apparent today to every farmer. I do not favor the destruction of food or growing crops, and I hope that when the program goes into effect for 1957, it can be put into operation before any crops are planted.

It will be of interest to note the participation in the acreage reserve program for 1956. I am showing in the following tabulation the participation in the soil-bank program by counties in the First District.

The 1956 acreage reserve signup in the 1st Congressional District of Minnesota

County	Number of corn agreements	Acres	Amount paid to farmers
Dodge	229	2,254.9	$98,022.30
Fillmore [1]	435	4,092.9	179,675.85
Freeborn [2]	380	3,698.4	168,550.47
Goodhue [3]	391	2,977.0	141,299.30
Houston [4]	267	1,988.9	92,995.01
Mower [5]	524	5,717.0	237,784.92
Olmsted [6]	406	4,686.5	213,063.95
Rice [7]	409	3,610.7	159,186.57
Steele [8]	151	1,671.6	79,424.73
Wabasha [9]	216	2,122.0	99,166.66
Waseca [10]	262	2,783.5	133,773.24
Winona	162	1,368.0	62,527.30
Total	3,832	36,971.4	1,665,470.30

[1] Fillmore: 12 tobacco acreage agreements were accepted.
[2] Freeborn: 1 wheat agreement was accepted.
[3] Goodhue: 18 wheat agreements were accepted.
[4] Houston: 4 wheat agreements and 8 tobacco agreements were accepted.
[5] Mower: 2 wheat agreements were accepted.
[6] Olmsted: 4 wheat agreements were accepted.
[7] Rice: 3 wheat agreements were accepted.
[8] Steele: 1 wheat agreement was accepted.
[9] Wabasha: 5 wheat agreements were accepted.
[10] Waseca: 3 wheat agreements were accepted.

231 acres, involving 41 wheat agreements, were placed in the acreage reserve, for which payments of approximately $4,600 will be made.

33 acres, involving 20 tobacco-producing agreements, were placed in the acreage reserve, for which payments of approximately $5,300 will be made.

The recent boost in wages on account of the steel strike will further widen the price spread which is affecting all consumers, and the farmers in particular. This wage increase has largely set the pattern for other manufacturers to follow. It all means that consumers will have to pay more for the necessary things that they are required to buy. It is my hope that this question can be dealt with in the next session of Congress without disturbing the economy of our country.

The House Committee on Agriculture has considered more than 800 bills. We have heard hundreds of witnesses, including representatives of the leading farm organizations, and officials from the Department of Agriculture. Considering the wide diversity of views and opinions, it has not been an easy problem to deal with the agricultural subject. It is the hope of most members of our committee that the day is not far distant when Government controls will not be necessary in any degree and that the farmers can secure full parity prices in the open market.

Meeting the Problems of Our Older People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the problems of America's aged have attracted an increasing amount of attention in recent years. As the life span has increased, the number of persons over age 65 has grown until they now form twice as big a percentage of our population as they did in 1900. In addition, the many private and governmental retirement plans have removed them from the labor force and created a distinct group with special problems.

The great extension in private pension plans, the Federal social-security and old-age assistance programs have made great strides in meeting the financial needs of our senior citizens. Many older persons do not receive an income adequate to their needs, but the day is approaching when few will live in need.

A start has been made in meeting the housing needs of oldsters, who have great difficulty in financing a home and must often live in substandard housing. The medical needs of these people are being met with increasing efficiency, and the fruits of the remarkable medical research of the last generation are being shared with those who often have the greatest physical problems.

But however essential these needs may be, to live usefully and happily in advanced years a person must have things to do. After an active life of earning a living and raising a family a person cannot be happy with nothing to occupy him. There are vast untapped resources in these older people which are going unused. In our own acquaintance we all know people who have made the golden years happy, productive ones. That a great many oldsters do not is the result of many factors, most of which can be changed by simple interest and cooperation.

In general our education is directed toward two-thirds of our life; the latter part is neglected. In even our grade and high schools we should study the latter part of life which is inevitable, unless we die prematurely. We should work toward making that part of life beautiful and happy so that we may approach it with confidence and expectation and not fear. We need to learn and know more about the autumn years from every aspect. We need to understand the problems of that period when we are young as well as when we are old. Each individual is unique, with his own characteristics and needs, whether he is 20 or 70. There are an infinite variety of activities in which older folks are interested when an opportunity is presented to them.

Cooperation and encouragement can go a long way in aiding these people to find these useful outlets. Often very little money is needed, and some of the activities become self-supporting. But progress is much greater when it is organized and when a group is formed which allows concerted effort.

It has been effectively stated that retirement should not be considered as a cessation of activities and interests but as a changing of activities and interests. An increasing number of elderly people live a happier richer life in their changing of interests and may even lead a more productive life in their new endeavors.

One of my most pleasant associations is with the Borrowed Time Club, composed of men and women who have exceeded the allotted span of years. Formed in Bloomington about 7 years ago, it has done a remarkable job in expanding the horizons of its members and in interesting the community in its activities. It has concentrated on the positive side of old age, and has made the most of its potential.

When the State of Indiana took congnizance of the problems of older people by establishing a commission on the aging and aged, Dr. Frank Beck, founder of the Borrowed Time Club, was named as its chairman. A better qualified man could not have been found.

The first State conference of the Indiana commission will be held in Bloomington October 4, 5, and 6. It is hoped that this conference will be the first step in stimulating statewide activity which will increase the usefulness and happiness of our 400,000 Hoosiers over age 65. Those interested in further information concerning the conference may write: Conference for the Aged, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

I am pleased that seventh district people are taking a part in this undertaking and I wish them every successs.

Dick Richards and Thurmond Chatham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, in the final moments of the 84th Congress I want to take the opportunity to express my regrets that two of the most able members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee will not be returning in the 85th Congress.

I need not elaborate, for I know that it is only too evident who these two great statesmen are—the Honorable JAMES P. RICHARDS, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. Both of these distinguished Congressmen will be returning to their home States of South Carolina and North Carolina, respectively.

Mr. RICHARDS is retiring after 24 years of outstanding and distinguished congressional service. Mr. CHATHAM has served his Nation and State with great competence and ability over the past 8 years.

It will be difficult to see them leave the Washington scene, but I sincerely hope that they will be back many times in the days to come, to visit with us and to give us the benefit of their sound advice, which I remember so well from our years of service together in the House of Representatives.

I have served with both gentlemen on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I can say without qualification that seldom have I worked with two men of such untiring energy, wise statesmanship, and understanding. Both men have enviable records of service to the Nation and their States.

The vacancies created by the retirement of these two Members will be difficult to fill. The record and standards set down in the field of world affairs by these two great statesmen will make the task somewhat easier for those who follow in their roles as members of the distinguished House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The Congress, the Nation, and the free world are better off because of the accomplishments and records of these two great Americans from the Carolinas. Both DICK RICHARDS and THURMOND CHATHAM will be remembered with gratitude and affection in the years to come.

It is not goodby to these two friends of long standing; it is only "so long."

Provisions of the New Social-Security Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the amendments to the social-security program which have been enacted by the 84th Congress will affect millions of Americans. All should be made aware of their rights, privileges, and responsibilities resulting from these new amendments. The House passed these amendments on July 18, 1955, but the Senate did not act on them until July 17, 1956.

Women's benefits: Under the new amendments, women otherwise eligible for benefits will be able to receive them after reaching age 62, instead of age 65. This is perhaps the most far-reaching of the new changes. Many widows have been left in dire circumstances waiting until they reach age 65; they will now be able to receive full benefits at age 62. Many working women have found it difficult to continue in employment until age 65 but have had to carry on until they could receive benefits at age 65. They will now be able to retire at age 62, although their benefits will be less than they would be if they continued working until age 65. Many men over 65 have had to delay retirement until their wives also reached 65, so that they would receive both his and her benefits. Such couples will now be eligible for benefits if he is age 65 and if she is 62, although the wife's benefit will be reduced if she elects to receive it prior to age 65. Women electing benefits prior to age 65 will be able to receive them for the month of November of this year.

This lower retirement age for women demonstrates the increasing interest in a general lowering of retirement age requirements to a more realistic level. Although this Congress did not drop the social security age for men, such legislation will surely be carefully considered by the new Congress which will convene in January.

Farm coverage: The amendments of 1954 extended social security coverage to farm operators for the first time, beginning with their income for 1955. When this extension was approved, most of us in Congress believed it would clearly include all farm operators who exercise any substantial part of the management of the farm. Purely rental income from real estate has always been excluded from the social security tax. It was believed, however, that farm owners who participate in the decisions concerning production, buying and selling stock and produce, and other management policies would clearly be covered. During 1955, as farmers began to make inquiries about social security coverage, we began to fear that the 1954 amendments were not being properly interpreted by the Social Security Administration and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which collects the tax. When the House approved the new amendments in 1955, some language was included to clarify the status of farm operators. Early in 1956, when farmers filed their first social security returns on their 1955 income, the confusion and misinterpretation became even more obvious. Congressman Ralph Harvey, the only Hoosier on the House Agriculture Committee, and I had had repeated consultations with the Social Security Administration and Internal Revenue Bureau about these problems. We decided it was necessary to spell out in legislation the obvious intent of Congress. The bill which the House had approved in 1955 was pending before the Senate. Working with Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART we composed a brief amendment which we believe will put the definition of farm operators beyond dispute. Senator CAPEHART introduced the amendment in the Senate, where it was accepted. Under it a farm operator may report his farm income if he participates materially in the production or in the management of the production of the farm. Those given coverage under this new clarification will be able to report all of their 1956 farm income for social security credits.

Farm income reportable under social security has also been changed for small farmers and farm workers. A farmer whose gross income from farming is $1,800 or less in a year will be allowed to report and pay taxes on either his actual net earnings or two-thirds of his gross income. Under the latter option he has previously been able to report only one-half of his gross. A farmer whose gross income is more than $1,800 will report his actual net earnings, unless those earnings are less than $1,200, in which case he will be permitted to report $1,200.

Farm workers will be covered only if they earn $150 from one farmer in a year, or if they work for one farmer at least 20 days in a year.

Disabled workers: Many families have been economically wrecked when the wage earner has been disabled. Under the law, a worker over age 50, who has been working long enough to be covered, and who becomes permanently and totally disabled, will be eligible, after a 6-month waiting period, to receive the benefits he would have had to wait until age 65 for. This will allow the family some income while the breadwinner is disabled. This provision will become effective January 1, 1957.

Dependent children: Dependent children of deceased workers presently receive benefits until they reach age 18. The new law would continue such benefits beyond age 18 to children who become mentally or physically incapacitated prior to reaching age 18, and to the mothers of such children. This provision will also become effective January 1, 1957.

Professional groups: Coverage is now extended to several self-employed groups, including lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, and optometrists. Such persons will be able to report their entire 1956 income for social-security credits.

Social-security tax: Effective January 1, 1957, the social-security tax will be increased from 2 percent to 2¼ percent for all covered employees. The tax on self-employment income will be 3⅜ percent effective January 1, 1957.

Public assistance: The formula by which the Federal Government matches State expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and dependent children is changed and the maximum amount matchable is increased. It is not known at this time how this will affect increases in old-age pensions. Directors of public welfare from the various States will soon meet in Washington to study this new program.

It is difficult to explain these new provisions in sufficient detail to answer all questions about specific cases. Social security field representatives will answer the questions of persons with specific problems. Seventh District counties are served by the following offices:

Greene, Morgan, Monroe, and Owen: 312 South Washington, Bloomington.

Daviess, Knox, and Martin: 214 La Plante Building, Vincennes.

Clay and Sullivan: 631 Cherry Street, Terre Haute.

Johnson: 36 South Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis.

Gibson: Courthouse, 4th and Vine Streets, Evansville.

Representatives from these offices visit each county regularly.

As usual my office will be happy to assist Seventh District people in getting

needed information concerning the social-security program or any other Government matter. My address is 1017 House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.

Legislative Achievements of Congressman Patterson Praised by President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, Cabinet Members, and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I was pleasantly surprised and deeply appreciative when President Eisenhower singled me out for special mention in connection with my modest legislative contributions to our national defense program. And I am also grateful to Vice President NIXON and Secretary of the Army Brucker for their commendation of my efforts in behalf of the Eisenhower national security program.

I wish to take this occasion to also thank Secretary of Labor Mitchell for his words of appreciation for my support of "legislation which benefits our working men and women and thereby our whole economy," and to Secretary of Agriculture Benson for what he described as "your consistent support of the Eisenhower administration's farm program"; and the kind words of Chairman Strauss of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. Furthermore, I wish to express my gratitude to House Republican Leader JOE MARTIN, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking minority member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and my many friends and constituents for their kind words of appreciation.

Following are the texts of letters mentioned:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Now that the Congress has adjourned I want to thank you most sincerely for the major contributions you made throughout the 84th Congress in behalf of our many programs to strengthen the Nation's defenses and to build an America stronger and better in every way. For your effective support, and especially for your leadership in respect to my proposal for an atomic-powered peace ship, I am grateful indeed. I wish you every success in your campaign this fall.

With warm regard.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: As the 1956 campaign swings into action, I cannot help but recall our long association together and the steadily growing respect which you have so rightfully earned from your colleagues in both the House and the Senate.

You and I first came to Congress 10 years ago, and during that time I have come to regard you not only as one of my closest friends but, even more important, as one of the most outstanding men in the House of Representatives. Your steadfast devotion to the people you represent, your energy in protecting their rights above and beyond the boundaries of political partisanship, have created for you among your fellow colleagues a position of leadership.

It is impossible to look at the record of the past 4 years without realizing what a tower of strength you have been to the Eisenhower administration. Your great work as a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has helped give this Nation the greatest military power in its history and atomic legislation which will have far-reaching consequences in promoting the welfare of the American people in both the fields of defense and peace.

I am well aware of the fact that your congressional district suffered terrible devastation durng the New England floods last year. But you met the challenge in a forthright manner, and it was largely through your vigorous efforts that the Federal agencies created a well-coordinated flood rehabilitation program.

I have also followed closely your work in behalf of flood control, flood insurance, and hurricane warning measures and feel that your contribution in these areas of legislation has been outstanding.

The continuance of the successful policies of the Eisenhower administration depends on the election of a Republican Congress in which the experience of men like you is a vital necessity.

With best personal wishes for another great Republican victory in November.

Sincerely,

DICK NIXON,
Richard Nixon.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: As a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, I want to express my appreciation to you for the position you have taken in support of legislation which benefits our working men and women and thereby our whole economy.

I particularly recall your support in the 84th Congress of the administration's proposal to increase the minimum wage and your support of President Eisenhower's 1954 proposals to amend the social security law, as well as your sponsorship last year of the District of Columbia wage collection bill which was enacted into law on August 3, 1956.

It has been a privilege to work with you in securing the labor surveys you have requested in your district's interest, and I am gratified that you believe that these surveys have paved the way for the people of your district, through their industries, to benefit from special provisions of the Government's contracting laws.

I am happy to learn that you have been renominated as the Repuvlican congressional candidate for Connecticut's fifth district and I wish you every success in the campaign.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. MITCHELL,
Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: Now that the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your consistent support of the Eisenhower administration's farm program. Had it not been for the cooperation of Members of Congress like you we would never have been able to enact the Soil Bank Act of 1956.

I well recall your personal visit with me last fall after floods had ravaged many of the farms in your district. Furthermore I am sure you are aware of the fact that most of the recommendations contained in your September 28, 1955, letter to me were substantially carried out by the Department of Agriculture.

The farmers of the Fifth District of Connecticut must indeed be appreciative of your continued efforts in their behalf. I am happy to learn that you have been renominated and wish you every success in the forthcoming campaign.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington.

Hon. J. T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: As the work of the 84th Congress is about to come to a close, I would like to express on behalf of the United States Army, my appreciation for your many courtesies and for your cooperation.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, you have accorded the Army a fair hearing and an unbiased audience on all occasions and your efforts to provide for our needs are sincerely appreciated.

On my own behalf, let me congratulate you on the dedicated and valuable service that you are rendering as a Member of the Congress.

With warm personal regards and best wishes,

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: With the adjournment of Congress for this session, I shall probably not be seeing you for some months. I write this, therefore, to tell you how much I appreciate the encouragement and help you have given to the atoms-for-peace program. It means a lot to those of us who spend all our time and strength in these endeavors to have the kind of intelligent and enthusiastic support which you have provided.

As I look at my calendar, I am reminded that just about a year ago I was with the President as he flew over the New England area, including your district, to see the flood damage at firsthand. Since then, you have certainly done a great job of helping your own people.

For their sakes, as well as my own, I hope you will be back in Washington in the next Congress.

Faithfully yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

OFFICE OF THE MINORITY LEADER,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I do not want you to leave for home without expressing my deep gratitude for your loyal support of the Eisenhower program and your great assistance to me. Your renomination is a tribute to the fine service you have rendered your district and the country in a trying and difficult period.

Considering the fact that we did not have a majority, our record was a remarkable one. We have made it possible for President Eisenhower to go before the country this fall with a record of achievement that has contributed much to peace and prosperity. The country is on the march upward, and you have helped to make it so.

We face a hard campaign this fall. The opposition, realizing how difficult—if not impossible—it is to defeat President Eisenhower will concentrate on the candidates for the House and Senate. They believe this is where they can defeat the Eisenhower program.

Recognizing the perils ahead, Republicans must present a united front. After the primaries there can be no differences. United we will be able to advance our program—prosperity through peace instead of war, a stable economy, a balanced budget, and progress in the American way. The people of the United States, I believe, want President Eisenhower to have a fair chance in his splendid efforts for a better America. This requires a Republican Congress. The last 2 years should have taught the American people that a Republican Congress is necessary if he is to have a chance to adequately serve America and the world.

It has been a great pleasure to serve with you. You have had a hard job, and your work has been fortunate in having the benefit of your good judgment and your courageous service.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Although we are all very busy in these closing hours of the 84th Congress, I want to take time out to commend you for your outstanding contributions to this Congress and to the lives of all Americans. I can think of no one whose position on all worthwhile legislation is more valuable to Connecticut and to the whole nation.

Your wonderful efforts in behalf of all veterans, particularly those who were disabled while fighting for their country, are unsurpassed by anyone in the Nation. When I was Chairman of the Veterans Affairs Committee, you were always the first to help. This can be proven by the fact that legislation which you sponsored was so important that it became law under your name. Only a few Representatives, of all the hundreds, have received such a tremendous honor.

I know of your great military record during World War II, and I cannot commend you too highly for your courageous fight as a member of the Armed Services Committee which has resulted in our having the strongest national defense establishment in the world. Your work on the Atomic Energy Committee has been of vital importance to our security.

I am particularly grateful for your untiring efforts to bring relief to the sections of New England which were ravaged by last year's floods and hurricanes. My people as well as yours will never forget your long, hard struggles to relieve the suffering and to enact legislation to make such disastrous results impossible in the future.

My warmest personal regards to you and your family. I know you will continue to fight for your people as well as for the entire nation, exercising the same high standards of integrity which have won you such complete respect from all of your colleagues. You are a great American and an outstanding Congressman. We cannot do without you.

Looking forward to seeing you again when the Eighty-fifth Congress convenes in January, I am,

Cordially yours,

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

CONNECTICUT STATE
INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,
Waterbury, Conn.

Representative JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: The letter dated February 6 to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, regarding the advisability of constructive action by our Government to relieve Middle East tensions and to carry through with our commitments to free nations, such as Israel, has come to the attention of our organization.

We feel your signing of this letter was a sound action. We hope it will contribute toward a firming up of our Government's foreign policy so that the United States may exert maximum leadership toward the objective of ameliorating the serious Middle East situation.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DRISCOLL,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CONNECTICUT FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Hamden, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your note of January 24 pertaining to the union amendment to the Commissioners' transit bill.

I am sure that the members of the A. A. Street Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America throughout the country will be grateful for your position on this important bill.

My best to you.

Sincerely,

JOE ROURKE,
Joseph M. Rourke,
Secretary-Treasurer.

FIRST DIVISION, NATIONAL POSTAL
TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our sincere thanks for your recent vote in supporting S. 1, the pay raise for postal workers. Almost 4 years without an increase in wages, in the face of increasing prices and economic pressure, should come to an early end.

Thanking you again, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEX FEDEROWICZ,
President, Connecticut Branch, NPTA.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: On behalf of the more than 100,000 members of the National Association of Letter Carriers, we want to express our thanks to you for your vote in support of S. 1, as reported by the conference committee.

In our opinion, this bill is a very fair compromise. It gives to the Post Office Department the major part of the reclassification program it requested, and it gives a fair increase in pay to the postal employees.

Two positions on reclassification and pay legislation were presented to the Congress. It is our opinion that the Congress did an excellent job in working out a compromise and we want to thank you for your support in this matter.

Sincerely,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
JEROME J. KEATING,
Vice President.
PETER J. CAHIL,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

FIRST DIVISION NATIONAL
POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The 47th convention of the First Division, National Postal Transport Association in regular session assembled desires to commend Congressman PATTERSON for his efforts in maintaining an efficient postal service, and for his valuable suport in our efforts to protect the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD L. HAGAR,
Secretary.

NATIONAL TAX CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,
COUNCIL OF MOTION PICTURE
ORGANIZATIONS,
New York, N. Y.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: In behalf of the 230,000 men and women engaged in this motion picture industry, I wish to tell you how deeply we appreciate the support you gave the King bill, H. R. 9875, which has just been signed into law by the President.

By helping to pass this legislation you unquestionably saved many of this country's movie theaters from extinction and made it possible for them and all other theaters to operate with some degree of hope for the future.

We hope that conditions will soon arise making it possible for our Government to remove the Federal admission tax entirely; but until that happy day we want you to know that we are grateful for your action in reducing this tax as much as you have.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. O'DONNELL.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Representative from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SIR: We of the department of Connecticut, the American Legion, wish and desire to express our sincere thanks for the interest and support you gave in restoring the 14 acres of property at the Veterans' Administration hospital, Newington, to that facility. We are most grateful for your assistance in this matter.

We certainly hope that conditions will not arise from a similar situation at the Veterans' Administration hospital located in West Haven, Conn., for us to have to call upon you.

We understand that a portion of that facility's property has been declared surplus. In order to get the proposed surplus property on the market, a portion of adjacent property which is used by the patients for recreational purposes may be linked with the surplus property.

If such a situation does arise, we will certainly be calling upon you. Sincerely hope nothing comes of this.

Again thanking you for your assistance and consideration of the welfare of our veterans, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES L. PARKER,
Department Adjutant.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Representative
from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: Permit me to express my deep appreciation and heartfelt thanks to you for your very fine expressions to the President of the United States on June 1 concerning the recommendations of the Bradley Commission.

I know that you will join with other veteran organizations in opposing this heartless and discouraging report concerning the veterans of this great Nation of ours.

We will keep in close touch with you within the next few months to ask your assistance and cooperation on important matters concerning the veterans.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. BENNETT,
Department Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Fifth Connecticut
District, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: In behalf of the Disabled American Veterans of Connecticut we wish to thank you most cordially for your prompt and courteous attention to our recent communication in regards to the objectionable questionnaire which had been sent out to veterans concerning their compensation.

We are appreciative of your assurances that our wishes in the matter will be given thoughtful and favorable consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

FREDERICK J. RUNDBAKEN,
Department Commander.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF CONNECTICUT,
Hartford, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Representative
from Connecticut,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I am writing at this time to thank you for the interest and help you have given our organization, and the other veterans' groups in the recent action which rescinded the order of disposing of the 14 acres of land at the Newlington VA Hospital.

It is gratifying to know of your continued interest in the welfare of the veterans of our State.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD N. BACHAND,
Department Commander.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I want to thank you for the many favors you have extended this office in the past, and particularly for the daily copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the session just ended.

I realize that you have many demands for this useful document and hesitate to request that you keep us on your mailing list. However, if you find it possible, it will be greatly appreciated.

Trusting that you can get some well-earned rest and recreation for the balance of the summer months I am,

Very sincerely yours,

OMER W. CLARK,
Director of Legislation.

CONNECTICUT FARM
BUREAU ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New Haven, Conn.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: During the past several weeks we have had occasion to write to you several times regarding our position on the farm bill.

It makes us very happy to learn that your vote last Tuesday clearly indicates that you have the welfare of the Connecticut farmer at heart.

Once again we thank you.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID A. CLARKE, *Secretary.*

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL
FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
Boston, Mass.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: As a gallery observer yesterday I hasten to congratulate you upon the magnificent way in which the flood-control survey amendment was handled.

May I say how pleasing it is to witness such a demonstration of New England congressional unity on a New England issue.

Thank you on behalf of our 3,300 members.

Sincerely,

WALTER RALEIGH.

CITY OF TORRINGTON,
Torrington, Conn., April 30, 1956.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I acknowledge receipt of your letter date April 27, 1956, in which you very kindly enclosed copies of correspondence with the United States Weather Bureau, concerning a flash-flood warning system for the Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut.

The interim report is very interesting and I know when this system is in operation it will be of great value to the Naugatuck River Valley and Connecticut in general.

We, in Torrington, appreciate everything that you have done and are doing to help us in getting back to normal and to be in a position to better control high waters when they come in the future.

With best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

BILL,
William T. Carroll,
Mayor.

THE AMERICAN BRASS CO.,
Washington, D. C.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 27 attaching a copy of letter dated April 20 from Brig. Gen. Robert J. Fleming, Jr., New England Division Engineer, Army Corps of Engineers, and a copy of letter dated April 26 from Mr. D. M. Little, Assistant Chief of the United States Weather Bureau.

You are to be complimented for your painstaking and ceaseless effort to obtain adequate flood protection in the Naugatuck Valley and I am deeply grateful for your thoughtfulness in keeping me advised of developments.

With very best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ELMER LANG,
Vice President.

CONNECTICUT PACKAGE STORES
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New Haven, Conn.

The Honorable JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: It is my wish to express my appreciation for the stand you took in our behalf against H. R. 4697.

Your realization and understanding of the necessity of supporting small business is gratifying to both our association and myself.

Therefore your definite position against this measure is one that I think is important.

Respectfully,

NATHAN M. KASOWITZ,
President.

CARPET INSTITUTE, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

Hon JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: I want you to know that the Carpet Industry is highly appreciative of the support you gave Congressman HARRISON'S carpet wool bill when it was voted upon in the House on Monday, July 23.

While the necessary two-thirds vote was missed by a very narrow margin, the results of the vote were highly gratifying to our industry. To us it is a good indication that we will have an excellent chance in the next session of Congress to get the much-needed relief this bill will give the industry.

We are hopeful that we will have your continued support on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL M. JONES,
President.

THE ALDON SPINNING MILLS CORP.,
Talcottville, Conn.

Hon JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATTERSON: One of the members of our organization has written you commending the position you have taken on H. R. 5550. I wish to add my applause for the down-to-earth, courageous position you have taken against H. R. 5550. It seems unlikely that any straightforward thinking Congressman can circumvent the logic expressed by you, and the effect H. R. 5550 would have on the Nation as a whole.

My hearty congratulations, and keep up the good work.

Very truly yours,

THE ALDON SPINNING MILLS CORP.,
ALFRED W. CAVEDON.

COUNCIL OF MECHANICAL SPECIALTY
CONTRACTING INDUSTRIES, INC.

Hon JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, a nonprofit organization with subscribing members from all branches of the mechanical specialty contracting industry, in the interest of the 87,000 independent small-business men in this field appreciates your support and vote for the Federal construction contract bill, S. 1644.

All of our member companies are aware of your help.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

GEORGE B. ROSCOE,
Executive Secretary.

Restoration of the First Newspaper Printshop in the Indiana Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, a noteworthy step in the preservation and restoration of one of the great cultural landmarks of the Midwest will take place in Vincennes, Ind., on Sunday, October 7, 1956, at 2 p. m. At that time the Lincoln-Free Press Memorial Association will formally dedicate the restored printshop where the first newspaper of the Indiana Territory, the Indiana Gazette, was published on July 4, 1804, at Vincennes, then the capital of the Indiana Territory. At that time the Indiana Territory included the States of Indiana, Illinois, and parts of Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. In 1807 the name of the paper was changed to the Western Sun. It is now the Vincennes Sun Commercial, one of the outstanding daily papers of Indiana. It is owned by Central Newspapers, Inc., of which Mr. and Mrs. Eugene C. Pulliam have the controlling interests.

This dedication is the culmination of the efforts of some of Indiana's outstanding citizens, who recognized that in connection with the first publication of a newspaper in the Indiana Territory was interwoven historymaking news and people.

Elihu Stout, who established this newspaper and operated it for many years, came to Vincennes in 1804. After a conference with William Henry Harrison, then Indiana Territorial Governor, he opened his print shop, using an old hand-operated Ramage press. The equipment is said to have been transported by water to Vincennes, and the supplies were hauled by horsedrawn cart over the buffalo trace. Issue No. 1, of volume I is lost, but the front page of issue No. 2 contains a copy of an act of Congress which so well illustrates the times of its issue. It is a law that has to do with Revolutionary War pensions and is signed by Nathaniel Macon, Speaker of the House of Representatives and Aaron Burr, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, and approved March 3, 1804, by President Thomas Jefferson.

Among the early books of Indiana printed in this shop was "Laws Adopted by the Governor and Judges of the Indiana Territory, at their Second and Third Sessions, Begun and Held at Vincennes 20th, January, 1802 and February 16, 1803". In 1816, Stout printed "The Constitution of the State of Indiana," with the imprint: "Vincennes; printed by Elihu Stout, 1816." It is impossible at this late date to comprehend the vast influence in government, education, culture, and progress that this early printing press and newspaper have had in the development of the great Midwest. Abraham Lincoln saw a printing press for the first time when he visited the shop while passing through Vincennes on his way to Illinois.

This great job of restoring this print shop which has meant so much to the free people of America was started several years ago by Judge Curtis Shake of Vincennes. Other leaders in the project have included: Ross H. Garrigus, editor of the Vincennes Sun Commercial; Isaac K. Beckes, president of Vincennes University; Florence G. Watts; Ralph F. Meeks; Howard Greenlee; all of Vincennes, and a score of others. A Ramage press of the same type used in this early newspaper office, 1 of only 7 known to be in existence, has been presented by the John Wanamaker store, of Philadelphia, as a gift to this memorial.

Second-Class Citizens in Uniform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position very clear at the outset. I am heartily in favor of American partnership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I am in favor of this Nation entering into foreign commitments that follow logically from its undoubted position as leader of the free world.

And I certainly am in favor of dealing with our allies as free men deserve to be dealt with, honorably, candidly, and respectfully.

But I am unalterably opposed to using our vital NATO partnership, our necessary foreign commitments, and the national honor of our allies as the excuse for undercutting the constitutional rights of Americans, least of all the rights of the men we send overseas to protect the free world against Communist aggression.

That, in my view, is precisely the effect of the NATO Status of Forces Agreement.

Under the terms of this outrageous agreement, the United States permits an American serviceman stationed abroad to be tried in foreign courts, before foreign judges and juries, and under foreign rules of legal procedure for alleged crimes allegedly committed on foreign territory. And to serve his sentence, if convicted, in a foreign jail.

DENIAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION

The agreement does, to be sure, list certain safeguards. There is to be a prompt trial, competent legal advice, and consultation with American representatives for any American serviceman tried in a foreign court.

But these safeguards cannot truly be enforced by the United States. They guarantee nothing. They are simply promises by foreign governments.

They carry no assurance that an American serviceman accused of a crime in a foreign country will receive the full protection of the guarantees embodied in the United States Constitution and in the rules and procedures of American jurisprudence.

He may even be accused, tried, and convicted of a crime that does not so much as exist in the eyes of American law.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the very fact such so-called safeguards had to be spelled out at all, lends substance to the fear that an American serviceman cannot count on receiving full justice at the hands of foreign judges and juries.

AN IRRESPONSIBLE AND IMMORAL AGREEMENT

The status of Forces Agreement offends against both morality and good sense.

It is immoral because it makes second-class citizens of the very men to whom we owe the greatest of obligations, the men we send abroad to defend this Nation and the entire free world against the aggressive designs of Communist imperialism.

As I said in a floor debate last year:

Our people are entitled to the protection of the Constitution of the United States when they are abroad to defend us and our friends. When we ask them to go out of this country not of their own choice but at the command of the Government, I see no reason in the world for not making doubly sure that their constitutional rights are protected.

And this agreement also offends against good sense. It assumes that our posture in the world should be one of timidity with respect to the principles and the free institutions that have made this Nation great.

It smacks, too, of the subservience that the present administration often shows to the least whim of our allies, and of its retreat before the least hint that so-called world opinion will be offended by our bold adherence to principle. I sometimes suspect that such world opinion is simply a handy extension of the soft minds and faint hearts of the appeasers among us. I suspect that it is a "red herring" drawn across the path of moral conviction.

I must, in conscience, go on record against such immoral senselessness.

THE BACKGROUND OF THE STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT

The United States entered into this agreement in June 1951. It was ratified as a treaty by the other body on July 15, 1953.

I think it is especially important to note that, before ratification, the other body held but 3 half days of hearings in which a score of high administration officials appeared to testify. The other body heard but one critic of the agreement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that the other body acted irresponsibly in this matter.

But I do mean to suggest that, on the record, it neither studied nor exhaustively debated the many ramifications of this agreement; that it acted primarily on the advice of administration officials whose testimony reveals scant regard for the effect of the agreement on the constitutional rights of American servicemen; and that, to put it bluntly, it ratified a bad agreement.

We owe a great debt to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], for seeing to it that the basic issues involved here were brought forcibly to the attention of the American people. On May 18, 1955, he proposed a joint resolution urging the President to seek immediate revision of the agreement or, at least, to let it lapse as scheduled, in July 1958.

The Bow resolution—House Joint Resolution 309—further expressed the sense of Congress that criminal jurisdiction over American forces abroad should never again be granted to foreign countries.

I am squarely in favor of the sense and substance of the Bow resolution.

ADMINISTRATION ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF THE AGREEMENT

When as a consequence of the proposal of the Bow resolution the House Committee on Foreign Affairs held extensive hearings in the summer of last year, those of us on the committee heard testimony on both sides of the question. And we heard some curious arguments, indeed, from those who supported the Status of Forces Agreement.

We heard, for example, that the agreement actually provides more protection to American servicemen abroad than they would otherwise have, that it actually guarantees their constitutional rights.

Such an argument begs more questions than it answers. What is meant by more protection, more than what? Surely not more than the Constitution itself. And surely not more than some alternate agreement which would have reserved criminal jurisdiction over American forces to American authorities.

But this agreement, we were also told, was the best we could get from our NATO partners. It was the best they would agree to. Perhaps it was the best, but only in the absence of a firm stand that this Nation will never default in its obligations to its citizens, home or abroad, civilian or military.

I wonder if our negotiators ever proposed some sensible compromise plan.

Without spelling out the details, perhaps the agreement might have provided for a review panel made up of both American and foreign judges to check over every criminal case involving American servicemen to make absolutely sure that their rights as Americans had not been abridged. We on the committee heard of no such compromise proposals.

FOREIGN COURTS VERSUS UNITED STATES COURTS-MARTIAL

We heard, moreover, the curious argument that the Status of Forces Agreement substitutes foreign courts not for United States civil courts but rather for United States courts-martial and, thus, that the rights of American servicemen are further protected by this agreement.

Does this argument mean to imply that United States courts-martial are not conducted in accordance with the Uniform Code of Military Justice, as revised by Congress in 1951?

Does it mean to imply that courts-martial are not as a consequence conducted in accordance with basic principles and practices of American justice?

With the single exception of no-jury trial, courts-martial are in fact surrounded with every normal guarantee of fair, impartial justice, and with adherence to every cherished principle of American jurisprudence.

I can go one step further: Courts-martial even involve mandatory appeals procedures, right on up to the President himself if the crime carries with it capital punishment.

Most important of all, courts-martial are American courts. Every recourse open to the American citizen is open, as well, to the servicemen who feels he has been denied justice.

How can this protection be seriously balanced against that afforded by French courts, for example, where the defendant is presumed guilty unless he can clearly prove his innocence, courts that have been described even by French critics as "aiming to convict the guilty, and not to protect the innocent." The comparison falls apart on the most cursory analysis.

THE PRECEDENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Then, too, we on the committee heard much dispute about the precedent, in this matter, of international law. There is of course, a major school of competent international legal authorities who subscribe to the view that the flag and the Constitution go wherever our Armed Forces go and that this agreement, therefore, flies in the face of accepted legal practice.

But even assuming, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the case, even assuming for the sake of argument that the status of America's NATO army is unprecedented in international law and custom, I am convinced that the Status of Forces Agreement is still wrong in principle.

Our NATO forces are not an army of occupation, they are in Europe as the guardians of freedom. They are there not on suffrance but at the specific request of our NATO partners. They are the symbol of our determination as a Nation to help halt the forces of Soviet Communist despotism.

How, then, can we ask the members of this army of freedom to forego the guaranties of their own freedom?

THE FLIMSY PRETEXT OF RECIPROCITY

We also heard administration officials make much of the argument that the agreement is reciprocal. They insisted that the status of forces agreement is of positive benefit to the United States because, under its terms, NATO forces in this country are subject to the jurisdiction of American courts.

This is an argument built of equal parts cheesecloth and begged questions.

In the first place, the numbers involved are of the order of 100 to 1—100 Americans in Europe for every 1 European soldier in the United States.

In the second place, whereas our forces are a semi-permanent military establishment, most of the Europeans in this country are here on short training missions, excluded by diplomatic immunity from the jurisdiction of American courts.

In the third place, therefore, who can be so gullible as to credit the notion that our Government entered into this agreement in order to insure its control over such visiting soldiers?

NATO is a partnership, to be sure, and a keystone of the United States defense system, but the movement of troops is almost wholly one-way, from the United States to Europe. And problems involving the status of NATO forces in foreign areas are almost wholly, from our point of view, those of the nation that sends troops abroad rather than those of the nation that welcomes them.

I want to be consistent in my position, however. If the price of retaining full control over our NATO forces and of guaranteeing them the protection of the Constitution is to waive all jurisdiction over NATO forces in this country, then that is a price I am willing to pay.

JURISDICTION IS USUALLY WAIVED ANYWAY

Finally, those of us on the committee heard the argument that foreign courts waive jurisdiction in a great majority of cases and that, for all practical purposes, the Status of Forces Agreement cannot do very much damage to the rights of American servicemen.

This is a doubly self-defeating argument. It has in it the ring of a last-gasp defense.

It implies that the privilege of trying Americans in foreign courts is so lightly regarded among the NATO countries that they usually waive their jurisdiction. Yet we are asked to believe, at the same time, that in order to station our troops overseas we had to enter into this agreement. These two arguments are flatly contradictory.

In essence, though, it makes no difference how many Americans run the risk of being denied their rights as American citizens. This is, to me, a matter of clear principle. And in matters of principle, numbers are of no consequence. Denial of rights is as indefensible in one case as it is in a thousand.

We do not, as a nation, guarantee our people their most basic rights only sometimes and at the convenience of other countries. Guaranties of impartial justice are as firm as our national honor is precious to us and should remain so, certainly not least to the men we send abroad to defend it.

These are the arguments we heard from those who defended the NATO Status of Forces Agreement before the Foreign Affairs Committee. They are weak and contradictory arguments. And they are basically immoral.

They take no account of the fact that, under this agreement, we draft our young men, send them overseas, and then fail to guarantee them either their rights as citizens, under the Constitution, or their rights as members of the Armed Forces, under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

A SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE AGREEMENT

Let me briefly review the arguments that have weighed heavily on my decision to oppose the Status of Forces Agreement.

Despite a specific reservation to the contrary when the other body ratified this agreement, it was used as the pattern for a like agreement with Japan before even a half year had gone by. And if the

courts of France and Turkey and Greece and the other NATO countries are foreign to American law, how much more so are those of Japan.

Under this agreement, one indiscreet remark by an American boy about the government or rulers of a foreign country, and he may be hauled into court on criminal charges. This would be true in Turkey and Greece, and even in Great Britain.

It is entirely possible that an American soldier may be tried by Communist judges and juries, before a Communist-influenced public, and made the pawn in a game of calculated anti-Americanism. Such a situation could be almost an everyday occurrence in France or Italy.

No matter how many safeguards are written into the agreement, the fact remains that the courts, along with their judges, procedures, customs, and language, will all be foreign, and foreign as well to the experience of nearly all American servicemen.

Prisons in Europe and Japan often fall below the absolute minimum of American standards, and yet at this moment American soldiers are jailed there under the terms of this agreement.

Although our diplomats and Foreign Service representatives, many of them of draft age, are covered with diplomatic immunity wherever they go, this agreement puts our servicemen at the mercy of foreign systems of justice.

WHAT SHOULD WE DO ABOUT THIS AGREEMENT?

These are the reasons, Mr. Speaker, for my unalterable opposition to the principle of the NATO status-of-forces agreement.

I say "to the principle" deliberately because I feel that however mistakenly and with whatever indefensible lack of responsibility to our servicemen abroad, this Nation has undertaken a solemn international obligation from which it cannot now withdraw.

To abrogate it now would throw into confusion the present status of our NATO forces. It would make us appear to the world both weak and vacillating. It would suggest that our word is not absolutely trustworthy and that we treat our obligations lightly.

We would only compound a bad situation by unilateral action now.

Fortunately, this agreement will be effective for but 2 more years. We must, I feel, let it run its course.

But we must also, in my view, learn the lesson of our experience.

This Nation must never again, any time in the future, enter into such an agreement as this one. I shall fight for this principle with all my heart and mind.

This Nation must never believe that it can bargain away the most fundamental of all the constitutional rights of American citizens and still maintain its world position as the bulwark of human freedom.

This Nation, when it sends its men abroad to defend this position of leadership, must send them as first-class citizens with every one of the constitutional protections that are their due. It should not do so arrogantly, but rather with justifiable pride in those institutions that have made us both free and great.

There are the issues, Mr. Speaker, that I see involved in the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. And there is my stand.

Legislation of Interest to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to summarize the legislation which has been before the Congress which is of special interest to the veterans of the United States.

The veterans of America were shocked a few months ago when the Bradley Commission filed its report. The Bradley report, as it is referred to, apparently recommended material changes in the relationship between the Government and veterans, changes in the policy which has existed since the very beginning of our country. I had visits, calls and letters from veterans throughout my District expressing fear that the Bradley report would adversely affect their pension or compensation or hospitalization or would generally change their rights as a veteran. I explained to them that this Bradley report is merely the opinion of the Bradley Commission and has no force or effect unless Congress would pass legislation in conformity with its recommendations. I was perhaps especially interested in this report and the effects it might have for I have served as post service officer of both my American Legion and VFW posts. I have also served as veterans' service officer of my hometown.

I am especially happy to point out that Congress has not put into effect or attempted to put into effect the Bradley Commission recommendations. On the contrary, the House of Representatives has passed an unusual amount of legislation this year which is favorable to veterans. However, most of this legislation has not become law as the Senate has not acted on it.

Both the House and the Senate passed fourteen laws for the benefit of veterans in the last session of Congress which have been signed by the President. In addition, the House passed 14 bills, many of them in the latter part of the session, which were not acted on by the Senate before adjournment. Notable among these bills were H. R. 7886, H. R. 2867, and H. R. 12038. H. R. 7886, which is commonly called the World War I veteran's pension, would have presumed World War I veterans at the age of 65 to be totally disabled for pension purposes. The veteran less than 65 years of age would have received $75 per month; if more than 65 years of age, or if he had drawn a pension for 10 continuous years, he would have received $90 per month. There were several other increases in this legislation. However, there was an income limitation for this total non-service-connected disability which would have prevented its being drawn if the single veteran earned more than $1,400 per year or if the married veteran earned more than $2,700 per year.

H. R. 2867 was passed by the House which would have increased the pension to widows of Spanish American War veterans to $75 per month.

H. R. 12038 would have increased the compensation for service-connected disabilities by 10 percent and more than that in some cases. It is regrettable that these three bills, H. R. 7886, H. R. 2867, and H. R. 12038, and 11 other similar but less extensive bills which were passed by the House, did not receive action in the Senate. This legislation, however, will be considered by the new Congress which will convene in January.

The veterans hospital program is making commendable progress. Today I doubt if there are any hospitals in the country which give better service than do the veterans hospitals. They are now engaged in a modernization program which will take several years to finish. There is a shortage of veterans hospitals, but we are trying to get caught up on that shortage. One difficulty, of course, is that in the past hospitals were often constructed without regard to the patient load in that area or as to the availability of doctors and technicians in the vicinity to staff the hospitals. That fault is being remedied and the new hospitals are being placed with a better view of the patient need and the medical service availability. We are working toward getting adequate facilities in Indiana. There is a special need for mental hospitals for veterans throughout the country.

A few years ago there was some difficulty encountered in getting appropriations through Congress to adequately take care of the veterans pensions, compensation, and hospital needs. However, no difficulty was encountered this year.

The loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill of rights were extended by the Congress. In general veterans legislation, except for the measures which I have mentioned above, received fair treatment at the hands of Congress.

There are other measures in which veterans are especially interested—those dealing with our country's defense. I believe our defense program is progressing satisfactorily and will adequately take care of our needs, yet will not place an undue burden on the American family and taxpayer.

There is a feeling that recent decisions of the Supreme Court have taken away from the American people proper protection from disloyal persons. I am not questioning the legality of these decisions but the job with which the country is confronted is that if existing laws are unconstitutional or did not properly cover the problems involved, then it is the duty of the Congress to pass additional laws to adequately protect us against disloyalty and subversion. At the close of Congress there was legislation being considered in several of these fields. If needed, they probably will receive favorable consideration in the next Congress which will convene in January.

Woodrow Wilson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, through the courtesy of my friend Mr. Walter J. Munro, who was a close friend and an able assistant to the late Honorable Newton D. Baker, the Secretary of War in the Administration of Woodrow Wilson, I have a copy of the address delivered by Mr. Baker at the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Services at the Washington National Cathedral, Washington, D. C., on April 13, 1932. As we know, we are celebrating this year the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. Mr. Baker's address is so informative and so fine in its tribute to the courage, the vision, the wisdom and the inspired leadership of Mr. Wilson that I count it a privilege to ask unanimous consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODROW WILSON

There are in every country places which have come to embody great traditions; their very names sum up epochs and to them succeeding generations repair to touch again, with their spirits, the emblems of great and triumphant faiths. Often such places are significant because they evoke noble personalties and we gather there knowing that we shall not see the face or hear the voice of the great dead, but sure that memory will reassociate our spirits with theirs and revive our flagging faith, as by an emanation from a faith that never failed. We rekindle our spirits with embers from the altars where their ashes lie and in the presence of the reminders of their mortality meditate upon their immortal services to their fellow men.

An American approaches with reverence the tomb of any man who has held the historic office of President of the United States, for each in his turn recalls a period of struggle and growth, each marks some part of the rising hope with which our country saw its own liberty made more broad and secure, its philosophy of freedom, by subtle adaptations, made more serviceable to the happiness of men everywhere. But among these there are places of especial sanctity and already St. Albans is moving to take its place with Mount Vernon, Monticello, Nashville, and Springfield, shrines which summon memories of the greater ordeals of democracy, met, it seems to us providentially, by great spiritual forces.

It was only yesterday, 8 years ago, that we laid all that was mortal of him here to rest. Only 11 years have passed since he laid down the Presidency. We are too near him to measure his place in the great background of history. We are yet too much under the spell of the inspiration he gave us to make detached estimates. His spirit is still mightily at work in the hearts and minds of men; years must show the harvest of his sowing.

But those of us who lived the brave years of Mr. Wilson's public career cannot be mistaken in our belief that they were years of tremendous moment, we cannot be mistaken in our belief that his spirit dominated our age, and we can set down some testimony as to his vision, his lofty singleness of purpose, and the intrepidity of his spirit which will help to explain, even if it cannot undertake to measure, the work he did.

It ought, at the outset, to be noted that Mr. Wilson's political education differed from that of any other man who has come to the Presidency. Almost without any other exception, our Presidents have been men of affairs, taking the world as they found it and occupying themselves in its business according to rules and practices already established. An occasional military figure has slipped into the Presidency without previous political experience, but for the most part, they have been men not only of strong political faith but of long continued partisan allegiance, graduated into the highest position after service in other legislative or executive places and so imbued with the traditions of their party and allied to the party's working captains. Mr. Wilson, on the other hand, had lived the life of the scholar, breathing the detached air of academic surroundings. He was a party man in the sense that he had a philosopher's appreciation of the fundamental faith upon which his party was founded, a faith only rarely set forth with any fullness in its platforms. His friends and intimates were college professors and college presidents. His career as a student began at the very time when the scientific spirit and the research method were first beginning to be applied in the study of sociology and politics. Throughout his career as a teacher he and his fellows were organized into great associations of scholars who were busy reexamining and often rejecting traditional beliefs and theories in economics and politics and substituting for wise saws and ancient maxims new doctrines and new rules based upon data compiled by observing the phenomena and experience of modern life.

Most of his contemporaries in other fields accepted the ancient order without question and were busy gathering its fruits. He and his academic associates, however, occupied themselves assigning recent occurrences their true place in a great historic order, discovering tendencies and changes by comparisons over great periods of time and questioning whether ancient forms and procedures were elastic enough to contain and direct the boundless new energies which civilization was developing. This gave him the detached point of view of the scholar, prevented him from having any illusions about the mere accumulation of wealth as the measure of enuring success, and as his own field of scholarship was politics he was equipped with knowledge and freed from prejudice in that special department of human affairs which was to be the scene of his whole public activity. It is difficult to imagine better training for a man called to leadership at a moment when the old order was changing and when the thing we call modern civilization was at a parting of the ways.

It was noteworthy, too, that while Mr. Wilson's career as a teacher brought him often into contact with groups and organizations of men of affairs, the major part of his life was spent addressing young men not yet caught up in the trammels of convention and tradition, not yet disillusioned by experience, still having the courage to take the long look, the naivete, if you care to call it that, to believe in the possibility of improving conditions by conscious personal effort. Now the happy effect of constant association with the young is to prolong the best part of your own youth. Successful teachers succeed perhaps because they have preserved the curiosity, the candor, and the courage of children. From this field of labor, from these associations, with these intellectual habits, Mr. Wilson went forth for years to various parts of the country making political addresses in which the virtue always present was challenge and from which the vice always absent was complaisance.

Up to the time of his election, these addresses, made with increasing frequency and becoming more daring in their directness, show that Mr. Wilson remained consistently loyal to a set of principles historically derived but that he always remained elastic as to method, in deference to the immense delicacy of the complicated social order in which they were to be applied. In his own mind there was always present a standard by which he tested the soundness and probable success of any program—will it bring young men eagerly trooping about it? He had no faith in policies which merely sought to protect and perpetuate established interests, as he had no faith in a policy which merely sought to attack established interests. His own philosophy was that every question had to be viewed from a democratic standpoint; that is, how does it affect all the people, and that in attempting to answer that question, too much reliance could not be placed in the judgment, however sincere, of those whose own immediate interests were involved in the issue under discussion.

It is possible to pick out, from addresses by Mr. Wilson, statements upon practically every political and economic question then or now of importance, and in retrospect they seem to have a prescience and validity perhaps not fully appreciated at the time. He declared that the old order was changing, that the political mechanisms devised to maintain popular control had become so complicated that in effect they defeated the very object of their creation, that many of the economic policies which had been at the very base of national legislation for a period of years had exhausted their virtue, that the tariff, once a policy of protection, had become a practice of patronage, that the banking system devised immediately after the Civil War had become obsolete and inadequate, that at the close of the Spanish American War the United States had entered the family of great nations with international responsibilities and interests and that, thenceforth, our life as a people had to be lived in a world which would be ruled by cooperation or conflict.

Thus his mind constantly dwelt in the higher fields of political speculation. The people seemed to have understood him perfectly, the politicians not at all, and his nomination was not a machine-made product resulting from the traditional mechanisms of party control but one of those reassuring instances, which sometimes happen, when a tide swelling up from the minds of inarticulate people drowns out the noisy gears of mere political machinery. The merely practical politicians, the morning after the Baltimore Convention, were in much the same state of mind as their forerunners were after the Chicago Convention which nominated Lincoln. They no doubt asked themselves in both cases, "Now that we have this strange and unaccountable person on our hands, what can we do with him?" And in both cases the answer was the same. They did nothing with him whatever but he did everything with them for both men were leaders with fixed principles, with vision, and with inflexible wills.

The consequence of all this was the instant assertion of a new type of leadership. The newly inaugurated President met the Congress with a program which had the orderly precision of a synopsis for a course of college lectures. He proceeded step by step to propose reconstruction of the economic life of the Nation, and it was a program which did not admit giving the 10th lecture before the 5th. In the accomplishment of these reforms the President invited the cooperation of the Congress. He was not unsympathetic with the difficulties which individual Members of Congress experienced from sectional and local feeling and interest, but his own largeness of view and his own courage comforted the falling.

Here at last was a man who was not politically afraid and here also was a man whose capacity for clear speech was unlimited. The White House became the lecture desk and the Princeton class in the theory

of government became the whole people of the United States. The same sort of clarity and the same sort of candor characterized the President's utterances to the people, and the response from the people was the same sort of comprehension and the same sort of courage. The net result of all this was the passage of a great series of constructive economic measures, any of which would have been impossible under any other kind of leadership, each of which was possible because of his leadership. This is no place to enumerate, much less to appraise, these economic measures. If we can but discern the qualities of character and education in the leadership which made them possible, the whole present purpose will be served.

In like fashion the quality of his leadership is made manifest by a consideration of his attitude toward international questions. There was the same freedom from traditional restraints in his thinking, the same realization of the newness of the age and of the necessity for new procedures and even new principles. Here as in domestic affairs he moved with courage as an attitude and faith as a foundation but here, too, he brought the scholar's passionate search for truth and the scientist's love of order. In the early days of his first administration he took new and higher ground in the field of our international relations and declined to be dominated by the theories of national interests which, up to that time, were accepted as the basis of national action. In those early days it is possible to find the seed which later flowered into the doctrine which was his outstanding gift to the future of mankind. This doctrine was a mere application to the actions of nations of the Christian ethic, long accepted as the ideal of individual action, that he who would be greatest among men must achieve that eminence by his service to his fellows.

From Machiavelli down to the most recent times the rules of individual morality were frankly discarded by political philosophers as having no application to the actions of states. The result was an obvious anarchy in the international relations of the world, with secret diplomacy, offensive and defensive alliances, forcible partitions of weak states, and a world armed to the teeth for aggression. The traditional answer to the perils of such a situation was more and more delicate balances of power, but the efficacy of that answer collapsed when a war involving the whole world destroyed not only the lives and fortunes of countless millions of men but destroyed also the frail materialistic philosophy upon which it had been attempted to build a permanent social order. The World War was not only the greatest catastrophe ever brought upon the race by its own fally but it revealed the fundamental insecurity of any social order built entirely upon force, and if it be true, as it doubtless is true, that the greatest loss the world sustained was its loss of faith, there is at least this comfort to be extracted from it that the thing we lost faith in was the thing which it had at last become dangerous to believe. This was the supreme challenge of the new era—could it find the basis of a new and better faith?

Fortunately, 3 years elapsed before the United States was caught up in the universal disaster. During that time we realized that the accident of geography as well as our democratic institutions had set us apart and in some ways made us different from other nations, but it was Mr. Wilson who found and stated the fundamental truths involved, and in a great series of messages and addresses he pointed out that our highest mission as a people would be to serve those whose differences from us had brought them to such tragic suffering. For 3 years he prepared this greatest nation in the modern world for a healing mission. His great hope was that by keeping ourselves free from selfish purpose we might ultimately not only bind up the wounds of the world but teach it a higher and better way. There is not in the political literature of any people a loftier conception or a nobler hope that he gave us in those years.

Then the war came to us and immense mobilizations of the manpower and material and financial resources of the Nation took place. The general attention was diverted from missions of service to fields of battle; the paramount duty of that hour was to create and support our great Army overseas, and there was no faltering in the performance by the President of this stern and tragic duty. But the tragedy of the war served only to lengthen the vision and elevate the hope of the man who had become the undisputed leader of the free peoples of the world. There can be no doubt that the added weight of the fresh and fearless army of American youth shifted the balance to the allied side; there can be no doubt that the financial and industrial strength of America sustained the almost desperate cause of the nations now associated with us who had long borne the brunt of the struggle; but the victory which was won on Armistice Day was, in its more enduring sense, a victory of ideas and ideals.

Readjustments will be made in territorial dispositions and men will forget the material gains which resulted from the mere triumph of arms, but the world will never forget the struggle of a nation moved by no selfish purpose and led by a statesman who dared to foresee as the result of the conflict a new world in which the principle of liberty would be safe, the principle of justice established, and conference, arbitration, conciliation and adjudication substituted in international disputes for the arbitrament of war.

We must not allow ourselves to be dismayed or deceived by the difficulties which faced the peace conference in Paris nor by the solutions of those difficulties which time is showing to have been inadequate or erroneous. I am one of those who ventures to believe that some day Mr. Wilson's phrase "peace without victory" will be accepted as one of the most profound and righteous wishes ever expressed by him or any other statesman. The conference at Paris demonstrated that the sense of victory does not create a favorable atmosphere for the construction of just and enduring peace. The portions of the Treaty of Versailles that were dictated by the spirit of victory are largely the parts of that treaty which still obstruct peace. Nations, like men, have emotions, are sensitive to hurts to their pride, and in moments of passion submerge their better selves. The only sort of peace which can endure must come from a recognition of virtues as springs of national action as well as guides for individual behavior. The future peace of the world cannot be secured by processes which attain diplomatic successes and inflict diplomatic defeats, which inflame nations with a sense of aggrandizement or humiliate them with a sense of wounded pride. Mr. Wilson's vision of the modern world made safe, rests upon the establishment of peacetime agencies which, working in the open, summon the intelligence and conscience of disinterested peoples to conciliate controversies before they have been fanned into conflagrations.

It has been said of Mr. Wilson that he was a dreamer, with this difference, that he made his dreams come true. To a remarkable degree this observation applies to the bold reforms he brought about in our domestic policies and in the start he gave to the kind of institutions necessary to rationalize international relations, but his long vision of a reordered world is too profound and ultimate to be speedily accomplished. It involves a change in the psychology of the race as well as in the technique of diplomacy, it rests upon a larger diffusion of knowledge and a deeper penetration of culture, it can be accomplished only by slow steps with hesitations and falterings as the nobler ideal encounters obstinate prejudices and arouses historic fears.

To a larger degree than we commonly realize, progress in these matters has been made since the World War, and if there was at one time a disposition to discount the thing called idealism, that disposition has been chastened by our experiences of very recent years, of which all the lessons are not yet clear but which surely seem to vindicate afresh the inadequacy of a purely materialistic foundation for a modern society. These lean and anxious years seem too to show again the completeness with which the life of any modern nation is integrated with that of the other nations of the world, a fact which has followed from the growth of international trade and finance and which in effect extends a nation's frontiers beyond its geographical limits until they coincide with its interests in farflung parts of the world. Implications of the dangers and of the opportunities of this new situation were implicit in Mr. Wilson's vision of the new era and in his realization that the end of the old era had come.

This 13th day of April is the birthday of Thomas Jefferson. I am speaking in the shade of the monument to Woodrow Wilson. Between the lives of these two men, throughout our national history, flows the current of a democratic philosophy, universal in its scope, propounded by the Sage of Monticello. From his day until now his philosophy has battled for the dominance of the world. The tide of its advance has sometimes been retarded, here and there it has met the obstacle of new conditions and has had to readjust itself in periods of doubt and hesitation, but each obstacle has but served to raise the tide and render its ultimate advance the more irresistible. Certain triumphant applications of it have followed each of our temptations to discard it. In the life of Andrew Jackson as in that of Abraham Lincoln it received fresh vindications, and in the whole of its great history it has had no more superb statement than from Woodrow Wilson, no other prophet has with greater vision extended its reach.

Again we have fallen upon days of doubt and disillusionment. Again we need the scholar's detachment and the leader's voice. For the moment we can but say to this great soldier, "Sleep on. The army which you led is still advancing, the acceptance of the doctrines you preached is still growing, the ideals you cherished are still vital, and the happier world toward which all of our faces are turned will recognize you as one of the great architects of its hope."

Hon. Thurmond Chatham

SPEECH
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 17, 1956

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, THURMOND CHATHAM, who has so well and ably repsented the people of the Fifth District of North Carolina, from the 81st Congress to the present, will be missed by his many friends in Congress. I came to know him very well a good many years ago when we were both engaged in the work of the North Carolina Department of the American Legion. When I came to Congress he was my friend, and I have

been grateful for his advice and assistance and appreciated his cooperation. THURMOND CHATHAM comes from one of the most outstanding families in North Carolina and has been a great leader in the State. He is a firm believer in the civil welfare of his hometown and community, and has generously demonstrated his interest in many ways. All of us will miss the warmth of his friendship and I join his many friends in wishing him many, many years of happiness, good health, and further success as he returns to private life.

Resolution Expressing Concern Over Present Events in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place a resolution in the RECORD expressing the great concern of the people of Lowell, Mass., over present events in Poland.

What has happened in Poland demonstrates that the traditional devotion to liberty is still very much evident in Poland.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 8, 1956.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution unanimously adopted this afternoon at the Polish National Home in Lowell, Mass., at a mammoth manifestation commemorating the uprising of Polish patriots at Poznan last week. Hundreds of persons representing the several thousands of Americans of Polish descent in the Greater Lowell area urge you to use every means at your command to insure justice for the innocent peoples of Poland—so long suffering under the Communist yoke not of their own making.

We deeply appreciate your sympathetic consideration of this most vital issue for all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

For the resolution committee:

Rev. Louis S. Bilicky, Henry Golec, Councillor John James, School Committeeman William R. Droll, Rev. Ferdinand E. Slyjn, Thelma Wozniak, Tadeusc Rursk, Thaddeus H. Karamanski.

RESOLUTION

We, Americans of Polish descent from Lowell and surrounding communities, gathered together at the Polish National Home in Lowell, Mass., this 8th day of July, in the year of our Lord 1956, in a mammoth manifestation commemorating the heroic uprising in Poznan of Polish martyrs for bread and freedom, turn to Your Excellency, the President of the United States of America, fully confident and hopeful that your personal offices and the influence of the Government of the United States will be used in every possible way in the open international forum of the United Nations to arrest the imprisonment and slaughter of innocent workers who could no longer endure the chains of slavery forged upon them by foreign masters; fully confident and hopeful that the force of the free world's public opinion under the leadership of your excellency will restore these laborers to human living conditions and will eventuate truly free and unfettered elections in Poland.

Mindful of the most gracious humanitarian offer of free food for the hungry, tortured people of Poznan and of Poland, we wish to express to you, Mr. President, the gratitude of the Polish-American community of Greater Lowell and the gratitude of the suffering victims of Communist tyranny in Poland who are unable personally to evidence their thankfulness.

Henry Golec, Councillor John James, School Committeeman William R. Droll, Rev. Ferdinand E. Slyjn, Rev. Louis S. Bilicky, Thelma Wozniak, Tadeusc Rursk, Thaddeus M. Karamanski, resolution committee.

Bloomington Is a City of TV Sets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a newspaper article, taken from the Indianapolis News, which tells part of the amazing story of Sarkes Tarzian. Of his many accomplishments, I believe none is more significant than the success he has made of a television station not located in a large metropolitan area. As explained in this article, he believes a television station should be operated not just to make money but as a community service.

The article follows:

BLOOMINGTON IS A CITY OF TV SETS

(By Charles Mercer)

NEW YORK.—For some time envoys west of here have been passing through and saying that if there is a television city anywhere in the country it certainly is Bloomington, Ind.

More than 90 percent of the homes in that city of 30,000 have TV sets—reportedly the heaviest saturation anywhere. Its industry is dominated by manufacture of TV equipment. Coaxial cables criss-cross the campuses and stadiums of Indiana University and the high school. A 100,000-watt transmitter and 1,000-foot tower give station WTTV, affiliated with the ABC network, an estimated audience of 3 million.

If any single person is responsible for this state of affairs, it is Sarkes Tarzian, a manufacturer of TV equipment and the owner and operator of station WTTV. When he came to New York the other day, he proved to be a pleasant, modest gentleman, who almost reluctantly told his saga of success.

A native of Kharput in Turkish Armenia, Tarzian migrated to Philadelphia at an early age and later became a radio manufacture engineer.

While working for various companies, Tarzian always had a hankering to be his own boss. In Bloomington in 1944, where he was then employed, his wife persuaded him to invest their $40,000 savings in their own future. It was the beginning of another of those familiar American success stories.

But manufacturing couldn't satisfy Tarzian completely. He started a TV station in 1949, when there were only 200 sets in Bloomington. Utter folly, many people said.

Today Tarzian's assorted enterprises gross an astonishing $30 million a year. But he does not emphasize commercial success. He emphasizes this philosophy of running his TV station:

"If we ran our station with only one idea—how to sell the most time for the most money—we might just as well be running a meat market. Having a channel entails responsibilities to the people to whom the air belongs, and the biggest part of our job is to see to it that the people get what is coming to them."

"Increase Wisconsin's Milk Checks—We Are With You, Senator, in Your Fight"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the RECORD, there be published a statement by me on the subject of the Grassroots Viewpoint of Wisconsin Dairy Farmers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S DAIRYLAND PRAISES ALEX WILEY'S EFFORTS

"Dairy parity must be raised."

"The farmer must get a break from his present cost-price squeeze."

"Conditions are serious in America's dairyland."

This is the voice of rural Wisconsin.

It is what folks on the rural routes throughout the Badger State have been writing to me about.

Into my office each day come hundreds of letters. They come from individual farmers and from their wives and sons. The letters come particularly from our elderly farmers, who are thinking of retiring. Why? Well, obviously because they cannot make enough, despite all their hard work, to make it worthwhile to continue.

FARMER ONLY MAKES 50 CENTS AN HOUR

Do city people know what a farmer and his family actually make on the average despite all their labor and all their heavy investment? Only around 50 cents per hour. That is a terribly low return. It doesn't amount to a fourth of what city people are getting on the average for their 40-hour week (plus city folks' paid vacation, time and a half for overtime, etc.).

"MR. BENSON, GET BUSY"

So naturally, letters of deep concern from farmers continue to pour into my office.

Most of these letters say, in effect: "Senator WILEY, we know that you are deeply interested in our welfare. Well, now, we ask you to work still harder so as to get Secretary of Agriculture Benson 'on the beam' and raise dairy parity support."

That is exactly what I am trying to do.

SENATOR WILEY'S EFFORTS TO RAISE DAIRY PARITY

It is why I have always voted to raise dairy parity. It is why I have written to Mr. Benson, time after time, stating that "$3.25 for 3.5 test milk for manufacturing purposes is absolutely too low a return."

The dairyman isn't getting enough for his fluid milk. And he is getting a particularly raw deal—a particularly inadequate re-

turn—for his manufacturing milk. Remember, over 80 percent of Wisconsin milk is nonfluid milk. But nonfluid milk isn't getting even the minimum $3.25 per hundredweight support today.

That is why family-size farms are closing. It is why our farm population keeps shrinking.

COSTS GOING UP, UP, UP

What does the farmer face?

Higher and higher costs, higer prices on that part of the feed which he must buy.

Higher and higher labor costs (if he can even get labor at all).

Higher machinery costs.

Higher repair costs, gasoline costs, fertilizer costs. Higher costs on money which he must borrow—if he can get credit.

NOT ENOUGH MILK, CHEESE CONSUMED

Meanwhile his milk check isn't rising. Consumption of dairy products is not increasing sufficiently. We American's don't drink enough milk. Our youngsters don't and our adults don't, unfortunately. And we don't eat enough cheese. We don't get enough body-building, vitamin-rich other dairy products.

This situation must be remedied. Uncle Sam has to "get on the ball" and help boost consumption of dairy products.

WILEY BATTLES FOR FARMER

I pledge my continued efforts for that end. Good publicity for dairying and for America's dairyland has been my constant aim. "Drink more milk"; I've told everyone—young and old, civilian and soldier, Senators and citizens.

But more milk drinking must be accompanied by more prodairy legislation.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I personally am glad to have battled for sound farm legislation night and day—52 weeks a year, for 17½ years in the Congress. I am humbly proud of the laws I've helped to write. That includes the Wiley Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway law. It will provide a great boost for the Wisconsin farmer. The Wiley seaway law is what we in Wisconsin fought for during 30 long, hard years. It is the historic law that we battled for—against the railroads and the greedy eastern monopolists who tried to deny us of the Midwest an outlet to the oceans of the world.

Now, however, the oceans have been brought to our doorstep; 25,000-ton deepwater ships, rather than 2,500-ton ships (the present limit) will carry Wisconsin farm products inexpensively to the world. And we will be able to buy more inexpensively from the rest of the world. This is all due to the Wiley seaway law which has been praised by President Eisenhower and praised by Wisconsin's press.

WILEY SOIL BANK, GAS REFUND, SCHOOL MILK, ANTI-BANG'S BILLS

Other Wiley bills, likewise, I believe, have served our farmers. That includes the Wiley bill which I introduced and cosponsored time and again for 90-percent dairy parity.

It includes Wiley cosponsorship of the soil-bank law, the Wiley cosponsored bill for refund of gasoline taxes. I am especially proud of my school milk legislation, plus Wiley-sponsored appropriations against the dreaded Bang's disease, plus the Wiley amendment against oleo misrepresentation.

These half dozen major fights have been but a few of my hundreds of efforts down through the years.

BATTLING ENEMIES—FROM MASTITIS TO DEPRESSION AND WAR

Now, additional battles must be fought. Wisconsin is fortunately Bang's-free, but we must still defeat mastitis (which costs our dairymen $50 million a year), and we must fight other enemies of dairying.

I'm glad to say that I've always been available to battle on these and other issues for every farm organization which has ever called upon me. I've battled for our REA's, our marketing co-ops, our livestock associations, our dairy-herd improvement groups, our soil-conservation districts, and others.

Yes, I've batled too, against depression, and I've battled against war, and I've battled against bossism. Depression, war, bossism—these are enemies which Wisconsin farmers and others rightly despise.

GRASSROOTS LETTERS HAVE PRAISED WILEY EFFORTS

I am proud to say, moreover, that in my files are literally hundreds and thousands of letters from Wisconsin farmers, expressing appreciation for my fight for the Wiley seaway law, and for other Wiley bills, as well as my fight for peace, for prosperity, and for progress.

FARMERS KNOW HOW IMPORTANT A SENATOR'S EXPERIENCE IS

The farmer remembers his friends. The farmer knows what it means to have a man battle faithfully for the farmer night and day. The farmer knows how important it is to have a man of experience in the Senate.

I personally am glad to have risen to be the second highest Republican in seniority in the Senate. Let me make this clear: I am not interested in that fact from any personal standpoint. What counts is not ALEX WILEY. What really counts is the fact that Wisconsin at last has a high-ranking Republican Senator who is fortunately in a powerful position to serve the interests of his State and Nation.

Seniority in the Senate means strength for Wisconsin. Seniority means strength and power for the individual dairy farmer.

Had I not been senior in position, had I instead been low on the long list of 96 Senators, we might never have achieved the St. Lawrence seaway law. We would probably still be struggling for it, as we did for 30 unsuccessful years.

SERVING PUBLIC INTEREST AS WALTER GOODLAND DID

Now, if a newcomer were to try to take my position, he would have no seniority. It would probably require 20 or 30 years for him to build up as much seniority as I now fortunately have.

I repeat—it is not ALEX WILEY personally that counts; it is the fact that he is in a high-up position to serve the public interest. That is what counts. Service is my aim, just as it was the aim of Wisconsin's great Gov. Walter S. Goodland—also a man of deep, independent convictions.

RURAL WISCONSIN SPEAKS

But now, let rural Wisconsin speak for itself.

Here are messages from Wisconsin grassroots farmers, exactly as these messages came to me. These are excerpts from what they have said on behalf of higher dairy parity and in kind comments on the work of their senior Senator; I am humbly grateful for their support.

From a letter from a farmer on route 1, outside Eldorado, Wis.:

"Senator, I heard your broadcast last evening.

"I was busy milking at the time * * *. You ask five important questions (which you wanted us to help answer). Question No. 1 about keeping a stable economy, ties right in with agriculture. If agriculture can be stabilized and farm income brought in balance with other segments of our economy, I think then our whole national economy would be on sound footing. So, the question as you know, is how to help agriculture. I think the soil bank is in the right direction. We must, however, reduce the price spread between producer and consumer, through co-ops and even direct subsidies."

From a farmer outside Chetek:

"I am going to vote for you this fall. I think your record in Congress is excellent. Your efforts on behalf of the seaway project, the school-milk program, and the dairy research laboratory at Madison plus other programs have been very commendable. I shall urge others to support you by pointing out your record in Congress to them. My best wishes in your forthcoming campaign."

From Hillpoint, Wis:

"Farmers just can't stand this low income and high outgo. They are at the breaking point—where they have been for months. The neighbor that joins me on the west has moved to town (closer to a big city) where he can get work. And the farm that joins us is having a sale this coming Friday. He is going to live there awhile, or until he can sell. Then he is going to do carpenter work near Madison. The wife of our neighbor in the east works in town and the wife of one of our neighbors on the north works in town. That isn't farming by any stretch of the imagination."

From a neighbor near my own dairy farm in Barron County:

"Dairying is in very bad shape, Senator, and I am sure you will do your part to help us. * * * Thank you for past favors."

From route 1, Winneconne, Wis.:

"It is time the dairyman got a decent wage, so his wife and children would not have to assist free of charge in order to produce enough for an adequate income."

From Spring Valley, Wis.:

"The farmers keep going broke in this part of the country. About one-third of the farm buildings are empty."

From a farm in Dane County:

"The Wisconsin farmer wants something done for him now. The soil bank may help in the long pull, but now is the critical time for the farmers of Wisconsin. All farmers should be treated equally. Dairy farmers are discriminated against and Wisconsin is principally a dairy state: My tenant had to quit—so now I am trying to hang on by hiring him on a salary basis, and I will take the loss."

From Merrill, Wis.:

"I have lived on this farm more than 56 years. But even the depression was not like this, even with a lot of debts."

From rural route 3, Jefferson, Wis.:

"I am confident that you have the best interests of the dairy farmer at heart."

From rural route 2, Oshkosh, Wis.:

"If something isn't done soon, the small farmer will soon fall out of the picture. Lots have already. I know you have always done your share to help us. So keep up the good work—please."

From Milton, Wis.:

"I have always regarded you as a Christian statesman eager for Wisconsin's welfare. I have kept my allegiance to you as a Senator and expect to vote for you. * * * The St. Lawrence seaway project alone should assure your victory. It is a great thing for the Middle West. * * * Best wishes for your success."

From Rock County, Wis.:

"We have a dairy farm of 160 acres, which we own free and clear. We operate the farm ourselves, together with our 22-year old son. We are writing in regard to the dairy parity amendment in the present farm bill. It is the only portion of the bill that will give any manner of assistance to the Wisconsin Dairy farmers. We are very appreciative of your efforts in our behalf."

Industrial Development in the Seventh District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, each Member of Congress naturally desires prosperity and a sound economic condition in our country and especially in the district he represents.

In a free enterprise system such as we have in America, an individual Member of Congress or even the Government itself cannot cause business to locate or remain in any certain locality. While the Government has authority in locating defense establishments, such as Crane Naval Ammunition Depot, these establishments form only a very small part of the overall commercial activities which make prosperity in a country. An interested and an aggressive citizenry can help to provide the proper publicity and interest in a community which may attract industry to it. Certain branches of the State government, as well as both State and National officials, can assist. The citizens of the Seventh Congressional District have been showing great interest in industrial development and have been working with local service and citizens' groups in interesting new businesses in their localities. Localities within the Seventh Congressional District have become increasingly successful in attracting business to this area. Two departments of the State government have been working with these communities: the department of commerce and public relations under the lieutenant governor of the State and headed by Ed Beaman; and the Indiana Industrial Council, headed by John Mellett, with offices in the State library. Southern Indiana, Inc., an organization of several communities of southern Indiana, is also very active in industrial development. There have been more than a score of new businesses located in the Seventh District within the last 2 years, including those at Linton, Sullivan, Jasonville, Carlisle, Vincennes, Bicknell, Bloomington, Oaktown, Farmersburg, Princeton, Shelburn, and others. There are also groups in almost every locality working toward obtaining new industries. A few of these communities are Dugger, Franklin, Edinburg, Greenwood, Worthington, Bloomfield, Fort Branch, Oakland City, Mooresville, Martinsville, Brazil, Plainville, Washington, and many others. Much remains to be done, but we are definitely making progress. I have greatly enjoyed working with many of these groups.

A typical example as to what a community can do for industry occurred when gypsum development was begun in Martin County. Incidentally, Indiana University was helpful in the exploration and study which led to the development of this great industry. It took a united effort on the part of local people to get certain State lands made available for gypsum mining. I have never seen finer community effort and spirit than was shown in the effective activities of the people of Martin County in obtaining this most useful industry. Another community enterprise which is of untold benefit was the united effort of the people of Vincennes in obtaining Federal legislation for the Vincennes seawall. It was very gratifying to me to have an opportunity to work with the citizens of these communities in these very worthwhile projects. Space prevents my discussing other similar projects in the Seventh District.

Southern Indiana, especially the coal-mining area, suffered a severe drop in industrial activity during the last two decades as people began to shift from coal to gas and fuel oil for heating their homes. Thousands were thrown out of work and there has been genuine hardship in the area. Today, however, the industrial outlook for southern Indiana is very bright. The demand for electric power in the United States is increasing at a tremendous rate. Hydroelectric power from the large rivers in the Midwest has been developed to the limit; from now on we will be dependent on coal for our industrial power. Coal production in the United States has gone up 20 percent in the last year and will continue to increase. This will help the Seventh Congressional District in two ways: mining will come back with increasing importance, and new industries will locate where they can get ample and cheap power. That area will be near the great coalfields of Indiana. Coal is found in substantial quantities in 7 of the 11 counties of the district, enough coal to meet Indiana's power needs for a thousand years, and that favorable condition will benefit the entire Seventh District.

There are four great attributes that encourage industry to move to any locality: an available supply of capable labor; power and the facilities for increasing that power as needed; ample water supply and adequate transportation facilities. The Seventh Congressional District possesses all of these to a high degree. There is a strong possibility that a large chemical plant will locate in the area in the near future.

No area in the country has a better supply of workers than does the Seventh Congressional District. This is clearly shown by comparison of the labor force at Crane Ammunition Depot with that of Government installations in other parts of our country. I have investigated this matter and find that there is less absenteeism, less attrition, and a higher degree of productivity at Crane than at any similar installation in the country. This same area has an ample water supply and a glance at the map shows that no area has better railroad and highway transportation facilities.

A Congressman cannot send industry to any locality but he can work with the people in that community toward attracting it. I have met with the people of many communities in the seventh district to assist in industrial development. Southern Indiana is definitely advancing, and I am always happy to lend every support I can to this advance.

Development and Conservation of our Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, water is something we take for granted if we have just the right amount of it. It is also something we view with concern when we have either too much or too little.

Americans are beginning to appreciate what it means to control our water resources. We are aroused by floods that sweep through the valleys of New England, or California, or the Mississippi Delta. We have sympathy when droughts sweep through the Midwest and Southwest creating duststorms and destroying crops. We don't want our basements flooded and our plants swept away or our homes swept away with loss of life. Nor do we want to sprinkle our laws and gardens and crops on rationed water.

The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has existed for 43 years. I have been its president the last 2 years. Since its organization in Baltimore in 1913, it has been concerned with water control in the form of floods and in the use of water for traffic on rivers and seas.

In addition to this interest, the Rivers and Harbors Congress has kept abreast of new developments in water use and control.

After its May 11–12 convention, in Washington, the Rivers and Harbors Congress sought a comprehensive report on the water problems of the Nation. A questionnaire was sent to all the Federal agencies that are concerned with the matter. It is encouraging that the Federal Government is studying water control and water use from so many directions. Our questionnaire went out to 40 agencies. The replies constitute must reading for those of us who have long been concerned with these matters.

The departmental replies are not yet fully completed. But, already they constitute a textbook that gives us a wide comprehension of the activities of our Government in the field of water control, usage and improvement.

These are the questions that the Rivers and Harbors Congress posed in the questionnaire. Time will not permit all the replies to these specific questions, but I hope to give you some of the highlights. The questionnaire asked replies—were applicable—to the following:

First. Possible control of hurricanes, and techniques being used in reporting hurricanes.

Second. Artificial rainmaking through seeding of clouds and other methods.

Third. Conversion of salt water into fresh water.

Fourth. New weather-reporting devices such as the unmanned weather reporting stations now being anchored in midocean; and weather-recording balloons.

Fifth. The effect of fallout upon reservoirs and lakes which supply our cities with water.

Sixth. The prospect that atomic power may replace water power and steam power as a major source of energy.

Seventh. The possibility that atomic power may make our maritime fleet obsolete.

Eighth. The decline in the ground water level in most parts of the country.

Ninth. The problem of obtaining sufficient amounts of water for industrial purposes.

Tenth. Methods to re-use industrial water.

Eleventh. Stream pollution: What can be done to clean up our rivers and streams?

Twelfth. Tornadoes: Can they be predicted? Can they be controlled?

Thirteenth. Without breaching military secrecy, of course, what can be said about weather observations in the Arctic and Antarctic insofar as it affects weather in the United States?

Fourteenth. What are your views with regard to control of dust storms? Are we on the verge of another cycle of dust storms? How can we control them?

Fifteenth. What are your views about disaster insurance—flood, hurricane, tornado, dust storms, atomic fallout, and so forth?

Sixteenth. Has your agency made any study of the effect of fallout on the fishing industry in such areas as the Chesapeake Bay, the Gulf of Mexico shrimp, the tuna off the Pacific coast, and so forth?

Seventeenth. Has your agency studied the effect of stream pollution on the fishing industry in various areas?

Eighteenth. Has your agency studied the effect of pollution fallout with regard to wildlife? For instance, have you studied the results that might occur if military firing ranges were established close to bird refuges or fishing grounds?

Now that the hurricane season has started, it is encouraging to know that this year, the Weather Bureau Advisory Committee on Weather Control has launched an exhaustive hurricane research program. Back in 1947, a tropical hurricane was seeded with dry ice from an aircraft, but the results were negative.

Subsequent observations of cumulus clouds were made for warning purposes, but without seeding. The Rivers and Harbors Congress was informed that seeding devices are being used in the present program while these destructive storms are in their formative stages.

Under a 1955 act of Congress, the United States Army engineers were charged with methods of "preventing loss of human lives and damages to property with due consideration of the economics of proposed breakwaters, seawalls, dikes, dams, and other structures, warning services, or other measures."

It is certain that the Weather Bureau and the Armed Services have greatly improved their hurricane warning systems. Warning itself is most important, for, to be forewarned, is to be prepared against loss of life and possessions.

Various agencies were asked about weather reporting in general, including, not only hurricanes, but also tornadoes, droughts, and hailstorms. Their interest in this matter ranged from the Artic to the Antarctic. What happens in these distant regions, especially in the Arctic, affects our weather, it was pointed out.

Of course, one of the most intriguing activities of man has been control of the rains and the weather. In answer to the questionnaire, the Weather Bureau's Advisory Committee made these interesting comments about artificial rainmaking:

Seeding individual clouds and storm systems with ground-based silver iodide generators. At times these operations may be supplemented by aircraft seeding with silver iodide or dry ice. Ground-based generators are used extensively in the United States and to some extent in many foreign countries.

Aircraft seeding of individual clouds and storm systems with dry ice or silver iodide dispensed from the aircraft. The Australians have reported increases amounting to 30 percent in precipitation over the mountains Southwest of Sidney, but the operations have not been underway long enough to give statistically significant results. Because of the rugged terrain, the Australians have indicated that the use of aircraft is the most economical method of seeding in this area. The United States and other countries use aircraft for supplementary seeding only due to the high cost of operating aircraft.

The seeding of individual cumulus clouds, so-called warm cumulus in the subtropics with water dispensed from an aircraft. Rainfall has been initiated by this method, but operations have not been extensive enough to determine whether this method is economically feasible. This research has been carried on quite extensively by the Department of the Air Force.

In Pakistan, cloud seeding has been carried out, using powdered salt to increase precipitation. Results to-date appear to be inconclusive. The Japanese have reported using aluminum oxide occasionally with a fair degree of success. Quite recently Switzerland has reported a new nucleating agent, cupric sulfide. This powdered chemical is blown into the air and preliminary results indicate that it may have many superior advantages over silver iodide or any other nucleating agent.

Suppression of lightning and hailstorms. At present, extensive research is being conducted into the possibility of inhibiting lightning fires in the western forests and reducing the frequency or eliminating destructive hailstorms. It is reasoned by some scientists that if lightning and hail-producing storms can be seeded with silver iodide or dry ice in the early stages of development, the storms will rain themselves out before reaching lightning or hail proportions. At the present time, Project Skyfire now being conducted by the United States Forestry Service is searching out breeding areas for cumulus clouds which produce lightning fires in the national forests and just recently experimental seeding operations have been conducted at San Francisco peaks near Flagstaff, in Arizona, to develop techniques for seeding potential lightning-producing thunderstorms. More than 85 percent of the recent forest fires in Arizona and New Mexico have been caused by lightning strikes according to reports from the Forestry Service.

Hail suppression experiments are underway in several areas in the United States. Scottsbluff, Nebr., has an extensive program underway to prevent hail damage to sugarbeet crops. Condon, Oreg., has similar experiments to prevent damage to wheat fields and, recently, similar cloud-seeding experiments were started in the Hudson River Valley to prevent damage to the apple crop. A similar experiment is being conducted in Washington State where very extensive apple crops are grown.

These latter cloud-seeding experiments are being conducted for additional information which may result in more efficient methods of increasing precipitation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority reported that the President's Advisory Committee on Weather Control is considering an experimental rain-making project on a selected watershed in the Tennessee River area. However, the TVA and other agencies point out that "serious legal questions" may arise where there is any change in precipitation brought about by artificial means.

The Interior Department's Bureau of Land Management reported that artificial rainmaking had been tried extensively over the public lands in the West. The Bureau commented:

The development of successful techniques in this field would be of tremendous benefit to the livestock industry in the Western States and to the local and regional economies dependent thereon.

From responses to our questionnaire, it would appear that more study should be given to the effect of fallout in the event of a nuclear attack. Interior's Bureau of Land Management said this was a matter of immediate concern to them. The acting head of the Bureau, Mr. Falch, said this:

The contamination of stock waters in the range country by atomic fallout could cause wholesale destruction of range livestock. I recognize also the serious effect such fallout would have on headwater sources of water supplying downstream domestic and irrigation needs of population centers.

The question of flood and disaster insurance was one that was discussed at our Rivers and Harbors Convention and also on the floors of Congress this year. In its resolutions last May, the Rivers and Harbors Congress took the position that Federal insurance was no substitute for flood protective works. In response to our questionnaire, the Department of the Army made this comment:

Insurance against flood losses would be beneficial in spreading the impact of specific flood events among a larger number of persons than those directly damaged. But insurance would not reduce the aggregate physical and economic loss nor would it ameliorate the distress and suffering and great indirect losses inflicted by catastrophic floods. Such insurance would not, therefore, provide a substitute for protective works. To be most effective flood insurance should be used to supplement protective works in situations where for any reason, physical or economic, such works are not feasible or cannot be provided immediately.

Flood insurance has not proved feasible on a commercial basis. Before a Government-sponsored program of flood insurance can be established, difficult technical problems in determination of flood frequencies, risks to individual properties, rate determination, etc., will have to be resolved. Thus, an exploratory experimental period appears desirable.

It should be anticipated that the availability of flood insurance, particularly on a subsidized basis, will encourage greater use of flood plain property. But, as pointed out above, insurance will not reduce flood losses.

Therefore, in order to avoid uneconomic flood-plain development and increased expenditures for protective works, the availability of flood insurance should be made conditional upon appropriate regulation of flood-plain development and use.

On the matter of conversion of salt water into fresh water, the Congress authorized a saline water conversion program in 1952. Here is the latest progress report from that agency, which is set up within the Interior Department:

The problem of saline water conversion is essentially a matter of reducing the cost of the water produced, whether accomplished by new processes or by improvement of existing processes. Technically, feasible methods of producing fresh water from either sea water or brackish inland waters have been known for many years, and are practiced on a large scale in various arid regions, but the cost of the water produced is far too high for general use.

The research under the program to date indicate gradual progress toward lower-cost production. Estimates of the probable cost of large-scale conversion of sea water show that it is approaching the maximum existing costs of municipal water in the United States and is considerably below the maximum being paid for industrial water, although still several times higher than that of currently used irrigation supplies. At the same time, economical improvement of brackish waters for many irrigation uses, which is inherently less expensive than conversion of sea water, is definitely in sight.

In view of the scope of the subject of water resource activities on the part of Federal agencies, I can cover but one more point, and that is:

The prospect that atomic power may replace water power and steam power as a major source of energy.

The Federal Power Commission, the Army engineers, the Tennessee Valley Power Administration generally agreed. They agreed that nuclear power would supplement rather than displace steam and water power. The consensus was that atomic power would not become competitive before 1965.

The subject is so important, as we plan ahead for the best possible use of our water resources, that I quote the answers to our questionnaire:

The Federal Power Commission:

The staff of the Commission has from time to time studied the place of atomic power in the overall picture of power supply throughout the United States. Present indications of the staff are that atomic power will augment and become a large part of the future power supply, but waterpower and steam-electric power will continue to be important segments of the total.

The Tennessee Valley Authority:

TVA believes that ultimately nuclear powerplants will be more economical than coal-burning plants, and that, once their superiority has been clearly demonstrated, new installations will be nuclear. It is felt that nuclear plants are not likely to be competitive with coal-burning plants in this area much earlier than 1965, and that perhaps several additional years will elapse before nuclear power will represent a substantial portion of the total generating capacity.

TVA does not believe that the useful life of existing steam plants will be affected by the advent of nuclear power. It seems likely that nuclear plants will be most advantageously operated at high-load factor and that existing steam plants will be used for peaking. Thus nuclear plants are not expected to replace steam plants, but rather to supplement them; even this effect will not be substantial during the next decade. Since hydroplants have very low out-of-pocket operating costs, it is not expected that existing hydroplants will be replaced by nuclear plants.

The Department of the Army, United States Army engineers:

Atomic power should not be viewed as replacing water or steam power but rather as a new energy source arriving at a time when overall power shortages are predicted within the foreseeable future. Undoubtedly, atomic power will play an increasingly important role in meeting our future national requirements. However, it may be expected to complement instead of replace water power and steam power in meeting these pyramiding demands.

The Bonneville Dam Authority, Department of the Interior:

If all major hydro potential in the Pacific Northwest is developed as needed, it will supply the estimated energy requirements to about 1975. Due to economic feasibility and conflict of interests, such as migratory fish, navigation and irrigation, some of the hydro potential may never be developed, and some sites may be delayed for many years. If the projects now considered to be economically competitive are all developed when required, they will supply the estimated needs of the region to between 1970 and 1975. A certain amount of thermal firming capacity is desirable and should be in operation before that time.

Since the Pacific Northwest does not have large reserves of oil or gas, and the coal reserves are of relatively low quality, fuel cost for conventional thermal electric generating plants will be high, probably not less than 30 to 40 cents per million B. t. u. even in large quantities. We are convinced that the cost of producing electric energy through the use of nuclear fission will gradually come down, while the cost of hydro energy will continue to increase after the low-cost sites have been developed. It appears at present that incremental hydro costs may reach the conventional-thermal level in this area in 15 to 20 years. By that time, several generations of power reactors will have been constructed and nuclear power should be competitive. Thus it appears that nuclear power is destined to supplement rather than replace both hydro and conventional thermal power resources.

These are but a few answers to our questionnaire and more will be reported as further replies are received. We are trying to make a composite picture of the water situation in the Nation.

We are encouraged by the amount of activity in the field of water use and control. We urge even greater activity in the future. Our water resources must be used and controlled to the extent of human wisdom and human capacity.

Hon. Joaquin Miguel Elizalde

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the membership of the House some salient facts to which I am sure most of you will wholeheartedly subscribe.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations is important today, and will become increasingly important with time. The United States should help elect as director of that organization a highly competent person. The reasons for such a desirability are too numerous to mention. The director should be a man who knows agriculture from top to bottom; he should be an outstanding businessman and one with broad experience in diplomacy and foreign affairs. To wrap up all of these qualifications in one man is almost desiring to do the impossible. But look at our former colleague, the honorable Miguel Elizalde—he is a natural for this job; he is an outstanding businessman; a legislator of proven ability; a diplomat of vast experience—who has a personal acquaintanceship with more foreign dignitaries than most any man I know. And what about farming: he has been a successful farmer since boyhood in the Philippines. And, not only that, he operates successfully a large farm in the State of Maryland. He knows eastern and western agriculture.

Again I say—he is a natural for this world leadership in agriculture.

Herter Quickly Squelches Dump Nixon Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House two editorials from different parts of the country about our able and energetic Vice President, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON.

Each of these comments expresses what I feel is a genuine and representative sentiment of the American people in these localities concerning the devoted leadership of Mr. NIXON to our great and beloved President.

I want to include the following editorial comments: A column from the Chicago Daily News of Wednesday, July 25, 1956, Harold Stassen's Revolt; and from the Nashville Banner of July 24, 1956, Stassen as Usual—Skunk at the Lawn Party.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily News of July 25, 1956]

HAROLD STASSEN'S REVOLT—HERTER QUICKLY SQUELCHES DUMP-NIXON MOVEMENT

A good many people with hotel reservations in San Francisco for the Republican convention have been wondering whether to use them. It all looked so cut and dried.

Harold Stassen, a special assistant to President Eisenhower, made the prospect somewhat more interesting, at least for a few hours.

To the astonishment of a great many people, he declared that the party would do a good deal better if it nominated Christian

Herter for Vice President instead of RICHARD NIXON. Herter is Governor of Massachusetts. On the basis of the Gallup poll and, more particularly, of a private poll Stassen and some others had financed, Stassen predicted that Ike-Herter would do 6 percent better than Ike-NIXON.

NIXON, however, is by no means a man without friends. One of the most influential turns out to be Governor Herter. Late yesterday the Governor announced he would nominate NIXON at the convention, thus collapsing the Stassen revolt.

One of NIXON'S most ardent admirers in journalistic practice is David Lawrence. He argues elsewhere on this page that any gain an Ike-Herter ticket might make among the liberal and uncommitted voters would be more than offset by regular Republicans who, in angry sympathy for NIXON, would stay at home. Without, apparently, the benefit of any poll takers, he estimates that 20 percent of the regulars would go on a sitdown strike.

We ourselves doubt there is any very precise statistical basis for either of these estimates.

Stassen's action in trying to stop NIXON astonished the country, because Stassen is a member of the President's official family. Designated as a special assistant, he is supposed to be a specialist in the problem of international disarmament, and has sometimes been referred to as a "secretary of peace."

It had seemed pretty clear to everybody that Mr. Eisenhower wanted NIXON for his running mate. His public statements sounded like a commitment. Normally, however, for a member of the President's official family to challenge NIXON would suggest that the challenger was floating a trial balloon at the President's request.

Stassen did inform the President of his intentions several days in advance. He was advised that as an individual he was free to speak, but not as a member of the White House group.

We can't understand what this restriction could mean, practically, unless it was intended as notice that he would have to resign first. There is no way for a man in a job like Stassen's to speak politically in complete disassociation from the job. He didn't resign first, and he shows no disposition to resign now.

A dump-NIXON movement has been stirring around in the left wing of the Republican Party for many months, particularly in New York. Thomas E. Dewey, the former Governor, apparently refused to support it, and his resistance seemed to have squelched it. Now, at least, it is out in the open.

We said that normally a man speaking as Stassen did would be speaking for the President. But Stassen has never been a normal performer, from his early days as a boy wonder in politics down to the present.

For one thing, he is abnormally ambitious. He must have decided when he was in high school, or earlier, that he was going to be President sometime. The prospect has receded ever since he left the Governor's office.

Men's motives are often obscure, even to themselves. We have no license to practice psychiatry, but we would guess that Stassen's own ambition may have helped to prompt his attack on NIXON. In the recesses of his consciousness, the thought must have flashed through that if the Vice Presidential nomination were put in doubt somebody might finally bestow it on Stassen himself.

This, we are ready to predict, will not happen in 1956.

During his tenure as Vice President, NIXON has had to confront a good many emergencies, large and small. In most of them he has performed with admirable presence of mind and good taste. He did so again in this one. Questioned about the Herter boom, NIXON said:

"As I have stated on several occasions, I shall be happy to abide by any decision the President and the delegates to the national convention make with regard to the vice presidential nominee.

"Governor Herter has been a personal friend of mine for almost 10 years. He is one of the ablest public officials it has been my privilege to know.

"In the event the convention decides that he is the man who could contribute the most to the reelection of President Eisenhower and the continued success of the Eisenhower administration, I shall be glad to give his candidacy my full support."

This forthright and modest comment is one more reason to believe that, when the Republican convention ends, NIXON will be back on the ticket.

[From the Nashville Banner of July 24, 1956]

STASSEN AS USUAL—SKUNK AT THE LAWN PARTY

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON need not be too concerned that Harold Stassen doesn't like him in that capacity and in his usual role of self-appointed kibitzer has urged that he be dumped from the 1956 ticket.

Stassen never was overblessed with a sense of proprieties, but an astonishing lack of ethics shows in his manner of projecting this idea—presuming to discuss at a time when the President is out of the country a sort of one-sided conversation he is supposed to have had with Mr. Eisenhower last Friday. As a sort of boy-wonder of politics a few years ago, he indicates still the immaturity of that time, and must leave the country still wondering.

It is not to the Vice President's discredit that he has made some enemies. It is not surprising that Mr. Stassen regards him with disfavor, for it is as one of those unhappy and frustrated "liberals" that this critic has been the NIXON star ascend while his own hung low and was saved from total eclipse only by the grace and the indulgence of Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Stassen is playing again to the gallery * * * the role of political savant, which doesn't fit him; believing possibly that by grabbing the limelight at this point he may draw the smile of destiny for second place at San Francisco. Never was Barkis more willing than Harold has been each quadrennium beginning in 1948 at Philadelphia.

The liberals do not like DICK NIXON, and never have.

They didn't like him as a conservative Member of Congress—first in the House and then in the Senate. They haven't liked him as Vice President. He opposed "Fair Dealism" and Trumanism, debauchery of our Government, the coddling of communism at home and appeasement of it in foreign policy. He spoke out forcefully against stupidity, dishonesty, and moral cowardice. He helped put some subversive characters in jail. In all of these things, almost from the outset he incurred the displeasure of a lot of people—from Alger Hiss up.

These same people, however, who do not want RICHARD M. NIXON as Vice President also do not want Dwight D. Eisenhower as President. Largely their expression of grave concern in that regard is a pose and a camouflage.

He has filled admirably the office assigned him—a faithful, capable member of the team that has brought dignity and prestige back to the White House, reestablished unity, restored confidence in America—helped through that confidence to build the strongest economy in history, shored up our defenses, and helped maintain peace in the world.

So they don't like him as Vice President.

The bulk of the American people have not indicated that dislike. It is to these—between now and August 20, and between now and November—that the liberals are striving to sell a bill of goods.

Mr. NIXON assuredly can rest his case with the President, and the judgment of an America that knows the score.

It is the people of the United States that will elect a President and Vice President in November—not citizens of the world outside.

Almost it would seem Mr. Stassen is under a misapprehension as to that, for a part of his self-interview of yesterday comes out this way:

"The independent people at home, important portions of the population abroad, and the uncommitted nations of the world, would have greater confidence in an Eisenhower-Herter ticket."

Is it a mistake, by Mr. Stassen's way of thinking, for NIXON to have been more concerned about the welfare of the United States of America than about the welfare, opinion, and point of view of, say India?

From former governor of Minnesota, at which he was reasonably successful we are sure, Stassen certainly plunged overboard in the waters of global giveaway. His "liberalism" showed there, and still shows: the obvious belief that one way of acquiring international friendships is to buy them by pouring out more and more billions. No avowed "New Dealer" has been more dedicated to the policy of gimme-ism, and one of the things he resents about Vice President NIXON is the latter's straight talk to such as India's Nehru.

It was time to talk straight to Nehru, to Nasser, to Tito. It was time to assert an American point of view, and a national interest for self-preservation.

RICHARD M. NIXON'S record as a good will ambassador to all quarters of the free world has accomplished more for confidence in America, respect to this Nation, and mutual effort for security and peace than all the spending expeditions put together by Mr. Stassen and his predecessors.

He has made friends for his nation, everywhere he has gone.

He has discharged with distinction every task undertaken.

He has the faith of those who regard with favor the essential qualities of good and faithful service. His enemies are generating a lot of smell, for a false scent to sidetrack and hoodwink the electorate.

Harold E. Stassen, as a member of the Eisenhower second team, has violated good taste. He should get out of the post to which the President appointed him.

His breach of a code of ethics, incorporated in this sniping at a superior and colleague, should have been accompanied by his resignation.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a biographical sketch of the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, which has been prepared by Mr. Francis Coleman Rosenberger, of the staff of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In 1947 Mr. Rosenberger prepared a biographical

sketch of Senator Kilgore for publication in the National Cyclopedia of American Biography, and at the request of Mrs. Kilgore he has revised and extended the sketch to accompany the memorial addresses delivered in Congress in honor of the late Senator Kilgore.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE ON SENATOR HARLEY M. KILGORE BY FRANCIS COLEMAN ROSENBERGER

Harley Martin Kilgore was born at Brown, in Harrison County, W. Va., on January 11, 1893, the only son and elder of two children of Quimby Hugh Kilgore (1860–1935) and Laura Jo (Martin) Kilgore (1870–1945). He was a seventh generation descendent of the Scotch-Irish immigrant John Kilgore who settled in Chester County, Pa., in 1730. His father was an oil-well driller and contractor in West Virginia. He was educated in the public schools of West Virginia and at the University of West Virginia where he received an LL. B. degree in 1914. He was admitted to the West Virginia bar the same year. In 1914–15 he taught public school in Hancock County, W. Va., and in 1915 he organized the first high school in Raleigh County, serving as its principal. He began the practice of law in Raleigh County, making his home in Beckley.

When the United States entered the First World War he enlisted in the Army, served from May 4, 1917, to March 15, 1920, and was successively second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain. In 1921 he became a member of the West Virginia National Guard, in which he maintained a lifelong interest, serving successively as captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel. He was commander of its second battalion from 1922 to 1932, was long active in its Judge Advocate General's Department, and retired in 1953.

After the First World War he resumed the practice of law at Beckley in 1920. He continued the practice of law until 1932 when he was elected judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County. He was reelected in 1938 and served until his election to the United States Senate. As a judge he won a statewide reputation for his concern with the problems of young offenders, and he was one of the organizers of Mountaineer Boys' State.

He was elected to the United States Senate in 1940, defeating Senator Rush Holt in the Democratic primary and the Republican candidate, Thomas Sweeney, in the general election, for the Senate term beginning January 3, 1941. During his first 6 years in the Senate he rose to a position of national prominence as a liberal Democrat.

He was reelected to the Senate in 1946, a year in which there were widespread Republican gains in other States, defeating the Republican candidate, again Thomas Sweeney, who that year was endorsed by John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers.

He was reelected to the Senate in 1952, defeating the Republican candidate, former Senator Chapman Revercomb, and becoming the first person ever elected by the people of the State to three consecutive terms in the United States Senate. (Before the popular election of Senators, Stephen B. Elkins served as a Senator from West Virginia in 1895–1911.)

In January 1941 Senator Kilgore became a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, on which he served continuously for more than 15 years, becoming its chairman in January 1955. During his first term in the Senate he served also as a member of the Committees on Military Affairs, Mines and Mining, Privileges and Elections, and Claims, and as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program and of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. After the consolidation of committees by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, he served, in addition to Judiciary, on the newly created Committee on the Armed Services until January 1949, when he relinquished his membership on Armed Services to become a member of the Committee on Appropriations. During his last 7 years in the Senate his committee assignments were Judiciary and Appropriations. As chairman of Judiciary he served also as chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and the Immigration Subcommittee, and was a member of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy. On Appropriations he served lastly as chairman of the State, Justice, and Judiciary Subcommittee. With his responsibility for appropriations for the Department of State he traveled in Europe, North Africa, and the Middle East.

Senator Kilgore first came to national attention as a member of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program under the chairmanship of Senator Harry S. Truman with whom he formed a close and lasting friendship. As a member of the committee he held hearings, inspections, and conferences in many parts of the United States, in Alaska, and in Germany. He took an active part in the committee's wartime investigations of steel, aluminum, rubber, domestic surpluses, manpower, shipping and shipbuilding, oil, and aviation, the objectives of which were to facilitate the war effort by insuring superior equipment, to increase production, and to correct waste and inefficiency. He continued to serve on the committee under the chairmanship of Senator James M. Mead and succeeded Senator Mead as chairman in 1946.

Senator Kilgore became even more widely known as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. This Senate unit, which became popularly known as the Kilgore Committee, was active in three major areas of investigation. One was the better overall organization of the war effort, and in this field subcommittee studies led to the creation by Executive order of the Office of War Mobilization and later to the creation by Congress of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The second area of investigation was the fuller development of the scientific and technological resources of the Nation, which led to the Kilgore bill for the creation of a National Science Foundation. The third was the subcommittees investigation of cartels and of the effect of international monopoly agreements on German resources for war.

Senator Kilgore published articles in a number of periodicals, spoke throughout the United States, and made a regular weekly radio report to West Virginia from Washington.

He served as a member of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, the Naval Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy. He was a delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1944 and 1948.

Senator Kilgore was known as a supporter of the Roosevelt and Truman administration programs throughout his terms in the Senate, and on his death the New York Times called him "one of the few remaining New Dealers in the upper House." He sponsored and supported legislation in a number of fields, for extended social security and unemployment protection, labor legislation, stronger mine-safety laws, a Federal program to combat adult illiteracy, rural electrification, and small business and antimonopoly legislation, and in foreign affairs he supported the Marshall plan, the Greek-Turkey aid program, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and point 4 development of backward countries.

Legislation in which he took much personal satisfaction was his measure for the establishment of a National Science Foundation, his sponsorship of the Youth Correction Act, which permits Federal courts to sentence young offenders to rehabilitation rather than to prison, his legislation for a liberalized Displaced Persons Act, and his early sponsorship of the unification of the War and Navy Departments.

Senator Kilgore was prominently proposed as Secretary of Labor in the Cabinet of President Truman, and later for appointment as a Federal judge, but he indicated his strong preference for continued service in the Senate.

Senator Kilgore throughout his life was an omnivorous reader, collected a sizable library, and had a particular interest in the history of the period of the American Civil War.

He was a member of the American Political Science Association, the West Virginia Historical Society, the Sons of the American Revolution, the American Legion, Delta Tau Delta, and of a number of fraternal organizations, among them the Masonic order, the Moose, and Elks. He was a member of the Christian Church.

He was married in Huntington, W. Va., on May 10, 1921, to Lois Elaine Lilly, daughter of David Green Lilly, of Bluefield, W. Va. They had 2 children, a son, Robert Martin Kilgore (born 1924), who married Shirley Ann Virginia Schubert, and a daughter, Elinor Stuart Kilgore (born 1926), who married Albert Thomas Young, Jr., and 5 grandchildren: Albert Thomas Young III (born 1946), Ellen Stuart Young (born 1947), Bonnie Jo Young (born 1949), Scott Roderick Hugh Kilgore (born 1954), and Candace Roxanne Elaine Kilgore (born 1955).

Senator Kilgore became ill in Madrid in October 1955, and after a brief hospitalization in Spain he continued a European tour. On February 13, 1956, he entered the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md., and there he died of a cerebral hemorrhage on February 28, 1956. Funeral services were conducted at Beckley, W. Va., on March 1, 1956, and he was buried with full military honors in Arlington National Cemetery on March 2, 1956.

People of United States Indebted to Polish Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON HAYWORTH
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the people and the Government of these United States are greatly indebted to the Polish nation. Over long periods throughout our history hundreds of thousands of her finest citizens have emigrated to our shores.

Every one recognizes the substantial integrity and fine character of those who have had the courage to leave their familiar environment in Europe and carve for themselves a new life in America. This emigration started long before the founding of our country and reached its climax in the decades before World War II.

In my district are many thousands of Polish people and their descendants. No one will deny that no finer group can be found in our national life. They are

a most religious people. Their family life is outstanding, and the care they give their older people is remarkable. In the city of Flint is a most remarkable institution known as Dom Polski. It is one of the most outstanding of Flint's civic institutions.

Since the Polish people have become so valued and significant a part of America and of our American heritage, it is only natural that all of us should have great concern for the Polish people in Europe. Save for the Jews, no people in history have suffered more than have the people of Poland.

Throughout modern history Poland has suffered from one ruthless conqueror to another. The one bright spot over these many years was provided by the fairmindedness and determination of Woodrow Wilson. Following the First World War, and at last given the breath of freedom, the Polish people proved their ability to govern themselves and establish a sound economy. Now again under the domination of Russia—and this time in the clutches of communism—they have resisted, as much as any people could, the oppression of their Communist masters.

We, in America, with so many Polish people firmly in our midst as part and parcel of the American family, ought never admit that the situation now existing can be permanent. We have no way of knowing what opportunity for freedom may come to Poland. But when that time comes America must be at her side.

Harley M. Kilgore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM R. LAIRD III

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for inclusion among the memorial tributes to the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, the text of a radio broadcast entitled "Personalities in Your Government: Harley M. Kilgore," presented over radio station WLW of Cincinnati, Ohio, on August 17, 1952, as one of a series of programs on distinguished Americans.

There being no objection, the radio broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSONALITIES IN YOUR GOVERNMENT: HARLEY M. KILGORE

(Radio broadcast over Station WLW, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 17, 1952—One of a series of programs on distinguished Americans)

Almost 10 years ago a retired Ohio schoolteacher heard a familiar name on the radio. She listened as it was repeated, introducing a Member of the United States Senate—then she listened to the Senator's speech.

When it was over she moved over to her old fashioned secretary and wrote a short note. In part it read, "from what I knew of you in Mannington when you were a little boy in my class I am sure that the United States Senator I heard today is the same person. * * * I am not surprised that you should today hold such a high, eminent position."

The teacher was writing a little boy she had taught more than 35 years before, and although he was now a Member of the United States Senate, he took time out to write her a long reply. Ever since then letters from the Finley, Ohio, schoolteacher arrive in the Senate office at regular intervals. Sometimes they chastise the Senator for a stand he has taken on one of the day's vital issues, other times they recommend that he interest himself in some issue that to an Ohio schoolteacher appears to need more thought and attention than it is receiving. And, each time West Virginia's Harley Kilgore studies the letters, follows the advice if he thinks it is practicable and writes a long, understanding reply.

The august United States Senate has not dulled the human touch of a man who, as a judge, wouldn't sentence a boy to an industrial school until he had made a thorough study of the school and brought about reforms improving the juvenile system in his native State.

"Youth," one of his West Virginia friends says, "is the key to Harley Kilgore. He has always thought about them, no matter what the issue might be. He thinks in terms of young people as the future of the Nation and unless he is convinced that something won't be of benefit to them, either now or 10 years from now, he won't be a party to it."

This interest in young people stems, perhaps, from Kilgore's first profession—that of a schoolteacher.

The son of an oil-well driller and contractor. Kilgore attended public schools and won his LL. B. at West Virginia University in 1914. That year he taught public school in Hancock County and in 1915 he organized the first high school in Raleigh County, serving a year as its principal.

The following year he began the practice of law at Beckley and when the United States went to war he enlisted in May 1917, and served until mid-1920, emerging from service as an infantry captain. After the war he was a member of the West Virginia National Guard until 1940, attaining the rank of lieutenant colonel. In 1922 and for the next 10 years, he commanded the 2d batallion. Kilgore first went on the bench in 1933 after being elected judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County.

"I had always been interested in helping out the youngsters," he says today, "and like Father Flannagan who founded Boys Town, I believe there is no such thing as a bad boy. Wayward boys can be rehabilitated and, if we provide the right conditions, few boys will ever become wayward."

Kilgore riffles through a file on his desk, pulls out a paper and says, "The Department of Justice estimates the Nation's crime bill at about $20 million a year.

"That is pretty steep. Yet, you hear people say we can't afford to improve our training schools * * * we can't afford to modernize our parole systems.

"They just don't realize that crime is costing so much money. They don't realize that if we spent more money for helping prevent crime, helping correct conditions which breed criminals * * * that we'd save on our crime bill every year."

Kilgore deplores the fact that training schools are sometimes used as a kind of dumping ground for all kinds of delinquents * * * children who are mentally retarded, children with epilepsy, children who are emotionally very sick.

"It's a sin," Kilgore says intensely, "but these children are tucked away in semicriminal institutions. We should have plans for helping children who have special problems * * * we can't neglect human beings, regardless of the cost."

Kilgore came to the Senate in 1941, and a year later he pioneered the movement to unite the armed services. With Senator Edwin Johnson, of Colorado, he introduced a bill calling for the unification of the War and Navy Departments.

Although no action was taken then because we were already at war, the efforts of Kilgore and Johnson paid dividends after the war when unification was finally achieved.

During the war Kilgore was chairman of the Special Subcommittee on War Mobilization. As a special investigating arm, it was active in three major areas of investigation. The first of these was the better overall organization of the war effort; in this field studies led to the creation of the Office of War Mobilization.

The second area of investigation was the progress of science of technology. Recommendations from the Kilgore group in this field provided for the fuller mobilization and better use of the scientific and technological resources of the Nation.

Kilgore also led the exposé of the cartel relationships among German monopolies, which were the backbone of the Nazi war effort. These investigations, incidentally, showed how cartels were jeopardizing the national defense and hindering the war effort of the United States and led ultimately to restrictions on monopoly agreements.

Kilgore also was a member of the famous Truman committee, and in this role traveled more than 100,000 miles, holding hearings, inspections, and conferences. He served, too, as a subcommittee chairman of investigations of steel, aluminum, rubber, shipping and shipbuilding, the Canol project and the Pan-American Highway.

Says Kilgore today: "I regarded the major objective of all these investigations as an effort to protect the lives of soldiers by providing them with superior equipment, breaking bottlenecks of production, and exposing waste and inefficiency."

Kilgore, who is 59, is just an inch shorter than 6 feet, and weighs 200 pounds. He speaks softly, has a ready smile, and has the knack of making friends easily.

Pictures of his political colleagues and Cabinet officers line the walls of his office. One wall, however, is reserved for the family. Although he loves to fish, he hasn't been able to find time during the last 12 years. He still, however, finds time to pursue another hobby, his study of the Civil War.

What was the most important lesson he has learned during his years in public service?

The West Virginia Senator thinks for a moment and then smiles, "Well, I think it was learning to lose. You know I lost the first political race I ever entered.

"It was for county clerk, right after I got out of law school. It taught me how to lose, and I think that is something everyone has to learn. And they ought to learn it while they are still young enough to benefit from it. If it doesn't happen to them until they are older, they become bitter."

After that defeat Kilgore hasn't had to worry much about losing.

At the present time Kilgore serves as a member of two of the Senate's most important committees: Appropriations and Judiciary. On the Judiciary Committee he is the ranking Democrat next to Chairman McCarran.

But despite the work which piles up on his desk, the Senator likes to take a break and just sit and chat, whether it's with a reporter or a constituent who may have dropped in from West Virginia.

One of the stories the Senator tells concerns his oil-drilling father.

Says Kilgore: "Dad never hit that big strike. At one time a driller only half a mile away brought in a well, and another time up near the Pennsylvania border he was drilling less than a mile from a strike that brought its driller a fortune."

One of Kilgore's Senate colleagues hearing that story remarked:

"Well, it wouldn't have made any difference to Harley if he had been born into a millionaire's family. He'd still be the same kind of person, he'd still be interested in people and in helping them.

"He'd still be interested in young folks and still be the type of judge who'd want to see the industrial school before he'd send an offender there."

It was during his term as judge of the Criminal Court of Raleigh County that Kilgore first became interested in prison reform. When the first youngster faced him, Kilgore immediately began to think of what might be done to reclaim him for society.

He knew that the only place he could send him was to the industrial school, but what kind of a school was it? He didn't know, the court officers only knew what they read in the official reports. There was only one way to find out. He adjourned court, went back home and put on an old suit and a battered hat, and then set out alone to look over the school.

It was strictly an unofficial inspection, but it told the young judge he wasn't going to sentence any young boys there until it was cleaned up and it would be cleaned up if he had to make it a one-man crusade. Before the reforms were instituted, however, it took a lot of campaigning.

Says Kilgore today, "Thankfully, more and more people are getting interested in such things.

"Community projects, whether its Red Cross work, Community Chest work, social service, or prison reform are attracting more and more people.

"Perhaps its because the people realize that it's up to them * * * that if a whole community said, 'Let's leave it to someone else—then nothing would be accomplished.' "

Kilgore thinks that newspapers and radio are making more and more citizens conscious of their duties and are inspiring them to help in their own towns, cities, and counties.

If Harley Kilgore has the opportunity he will always lend a willing hand—whether the cause is little or big. If the effort is worthwhile, Kilgore will be for it. (Published in the Fairmont (W. Va.) Times, September 9 and 10, 1952, and in other West Virginia newspapers.)

Stimulate American Construction: More Home Building, More Home Ownership, Keys to United States Prosperity

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a key foundation of the free enterprise system is America's great construction industry.

There are few other industries which more crucially affect the well being of the American people as a whole.

It is understandable therefore why the Nation follows so closely current construction reports on residential, industrial, and commercial installations.

Recently, we have noted with disappointment the estimate that only perhaps 1.1 million new homes may be begun this year. That relatively small number is a source of concern to all of us who are deeply interested in assuring a completely prospering economy. We had hoped to reach and surpass last year's 1.3 million figure of new home starts.

I ask unanimous consent that in the final edition of the RECORD, there be published a statement by me on the overall problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

"A Nation of homeowners," is the American ideal.

Already, fortunately, 55 percent of our people own their own homes. That percentage is constantly climbing.

We want still more Americans to "strike roots," so to speak, in their own homesteads. And we want them to enjoy ever finer, ever more modern, relatively fireproof, and comfortable homes.

WISCONSIN—A HOMEOWNING STATE

Wisconsin, in particular, has always prided itself in its high proportion of homeownership.

Last year, 21,283 new nonfarm homes were started in my State. Thus, we ranked 13th among the 48 States in home-building volume.

We of Wisconsin not only like our homes, we are constantly improving our homes.

Figures cited by A. A. Lenroot, Jr., our State FHA director in Milwaukee, show that Wisconsin homeowners spend a bigger percentage of their income on housing than do homeowners elsewhere in the Nation. Thus, in 1955, Wisconsin FHA homeowners spent 25.7 percent of their incomes on housing which included principal, interest, taxes, insurance, maintenance costs, and regular operating expenses.

Our attractive, well-kept homes are an asset to our communities. They are, moreover, as any realtor will point out, a priceless asset to the individual family as well.

HOME BUILDING—AN INDUSTRY OF SMALL-BUSINESS MEN

All in all, our home-building industry is of course a mainstay of our Wisconsin prosperity. I have been glad to be in constant touch with it. Earlier this year, Mr. Lowell E. Garretson, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Builders Association, pointed out to me that "the average home builders in Wisconsin—in fact, a majority, build less than 7 homes a year. The number of home builders that build more than 50 homes a year is very small."

In other words, our home builders are small-business men and are certainly entitled to every bit of encouragement we can give them.

Lately, the lot of small business has not been an easy one.

To be of help to them, I am delighted that, at the very minimum, we of the Congress have wisely extended the GI home-loan law for another year until July 25, 1958. Under the extension, an ex-GI can apply right up to July 25, 1958. He is allowed even an additional year in which to complete loan arrangements and sign the final papers.

I had personally introduced legislation for extension of this GI home-loan law, just as I have been pleased down through the years to offer many other prohousing bills, as recommended by builders, realtors, contractors, and other experts in this field.

MONEY FOR FINANCING STILL TIGHT

Unfortunately, today, the mortgage money situation in Wisconsin remains tight. For example, mortgage lending by the Nation's savings and loan associations during the first half of 1956 showed a 7 percent drop below the like period in 1955, the United States Savings and Loan League reports.

Our savings and loan associations remain nonetheless a bulwark of our prosperity, along with other lending institutions.

This year, our savings and loan associations have celebrated their 125th year of business in our country, and their 80th year in my own State. The assets of 154 savings and loan associations in Wisconsin at the end of 1955 totaled more than $980 million. Members totaled approximately 500,000. This is a tremendous jump over the figures of previous years.

Throughout the postwar period, savings and loan associations financed throughout the Nation the building of 2.3 million new homes. They helped 9.7 million families buy homes through the issuance of about 40 percent of all home loans made. They recorded an increase in the number of savings accounts from 7.4 million in 1946 to 18.7 million last year.

These savings and loan associations are, therefore, a tremendously valuable contribution to home financing, along with other sources of sound credit.

LETTER FROM MR. JOE M. BAKER

As important to the financing of homes is, of course, the solid construction of homes.

From time to time, I am pleased to receive from various expert sources within the construction industry comments as regards improved and safer methods of construction.

I was pleased recently to hear from Mr. Joe M. Baker, executive secretary of the National Bureau of Lathing and Plastering. I believe that his comments will be of interest, and I should like to reprint excerpts from his letter at this point.

NATIONAL BUREAU FOR
LATHING AND PLASTERING, INC.,
311 Tower Building, 1401 K Street NW.,
Washington, D. C., July 25, 1956.

(Edmond F. Venzie, president; John E. Rooney, vice president; Lloyd A. Mashburn, vice president; Robert L. Maidt, secretary-treasurer; Loyd G. Peterson, executive board; Joseph D. McNulty, executive board; Joe M. Baker, executive director.)

Hon. ALEX WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Much has been said about elimination of slums and also fire prevention to save the lives of our women and children which are lost in home fires. To begin with, it is our opinion that "slums for tomorrow" are being constructed faster today than we can demolish the slums of yesterday and this is brought about by the minimum specifications recommended by our Government agencies.

First, let us look into the loss of life by fires. It is estimated that 6,180 men, women, and children lose their lives in home fires during the year. Many of these lives could be saved if our Government agencies would lead the way in promoting construction of firesafe materials instead of looking at the initial cost and calling it economy to build homes with imitation materials which later on result in the loss of lives.

This happened recently in a large development project in which three small children lost their lives. We are advised that this home was constructed of material which will not retain a fire in 1 room more than 30 minutes. Furthermore, homes of this type of construction are being built in many areas today and they are what we refer to as "slums for tomorrow."

If an impartial survey was made today, anyone would soon realize that such homes will not stand up for 20 to 30 years—the period of time on which the Government guarantees the mortgage thereon. Is this economy?

Isn't it about time that our Senators and Congressmen looked into these minimum specifications and insisted on better grades of materials being used on homes guaranteed by the Government, especially when it means protecting our middle-income-bracket buyers who are purchasing these homes on long-term mortgages?

The minimum specification of the Government permits interior finishes to be one-fourth inch, three-eighths inch, and one-half inch think, which is not firesafe, nor does it furnish any privacy to a family. If genuine lath and plaster is used, it would carry from 45 minutes to an hour and a half fire rating, according to the type of material used. Lath and plaster construction would result in a wall thickness of seven-eighths inch, which in addition to being fire safe, would also create privacy due to the sound absorption.

Very little is saved when imitation materials are used in place of the genuine product. In fact, the average home can be completely plastered for as little as $100 to $150 additional, and many a life may be saved. Why not prevent fires by building homes, schools, and commercial buildings as nearly fireproof as possible?

Let's prevent fires by planting the seed that will insure homes being built of fire-safe materials and at the same time save the precious lives of our loved ones.

We have a number of files in our office to substantiate our statements and would certainly appreciate your lending your influence in having our Government agencies set a standard for the minimum requirements that would not only protect our loved ones from being destroyed by needless fires in homes but also to protect them economically.

Sincerely yours,

JOE M. BAKER,
Executive Director.

HOME OUTLOOK IS BRIGHT

Fortunately the overall future is quite bright for United States housing.

The omnibus housing law of 1956 should prove a fine "shot in the arm." It continues and liberalizes FHA title I home repairs, extends to existing homes under FHA section 203, the same loan-to-value ratios as for new dwellings, and provides for FHA assistance for housing for elderly people (an important subject which I have previously discussed in the Senate).

ROAD PROGRAMS WILL SPUR HOUSING

I am glad to state, too, in addition, that the Nation's new Federal-State superhighway program should open up vast areas for new developments. Thirty-three billion dollars will be spent on the 40,000-mile Interstate System and on related programs during the next 13 years. This will mean that we can expect bulldozers to be clearing the land for new homes in areas which were once off the beaten track, but which will now be easily linked by fast new superhighways.

CONCLUSION

I pledge in the period up ahead continued constructive contacts with the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Department of Commerce, and with National, State, and local trade associations in the housing field, so as to increase to a peak the prosperity of the great construction and related industries.

Fogarty Reports on 10 Years of Progress in Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, during hectic but vitally important weeks which precede the closing of a session of Congress, rarely does a busy legislator find an opportunity to express his appreciation of those who have aided him in the achievement of his objectives, either through support within the legislative Chamber, or by way of encouraging support by the people—which, after all, is the essence of successful relations between a legislator and his constituents.

In the session of Congress which has just concluded, I have been accorded heart-warming support of both kinds. For this I am deeply grateful, not so much for me as an individual, but more because of the programs which I have been privileged to propose and carry through to constructive and affirmative action.

I want the RECORD to affirm my appreciation for that support.

I wish it were possible for each American to observe and come to understand the inner workings of his Government.

He would find, for the most part, industrious, well-educated, and generally enlightened men and women dedicated to their tasks—men and women whose primary motivation is to assess and then endeavor honestly to reflect the will of the people and to act always in their best interests.

For a Congressman, this responsibility and obligation has a special meaning. Each of us, of course, represents his immediate constituents—those who by their majority action at the polls in his district have expressed their confidence in his ability to represent them at the national level. In addition, each of us represents the people of the United States as a whole. The essence of our democratic government rests on the ability of the elected members to discharge their trust with wisdom and integrity.

Moreover, each of us—particularly those of us who have served our country for many years—assumes responsibility for specific segments of the legislative process. This is not only a matter of seniority, it is also a matter of interest and preference. Those who have earned key positions on important committees of Congress are thus able to and are expected to provide leadership in that committee's area of responsibility.

With the support of my constituents, who have returned me to Congress for consecutive terms begining back in 1940, and because of my own interest, I have devoted special attention to the activities of the Federal Government in the field of health and welfare. For 10 years I have been a member and for 6 years chairman of that committee in the House of Representatives which has responsibility for the programs and activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The primary concern of my committee is appropriations. It is our job to insure that adequate funds are provided for the important work of this Department, and that there is no waste or extravagance or useless expenditure.

Any one who has planned a budget of any kind—household, business, civic group, or whatever—knows that one quickly gets involved in assessing relative needs and priorities. This is true, too, for a committee of your Government. Thus in order to handle the work of the committee with integrity, I have had to study health programs at the national, State, and local level. It has been a rewarding experience.

One of these programs is medical research. During the 10 years I have been on the committee, and particularly while I have been chairman, there has been sustained growth in our Nation's medical research effort. I am pleased to say that this strengthening process has been the result of private and voluntary action as well as Government action. But the Government has had a large role, as it should, and it has been my privilege to be in a position to work on the congressional side of your Government's activities in this field.

On June 27, when final consideration was being given this year's medical research appropriations on the floor of the House of Representatives several of my colleagues took occasion to speak of the support which the rank and file of the American people had given to this cause and of the leadership I had been able to provide in order to assure that the wishes of the people were reflected in legislative action.

I, of course, appreciated the compliment. But mostly I appreciated the realization that I had fought long and hard and successfully for something urgently desired by every person in the United States: ultimate victory over heart disease, cancer, mental illness, and the rest of the tragic diseases that cause most of the 1½ million deaths in our country each year.

In this same discussion on the floor of the House, many of my colleagues, Democrat and Republican, were kind enough to stress that I had for years given leadership in the House to a course of action which has had a major impact on the national research attack on disease. They pointed out that I had spent a great deal of time over the years learning to understand the intricate problems involved in more and better research, assuring a continuing supply of research manpower, developing new medical research facilities, and doing all of the other things required for the Federal Government to play an appropriate, helpful, nonregimenting role, including making available the necessary funds.

The remarks of my colleagues on this particular occasion were a tribute I shall never forget. They know that strong support of medical research had immediate, practical values. They also know that in taking action on the many bills and measures before us, the best Congressmen always strive for what is best for the Nation and for our individual and collective constituents.

In the 10 years since 1946, more progress has been made against disease in the United States than in any other period in our history.

This is a fact of which we may all be proud. For advances in medical science and public health are not to the exclusive credit of any individual. True, great names are usually associated with great medical discoveries. But, increasingly, medical science has become a part of, instead of standing apart from, our

society. And if there is to be a cure for rheumatoid arthritis or a preventive measure for high blood pressure or an effective treatment for leukemia—and, sooner or later, there surely will be—the triumph will be attributed not to an individual scientist, or to a team of scientists, but to all of us who helped create a productive and creative medical research environment from which such progress can surely be expected.

Let me cite some of the health gains that have been made and others certain to come.

It is difficult to believe, but the average child born today is expected to live 5 years longer than his brother born a decade ago. It is difficult to believe, but true, that just yesterday death came twice as often as it does now from such diseases as pneumonia, influenza, tuberculosis, and syphilis. Once commonplace killers, these disorders have been tamed by a wide spectrum of antibiotics, a major development in medical science during the past decade. Appropriations for research which I succeeded in getting Congress to approve have played a vital role in winning these victories.

Not only has death been stayed by modern medical research, but crippling and pain have been reduced as well. Many arthritics have arisen from their beds and wheelchairs because of the benefits of two drugs that were developed just 2 years ago. Those who might have been blind, but can still see, may do so because of the benefits of cortisone and ACTH. These were developed about 9 years ago. While we do not yet know the exact benefits of the recently introduced drugs for the relief of mental illness, it is a fact that very large numbers of the mentally disturbed have been able to leave the confines of barred sanatorium rooms to rejoin their families at home. This is great progress, heart-warming progress.

Today, we have a method for preventing kernicterus, a disorder of infancy which previously resulted in cerebral palsy, mental retardation or death in about 2,000 children yearly. Tax dollars voted by my committee in Congress made the work possible. The recent trials of a diagnostic test for cancer of the cervix, deadly to many women each year, show that such tests if applied on a mass scale can catch this cancer early enough to reduce mortality to almost zero.

There has been encouraging progress against heart disease—a term which includes "heart attacks," hardening of the arteries, high blood pressure, heart and blood vessel defects children are born with, and damage to the heart valve resulting from rheumatic fever. In terms of death, heart disease is the greatest burden of all. Over 50 percent of all deaths in the United States each year are caused by it.

What has happened in the past ten years? We in Congress determined, at the people's request, to start a realistic, large-scale attack on heart disease. As a member of this committee I helped in establishing the National Heart Institute in 1948 and have since done everything possible to induce Congress to support it to the hilt. The work made possible by Federal dollars, and the private support that has grown up parallel to the Federal program, has begun to turn the tide—and in the near future we may well see the number of untimely heart deaths and the amount of suffering from cardiac disabilities dramatically reduced.

In every aspect of the gains over heart disease, the funds provided by Congress have meant the difference between little being done and an intensive attack. Before we in Congress determined, knowing what people wanted, to get resources mobilized, heart disease was almost like an untilled field or an inlet or bay that had never yielded its catch to the fisherman's net.

This, of course, was true in other disease conditions. And I shall be eternally, humbly, glad that I have been privileged to serve in Congress at a time when I could lead the support for these medical research and public health activities on the scale that they should and must have if our children and kin and friends and neighbors are to have the way opened for better health and longer, happier, more productive lives.

I have enumerated only a few of the medical triumphs of the past decade. There have been many more. Words cannot describe what they mean and will mean—to the father, mother, son, daughter, grandparents, to all the members of a family—when one or another of them sees his loved one helped or saved when suffering from such conditions as heart disease, tuberculosis, cancer, mental illness, diabetes or neurological disorders.

This is not to say that the end is in sight. Actually, it is only a good beginning. True, physicians are saving people who a few years ago couldn't be saved. But—as all of us know—there are still vast gaps in our knowledge, many afflictions which remain unconquered. Everybody agrees that the fight must go on—that this is a thing we cannot afford to stop. And I shall continue, in the future as in the past, with the support of the people of my district of Rhode Island, to provide leadership in the conquest of disease.

I shall be privileged and proud to continue this fight against disease as long as I live.

Address of Roy Cullen, South Texas College of Law and Commerce

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 26, 1956

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, Hugh Roy Cullen is a great and good man. He is an outstanding American and sterling patriot who has contributed much to the development and progress of our country.

Because Mr. Cullen started from the bottom and rose to the top in our industrial and financial world is not my main reason for admiring him. Of course, we all do or should admire men who make a success in business. Roy Cullen, through adversity and against great odds has climbed to the top of the ladder of success through his own efforts, the faith of his friends, and the undying loyalty of his good wife. There were hours of dark despair and moments of disillusionment but he never lost faith in himself, which the good God and his parents bequeathed him.

Through all the vicissitudes of fortune, H. R., as he is belovedly known, never gave up. He had singleness of purpose and concentration of energy on a definite goal.

The remarkable thing about Mr. Cullen is that after achieving heights of greatness he never lost the common touch. Always he helped those associated with him and people below him. He never asked nor gave any quarter in his struggle for existence.

With a clear mind, a big and generous heart, and with willing hands, he has served his State and Nation well. He is a stubborn man for what is right and a fearless man against what is wrong. No one will ever question his purity of motive, his honesty of purpose, his resolute will to do what is right.

H. R. Cullen is a unique combination of determination and compassion. He fights forcefully for his ideals and with a kind and generous heart forgives people who differ with him.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to have talked to many people, leaders and followers all over this world, but I can truthfully say that I know of no grander, finer, abler, or better man than Hugh Roy Cullen.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a most memorable address which he recently delivered. Not everyone will agree with what he said, and I may not accept in toto, any more than I would always agree with my father or my wife. That does not keep me from loving my father, my wife, or Roy Cullen. So much knowledge, wisdom, and courage is expressed in his address that I think all Americans, including the Supreme Court, should read, ponder, and prayerfully study it. Without doubt he is one of the finest, sweetest, most lovable and able men I have ever met.

ADDRESS OF H. R. CULLEN, SOUTH TEXAS COLLEGE OF LAW AND COMMERCE, RIVER OAKS BAPTIST CHURCH, JUNE 4, 1956

I am honored to have been selected to make the commencement address to the South Texas College of Law and Commerce.

It was 15 years ago that I last addressed a group of graduates of this worthy institution. Many of the things I said on that occasion would be appropriate to repeat this evening, for we are confronted with many of the same problems. I am happy to say that some have been eliminated—yet sad to relate that many have been compounded.

When reviewing my speech file, I discovered the address I made to the graduating class 15 years ago, and I must admit that I was tempted to repeat it with merely a few extra comments, adjusting it to the present day. Even though I resisted that temptation, the theme is the same.

I realize there is nothing quite so boring as the repetition of an old story, and you may wonder why so many of us oldsters keep on repeating the same tales year after year. Recently I read a brief editorial released by

the Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, which makes so much sense that I believe I will read it in part:

"Some may wonder why the circus keeps coming back year after year. After all, the acts and the animals and the clowns and all the rest of it are pretty much the same.

"One reason is that a great new audience comes into being in this country each year. Last year, for instance, 4 million babies were born—and none had ever seen an elephant.

"In other words, the circus comes back because the American scene is forever changing."

And so we need to remember that millions will never see an elephant if the circus doesn't keep performing, just as millions may never know the blessings of freedom if we don't keep selling the philosophies and ideals based on the principles that have made our country great.

Today marks an important milestone in your lives. You have studied and worked through a course designed to fulfill the requirements of a complicated pattern of life. Naturally you are eager to apply those things you have learned.

What can you expect from the life that you have dreamed will await you upon your graduation?

You can rightly expect to fill the niche reserved for all industrious people in a world anxious to accept fresh talent. Of course, you know that learning is a continuous process and so you will not completely close the school door, but merely change the location of your study activity. You can never expect to rest on your laurels, for the world moves on and you must move with it.

But you may ask, what lies ahead in a world divided between the struggle of atheistic communism on the one hand and our Christian free enterprise system on the other, with the forces of socialism, that Trojan horse galloping along beside?

The young people of today are the masters of their destiny to the extent they are willing to conquer their fears and overcome them through faithful diligence. By diligence, I mean that hard core of resistance, that willingness to work for your happiness and reject the theory that is so prevalent that the Government or somebody else owes you a living.

You cannot for 1 minute forget that the promises of security by a centralized, socialized bureaucracy will be the damnation of the soul of our great Nation. There is no true middle ground between the forces of evil and those of right. You cannot ignore the history of 19 fallen civilizations.

Some will say, "But this is different—we are living in a period of revolution. We cannot turn back the clock. We must change in the name of progress." Don't let anyone fool you that there is anything new about a planned economy and guaranteed security, which we have been hearing so much about for the last quarter of a century. There is nothing in my book which indicates that a change is necessarily progress.

A great many have been deceived by the planners, and so we have been experimenting with providing social welfare for all the people. This has been tried on numerous occasions during the past 6,000 years, so history tells us. Augustus Caesar planned carefully for his people, and started many social reforms, but the Roman empire disappeared into the oblivion of the Dark Ages.

Our forefathers even experimented in the first colonies of Jamestown and Plymouth. Many people who theorize on the wonderful dream of freedom from want, don't even know that two of the most colorful examples of the failure of socialism existed right here in the United States. And these should have thrived, if there could be a reason for socialism to work anywhere, because these colonists had a common religious heritage and their Christian philosophy of sharing from the common stores, certainly ought to have proven more successful than any other attempts.

However, the unwillingness of Jamestown men to work, waiting to be fed and clothed, was almost fatal to that band of 105 who landed on the banks of the James River in May 1607. As you could expect from such circumstances, the people began to die from disease and starvation, and the only thing that saved the colony was Captain Smith's proclamation, which in short, meant: He who will not work, will not eat.

When the common stock of the Puritans at Plymouth began to dwindle, they were in the same straits as those of those in Jamestown. But by 1623 when their economy had changed to free enterprise, Governor Bradford was able to report that they not only provided for their own, but had enough to sell to others, and by the next year, the colony even exported a boatload of corn.

Man is a creature of desires and a most important economic fact is that not many of his wants are supplied in the amounts required without effort on his part. Thus, when men work without the full benefit of their labors being realized, with only a dole for existence sake, and with those who do not work receiving the same, laziness and shirking become the order of the day. Therefore we can see the futility of the socialistic state and learn from the examples that history relates, that the results of socialistc controls follow a very definite pattern. The capacity as well as the necessity for savings start to decline. There seems no need for hard work or storing up for a rainy day, when the people are led to believe that the Government will take care of them no matter what befalls. The outcome is decreased production and finally—want.

The real tragedy of the whole situation is the difficulty of turning back once the die is cast. It has been said that experience is a dear teacher, but let me say here, it is too dear when we are threatening not only our lives but those of future generations.

England's experiment with socialism failed, but theirs was the good fortune to have the United States Treasury to fall back upon.

Our forefathers were fortunate to survive those early winters of famines and tryrannies to leave us a heritage of freedom to worship God under our great Constitution with the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

A fallacy which exists today is spread by those so-called liberals who have taken the Constitution to guarantee happiness in the form of prosperity for everyone. The Constitution reads—the pursuit of happiness—and always remember that nine-tenths of happiness rests in the pursuit thereof. If each of you had been guaranteed a place in society with all your wants supplied when you came into this world, how many of you do you suppose would be graduating tonight? If everyone had such a guaranty, just how good would that guaranty be?

When I spoke to the graduating class at South Texas College of Law and Commerce in 1941, I dealt at length with our Bill of Rights. We were at war against a totalitarian state, and yet we were threatened with the loss of our rights as guarantied by the Constitution and Bill of Rights in our very efforts to preserve our freedom. The spirit of sacrifice brought on by the war, almost lost to a totalitarian government at home the very principles we were fighting to protect on foreign soil. Indeed, we had so many emergencies and so much "must legislation" that we were on the verge of losing our cherished Bills of Rights.

After the war the people became aware of the deception of "must" legislation and emergencies when they persisted in spite of peace, and the people voted overwhelmingly against our continued loss of freedom. They proved beyond a shadow of a doubt in 1952 that they wanted a change. In many respects we have had a change. The people have been awakened to the dangers of big government and many of the Hoover Commission recommendations are being put into practice. There is an awakened and enlightened citizenry with many patriotic organizations sounding the principles of sane legislation, including necessary amendments to protect our form of government. We can never afford to be complacent for a minute, for the forces of communism are working from within with every conceivable method to weaken our resistance. We must never forget that eternal vigilance is truly the price of liberty.

In 1941 it was the third article of the Bill of Rights that was of so much concern. Today it is the 10th article. Our greatest bulwark against communism has been the 43 States with the 10th article of the Bill of Rights protecting their sovereignty. Suppose a strong centralized government had had complete control during World War II when Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White were such prominent figures in our Federal affairs. There is no doubt but that we would be under Communist dictatorship today.

Yet with each passing day we seem to be sitting back and permitting the Supreme Court to diminish those very States rights which have in the past saved us from destruction. Unless we can amend the Constitution to provide Justices with judicial background instead of pure political appointees, I greatly fear for our future.

Our great Constitution was written and adopted on the principle that this would be a Nation governed by laws and not by men. Our deep concern today over the usurpation of States rights by the decisions of the Supreme Court, were voiced long ago by the father of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, who said:

"The germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in the Constitution of the Federal judiciary; an irresponsible body working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the States, and the government of all be consolidated into one. To this I am opposed; because, when all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another, and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

Article 6 of the Constitution states, in part: "all judicial officers * * * shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

By applying this constitutional test, in my opinion, every member of the Supreme Court could be impeached. And I say they should be, for the Supreme Court's usurpation of the power to legislate, which was delegated to Congress by our Constitution, smacks of fascism, nazism, and communism, Congress should act at once to correct this situation, and any candidate for Congress who will not accept this responsibility should be defeated in this coming election. Until we are able to find a way to protect our States and the people from the baseless decisions of the Court, we are a nation governed by men and not by law. And who can say what whim may prevail over the so-called "nine old men" tomorrow?

Certainly if our Constitution guarantees us any rights, it provides for the right to work. And yet, the Supreme Court a few days ago, ruled against the right-to-work laws of the various States.

The time has come when it is imperative that we appraise our national situation with relation to capital and labor. Too great

emphasis has been placed on the distinction between these two factors of production. This dividing line is being drawn more clearly each day by some labor leaders due to their personal ambitions, and others because of lack of knowledge, who are using the labor unions to build a political machine. Samuel Gompers, the father of the labor unions and highly respected by all who knew him, bitterly opposed this, as do many of the well informed labor leaders. But the acts of a few labor leaders are hurting labor's cause.

Evidence is on hand at every turn to prove this, but to cite an instance—take the position of the employees of Ford Motor Co. during their last labor dispute. If the union leaders had accepted the management's proposal of ownership of stock in the company instead of the union leader's proposition, they would have benefited by about 42 percent more than they actually received in hourly cash benefits.

An important factor in analyzing this labor-management situation, is to recognize that there is no clearcut distinction between the people involving the four factors of production—labor, land, capital, and management—for the truth of the matter is that any individual in a community can be described in relation to one or more of these factors. For instance, every laborer who so much as owns a car, is also a capitalist, and it is not infrequent for one individual to be a landowner, laborer, capitalist, and manager.

Let us take a look at what the so-called laborer will have if he permits his labor boss to completely dominate the production scene. The manager is the one who performs the function of organizing, planning, and bearing the risks of production. If through strikes, closed shops, and other means that labor uses of forcing management to increase wages and benefits, the margin of profit becomes too low or becomes a loss, what will become of capital and management? It is ridiculous to assume that management will continue to organize and plan and bear the risks of production when there is little or no chance for profit. The next step is Government ownership and complete socialization.

The laborer's greatest friend and the greatest statesman of this generation in my opinion, Bob Taft, is now deceased, but the benefits of the Taft-Hartley labor law live on. Under the old Wagner Act some of the cruel labor leaders were using goons to beat up the laborer and their families to make them conform to their ideas, and under that act the laborer had no protection under the law. The Taft-Hartley law changed this situation and naturally the selfish labor leader wants to weaken the law. The Taft-Hartley law may need some improvements, but I do not believe the laborer will ever want to weaken it and go back to the days of the Wagner Act, because he has come to realize that his success depends more upon the success of the company for which he works than upon his labor boss.

The laborer cannot ignore the absolute truth that his welfare is bound to the welfare of management and capital. Plain commonsense calls for labor and management to join hands for their mutual progress.

There are not many ills in our Nation today that could not be cured by a good dose of constructive thinking followed by a round of concentrated activity. Our greatest weakness is within us—as a nation we have grown complacent because of materialistic success. The advances we made under a free-enterprise economy, we are jeopardizing without much thought.

To think, one must be informed. Thomas Jefferson said: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

And Plato said: "The penalty good men pay for indifference to public affairs, is to be ruled by evil men."

Along with your life's work, it is your duty and privilege to take an interest in your local, State, and National Governments, and in doing this, you should avoid every form of socialism, old fogyism, and middle-of-the-roadism. You must never become narrow-minded, but always be willing to compromise on circumstances, but never on principles.

In conclusion, I wish to say that you have every right to be cheerful as you go forth to meet the new challenges in an exciting and creative age. One of you may possess a dream that will advance the human race. Make it your business to remain informed, to use all your powers to think and act, but never from a selfish viewpoint. Above all, never permit the sin of indifference to enter your lives to destroy your souls.

Atomic Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. JAMES TUMULTY
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, under previous leave to extend my remarks, I want to point out that Chairman Lewis E. Strauss, who has an outstanding record of service and devotion to the United States, was the subject of derogatory accusations against him. The following letter and editor's note from the Washington Post and Times Herald set the record straight. Lewis E. Strauss has an unequaled reputation in the country for patriotism, competence, and devotion to duty. He should be impervious to this type of attack. The letter follows:

ATOMIC POWER

Your editorial on July 26 on the defeat of the Gore-Holifield bill states that the House Appropriations Subcommittee accused me of "duplicity" and "fraud."

What transpired before the subcommittee can be briefly summarized. Its chairman vigorously objected to part of a letter from the Commission to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That letter, which stated a legal opinion of the General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, was signed by the Acting Chairman of the Commission in my absence from Washington. I took full responsibility for the letter, as indeed I must as Chairman for all Commission affairs.

In essence, it was a disagreement over an involved legal point, but certainly the Commission acted properly, in good faith, and even on request, when it informed the Congress of our General Counsel's opinion.

The charge of "fraud" is not to be found in the report which the Appropriations Committee of the House adopted.

I will appreciate an appropriate explanation of this and, since the committee did not make the charge, a public avowal that The Washington Post itself did not intend to accuse me of "fraud."

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

WASHINGTON.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Mr. Strauss' summary is correct. The testimony before the subcommittee did indeed concern a dispute about differing views of an involved legal question. The charge that the Atomic Energy Commission's legal argument was "fraudulent" and "duplicitous" appeared in a draft report submitted by the subcommittee chairman. The word "fraudulent" was removed in the final report of the full committee. This report did not accuse Mr. Strauss of "fraud" and we disavow any intention of doing so in our editorial. We are happy to make the record entirely clear on this.

Report to the Constituents of the First District of Florida

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the 84th Congress adjourns, I believe it is appropriate and purposeful to make this report to my constituents, the people, estimated at 600,000, of the first district of Florida, summarizing some of the activities of this Congress and my actions thereon.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

I have always believed that an informed and alert citizenry is the cornerstone of our republican form of government. I further feel that my constituents are entitled to know what is being done in their interest by their Representative in Washington. Thus, I have attempted, during my first term in Congress, to advise the folks at home and, as far as possible, to be advised by them. To implement this, I have made biweekly television and radio broadcasts; sent out newsletters; instituted district-wide telephone polls on important issues arising suddenly and on which, otherwise, there is no means of determining the wishes of the people at home; and have taken annual tours, with my "office on wheels" and staff in accompaniment, of every city, village, and settlement in Pinellas, Hillsborough, Pasco, and Hernando Counties that comprise the First District of Florida. Incidentally, these activities in the main were not at Government expense although they could probably be classified as proper governmental activities. This report is made consistent with my belief that the people have the right to know.

My actions this session have been based on what I believe to be the best interests of all the people of my district, and services have been rendered on a fair and impartial basis, regardless of political affiliation, personal motivation, or any other consideration. All views, majority and minority, as well as individual, have been given careful consideration and careful and thorough attention has been paid to the issues involved, while maintaining an awareness of the effect of my actions on the district, State, and Nation. This is representative government in action.

SERVICE TO CONSTITUENTS

One of the more important and personal functions of the congressional office is to be of service to the many constituents your Congressman represents. This includes action for individuals with many small problems, as well as the representation of larger groups and organizations. For example, in your Washington office, we have handled during

the last 2 sessions of Congress over 375 veterans' cases, dozens and dozens of applications for passports, have forwarded hundreds of Government documents, and have met several thousand visitors in the Nation's Capitol.

ATTENDANCE

As your Representative in Congress, I have deemed it a privilege to be on the job and attend to the many problems of legislation which is presented. In the 2 sessions of the 84th Congress in which 133 quorum calls were made I was absent on only 3 occasions, and in the 148 roll-calls I was absent on only 4 occasions, a total attendance record of 97.5 percent of which I am very proud. Incidentally, all occasions on which I was absent from the floor were necessitated by duties attended in the First District.

DISTRICT

At all times since being elected to this Congress, I have for your convenience maintained a district office. This office has been staffed and is completely prepared to meet constituents and to gain a first-hand knowledge of their problems. Many times, through the operation of the district office, I have been better prepared to represent my constituents in the Nation's Capitol. There has been at hand at all times a staff that is prepared and understanding of the problems facing various individuals and, further, a staff that is able at first hand to completely report all activities of your congressional office through the press, radio, and television to all people of the district so that they might be informed. In addition, I have made dozens of reports to groups following the first session and plan to do so again following this second session of Congress, attempting to bring the Government closer to the people.

WASHINGTON VISITS

One of the greatest pleasures that I have had in the Nation's Capital has been to greet the many visitors, families, school patrols, class groups, high school organizations, and others who have come to see and learn about their Government. It has been a pleasure in many instances to renew old friendships and in others to make the acquaintance and assist in visits and tours of new friends. The opportunity to visit the Nation's Capital and at first hand see the many agencies and departments of Government in action is one which should be afforded every American. Consistent with this, I shall urge that this be done, particularly by young people who will grow up to be the great men and women of tomorrow.

COMMITTEE WORK

One of the most important functions of your Representative is to consider legislation referred to committees on which he serves. I was fortunate in being appointed to the Public Works Committee and the Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control and Roads Subcommittees thereof early in the session. This committee is vital to Florida because of our many harbor, erosion, river, flood control, drainage, beach erosion, and public building problems. Upon the death of the former chairman, Chauncey Reed, of the powerful Judiciary Committee, I was unanimously appointed to the vacancy created and served also on the Claims Subcommittee. My district was highly honored by this appointment not only because this is one of the major and most sought after committees but because I was the first Floridian ever appointed to it. This committee considers immigration, claims, court, States rights, and other matters, including over 50 percent of all the legislation introduced.

HONORS RECEIVED

As the first Republican Representative elected from Florida I, and in turn my district, received many honors. I was chosen to represent all freshmen members of my party in the 84th Congress as speaker at the Board of Trade dinner in Washington upon the convening of Congress and shared the platform with Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina. Thus the South gained unprecedented recognition in both parties on this occasion. By House resolution, I was unanimously chosen to read Washington's Farewell Address before the House on Washington's Birthday. Being appointed to the campaign committee and the committee on committees representing Florida, and the district I was privileged to have an effective voice in committee appointments and party policies.

The Chowder and Marching Organization chose me a member as one of two freshmen Congressmen selected and the insight into legislative procedure and issues gained from this association with experienced Members of the House, Senate, and executive branch proved invaluable. Many sections of the country, including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Virginia, Nebraska, and West Virginia are now better acquainted with Florida, and the First District as the result of the many invitations to visit and speak which I received. The Georgetown Forum of the Air invited myself and Senator BIBLE of Utah, to appear on its nationwide weekly program and many other local programs invited me as their guest. Thus the people of the district were represented in many areas before many groups and many mediums.

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED

Perhaps one of the best keys to the aggressiveness and effectiveness of a Member of Congress is the bills and amendments to bills he introduces and the action taken on the subject matter contained in them. Of course, as a minority Member of the House, it is usually necessary to join with others on the majority side in order to accomplish the objective sought, and an analysis of the bills which I introduced and the action taken on the subject matter contained in them is important.

MATTERS OF PARTICULAR LOCAL INTEREST

First. I introduced two immigration bills and one was passed permitting a young Spanish girl who had been living in Tampa for years to be adopted by those who had grown to love her.

Second. A bill to convey 16 acres of surplus Government property adjoining Bay Pines to the Pinellas County School Board. This served the purpose of keeping the land from being sold to private interests until it could be conveyed under existing law. This was 16 acres in addition to the adjoining 10 acres conveyed on my request, the Pinellas school system having thus received some 26 acres valued at $62,000 at no cost.

Third. Bills to serve veterans' interests were pushed, including one to establish a national veterans' cemetery in the First District, which is under study and survey resulting from introducing the bill, and one introduced after Veterans' Administration surveys made at my request were completed showing that a need exists to add 1,000 general medical and surgical beds to the overcrowded Bay Pines Veterans' Hospital on which hearings before the Veterans' Affairs Committee are being planned during adjournment—this is in addition to the proposal to build a 1,000-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Gainesville—and one to continue the GI home loan program which was continued as the result of interest shown by many of us who introduced bills and constantly sought the support of committee members.

Fourth. A bill to determine the feasibility of making a National Spanish-American War Memorial and Shrine out of Fort De Soto on Mullet Key in Tampa Bay and Pinellas County is presently under study by the United States Park Service and a report on the bill will be available for early action next session.

Fifth. A bill to provide for the location of a National Institute for the Physically Handicapped in Hernando County to serve the State and Nation, as well as the First District, is receiving attention of General Services Administration and Health, Education, and Welfare Department after numerous conferences in Washington and in Brooksville, and there seems to be an excellent chance for accomplishing this objective on a negotiated basis.

Sixth. A bill to make greater Federal protection to eroding beaches and shores available to local governing units in the protection of public beaches and other public property was considered by my Public Works Committee and a bill similar to mine which contained the principle of protecting all public property that might be subject to eroding action even though it does not actually abut on the water was enacted by the Congress. This should mean that the Pinellas County beach-erosion project will, for example, have a better chance of getting underway.

Seventh. A bill to expedite the immigration of skilled sponge divers to help the rehabilitation of the Tarpon Springs sponge industry, which had as its purpose the permitting of skilled divers, when need is shown and income is guaranteed, to be brought in under existing law, but without having to wait for 18 months to 2 years for entry, has received favorable Immigration Subcommittee action and was scheduled for passage, but other Members of the delegation in the House and on the Senate side were unwilling to act on the bill without further study. Thus, action awaits next session, after full investigation of the merits of the bill.

Eighth. A bill for preliminary survey of Gulfport Harbor and Sunshine Skyway

Channel was passed as a part of the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. This bill was vetoed by the President because so many pork-barrel projects were included that were not justified. A new bill will be acted on next session.

MATTERS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

First. The greatest public works program in the history of the world was first acted upon by my Roads Subcommittee and the full Public Works Committee and then the entire Congress this session. I sat in on and was a part of these hearings and debates, both in 1955 and 1956. Many weeks of hard work and diligent effort went into this $47 billion program, $33 billion Federal and $14 billion State funds, that will see the completion of the 41,000-mile interstate program and acceleration of all other systems in order to accommodate the anticipated 86 million cars to be on the roads in the next 10 years. It was an inspiration to me to be a part of this monumental work, probably the most important new legislative action of the 84th Congress, and to have contributed something to making it a good program. I introduced a bill early in the second session to make Federal-road funds available for the purchase of rights-of-way up to 5 years in advance of construction which, when applied to the entire program, it is estimated could save as much as $1.5 billion. This is a new concept in roadbuilding with Federal funds and means substantial savings to Florida, too, because more roads can be built with less money if right-of-way can be purchased substantially before actual construction is programed. It also makes possible long-range planning. This new concept was unanimously accepted by the subcommittee and the full committee on my motion as a part of the new 1956 road bill and is now the law. Many other amendments which I proposed, in an effort to enact the best possible bill, were accepted.

ON PENSION, SOCIAL SECURITY, AND RETIREMENT

Second. A civil-service retirement bill was introduced which increased pensions to those to retire in the future as well as those on retirement and improved the retirement system. A similar bill was passed which will mean greater job security to all postal and Federal employees but, despite the efforts of many, the provisions were not made applicable to those already retired. There was, of course, a pension increase, as an interim approach, passed in 1955 for which I worked assiduously. This session Spanish War widows' pensions were increased, along with a 10-percent increase for retired railroad employees, and about an 8-percent increase in postal employees salaries. Thus, those on retirement and those to retire in the future received my active efforts and attention.

I pressed for the social-security amendments providing retirement of women at 62, disability retirement at 50, greater coverage and children's benefits.

Third. Again as a member of the Public Works Committee when the water pollution bill was up for consideration, I was able to get the committee to unanimously accept my amendment to make Federal grant funds, which had already been approved by the committee, for the use for advanced planning and engineering for sewage disposal plants to be done by the local governing authorities. Although the House unanimously accepted this amendment on the floor the actual designation of 10 percent of the funds to be used for this purpose was deleted in conference although the advance planning and engineering was retained in the definition of "construction" so such funds as the Surgeon General might decide is merited can still be used for this purpose as the result of my amendment. This is important in the many communities that are planning new or expanded sewage disposal plants.

Fourth. I introduced a bill to eliminate the 5-percent absorption clause in the Federally Impacted Area School Act which provided previously for Federal contribution in areas affected by Government installations of Federal funds—such as to the school system of Hillsborough County serving MacDill Air Force Base—only when up to 5 percent of total county enrollment was attributable to the Air Force installation. Hillsborough was 4.9 percent impacted under this formula and it was necessary to have the unreasonable formula waived to entitle the county to some $100,000 in Federal funds. This was done in 1955 and again in 1956 when the efforts of many of us resulted in the elimination of the 5-percent absorption feature altogether, and at the same time the base figure for determining the contributions was changed to benefit Hillsborough another $46,000. This is an example of little-known or publicized services which a member of Congress is expected to render.

Fifth. A bill to modernize and make more effective the commercial and conservation fish and wildlife services of the Federal Government was introduced by me and a number of other Congressmen and a compromise bill was enacted. With the commercial industry worth over $10 million per year to Florida, and the sports fishing industry being of more than 10 times that value, this creation of an Assistant Secreatry for Fish and Wildlife in the Department of Interior and a deputy for commercial and one for conservation interests will mean much to Florida.

Sixth. A bill to provide an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Florida was cleared informally by the Judiciary Committee of the House and was to be offered as a committee amendment to the omnibus judgeship bill. This bill was not reported out by the Rules Committee for obvious political reasons until after the presidential election.

Seventh. A bill to provide Federal funds for airport terminal construction I introduced and pushed before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. A similar bill was enacted and both Pinellas and Hillsborough International Airports have received nearly a total of $500,000 for terminal construction under this legislation.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Of course, I appeared before many congressional committees presenting petitions submitted by constituents and groups in the district and in an effort to secure favorable committee action on matters of importance to the district and the Nation. There were too many such appearances to enumerate here but statements made are contained in the records of the committee hearings.

In addition, numerous conferences were held with executive branch of the Government on such problems as the rehabilitation of the sponge industry—research program resulted of which $26,000 has been allocated and $20,000 still programed—the cigar industry and the reduction of tariffs on tobacco leaf importation needed to offset reduction in Cuban cigars, the establishment of the National Institute for the Rehabilitation of the Handicapped in Hernando County—add to these other conferences. Numerous arguments on the floor of the House were made in the interest of good legislation.

ON THE LOCAL SCENE

As your Representative, most particular interest was paid the demands and needs of the First District. Florida being threatened with the invasion of the Mediterranean fruitfly called for immediate Federal assistance in combating this dread peril to our citrus growers. I am proud of the cooperation given me and the rest of the Florida delegation by the Department of Agriculture and the appropriation of some $5 million in emergency matching funds. The Department also has proved outstanding in research against the spreading decline, which is also a threat to Florida citrus production. The Post Office Department has seen the need for expanded facilities in a great and growing State, and new post offices are either underway or are being planned for St. Petersburg, Tampa, Dade City, Mango, Safety Harbor, Palma Ceia, West Tampa, New Port Richey, and Ybor City. I was proud to be of assistance in obtaining Federal aid for mosquito-control measures—assisting a low-cost housing project for Plant City—working with the Ybor City Redevelopment Committee in establishing a Latin center—to receive authorization for reserve armories in Tampa and St. Petersburg—achieve establishment of an Air Reserve Squadron at Pinellas International Airport of over $2,500,000—and, perhaps, what is the greatest single development feature of the West Coast in many years to have gotten underway and actually see development of the $11 million Tampa Harbor Improvement project.

This has been a year of great progress for the first district of Florida, and I feel that many benefits were received through the cooperation of local representatives, citizens' groups, and the hard work of many individuals. I am proud to offer this record as a proof of progress.

Report From the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a report from the executive committee of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, of which I am a member, which will be of use to Members of Congress and those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who will be called upon in the remaining months of the centennial year to participate in programs honoring Woodrow Wilson.

The list of activities enumerated in this report includes: A summary of the publications and papers prepared or published during the first half of the centennial year; a report on the centennial activities in other countries including centennial information sent overseas by the United States Information Agency and the Free Europe press, and a general listing of materials available to all organizations planning Wilson programs.

The following excerpts from the Commission's report include but a few of the activities presented in the first 6 months of the centennial year. Other materials will be submitted as they become available.

SPECIAL EVENTS

Association of International Relations Clubs, which met April 4–7 in Philadelphia, Pa., took Woodrow Wilson as the theme for its ninth annual conference. Speakers included: Mr. August Heckscher, president of Woodrow Wilson Foundation; Mrs. Vera M. Dean, editor, Foreign Policy Association; and Dr. Harry D. Gideonse, president, Brooklyn College.

Princeton University dedicated 1956 to events commemorating Wilson centennial year, including talks by President Harold W. Dodds and Harold Medina, special Wilson issue of college newspaper, a 3-day conference on The Political Executive in the National Government, under the direction of Prof. Stephan K. Bailey, attended by more than 60 leaders and scholars of American public life, including Harold Stassen, Joseph Dodge, and Arthur Fleming; dedication of the Stafford Little lectures to Wilson; and a most extensive library exhibit and other events.

Trifaith panel: Talks by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Father George B. Ford, and Rev. Ralph W. Sockman, representing the three major faith groups of America, in a special service presented at King Auditorium at Mary Baldwin College. Tape recordings of an edited version of these talks are available from the Commission.

Woodrow Wilson Institute was held April 26 at Mary Baldwin College with Virginius Dabney, editor of Richmond Times-Dispatch as chairman. This all-day session included Arthur Krock, New York Times correspondent; Dr. Robert C. Clothier, president emeritus of Rutgers University; Sir Leslie Munro, Ambassador from New Zealand; Princeton University's T. J. Wertenbaker and Dr. Harold W. Dodds, president of Princeton, as among its participants. The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Commission of Virginia sponsored an outdoor drama, The Eleventh Hour, based on the life of Woodrow Wilson.

Bryn Mawr Conference was held January 5 and 6, taking as its theme Woodrow Wilson and the World of Today. Speakers included William Langer, of Harvard; Arthur Link, of Northwestern; and Eric Goldman, of Princeton. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation shared sponsorship of the conference with Bryn Mawr.

Wilson film released: A special documentary film made from newsreels and other film of the Wilson era was produced for the Wilson Foundation and is now available for showings by civic, governmental, school, and similar non-profit-making organizations. The film is titled "Woodrow Wilson—Spokesman for Tomorrow."

A special session of the Virginia General Assembly was held to commemorate the Woodrow Wilson Centennial. United States Senator HARRY F. BYRD and former United States Senator Tom Connally addressed the group.

RADIO AND TV

In the first 6 months of the centennial year local and national radio and television broadcasts were devoted to Wilson. These programs included dramatic, forum, interview and other types of presentations. The following listing of radio programs includes both network and local originations:

The National Broadcasting Co. featured a talk on Wilson by Jonathan Daniels, editor of the Raleigh News and Observer on Monitor; an interview with August Heckscher, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, by Margaret Truman and Mike Wallace on Weekday, and the dramatic presentation, "Nor Reach the Uplands," a story of Woodrow Wilson and Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, supervised by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, on the Eternal Light program.

The CBS network presented a panel discussion on Town Meeting of the Air with the following participants: Colgate Darden, president of the University of Virginia, August Heckscher, and the late Senator Alben Barkley. This Is New York, CBS, presented interviews with Mr. August Heckscher, president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, and Mrs. Eleanor Wilson McAdoo, daughter of President Wilson.

Television contributed to the centennial celebration by producing the following programs with a Wilsonian theme: A speech on Wilson by the late Alben Barkley, speaking before the Democratic National Committee, was simulcast over many Radio and TV networks; The New York Times Youth Forum presented Gov. Robert Meyner of New Jersey answering questions concerning Wilson's contribution to world peace. The program was titled "Can We Make the World Safe for Democracy?" and the panel consisted of high school students.

Another Forum program, Does the World Depend on Free People? featured Dr. Grayson as guest and included many references to President Wilson. WRCA-TV in New York presented Man of the Year, which included a commentary on the life of Woodrow Wilson. Reviewing Stand, a presentation of Northwestern University in Evanston, Ill., was simulcast over TV and Radio. Speakers included: Prof. Arthur S. Link, Northwestern University; Dr. Richard Leopold, Northwestern University; Prof. Robert Osgood, University of Chicago, and Dean James H. McBurney, Northwestern University, moderator.

* * * * *

MEMORIALS

A 7-cent stamp was issued early this year to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. The stamp bears a likeness of Wilson from a drawing by F. Graham Cootes and is maroon in color with white face gothic lettering.

The commission sponsored legislation by Congress directing that the proposed new bridge across the Potomac River connecting Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia be named the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge.

A bronze bust of Wilson, together with a tablet, was unveiled at the Hall of Fame for Great Americans at New York University. Wilson was elected to the Hall of Fame in 1950 and is the 82d American and the 12th President to be memorialized in the open-air colonnade of the hall. Walter Hancock, American sculptor, modeled the bust and tablet.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral in Washington, D. C., announced earlier this year that plans have been completed for a special memorial service to be held on November 11 of this year when Wilson's final resting place will be moved to the nave of the cathedral from the chapel of the cathedral. Bernard Baruch will be the guest speaker and he will talk on religious freedom and Wilson's philosophy. Government, diplomatic and church dignitaries will take part in the service.

Tributes from American leaders

Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, the only living former Presidents of the United States, each issued a statement paying tribute to Woodrow Wilson and recalling his many contributions to the development of the Nation.

Tributes to Wilson were also accorded by many other American leaders including Adlai Stevenson and John Foster Dulles.

ACTIVITIES IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Tributes from foreign leaders

During the Wilson centennial year statements were received from present and former government officials from many parts of the world paying tribute to Wilson's role in international affairs. Some of the statements were addressed to the Federal Commission, some to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, and others were released directly to the press.

Among those issuing statements have been Ambassador Wellington Koo, of China; Sir Anthony Eden, Prime Minister of Great Britain; Dr. Carl J. Hambro, President of the Lower House of the Norwegian Parliament; the Honorable E. N. van Kleffens, Ambassador to Portugal from the Netherlands; Viscount Cecil, British statesman and one of the signers of the Covenant of the League of Nations; Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States; the Honorable J. Paul-Boncour, who represented France at the League; William E. Rappard, Swiss educator and former League official; Dr. Bogumil Vosjniak, chairman of the Central-Eastern European Woodrow Wilson Committee, whose membership includes representatives of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, now in exile.

Dag Hammarskjold, speaking in his official capacity as Secretary General of the United Nations, delivered a speech in honor of Woodrow Wilson at New York University's Hall of Fame at the unveiling of a bust and tablet of Woodrow Wilson.

Ceremonies: Geneva, Switzerland, was the scene of several programs honoring Woodrow Wilson, including a talk by Prof. William E. Rappard, at the American Club, entitled "What Geneva Owes to Woodrow Wilson." A commemorative program at the University of Geneva, in cooperation with the Institute of Higher International Studies, featured addresses by Prof. Paul Mantoux, interpreter at the Paris Peace Conference; Prof. William Rappard, Director of the League Mandates Section; and M. Bourquin, delegate from Belgium to the League.

The European Center of the Carnegie Endowment at Geneva presented addresses by Prof. Jean-Baptiste Duroselle, of the Institut d'Etudes Politiques in Paris, and Herbert Nicholas of New College, Oxford, England.

The chairman for the Carnegie program was President Harry S. Gideonese, of Brooklyn College, New York.

Cambridge, England: Public lecture by Prof. Denis W. Brogan, Woodrow Wilson, 1856–1956, at Cambridge University.

Panama Canal Zone: Library and museum exhibitions.

London, England: Lecture on Woodrow Wilson by Herbert Agar at Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Centennial information for foreign countries

The following material was sent to all overseas posts of the United States Information Agency: Bibliography Woodrow Wilson and His Times, listing 45 separate books; the Wilson Reader, edited by Frances Farmer (2,500 volumes ordered to date); copies of President's proclamation, and assorted documents and pamphlets; copies of David Loth's the Story of Woodrow Wilson.

News stories have been sent to other nations on all Wilson centennial activities of foreign interests, including: three stories on addresses given by Arthur Krock, Sir Leslie Munro, of New Zealand, Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson, and President Harold Dodds, of Princeton; reprints of lectures given at Princeton by Thomas Wertenberger and Gerald W. Johnson; reprints of articles from Foreign Affairs, New York Times magazine, the Christian Science Monitor, and a picture story with 14 illustrations.

Radio programs beamed at the rest of the world have included a special script honoring Wilson (broadcast in English and 14 other languages); a Czechoslovakia Service feature with Eva Reintz, Woodrow Wilson Fellow; the Staunton Pilgrimage (English, Serbo-Croat and Polish languages); Adlai Stevenson's University of Virginia address, and a recording of addresses by Senator HUMPHREY and Congressman ZABLOCKI.

Balloon drop: More than 250,000 leaflets telling about the Woodrow Wilson Centennial and of the late President's role in establishing Czechoslovakia Republic were delivered to that country by balloons launched by Free Europe Press. Material for the article, which was printed in Czech and Slovak, was provided by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation.

PROGRAM AIDS AVAILABLE

The following materials may be obtained, free of charge, from the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, Interior Building, Washington 25, D. C.:

Handbook of Information and Suggestions for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial containing biographical, chronological, and historical information as well as program suggestions; copies of presidential and state proclamations.

The commission will furnish reference materials, suggested speech topics, discussion themes, news releases, photographs, and any other information needed to assist you in planning a Wilson Centennial program.

The materials listed below may be had in single copies at no charge by addressing the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 45 East 65th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

Discussion guides: Four booklets on Wilson, the Educator, the President, the World Statesman, and the Man of Religion, including questions for discussion and a reading list; display folder—a 3-panel folder, 9 by 11 inches, including a portrait of Wilson centered, with quotations on either side; bibliography—a selection of 110 books relating to Wilson, by Katharine E. Brand, with 33 additional titles by Perry Laukhuff; reading list, a leaflet of suggested readings; 8 titles by Wilson, description of 15 titles about Wilson; biographical pamphlet, The Story of Woodrow Wilson by David Loth; a 48-page illustrated booklet with reading list and chronology.

Woodrow Wilson: Spokesman for Tomorrow, the newsreel documentary film (27 minutes, black and white, 16 millimeter, sound) may be rented from public, university and college film libraries or purchased from text-film department, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., 330 West 42d Street, New York 36, N. Y.

Reflection Is Good for the Political Soul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a giant hoax was perpetrated on the American people. They were promised a new approach to Government, one that truly was to represent them. In 1952, they were promised a world of peace and prosperity, lower taxes, higher wages, lower prices, and a balanced budget. The best business heads in America were to run our Government.

Two years went by, and the disillusioned American people went back to their own party, the Democratic party, by electing a Democratic Congress. The administration moaned and warned of a partisan cold war, of a stalemate within the Government. President Eisenhower cried loudest. Let us now review what happened.

Whatever good there was in the President's program had more support in every instance from the Democratic Party than from his own Republican Party. The President, himself, presently admits that the Democratic Congress produced a substantial amount of worthwhile legislation.

In 1952 the American people were fooled into believing in a program that its authors themselves did not believe in. We hope in this election year they will not fall prey to the hoax that the elephant will again try to foist upon them.

Evaluation of the past will help us to spot the election year myths when they are presented by Republican campaigners.

THE ADMINISTRATION—ABSENTEE MANAGEMENT; WHO'S MINDING THE STORE?

We were promised a President who would be a guiding knight, an active and strong manager, a leader of our country, an expert in military affairs, and a friend of our foreign allies.

Instead we have an aiing gentleman, who had no experience in government, and who has shown no interest or desire to learn about his tasks. On several occasions he has told his press conferences about seeking the enactment of bills he had already signed into law. This disinterest or lack of knowledge cannot be attributed to ill health. Eisenhower's pleasing personality and past military achievements are no substitute for political leadership. There can be no justification for his delegating the authority and responsibility vested by our Constitution solely in the President.

The business managers of our Nation, such as Secretary Wilson and Secretary Humphrey, may be fine in business, but they have proved they do not belong in government. The promotion of the national well-being for the benefit of the many rather than the few is foreign to their philosophy.

It is not true that what is good for General Motors is good for the country. Profits of an automobile industry are not equivalent to the welfare of a people.

Our health program should not be measured with an eye to a balanced budget. Nor has Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey earned the right to act as an adviser to our Armed Forces. Defense and national security must not be impaired by a desire for a balanced budget.

THE CONSUMER, LABOR, AND THE FARMER—THE TIGHT SQUEEZE

The one problem common to the farmer, to labor, and to all of us, is that of the consumer.

Candidate Eisenhower promised us a lower cost of living. President Eisenhower will surely disclaim responsibility for a higher cost of living.

Consumers prices are at a record high. The National Consumer Price Index rose for the fourth successive time in a year. It has reached the highest peak in 5 years. Next month another rise is expected.

The Democratic farm program is based on the knowledge that general prosperity cannot be maintained while we continue to depress the farmer. President Eisenhower vetoed our Democratic farm price support bill and then quickly raised price supports himself. Apparently his sliding scale had slid too far, for farm income is down 30 percent in the past year.

Milk prices to the consumer have continued to rise. Secretary Benson decided to raise dairy prices just when manufacturers had warehouses filled with cheese and butter bought at the lower price level. The farmer who sold his milk at the lower price then had to buy it back as high priced butter. This apparently is the Republican idea of how to aid the dairy farmer. No wonder so many of these farm families spread oleo on their bread.

Milk prices no not worry Secretary Benson who finds that the little farmer is of no importance. Benson is more concerned with the three members of his advisory Board whose firms have been indicted for monopolistic practices. Mr. Benson is apparently fully occupied in directing the administration's ever-changing farm policy. He first opposed and then supported a soil bank; he first opposed and then approved the plowing under of crops; first opposed and then approved the idea of farm policy as a political issue.

The present administration makes many boasts as to the increase in the size of the labor force. This increase is largely a result of our ever-increasing population. Of far greater significance is the fact that at least 2,900,000 people who want jobs, cannot find them. In the past year one million persons have been added to our unemployed rolls. That represents a total of nearly 10 million American men, women and children who have lost their means of support. The billion dollar year that General Motors has just concluded does not help these people.

The Democratic Party sponsored a bill to help our unemployed learn new skills when their previous trades no longer offer employment. Retraining these people will help to relieve all of us of the burden of support. This is the type of constructive, positive, legislation which brought our country to the prosperous state which it enjoyed in 1952 when Republican businessmen began to tear it down.

Candidate Eisenhower peldged himself to the amendment of the Taft-Hartley bill. President Eisenhower has consistently refused to live up to his campaign promises. Former Secretary of Labor Durkin offered the President 19 amendments, which were in accord with Candidate Eisenhower's promises. Eisenhower refused to go along with any of them. Instead he submitted to Congress a program which would toughen the Taft-Hartley Act. His Labor Secretary resigned and was replaced with another big businessman. Congress refused to go along with President Eisenhower's labor program as presented.

In an attempt to meet the increased cost of living, Congress has raised the minimum wage to $1 per hour over President Eisenhower's protest that 90 cents was adequate.

The Republican Party as represented by President Eisenhower may be a party of the people—but of and for a very few people.

BAD GOVERNMENT

During his 1952 campaign Candidate Eisenhower had much to say about corruptions in government and useless personnel in government.

We said then and repeat now: no political party has a monopoly on virtue or efficiency. Every party when trusted with the privilege to govern must be ever alert to weed out the loafers, the incompetent, and the criminal.

President Eisenhower has sadly failed the people in that regard.

The executive departments, in almost every instance, are employing more people and more top executives at higher salaries than in any previous administration. The exceptions are in the so-called service departments. The Post Office Department serving all of the American people is using fewer employees and giving the worst service we have ever experienced.

The Veterans' Administration, serving our veterans and particularly our disabled veterans, has been reduced in force, moved around, kicked around and made a less useful agency to those who need it most.

The Agriculture Department has been reorganized to take out of the hands of the farmers, most of the things they can do best for themselves.

Misappropriating funds is the order of the day for this administration. This administration has appointed more corrupt officials than any other in our history.

Starting with Secretary Benson using department funds to refurbish a government lodge for his personal use, we find corruption rampant in every department.

Warehouses bursting at the seams, because improperly constructed; selling millions of dollars worth of cheese to the processors and buying them back at higher prices, without the cheese ever leaving storage or changing hands; indictment of three members of Secretary Benson's Advisory Board; self-dealing for his private profit of one of his paid subordinates; loading the school lunch program with more than $400,000 worth of phony transportation charges in Illinois for the sole benefit of one of his Republican friends. There are no doubt many more such incidents which have not yet been exposed. We are just beginning to investigate the monoply enjoyed by three companies in disposing of surplus commodities.

Under 20 years of Democratic administration the Commodity Credit Corporation never exceeded an authorization of $6¾ billion. The total lost in those 20 years from operation of the program, was about $1 billion. During 3½ years, the Republicans have increased that authorization to $14 billion. The losses have increased by at least $4 billion. No small part is attributable to the increased interest rates paid to bankers and much of it paid in violation of law.

Dixon-Yates was bad, so bad that even the Republican administration has backed down on its spurious claim of legality.

The cancellation by a Defense Department contract awarded to the Chrysler Corp. and awarding the same business to General Motors is only a small part of the wrong doing in that Department.

The foot-in-mouth statements of Secretary Wilson is the least important of the many things that are bad in this administration.

The Small Business Committees of the Congress have devoted some part of almost every day to urging the Defense Department to follow the law and its own regulations in awarding contracts and making payments earned thereunder.

The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have also been managed in a manner adverse to the public interest.

The big banks and big holding companies have grown bigger with the aid and abetment of the Republican appointees to those agencies.

The responsibility for the Illinois bank scandal, the theft of State funds through bank manipulations, must be borne at least in part by those same Republican Federal appointees.

Internal mismanagement by those officials of their offices I hope will soon be the subject of thorough investigation.

Under the leadership of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Comptroller of the Currency attempts are being made to weaken our banking laws for the benefit of the big banks and to the detriment of the small banks and small investors. A part of that scheme was the abortive attempt to destroy the right of minority stockholders to minority representation on the directorates of national banks.

The full story about the giveaways by the Interior Department, the attempt to destroy TVA, REA, and our other public facilities and natural resources requires much more time than I can give here.

SMALL BUSINESS

Since 1953 our Government has been taken over by big business and the big banking interests of the country. The little fellow has had no representative in the Cabinet or at the top of any executive department. On the contrary, he has had as antagonist big business and the big banks, not only in the market place but also in every department of Government.

What is even worse, the so-called WOC—the big-business man on loan to the Government, drawing no compensation from the Government, but being paid by his big-business employer—has an inside track keeping big business constantly informed as to Government plans and channeling Government business away from the small-business man and to big business.

Credit restrictions are manipulated so as to dry up all sources of credit for the small-business man.

Except in times of war or emergency, WOC's should not be employed by the Government.

I have contended and will continue to urge that the Small Business Administration Act must be strengthened by eliminating the Policy Board now dominated by Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey and Secretary of Commerce Weeks. The agency must be made not only permanent, but permanently independent of the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce.

The small-business man, displaced by slum clearance and highway construction, should be entitled to low interest rate loans based upon character and ability to perform, rather than bankable collateral.

The Defense Department must be directed by the Small Business Administration to discard, as required by law, the old arbitrary, numerical definition of a small business firm, and follow a more realistic one. This will give small business a larger and more equitable share of government contracts.

The Small Business Administration may boast that during 3 years, it has approved 3,560 business loans in an aggregate amount of $137,915,000 on account of which it disbursed $52,578,000. Compare that, however, to what this administration has done for big business in the same period through the Export-Import Bank alone, to wit: 805 loans for a total authorized aggregate amount of almost $7,500,000,000 against which it disbursed over $5,171,000,000. The Export-Import Bank made 22 percent as many loans with an average disbursement of over 426 times more per loan. To put it more simply, SBA's loan disbursements averaged less than $15,000 each and the bank's more than $6,400,000 each.

While big business has made more and bigger profits than at any time in the history of our country, small business has been going into bankruptcy in greater numbers than at any time since the depression days of the early 1930's.

For years, I have led the fight to establish offices of the Small Business Administration in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico so to enable American citizens residing so far from the mainland

to avail themselves of the privileges accorded by law to all. I personally urged the Appropriations Committee to give the agency the money for that purpose. The money was voted. I am still waiting to be informed that even one of those offices has been opened.

GIVEAWAYS: THE GOVERNMENT'S PRIVATE CHARITY

The administration in its "partnership" plan gives, and gives, and gives, and the people get nothing in return. First, it was offshore oil lands, then TVA, then natural gas. Now, any river or forest that big business wants, it can have for the asking.

The President wanted and got a Federal water storage project on the upper Colorado River. Since no big business wanted it, the President's partnership plan was forgotten. And Idaho Power Co. wanted to build a private power project at Hells Canyon, so the administration opposed the public sponsored Hells Canyon project. The administration opposed the idea of municipalities in New York State having priority purchase rights to the electric power which would issue from the Niagara River power development program.

The development of atomic energy for peace is an idea that the Democratic Party sponsors wholeheartedly. But we voted against the administration's atoms-for-peace program since it would have given a few big businesses a monopoly in the development of atomic energy for peacetime use.

Incidentally, Attorney General Brownell now has completely disavowed the Dixon-Yates contract and has accepted the view of the Democratic Party that the whole agreement was illegal.

It took New Deal reclamation programs to give us back our forests. It has taken less than 4 years of an Eisenhower administration to lose them. The administration's policy is to lease them to private industry—which flagrantly abuses them.

We have no right to expect anything else of the Department of the Interior under this administration. Its consistent policy is to put political appointees in the place of ardent careermen. It has been no accident that many of these political appointees have been anticonservationists. There is no necessity for commenting on the scandals that have evolved over the private uses that many of these appointees have made of the assets of the Department.

FEDERAL AND POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Anyone aware of the importance of all Federal and particularly the postal employees, can see no reason why they should not have many of the rights that are accorded to workers in private industry.

We have, over the objection of the administration, raised their wages, to enable them to meet the rising costs of living. This, while the President kept clamoring for increased pay for those already in the highest brackets. We have also liberalized the civil service retirement benefits.

We have not yet devised any method to stop administrative destruction of the merit system.

Nor have we been able to abolish the brazen gag order that Republican Postmaster General Summerfield has imposed on postal workers. He has forbidden them to complain about the postoffice to anyone but their superiors in the post office. Members of Congress and the press have become off limits to these employees. We must now write into the law, permission for these employees to complain to their Congressmen without impairing their merit standing.

The Supreme Court's decision, limiting the scope of the security program to those areas of government which can be defined as sensitive, would seem to have eliminated the problem created by the unwarranted administrative security clearance procedures. The administration is now sponsoring a bill which would classify all Government positions as "sensitive." The recommendations of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York, which fundamentally agree with the decision of the Supreme Court, should be followed in this regard. No American wants subversives in our Government. We can and must provide adequate means for protecting the Government's best interests. But we must do it without needless duplication of effort and without destroying our fundamental principles of fair play and of good Government.

VETERANS AND ARMED FORCES

Neither the veterans nor the Armed Forces have been forgotten by the 84th Congress. Aware of our debt, we, the Democratic Party, sponsored and supported measures to better their lot.

The veteran home-loan program has been extended, as have been the disability benefits for the veterans of World Wars I and II. Neither forgetting the youth of our Nation nor those who were their fathers, we are providing educational assistance to children of servicemen who died in World War II and in Korea. We have extended the Missing Persons Act authorizing continued pay for service personnel missing or captured in Korea.

To maintain a strong Armed Force, we have extended the draft law to 1957. To provide greater incentive for career personnel—a necessary essential in our defense program—we have placed all military personnel under our social-security program, and have increased the benefit payments to survivors of servicemen and veterans. We have also provided for medical care for the dependents of members of our Armed Forces. We have raised the pay of our 6-month trainees under the Reserve program as well as the pay of the Armed Forces in order to attract and keep better men in the service.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION—THE UNBALANCED SCALE

Social legislation is not a partisan matter to the Democratic Party. The welfare of the Nation is more important than party politics. We, of the Democratic Party, were happy to note that much of the welfare legislation of the administration was an extension of New and Fair Deal plans. These acts and others of a similar nature were supported wholeheartedly by the Democrats.

Over the administrations protests we succeeded in amending the Social Security Act by lowering the retirement age for women to 62 and permitting the disabled to become eligible for full benefits at the age of 50. Democratically supported and New Deal initiated, and administration sponsored, the benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, and the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act were increased.

National Disaster Insurance for the victims of flood and hurricane disasters was established.

We have extended the Federal school milk program to include child care centers, nursery schools, settlement houses, summer camps and other similar nonprofit associations.

I sponsored a Federal Scholarship Act. Worthy students who desire a college education or postgraduate work, would be enabled to apply for these loans to aid them through school. This is no giveaway, since the students will repay these loans when their education has been completed. Such a program has been found feasible in prior years. It should have never been abandoned.

We have also authorized $378 million in Federal aid for school construction, in areas which have become overcrowded by increased governmental activity.

Little need be said of the failure of the school-aid bill. Due to a shameful coalition of a minority of the members of my own party and of a majority of the Republicans, this much-needed bill was defeated.

In matters of national health and medical research we went beyond what the administration requested. The Oveta Hobby attitude, of health being a strictly private affair, did not reoccur during this session. Ninety million dollars have been set aside for medical research of crippling and killing diseases, for extended hospital construction and for training nurses and health specialists. Four million dollars have been set aside for a Dental Research Institute.

The housing bill authorizes a public housing program of only 35,000 units a year for 2 years. The Democratic majority in the House felt that this was an unrealistic attempt to remedy the housing shortage. Administrative opposition proved too strong and we were compeled to settle for less than is needed. We did succeed in liberalizing the terms of Federal mortgages; for financing home improvements, for financing single-family home purchases, and for financing rental dwellings. We also liberalized, not enough, but somewhat, the Federal mortgage terms for elderly people and for urban renewal projects.

The administration sponsored a civil rights bill which was quite innocuous. It provided for things which the President now has the right to accomplish without any new laws. Once again a self-interested coalition of a few Democrats and a great many Republicans thwarted this measure. That action will no doubt be President Eisenhower's excuse to do nothing about the matter.

We did not enact the health insurance program of the President since it would have done nothing except help some insurance companies. It would have done

nothing for the individuals who need medical and hospital assistance or insurance to pay therefor.

Throughout this program, the unbalanced scale continued to dominate the administration's thinking. No matter who sponsored the legislation, the Democratic Party approach was: if it was for the benefit of the people as a whole, we supported the bill. This can not be said of the Republican Party. Their narrow interests and petty insights have not yet revealed to them the importance of the broadest approach for the benefit of the greatest number.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS—PERILOUS PATHS

Under our system of government, the President must assume the leadership in the realm of International Affairs. He must make the policy in the first instance. His State Department should be his spokesman. Congress may respond by approving appropriations or by Senatorial action on proposed treaties.

The path of peace is always difficult. The Democratic Party believes it can only be maintained by an unequivocal but honorable approach to foreign affairs. To find a permanent peace, we must be vigilant and alert, honest with ourselves and with our allies, and firm with our potential enemies.

The ideological conflict between the East and West continues. The Communist countries have changed their outward demands, but they have not changed their aims of world domination. This administration has made no attempt to move forward in this field. It has mumbled and fumbled, it has bluffed and rebuffed, it has bleated and retreated.

The Democratic Party has supported President Eisenhower in his attempts to find a road to peace. We have supported his foreign-aid program authorizing $3.9 billion to be used for military, economic, and technical assistance to our friends and allies during the next year. Although the President asked for more, his aides have admitted that they cannot spend in the next year the funds now appropriated for those purposes.

The removal of United States troops from Japan is imminent and will permit her, as our ally, to regain her true place in the world of nations. The House passed a resolution asking that Japan be admitted to the United Nations.

I have been continually opposed to the Near East policies of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles. Their blindness, if not stupidity, has helped raise Egypt's Nasser to a position in which he threatens the peace of the world.

Our demand for arms for Israel have been ignored. Instead of firmly insisting upon a cessation of hostility, Dulles has encouraged Arab fighting. We demanded that Dulles and Eisenhower protest against blocking the Suez Canal to Israeli and Greek ships. My question is still unanswered: "What will the United States do when American ships are barred?"

The antisemitic boycott by the Arab States has been approved by a delinquent administration. It has excluded American soldiers and American civilian employees of the Jewish faith from American bases in Saudi Arabia.

PROTECTING THE INTEGRITY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENSHIP

From the very earliest days of the establishment of our Nation, we have insisted that American citizens, wherever they may be and wherever they may go, must be treated as such regardless of race, color, or religion. We have a long history of having come to the aid of American citizens wherever their rights have been threatened, impaired, or impeded.

This administration has sadly failed the American people and has repeatedly and constantly backed away from that fundamental principle of American freedom.

The protection of the integrity of United States citizenship and of the proper rights of United States citizens to lawful trade and travel and other activities abroad, is a basic principle of United States sovereignty. It is a primary principle of our Nation that there shall be no distinction among United States citizens based upon individual religious affiliations.

Any attempt by foreign nations to create such distinction among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access, or any other rights otherwise available to United States citizens, is inconsistent with and contrary to our principles. Any such distinctions directed against United States citizens is incompatible with the relations that should exist among friendly nations.

We should insist that in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state, that every reasonable effort should be made to maintain these principles. We should carry on no negotiations and engage in no conventions, agreements, or treaties with any foreign nation that does not recognize these principles or violates them.

These principles have been so firmly imbedded in our tradition that up to 1952, no political party found it necessary to restate them in a political platform.

In 1952, however, the Republicans inserted these words in their platform, to wit:

> We shall see to it that no treaty or agreement with other countries deprives our citizens of the rights guaranteed them by the Federal Constitution.

That should have been a warning signal. We had no such treaties or agreements then and have none now. No prior administration, Republican or Democratic, ever permitted the rights of American citizens to be impaired by any foreign country.

This administration, however, has permitted the Arab States to disregard, ignore, and even trample upon the rights of American citizens in travel and trade. They prohibit Americans from traveling into, through, or over these nations because of religion. On the same basis they refuse to allow Americans to trade with their own citizens.

This administration has ignominiously permitted a foreign nation to violate a treaty obligation and acquiesced in that country, Saudi Arabia, banning American citizens from an American base on the sole ground of religion.

CIVIL DEFENSE

To aid our civilian defense program Congress has increased the appropriation for construction of aircraft control and warning systems.

Testimony adduced before congressional committees established that our so-called civilian defense is utterly worthless and completely valueless in the event of an atomic bomb attack. Every penny presently being spent by the so-called Department of Civilian Defense is wasted.

Nevertheless, this Administration would do nothing to improve this horrible and horrifying situation.

CONCLUSION

The record of the 84th Congress speaks well for our country. It could have been better. I am sure it would have been better, if we had had a Democratic president.

The levelheaded approach of a Democratic Congress under a Republican President produced meritorious legislation. We did not enact all the legislation that should have been passed. What was accomplished, in the main, is a record that the Democratic Party can be proud of. Even though we worked under an unsympathetic Administration, the National interest was our first thought at all times. I am proud to have had the privilege to serve in the responsible 84th Congress.

During the ensuing recess I will continue to serve my constituency. My office at room 1305, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C., will remain open and fully staffed for that purpose.

A Report to Constituents of Accomplishments of the 84th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the 84th Congress has come to an end and I think it an obligation on my part to give to the people of Michigan, whom I represent, a brief account of what Congress has done on legislation and a report on other matters of particular significance to the welfare of the 13th Congressional District of Michigan.

With few exceptions, an enviable demonstration of party responsibility by Democrats has exploded Republican predictions of 1954 that a Republican President could not expect the proper kind of cooperation with the legislative branch of our Government in the hands of those in opposite political faith. As the legislative record shows, while some Republican Members of Congress laid aside partisanship for the welfare of the people, the major credit for the successes of the 84th Congress lies with Democratic Members who cooperated with the White House over opposition by its own party tc give it its estimated record of 57 per-

cent of the 37 pieces of major legislation requested. In addition, a Democratic-controlled Congress went on to make substantial achievements in the interest of a people's program.

These accomplishments include a $1 minimum-wage law, a postal pay increase of 7 percent; a Federal pay increase for all workers of 7.5 percent—all pushed through by Democratic leadership with increases larger than the President recommended.

Democrats sponsored a farm measure providing for a return to 90 percent farm price supports, but Presidential veto forced a compromise measure lowering the range to between 75 to 90 percent of parity.

In foreign policy, over Republican opposition, a Democratic-controlled Congress gave the President the 3-year extension of authority to negotiate trade agreements which he had requested. Foreign aid appropriations were less than the President requested in each of his four annual budgets, but it was Democratic leadership in both Houses which fought against and prevented further cuts in the program than were made by Republican opposition. In exemplary cooperation, however, in 1955 the defense of Formosa and the Pescadores Islands was authorized by Congress.

A social security measure establishing a new program of benefits for totally and permanently disabled workers, beginning at age 50, and reducing the age of eligibility for women from 65 to 62 was passed under Democratic House and Senate leadership.

In 1955, Congress passed a public housing bill for 35,000 units and in the closing days of this session, a multi-billion-dollar housing bill extending the Veterans' Administration home-loan program, providing $3 billion of mortgage insurance, insuring 5-year loans to finance repairs instead of the maximum 3-year loans, insuring long-term mortgage loans for disaster relief, authorizing 70,000 units of public housing for 2 years, increasing the slum-clearance program mortgage loans, extending the military housing program, and providing mortgages for housing for elderly persons.

Democrats, principally from the North, were defeated in efforts to overcome the alliance between Republicans and Democrats from gas-producing States to exempt natural-gas producers from Federal regulations. A White House veto, in disfavor of pressures by lobbyists, saved the public—temporarily, if administration programing is successful in the next Congress—from unwarranted increases in gas bills.

Congress in 1955 and 1956 extended corporate and excise tax rates, but Democratic efforts to win a reduction in individual tax rates were defeated in both instances.

On the credit side of the congressional record, health measures were passed providing for $90 million in grants to build medical research facilities; to extend the Hill-Burton Act hospital construction program for 2 years; and to continue the polio vaccine program. A highway program calling for more than $30 billion in Federal-State funds for 13 years was authorized. To conserve national resources, a $760 million irrigation and reclamation project was authorized for the upper Colorado River area. An Armed Forces pay increase and a military Reserve program was established.

On the debit side of congressional action were matters of extreme importance to the welfare of our Nation. With many of my colleagues, I am extremely disappointed that the 84th Congress was not able to achieve action to revise and amend the discriminatory and arbitrary McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1950 and to liberalize the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. I regret that the House-passed bill to increase rates and liberalize pensions for veterans died in the Senate and that an antilabor coalition of Republicans and Dixiecrats discouraged consideration of revisions to the Taft-Hartley Act in its restriction of the labor movement.

It is a particular blot on the record of the 84th Congress that the same coalition of Republicans, opposed to a Federal-aid program, and Dixiecrats of the South, with defiance of Supreme Court decisions its aim, combined to defeat the school construction program.

With civil rights the major issue in our national and international life, the passage of a bill by the House to protect the right to vote of Negro citizens was an historic achievement. However, despite the predictions of death of the bill by Senate filibuster, the responsibility for cutting off opportunity of the liberal bloc of Congress to fight for enactment of this legislation rests with the administration which withheld its recommendation until late in the 2d session of Congress and delayed its request to Senate leadership for action on the bill until it was certain that adjournment was imminent. Another alliance between Republicans and Dixiecrats defeated the passage of bills to grant statehood to Hawaii and Alaska to spread the blot on the record of the 84th Congress on matters of human rights.

These are but some of the legislative actions which concerned the people of Michigan and our Nation. There were numerous other important issues to come before Congress, but mention of them could only be handled in a voluminous report. Those I have mentioned are principally the issues which concerned the greatest number of people.

I do not think this summary of congressional action would be complete without inclusion of a résumé of my own record of activity and accomplishment as Representative in Congress of the 13th District of Michigan. The following report is therefore included:

THE RECORD OF CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., DURING THE 84TH CONGRESS, 1953–56

Voting record: Has won the approval of labor, veterans, and nationality organizations. Has been consistent in support of the Diggs platform of 1954, the interests of the people of Michigan and the Nation and consistently with the vote of the liberal bloc in Congress.

Legislation: Introduced a total of 25 public bills, covering the areas of civil liberties, immigration, Government employees' salaries, minimum wage, veterans' benefits, and civil rights, among others, and a total of 17 private bills pertaining to immigration cases of hardship, separation of families, and loss of scientific talents to the United States.

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE ACTION

Housing: Supported all legislation to extend the public housing program and increase housing units; established continuing contact with the Housing and Home Finance Agency to keep informed of housing administrative policies and their application to needs and to communicate needs, problems, and interests of various groups, as Corktown Home Owners Association, Oakdale Residents Cooperative Housing, Inc., and the Detroit Real Estate Brokers Association. Petitioned the Detroit Real Estate Board to open its membership to minority group brokers as a means of helping to resolve problems in this area. Through Washington and Detroit offices, have processed hundreds of cases to assist constituents and other persons in obtaining low-cost rental facilities—private or public—and to obtain home financing.

Civil liberties: Supported and initiated action to achieve revision of military security regulations. Investigated and pressed 4 separate security risk cases, 3 involving servicemen and 1 a Government employee—all successfully concluded by retention in service. Investigated individual cases of discrimination involving applicants for Federal employment, employees, armed service personnel, veterans, and cases of discrimination concerning public-service facilities. Investigated and reported to CAA discriminatory practices by airports participating, contrary to law, in building programs involving Federal funds. Made an on-the-spot investigation of civil rights violations in Mississippi and Alabama. Investigated discrimination against Negroes and Jews in rentals of downtown Detroit office buildings; assisted Michigan Credit Union, Ford Rouge and Flint Buick Credit Unions in presenting complaints to Health, Education, and Welfare Department concerning alleged abusive tactics of the Federal Bureau.

Immigration: Introduced legislation to amend and revise McCarran-Walter Act; petitioned Senate Foreign Affairs Committee for revision and liberalization of Refugee Relief Act; interceded with Department of State and Immigration Department in cases not involving private bills, including assistance to servicemen in approval of visas for alien wives.

Aged and youthful: Cosponsor of Townsend pay-as-you-go social-security program; supported and voted for legislation to extend social-security benefits; introduced legislation to permit 18-year-olds the right to vote.

Interior affairs: Served as a member of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Territories and Insular Affairs, and Indian Affairs Subcommittees. Consistently in support by action and vote of legislation to conserve natural resources and legislation to compensate Indians for lands and for adequate health, education, and social-security programs. Maintained close contact with executive director of the National Congress of American Indians to determine Indian views on legislation pend-

ing and desired. Investigated alleged abuses in awarding of school lunch programs for Cherokee Indian children. Supported such public power programs as upper Colorado River and Hells Canyon projects.

Veterans: Served as a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee; the Administration and the Compensation and Pension Subcommittees. Voted consistently for improvements in veterans' welfare; protested closing of VA medical service in Grand Rapids; investigated firing of ten veterans at Ordnance Tank Automotive Command; interceded to obtain sanitary and standard facilities for mentally ill at Battle Creek Hospital; requested Post Office and Justice Department intervention concerning the use of mails by debt-collecting agencies to deceive veterans; investigated cases of discrimination against veterans in administration of GI benefit and loan programs; made visits to VA hospitals to determine needs; periodically contacted all Michigan veterans' organizations for recommendations regarding needs and to offer service of congressional office in their interest; was the author of Public Law 92 to extend for 2 years time for disabled veterans to apply for down payment on automobiles—other conveyances.

Action of interest to Detroiters and the Nation: Urged United Nations and Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committee to protest Cyprus action by British and to offer American aid in resolution of problems and American support of the principle of self-government; joined with 86 Democratic colleagues in joint declaration requesting arms for Israel—urged Congress, White House, State Department, Senate and House Foreign Affairs Committees to take action. Protested Department of Agriculture increase of income eligibility scale in Michigan for participation in the surplus-food-distribution plan; joined in requesting aid for Detroit in unemployment situation and made contact with the Department of Labor, Defense Department, General Services Administration, and United States Atomic Energy Commission in this behalf. Associated with Governor Williams in asking for increase in unemployment-compensation and welfare benefits to aid in problem. Joined with colleagues in asking Department of Agriculture for special allotment for Detroit's school milk program; interceded with Civil Aeronautics Board for reconsideration of Wayne University's petition for charter flight service in connection with its travel-study program. Requested commemorative stamps, on behalf of interested citizens, to honor Dr. Albert Einstein, Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, and Walter White. Of nominations to the three service academies, had four successful candidates—Thomas J. Jozwiak, 1427 Burlingame Street, Detroit, Air Force Academy class of 1955; Roland M. Navarro, 2019 Clairmount Street, Detroit, Military Academy, class of 1956; Thomas G. Curtis, 1450 Brainard Street, Detroit, Naval Academy, class of 1956; and George D. O'Brien, Jr., son of former Congressman George D. O'Brien, 757 Covington Drive, Detroit, Naval Academy, class of 1956. Sought and obtained 13th District representation at the 1955 White House Conference on Education; made known support of and offered cooperation concerning promotion of the St. Lawrence seaway project, port of Detroit project, and adequate airport facilities in the Greater Detroit community.

Presenting to Congress for inclusion in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD resolutions, articles, and other materials representing the viewpoint of organizations in Detroit and Michigan on major issues—the Federation of Hellenic Societies, Inc. of Detroit, the Jewish Daily News, the Jewish Community Council of Detroit, the Detroit Common Council, among a few. Aid to district travel agencies in tracing and obtaining action on passports—also to numerous individuals. Assisting constituents in expediting foreign documents through the State Department; in tracing and speeding up Government payments. Furnishing Government publications, maps, and other literature to public libraries, schools, constituents, and students. Presenting American creed certificates to district high-school graduates in effort to emphasize good citizenship; obtaining research information for constituents, schools, and organizations; furnishing information to interested families concerning the adoption of war orphans; obtaining flags flown over the Capitol for interested organizations; placing orders for reprints of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks for interested constituents; periodic contact with Detroit and Highland Park governmental bodies and officials to make the service of the congressional office available in matters within jurisdiction.

Cases: Through congressional offices in Washington and Detroit, assistance has been given to hundreds of citizens in problems of wide variety. Cases have concerned such matters as—welfare aid, social security, old-age pensions, aid to blind and handicapped and dependent children; housing and home financing; referrals of unemployed to Government and private sources of employment; obtaining information for school students on scholastic requirements for designated careers; checking civil-service status, promotion possibilities, investigation of reasons for terminations, requesting reinstatements, verifying career status, intervening in cases of unjustified discharge, requesting reviews of appeals for Government employees; assisting in expediting claims for compensation for injury while Government-employed and action on retirement fund payments; furnishing letters of recommendation for placement with public institutions; assistance in obtaining birth records—foreign and domestic; assistance in investigating scholarship opportunities for students; referrals of families for counseling service and to legal aid and other agencies for court representation; providing legal counsel through staff attorney, Basil W. Brown, on civil matters; assistance to servicemen in applications for morale leave, hardship discharge, compassionate reassignment; in establishing validity of applications for allotment to dependents; investigating service promotion opportunities, requesting foreign service duty; investigation and appeals of court martials, general discharge, dishonorable discharge, and revocation of commissions; aid to veterans in cases concerning disability compensation, processing claims for change in disability ratings, appealing adverse decisions; making applications for loans under GI loan program and for pension and benefits. Assistance to widows of veterans in determining eligibility for pension benefits; assistance to prisoners in petitioning for transfer, emergency visits home in family death or illness, investigation of parole possibility, of discrimination and adequacy of medical care; and referral of cases to proper agencies for legal counsel and representation in cases apparently meriting such intervention.

These, and other activities and concerns of your Representative in Congress including the attendance of well over 200 conferences and meetings, community programs and receptions in Detroit and Washington to promote and forward the interests of my District, people of Detroit and Michigan, and interests of the Nation and speaking engagements before a variety of groups in Ohio, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Indiana, Virginia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Tennessee, South Carolina, California, are matters which have made it a welcomed opportunity and the highest privilege to serve in this office in the 84th Congress.

At the spring convention of the Michigan Democratic Convention, over which I presided, I was selected as 1 of the 2 people from Michigan to serve on the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention. I was happy for the opportunity to serve as a vehicle to reflect the desires of various segments of the 13th Congressional District in that position and as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention.

I will continue diligently to work for great accomplishments in the interest of promoting the welfare of all people.

Listing of Events, Activities, Materials, Cooperating Groups of Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 27, 1956

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have received a report from the executive committee of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, of which I have the honor of being vice chairman, which will be of use to Members of Congress and those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who will be called upon in the remaining months of the centennial year to participate in programs honoring Woodrow Wilson.

The list of activities enumerated in this report includes the official acts taken by Federal, State, and local government; the proclamations issued by the President of the United States as

well as by governors of many States and Territories urging participation in Wilson ceremonies; the establishment of mayors' committees to coordinate and arrange community programs; and the activities of national and religious organizations cooperating with the commission by encouraging their affiliates to initiate Wilson programs.

The excerpts from the commission's report include but a few of the activities presented in the first 6 months of the centennial year. Other materials will be submitted as they become available.

I ask unanimous consent to include the excerpts in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTING OF EVENTS, ACTIVITIES, MATERIALS, COOPERATING GROUPS OF THE WOODROW WILSON CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

The Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission has prepared this summary of the activities so far during the Centennial Year with the help of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation of New York, the Woodrow Wilson Birthplace Foundation of Staunton, Va., and the Virginia State Wilson Centennial Commission, and other cooperating organizations. It is designed to aid individuals and organizations in this and other countries whose participation in the Year is still in the planning stage.

We believe that the deversity of subject matter and the variety of activities to date will be useful in determining the form and scope of events yet to come. We believe also that libraries and schools will want to keep this summary available for reference use during the remainder of the year and until it is replaced next year by the formal report to the Congress of all Centennial activities.

We realize that due to space limitations and lack of information from hundreds of other sponsoring organizations it is not complete. The commission respectfully urges, however, that all concerned with the centennial report their activities to the commission for inclusion in future publications.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Congress establishes the Commission

On August 30, 1954, the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission was created by a joint resolution of Congress (Public Law 705, 83d Cong., 2d sess.) "to develop and to execute suitable plans for the celebration, in 1956, of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson."

Congress requests proclamation from President

A joint resolution from Congress (Public Law 493, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) requested the President to issue a proclamation, "inviting the people of the United States to observe the centennial anniversary of the birth of Woodrow Wilson with appropriate ceremonies and activities during the year."

Congress names bridge after Wilson

Congress also approved a resolution (Public Law 535, 84th Cong., 2d sess.) introduced by Representative BURR HARRISON, a member of the Wilson Commission, directing that the proposed bridge across the Potomac River connecting Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia be named "The Woodrow Wilson Memorial Bridge."

Presidential proclamation

President Dwight D. Eisenhower emphasized the national importance and nonpartisan nature of the Wilson Centennial Year when, at the request of Congress, he issued a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe the centennial of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. He urged "interested individuals and organizations, both private and governmental, to participate in appropriate ceremonies during 1956 to honor and commemorate his (Wilson's) life, his ideals, and his concern for the freedom of peoples throughout the world."

Governors' proclamations

State commissions were established by Virginia and New Jersey at the request of the Commission. Governors of the following States and Territories issued proclamations calling upon the people in their jurisdiction to participate in centennial observances:

Alabama, American Samoa, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Canal Zone, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Guam, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mayors' committees

Fifty-seven mayors of cities with a population in excess of 5,000 answered the Commission's request for the establishment of local coordinating committees. Following is a list of these cities and the name and address of committee chairmen:

Alabama: Alexander City, J. C. Henderson, editor of the Alexander City Outlook Publishing Co. California: San Fernando, Neville R. Lewis, Esq., city attorney. Colorado: Denver, Thomas L. Girault, 2280 South University Boulevard; Greeley, John R. P. Wheeler, 809 Ninth Street. Connecticut: Middletown, Prof. Wilbert C. Snow, 473 Newfield Street; Stamford, Miss Mary Louise Alexander, The Ferguson Library; Windsor, Lloyd Fowles, Loomis School. Delaware: Wilmington, Harland A. Carpenter, Wilmington Institute Free Library, Rodney Square. Florida: Tallahassee, Richard O. Mitchell, Esq., c/o George C. White, city auditor and clerk. Georgia: Atlanta, Curtis H. Bryant, 404 Mark Building; Augusta, Hugh G. Grant, 16-A Country Club Apartments; Toccoa, Mrs. Bruce Schaefer, 110 East Franklin Street. Iowa: Ottumwa, J. B. Mincks, RD 1. Kentucky: Henderson, Odie Duncan; Mayfield, C. N. Apperson, city clerk. Massachusetts: Fitchburg, Burton M. Stevens, Esq., 429 Main Street; Newton, Harold T. Pilsbury, administrative assistant to the mayor, City Hall. Minnesota: Robindale, Richard Parish, 4101 Quail Avenue, North. Missouri: Columbia, Woodrow Wilson, Court House. Montana: Great Falls, Leo E. Aumell, 210 30th Street North. New Hampshire: Franklin, Basil Broadhurst, Office of the Mayor. New Jersey: Hackensack, Emil M. Wulster, Esq., Peoples Trust Company Building; Linden, A. J. Frankel, 605 South Wood Avenue; Morristown, J. Robert Tracey, c/o Office of the Mayor; Union, Ervin S. Fulop, Esq., 968 Stuyvesant Avenue. New Mexico: Albuquerque, Dean Alfred L. Gausewitz, School of Law, University of New Mexico. New York: Johnson City, Brigham P. Thomson, 298 Main Street. North Carolina: Goldsboro, Col. George E. Hood and Col. John D. Langston; Kings Mountain, K. E. Morrison, East Gold Street; Wilmington, Mrs. T. D. Love, Post Office Box 1035. Ohio: Cambridge, Robert W. Amos, Jeffersonian Co. Oklahoma: McAlester, Woodrow King, 204 West Ottawa Avenue. Pennsylvania: Lancaster, David R. Eaby, Esq., 45 North Duke Street; Phoenixville, Daniel J. C. O'Donnell, 117 South Main Street. South Carolina: Columbia, S. L. Latimer, Jr., editor and publisher, The State; Spartanburg, W. C. Herbert, 136 Ponce de Leon Avenue; Sumter, H. D. Osteen, The Item newspaper. Utah: Ogden, Lawrence J. Burton, c/o Weber College. Virginia: Front Royal, W. C. Armstrong, Esq.; Pulaski, A. Dow Owens, Esq., Pulaski National Bank Building; Salem, Benjamin E. Chapman, Esq., 216½ East Main Street. Washington: Chehalis, Don G. Abel, 899 St. Helens Avenue; Seattle, Harry J. Martin, c/o Washington Athletic Club. West Virginia: Martinsburg, Wilson P. Sperow, secretary of chamber of commerce.

COOPERATING ORGANIZATIONS

The following national organizations, representing millions of individual members, are cooperating with the commission by encouraging programs through their affiliate members as well as publicizing the centennial year in their respective periodicals and newsletters: American Association of School Administrators, American Civil Liberties Union, American Council on Education, American Farm Bureau, American Legion Auxiliary, American Legion, Department of Virginia, American Legion, National Headquarters, American Library Association, AMVETS, B'nai B'rith, Boy Scouts of America, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Church Peace Union, Jaycees, Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, Kiwanis International, Motion Picture Association of America, National Association of School Principals, National Association of Deans of Women, National Association of Retired Civil Servants, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc., National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Council of Catholic Women, National Council of Chief State School Officers, National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, National Council of YMCA's, National Education Association, National Farmers Union, National Grange, National Municipal League, National School Public Relations Association, Pilot Club International, Public Administration Clearing House, and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In addition to the national organizations listed above, the following groups have presented Wilsonian programs so date: Polish-American Woodrow Wilson Committee, Mississippi Historical Society, World Affairs Council of Philadelphia, Southern Speech Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, American Association for the United Nations, New Jersey branch.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

All principal national religious organizations have been requested to cooperate in the centennial and, where it is consistent with their governing policies, have agreed to call attention to the spiritual aspects of Woodrow Wilson's life and works, or to secure as soon as possible the approval of their governing bodies to do so.

Among those cooperating are the Church Peace Union, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, the Methodist Church, the American Baptist Convention, the National Council of Catholic Women, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

Arrangements were made with the joint chiefs of chaplains of the United States armed services to conduct religious services dedicated to Wilson at United States military posts throughout the world. The following are just a few of the significant tributes paid to Woodrow Wilson by houses of worship of every denomination: Federal Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission dedicated January 8 to Woodrow Wilson in the Churches; First Presbyterian Church (sermon by Rev. James McDowell Richards); Washington Cathedral Memorial Services, Washington, D. C.; Trinity Methodist Church, Pueblo, Colo. (sermon by Rev. Glen Ray Barber); Jewish Theological Seminary (radio program, Eternal Light, NBC-WW and Justice Brandeis); Christian Science Monitor (published full-page article); Tri-Faith Panel (talks by Rabbi Louis L. Mann, Father George B. Ford, and Rev. Ralph W. Sockman) in Staunton, Va.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the first calendar quarter of 1956 were received after April 20, 1956, too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $1,086. E. (9) $479.77.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,308.19. E. (9) $8,825.42.

A. Joseph Amann, 343 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, 343 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cancer Society, 521 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $6,777.97.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,540.68. E. (9) $1,540.68.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $19,937.82. E. (9) $19,937.82.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,821.24. E. (9) $12,521.24.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) $264.02.

A. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $35,907.14.

A. Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, 23 West 45th Street, New York City, N. Y.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $1,220.06.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. N. W. Barber, 5358 Chillum Place NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Household Finance Corp., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. H. Barry, 121 15th Avenue North, Fargo, N. Dak.
B. American Seed Trade Association, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,804.25.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma 2, Wash.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,498. E. (9) $363.13.

A. Warren B. Bledsoe, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $26.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,950. E. (9) $198.95.

A. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $268.38. E. (9) $340.50.

A. Boykin & DeFrancis, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Studiengesellschaft fur Privatrechtliche Auslandsinteressen e. v. Contrescarpe 46 Bremen, Germany.
D. (6) $17,366.07. E. (9) $694.50.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Derek Brooks, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Board of Trade, Inc., International Trade Section, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $415.

A. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Frankie Childers, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,365. E. (9) $910.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,600. E. (9) $2,028.41.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Herman Clott, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union of Mine, Mill & Smelter Workers, Tabor Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,287.

A. Clarence F. Cockrell, 501 Patrick Street, Portsmouth, Va.
B. Active Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $125.67.

A. Committee for Collective Security, 20 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $955. E. (9) $533.40.

A. Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., 104 East 52d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,103.43.

A. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
D. (6) $1,997.33. E. (9) $432.95.

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $345.

A. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Eugene P. Conser, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $519.23.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $217.

A. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York 36, N. Y.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $24,467.50. E. (9) $18,816.46.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 173 West Madison Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $763.09.

A. Arnold H. Dadian, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved U. S.-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $90.

A. William L. Daley, 912 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $166.50.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $126.21.

A. S. P. Deas, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee.
E. (9) $67.50.

A. Ralph B. Dewey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Steamship Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,874. E. (9) $3,328.94.

A. John M. Dickerman, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $64.23.

A. William C. Doherty, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Alfred J. Elliott, P. O. Box 134, Tulare, Calif.
B. County of Tulare, Calif.
E. (9) $1,468.85.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $515.50. E. (9) $18.

A. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James Finucane, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Return of Confiscated German and Japanese Property, 926 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $419.84.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers, Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $7,500.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $71.65.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley Gewirtz, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $82.40.

A. Grain Sorghum Producers Association, Box 77, Bushland, Tex.
D. (6) $3,850. E. (9) $1,351.53.

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,700. E. (9) $400.

A. Carl O. Gustafson, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,462.85.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $807.67.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $326.94.

A. Robert B. Harper, 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Mrs. A. Paul Hartz, Box 228, Waverly, Va.
B. General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

A. F. Cleveland Hedrick, Jr., 1001 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph B. Henderson, 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
B. American Association of Small Business, Inc., 431 Balter Building, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Laurence G. Henderson, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. North American Airlines, Burbank, Calif.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,350.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $1,687.12.

A. Mrs. Jency Price Houser, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,235. E. (9) $1,235.

A. Housewives, Ltd., 2915 Foxhall Road NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $86. E. (9) $65.75.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,647.15.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. John M. Hurley, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.
D. (6) $816.55. E. (9) $1,813.11.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,150. E. (9) $2,150.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W-1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $1,225.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.
E. (9) $15.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $2,865. E. (9) $1,850.02.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, DeBlois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $49.79.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $27.39.

A. J. M. DeW. (Jack) Kyle 2d, Post Office Box 1520, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $712.24. E. (9) $580.81.

A. D. B. Lasseter, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
B. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $94.74.

A. Randall J. LeBoeuf, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $183.48.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,760. E. (9) $1,517.29.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Dr. William N. Leonard, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. U. G. Lewellen, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Bus & Truck Association, 628 Jefferson Street, Jefferson City, Mo.
D. (6) $301.44. E. (9) $851.06.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Esther Lipsen, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $200.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado, Window Rock, Ariz.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $10.

A. Powers Luse, North Baltimore, Ohio.
B. Pennsylvania-Ohio-New York Committee on Low-Cost Niagara-St. Lawrence Power, Box 117, North Baltimore, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,716.65. E. (9) $556.56.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $154.35.

A. William A. McClintock, Jr., 7447 North Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, The Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $143.32.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $1,982.52.

A. MacLeish, Spray, Price & Underwood, 134 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $1,349.26.

A. Harry B. Madsen, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,822.80. E. (9) $1,162.31.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,059.81.

A. William R. Merriam, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Philip Merryman, Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.
B. Committee for Hometown Television, Inc., Box 9140, Bridgeport, Conn.

A. Ross A. Messer, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office & General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $142.05.

A. Mica Fabricators Association, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. James E. Milano, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, 150 Causeway Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $268.38. E. (9) $340.50.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,325. E. (9) $148.03.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Boston, Mass.; Abitibi Power & Paper Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ontario; and Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, Southbridge, Mass.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $574.22.

A. Silas A. Morehouse, Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.
B. Silok, Inc., Post Office Box 4085, Jefferson Manor, Alexandria, Va.

A. Andrew P. Murphy, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $174.20.

A. John H. Myers, 1224 Cleveland Street, Wilmette, Ill.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Field Officers, 402 Fourth Avenue, New Kensington, Pa.
D. (6) $1,284.45. E. (9) $300.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17 Street NW., Washington, D. C.,
D. (6) $1,466.40. E. (9) $1,689.69.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,852.16. E. (9) $15,284.72.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $311,889.60. E. (9) $4,896.39.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., D. C.
D. (6) $14,257.29. E. (9) $1555.85.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,456.56. E. (9) $5,715.64.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,594.75. E. (9) $14,329.50.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $37,797.27. E. (9) $26,551.35.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $3,500.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council Against Conscription, 513 West 166th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,082.35. E. (9) $1,693.76.

A. National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc., 80 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,791. E. (9) $420.51.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $205.56. E. (9) $1,130.57.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 740 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,803.53. E. (9) $6,803.53.

A. National Institute of Social Welfare, 300 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., and 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $747.37. E. (9) $9,938.57.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $813.37.

A. National Postal Committee for Books, 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $34.10.

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,044.13. E. (9) $7,781.62.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $7,177.60. E. (9) $5,503.41.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bureau of Accident and Health Underwriters, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y., and Health and Accident Underwriters Conference, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago 4, Ill.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,224.45.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinist Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ross D. Netherton, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,775.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rutherford T. Phillips, executive director, the American Humane Association, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $990. E. (9) $264.02.

A. John O'Donnell, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $35.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Organization of Professional Employees of the United States Department of Agriculture, Post Office Box 381, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $768.94. E. (9) $528.74.

A. L. M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Kansas City, Kans.
B. Missouri-Arkansas Basins Flood Control and Conservation Association, Town House, Kansas City, Kans.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $2,100.

A. Charles A. Parker, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Aviation Trades Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,025.80. E. (9) $1,348.78.

A. George F. Parrish, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, Post Office Box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
D. (6) $3,999.99. E. (9) $506.02.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,552.25.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N. J.
D. (6) $2,192.28. E. (9) $1,809.45.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $44.37.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cancer Society, United Cerebral Palsy Association, Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, and National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.
D. (6) $10,999.97. E. (9) $5,898.97.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,249.98. E. (9) $896.60.

A. Stanley Rector, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. George L. Rodgers, 1504 Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., the Montana Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., and the Washington Water Power Co.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $450.

A. Rowe-Doherty Associates, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and 612 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $748.37. E. (9) $748.37.

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.

A. Rosario Scibilia, 378 Avenue T, Brooklyn, N. Y.
B. Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $323.50.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Carpet Institute, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $66.44.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,249.98. E. (9) $163.40.

A. Selvage & Lee, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, 113 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $76.60.

A. M. Q. Sharpe, Kennebec, S. Dak.
B. Tribal Council, Lower Brule Tribe, Sioux Indians, Lower Brule, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Crow Creek Tribe, Sioux Indians, Fort Thompson, S. Dak.; Tribal Council, Standing Rock Tribe, Sioux Indians, Fort Yates, N. Dak.
E. (9) $592.50.

A. Richard L. Shook, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $36.05.

A. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,492. E. (9) $11,003.75.

A. Elizabeth A. Smart, 144 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.
B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $606.12. E. (9) $183.79.

A. Fred Smith & Co., Inc., 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Edward Mallinckrodt, Jr., 16 West Moreland Place, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $4,550.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $64.37.

A. Stanley L. Sommer, 715 Albee Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $260.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. (6) $4,284.59. E. (9) $4,125.32.

A. Sterck, Richards & Roots, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $280.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $12,674.97. E. (9) $13,954.34.

A. Mrs. Joseph Mills Stoll, 4001 61st Street, Brookmont, Washington, D. C.
B. Volunteer Worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $111.56.

A. Ada Barnett Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $146.14.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Blackfeet Tribe, Browning, Mont.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho, Lapwai, Idaho.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Oglala Sioux Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation, Pine Ridge, S. Dak.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pueblo of Laguna, Laguna, N. Mex.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried & Frank, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Winnebago Tribe of Nebraska, Winnebago, Nebr.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washintgon, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Surrey, Karasik, Gould & Effron, Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comision de Defensa del Azucar y Fomento de la Cana, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $38,612. E. (9) $38,612.

A. John D. Swygert, Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors.
D. (6) $2,562.50. E. (9) $200.

A. Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association of the United States, 41 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $32. E. (9) $32.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. The Townsend Plan, Inc.; and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugh C. Tuttle, Dover, N. H.
B. National Association of Soil Conservattion Districts, League City, Tex.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., 369 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,355.57.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Herbert F. Walton, 7447 North Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, the Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. Marion G. Ward, Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Arkansas Bus & Truck Association, Inc., Post Office Box 2798, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,078.67.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,425.

A. Richard H. Wels, 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Bowling Proprietors Association of America, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $5.71.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $78,388.08. E. (9) $65.95.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $173.18.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,440.36. E. (9) $2,440.36.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 120 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $974.28.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $15. E. (9) $15.

A. Howard Zahniser, 6222 43d Avenue, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Council of Conservationists, 588 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $329.22.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $356.03.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the second calendar quarter 1956:

NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	P	QUARTER 1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer." (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" as answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report.
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) description; (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this Item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D."—(a) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value.* When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter

5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")

7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $_____"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no": _____

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures

9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More
In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15: Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL

A. Claris Adams, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $261.60. E. (9) $261.60.

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $85.45.

A. Arthur F. Aebersold, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,367.28. E. (9) $89.75.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,676.59. E. (9) $6,064.49.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,396.92. E. (9) $5,396.92.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,854.84. E. (9) $9,854.84.

A. W. L. Allen, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International, 8605 Cameron Street, Silver Spring, Md.

A. William B. Allen, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $363.45.

A. Thomas H. Alphin, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $235.50.

A. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $5,508.06. E. (9) $5,508.06.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $30,814. E. (9) $31,311.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, AFL–CIO Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $35,275.57.

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $275.

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $13,094.47. E. (9) $11,794.47.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York 19, N. Y.
D. (6) $157,751.11.

A. American Legion National Headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $5,612.69. E. (9) $15,593.07.

A. American Life Convention, 250 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $376.62. E. (9) $376.62.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $11,956.99.

A. American National Catlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $24,757.76. E. (9) $6,392.27.

A. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $334,271.67. E. (9) $3,093.40.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., development fund (legislative), care of Dr. H. Ward Ewalt, Jr., 8501 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $5,818.30.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $832.67. E. (9) $832.67.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,167.41. E. (9) $1,700.49.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,378. E. (9) $14,767.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $67,236.26. E. (9) $14,336.45.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,283.19. E. (9) $2,283.19.

A. American Social Hygiene Association, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,800.

A. American Sugar Beet Industry Policy Committee, 500 Sugar Building, Denver, Colo.

A. American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, 60 Batterymarch Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $43.40.

A. American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $17,648.90. E. (9) $6,088.89.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $29,838.54.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,268.72.

A. American Vocational Association, Inc., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,821.01. E. (9) $2,752.77.

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,660. E. (9) $2,696.63.

A. Samuel W. Anderson, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.99. E. (9) $41.40.

A. John R. Arent, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $78.25.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,495. E. (9) $93.26.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1115 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,160.26.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Simon & Schuster, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $23.43.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.
B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

A. George E. Ashley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $812.50.

A. Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,010. E. (9) $8,838.04.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,500.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $48,125.10. E. (9) $48,125.10.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,878.93. E. (9) $1,878.93.

A. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,536.72. E. (9) $4,536.72.

A. Edward Atkins, 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., 51 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 186, Vienna, Va.
B. Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $12.90.

A. George P. Baker, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. John A. Baker, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) $160.28.

A. H. M. Baldridge, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George W. Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. H. Ballew, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Hartman Barber, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,028.27. E. (9) $644.24.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

James M. Barnes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reciprocal Inter-Insurers Federal Tax Committee, United Artists Building, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $948.74. E. (9) $86.81.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. F. W. H. Beauchamp, 26 O'Farrell Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Transportation Association of America, 6 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $312.86.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The League of New York Theatres, Inc. and the National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $496.71.

A. Ralph E. Becker, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $225.13.

A. Burton M. Behling, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 814 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $1.

A. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,307.69. E. (9) $120.

A. George L. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625.

A. Rachel S. Bell, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,958.59.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The G. B. Macke Corp., 212 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Automatic Canteen Co. of America, Merchandising Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and National Automatic Merchandising Association, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 1306 Washington Building, Tacoma, Wash.
E. (9) $528.11.

A. Bergson & Borkland, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Freeport Sulphur Co., 161 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and its subsidiaries.
E. (9) $13.50.

A. J. Raymond Berry, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $596.

A. Andrew J. Biemiller, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $426.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 900 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hudson Biery, 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc., 1012 Federal Reserve Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., and 839 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, the Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States, American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange, American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
E. (9) $60.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Massachusetts Protective Association, Worcester, Mass.

A. Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Henry Bison, Jr., 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $642.39.

A. John H. Bivins, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $925. E. (9) $200.70.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Thomas D. Blake, 4664 Reservoir Road, Washington, D. C.
B. United States-Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $4.65.

A. William Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $669.20. E. (9) $447.34.

A. Henry W. Blalock, Sr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Electric Power Cooperative, Jefferson City, Mo.; N. W. Electric Power Cooperative, Cameron, Mo., and Western Farmers Electric Cooperative, Anadarko, Okla.
D. (6) $250.

A. Charles J. Bloch, First National Bank Building, Macon, Ga.
B. Pacific National Fire Insurance Co., San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $12,500. E. (9) $409.61.

A. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Blum, Lindsey & Powell, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,710. E. (9) $363.07.

A. Leo V. Bodine, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Hyman Bookbinder, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $396.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Lyle N. Boren, Seminole, Okla.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,953. E. (9) $184.63.

A. Robert T. Borth, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $294.50.

A. R. B. Bowden, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants' Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $20. E. (9) $10.

A. Roland Boyd, McKinney, Tex.
B. Hub Hill, 2121 North Field Street, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $6,825. E. (9) $2,289.35.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $293.80.

A. Harold P. Braman, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $900.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Frank P. Brennan, Avoca, Iowa.
B. Iowa Power & Light Co., Des Moines, Iowa.
E. (9) $907.10.

A. William A. Bresnahan, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,400.

A. Homer L. Brinkley, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,249.96. E. (9) $318.15.

A. Clark L. Brody, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Farm Bureau, 4000 North Grand River Avenue, Lansing, Mich.
D. (6) $415.38. E. (9) $16.88.

A. W. S. Bromley, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Freemont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $350.

A. Brookhart, Becker and Dorsey, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Agencia Industrial, C. por A., P. O. Box 199, Ciudad Trujillo, Dominican Republic.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $413.64.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $7,091.32. E. (9) $7,091.32.

A. J. Olney Brott, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $437.50. E. (9) $83.20.

A. C. R. Brown, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,374.15.

A. Brown, Land & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American and Foreign Power Co., Inc., 2 Rector Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1000. E. (9) $8.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $4,131.65.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Power Reactor Development Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. 133.50.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Rollin Brown, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $12.87.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Toby E. G. Brunner, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Robert R. Bryant, 203 Littlefield Building, Austin, Tex.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Carl S. Buchanan, 404 Hollister Building, Lansing, Mich.
B. Michigan Motor Bus Association.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $168.75.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $31.80.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
D. (6) $1,350.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Bulgarian Claims Committee, 24 Beckman Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald T. Burke, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22. E. (9) $12.60.

A. Harold Burke, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas H. Burke, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Union United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich., and 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $995.67. E. (9) $624.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $6,495.40. E. (9) $5,969.58.

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,550. E. (9) $407.96.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,874.99.

A. Sherman E. Burt, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Coal Sales Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clint Bush, 105 East 70th Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $120.

A. Charles C. Butler, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $262.50. E. (9) $2.87.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.
E. (9) $105.87.

A. C. G. Caffrey 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $32.

A. Leonard J. Calhoun, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. Carl C. Campbell, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.

A. James A. Campbell, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,692.34. E. (9) $269.23.

A. Wallace J. Campbell, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cooperative League of the U. S. A., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Daniel W. Cannon, 303 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Bituminous Coal Operators' Association, 303 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $115.

A. Julian W. Caplan, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. James K. Carr, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 2101 K Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $696.88. E. (9) $365.85.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. T. C. Carroll, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio, and 744 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $1,578.94.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,670.90.

A. Chauncey P. Carter, Jr., 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. Clarence B. Carter, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
B. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.

A. William L. Carter, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $103.63. E. (9) $5.30.

A. Ralph H. Case, 889 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sioux Tribe of Indians, Lower Brule Reservation, S. Dak., and Crow Creek Reservation, S. Dak.; also Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak. and S. Dak.

A. Benjamin F. Castle, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Larry Cates, 861 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clarence N. Sayen, 55th Street and Cicero Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,757.02.

A. Francis R. Cawley, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,558. E. (9) $236.65.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2521 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. M. Golodetz & Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Justice M. Chambers, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,252.30. E. (9) $4,144.61.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $506. E. (9) $3,716.

A. Earl W. Clark, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $125.36.

A. Clark and Lanahan, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert W. Groves, John Morel, F. D. M. Strachan, Jr., and Thomas H. Adams, Savannah Bank & Trust Co. Building, Savannah, Ga.
E. (9) $59.23.

A. Omer W. Clark, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $3,230.78.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 531 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $120.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Cuban Sugar Mill Owners Association, and The Cuban Sugar Cane Growers Association, Habana, Cuba.
E. (9) $140.96.

A. Clarence E. Cleveland, Montpelier, Vt.
B. Vermont State Railroads Association, Montpelier, Vt.
D. (6) $30.18. E. (9) $66.44.

A. Warren A. Clohisy, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mail Order Association of America, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Clay L. Cochran, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $140.63.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tramp Shipowners Association, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $281.56.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washintgon, D. C.
B. Browning Lines, Inc., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $150.69.

A. Don C. Collins, Kit Carson, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $781.19.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $34,800. E. (9) $6,165.84.

A. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,050. E. (9) $9,160.89.

A. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Committee on Laws, National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,594. E. (9) $3,221.

A. Committee for Oil Pipe Lines, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $75.

A. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 9 South William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $395. E. (9) $20,098.91.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Citizens Group, Anne Arundel County and Prince Georges County, Md.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Salt Producers Association, 726 La Salle-Wacker Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Lawrence R. Condon, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Estate of Mary Clark DeBrabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pan American World Airways System, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Conference for Inland Waterways Dry-Bulk Regulation, c/o Ames, Hill & Ames, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.99. E. (9) $63.75.

A. J. Robert Conroy, 610 Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $42.25.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 1100 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N. C.

A. Wilmer A. Cooper, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,442.30. E. (9) $333.40.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $310.47.

A. Edward J. Coughlin, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $195. E. (9) $20.

A. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $9,000. E. (9) $8,967.38.

A. Council of Mechanical Speciality Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,695. E. (9) $11,158.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 173 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $238.85.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago & North Western Railway System, 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $28.29.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Club Managers Association of America, 408 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $8.63.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Joint Resolution 1955 Legislature, Post Office Box 3170, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Embassy of Denmark, 2374 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $101.63.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Ltd., et al.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2071 East 102d Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transamerica Corp., 4 Columbus Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $16,200. E. (9) $88.59.

A. Robert W. Coyne, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $623.29. E. (9) $360.72.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $236,708.88. E. (9) $561.90.

A. Robert A. Crichton, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $78.57. E. (9) $78.57.

A. Edward B. Crosland, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,375.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 540 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 613 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $781.19. E. (9) $781.19.

A. John C. Cuneo, Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,277.94. E. (9) $1,810.74.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $525.

A. Bernard Cushman, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Arnold H. Dadian, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D (6) $750. E. (9) $90.

A. R. Harvey Dastrup, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,406.25. E. (9) $50.51.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $932.81. E. (9) $320.62.

A. Bertram G. Davis, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 West Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $1,635.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Clearing Industrial District, Inc., 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Trustees under the will of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, in care of The Northern Trust Co., 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Ontario Land Co., 807 Lonsdale Building, Duluth, Minn.
E. (9) $693.64.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $230.85.

A. Sherlock Davis, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waters S. Davis, Jr., League City, Tex.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $202.75. E. (9) $202.75.

A. Paul J. Daugherty, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $213.78.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Tony T. Dechant, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Richard A. Dell, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $831.81.

A. Mary S. Deuel, 3026 Cambridge Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. R. T. DeVany, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,300.

A. George J. Dietz, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $883.75. E. (9) $8.08.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Sacramento-Yolo Port District, 705 California Fruit Building, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,736.40. E. (9) $111.40.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, 1234 Wishon Avenue, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $2,668.20. E. (9) $68.20.

A. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $7,500.

A. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $2,767.50.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Petroleum Industry Trade Association.
D. (6) $362.05. E. (9) $362.05.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $14,093.18. E. (9) $15,759.75.

A. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15,284.45.

A. Division 689, Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric Railway and Motor Coach Employees of America, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,399.60.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1523 L Street N W., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $437.51. E. (9) $6.

A. James L. Donnelly, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $425.80.

A. Robert F. Donoghue, 236 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,625.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U. S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,356.50. E. (9) $342.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $47.50.

A. James W. Douthat, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipelines.

A. W. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $2,033.33. E. (9) $225.

A. Ben Du Bois, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Stephen M. Du Brul, 11-134 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold R. Duffie, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Donald H. Dunham, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. J. R. Dunkerley, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $462.50. E. (9) $175.

A. Read P. Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $232.50. E. (9) $8.49.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $268.74.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $692.04.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $27.20.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,276. E. (9) $496.14.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $140. E. (9) $15.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, Homer Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,552.12.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $22.47.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 16th Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $29.61.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $5,102.50. E. (9) $69.85.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Ely, McCarty & Duncan, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.

A. Emergency Conservation Committee, 767 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $38.25. E. (9) $192.63.

A. K. Blyth Emmons, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Small Business Men's Association, Inc., 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $2,700. E. (9) $310.91.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
E. (9) $425.72.

A. Edward Falck & Co., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Gas distribution companies.
E. (9) $529.36.

A. Hugh F. Fall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $8.27.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $41,142.75. E. (9) $22,263.34.

A. Joseph G. Feeney, 201 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $150.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washintgon, D. C.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.; United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Asso-

ciation, Fellsmere, Fla.; Okeelanta Sugar Refinery, Inc., South Bay, Fla.
D. (6) $5,250.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $13.55.

A. Maurice W. Fillius, 703 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.
D. (6) $375.

A. Financial General Corporation, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $92.73.

A. Bernard M. Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $337.50.

A. Stephen Fitzgerald & Co., 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Berchmans T. Fitzpatrick, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $225.

A. Norman A. Flaningam, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Consolidated Natural Gas Co., 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,557.22. E. (9) $37.58.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 820 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $151.80.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Automatic Phonograph Manufacturers Association, 1603 Orrington Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

A. John F. Floberg, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Conference of Local Airlines, 800 World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,702.66.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
E. (9) $1,381.80.

A. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $4,750. E. (9) $2,503.51.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, Evans Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Forest Farmers Association, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. James W. Foristel, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $712.50. E. (9) $16.

A. James F. Fort, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $75.80.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. L. S. Franklin, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C.
D. (6) $535. E. (9) $535.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Book Publishers Council, Inc., 24 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,095. E. (9) $926.12.

A. Robert W. Frase, 812 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Committee for Books, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,825. E. (9) $1,751.85.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
D. (6) $3,900. E. (9) $1,124.

A. James G. Frechette, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Walter Freedman, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Patchogue-Plymouth Mills Corp., 295 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $22.58.

A. Elmer M. Freudenberger, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 5555 Ridge Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,500.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $266. E. (9) $50.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $13,165.35. E. (9) $16,157.33.

A. George Milan Fuller, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Nolen J. Fuqua, Duncan, Okla.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $1,087.59. E. (9) $1,087.59.

A. Henry T. Gage, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $537.64.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Gordon H. Garland, Post Office Box 507, Woodlake, Calif.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.
E. (9) $983.13.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $4.40.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,758.53. E. (9) $2,001.96.

A. Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd, 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $115.91.

A. Gus F. Geissler, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Interstate Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $183.15.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,868. E. (9) $108.50.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $541.59.

A. Leif Gilstad, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Henry W. Goodall, 28 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $293.49.

A. Nathaniel H. Goodrich, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $162.49. E. (9) $14.70.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,009.25. E. (9) $5,175.02.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (9) $75.20.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $19,155.50. E. (9) $8,546.32.

A. Robert A. Grant, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
B. The Ethanol Institute, 624 Associates Building, South Bend, Ind.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $325.72.

A. Mrs. Edward R. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $330. E. (9) $21.42.

A. Ernest W. Greene, 723 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, Post Office Box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Francis T. Greene, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $729.17.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, 15th and H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Weston B. Grimes, 436 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6.75.

A. I. J. Gronfine, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Carroll A. Gunderson, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $490. E. (9) $55.

A. James S. Gunn, 2110 Davenport Avenue, Richmond, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $105.

A. John J. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,519.96. E. (9) $285.25.

A. Mrs. Violet N. Gunther, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1341 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,669.98. E. (9) $165.95.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $803.08. E. (9) 596.01.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,560. E. (9) $210.65.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $362.21.

A. Hal H. Hale, 423 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,112.35. E. (9) $41.96.

A. Hugh F. Hall, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,062.50. E. (9) $8.27.

A. Radford Hall, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $2,500.01. E. (9) $393.82.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,875.12. E. (9) $236.19.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,591.31. E. (9) $466.31.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Murray Hanson, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $454.49.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96. E. (9) $39.90.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. Wade Harrison, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,750. E. (9) $17.50.

A. Merwin K. Hart, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $270.17.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 520 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Livestock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $46.50.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $16.

A. John C. Hazen, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $365.50.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $341.20.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $800.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $95.75. E. (9) $95.75.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, National Wool Trade Association, 283 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $44.10.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Hot House Vegetable Growers, Post Office Box 659, Terre Haute, Ind.

A. Clinton M. Hester, 426 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Brewers Foundation, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $333.32.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $107.07.

A. W. J. Hickey, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $196.88.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Buiding, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,333.76. E. (9) $83.76.

A. Claude E. Hobbs, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $3,200.

A. Charles Holloway, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $610.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Victor Hood, 4200 Clagett Road, Hyattsville, Md.
B. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union, 1141 North Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,540. E. (9) $790.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 1305 West 105th Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building,
B. Estate of Thomas C. Dennehy, deceased, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Samuel H. Horne, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Singer Manufacturing Co., 149 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $230.85.

A. Donald B. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Harold A. Houser, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Vernon F. Hovey, 101 Nott Terrace, Schenectady, N. Y.
B. National Dairy Products Corp., 260 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $467.49.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Harold K. Howe, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, Box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
D. (6) $2,649.99. E. (9) $1,280.10.

A. Harold K. Howe, 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lawn Mower Institute, Inc., 307 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. William T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,580. E. (9) $285.

A. Raymond E. Hughes, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $510. E. (9) $1,205.

A. C. E. Huntley, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $275.

A. W. C. Hushing, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,302. E. (9) $402.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,381.77.

A. Independent Advisory Committee to the Trucking Industry, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $13,497.50. E. (9) $10,315.69.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,020.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $29.30.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., W–1481 First National Bank Building, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $25.

A. Nelson P. Jackson, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co., Schenectady, N. Y.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $1,968.75. E. (9) $260.14.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Japanese American Citizens League.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $300.

A. Daniel Jaspan, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,010.43. E. (9) $110.

A. Ray L. Jenkins, 541 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Societe Internationale Pour Participatione Industrielles et Commerciales, S. A., Peter Kerianstr 19, Switzerland.

A. The Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Inc., 820 Highland Avenue, Newark, N. J.
D. (6) $215. E. (9) $2,157.66.

A. William T. Jobe, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Ice Industries, 810 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Forests, Inc., 810 Whittington Avenue, Hot Springs, Ark.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1,250.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson, Jr., 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,884.96. E. (9) $75.04.

A. W. D. Johnson, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $13.87.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 705 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The United States Potters Association, East Liverpool, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $735.41.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $294.90.

A. Wallace M. Jopling, People's Hardware Building, Lake City, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $450.

A. Journeymen Barbers and Hairdressers International Union.
E. (9) $2,540.

A. Orrin G. Judd, 655 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Dr. Ching-Lin Hsia and wife, Wai Tsung Hsai, 21 Park Place, Great Neck, N. Y.
E. (9) $5.17.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $950.96.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $62.05.

A. James C. Kelley, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1900 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Joseph Duff Kelly.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. James P. Kem, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $22,500.

A. Elizabeth A. Kendall, 2310 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $15.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Zionist Committee for Public Affairs, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $66.67. E. (9) $88.25.

A. William J. Kennard, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $641.67. E. (9) $123.85.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $228.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,100. E. (9) $190.30.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, 1148 Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $3,150. E. (9) $286.95.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,308.78. E. (9) $1,008.34.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Minot, De Blois & Maddison, 294 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $20.57.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $375.

A. King, Noble & Sonosky, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas R. Kingsley, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Bill Kirchner, Sauk Centre, Minn.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $2,475.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, postoffice box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $40.04.

A. Rowland F. Kirks, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,461.52. E. (9) $198.55.

A. Clarence C. Klocksin, 2649 North Hackett Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. The National Board of Fire Underwriters, 85 John Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $300.

A. Burt L. Knowles, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert M. Koch, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $40.

A. Robert M. Koch, 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 615 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $16.40.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Georgia Koonce, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $173. E. (9) $170.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,128.50. E. (9) $6,145.71.

A. Frank W. Kuehl, 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $575. E. (9) $109.35.

A. Catherine G. Kuhne, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,140. E. (9) $4,708.19.

A. Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James W. Lamberton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. A. M. Lampley, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $249.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West 11th Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $999.96.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, 718 Insurance Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $1,275.

A. William C. Lantaff, 916 DuPont Building, Miami, Fla.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $276.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $2,973.40.

A. La Roe, Winn & Moerman, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $3,476.29.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $134.64.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,749.98. E. (9) $147.07.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $75.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $5,754.68.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $62.54.

A. James R. Lee, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Water Heater Division, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $395.36.

A. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $541. E. (9) $963.40.

A. Legislative Committee of Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. G. E. Leighty, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Artemas C. Leslie, 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Cross Commission of the American Hospital Association, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Federation of Musicians, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,998.98. E. (9) $7,126.29.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,937.35. E. (9) $8,937.35.

A. Leo F. Lightner, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Engineers and Scientists of America, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 15th Street NW., Washintgon, D. C.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $55.57.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Leon Lipson, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Ball, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert W. Lishman, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $536.25. E. (9) $117.02.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navaho Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $10.

A. Walter J. Little, 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,324.68. E. (9) $1,800.96.

A. John M. Littlepage, 15th and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 418 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Oil Pipelines, 35 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $75. E. (9) $75.

A. Benjamin H. Long, 2746 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,450. E. (9) $1,205.44.

A. Leonard Lopez, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,749.93. E. (9) $15.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Joe T. Lovett, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. Lowenstein, Pitcher, Spence, Hotchkiss, Amann & Parr, 25 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $450.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic of Panama, Panama, Panama.
D. (6) $500.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Loan and Finance Corp., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Adolph von Zedlitz, 60 Sutton Place, South, New York, N. Y.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,718.75. E. (9) $50.59.

A. A. E. Lyon, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association.
D. (6) $750.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 530 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $1,541.70. E. (9) $454.39.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,937.50.

A. John A. McCart, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,997.66. E. (9) $43.10.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $390. E. (9) $143.37.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,550. E. (9) $189.30.

A. Angus McDonald, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,809.47. E. (9) $296.35.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, Esq., 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., 425 Crocker Building, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $28.07.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportes Maritimos Mexicanos, S. A. Avenue, Insurgentes No. 432, Mexico, D. F.
E. (9) $15.25.

A. Joseph A. McElwain, 500 Main Street, Deer Lodge, Mont.
B. The Montana Power Co., Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $781.25. E. (9) $1,315.32.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $200.

A. Thomas Edward McGrath, 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Taxpayers, U. S. A., 4012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. George McLain, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,300. E. (9) $2,230.91.

A. J. V. McLaughlin, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,623.75. E. (9) $406.81.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $850.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Optometric Association, 8001 Jenkins Arcade, Pittsburgh, Pa.
E. (9) $55.38.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Frankel Bros., 521 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.75.

A. John G. Macfarlan, Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Express Agency, 1503 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $161.60.

A. Maclay, Morgan & Williams, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Ship Owners, 76 Beaver Street, New York, N. Y.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1701 K Street NW., Washinton, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $383.23.

A. James Madaris, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Don Mahon, Box 959, Ben Franklin Station, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $470.21.

A. William J. Mahon, 1 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New York State.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1413 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,600. E. (9) $214.40.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, Post Office Box 1170, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $375.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,375. E. (9) $2,375.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1 West 47th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,625.78. E. (9) $58.34.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,319.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
E. (9) $1,272.58.

A. Winston W. Marsh, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $821.80. E. (9) $6.46.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112–18 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. Edwin G. Martin, 717 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kasser Distillers Products, Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $3.25.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee on Japanese American Evacuation Claims, 12427 Milton Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $199.56.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 1217 Hurley-Wright Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1759 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif.
E. (9) $75.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $426.

A. P. H. Mathews, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,617.50. E. (9) $1,796.96.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Waste Material Dealers, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $13.30.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $675. E. (9) $123.85.

A. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 17 Molton Building, Montgomery, Ala.
D. (6) $20,377.50. E. (9) $2,258.33.

A. The Merchants National Bank & Trust Co. of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Ross A. Messer, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, Post Office Box 1611, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $120.70.

A. J. T. Metcalf, 1002 L. & N. Building, Louisville, Ky.
E. (9) $361.92.

A. James G. Michaux, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $228.94.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,218.85.

A. Clarence R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Charles C. Miller, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $25.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, 1028 Electric Building, Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. The Blue Cross Commission, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $207.77.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Blue Shield Medical Care Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,250. E. (9) $249.03.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $2,226.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Northern Textile Association, Quinebaug-French River Manufacturers Association, and Abitibi Power and Paper Co.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $742.30.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., and Robert K. Eifler, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. John H. Davis, Harriett O. Davis, Harry Handley Cloutier, Elinor S. Cloutier, estate of Henri H. Cloutier, deceased, Marry M. Cloutier, executor, Margaret S. Cloutier, Seattle, Wash.

A. Seymour S. Mintz, William T. Plumb, Jr., Robert K. Eifler, and Richard A. Mullens, 810 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hughes Tool Co., Houston, Tex.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $311.02.

A. H. D. Mobley, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Vocational Association, Inc.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350. E. (9) $27.34.

A. F. E. Mollin, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $231.42. E. (9) $231.42.

A. Donald Montgomery, 777 14th Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,300. E. (9) $188.65.

A. Donald Montgomery, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $2,100. E. (9) $1,503.44.

A. Walter M. Moorman, 4650 East West Highway, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Maryland Railroad Association, c/o E. H. Burgess, 2 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $5.

A. Morrison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ford Motor Co., 3000 Schaefer Road, Dearborn, Mich.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $68.32.

A. Morrison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Group Health Dental Insurance, Inc., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.

A. Morrison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Salyer Water District, Post Office Box 488, Corcoran, Calif.
E. (9) $81.16.

A. Morrison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, The Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 114 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $90.

A. Giles Morrow, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,374.99. E. (9) $99.91.

A. Harold G. Mosier, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $609.05.

A. William J. Mougey, 802 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Movers Conference of America, Corner 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,008.12. E. (9) $2,008.12.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Howard E. Munro, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of the Panama Canal Zone, Post Office Box 471, Balboa Heights, C. Z.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $1,797.31.

A. Walter J. Munro, Hotel Washington, Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., National Building, Webster City, Iowa.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $300.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $118.75.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 7284, Station C, Atlanta, Ga.

A. National Agricultural Limestone Institute, Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,173.93. E. (9) $2,173.93.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,592.15. E. (9) $1,552.41.

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 601 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $14,356.25. E. (9) $100.87.

A. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,607.97. E. (9) $16,364.09.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 1415 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 96 Fulton Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,148.25. E. (9) $6,036.75.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $275.88.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, 724 9th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,931.58. E. (9) $1,378.90.

A. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $940.97. E. (9) $1,789.26.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, P. O. Box 2013, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $38,523.76. E. (9) $5,368.07.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,763.76. E. (9) $682.50.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $26,817.29.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $415,643.05. E. (9) $2,304.62.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Committee on Parcel Post Size and Weight Limitations, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $1,232.32.

A. National Committee of Shippers and Receivers, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $1,938.81.

A. National Conference for Repeal of Taxes on Transportation, care of D. G. Ward, Mathieson Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $6,168.52. E. (9) $6,168.52.

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,443. E. (9) $2,267.68.

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
E. (9) $245.02.

A. National Crushed Limestone Institute, Inc., 615 F Street NW., Washintgon, D. C.
D. (6) $631.93. E. (9) $631.93.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,480.79. E. (9) $1,883.32.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $141.59. E. (9) $141.59.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 14th Street NW., Washintgon, D. C.
D. (6) $146,652.38. E. (9) $29,115.20.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,267.89. E. (9) $2,267.89.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $17,246.20. E. (9) $17,983.72.

A. National Live Stock Tax Committee, 801 East 17th Avenue, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $4,433.50.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,790.36. E. (9) $2,535.17.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,453.58. E. (9) $4,453.58.

A. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $40,728.01. E. (9) $3,000.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $10,932.50. E. (9) $11,383.30.

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,519.56.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $345.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,588.84. E. (9) $8,011.66.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16,581.52. E (9) $16,581.52.

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,446.11. E. (9) $2,503.48.

A. National Small Business Men's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $5,227.87.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100,545.10. E. (9) $1,468.82.

A. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1661.79. E. (9) $1661.79.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Grandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $9,018. E. (9) $4,634.70.

A. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $8,082.61.

A. William S. Neal, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,083.36. E. (9) $2,598.59.

A. A. Z. Nelson, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $48.05.

A. George S. Newcomer, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.

A. Blake T. Newton, Jr., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,041.67.

A. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,250. E. (9) $3,934.81.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3,056.25.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, 11 East 51st Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,170. E. (9) $260.

A. Christian P. Norgord, 1617 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Humane Association, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,980. E. (9) $304.99.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $727.50. E. (9) $57.34.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers.
E. (9) $338.25.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Northern Hemlock & Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis..
D. (6) $100.

A. E. M. Norton, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $583.87.

A. Francis A. O'Connell, 625 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Division, Transport Workers Union, 80–07 Broadway, Elmhurst, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,885. E. (9) $938.45.

A. E. H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurnace Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6)) $9,108.25.

A. Robert E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42 Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Herbert R. O'Conor, Jr., 10 Light Street, Baltimore, Md.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $15.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theatre Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $2,213.89.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Mira Quesada 376, Of. 504, Lima, Peru.
E. (9) $57.03.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $97.85.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $14.90.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $15.20.

A. Graeme O'Geran, 131 Orvilton Drive, Dewitt, N. Y.
B. The Merchants National Bank & Trust Company of Syracuse, 216 South Warren Street, Syracuse, N. Y.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
E. (9) $1,141.59.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 600 Folger Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $28.85. E. (9) $4.

A. E. L. Oliver, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Robert Oliver, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,345.46. E. (9) $426.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,370. E. (9) $18.25.

A. Samuel Omasta, 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Agricultural Limestone Inst., Inc., 619 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $17.50.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $3,916.07.

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.
B. Missouri Railroad Committee.
E. (9) $375.53.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,690. E. (9) $429.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $89.80.

A. Pacific American Tankship Association, 25 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200.

A. Lovell H. Parker, 611 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Maryland Electronic Manufacturing Co., College Park, Md.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Record Industry Association of America, Inc., New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. A. Lee Parsons, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Manufacturers Institute, 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $48.63.

A. Patent Equity Association, Inc., 540 West 58th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,225. E. (9) $2559.05.

A. James G. Patton, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver 3, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $635.88.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Allstate Insurance Co., 7447 Skokie Boulevard, Skokie, Ill.
E. (9) $56.07.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clerk de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.08.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. N. R. Caine & Co., 40 Exchange Place, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $28.80.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. S. Gumbel Realty and Security Co., Inc., New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $69.44.

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Howard F. Knipp, 3401 South Hanover Street, Baltimore, Md.,

---

A. Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison, 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $64.34.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,916.66. E. (9) $228.71.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $945. E. (9) $500.

A. Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $22.65.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Georgia Power Co., 75 Marietta Street, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hugh Peterson, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Florida Citrus Mutual (Legislative Fund), Lakeland, Fla.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $202.66.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $36.42.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $167.79.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Box 111, Lakeland, Fla.
B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $40.81.

A. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. J. E. Phillips, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $750.

A. Albert T. Pierson, 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $213.66. E. (9) $232.55.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison, Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $62.50.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $114.45.

A. Piper & Marbury, 1000 Maryland Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. The Peoples Water Service Co., 1607 Mercantile Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
E. (9) $11.84.

A. B. J. Pittman, Jr., Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
E. (9) $408.28.

A. Walter C. Ploeser, 50 South Bemiston Avenue, Clayton, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,300.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunkist Growers, Inc., and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Portland, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $54.53. E. (9) $7.10.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West 50th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Nelson J. Post, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $5.25.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $7.40.

A. Homer V. Prater, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,939.84.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $21.60.

A. Public Information Committee of the Cotton Industries, 410 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1406 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $3,900.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Devalin Corp., 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $19.74.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Little & Christman, 120 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $843.75. E. (9) $199.89.

A. Edmund R. Purves, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $35.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
E. (9) $561.02.

A. Alex Radin, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,925.

A. Mrs. Richard G. Radue, 3406 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn.
D. (6) $130.80. E. (9) $134.73.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Sydney C. Reagan, 3840 Greenbrier, Dallas, Tex.
B. Southwestern Peanut Shellers Association, Box 48, Durant, Okla.
D. (6) $150.

A. Reasoner & Davis, 505 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Joint Committee of the National Creameries Association and the American Butter Institute, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,711.11.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $7,989.58. E. (9) $7,989.58.

A. James Francis Reilly, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Potomac Electric Power Co., 10th and E Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $8,000. E. (9) $175.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $32,952.85.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5,369.85. E. (9) 7,311.41.

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 11th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. P. F. Claveau, Post Office Box 1958, Anchorage, Alaska.

A. Roland Rice, 618 Perpetual Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Association, Inc., 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $858.75.

A. Harry Ricek, Preston, Md.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Siert Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,024.96.

A. C. E. Rightor, 3300 Rolling Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $511.16.

A. George D. Riley, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,899. E. (9) $438.

A. John J. Riley, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, 1128 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North 22d Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,080. E. (9) $940.61.

A. E. W. Rising, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, Post Office Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $417.36.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Frank L. Roberts, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $350. E. (9) $100.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $90.75.

A. Edward O. Rodgers, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $761.21.

A. George L. Rodgers, 1504 Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., the Montana Power Co., Portland General Electric Co., the Washington Water Power Co.
D. (6) $880. E. (9) $450.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Watson Rogers, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 827 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. James F. Rowan, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Movers Conference of America, 16th and P Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $93.75.

A. George B. Roscoe, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $5.60.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $540. E. (9) $126.19.

A. Horace Russell, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $180.05.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $240.55.

A. William H. Ryan, 303 Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, Medical Science Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,249.91. E. (9) $60.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $833.34. E. (9) $91.14.

A. Kimball Sanborn, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, 705 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Harrison Sasscer, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of Legislation and Federal Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $528.

A. Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens, 460 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Nurses' Association, 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $63.03.

A. Benjamin H. Saunders and Fuller Holloway, 1000 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sunray Mid-Continent Oil Co., Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $120.56.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. James J. Saxon, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Bankers Association, 12 East 36th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $344.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 77 Lincoln Street, Jersey City, N. J.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $1,360.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $8.54.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $50.

A. W. J. Sears, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $100.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

A. James D. Secrest, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Electronics-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harry See, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
E. (9) $9.35.

A. Howard L. Shannon, acting trustee for Color Legislative Fund, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $167.79.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,094. E. (9) $134.37.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,582.49.

A. Leander I. Shelley, 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., and Airport Operators Council, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $148.54.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $131.25.

A. Manly Sheppard, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Passaic Valley Sewerage Commission, 24 Branford Place, Newark, N. J.
E. (9) $12.

A. W. Lee Shield, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9.45. E. (9) $9.45.

A. Robert H. Shields, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. The Ship Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 720 Florida Title Building, Jacksonville, Fla.
E. (9) $1,350.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 801 International Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Paul Sifton, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America.
D. (6) $2,030. E. (9) $1,128.58.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $5,172.35.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $46.85.

A. Smaller Magazines Postal Committee, P. O. Box 975, New Canaan, Conn.
D. (6) $1,258. E. (9) $1,545.21.

A. R. S. Smethurst, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 2 East 48th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. T. W. Smiley, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,210.62.

A. Dudley Smith, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $4,250.

A. James R. Smith, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill., and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul Minn.
D. (6) $3,897.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.
B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 2140 P Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,100. E. (9) $67.40.

A. Wallace M. Smith, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Mutual Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Edward F. Snyder, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislative, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,326.92. E. (9) $159.17.

A. J. D. Snyder, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $346.15.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. J. Taylor Soop, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,027.83.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $17,798.28. E. (9) $26,003.53.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 19 East 92d Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $99. E. (9) $355.83.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West 104th Place, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $4,385.67.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150. E. (9) $27.50.

A. Preble Staver, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $32.45.

A. Samued Elliot Stavisky, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Asociacion de Colonos de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba and Asociacion Nacional de Hacendados de Cuba, Agramonte 465, Habana, Cuba.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $7,289.58.

A. Mrs. Nell F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northwest Station, Washington, D. C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Utility Trailer Rental Association, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Chicago Rental Trailer Association, Chicago, Ill.

A. William T. Stephens, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nationwide Trailer Rental System, 519 South Broadway, Wichita, Kans.

A. Herman Sternstein, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. O. David Zimring, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 214 Second Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $15,364.80. E. (9) $14,197.79.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $3.50.

A. Erskine Stewart, 801 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Improved United States-Japanese Trade Relations, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $120.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $958.34.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $592.59.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $125.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,538.46.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Allied Printing Trades Association, Box 728, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nation-Wide Committee of Industry, Agriculture, and Labor on Import-Export Policy, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,875.

A. Eugene C. Struckhoff, 95 North Main Street, Concord, N. H.
B. Boston & Maine Railroad, North Station, Boston, Mass.
E. (9) $1,706.95.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $8.

A. J. E. Sturrock, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, Post Office Box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,078.53.

A. Sullivan Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Fruit and Steamship Co., 964 St. Charles Avenue at Lee Circle, New Orleans, La.
D. (6) $6,500.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $475. E. (9) $129.31.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $212.50.

A. Glenn J. Talbott, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.

A. Clarence Talley, Route 1, Box 86, McLean, Va.
B. American Oil Co., 555 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
E. (9) $900.

A. Dwight D. Taylor, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $625.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $100. E. (9) $7.

A. Tyre Taylor, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $341.18.

A. Ruth E. Tegtmeyer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West 15th Street, Austin, Tex.
D. (6) $8,525. E. (9) $5,716.01.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
D. (6) $1,050. E. (9) $445.09.

A. W. M. Thomas, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Postal Transport Association, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,500. E. (9) $2,938.16.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,723.05.

A. Eugene M. Thore, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $34.01.

A. G. D. Tilghman, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled Officers Association, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $17.50.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Suburban Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $540.87. E. (9) $13.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 4200 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Solano County, Calif.
D. (6) $295. E. (9) $231.56.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,418.75. E. (9) $75.81.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Tomoka Land Co., Sebring, Fla.

A. Touche, Niven, Bailey & Smart, 208 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $243.12.

A. Harry L. Towe, 241 Main Street, Hackensack, N. Y.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $232.66.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $270. E. (9) $90.34.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,156.25. E. (9) $42.39.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
E. (9) $467.24.

A. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

A. U. S. Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. United States Citizens Association, Box 354, Balboa, C. Z.
D. (6) $3,917.15. E. (9) $5,525.11.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 801 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $39,174.04.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $20,446.15.

A. R. G. Van Buskirk, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Vegetable Growers Association of America, Inc., 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (9) $96.99.

A. Weston Vernon, Jr., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $56.25.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $27. E. (9) $27.

A. Addie W. Viars, 2818 Kenmore Road, Richmond, Va.
B. Ladies' Society of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 202 Rector Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $70.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Stanley W. Vogt, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,534.96. E. (9) $224.57.

A. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Claude R. Wallace, 1453 Harvard Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Woollen H. Walshe, 2800 Woodley Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Standard Oil Company of California, 1700 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $490.24. E. (9) $374.16.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $119.50. E. (9) $6.89.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employes' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,625.

A. Quaife M. Ward, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $45.

A. William C. Warren, 116th Street and Amsterdam Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Webb & Knapp., Inc., 383 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $339.16.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Washington Committee, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,750. E. (9) $6,750.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 1728 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,956.30. E. (9) $3,760.63.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 17711 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Waterways Council Opposed to Regulation Extension, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,420. E. (9) $1,080.81.

A. J. R. Watson, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, I. C. Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss.
E. (9) $598.16.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York City.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Hilary Waukau, Keshena, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association and the Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,069.67. E. (9) $1,555.33.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Philco Corp., Tioga and C Streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,699.60. E. (9) $600.87.

A. E. E. Webster, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Wayne M. Weishaar, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1115 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,300. E. (9) $3.53.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,499.96. E. (9) $326.57.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) 247.18.

A. Wenchel, Schulman & Manning, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Mary Clark de Brabant and Katherine C. Williams, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
E. (9) $3.09.

A. Monroe Weso, Zoar, Wis.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Keshena, Wis.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $640.81.

A. Robert V. Westfall, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. A. L. Wheeler, 911 Sheraton Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marvin Small, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., and J. George Spitzer, 923 Old Nepheran Avenue, Yonkers, N. Y.
E. (9) $50.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Montana Power Co., Electric Building, Butte, Mont.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Pacific Power and Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Water Power Co., Spokane, Wash.
E. (9) $1.25.

A. Wherry Housing Association, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $87.81.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Mutual Insurance Committee on Federal Taxation, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,160.69. E. (9) $2,160.69.

A. Albert E. Wilkinson, 417 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Anaconda Co., 616 Hennessy Building, Butte, Mont.
D. (6) $2,250. E. (9) $584.37.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Arapahoe Tribe of Indians, Wind River Reservation, Fort Washakie, Wyo.
E. (9) $18.81.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.
E. (9) $17.45.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Klamath Indian Tribe, Klamath Agency, Oreg.
E. (9) $20.93.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Menominee Tribe of Indians, Menominee Indian Agency, Keshena, Wis.
E. (9) $50.10.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 120 Danbury Street SW., Washington, D. C.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Quinaielt Indian Tribe, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribe, Wellpinit, Wash.
E. (9) $1.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun, Barker & Hawkins, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Ute Indian Tribe et al.
E. (9) $422.89.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Leon W. Williams, 2 Gouverneur Place, Bronx, N. Y.
D. (6) $1. E. (9) $5.18.

A. John C. Williamson, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $3,200. E. (9) $500.65.

A. Kenneth Williamson, Mills Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,568.87. E. (9) $367.07.

A. James L. Wilmeth, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The National Council of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America.
D. (6) $95.02. E. (9) $95.02.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 104 C Street NE., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,950. E. (9) $198.91.

A. Everett B. Wilson, Jr., 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $17.24.

A. Everett T. Winter, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 1978 Railway Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $824.39.

A. Wood, King & Dawson, 48 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $6,024.48.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 1828 Bank of Southwest Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., et al.
D. (6) $6,740.55. E. (9) $2,141.39.

A. Walter F. Woodul, 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
D. (6) $916.08. E. (9) $1,080.56.

A. Albert Young Woodward, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,196.20.

A. Frank K. Woolley, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 2300 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,437.50. E. (9) $89.05.

A. Edward W. Wootton, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Donald A. Young, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 9905, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,950.

A. William Zimmerman, Jr., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., 48 East 86th Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $114.29.

A. O. David Zimring, 11 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amalgamated Association of Street, Electric, Railway, and Motor Coach Employees of America, et al.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the second calendar quarter of 1956:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_____

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:
1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports. ☐

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed; (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

A. Charles J. Alexander, 1626 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz., and Norman M. Littell, 1826 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. American Monument Association, Inc., 282 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y.

A. American National Theatre and Academy, 1545 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Anti Tax Association of New York, 141 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Indians of California.

A. George E. Ashley, 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. Albert F. Beitel, 905 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircoach Transport Association, Inc., 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Adm. Frederick J. Bell, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. C. Blake Brown, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Power Reactor Development Co., care of the Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Harold J. Buoy, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.

A. William J. Burns, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Munitions Carriers Conference, 1424 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Edward T. Butler, 1191 Clay Avenue, Bronx 56, New York, N. Y.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

A. Clark & Lanahan, 700 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Robert W. Groves, John Morel, F. D. M. Strachan, Jr., and Thomas H. Adams, Savannah Bank & Trust Co. Building, Savannah, Ga.

A. Ernest W. Clausen, 531 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Coles & Goertner, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Browning Lines, Inc., 3050 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.

A. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Roberts Dairy Co., 4469 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. John W. Cross, 920 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Deutsche Amerikakohlen-Transportgesellschaft m. b. H. (American-German Coal Transport Co.), 17 Grabenstrasse, Dusseldorf, Germany.

A. Joan David, 4737 36th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans American Airlines, 1138 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Donald S. Dawson and Robert J. Bird, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., 720 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Michael B. Deane, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Watch Association, Inc., 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Westlands Water District, 1234 Wishon, Fresno, Calif.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Monsanto Chemical Co., World Center Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Rayon Staple Fiber Producers Association, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

A. Dwight, Royall, Harris, Koegel & Caskey, Wire Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.

A. Harold R. Duffie, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John W. English, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Russell J. Fisher, Gordonsville, Va.
B. National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Florida Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. O. J. Fox, Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla.
B. Welfare Federation Act Committee of 1,000, Inc., Post Office Box 916, Oklahoma City, Okla.

A. Gaston, Snow, Rice & Boyd, 82 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
B. American Research & Development Corp., 200 Berkeley Street, Boston, Mass.

A. C. O. Griffis, 435 North Walnut Street, Slater, Mo.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. James S. Gunn, 2110 Davenport Avenue, Richmond, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Moultrie Hitt, 718 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Kendall K. Hoyt, 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircoach Transport Association, Inc., 211 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.

A. W. J. Hynes, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad, 15th and Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Kansas City, Kans.

A. Joe Jenness, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. John G. Johnson, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. W. A. Key, 401 North Hays Avenue, Jackson, Tenn.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, ORC Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York City, N. Y.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, Chevy Chase Club, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. Patent Office Society, Post Office Box 685, Washington, D. C.

A. League of New York Theatres, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Charles E. McCarthy, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Council of Motion Picture Organizations, Inc., 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.

A. John E. McClure, 626 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Reading Co., Reading Terminal, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Harry B. Madsen, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Committee for Insurance Taxation, Hay-Adams House, Washington, D. C.

A. John J. Marr, 1098 Chapel Street, New Haven, Conn.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Joseph Meagher, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Competitive Television, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Michigan Railroads Association, 601 Prudden Building, Lansing, Mich.

A. Aubrey C. Mills, foot of Washington Avenue Bridge, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, foot of Washington Avenue Bridge, Minneapolis, Minn.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Area Employment Expansion Committee, 1144 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D. C.

A. National Association of Concert Managers, 30 Lafayette Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A. The National Association of the Legitimate Theatre, Inc., 234 West 44th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. National Association of Motor Bus Operators, 839 17th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Institute of Social Welfare, 1031 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Nordlinger, Riegelman, Benetar & Charney, 420 Lexingston Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang (wife), 157–16 20th Road, Whitestone, N. Y.

A. Robert J. O'Donnell, Majestic Theater Building, Dallas, Tex.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Fibres Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wool Stock Institute, 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, 4401 East Colonial Drive, Orlando, Fla.

A. Joseph O. Parker, 531 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Institute of American Poultry Industries, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Patent Office Society, Box 685, Washington, D. C.

A. Peoples Lobby, Inc., 1337 21st Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Phillips, Nizer, Benjamin & Krim, 1501 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Bulova Watch Co., New York, N. Y.

A. B. J. Pittman, Jr., care of Texas Employers Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas Employers Insurance Association, Dallas, Tex.

A. Kenneth Michael Plaisted, 152 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. National Board of Fur Farm Organizations.

A. Thomas L. Preston, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Thomas J. Quinlivan, 927 Olney Street, Rocky Mount, N. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. Earl G. Quinn, 9807 South Oakley Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Reasoner & Davis, 505 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Thomas E. Rhodes, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co., San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. John A. (Jack) Smith, Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.
B. Continental Air Lines, Inc., Stapleton Airfield, Denver, Colo.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. William L. Breese, Longview, Accokeek, Md.

A. Spencer, Moore & Whalen, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Josefa Kusiak, 4814 Dexter Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Preble Staver, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph M. Stone, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Local One, GCEOC, 1007 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Clarence Talley, Route 1, Box 86, McLean, Va.
B. American Oil Co., 555 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

A. William P. Tidwell, 925 15th Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Addie W. Viars, 2813 Kenmore Road, Richmond, Va.
B. Ladies' Society of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 202 Rector Building, Little Rock, Ark.

A. Bailey Walsh, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Nickel Co., Inc., 67 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Han Hong Wang and An-Yin Chen Wang (wife), 157–16 20th Road, Whitestone, N. Y.

A. Lloyd W. Weaver, 401 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

A. Wilmer & Broun, 616 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Bullard Co., Bridgeport, Conn.

A. Burton C. Wood, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Joseph M. Wyatt, 501 Keyser Building, Baltimore, Md.
B. Chesapeake Gardens, Inc., 2406 Greenmount Avenue, Baltimore, Md.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms.
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle.
Barrett, Frank A., *Wyo*.....The Woodner.
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bender, George H., *Ohio*.....120 Schotts Court NE.
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bricker, John W., *Ohio*.....The Mayflower.
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham.
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester.
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....3327 Cleveland Ave.
Clements, Earle C., *Ky*.....The Congressional
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Daniel, Price, *Tex*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Duff, James H., *Pa*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Flanders, Ralph E., *Vt*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
George, Walter F., *Ga*.....The Mayflower.
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.* University Club.
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Humphreys, Robert, *Ky*.....
Ives, Irving M., *N. Y*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Jenner, William E., *Ind*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4848 Upton St.
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Knowland, William F., *Calif.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Laird, William R. III, *W. Va*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lehman, Herbert H., *N. Y*.....Sheraton-Park
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Joseph R., *Wis*.....
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham.
Malone, George W., *Nev*.....The Mayflower.
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Edward, *Pa*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4545 Conn. Ave.
Millikin, Eugene D., *Colo*.....
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....5020 Lowell St.
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham.
Neely, Matthew M., *W. Va*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.* Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Payne, Frederick G., *Maine*.....
Potter, Charles E., *Mich*.....
Purtell, William A., *Conn*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, W. Kerr, *N. C*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, H. Alexander, *N. J*.....Sheraton-Park
Smith, Margaret Chase, (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John J., *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Thye, Edward J., *Minn*.....
Watkins, Arthur V., *Utah*.....
Welker, Herman, *Idaho*.....4823 Tilden St.
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Wofford, Thomas A., *S. C*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Clements, Humphrey, Scott, Symington, Aiken, Young, Thye, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Clements, Johnson of Texas, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young, Knowland, Thye, McCarthy, Mundt, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Dworshak, Dirksen, and Potter.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd, Johnson of Texas, Kefauver, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Saltonstall, Bridges, Flanders, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Duff, and Welker.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Robertson, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Lehman, Monroney, Morse, Capehart, Bricker, Ives, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Payne.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Neely (chairman), Bible, McNamara, Morse, Frear, Beall, Hruska, Case of New Jersey, and Allott.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd (chairman), George, Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Millikin, Martin of Pennsylvania, Williams, Flanders, Malone, Carlson, and Bennett.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. George (chairman), Green, Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Wiley, Smith of New Jersey, Hickenlooper, Langer, Knowland, Aiken, and Capehart.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Kennedy, Symington, Ervin, Humphrey, Wofford, McCarthy, Mundt; Mrs. Smith of Maine, Messrs. Cotton, Bender, and Martin of Iowa.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Laird, Scott, Millikin, Malone, Watkins, Dworshak, Kuchel, Barrett, and Goldwater.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Daniel, Ervin, Bible, Wofford, Bricker, Schoeppel, Butler, Potter, Duff, Purtell, and Payne.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, Daniel, O'Mahoney, Neely, Wiley, Langer, Jenner, Watkins, Dirksen, Welker, and Butler.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Neely, Lehman, Kennedy, McNamara, ———, Smith of New Jersey, Ives, Purtell, Goldwater, Bender, and Allott.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Hennings, Scott, Neuberger, Laird, Carlson, Jenner, Langer, Curtis, Martin of Iowa, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, Gore, McNamara, Neuberger, Wofford, ———, Martin of Pennsylvania, Case of South Dakota, Bush, Kuchel, Cotton, and Hruska.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Green (chairman), Hayden, Hennings, Gore, Mansfield, Jenner, Barrett, McCarthy, and Curtis.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Reed, of Kentucky, the Mayflower.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 3701 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Burton, of Ohio, the Dodge.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Minton, of Indiana, the Methodist Building.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—Harold B. Willey, 3214 N. Wakefield St., Arlington, Va.
Deputy Clerk—Reginald C. Dilli, 1329 Hemlock St.
Deputy Clerk—Hugh W. Barr, 4701 Connecticut Ave.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Road.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMERACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Puerto Rico.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Vermont, Connecticut, New York.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Burton, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Canal Zone.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Reed. Ohio, Michigan, Kentucky, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Minton. Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Nebraska, Missouri, Arkansas.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Washington, Oregon, Montana, Idaho, California, Nevada, Arizona, Alaska, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Oklahoma, New Mexico.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Polk, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Watts, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Anfuso, Bass of Tennessee, Mrs. Knutson, Messrs. Jennings, Matthews, Hope, August H. Andresen, Hill, Hoeven, Simpson of Illinois, Dague, Harvey, Lovre, Belcher, McIntire, Williams of New York, King of Pennsylvania, Harrison of Nebraska, Laird, Dixon, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Fernandez, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Sieminski, Evins, Lanham, Deane, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Murray of Illinois, Taber, Wigglesworth, Jensen, H. Carl Andersen, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Phillips, Scrivner, Coudert, Clevenger, Wilson of Indiana, Davis of Wisconsin, James, Ford, Miller of Maryland, Vursell, Hand, Ostertag, and Bow.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Brooks of Louisiana, Kilday, Durham, Rivers, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Green of Pennsylvania, Doyle, Wickersham, Miller of California, Pennett of Florida, Holtzman, Mollohan, Lankford, Huddleston, Short, Arends, Cole, Johnson of California, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Patterson, Cunningham, Bates, Hess, Nelson, Devereux, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson of California, Osmers, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, O'Hara of Illinois, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Fountain, Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Bell, Holland, Healey, Wolcott, Gamble, Talle, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Betts, Mumma, McVey, Hiestand, Nicholson, Oliver P. Bolton, and Bass of New Hampshire.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Harris, Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Klein, Teague of Texas, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson of Illinois, Williams of Mississippi, Steed, Wier, Jones of North Carolina, Rutherford, Simpson of Illinois, O'Hara of Minnesota, Talle, Miller of Nebraska, Auchincloss, Allen of California, Kearns, Patterson, Gubser, Broyhill, and Hyde.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Kelley of Pennsylvania, Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Metcalf, Bowler, Chudoff, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, McDowell, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, McConnell, Gwinn, Smith of Kansas, Kearns, Velde, Hoffman of Michigan, Bosch, Holt, Rhodes of Arizona, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Coon, and Fjare.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Richards (chairman), Gordon, Morgan, Carnahan, Chatham, Zablocki, Burleson, Hays of Arkansas, Mrs. Kelly of New York, Messrs. Dodd, Hays of Ohio, Donovan, Jarman, Byrd, Selden, Pilcher, Williams of New Jersey, Chiperfield, Vorys, Mrs. Frances P. Bolton, Messrs. Smith of Wisconsin, Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Morano, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Prouty, and Bentley.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson of Illinois (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Chudoff, Brooks of Texas, Holtzman, Mollohan, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Hoffman of Michigan, Riehlman, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Brownson, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Lipscomb, Reece of Tennessee, Younger, Knox, Krueger, Jonas, and Minshall.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Byrd, Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Dowdy, Long, Alexander, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, LeCompte, Morano, Schenck, Carrigg, Harrison of Nebraska, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Hillings, Oliver P. Bolton, Lipscomb, and Halleck.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Engle (chairman), Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Shuford, Powell, Edmondson, Metcalf, Christopher, Sisk, Udall, Diggs, Rutherford, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Miller of Nebraska, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Dawson of Utah, Westland, Pillion, Young, Hosmer, Rhodes of Arizona, Budge, Chenoweth, Utt, Mrs. Farrington, Messrs. Bartlett and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Priest (chairman), Harris, Klein, Carlyle, Williams of Mississippi, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Dollinger, Rogers of Texas, Dies, Fricdel, Flynt, Macdonald, Hayworth, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Wolverton, Hinshaw, O'Hara of Minnesota, Hale, Dolliver, Heselton, Bennett of Michigan, Hoffman of Illinois, Beamer, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Carrigg, and Derounian.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Frazier, Rodino, Jones of North Carolina, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Quigley, Boyle, Davidson, Keating, McCulloch, Miss Thompson of Michigan, Messrs. Hillings, Crumpacker, Miller of New York, Taylor, Burdick, Curtis of Massachusetts, Robsion of Kentucky, Hyde, Poff, Scott, and Cramer.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, Miller of California, Kluczynski, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Bell, Tumulty, Davidson, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Tollefson, Allen of California, Seely-Brown, Sheehan, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Cederberg, Baumhart, Chase, Norblad, and Bartlett.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray of Tennessee (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Dowdy, Alexander, Moss, Robeson of Virginia, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Fascell, Tumulty, Kilgore, Holifield, ———, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Mrs. St. George, Mr. Gross, Mrs. Harden, Messrs. Cretella, Gubser, Broyhill, Cederberg, Henderson, and Johansen.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Dempsey, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Steed, Thompson of Louisiana, Gentry, Burnside, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Rogers of Florida, Dingell, Dondero, McGregor, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scudder, George, Becker, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Alger, Bush, and Nicholson.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen of Illinois, Brown of Ohio, Ellsworth, and Latham.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Frazier, Willis, Velde, Kearney, Jackson, and Scherer.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Long, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Edmondson, Boykin, Aspinall, O'Brien of New York, Shuford, Christopher, Diggs, Sisk, Haley, ———, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Kearney, Ayres, Adair, Fino, Weaver, Avery, Thomson of Wyoming, Siler, and Teague of California.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Cooper (chairman), Mills, Gregory, Forand, Eberharter, King of California, O'Brien of Illinois, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison of Virginia, Karsten, Herlong, McCarthy, Ikard, Machrowicz, Reed of New York, Jenkins, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Kean, Mason, Holmes, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Sadlak, Baker, and Curtis of Missouri.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017

Circuit Judges

	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Oliver 2-3263
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-0544
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Adams 2-6327
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	District 7-4704
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.
Sterling 3-5700	Emerson 2-6253

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Vacancy.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Noble J. Johnson, of Indiana, 4318 Warren St.
Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St. North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—William P. Cole, Jr., of Maryland, 100 West University Parkway, Baltimore, Md.
Judge—Joseph R. Jackson (retired), of New York, Westchester Apts.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Benjamin H. Littleton, of Tennessee, 2737 Devonshire Place.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don. N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Road, Sumner, Md.

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
Judge—Walter C. Lindley, Danville, Ill. (United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.)
Judge—Bolitha J. Laws, Washington, D. C. (Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Edward M. Curran
James W. Morris	Edward A. Tamm
David A. Pine	Charles F. McLaughlin
Matthew F. McGuire	James R. Kirkland
Henry A. Schweinhaut	Burnita S. Matthews
Alexander Holtzoff	Luther W. Youngdahl
Richmond B. Keech	Joseph C. McGarraghy

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*----
Abernethy, Thos. G., *Miss*--6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*--------4200 Cathedral Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*---
Albert, Carl, *Okla*---------
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*--
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*---------
Allen, John J., Jr., *Calif*---
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*----------University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*---4545 Conn. Ave.
Andresen, August H., *Minn*-
Andrews, George W., *Ala*---3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*----
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*-------4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*---
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*---
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*--Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*-113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*---
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*---

Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va*-
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*---
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*-
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*--2601 Woodley Pl.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*----
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*--------
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*----------
Bates, William H., *Mass*----
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*-
Beamer, John V., *Ind*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*-----
Belcher, Page, *Okla*--------
Bell, John J., *Tex*----------
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*---1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*----5804 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*---
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*--------2720 Terrace Road SE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*----
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*----
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, *Ga*--
Boggs, Hale, *La*-----------
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*---
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*------3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P., *Ohio*---2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bolton, Oliver P., *Ohio*----
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*--The Dorchester
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*-----
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*-------4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowler, James B., *Ill*------
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*-----The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*------
Bray, William G., *Ind*------
Brooks, Jack B., *Tex*-------
Brooks, Overton, *La*-------4413 46th St.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*--Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*----------Boston House
Brownson, Charles B., *Ind*-
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*-------
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*--
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*---
Burdick, Usher L., *N. Dak*--
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*------2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burnside, M. G., *W. Va*----
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*---------
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*----
Byrne, James A., *Pa*-------
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*-----1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.

Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*-----
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*------
Carlyle, F. Ertel, *N. C*------The Washington
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*----
Carrigg, Joseph L., *Pa*-----
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*-
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*-----The Mayflower
Chase, Jackson B., *Nebr*---Sheraton-Park
Chatham, Thurmond, *N. C*-
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*----------
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*-
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*--1713 House Office Building
Christopher, George H., *Mo*.
Chudoff, Earl, *Pa*---------
Church, Marguerite Stitt, *Ill*. 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*-------3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Clevenger, Cliff, *Ohio*------The Jefferson
Cole, W. Sterling, *N. Y*----1610 44th St.
Colmer, William M., *Miss*--
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*----2480 16th St.
Coon, Sam, *Oreg*----------
Cooper, Jere, *Tenn*--------The Washington
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*-----
Coudert, F. R., Jr., *N. Y*----
Cramer, William C., *Fla*---Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Cretella, Albert W., *Conn*--
Crumpacker, Shepard J., Jr., *Ind*.
Cunningham, Paul, *Iowa*--
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*----3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*-----

Dague, Paul B., *Pa*---------
Davidson, Irwin D., *N. Y*---
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*------4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis*------2550 South Joyce, Arlington, Va.
Davis, James C., *Ga*-------
Dawson, William A., *Utah*--
Dawson, William L., *Ill*---
Deane, Charles B., *N. C*----
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*----
Dempsey, John J., *N. Mex*--2500 Q St.
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*--
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*-
Devereux, James P. S., *Md*-
Dies, Martin, *Tex*----------
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*-2705 13th St. NE.
Dingell, John D., *Mich*------
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*-
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*----
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*----
Dolliver, James I., *Iowa*----3752 Jocelyn St.
Dondero, George A., *Mich*--The Continental
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*-
Donovan, James G., *N. Y*--
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*-----
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*----
Dowdy, John, *Tex*----------
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*--------3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*-----The Lee House

Eberharter, Herman P., *Pa*-3101 4th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*-----
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*----------
Ellsworth, Harris, *Oreg*----4301 Mass. Ave.
Engle, Clair, *Calif*---------3840 Lorcom Lane Arlington, Va.
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*--------5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*-----

Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*-----
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*-
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*--------3725 Macomb St.
Fernandez, A. M., *N. Mex*--200 C St. SE.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*--------
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*---------Calvert-Woodley
Fjare, Orvin B., *Mont*-----
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*-------The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*-----
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*-----3627 Chesapeake St.
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*------4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*--514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*--------
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*------The Westchester
Frazier, Jas. B., Jr., *Tenn*--Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*----
Fulton, James G., *Pa*-------

Gamble, Ralph A., *N. Y*---
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*---
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*------
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*-------6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*--------
Gentry, Brady, *Tex*--------
George, Myron V., *Kans*---3801 Rodman St.
Gordon, Thomas S., *Ill*----
Grant, George M., *Ala*-----4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*------
Green, Edith, *Oreg*--------
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*--
Gregory, Noble J., *Ky*------2401 Calvert St.
Griffiths, Martha W., *Mich*-
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*---------
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*---
Gwinn, Ralph W., *N. Y*----

Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*------
Hale, Robert, *Maine*-------2722 N St.
Haley, James A., *Fla*-------
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*---4926 Upton St.
Hand, T. Millet, *N. J*------
Harden, Cecil M., *Ind*-----The Congressional
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*------
Harris, Oren, *Ark*---------1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*------4519 So. 34th St., Arlington, Va.
Harrison, Robert D., *Nebr*--
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind*--------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hays, Brooks, *Ark*---------314 2d St. SE.
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*------Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Hayworth, Don, *Mich*------
Healey, James C., *N. Y*-----
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*-----104 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*--
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*----
Heselton, John W., *Mass*---
Hess, William E., *Ohio*-----
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*--
Hill, William S., *Colo*------110 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hillings, Patrick J., *Calif*--
Hinshaw, Carl, *Calif*-------
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*--100 Maryland Ave NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*---Methodist Bldg.
Hoffman, Richard W., *Ill*---
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*------
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*------
Holmes, Hal, *Wash*--------
Holt, Joe, *Calif*----------
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*----
Hope, Clifford R., *Kans*----3541 Brandywine St.
Horan, Walt, *Wash*--------
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*-------
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala*.
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*-------
Hyde, DeWitt S., *Md*-------

Ikard, Frank, *Tex*---------

Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*--
James, Benjamin F., *Pa*----200 C St. SE.
Jarman, John, *Okla*-------
Jenkins, Thomas A., *Ohio*--The Mayflower
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*------
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*------2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*-
Johnson, Leroy, *Calif*------630 North Carolina Ave. SE.
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*----3816 Pope St. SE.
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*-
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*--------3613 Greenway Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Jones, Robert E., Jr., *Ala*---
Jones, Woodrow W., *N. C*--
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*----3083 Ordway St.

Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*----
Kean, Robert W., *N. J*-----2435 Kalorama Road
Kearney, B. W. (Pat), *N. Y*-
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*-----Sheraton-Park
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*-1612 34th St.
Kee, Elizabeth, *W. Va*-----
Kelley, Augustine B., *Pa*---
Kelly, Edna F., *N. Y*-------
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*----The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*-The Gen. Scott
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*-------3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*-------
King, Cecil R., *Calif*-------
King, Karl C., *Pa*----------
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*--
Klein, Arthur G., *N. Y*-----
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*---
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*-----
Knutson, Coya, *Minn*------
Krueger, Otto, *N. Dak*-----112 Schotts Court NE.

Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*
Lane, Thomas J., *Mass*
Lanham, Henderson, *Ga*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md*
Latham, Henry J., *N. Y*
LeCompte, Karl M., *Iowa*—Sheraton-Park
Lesinski, John, Jr., *Mich*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif*
Long, George S., *La*—2136 31st St. SE.
Lovre, Harold O., *S. Dak*—1605 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md.
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*—419 Raymond St., Chevy Chase, Md.
McConnell, Samuel K., Jr., *Pa.*
McCormack, John W., *Mass*—The Washington
McCulloch, Wm. M., *Ohio*—Westchester Apts.
McDonough, G. L., *Calif*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McGregor, J. Harry, *Ohio*—The Westchester
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C*—1201 S. Barton St., Arlington, Va.
McVey, William E., *Ill*—The Coronet
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—812 Park Ave., Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash*
Mahon, George H., *Tex*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn*
Martin, Jos. W., Jr., *Mass*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
Meader, George, *Mich*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont*
Miller, A. L., *Nebr*—2801 East-West Highway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Miller, Edward T., *Md*—2901 Conn. Ave.
Miller, George P., *Calif*
Miller, William E., *N. Y*—3708 Calvend Lane, Kensington, Md.
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio*
Mollohan, Robert H., *W. Va.*
Morano, Albert P., *Conn*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa*
Morrison, James H., *La*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa*—The Coronet
Murray, James C., *Ill*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn*
Natcher, William H., *Ky*—5108 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
Nelson, Charles P., *Maine*
Nicholson, D. W., *Mass*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill*—The Congressional
O'Hara, Joseph P., *Minn*—2813 31st St.
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thomas P., Jr., *Mass.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y*—100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Passman, Otto E., *La*
Patman, Wright, *Tex*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Patterson, James T., *Conn.*
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky*
Pfost, Gracie, *Idaho*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass*
Phillips, John, *Calif*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y*
Poage, W. R., *Tex*—2309 Skyland Pl. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va*
Polk, James G., *Ohio*
Powell, Adam C., Jr., *N. Y*
Preston, Prince H., Jr., *Ga*
Price, Melvin, *Ill*
Priest, J. Percy, *Tenn*—The Berkshire
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Quigley, James M., *Pa*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich*
Radwan, Edmund P., *N. Y*
Rains, Albert, *Ala*
Ray, John H., *N. Y*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn*
Reed, Daniel A., *N. Y*—The Woodner
Rees, Edward H., *Kans*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis*—1650 30th St.
Rhodes, George M., *Pa*—1809 Franklin St. NE.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz*
Richards, James P., *S. C*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robeson, Edward J., Jr., *Va.*
Robsion, John M., Jr., *Ky*—1500 Delafield Pl.
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo*
Rogers, Edith Nourse, *Mass*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex*
Sadlak, Antoni N., *Conn*
St. George, Katharine, *N. Y.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio*—3801 Conn. Ave., Apt. 307
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio*—The Mayflower
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Scrivner, Errett P., *Kans*—2331 Cathedral Ave.
Scudder, Hubert B., *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Seely-Brown, Horace, Jr., *Conn.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—4625 B 36th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Sheehan, Timothy P., *Ill*
Shelley, John F., *Calif*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif*
Short, Dewey, *Mo*
Shuford, George A., *N. C*—Sheraton-Park
Sieminski, Alfred D., *N. J*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa*—5205 Lawn May, Chevy Chase, Md.
Simpson, Sid, *Ill*—2100 Mass. Ave.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss*
Smith, Howard W., *Va*—204 W. Walnut St. Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Lawrence H., *Wis*—2480 16th St.
Smith, Wint, *Kans*
Spence, Brent, *Ky*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla*
Sullivan, Leonor K., *Mo*
Taber, John, *N. Y*
Talle, Henry O., *Iowa*—4613 Harrison St.
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex*—6015 Mass. Ave.
Thomas, Albert, *Tex*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex*—Sheraton-Park
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, Ruth, *Mich*
Thompson, T. A., *La*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, E. Keith, *Wyo*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash*
Trimble, James W., *Ark*
Tuck, William M., *Va*
Tumulty, T. James, *N. J*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz*
Utt, James B., *Calif*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Velde, Harold H., *Ill*
Vinson, Carl, *Ga*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Vorys, John M., *Ohio*—2032 Belmont Rd.
Vursell, Charles W., *Ill*—The Congressional
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa*
Watts, John C., *Ky*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Westland, Jack, *Wash*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Wickersham, Victor, *Okla*
Widnall, William B., *N. J*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn*
Wigglesworth, R. B., *Mass*—3257 N. St.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss*—1001 26th Road S., Arlington, Va.
Williams, William R., *N. Y*—1241 Pa. Ave. SE.
Willis, Edwin E., *La*
Wilson, Earl, *Ind*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis*
Wolcott, Jesse P., *Mich*—3707 Thornapple St., Chevy Chase
Wolverton, Charles A., *N. J*—1336 HOB
Wright, Jim, *Tex*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill*
Young, Clifton (Cliff), *Nev*—2705 Westminister Pl., Alexandria, Va.
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y*

DELEGATES

Bartlett, E. L. (Bob), 1718 33d Pl. SE. *Alaska.*
Farrington, Mrs. Joseph R., *Hawaii.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 1732 S St. SE.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATE

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
J. Chester Wilfong, 4408 Fourth Road North, Arlington, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 400 Williamsburg Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 1200 North Stuart St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 4820 Linnean Ave.
F. S. Milberg, 5032 Massachusetts Ave.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Paul L. Miller (clerk), Shadyside, Md.
Sidney W. Williston (assistant clerk), 1830 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1921 You Place, SE.